

The Illusion of the *Prima Pratica* and *Seconda Pratica* in the Music of Willaert and Rore

Karen Atkins

A thesis submitted to the faculty of the University of North Carolina at Chapel Hill in partial fulfillment of the requirements for the degree of Master of Arts in the Department of Music (Musicology).

Chapel Hill
2012

Approved by:

Anne MacNeil

Tim Carter

John Nádas

© 2012
Karen Atkins
ALL RIGHTS RESERVED

ABSTRACT

KAREN ATKINS: The Illusion of the *Prima Pratica* and *Seconda Pratica* in the Music of Willaert and Rore
(Under the direction of Anne MacNeil)

In his famous “Dichiaratione” defending Claudio Monteverdi from Giovanni Maria Artusi, Giulio Cesare Monteverdi listed Adrian Willaert as the composer that typified the *prima pratica* and Cipriano de Rore as the leader of the the *seconda pratica*. Giulio Cesare Monteverdi’s construction of the *prima* and *seconda pratica* and the composers who supposedly typify it is a strategy in his debate with Artusi, but the accuracy of his assessment has been taken for granted by musicologists. I uncouple the analysis of Willaert and Rore’s music from the writings of Giulio Cesare Monteverdi. The end results of this analysis show Willaert and Rore to be clear contemporaries in style, with Willaert more progressive in his text setting than his *prima pratica* association indicates, and Rore frequently following the older eight-mode system that informed the publication of his first books of madrigals.

Acknowledgements

I would be remiss if I did not acknowledge the various sources of help and support, academic and otherwise, that I received during the writing of this thesis. I sincerely thank, first of all, my advisor Anne MacNeil, who provided valuable insight and support throughout the entire process of research, composition, and editing. I likewise thank my committee, Tim Carter and John Nádas for their comments and insight. My colleagues Megan Eagen and Samuel Brannon were always willing to discuss with me various aspects of my research, and their perspectives informed my own thinking. My parents and sister offered their encouragement and proofreading expertise. And finally, I am grateful to my husband, Steve Mann, without whose steadfast support I would never have been able to finish this thesis.

Table of Contents

List of Examples.....	vi
-----------------------	----

Chapters

1. Historical Context.....	1
2. Comparison by Mode: “Mia benigna fortuna” and “O Invidia”.....	26
3. Comparison by Common Italian Text: “Quando fra l’altre donne”.....	43
4. Comparison by Common Latin Text: “O socii”.....	66
5. Rore’s Fifth Book, “Concordes adhibite animos” and Willaert’s F Ionion Pieces.....	83
Conclusions.....	99
Examples	106
Bibliography.....	141

List of Examples

Example

1. “Mia benigna fortuna” by Cipriano de Rore.....106
2. “O Invidia” by Adrian Willaert.....109
3. “Quando fra l’altre donne” by Adrian Willaert.....115
4. “Quando fra l’altre donne” by Cipriano de Rore.....120
5. “O socii” by Cipriano de Rore.....124
6. “O socii” by Adrian Willaert.....130
7. “Concordes adhibite animos” by Cipriano de Rore.....137

Chapter 1: Historical Context

When Giulio Cesare Monteverdi defended his brother from the accusations of Giovanni Maria Artusi in the 1607 version of Claudio Monteverdi's *Scherzi musicali*, he expounded somewhat on the idea of the *seconda pratica* that Claudio Monteverdi had introduced in his 1605 *Quinto libro de madrigali*. As Tim Carter has noted, the technique of using the *prima* and *seconda pratica* is particularly clever because it allowed the Monteverdi brothers to dismiss Artusi's critiques as simply inapplicable.¹ Giulio Cesare and Claudio Monteverdi, however, took their argument beyond a simple old versus new narrative. They addressed the fact that Artusi had a distinguished pedagogical pedigree and the implicit authority of his teachers. Artusi had studied with Gioseffo Zarlino, author of *Le institutioni harmoniche* and *maestro di cappella* at S. Marco in Venice from 1565-1590. That Artusi had studied with Zarlino was hardly a secret; he established himself as one of his teacher's staunchest defenders against Zarlino's wayward pupil Vincenzo Galilei, created a compendium of *Le institutioni harmoniche*, and wrote a eulogy for Zarlino in 1604. That Artusi wrote a eulogy for his teacher fourteen years after Zarlino died testifies to a strong devotion to Zarlino and perhaps also serves to give Artusi some scholarly credibility in the midst of his debates with Ercole Bottrigari and L'Ottuso Academico. Zarlino had studied with Adrian Willaert, the well-known

¹ Tim Carter, "Artusi, Monteverdi, and the Poetics of Modern Music," *Musical Humanism and its Legacy: Essays in Honor of Claude V. Palisca*, ed. Nancy Kovaleff Baker and Barbara Russano Hanning (Stuyvesant, NY: Pendragon Press, 1992), 187.

composer and *maestro di cappella* of the Basilica of S. Marco in Venice from 1527-1562.

Zarlino's long-standing position at S. Marco, his studies with Willaert, and the clear, significant respect paid to Willaert in *Le institutioni harmoniche* all emphasize Zarlino's connection to Willaert, just as Artusi marked his own connection to Zarlino.

Claudio Monteverdi attempted to establish his own credibility and authority by citing his employer, the Duke of Mantua, in his 1605 letter. Giulio Cesare Monteverdi took this idea further in his explanation of the *prima* and *seconda pratica*. He listed composers for each practice, placing older, but still revered composers in the *prima pratica*: Johannes Ockeghem, Josquin, Pierre de la Rue, Jean Mouton, Thomas Crecquillon, Clemens non Papa, and Nicolas Gombert. To this list, G. C. Monteverdi added Willaert, who perfected the style, and Zarlino, its codifier. In this way, G. C. Monteverdi clearly established Willaert and Zarlino, Artusi's two main sources of authority, as belonging to a notably earlier idiom. He also avoided unduly slighting the established figures of Willaert and Zarlino by granting them special prominence in their style. G. C. Monteverdi also provided an established composer to head the *seconda pratica*: Cipriano de Rore. Rore was allegedly a student of Willaert's and even succeeded Willaert (very briefly) at S. Marco from 1563-1564. He also held a position at the Ferrarese court from 1546-1559, where he met Giaches de Wert, who was *maestro di cappella* at the Basilica of S. Barbara in neighboring Mantua. G. C. Monteverdi, then, could trace his brother's authority through connections to Wert and then to Rore. Part of Rore's appeal to G. C. Monteverdi's argument lay in his undisputed position among the past musical luminaries. Artusi could, and did, cite Rore's music as exemplifying proper musical practices as Artusi understood them.

Giulio Cesare Monteverdi's concept of *prima* and *seconda pratica* was a shrewd rhetorical device that separated Artusi from Claudio Monteverdi and thus aimed to nullify Artusi's critiques. The musical specifics of *prima* and *seconda pratica* are far more vague. Neither Monteverdi was a music theorist. G. C. Monteverdi bungled his discussion of modes in the "Dichiaratione."² And although Claudio Monteverdi promised a theoretical treatise on the *seconda pratica* in his letter of 1605, he never mentioned it again until Giovanni Battista Doni wrote to ask him about it in 1633. Monteverdi's response to that inquiry was simply to state that he did not have time to finish it. No one has found a trace of evidence that Monteverdi ever actually undertook that project. At most, the designations of *prima* and *seconda pratica* in Giulio Cesare's "Dichiaratione" could be ascribed to a general (and natural) stylistic difference between different generations of composers. But G. C. Monteverdi drew a line of demarcation separating Willaert and Rore, both of whom were forty years removed from the modern music scene of the early seventeenth century. His characterization of them still influences the scholarship on the two composers today.

As discussed above, the distinction that G. C. Monteverdi drew between Willaert and Rore can be attributed to rhetorical strategy. Yet this stylistic divide is assumed in almost all modern scholarship. Martha Feldman, for example, explicitly positions all of Rore's work following his first three books of madrigals as belonging to his *seconda pratica* style, although her book primarily focuses on Rore's earlier work.³ In Feldman's

² For an accurate modal analysis of "Quando, signor, lasciate," see Robert G. Luoma, "Relationships between Music and Poetry (Cipriano da Rore's 'Quando, signor, lasciate')," *Musica Disciplina* 31 (1977): 135-54.

³ Martha Feldman, *City Culture and the Madrigal at Venice* (Berkeley: University of California Press, 1995), 426.

evaluation of Rore as foil for Willaert, however, she is heavily influenced by the ideal of Rore as the groundbreaking *seconda pratica* composer and Willaert as the culmination of the *prima pratica*. This association pervades modern scholarship, even when the two composers are considered separately. Part of this pattern in Willaert scholarship, for example, depends on uncritically following G. C. Monteverdi when he declares Zarlino the codifier of the *prima pratica* (and of Willaert's music). That Zarlino highly admired Willaert and was strongly influenced by him is undeniable. That Zarlino codified Willaert's style in *Le institutione harmoniche*, however, is oversimplification. In the practical sections of *Le institutione harmoniche*, Zarlino described the basics of composition, frequently offering Willaert's music as exemplary. Willaert's music here serves to show the reader the various incarnations and permutations of the basic principle when utilized by a skilled composer. In no way did Zarlino encompass all of Willaert's style through his writing, and Willaert's music is far more complex than Zarlino's introductory text can describe.

Gaspar Stocker, another theorist writing slightly later than Zarlino, wrote more of an encomium to Willaert in his treatise on music text setting. To Stocker, Willaert was the innovator of an entirely new style of treating text, although how much of Willaert's music he knew first-hand and how much he knew only by reputation is open to question. Stocker's definition of innovative text setting lumps together Willaert and his pupils, in contrast to an older generation of composers exemplified by Josquin. Rore fits into this new style and, in fact, he follows some of Stocker's guidelines more closely than does Willaert.

I argue that G. C. Monteverdi's designation of *seconda pratica* is analogous to what Stocker labeled as innovative forms of text setting at a generation's remove. The trend of diametrically splitting contemporary composers from their predecessors has considerable precedent in Renaissance music treatises, and the work of older composers was rarely given much reverence. Tinctoris wrote in 1477 that "...it is a matter of great surprise that there is no composition written over forty years ago which is thought by the learned to be worthy of performance."⁴ Tinctoris's stated viewpoint is more extreme than Monteverdi's; the tradition of lauding newer composers in comparison to the old, however, gives Monteverdi's placement of Willaert (and therefore Artusi) in the *prima pratica* a derogatory subtext.

The purpose of this thesis is to examine the madrigals of Willaert and Rore and to compare their styles with a view toward complicating the false dichotomy of *prima pratica* and *seconda pratica*. Analysis will focus on handling of text and mode, the two main factors cited by Giulio Cesare Monteverdi in defining the *prima pratica* and *seconda pratica*. Willaert's and Rore's musical styles will be compared both to Zarlino's principles and to Stocker's. Stocker, though not as precise as Zarlino, is vital for techniques specifically concerning text setting. In order to make comparative studies as valid as possible, my analysis first focuses on "competitive" settings of common secular texts and then on settings of sonnets by Petrarch, which are further refined by common

⁴ Quoted in Piero Weiss and Richard Taruskin, *Music in the Western World: A History in Documents*, 2nd ed (Belmont, CA: Thomson Schirmer, 2008), 68; Johannes Tinctoris, *Liber de arte contrapuncti* [1477], trans. Albert Seay (Rome, American Institute of Musicology, 1961), 15-16.

mode.⁵ The repertoire for Willaert is excerpted from the *Musica nova* madrigals, together with one piece published in a book of Rore's madrigals. In order to avoid rehashing work done on Rore's earlier style, the repertoire for Rore primarily consists of madrigals dating after 1548, from what Feldman calls his *seconda pratica* style. The picture that emerges from the analysis shows contemporary composers with distinct styles, both of whom are conscious of the ways in which words and meaning interact with music.

After Artusi criticized Monteverdi's dissonances (and elaborated on them in mathematical terms), he moved on to briefly criticize Monteverdi's use of mode before launching into a long, involved explanation of modal theory. Artusi faulted "Cruda Amarilli" for having more cadences on C than G when the piece was supposedly in G Mixolydian mode. A G Mixolydian piece, according to Artusi, would have regular cadences on G and D, but not C. He also criticized "O Mirtillo" for seeming to begin in one mode and end in a different, unrelated one.⁶ Giulio Cesare Monteverdi fiercely defended his brother against Artusi's criticism:

L'Artusi has likewise explained and demonstrated the confusion introduced into the composition by those who begin in one mode, follow this with another, and end with one wholly unrelated to the first and second ideas, which is like hearing the talk of a madman...Poor fellow he does not perceive that, while he is posing before the world as preceptor ordinary, he falls into the error of denying the mixed modes... The madrigal "Quando, signor, lasciaste" of the divine Cipriano de Rore which begins in the eleventh mode, passes into the second and tenth in the

⁵ On competitive settings, see Howard Mayer Brown, "Emulation, Competition, and Homage: Imitation and Theories of Imitation in the Renaissance," *Journal of the American Musicological Society* 35 (1982): 1-48.

⁶ Giovanni Maria Artusi, *L'Artusi overo Dell imperfettioni della moderna musica*, trans. Malcolm Litchfield (M.A. thesis, Brigham Young University, 1987), 343-5. Intriguingly, the reciting tone of Hypomixolydian mode is C, a fact which will later become significant.

middle, and ends in the first [mode], and the second part in the eighth—would not this thing of Cipriano's be a truly trifling vanity? But let the opponent read chapter 14 of the fourth book of the Reverend Zarlino's *Institutions*, and he will learn.⁷

Of course, the idea that Artusi was unfamiliar with Zarlino's writings was absurd given his status of loyal pupil and staunch defender of Zarlino. By directing Artusi to study Zarlino, G. C. Monteverdi was probably responding sarcastically to Artusi's rather grating habit of referring the people he criticized to certain works to enrich their understanding (as he implicitly referred Claudio Monteverdi to Rore for the proper treatment of tritones or as he directly refers Vincenzo Galilei to a whole catalogue of composers and then warns him against living in ignorance).⁸ Braccino da Todi retorted that Artusi understood the concept of mixed modes quite well and that Claudio Monteverdi had exceeded its boundaries. Braccino defined acceptable modal mixture as the combination of plagal and authentic modes apportioned to the voices in a polyphonic piece (for example, the cantus and tenor of a piece in D Dorian and the altus and bassus in D Hypodorian). Artusi (with Zarlino) believed that each mode had a governing ethos and that a composer should choose the mode most suited to a composition and stay with

⁷ Giulio Cesare Monteverdi, "Dichiaratione della lettera stampata nel quinto libro de' suoi madrigal" in *Scherzi musicali a tre voci di Claudio Monteverde*, ed. Giulio Cesare Monteverdi (Venice: Ricciardo Amadino, 1607), trans. Oliver Strunk in *Source Readings in Music History*, rev. ed., ed. Oliver Strunk and Leo Treitler (New York: W. W. Norton and Company, 1998), 543.

⁸ See Maria Rika Maniates, "The Cavalier Ercole Bottrigari and his Brickbats: Prolegomena to the Defense of Don Nicola Vicentino against Messer Gandolfo Sigonio," in *Music Theory and the Exploration of the Past*, ed. Christopher Hatch and David W. Bernstein (Chicago: University of Chicago Press, 1993), 142-3.

it.⁹ Artusi, then, would strongly dispute G. C. Monteverdi's analysis of Rore's "Quando, signor, lasciate," lest that piece would fall victim to wildly vacillating moods.

Rore was acutely aware of his modal practice, and in the case of his madrigal, "Quando signore lasciate," a listener would need to recognize the modes and understand the relationships between them to fully appreciate the piece. The only two books of madrigals that he published alone (and apparently with no patrons) were the *Primo libro di madrigali à cinque voci* (1542) and the *Primo libro di madrigali à quattro voci* (1550), both of which are written in modal cycles. As noted by Angela Lloyd and Robert G. Luoma, both use eight-mode cycles and not twelve-mode cycles.¹⁰ Monteverdi's assertion that the piece begins in the eleventh (Ionian) mode demonstrates his lack of understanding of it. As Luoma remarks, "His analysis probably tells us more about his own theory in 1607 than Cipriano's fifty years earlier."¹¹ Luoma's analysis places the work solidly in Hypomixolydian mode; the prevalence of the early C is thus explained by the fact that it is the reciting tone of Hypomixolydian mode, not the final of Ionian mode. The piece was written during Rore's time in Ferrara, and expresses joy upon the return of Prince Alfonso (who had gone to fight for the French against the Holy Roman Empire, much to the consternation of his father Duke Ercole II) and rejoices at the reconciliation between father and son.¹² According to Zarlino, the Hypomixolydian mode expresses

⁹ Claude V. Palisca, "The Artusi-Monteverdi Controversy," in *The New Monteverdi Companion*, ed. Denis Arnold and Nigel Fortune (London: Faber and Faber, 1985), 145.

¹⁰ Angela Lloyd, "Modal representation in the early madrigals of Cipriano de Rore" (Ph.D. diss., University of London, 1996), 44-45.; Luoma, 150.

¹¹ Luoma, 148, n. 24.

¹² *Ibid.*, 136.

virtue and moderation; it blends into the martial Dorian mode (through D—the fifth of the Mixolydian scales and the reciting tone of authentic Mixolydian), to the sorrowful Hypophrygian, and back to Hyponmixolydian as Alfonso returns in part two.¹³ By Luoma’s analysis, then, Rore began and ended on the same mode, although early in the piece he avoided cadencing on a clear final. The shades of Dorian and Hypophrygian mode serve expressive purposes, describing the wayward warrior prince and the mourning of his absence. Rore used modal intricacies to express his text in “Quando, signor, lasciate,” but his actual method is surely not the one that Monteverdi described. Perhaps in this instance Rore did not meet Artusi’s exacting standards for proper modal usage, but the subtle ambiguity of mode serves a very specific purpose. Although Palisca states that G. C. Monteverdi would have better defended his brother’s modal irregularities by declaring the modal system outdated, as Galilei had done,¹⁴ in the case of Rore’s “Quando, signor, lasciate,” his use of modal mixture offered a subtle way of setting the meaning of the text.

Rore’s effective use of modes to express the text in “Quando, signor, lasciate” and his willingness to bend modal rules to achieve this purpose are perhaps what attracted Giulio Cesare Monteverdi to name him as the initiator of the *seconda pratica*. On the other hand, Rore continued to follow the theories of Zarlino as championed by Artusi.

¹³ Ibid., 144, 146-8. Luoma’s discussion is extremely insightful and illuminating in this context; I refer the reader to it for more detailed analysis of this piece and Rore’s expression of text via modes and other compositional devices. Jessie Ann Owens analyzes the first part of this piece as unmodal and the second firmly in Hypomixolydian mode in “Mode in the Madrigals of Cipriano de Rore,” in *Altro Polo: Essays on Italian Music in the Cinquecento*, ed. Richard Charteris (Sydney: University of Sydney, 1990), 8.

¹⁴ Palisca, “The Artusi-Monteverdi Controversy,” 145.

Both writers could use him as an authority in their side of the debate. But Rore was a potent symbol and thus useful in other aspects of their debate, as well. From a purely practical standpoint, his works were very popular; from 1540 until his death in 1565, multiple printers in Venice (especially Gardano and Scotto) released multiple, “newly set,” “newly printed,” versions of Rore’s works. The books must have sold well, as printers continued to publish them in the decades after Rore’s death until Gardano published a last reprinting of Rore madrigals in 1593 and motets in 1595. Rore’s work was easily accessible to theorists searching for musical examples, and Rore himself (consistently called “il divino Cipriano”) was a figure of enduring popularity and respect. To cite Rore, then, was to invoke the authority of a much-respected composer who continued to retain current popularity. Artusi, perhaps, also had a proprietary interest in Rore in the name of his teacher Zarlino, while Monteverdi might have viewed Rore as a representative of the recently-influential, but now defunct, court of Ferrara.¹⁵

Giovanni Maria Artusi was very protective of his teacher, Gioseffo Zarlino, and apparently was always ready to spring into battle to correct a slight. He wrote polemical pamphlets in 1588 and 1590 against Vincenzo Galilei, who had written biting against his former teacher in 1581 and 1589 (the latter in response to Zarlino’s defense of 1588). In his invective against Galilei, Artusi provided a list of commendable composers that Galilei should emulate: Adrian Willaert, Cipriano de Rore, Claudio Merulo, and Costanza

¹⁵ My paper here owes a debt to Tim Carter, whose paper entitled “*E in rileggendo poi le proprie note: Monteverdi Responds to Artusi?*” first drew my attention to the Artusi/Monteverdi conflict in connection with the dissolution of the ducal court of Ferrara and the church/court tensions inherent therein. I heard the paper given at the American Musicological Society’s Southeast Chapter meeting at the University of North Carolina-Chapel Hill on September 25, 2010.

Porta.¹⁶ In the “Discorso Secondo Musicale” of Antonio Braccino da Todi, the admirable composers are Willaert, Rore, Porta, Andrea Gabrielli, and Giovanni Pierluigi Palestrina.¹⁷ All of these composers except Palestrina were closely associated with Willaert in Venice, together with Artusi’s teacher Zarlino. This list of lauded composers shares something else: they were all associated with the church in some way or other. Willaert, Zarlino, and (briefly) Rore served as *maestri di cappella* at S. Marco in Venice, where Gabrielli was organist; Palestrina served the Papal Chapel in Rome; and Porta was a Franciscan friar. Rore figures again in another quote, this time from *L’Artusi, overo delle imperfettioni della moderna musica* (1600):

...why do you not use [dissonances] in the ordinary way, conformable to reason, in accordance with what Adriano [Willaert] and Cipriano [de Rore], Palestrina, Porta, Claudio [Merulo], Gabrieli, [Giovanni] Gastoldi, [Giovanni] Nanino, [Ruggiero] Giovanelli, and so many others in this academy have written? Have they perhaps failed to cause asperities to be heard? Look at Orlando Lasso, Fillippo di Monte, Giaches Wert, and you will find full heaps of them.¹⁸

To his list of laudable composers, Artusi adds Merulo, who served as organist at S. Marco, Gastoldi, who was Wert’s deputy and replacement at the Basilica of S. Barbara in Mantua, Nanino, who served at various religious institutions in Rome (as *maestro di cappella* at S. Maria Maggiore and S. Luigi dei Francesi and then a singer in the papal choir), and Giovanelli, who also served in religious posts in Rome (including as *maestro*

¹⁶ Maniates, 142-3.

¹⁷ Giovanni Maria Artusi [Antonio Braccino da Todi, pseud.] “Discorso Secondo Musicale” (Venice: Giacomo Vincenti, 1608; Milan: Bollettino Bibliografico Musicale, 1934), 8.

¹⁸ Giovanni Maria Artusi, “Second Discourse,” in *L’Artusi overo Delle imperfettioni della moderna musica* (Venice: Giacomo Vincenti, 1600), trans. Oliver Strunk, rev. Margaret Muraa in *Source Readings in Music History*, rev. ed., ed. Oliver Strunk and Leo Treitler (New York: W. W. Norton and Company, 1998), 532.

di cappella for the Cappella Giulia at S. Pietro and as a member of the papal chapel). Lasso, too, held religious posts, although he served most prominently at the court of Bavaria from 1556 until his death almost thirty years later. Philippe de Monte similarly served the Hapsburg courts from 1568. Giaches de Wert exceptionally served as *maestro di cappella* both at the Mantuan court and the Basilica of S. Barbara in Mantua from 1565. Artusi's interest in the Catholic Church thus seems to have gone beyond his status as a priest. And his *L'Artusi* of 1600 is dedicated to Cardinal Pompeo Arigoni, one of the main officials involved with the Inquisition in Rome.¹⁹

Whatever motivated Artusi's decision to malign Monteverdi's madrigals in 1600 and implicitly to set the young Monteverdi against the "academy" of Willaert, Rore, Palestrina, Porta, Merulo, et al., G. C. Monteverdi tried, in various ways, to deflect Artusi's attack. He offers his own lists of composers: the list belonging to the *prima pratica* includes Johannes Ockeghem, Josquin, Pierre de la Rue, Jean Mouton, Thomas Crecquillon, Clemens non Papa, Nicolas Gombert, and Willaert. These composers allegedly followed the rules that Zarlino codified, presumably in response to Willaert's perfected style.²⁰ Although G. C. Monteverdi was careful not to slight Willaert or Zarlino, his list is made up of composers far older than Artusi's list of laudable composers, which includes Willaert and Rore (and implicitly Zarlino). Apparently, to be a *prima pratica* composer was to be one of a vanishing breed.

¹⁹ For this insight, I cite Carter's typescript "*E in rileggendo poi le proprie note: Monteverdi Responds to Artusi?*" and its citation on p. 11 to Ulrich Siegele, "Cruda Amarilli, oder: Wie ist Monteverdis 'seconda pratica' satztechnisch zu verstehen?" *Musik-Konzepte* 83–84 (1994): 31–102.

²⁰ Giulio Cesare Monteverdi, trans. Strunk, 540.

The *seconda pratica* pioneers G. C. Monteverdi named are a more inclusive group. Rore (the oldest and founder) and Wert (the exception in Artusi's lists, as well) were Netherlanders, like their predecessors; however, Marc'Antonio Ingegneri, Luca Marenzio, Luzzasco Luzzaschi, Jacopo Peri, and Giulio Caccini were Italians, with no particular affiliation to the Catholic Church.²¹ G. C. Monteverdi's other list of *seconda pratica* luminaries similarly includes noblemen, amateurs, and composers, who were sympathetic to the new music, and thus ennobled it by their approbation. They are again headed by "the divine Cipriano de Rore" and include "the Prince of Venosa [Carlo Gesualdo], Emilio de' Cavalieri, Count Alfonso Fontanella, the Count of the Camerata [Giovanni de' Bardi], the Cavalier Turchi, [Tommaso] Pecci, and other gentlemen of that heroic school..."²² And thus the mantle passed from Willaert to Rore, from the old Franco-Flemish masters of the *prima pratica* to the more inclusive, more Italian *seconda pratica*, through two Franco-Flemish composers who spent a notable part of their careers in the noble courts of northern Italy.

G. C. Monteverdi's and Artusi's claims on Rore were nothing new. As previously noted, Rore's music was enormously popular after his death, and his reputation remained strong among theorists and composers throughout the sixteenth century. Claude Palisca notes another citation of Rore that surely would have enraged Artusi. In his 1588 treatise on counterpoint, Vincenzo Galilei differentiated between composers who followed the rules and those who were guided by their own judgment. Galilei categorized Rore as a

²¹ Ibid.

²² Ibid., 539.

composer who followed judgment.²³ Artusi, of course, did not respect Galilei's opinion in the least. Artusi's 1588 response to Galilei's 1581 treatise had specifically directed Galilei to study Rore to learn how to compose. Through this dialogue, Galilei and Artusi claimed and re-claimed Rore for their own points of view.

Their citations of Rore serve to illustrate how Artusi and the Monteverdi brothers were, in a sense, talking around each other in their debates. As G. C. Monteverdi accused Artusi of applying the rules of one type of music to another, he never really responded to Artusi's charge—that expression does not necessarily violate the rules of counterpoint. Artusi used the music of Rore to exemplify this principle, but his insistence on mathematical demonstrations and justifications reveals his bias as a (conservative) theorist. Claudio Monteverdi was certainly not a theorist—he never did complete his theoretical rebuttal, if, in fact, he had ever begun it at all. He was a practical musician. And perhaps that is the supreme irony of the debate that has served to focus so much scholarly attention on text setting in the early seventeenth century. Monteverdi must be ultimately justified by his music.

Willaert's publication history presents problems of stylistic chronology, especially with regard to his secular works. Other than his publication of French chansons in 1536, the collected publications of Willaert's secular works center on the impressive and beautiful *Musica nova* and the posthumous collection of four-voice madrigals, published in 1563. Willaert's remaining published pieces, spread over various anthologies, offer few hints as to their chronology. However publishers got his pieces (or

²³ Palisca, "The Artusi-Monteverdi Controversy," 155-6.

pieces they attributed to him) and in which anthologies they published them is not necessarily connected to their compositional order. For the purpose of this study, I studied secular works primarily from the *Musica nova*, also including pieces published within Rore's collections, notably the secular motet "O socii," written by both composers to the same text and for the same patron. Willaert's style is not as often divided into periods as Rore's (perhaps because there is no *seconda pratica* for which to watch), and so the chronological placement of his pieces, for the purpose of comparing what has been traditionally dubbed *prima pratica* and *seconda pratica* is less critical.

Adrian Willaert's *Musica nova*, a beautiful, lavish print of previously unpublished madrigals and motets, appeared in 1559 after considerable efforts by Duke Alfonso II d'Este to acquire it and have it published. The Duke apparently also went to great trouble to preserve it from piracy; he acquired for it privileges in Florence, Vienna, and Rome, and difficulties in accomplishing this in Venice and Rome apparently delayed its publication.²⁴ Duke Alfonso II's considerable and expensive interest in the *Musica nova* makes it possible that the Ferrarese ties of some of its pieces extended beyond the work of a former servant now under new patronage. Duke Alfonso acquired it in manuscript from the famous Venetian singer Polissina Pecorina, and it was apparently known, both in its manuscript form and after publication, as "La Pecorina." In 1994, Michèle Fromson proposed that Willaert's *Musica nova* could possibly be tied to the city of Florence

²⁴ See the following for discussion of the issues and possible chronologies surrounding the printing of *Musica nova*: Armen Carapetyan, "The *Musica nova* of Adriano Willaert," *Journal of Renaissance & Baroque Music* 1 (1946): 200-21; Anthony Newcomb, "Editions of Willaert's *Musica nova*: New Evidence, New Speculations," *Journal of the American Musicological Society* 26 (1973): 132-40; Richard Agee and Jessie Ann Owens, "La stampa della *Musica nova* di Willaert," *Rivista italiana di musicologia* 24 (1989): 219-305; David Butchart, "'La Pecorina' at Mantua: *Musica nova* at Florence," *Early Music* 13 (1985): 358-66.

through allusions in text and chant quotations to the controversial preacher, reformer, and eventual heretic Girolamo Savonarola.²⁵ Savonarola had close connections to the Florentine republic, and when that republic collapsed, many of its supporters fled to Venice. Antonfrancesco Doni places Willaert and Pecorina in the private academy of one of these Florentine expatriates, Neri Capponi. Because of Pecorina's connection to *Musica nova*, scholars have generally linked Capponi to *Musica nova*, as well.²⁶ From this prospective background, Fromson links the idea of Florentine republican patronage through allusions to Savonarola to present *Musica nova* as a tribute to the fallen Florentine republic. And this possible link to Florence resonates with the presence of Willaert's music in the Medici Codex. Whether or not the imbedded chants and allusions that Fromson enumerates in her article are specifically references to Savonarola, her article opens new possibilities for tracing the origins of *Musica nova*.

Still unclear is whether Willaert or a patron chose the texts and selected chants to interweave in the music. The chronology of *Musica nova* also being unclear, these uncertainties make analysis of Willaert's style in *Musica nova* somewhat problematic. *Musica nova* still offers, however, a collection presumably in its final form by the time Duke Alfonso II d'Este acquired it in 1554 and the only collection that the composer reportedly revised prior to publication. Twenty-four of its twenty-five madrigals set

²⁵ Michèle Fromson, "Themes of Exile in Willaert's *Musica nova*," *Journal of the American Musicological Society* 47 (1994): 442-87.

²⁶ Doni, apparently, was not the most reliable person; Haar, however, finds independent corroboration for the existence of the described gathering. See James Haar, "Notes on the 'Dialogo della Musica' of Antonfrancesco Doni," *Music & Letters* 47 (1966): 206. The existence of this gathering does not necessarily imply that *Musica nova* was written specifically for Capponi (or even in Venice), but most scholars seem to have come to that conclusion.

sonnets from Francesco Petrarch's *Canzoniere*, and the book as a whole has the unusual distinction of containing settings for four, five, six, and seven voices.

Rore's publishing history begins with a volume of madrigals entirely devoted to his work: the *Primo libro di madrigali à cinque voci* appears in 1542 in a modally-ordered set published by Scotto in Venice. Rore's published works include only two other collections devoted entirely to his work: the 1545 *Motetti*, another modally ordered set, and the *Primo libro di madrigali à quattro voci*, published in 1550 by the Ferrarese firm Buglhat and Hücher (and in 1551 by Gardano in Venice). All other publications of his works, including Rore's second through fifth books of five-voice madrigals, contain pieces by other composers. These collections were very likely publisher-driven compilations, the source material of which publishers could gather from patrons or other informants, other publishers, or, sometimes, the composers themselves.²⁷ One vivid illustration of the results of such indirect method of repertoire collection is the case of "Vergine bella" from Rore's *Terzo libro di madrigali à cinque voci*. The 1548 publications contain only the first six stanzas, with later supplements providing the missing stanzas, but it was not until 1552 that the full "Vergine bella" cycle was published in the third book.²⁸ Twentieth-century scholars have generally tended to assert that Rore guarded his music zealously and tried to keep it from the piracy that had

²⁷ For an overview of all the various networks that were involved in the acquisition of pieces in the sixteenth century, see Mary S. Lewis, "Twins, Cousins, and Heirs: Relationships among Editions of Music Printed in Sixteenth-Century Venice," *Critica Musica: Essays in Honor of Paul Brainard*, ed. John Knowles (Amsterdam: Gordon and Breach, 1996), 193-224.

²⁸ See Mary S. Lewis, "Rore's Setting of Petrarch's 'Vergine Bella': A History of Its Composition and Early Transmission," *The Journal of Musicology* 4, no. 4 (Autumn 1985): 365-409.

resulted in so many of its printed releases. The assertion is most frequently supported by the dedication, written by Giulio Bonagionta, of Rore's posthumous collection *Le vive fiamme*, in which Bonagionta explained that, as a friend of Rore, he was the recipient of manuscripts that Rore did not want publicized: "...thanks to the great familiarity and the friendly relationship which for a long time united me with the excellent musician M. Cipriano Rore, he kindly shared with me some of his most beautiful four- and five-voice madrigals with the request that I keep them close by me, so that his works might not fall so easily into the hands of everyone who would like to make them public."²⁹

Regardless of whether Bonagionta can be taken entirely at his word, dedications like this one comprise the majority of contemporary links from Rore to Willaert. As Feldman notes, this practice essentially began in 1548 with Scotto's version of the third book, in which the flautist Paolo Vergelli penned a dedication to Gottardo Occagna. This was followed with similar claims in books subsequently published by Scotto and Gardano, although the term used there, "*discepolo*," can as easily refer to a follower of a practice as a literal student.³⁰ The expansive dedication written by Gardano in the posthumous fifth book also lists Rore as a follower of Willaert, placing them both in a lineage that also includes Mouton and Josquin.³¹ I will discuss this preface further in chapter 5, but, for now, it serves as another example of a dedication linking Willaert and

²⁹ Translated and cited in *ibid.*, 394-95. Lewis cites the source of the quotation as Alfred Einstein, *The Italian Madrigal* (Princeton, NJ: Princeton University Press, 1949), 385.

³⁰ See Feldman, xxviii, n. 20; 309-10, n. 55.

³¹ Cipriano de Rore, *Il quinto libro di madrigali a cinque voci insieme alcuni de diversi autori nouamente per Antonio Gardano stampato & dato in luce*. (Venice: Antonio Gardano, 1566), 1 v.

Rore. This dedication is written by the publisher and thus gives a glimpse of attitudes which may be gleaned from a study of the publications he presumeably arranged. Rore's *Secondo libro di madrigali à cinque voci*, published by Gardano in 1544, includes twenty-seven pieces, only eight of which (1, 3, 14-18, and 26) were written by Rore. Three (2, 9, and 27) were composed by Willaert, and their positions within the collection give them prominence. Willaert's name is even accorded a position in the full title (*Di Cipriano de Rore il secondo libro di madrigali a cinque voci insieme alcuni de M. Adriano & altri autori nouamente ristampato*). Rore's opening madrigal is followed by one of Willaert's, which is again followed by a piece of Rore's. The penultimate madrigal is also by Rore, but a composition by Willaert receives the final say.³² Willaert's compositions continue to have a presence in anthologies published under Rore's name, including the third, fourth, and fifth books of five-voice madrigals. Rore is classed with Willaert's Venetian school by other contemporary writers, including Gaspar Stocker.³³ The positioning of Rore as a pupil or disciple of Willaert was very prominently advanced by the publishers who prepared most of the editions of his music.

This publication history leaves open many issues of chronology in Rore's works, especially when scholars consider so-called early works versus the late ones. Publication order does not necessarily imply compositional order, especially with a publication history that is as murky as Rore's. Furthermore, much of the stylistic analysis that has been made separating Rore's early style from his late style assumes a publication

³² For an excellent discussion of the Rore's second book, as well as a table of its contents, see Feldman, 297-301.

³³ Gaspar Stocker, *De musica verballi, libri duo*, trans. Albert C. Rotola (Lincoln, NE: University of Nebraska Press, 1988), 194-5.

chronology, which makes it problematic proof of a stylistic evolution. Yet scholars continually mark Rore's early style and later style, with the later almost always as the start of the *seconda pratica*. Feldman denotes the "Vergine bella" cycle, first published in 1548 in the *Terzo libro di madrigali a cinque voci*, as the nexus of the new and old style; Meier states boldly that the new *seconda pratica* style must be found in the madrigals published after 1557.³⁴ Jessie Ann Owens indicates in her article for *Grove Music Online* that Rore's style changed abruptly between 1550 and 1557, noting both the dearth of publishing and the changes in the published material. Her study of Rore's use of mode in his later style follows the same model.³⁵ That Rore has an early and a late style is thus firmly established in the secondary literature, despite the fact that his publication history is a particularly troubled way to track the chronology of his pieces. The persistence of this divide is perhaps, as Meier's comment hints, due to his traditional position at the head of a *seconda pratica*, and the necessity of fitting this narrative to his musical style.

In this thesis, since I am attempting to explore the stylistic similarities and differences between Willaert and Rore around and concerning the idea of the *seconda pratica*, I selected madrigals from Rore's output that he published in the second half of his career (the exception here is the piece with identical Italian text, "Quando fra l'altre donne," which is from the third book of 1548). A rethinking of Rore's style evolution, or lack thereof, from the perspective of individual pieces rather than their publication history is in order, but beyond the scope of this study. By focusing mostly on the pieces

³⁴ Feldman, 408-9; see Meier's notes in Cipriano de Rore, *Opera Omnia*, vol. 2, ed. Bernhard Meier, *Corpus Mensurabilis Musicae*, vol. 14, ed. Armen Carapetyan ([Rome]: American Institute of Musicology, 1963), 2.

³⁵ See Owens, "Mode in the Madrigals of Cipriano de Rore," 1-15.

traditionally called late works in the Rore canon, I seek to engage with scholars at the current understanding of Rore's output.

Music's relationship to text was an issue of abiding interest throughout the sixteenth century, and composers from Josquin to Claudio Monteverdi strove to fit text to music in ways suited to their generations and aesthetics. Willaert's solutions to the problem of setting text to music were of apparent interest to contemporary music theorists. To his pupil Zarlino, Willaert served as a positive example for various compositional techniques and methods, including text underlay and the art of suiting the mood of the music with the mood of the text. Gaspar Stocker found in Willaert no less than the leader of a new generation of composers and the inventor of a new type of music. Stocker's treatise from the middle of the sixteenth century deals entirely with text underlay, and his admiration of Willaert is thus framed within this context. He writes,

Recently, Adrian Willaert seems to have not unsuccessfully originated a new music in which he totally removed that erratic freedom of the older composers and restricts himself to certain rules so that his songs are sung with great enjoyment and with no difficulty at all as to the method of the words. All the modern composers now follow him. Therefore, as Josquin seems to be the leader of that older music, so Adrian existed both as its end and as the father or leader of the new music, which all now imitate. He followed the precepts of the past composers in many of his published cantilenas and eventually, through a more precise judgment in regard to the precepts, found a new music and taught it to others, such as Orlando di Lasso, *Cipriano di Rore*, etc. He himself expressed it in many songs, some in Latin and some in Italian, of which those that exist are commonly termed by the Italians "Le pecorine," from the sheepskins with which they were customarily bound.³⁶

Oddities in Stocker's text cast doubt on whether he personally knew *Musica nova*. He appears to have been unaware of the fact that "La Pecorina" referred to a singer, and his

³⁶ Stocker, 195; emphasis mine.

wording seems to imply that he did not know the pieces he cited as a collection, but rather as scattered surviving pieces. Perhaps his references to the “new music” style that Willaert inaugurated are even oblique, unintentional references to the title of the collection. Profoundly unclear, however, is how much this projected misunderstanding would have affected Stocker’s judgment of Willaert’s music and his conviction that Willaert had created a new style.

Stocker and Zarlino differ in the extent of their theoretical guidelines on text. Stocker focused almost entirely on text underlay, while, in part four of the *Istitutioni harmoniche*, Zarlino devoted a chapter each to text underlay and suiting music to the content of the text. Zarlino also emphasized the importance of the suitability of music to text in part three; it is one of his six requirements for every composition. “With gay texts [the music] should not be plaintive, and vice versa; with sad subjects it should not be gay.”³⁷ Zarlino associated the minor triad (fifth divided arithmetically) with sadness and languor and the major triad (fifth divided harmonically) with liveliness and happiness. In these distinctions he found reason to associate certain modes with certain affects; the Lydian, Mixolydian, and Ionian modes and their plagals are lively, while the Dorian, Phrygian, and Aeolian modes and their plagals are more languorous.³⁸ The major intervals can also express hardness and harshness and the minor softness and sweetness. In part four of *Le institutioni harmoniche*, outlining his conception of text setting, Zarlino listed the three components of music found in Plato: melody (*harmonia*), speech

³⁷ Gioseffo Zarlino, *The Art of Counterpoint: Part Three of Le Istitutioni Harmoniche, 1558*, trans. Guy A. Marco and Claude V. Palisca (New York: W. W. Norton and Company, 1968), 52.

³⁸ *Ibid.*, 21-2.

(*orazione*), and rhythm (*numero*). According to Zarlino, *harmonia* and *numero* must follow *orazione*. *Harmonia* reflects *orazione* through mode, interval, and treatment of dissonance. *Numero* enhances *orazione* according to content; happy words are associated with swift and vigorous rhythms, sad ones with slower rhythms. *Numero* also must follow the accents of the poetry. Accented syllables get long notes and unaccented syllables shorter notes.³⁹

Stocker shared Zarlino's insistence on the proper setting of accented poetry in his rules on text underlay. This is a rule that he gave as discretionary to the younger composers, apparently including Willaert and Rore. How discretionary Stocker thought these rules were is not clear, as he views the younger composers as apt to follow their discretionary rules without exception. The rules are discretionary, Stocker writes, but only because they are not derived from nature. Stocker lists fifteen rules for text underlay in his treatise, and he divides them into groups of five. Five are necessary for all composers since they have their justification in nature, five are discretionary rules for older composers, and five are discretionary rules for the younger composers. The discretionary rules for younger composers are as follows:

1. Individual syllables must be adjoined to a minima and individual notes larger than a minima.
2. Only one syllable must be granted to semiminimae and notes smaller than semiminimae, regardless of their number.
3. The note, too, that immediately follows the semiminimae or fusae, regardless of its value, shares the same syllable with the semiminimae themselves.
4. Repetition of text must be avoided—more, however, of words than phrases.

³⁹ My understanding of Zarlino's rules of text setting in part four of the *Istitutioni* is indebted to Don Harrán, *Word-Tone Relations in Musical Thought* (Hänssler-Verlag: American Institute of Musicology, 1986), 190-2.

5. Short notes must be granted to short syllables, long notes to long syllables.⁴⁰

The discretionary rules for older composers are:

1. To the accented penultimate or antepenultimate syllable of any word many semiminimae can be adjoined.
2. A syllable is frequently added to a semiminima put down alone, and if to the semiminima, a syllable must also be adjoined to the first note as follows.
3. If two notes follow the punctus of a minima or semibrevis and together they are equivalent to the value of the punctus, no syllable is given to them separately nor frequently to the note that immediately follows them.
4. One syllable is sometimes granted to two minimae or semiminimae (in the same manner that final syllables are given to more notes) in which instance, the syllable adjoined to the first note is extended to the note following.
5. Only one syllable is customarily added to a succession of several semiminimae or notes of lesser value, and this syllable ought to be given to the first note.⁴¹

Stocker's rules for the older and younger composers differ mainly in subtleties. The older composers may put runs of semiminims on the accented penultimate syllable of a word, and younger composers must use longer note values or runs for accented syllables. Older composers may set a pair of minims with a single syllable, but younger composers must set any note value of a minim or longer with its own syllable. Both groups must assign semiminim runs a single syllable that is given to the first note. The distinction of the rules for younger composers is the injunction against excessive text repetition. Since Stocker's necessary rules are mandatory for all composers, they do not help place Willaert into Stocker's group of older or younger composers, and I will not discuss them in great detail here. Stocker's necessary rules for all composers do include a specification that the first

⁴⁰ Stocker, 236-9.

⁴¹ Ibid., 200-3.

syllable is given to the first note of a phrase, and the last syllable to the last note.⁴² This rule echoes one of Zarlino's cautions about properly using cadences: a cadence should only be used at the end of a clause or phrase.⁴³

To Zarlino and Stocker both, Willaert served as a model composer.⁴⁴ Here, then, will this paper turn to analyze Willaert's and Rore's text settings and underlay and the extent to which their practices are in accord with the practices outlined by Zarlino and Stocker. The proper placement of long notes and runs on accented syllables is of paramount importance to the text underlay theories of both, and, for the most part, Willaert and Rore followed this principle. Their practices are not, however, always exact, and they lapse in moments that can help illuminate their other compositional priorities.

⁴² Ibid., 158-9.

⁴³ Zarlino, part III, 142.

⁴⁴ Walter Gerstenberg points out that Zarlino apparently knew about these pieces before their publication in 1559, for the *Istitutioni* was first published in 1558. Zarlino, as a student of Willaert, apparently had excellent access to Willaert's works. Stocker certainly knew of Willaert's work, even if it was only knowledge of reputation. See Walter Gerstenberg, foreword to Adriano Willaert, *Opera Omnia*, vol. 13, ed. Hermann Zenck and Walter Gerstenberg, *Corpus Mensurabilis Musicae*, vol. 3, ed. Armen Carapetyan (Rome: American Institute of Musicology, 1966), iv.

Chapter 2: Comparison by Mode, “Mia beninga fortuna” and “O Invidia”

Because modal usage is one of the most frequently discussed points comparing the *prima* and *seconda pratica* (and was cited by both Artusi and Giulio Cesare Monteverdi), I will begin my own analysis by comparing Willaert’s and Rore’s treatments of transposed D modes (in the case of Willaert, once-transposed Dorian or D Aeolian, and for Rore, twice-transposed Dorian or D Phrygian). Zarlino characterizes Aeolian mode as “...open and terse, very suitable for lyrical verses; hence one can accompany with it words containing gay, sweet, soft, and sonorous subject matters, because (as they say) it has in itself a pleasant severity, mixed with a certain gaiety and moreover sweet softness.”⁴⁵ Moreover, he makes clear that Aeolian mode is closely related to Dorian mode, as both contain the first species of diapente (that is, the intervallic makeup of the fifth between the final and cofinal is whole step, half step, whole step, whole step). Although the unaltered Aeolian mode has a final on A, Zarlino notes that it is also quite common for composers to transpose it to D, which further connects it to Dorian mode.⁴⁶

Zarlino also relates Aeolian mode to Phrygian mode, as both share the second species of diatesseron (that is, the fourth between the final and cofinal is comprised of

⁴⁵ Gioseffo Zarlino, “Zarlino on Modes: An Annotated, Indexed Translation with Introduction and Commentary, of Part IV of *Le Istitutioni harmoniche*,” trans. and ed. Vered Cohen (PhD. diss., City University of New York, 1977), 171.

⁴⁶ Ibid., 131, 171. Definitions of species of diapente are found in Zarlino, part III, 26.

half step, whole step, whole step). Due to this similarity, Zarlino notes that mixture with the Aeolian mode can alleviate the harshness of the tritone between the second scale degree and the cofinal B in Phrygian mode. Composers may accomplish this by using the Aeolian diapente (which is to say, a raised second scale degree, transforming the second species diapente which begins with a half step into the first species diapente, which has a half step for its second interval) or with prominent cadences on the Aeolian final of A, substituting for the regular cofinal B. In fact, Zarlino maintains that this mixture with the Aeolian mode is almost compulsory; without it the mode would sound “somewhat hard.”⁴⁷ These three modes, Aeolian, Dorian, and Phrygian, are also related in the arithmetic division of the diapente (the division of the fifth between the final and cofinal into thirds so that the minor third is lower than the major third—in essence, a minor triad). According to Zarlino, this arithmetic division results in a composition that is generally “sad or languid” or “soft.”⁴⁸ The interconnections between these modes hold between their plagal versions, as well, since a plagal mode differs from an authentic one only by ambitus.

The D Aeolian mode is therefore linked to Dorian mode via modal center and the same species of diapente, and to Phrygian mode via the same species of diatesseron. All three have a minor third between scale degrees one and three. The Aeolian mode contains a structural Phrygian cadence to the cofinal, as well as a tritone between scale degrees two and six which requires contrapuntal attention. In any transposed piece, the B-flat will invite increased usage of E-flat in order to avoid the tritone. Rore and Willaert treat the

⁴⁷ Zarlino, part IV, 143. Zarlino’s remarks on the similarities of the Phrygian and Aeolian modes are limited to the section on Phrygian mode.

⁴⁸ Zarlino, part III, 21-2.

modal tendencies of their transposed Dorian modes in subtly different ways that reflect their treatments of different texts.

Rore's "Mia benigna fortuna" (Example 1) is contained in his *Quarto libro di madrigali à cinque voci*, first published by Gardano in 1557. Like all of Rore's books of madrigals after the first book of four-voice madrigals and first book of five-voice madrigals, it contains pieces by multiple composers. "Mia benigna fortuna" sets the first two stanzas of a double sestina in Petrarch's *Canzoniere*:

1 *Mia benigna fortuna e'l viver lieto,*
2 *i chiari giorni et le tranquille notti*
3 *e i soavi sospiri, e'l dolce stile*
4 *che solea resonare in versi e'n rime,*
5 *vòlti subitamente in doglia e'n pianto*
6 *odiar vita mi fanno et bramar morte.*

7 *Crudele, acerba, inesorabil Morte,*
8 *cagion mi dà di mai non esser lieto*
9 *ma di menar tutta mia vita in pianto*
10 *e i giorni oscuri et le dogliose notti;*
11 *i mei gravi sospir non vanno in rime,*
12 *e'l mio duro martir vince ogni stile.*

My kind fortune and glad life,
bright days and tranquil nights,
and gentle sighs and a sweet style
that used to resound in verses and rhymes,
suddenly turned to grief and weeping
make me hate life and yearn for death.

Cruel, untimely, inexorable Death,
you give me cause never to be glad
but to live my life ever weeping,
with dark days and sorrowing nights;
my heavy sighs cannot go into rhymes.

and my harsh torment surpasses every style.⁴⁹

Rore's excerpt of the double sestina features two stanzas of six lines. The final word of each line in the first stanza serves again as a final word in the succeeding stanza in a prescribed order (abcdef, faebdc). In addition, the stanzas are linked by reuse of the rhyming word at the end of the last line in the first stanza in the first line of the next stanza. The repeated words create a nuanced poem with subtly shifting meanings and form a type of subtle refrain. The sestina comprises twelve-syllable lines in *verso piano*, and features slant rhymes between "lieto" and "pianto," and "notti" and "morte," together with assonance between "stile" and "rime." The short "i" that forms the assonance between "stile" and "rime" also appears in the first diphthongs of "lieto" and "pianto." This closing repetition is not Petrarch's only method of subtly weaving his poem together. He also embeds internal parallelisms in his verse, including the list marked by assonance and joined by short, vowel-dominated conjunctions in lines 1-3 ("e'l viver lieto, / i chiari giorni **et** le tranquille notti / e i soavi sospiri, e l' dolce stile..."). The second halves of lines 4-5 expand on this by alternating conjunction and article (e n') with preposition (in) ("in versi **e'n** rime, / ... in doglia **e'n** pianto...") and achieving a nearly-identical sound. The sestina is number 332 in Petrarch's *Canzoniere* and, as such, was written after the death of Laura. The repetition inherent in the sestina diffuses the narrator's grief throughout the whole of the poem. The thought process represented is not stuck in a grieving cycle, but rather finds itself repeating hints of previous lamentations even after moving on to a new topic. The figure of death plays a double role in the

⁴⁹ Francesco Petrarch, *Petrarch's Lyric Poems: The Rime sparse and Other Lyrics*, trans. and ed. Robert M. Durling (Cambridge, MA: Harvard University Press, 1976), 524-5.

narrator's lament. He curses death for taking Laura from him, while at the same time longing for death so that he can join her. Rore's text, which stops after two sestinas, is more closely aligned in length with a sonnet, while the cut decreases much of the sense of persistent mournfulness that characterizes Petrarch's full text.

The first two stanzas are set formally as a sonnet would be, the first stanza comprising the *prima parte* and the second the *seconda parte*. The structural voices, the cantus and tenor, each have an ambitus of D-D. The bassus has an ambitus of G-G with a single extension down to F and occasional instances of A and A-flat up to B-flat. The altus has a range of G-G, occasionally moving down to F, and once reaching up to A. This piece lacks the clear cadences more typically found in Rore's work, and the pivoting between D and G sonorities reflects the ambiguity of the Phrygian mode and its relationship to the Aeolian and Dorian modes as described by Zarlino. The twice-transposed Dorian mode of Rore's setting is strengthened by frequent cadences to G, which is the reciting tone of D Phrygian in the eight-mode system.

Before the first gestures to D, Rore writes relatively strong cadences to the third scale degrees of both D and G, foreshadowing their importance in the piece: evaded to F in mm. 4-5, and to B-flat in m. 8. A D sonority without a cadence makes for a brief resting place at the midpoint of line 2 (mm. 10-11); an evaded cadence in mm. 14-15 further solidifies D. The tenor, however, rests where its cadence with the cantus would be, and repeats the second half of the last line. The altus and bassus also repeat the second half of the last line, in a piece in which text repetition overall is extremely minimal. The medial cadence is a clear Phrygian cadence to G, which in Zarlino's configuration of the Phrygian mode substitutes for the cofinal A. This substitution is, in

Zarlino's terms, a link to the Aeolian mode, borrowing the final of the twice-transposed Aeolian mode to substitute for the cofinal of the twice-transposed Phrygian mode. Additionally, in the Aeolian mode, the cadence to the cofinal is naturally Phrygian. G continues to play a prominent part in the *seconda parte*, but it yields to D via an interplay of offset cadential motion between G and D. At mm. 65-66 is a Phrygian cadence to Zarlino's cofinal A between the cantus and tenor at the end of their line 10. This is preceded by A-flats in m. 62 in the altus and bassus that pull down to G in m. 63; the altus descends directly, and the bassus via F, forming a cadence to mark the end of the first half of line 10, although there is no caesura in the text. The cantus, altus, and tenor do not pause for long, and the cantus and tenor continue to form the more textually appropriate cadence to A-natural at the end of the line in mm. 65-66. The tenor repeats the whole of line 10 to align itself with the bassus, which takes a large break between the first and second halves of line 10. The altus and bassus end line 10 with Phrygian cadential motion to D in mm. 67-68 that is weakened by lack of agogic accent in the bassus and a sense of misalignment between the altus and bassus that results from the altus's repetition of the final D, while the bassus moves on to line 11. No real cadence occurs between lines 11 and 12, but all four voices have cadential gestures, which seem to indicate both D and G (mm. 71-72). The tenor has a cantus-like cadential gesture to G, while the altus above it carries an A that could descend to G, but rests instead. The cantus, meanwhile, has a notated D-C-sharp-D gesture preceded by an emphasis on D that extends back to m. 70 and which includes a decorative notated E-flat. The bassus descends a fourth from A to D in time to support the cantus before dropping to G in time to support the tenor and altus, then ascending stepwise back to D where it finishes its line

in m. 73. A final evaded cadence to G in the tenor and altus occurs at mm. 78-79 between the repetitions of line 12; the altus rests rather than resolving down by step from A. The cantus, meanwhile, still emphasizes D with a descent from E-flat, but fails to emphasize it agogically before moving directly to the repeat of line 12; the bassus rises from C in time to cadence with the altus, but has not reached the end of its text line, and continues to G in time to support the tenor and nonexistent altus before rising again to D. The concluding sonority of the piece is on D, but without a conclusive final cadence, thereby reinforcing the ambiguity of the Phrygian mode.

Rore emphasizes Phrygian mode in his frequent use of E-flat, which appears in the key signature of the bassus in the *prima parte* and the bassus and altus in the *seconda parte*. The altered signature in the *seconda parte* of the altus part probably owes to the paired duets that begin that section of the piece; the altus and bassus here are in exact imitation. The fact that only the altus and bassus carry the E-flat in the key signature is a testament to the frequent mixture of the Phrygian mode with the Aeolian diapente. Practically, the frequent use of E-flat instead of E helps to avoid the tritone with B-flat. On the contrapuntal level, its pull down to D helps to emphasize the true modal center of the piece. Expressively, the downward pull emphasizes the mourning character of the text. The frequent use of E-flat also results in an occasional A-flat, which pulls downward to G. Its most prominent use occurs at mm. 33-34 and m. 39 (essentially a repeat of mm. 33-34), where it is emphasized by an octave leap in the bassus and results in a Phrygian medial cadence to G. Expressively, A-flat augments the downward motion and sorrowful character of B-flat and E-flat, which express the overall grieving nature of the text.

While the speaker in the poem is grief-stricken, the entirety of the text is not. The first stanza, especially, begins with cheerfulness, which is abruptly lost in that stanza's closing two lines. The *prima parte* has the strongest mixture with the Aeolian diapente and the least number of E-flats. As previously discussed, Zarlino regards the Aeolian mode as most suited for lyrical poetry and "...gay, sweet, soft, and sonorous subject matters" with an inherent "pleasant severity, mixed with a certain gaiety and moreover sweet softness."⁵⁰ This character complements the first stanza fairly well, especially in the first four lines, which are characterized by fond, wistful recollection. The bitter lamentations of the second stanza are neither soft nor sweet; this is, however, when the piece takes a more purely Phrygian turn, as indicated by the altus's altered key signature. Zarlino designates the Phrygian mode as depicting tearfulness and weeping.⁵¹ The descending E-flat and A-flat gestures from Phrygian mode moreover appear throughout the piece, especially at the medial cadence, shortly after the narrator has introduced his loss. The lyricism of Aeolian mode mixed with the more pronounced gravity of Phrygian mode reflects the narrator's fond recollections contrasted with his current sorrow. Furthermore, the modal mixture reflects the overall paradox of this section of Petrarch's poem. The narrator simultaneously curses death and longs for it. The overall Phrygian mode, suited for grief and tears, is tempered by Aeolian mode and its evocation of lyrical or pleasant subjects, just as the narrator's grief of his loss is muted by fond memories.

Outside of modal considerations, Rore sets "Mia benigna fortuna" with a minimum of repetition at a brisk 87 measures. The major exceptions to this generalization

⁵⁰ Zarlino, part IV, 171.

⁵¹ Ibid., 143.

come, as one might expect, at the ends of the *prima* and *seconda partes*. Line 6 repeats both text and music to end the first stanza, emphasizing the cyclical nature of the text (mm. 29-34; mm. 35-40). There is more variation to the repetition of line 12. The first iteration of line 12 contains a repeat of its first half; the second adds a repeat of the second half in every voice except the cantus (mm. 72-78; 79-87). These repetitions reinforce the cyclical nature of the poem and its rhyme scheme. One of the only instances of repetition outside of the closing lines of the stanza occurs in line 10 (mm. 59-68), when the tenor sings the first half of the line, then sings the entire line from the beginning. This repetition, along with the split in the middle of line 10 (which is not invited by the text) especially serves to help shift the piece's emphasis from G to D, as previously discussed. Wide leaps of a sixth or octave in every voice part begin the last line of the *prima parte* and its repetition (mm. 29-30 35-34). The *seconda parte* begins with sixth leaps in the cantus and tenor voices (mm. 41-42, 44-45) and leaps of a fifth in the altus and bassus. These leaps serve to connect the two halves of the piece stylistically, as suits their interlocking rhyme scheme. They also portray the grief of the narrator that manifests at the end of the *prima parte* and continues into the *seconda parte*. "Mia benigna fortuna" is marked by moments of homophony or near-homophony (mm. 9-25, 50-55, 55-60, 61-63). In the case of mm. 50-55 and 55-60, the phrase begins in homophony before the voices diverge from each other, then realign for the end of the phrase. The unusually homophonic texture allows a listener to better hear the subtle sounds shifting in the poem's text, which is marked by rhyme and assonance.

Rore's interpretation of Petrarch's text is enhanced by modal interplay and the modal characteristics outlined by Zarlino. The piece's interweaving of elements from

Aeolian and Phrygian modes reflects the overwhelming grief of the narrator introduced in line 5 that continues for the rest of the piece. Rore highlights the cyclic nature of the sestina rhyme scheme by repeating the words and music to lines 6 and 12. The entire sestina portrays grief entangling the narrator, inherent in the interlocking rhyme scheme, and coloring each new thought. The severe cut to the text does not allow this theme to be fully established, nor is the cut text as crushing an expression of loss as the full text. The piece's briskly moving text follows Stocker's rule that younger composers should not repeat text to a close degree. The frequent homophony highlights the interplay of sounds in Petrarch's *sestina*. Overall, "Mia benigna fortuna" is an admirable study in the modal tendencies and relationships inherent in a twice-transposed D mode.

The poem that Willaert sets in a transposed D mode is "O Invidia" (Example 2), which is number 172 in the *Canzoniere*, and thus written while Laura was still alive. It describes an episode in the narrator's relationship with Laura in which she is angry with him. Biographical assessment of the poem suggests that it references Laura's disapproval of the poet's love affairs.⁵² Willaert's setting of "O Invidia" opens the five-voice section of the *Musica nova*.

- 1 *O Invidia nimica di vertute,*
- 2 *ch' a' bei principii volentier contrasti,*
- 3 *per qual sentier così tacita intrasti*
- 4 *in quel bel petto, et con qual arti il mute?*

- 5 *Da radice n'ài svelta mia salute:*
- 6 *troppo felice amante mi mostrasti*
- 7 *a quella che' miei preghi umili et casti*

⁵² Frederic J. Jones, "Notes on the *Canzoniere*" in *The Canzoniere (Rerum Vulgarium Fragmenta)* by Francesco Petrarca, trans. Frederic J. Jones, vol. 1 (Market Harborough, UK: Troubador Publishing, Ltd., 2000), 267.

8 *gradì alcun tempo, or par ch' odi' et refute.*

9 *Né però che con atti acerbi et rei*

10 *del mio ben pianga e del mio pianger rida*

11 *poria cangiar sol un de' pensier mei,*

12 *non perché mille volte il dì m'ancida*

13 *fia ch' io non l'ami et ch' i' non sperì in lei;*

14 *ché s' ella mi spaventa, Amor m'affida.*

O Envy the enemy of virtue, you who gladly
fight against good beginnings, by what path
did you so silently enter that lovely breast,
and with what art do you change it?

You have plucked up by the roots my salvation:
you made her think me too fortunate a lover,
she who for awhile accepted my humble and
chaste prayers and now seems to hate and refuse them.

But though with bitter, cruel gesture she weep
at my luck and laugh at my weeping, she cannot
change even one of my thoughts;

though she kill me a thousand times a day, I
shall still love her and hope in her; for if she
terrifies me, Love gives me confidence.⁵³

In this poem, the narrator ascribes a fault, envy, to Laura, something he rarely does throughout the *Canzoniere*. The first octave is written as an apostrophe to Envy, which the narrator directly blames for infiltrating Laura's feelings. On a more allegorical, spiritual level, envy, as a sin, can cost the narrator his salvation if he gives into it, but love (divine love, in this case) can still save him. In this interpretation, his vow to keep loving and hoping for Laura on a physical level also reflects his determination to hold on to his salvation on a metaphysical level. Envy, the sin which he assigns to Laura, is also

⁵³ Petrarch, trans. Durling, 318-19.

his own, as he longs for the love of a married woman. At the same time, the chaste and humble prayers vie directly with the narrator's label of himself as a lover.

Willaert's use of transposed D mode in "O Invidia" hints at the Aeolian mode's natural relationships in a similar, but more subtle, manner to Rore's "Mia benigna fortuna." The altus, tenor, and quintus all have D-D ranges, although the altus range extends up a third to F, and the quintus range extends down a third to B-flat. The cantus has a range of A-G, descending in one instance to G (m. 34). The bassus has a solid range of G-G. Thus the G-G range in the bassus and altus are more accurately described as slightly displaced from the plagal A-A. The voices are arrayed *a voce mutata*, so that their ranges interlock; the altus and quintus share an identical range with the tenor; the altus extends it up by a third, and the quintus extends it down by a third. The lower vocal timbre could be indicative of sorrow—or perhaps a distinctly male speaker, as is reflected in the poem. His lamentations on the effect of envy on his lover are either reflected at an absent woman, or his recriminations about the effect of envy on his character are directed wholly to himself.

Willaert's cadences are often evaded, weakened, or unclear. In "O Invidia" the first clear cadence is on the final D at mm. 25-26 between the cantus and quintus. This cadence occurs at the end of line 3, which is poetically enjambed with line 4. To preserve the momentum of the piece, the altus continues with no reference to the cadence, the quintus descends from F to D a half note too late to be involved in the cadence, and the bassus finishes its line 3 on A, rests on the first beat of the cadence, and then begins line 4 on D. Its supportive A-D motion is thus interrupted and realigned with the text so that it no longer seems to be a part of the cadence. The tenor and altus form an allusion to a D

Phrygian cadence at m. 36, at the end of the first quatrain, but it is textually weak; while the altus lingers on the first syllable of “mute,” the tenor is in the midst of the decorated final syllable. The next clear cadence is at m. 59, evaded to the cofinal A, more clearly defining the mode. Such a strong modal outline is confirmed by the medial cadence on A (mm. 67-68).

Willaert places an F-E descending half step motion at prominent places in the *prima parte*, often in the cantus. The first example of this gesture is in m. 6 in the cantus, but it is more prominently located at the end of line 1, in the cantus, at m. 9. It occurs again at the end of line 2 in the cantus (mm. 15-16) and quintus (mm. 16-17), and incidentally at the end of line 3 as a brief interruption of the cantus’s climb to G and eventual descent, in which it falls to C-sharp, and raises again to form the cadence to D (mm. 23-26). Here, too, the quintus has F-E motion in its descent to the cadence on D (mm. 25-26). An agogically emphasized descending half step from B-flat to A in mm. 29-30 marks the altus’s completion of the first half line 4. The end of line 4 and the first quatrain is emphasized by descending half steps in the cantus (F-E, mm. 37-38), tenor (E-flat-D, m. 36), and quintus (B-flat-A, mm. 36-37), while the altus foreshadows in m. 35 with E-flat –D. The descending B-flat-A at the end of line 6 (mm. 52-53) in the cantus foreshadows the deceptive Phrygian cadence to A between the tenor and quintus that marks the caesura in line 8. Thus, the prominent, agogically accented descent from F-E in the cantus that contributes to the medial cadence is foreshadowed, although still unusual. The altus augments the descending half-step motive by falling from D to C-sharp

The medial cadence in the *prima parte* yields to clear, but evaded, D cadences in the *seconda parte*, which both close the first half of the fragmented, repeated tenth line

(mm. 80-81, cantus and altus; mm. 85-86, cantus and tenor). The next several cadential events are all to G, or related to G. The first tercet ends at mm. 95-96 with an evaded cadence to G between the cantus and the quintus, which rests rather than descending from A-G. A repeat of the second half of line 11 ends with more cadential motion to G at mm. 101-102. This cadence is rhythmically thwarted by the tenor, which moves from a half note on A to a mere quarter note on G, followed by another quarter note on G that begins the text to line 12. Line 13 in the altus ends with a strong cadential gesture to D in mm. 112-113, but the cantus and tenor are still in the midst of line 13, and the bassus concludes line 13 in m. 112. The quintus moves from A-D over mm. 112-113 to end line 13, but its movement to D is rhythmically short, and it continues immediately to repeat the second half of line 13 (aligning it with the cantus and tenor). The cantus and quintus have a textually offset cadence to F at mm. 114-115 (the cantus is on the first syllable of “lei” and the quintus on the second; the cantus repeats the cadential F to conclude the word) that concludes line 13. F is a regular cadence point in D Aeolian mode, so it reinforces the modal implications of the D gesture made by the altus a few measures earlier. Willaert repeats the final line twice in its entirety in the cantus, while the other four voices sing the final line and repeat its second half (i.e., “Ché s’ ella mi spaventa, Amor m’affida, Amor m’affida”). Each iteration of the final line, or the final line plus second half is set to identical music; this is a musical, as well as textual, repetition. The quintus aligns with the cantus at the end of their first statements (mm. 122-123) to form the strong, final cadence to D that confirms the modal center. An additional repeat of the second half of line 14 in the quintus (mm. 130-131) obscures the final cadence, so that the piece concludes on a clear D sonority, but not a clear cadence. The altus and tenor,

meanwhile, have an evaded cadence to G, supported by the bassus, at the end of their first iteration of line 14, but before they repeat the second half. This cadence appears again at the repeat in mm. 127-128, so that G, although clearly less structurally important than D, never quite yields to D the second half of the piece.

The *seconda parte*, with its increased emphasis on G, is more modally conflicted than the *prima parte*, which clearly emphasizes D. Instances of E-flat are also more common in the *seconda parte* than the *prima parte*, although this is partially due to the text-painting of “pianga” and “pianger” that occurs in line 10, toward the beginning of the *seconda parte*. This use of the descending half step has further implications than mere text painting, however, as it is connected to the descending half step that was prominent in the *prima parte*. Perhaps the weeping, mentioned in the *seconda parte*, is prefigured in the *prima parte* as well, as the narrator laments his misfortune. An increased appearance of E-flat would possibly produce more cadences to G as a result of the allusion to Phrygian mode and the contrapuntal problems inherent in the cofinal with the A-E-flat tritone. The presence of E-flat is not prominent enough to warrant such an emphasis on G, however, and the ambiguous vocal ranges make the modal allusion more clearly to Hypodorian than Phrygian.

Willaert augments the Aeolian mode that Zarlino describes as tuneful and sweet with allusions to the related and more dolorous Phrygian mode. The exchange between the G and D cadences of the last line of the piece might suggest a tug between modal centers, with G representing the terror in line 14 and D representing the hope. Willaert has not thoroughly established G as an alternative modal center, however, and I will not attempt to make specific hermeneutic claims for a cadence. The persistent G cadences,

unusually emphasized in D Aeolian mode, do create a degree of modal instability that reflects the narrator's uncertainty of his salvation; the persistent return of D at the end of the piece reflects his determination. The more expressive gesture is internal to the Aeolian mode. The descending half step motive suffuses the piece with weeping, and it comes from a specific attribute of the mode characterized by Zarlino as soft and lyrical. Zarlino's modal characterizations are often derived from specific modal qualities inherent in their diapentes, diatesserons, and harmonic versus arithmetic division of the diapente. They are more or less generalities based on the tendencies of certain musical characteristics. Willaert's use of Aeolian mode emphasizes its two descending half steps, to the effect of creating a more sorrowful Aeolian mode. As the narrator gains hope throughout the *seconda parte*, the descending half step motive grows less prominent, and the emphasis of Aeolian mode shifts toward the sweet and lyrical, while the tone of the piece shifts from despair of lost salvation toward hope and determination to regain it.

Apart from modal considerations, Willaert's piece is marked by the alignment, divergence, and realignment of text among all of the vocal parts, unclear or evaded cadences, and brief similarities in opening voices that fall short of full imitation (what Joshua Rifkin calls "motivicity").⁵⁴ I will discuss these techniques more in the next chapter. The *seconda parte* is notable for beginning in homophony, with the exception of the cantus voice. This state does not persist for long: by m. 73 it has dispersed. This homophony provides an aurally clear beginning to the *seconda parte*. The other notable feature of Willaert's setting is its highly repetitive presentation of the final line, which

⁵⁴ Joshua Rifkin, "Miracles, Motivicity, and Mannerism: Adrian Willaert's *Videns Dominus flentes sorores Lazari* and some aspects of motet composition in the 1520s," in *Hearing the Motet: Essays on the Motet of the Middle Ages and Renaissance*, edited by Dolores Pesce (New York: Oxford University Press, 1997), 243-64.

emphasizes the determination of the narrator to win either Laura or his salvation (or both).

Willaert's modal allusions are more subtle than Rore's and focus inward on the properties of Aeolian mode, rather than outward to its relationships with other modes. Whereas Rore uses modal ambiguity to highlight the relationships between Aeolian mode, Dorian mode, and Phrygian mode, Willaert uses the two descending half steps built into Aeolian mode to create a motive, which he then emphasizes with an unusual (but motivically foreshadowed) cadence to E. Willaert makes allusion to Phrygian mode (via the use of E-flat and cadences to G), but he focuses more specifically and closely on the properties of the Aeolian mode of the piece. Both composers use transposed D modes and their intricacies to express the tone of their poetic texts.

Chapter 3: Comparison by Common Italian Text: “Quando fra l’altre donne”

“Quando fra l’altre donne” is the thirteenth sonnet in Petrarch’s *Canzoniere*, probably written around 1331. Since it is in part one of the *Canzoniere*, it was written when Laura was still alive. It is set during a period of reconciliation between the narrator and Laura; their good relationship here contrasts with the tension present in sonnets eleven and twelve.⁵⁵ The sonnet reads as follows:

- 1 *Quando fra l’altre donne ad ora ad ora*
- 2 *Amor vien nel bel viso di costei,*
- 3 *quanto ciascuna è men bella di lei*
- 4 *tanto cresce’l desio che m’innamora.*

- 5 *I’ benedico il loco e ’l tempo et l’ora*
- 6 *che sì alto miraron gli occhi mei,*
- 7 *et dico: “Anima, assai ringraziar dei*
- 8 *che fosti a tanto onor degnata allora.*

- 9 *“Da lei ti ven l’amoroso pensiero*
- 10 *che mentre’l segui al sommo ben t’invia,*
- 11 *poco prezando quel ch’ ogni uom desia;*

- 12 *“da lei vien l’animosa leggiardria*
- 13 *ch’al ciel ti scorge per destro sentero,*
- 14 *sì ch’ i’ vo già de la speranza altero.”*

When among the other laides now and again Love
Appears in her lovely face, by as much as each is
Less beautiful than she, by so much grows the
Desire that enamors me.

I bless the place and the time and the hour that my
Eyes looked so high, and I say: “Soul, you must
Give great thanks that you were found worthy of

⁵⁵ Jones, 217.

Such honor then.

“From her comes the amorous thought that, while
you follow it, sends you toward the highest good,
little valuing what other men desire;

“from her comes the courageous joy that leads you
to Heaven along a straight path, so that already I
go high with hope.”⁵⁶

The tension of sonnets eleven and twelve has not been entirely resolved, for sonnet thirteen is marked by internal tensions. In the middle of the second quatrain is a major shift in form of address from the narrator’s soliloquy in lines 1-6 to the direct address to his soul that begins in line 7 and continues to the end of the poem. A division of the sonnet here results in an inversion of the normal thematic form: sestet then octave, rather than octave then sestet. Nevertheless, this sonnet preserves the normal thematic form. The opening octave focuses more narrowly on the narrator and his feelings; even the direct address to the soul begins by reveling in the narrator’s own good fortune. The sestet broadens this view by focusing on the result of the narrator’s feelings: the compulsion toward heaven and divine good. At the same time, the setting of the poem shifts from the grounded earth in the octave to the heights of heaven in the sestet. The focus of the narrator also shifts from profane admiration of a woman’s beauty to devotion to divine goodness. The normative rhyme scheme of ABBA ABBA CDD DCC confirms the standard division between the octave and tercet.

This rhyme scheme also unifies the sestet; the rhyme scheme of the second tercet is essentially an inversion of the first. The sestet is further unified by the parallelism between lines 9 and 12. These lines open almost identically, with “Da lei ti ven” and “da

⁵⁶ Petrarch, trans. Durling, 48-9.

lei vien” followed by “l’amoroso” and “l’animosa.” The only words in lines nine and twelve that are not parallel are “pensero” and “leggiadria”; together they form the “happy thought” of self-improvement and hope of salvation that pervades the sestet. Depending on how one reads the sonnet, however, the shift in focus from the divine to the secular might also be interpreted to take place after the first quatrain, when the narrator moves from mere admiration of Laura to blessing the location, time, and hour that he first saw her followed by the direct address to his soul. The specific reference to “benedico” in the first line of the second quatrain helps to support this reading. In any case, the looser link between the first and second quatrains stands in marked contrast to the integration between the tercets of the sestet. The contrasts inherent in the sonnet’s form belie the calm determination of the narrator to follow the “straight path” to heaven set out in the final tercet.

Further contrast and tension in the poem exists between the virtuous feelings that the narrator assigns to himself and in his manner of expression. Especially in the first quatrain, his fervent praise focuses on Laura’s beauty and his desire. While the second quatrain purports to honor her (and, as it turns out in the sestet, her virtue), the blessing of “il loco, e ’l tempo e l’hora” is almost desperate in its repetition. Even in the sestet, while the narrator sets the object of his affection as a model for virtuous behavior, it is still an “amoroso pensiero” that pulls him in that direction; the character of his love here is still ambiguous and quite possibly still contains hints of lust. The “courageous joy” that the narrator cites in the opening of the second tercet provides the strength to keep away from “what other men desire” in the closing of the first, but the mention of desire pulls from the octave into the sestet. The sonnet concludes with the narrator’s hope—most overtly

for heaven, but also suggesting the narrator's hope of overcoming his physical attraction or of eventually wearing down Laura's resistance and starting a romantic relationship with her. Thus, the underlying tension in the poetic structure augments the ambiguity in the poet's words. The poem's theme is overtly one of the soul's triumph over temptation, but the narrator's own romantic temptation assures that a slight shadow remains over his determination.

"Quando fra l'altre donne" is numerically the first sonnet in the *Canzoniere* that Willaert sets in his *Musica nova*, and that setting (Example 3) is the seventh piece in *Musica nova*'s madrigal section. Willaert sets "Quando fra l'altre donne" in the plagal F-Ionian mode (i.e., F Hypoionian), with enough skill that Zarlino used it to exemplify the twelfth mode in Part IV of the *Istitutioni harmoniche*. According to Zarlino, the twelfth mode is most suitable for love songs with sad elements, although some composers also use it for compositions with happier texts. Zarlino relates the twelfth mode to the sixth (Hypolydian) by stating that contemporary churchmen had changed pieces that used to be written in the sixth mode into the twelfth via B-flat.⁵⁷ In the context of "Quando fra l'altre donne," the mode amplifies the position of the lovelorn narrator, and the fact that Willaert uses it in this context rather than a joyful one may have earned Zarlino's approbation. Four of the twenty-four Petrarchan settings (along with the one Sasso setting) in the *Musica nova* are in transposed F modes, and perhaps the theme of denied love that pervades the *Canzoniere* filters into the *Musica nova* via the mode of the sad love song. Willaert's vocal ranges are relatively straightforward to the F-Hypoionian mode. He sets the cantus, tenor, and quintus in the plagal C-C ambitus, while the altus

and bassus are in the authentic F-F ambitus. Despite their different cleffing, the tenor and quintus have the exact same range and frequent voice-crossing, and they are densely and thickly interwoven. The effect of these two voices augments Willaert's overall style of subtle interactions between voices.

The gradually shifting textures in Willaert's style often involve vocal or syllable pairings that last just long enough to strike the ear or gain the notice of the singer before morphing into a different arrangement. The opening of "Quando fra l'altre donne" begins this way, with the altus and quintus voices paired. The tenor starts with them, but its opening motive and rhythm are such that it quickly diverges, only to briefly align with both the bassus and cantus in their staggered entrances. The rest of the voices have a brief rhythmic and melodic motive that helps the listener identify the beginning of the phrase in all voices as they enter. This very brief and loose stylistic similarity is what Joshua Rifkin defines as "motivicity," and I will continue to use this term as Rifkin defines it throughout my thesis.⁵⁸ There is a similar, vague correspondance between the setting of "hora" in the tenor and quintus voices in mm. 4-6; they use similar motion a third apart to decorate the same word. The similarity does not last long, however, and the same method of setting "hora" is not present in the other voices, so the impression is fleeting. Willaert uses a similar technique to demark the opening of the second line, which is staggered in all voices except the tenor and quintus. Although all the voices have a brief break between the end of the first line and the opening of the second, they are staggered so that there is no break in the overall flow of music. The possible cadential gesture on

⁵⁷ Zarlino, part IV, 191-2. Modal numbering in this translation conforms with the 1558 edition of the *Istitutioni harmoniche*.

⁵⁸ Rifkin, 243-64.

the final F in mm. 9-10 between the altus and bassus is substantially weakened by the very short, almost nonexistent preparation by the altus, as well as by the tenor, which continues through the cadence. This cadential gesture to the final confirms the transposed Hypoionian mode, but its weakness maintains the flow of the composition, in line with the narrator's thoughts. The brief pause of the poem at the end of line 2 is indicated by a comma, but the pause here does not interrupt the flow of the poem, just as the cadential gesture does not interrupt the flow of the piece.

Line 3 of the sonnet opens in a similar manner to the first two lines, with pairings of the altus with tenor and quintus with bassus. The altus and tenor share a motive, which the quintus has in inversion. By the end of m. 11, the cantus has aligned itself with the bassus, an alignment which it keeps only through m. 12. The ascending dotted quarter, eighth, quarter/half note figure that decorates syllables “-scun-” and “men” in mm. 12-16 is an example of motivicity, rather than full motive, because it is brief, a fairly common figure, and does not decorate all the iterations of “-scun-” and “men.” Nevertheless, the alignment of this figure, in thirds, in the altus, quintus, and bassus at m. 12 is noticeable to the listener, as is the alignment of syllables in mm. 13 (“bel” in the altus, tenor, and bassus) and 14 (“la” and “le” in the lower four voices). The cantus (starting later) and bassus (moving slowly) do not repeat any of the text of the third line, while the altus, tenor, and quintus repeat all but the first word. Although the cantus and bassus both have a fairly long rest separating the third line from the fourth, the altus, tenor, and bassus have shorter rests or none at all, and no cadence separates the third line from the fourth. This, again, complements the structure of Petrarch's sonnet, as the third and fourth lines are enjambed. The first real cadence of the piece is suitably on the final of F at mm. 24-

25, marking the end of the first quatrain. Although the altus and quintus sing through it, the cadence is quite strong; the cantus and tenor fulfill their regular cadential roles, supported by the bassus.

I have included the above discussion of Willaert's setting of the first quatrain of "Quando fra l'altre donne" as a specific, detailed example of Willaert's general style. My discussion of the rest of the piece will address how he uses these techniques to highlight the poem's structure, diction, and thematic material. The last aspect, that of addressing the thematic content of the texts, is the one traditionally neglected by Willaert scholarship and the one that Willaert, as a model of the *prima pratica*, was not supposed to have followed.

Willaert generally tends to obscure, elide, or otherwise weaken his cadences. In the *prima parte* of "Quando fra l'altre donne" hints of cadential motion between voices help to move the piece through a series of gestures irregular to the F-Hypoionian mode (by Zarlino's classification, cadences on F, C, and A are regular cadences). The weak cadence from mm. 9-10 confirms the modal center, F, but more prominently emphasizes the third, A, with a cadential gesture in the cantus to A and agogically unaccented motion in the tenor from B-flat to A. The next cadential gesture occurs at mm. 17-18 to D before the strong cadence at mm. 24-25 to F that strongly confirms the modal center. From there, an evaded cadence to the cofinal C at mm. 31-32 begins a series of cadential gestures that shift the center of the piece from F to the A emphasized in the first cadence. A very weak evaded cadence to E occurs between the tenor and bassus at mm. 41-42 (those voices are at the end of line six, although the cantus and quintus ended that line a beat earlier and the altus ends it four beats later). A relatively strong cadence to A in mm.

48-49 between the cantus and tenor is weakened by the fact that all of the other voices march heedlessly through it. The altus and bassus, in fact, cadence on D at the end of their text phrase a few measures later (mm. 51-52). The repeat of the direct address begun in line 7 is almost exact in the cantus, altus, and bassus, but the tenor's line and function is taken over by the quintus in identical range. The quintus cadences with the cantus on A at mm. 56-57 in a nearly exact repetition of the preceding cadence, which strengthens A as a secondary modal center, weakened again by the repetition of the altus-bassus cadence to D at m. 59. The tenor repeats a vague cadential gesture to G that it had at mm. 51-52 (in alignment with the first altus-bassus cadence), but this time delayed to mm. 60-61, after the altus-bassus cadence. The movement of the quintus at this point evades a unison cadence to G. The sharp final inherent in the G cadential gesture takes the piece further from the modal center of F. The cantus and tenor restore the modal center with an evaded cadence to F in mm. 68-69, but the cadential gesture is weakened by its placement in the middle of the text phrase in the tenor voice, as well as the lack of participation by the quintus and bassus. The F, coming immediately from a cadence on G, also seems to be more of a formality of restoration to the modal center before the end of the *prima parte*. A similar, extremely weak gesture to F between the cantus and altus occurs at m. 72, but the altus evades by leaping a sixth up to C, and the gesture is substantially weakened by its textual and metrical placement. Throughout the *prima parte*, Willaert subtly undermines his F Hypoionian mode, reflecting the narrator's underlying turmoil.

The conclusion of the *prima parte* is a sonority on the confinal C, but without a cadence. The sixth preceding the cadence is here between A and F in the tenor and

cantus, which in fact suggests a cadence to G, an odd way to end the *prima parte* of a piece in F Ionian. The suggestion is thwarted by the partwriting; the F in the cantus cannot be raised against the F in the bassus, which descends from C in a perfect fifth. The natural cantus proceeds downward to E. The tenor voice could conceivably move from B-flat to A-flat to produce an evaded cadence to G; the oddity of a cadence here on G, the fact that G occurs in one voice against three on C, and the foreignness of A-flat to the F Hypoionian mode, make this an unlikely scenario. The only remotely cadential motion to C, the actual final sonority, occurs in the leaping bassus. The quintus and altus have already arrived via leap: the altus in the leap to C that thwarted the F cadence in m. 72, and the quintus in m. 71 from F. Willaert's setting of Petrarch ends in the *prima parte* in the most modally standard place, reflecting the standard division between octave and sestet. The conclusion is not so solid, however, reflecting the narrator's ostensible resolve belied by underlying tension.

Throughout the *prima parte* and at the beginning of the *seconda parte*, the cantus voice has the character of an echo. It consistently begins each new phrase significantly later than the lower four voices, and is the only voice not to repeat text until the apostrophe to the soul in line 7. It has substantial periods of rest between every line of the octave and between every musical phrase in the *prima parte*, excepting the elision between lines 5-6 and 6-7 (see mm. 10-13, 18-20, 25-29, 50-52, 58-59). A particular example of this can be seen in the setting to line 5. Willaert sets off and emphasizes the benediction of line 5 through an alignment of the altus with quintus, slightly offset by the aligned tenor and bassus (mm. 26-29) for "I benedico il loco," which repeats in the quintus and altus in mm. 29-30 against silence in the lower two voices. The cantus moves

independently here. It shares the rhythmic profile of the rest of the voices, but its only iteration of the first half of line 5 bridges the end of the first iteration and the repeat by the altus and quintus. While the other voices continue on to the second half of line 5 in mm. 32-33, the cantus pauses until m. 34, eliding into line 6 much later than the lower four voices. The cantus continues to play the role of echo in the *seconda parte*, delaying its entrance until m. 78, while the rest of the voices enter homophonically in m. 74. It has a similarly staggered entrance at m. 88, where it states—exactly once—line 10; the other voices begin line 10 in m. 84, continued nearly seamlessly from line 9. The transition from line 10 to 11 is much less directly marked. The cantus is the last voice to begin the text for line 11 at m. 93, but there is only a quarter rest between the whole note that ends line 10 and the beginning of line 11. The cantus completes its assimilation into the timing of the other voices by m. 97. Following the strong cadence on F that completes the first tercet, it is the first voice to begin line 12, a half note earlier than the quintus. It, however, continues to sing the text without repetition until the final line, which it repeats exactly, and entirely, once.

This echo in the highest voice seems to represent the influence of Laura, to which the narrator is aspiring. Its independence and lack of repetition and fragmentation exhibit stability against the lower voices. In the *seconda parte*, it becomes more aligned with the lower voices as the narrator becomes more aligned with the higher moral rectitude of the second part. Yet the echo is not just a quiet conscience reminding the other voices of a more orderly style. Its transition from quietly independent to subsumed by the overall texture inspires a more sinister reading, as well. Did moral high ground triumph over

disorder, or get consumed by it? Does the narrator follow platonically the spiritual path set by Laura, or let his desire slowly subsume it?

The apostrophe to the soul that occurs in line 7 marks one of the major events in the sonnet, and Willaert emphasizes it heavily. The start of line 7, “E dico,” receives a single, brief iteration in all voices, followed by a brief pause (which corresponds to Petrarch’s colon), and then “Anima,” decorated in the altus, quintus and bassus in mm. 44-47 and further set off by rests. The direct address is punctuated by rests in all voices, followed by the remainder of the line. Although in Petrarch, line 7 is enjambed with line 8, Willaert ends both complete repetitions of line 7 with a Phrygian cadence on A between the cantus and tenor. In addition, the second half of the line is highly fragmented and the word “dei” is often ornamented. None of this makes particular sense in strict terms of the poetic form of the line. A cascade of cadences through A, D, and G from mm. 57-61 build energy to the end of the *prima parte*. Line 8, the final line of the opening octave and the *prima parte* is heavily repeated and fragmented in all of the voices. Most of the fragmentation falls after “honor,” dividing the line approximately in half. Although Willaert here repeats a single word rather than a phrase, the extensive fragmented repetition seems to drastically contradict Stocker’s injunction against repeated words. The repetition and fragmentation serves to propel the piece to the end of the *prima parte*. Instead of illustrating the proper rhetoric of the words, Willaert creates a sense of urgency that illustrates the narrator’s rather fervent gratitude. Perhaps this is strength and determination of purpose, or perhaps it is excitement of a more earthly nature. Further increasing this urgency, whatever it is, is the change in rhythm between lines 7 and 8. Line 7, the beginning of the apostrophe, featured relatively melismatic text

setting (flouting Stocker's rules for effect), while line 8 resumes the syllabic setting of the rest of the piece, and moves predominantly in quarter notes. Willaert uses the text in this instance to help him build intensity to the close of the *parte*. The cantus, quintus, and bassus begin line 7 together, while the altus and tenor are paired, but the fragmentation and repetition of text pull the voices in and out of alignment with one another.

The building energy of the end of the *prima parte* is ultimately thwarted by its lack of cadential closure. The narrator's fervent thanks and determination end with a more demure, and ultimately weak, conclusion. The *seconda parte* opens with homophony in the four lower voices, which gradually dissipates over the first measures, until the entrance of the cantus at m. 78 pulls it further apart. To complement the more staid opening (and the determination of the narrator to follow the path of righteousness), the abnormal modal practice that begins in the *prima parte* gradually rights itself over the course of the *seconda parte*. The cofinal cadence to C, denied in the *prima parte*, finally occurs in mm. 91-92 in the *seconda parte*. This regular cadence is, however, preceded by an extremely odd evaded cadence to G at mm. 83-84, perhaps echoing the thwarted (and irregular) allusion to a G cadence at the end of the *prima parte*. At mm. 83-84, the cantus makes a very clear cadential gesture, but the cadence that is prepared in the tenor finishes in the altus, which itself makes a gesture reminiscent of a bassus's descending fifth. According to Zarlino, the regular cadences in the twelfth mode occur on the final, cofinal, and third (C, G, and E, transposed to F, C, and A), which makes the G cadence at mm. 83-84 irregular.⁵⁹ The *ficta* that marks the cadential gesture in the cantus, F#, is extremely odd for being a sharp final. Further weakening the sense of cadence, the

⁵⁹ Zarlino, part IV, 191.

quintus and bassus are in the midst of beginning line 10 and ending line 9 respectively, make no pauses between lines, and, although the upper two lines are textually together, the text of the lower two voices provide no complementary declamation. This cadential gesture to G falls at the end of line 9 in the poem, which enjambs directly with line 10. The weakness of the cadence recognizes the enjambment while still, perhaps, allowing the narrator the briefest respite with his amorous thoughts.

The actual cofinal cadence at mm. 91-92 is, again, weakened by the tenor's lack of clear cadential motion. The tenor barely rests on the C at all, moving almost immediately on to line 11. The break between lines 10 and 11 is also primarily in the altus and cantus, while the quintus and tenor weaken the cadence rhythmically and the bassus, which has taken a long break between the end of its line 10 at m. 88 and beginning of line 11 at m. 92 finally enters when the cantus and altus are finishing line 10, further obscuring the sense of pause. In fact, in terms of poetic meaning, a pause here would hint at baser desires; the immediate continuation illustrates that the narrator's amorous thoughts toward Laura lead to higher things.

Although the cadential motion at the ends of lines 9 and 10 are weak, the cadence ending line 11 at mm. 96-97 is extremely strong. In fact, it consists of two cadences on top of one another, and all five voices support the cadence textually and rhythmically. The cantus and altus form a Phrygian cadence on A, while the tenor and bassus form a more conventional cadence on F. This cadence is unusual in its strength, especially in the music of Willaert. Additionally, no part of line 11 receives any textual repetition. The cadence marks a full stop in the poem and the end of the first tercet, and so has a structural function. This also calls attention to the parallelism and the sound of the line. A

listener might be tempted to think she is hearing a distinct repetition until she hears the second line of the tercet. This break also serves to further separate what other men desire and the narrator's higher line of thought inspired by Laura. The final clear cadence of the piece is a Phrygian cadence at mm. 102-103 on A in the cantus and tenor. It is substantially weaker than the cadence at mm. 96-97; it lacks the stacked F cadence, and it is especially undermined by the altus, which has already started line 13. The textual reason for a cadence here is at first unclear; although Willaert (or whoever copied his texts) places a comma at the end of this line, Petrarch's poetic line is enjambed. The main point of contrast between lines 12 and 13 is the differentiation between the joy created by Laura and its result, a drive toward the heavens. From the perspective of the modal outline of the piece, the double cadence on F and A marks the end of the wandering irregularity that characterized the piece until this point. By pairing the point of departure, A, with the final F, Willaert also ties the modal wanderings in a complete circle. The final, clearer cadences of the piece are on A (mm. 102-103) and C (mm. 108-109), outlining the F sonority. The drive to virtue which characterizes the final lines is thus underpinned by the most modally certain music of the piece.

Drive also characterizes the musical setting of the final two lines of the sonnet. Line 13 opens with recognizable motivicity in mm. 103-105 between the cantus, altus, tenor, and bassus, perhaps to help guide the listener, but the similarity between these voices evaporates after their first few notes. While line 12 contains no repetition, the first part of line 13 ("Ch'al ciel ti scorge") is separated and repeated in the cantus, altus, and quintus voices, which are the first three voices to begin line 13. The repetition aligns the altus textually and rhythmically with the tenor at m. 104 and emphasizes the "ch" sound

that dominates the first part of Petrarch's line. Stocker's injunction against text repetition aside, this type of fragmentation and repetition is relatively common in Willaert's music, often driven by similar causes: to align rhythm in text in two parts for a brief period or to emphasize the sound of words.⁶⁰ The fact that this segment is a phrase, rather than a single word, makes its repetition more acceptable to Stocker's rules, although the division does not come at a caesura or pause in the line. The vaguest hint of a cadence on C between the bassus and altus marks m. 109 and the end of line 13 in the altus and cantus; although the altus makes a fairly clear cadential gesture, the bassus has already started line 14 in m. 108, the tenor continues an extended decoration on "sentero," and the cantus has only a quarter note to end line 13, while beginning line 14 with a half note. The text of line 14 is fragmented, with the voices weaving around each other textually. The cantus and altus begin the line with a beat displacement at m. 109, and they remain relatively close for the rest of the piece. The quintus and bass are prominently paired at m. 116, but their connection is gone by the end of m. 117 into 118 because Willaert has the bassus repeat the first part of the line ("sì, ch'i vo già"), after which point the rhythms of the two voices diverge as well. The weaving voices portray soaring hopes, although, it should be noted, not via the literal ascension that one would associate with text-painting. In fact, the word "altero" is as often set to a descending motion as to an ascending one (for example, see cantus and altus, mm. 119-120, tenor mm. 114-115, mm. 121-122, quintus mm. 111-112), and even in cases when the line first ascends, it closes with a descent (see quintus mm. 119-120, for example).

⁶⁰ For a thorough analysis of Willaert's alignment of syllables, see Jonathan Marcus Miller, "Word-Sound and Musical Texture in the Mid-Sixteenth-Century

The buildup and drive at the conclusion of the *seconda parte* meet an equally unsatisfying end as they did in the *prima parte*. The F sonority at the close of the piece is safely on the final, but there is no sense of cadence, despite the clear cadential gesture in the cantus voice at mm. 120-121. The cantus's clear cadential gesture is theoretically evaded by the altus from m. 120 into m. 121, but the altus has no rhythmic or textual markers of cadence. It continues heedlessly in the quarter note homophony with the tenor and quintus that began earlier in m. 120. In mm. 121-122, the bassus has an F-B-flat-F progression set in half notes, which does not fully support the cantus's cadence. The end of the piece pulls back from any sense of finality or final triumph. In this concluding cadence Willaert encapsulates the underlying tensions that haunt the poem. Petrarch's sonnet is, on the surface, a straightforward dedication of the narrator to the spiritual rectitude suggested by Laura's example. His obsession with her, however, thwarts his best efforts, and the structure of the poem and the narrator's mode of expression suggest that he is not as pure-minded as he would wish.

Rore's setting of "Quando fra l'altre donne" (Example 4) was published by Scotto in 1548 in Rore's *Terzo libro di madrigali à cinque voci*. Its publication predates that of Willaert's piece by eleven years, although determining which piece was composed first would be a matter of blind speculation. Rore's earlier publication date is valuable to note, however, in that it discourages the tendency of scholars and analysts to assume that Rore, as Willaert's pupil, would have necessarily modeled his piece on Willaert's.

Venetian Madrigal" (Ph.D. diss., University of North Carolina at Chapel Hill, 1991). Miller's work is useful, but highly beholden to Feldman's paradigms.

The most overtly remarkable aspect of Rore's setting is that he chose to split the sonnet after the first quatrain. The result of this split, as noted by Meier, is an emphasis of the direct address which starts in the middle of the second quatrain and continues for the rest of the piece.⁶¹ Feldman uses this division of the piece to exemplify Rore's musical emphasis on the meaning of his texts, although I believe that this compositional choice reflects more of a structural tension than a division in meaning.⁶² Whereas madrigals are generally balanced in regards to length of the first and second parts, Rore's setting emphasizes the second half in length. The *prima parte* has 31 measures (breves) to the 60 of the *seconda parte*. The *second parte*, which has three-fourths of the poem text, is therefore twice as long as the *prima parte* and makes up two-thirds of the madrigal's length; Rore has split his piece along a golden mean. In this way, he represents the tension in Petrarch's sonnet between the normal octave-sestet, and the inverted sestet-octave.

Rore opens "Quando fra l'altre donne" with a point of imitation at the octave and fifth, which lasts only long enough to establish the phrase before evaporating after the word "donne." The clear cadence on G between the quintus and bassus at mm. 9-10 establishes the G Hypomixolydian mode and marks a clear end to line 2 of the poem. Lines 1 and 2 are enjambed, which Rore respects by observing no pause between the lines in every voice but the cantus, which has only a brief eighth rest in m. 6. Rore changes his opening strategy for line 3. Line 3 opens with exact imitation between the

⁶¹ Cipriano de Rore, *Opera Omnia*, vol. 3, ed. Bernhard Meier, Corpus Mensurabilis Musicae, vol. 14, ed. Armen Carapetyan ([Rome]: American Institute of Musicology, 1961), ii.

⁶² Feldman, 261-2.

altus, tenor, and cantus and between the bassus and quintus. Rore pairs the bassus and tenor so that, although singing different lines, the two begin line 3 together. He staggers the upper three voices in such a way that, although each voice individually rests between lines 3 and 4, the two are interwoven in the overall texture: the altus begins line 4 in m. 14, while the quintus begins its iteration of line 3 in m. 13. Rore further ties the two lines together by repeating both of them, in their entireties, in all voices. While the cantus and quintus conclude line 4 by cadencing on C in mm. 20-21, the tenor and bassus start the repeat of line 3, which leads into a repetition of line 4 beginning at m. 24. Assisting in the interweaving of lines 3 and 4, they start with similar sounds, “Quanto ciascuna” and “tanto cresce.” At the repeat of line 3, the cantus and tenor each have the exact same line that they had for the first iteration, and the quintus, too, exactly repeats its part except for the note setting “di” in m. 26. This time, the bassus follows the rhythmic profile of the cantus and tenor. At the first iteration of line 4, the cantus, tenor, bassus, and altus all have almost the exact same motive for the first half of the line; the only differences are in the size and notes of the first descending interval (the cantus has a fifth, the tenor a fourth, the bassus a fourth, but with an inversion of the cantus’s notes, and the altus a third) and the fact that the altus is imitating at the fifth rather than the octave. The second iteration has the cantus, tenor, and bassus repeating the exact motive from “tanto,” but the altus merely imitates the cantus’s opening interval of a descending fifth before embarking on a new melodic and rhythmic line. The *prima parte* ends with a strong, clear cadence on C, which is, according to Zarlino, an irregular cadence in the 12-mode system’s G Hypomixolydian mode. In the 8-mode system, a strong C cadence here instead reinforces the mode.

The last two lines of the first quatrain comprise what is essentially a varied repeat in Rore's setting. Rore adjusts the entrance locations of all voices during the repeat of both lines so that the end result is a complicated and impressive section of interwoven counterpoint. The only text repetition that Rore uses is in service to this contrapuntal idea, and he repeats lines 3 and 4 in their entirety.⁶³ Rore's settings are almost entirely syllabic, and move largely in quarter notes, with the largest melismas saved for the penultimate syllable of the line.⁶⁴ Notable words like "viso" (mm. 6-8 in the cantus, quintus and tenor) and "bella" (m. 15 in the quintus) may receive decorations in some voices, but not always; the counterpoint takes precedence in determining whether they do or not. In this section, longer notes are not terribly common, so they certainly do not set every accented syllable, but when they do appear, they almost always set an accented syllable, making them in overall accordance with Stocker's description. Longer notes setting accented syllables in one part do not necessarily transfer to other parts, however; compare the setting of "cresce" in the quintus in m. 27-28, for example, to the setting of the same word in surrounding voices.

The opening of the *seconda parte* is almost homophonic, setting a solemn, choral tone for the benediction that begins the second quatrain. The homophonic texture and similar rhythmic profile Rore uses for the first half of line 5 also sets off the second half, dealing with time, which is far more staggered across the voices. Rore's repetition of the

⁶³ The altus repeats the first half of line 4 in mm. 25-29, and the bassus repeats the second half of line 4 in mm. 27-31, but those are isolated instances.

⁶⁴ This text setting corresponds with Stocker's discretionary rules for younger composers in its avoidance of repetition and syllabic setting of quarter notes (semiminims). The melismas on the accented penultimate or antepenultimate syllables is in accordance with Stocker's first discretionary rule for younger composers.

first half of line 5 in the altus and quintus voices further staggers the iterations of “e’l tempo e l’hora,” as does the decoration in the altus of the final syllable of “loco.” The entrance of line 6 is heavily staggered, but overlaps the iterations of “e’l tempo e l’hora” to reflect the enjambment of lines 5 and 6. The tenor and altus begin line 6 with a very similar melodic profile, as do the cantus and altus at the fifth. All voices have the same rhythmic profile, which aids the listener or the singer in hearing the entrance of line 6 across the staggered vocal parts. The rest following “dico” at the beginning of line 7 realigns the lower four voices (the quintus and tenor are exactly aligned) for the apostrophe to the narrator’s soul. All of the voices except the quintus have a descending minor third to set “animus;” the quintus has a descending major third. The tenor, quintus, and altus share the exact rhythm, as do the cantus and bassus. These compositional techniques help to emphasize the direct address, which is also followed by a rest in all voices, even if only an eighth rest in the altus and quintus. Line 8 begins with the voices slightly staggered, the cantus and tenor together and joined very briefly by the bassus in m. 53, which then goes on to align with the quintus. At m. 56, a cadence between the cantus and tenor, again on the pitch C, emphasizing the 8-mode system, ends the second quatrain. The bassus, however, has already begun the first line of the sestet, which leaves the listener with the impression that the narrator’s thoughts have run away with him, interrupting the end of the benediction.

Line 9, the first of the sestet, opens with a point of imitation. Line 10 begins in mm. 60-61 with paired quintus and tenor, cantus and bassus. Although this line has no caesura, rests of varying lengths at the midpoints of the cantus, altus, tenor, and bassus lines help to pull the voices into different alignments with one another. The decorations

on “ben” in the tenor voice at m. 63 and on “t’invia” at mm. 64-65 in the cantus and altus perform similar functions. Although Petrarch has a break between lines 10 and 11, Rore mostly obscures any sense of rest by overlapping the entrances of the two lines, although the tenor is the only voice that proceeds from line 10 to line 11 without pause. Oddly placed rests in the middle of line 11 in the lower three voices again adjust the alignment of voices. They also lend a breathless quality to the allusion of “what other men desire,” although the earthly desire in the lower voices is countered by the upper voices, which start later, but have no interruption. The altus, especially seems to hurry through in eighth notes (m. 67) that over which the lower voices would linger. The first tercet ends with a relatively clear cadence on F between cantus and tenor at m. 69. The cadence is, once again, irregular according to Zarlino’s 12-mode system. The bassus continues the flow of the sestet (which does focus, after all, on the progression of the narrator’s thoughts, which are not likely to pause) by starting line 12 underneath the cadence.

At m. 69, Rore drops the texture from five voices to four. The absent voice alternates, but the four-voice texture persists until m. 87, when all the voices come together to add emphasis and drive to the final cadence. The cantus, tenor, and bassus have the same six-note motive, displaced by fifths, to open line 12 at mm. 68-71. The bassus, altus, and tenor enter separated by two beats; the cantus follows the tenor by four beats, and the quintus follows the cantus by one. The motive in the cantus, tenor, and bassus helps the melody maintain coherence throughout its staggered entrances. At mm. 73-74, the cantus and altus form a weak evaded cadence to G. The cadence is inverted, with the cantus fulfilling the tenor role and the altus the cantus role, and the cantus lacks the rhythmic component of its conclusion. Still, this prospective cadence foreshadows the

return of the appropriate modal center as the narrator's thoughts get closer to heaven and is the first of several attempts at a strong G cadence that finally reaches fulfillment at the end of the piece.

Rore opens line 13 with imitation between the cantus, altus, and tenor voices. The second half of the line offers another example of variation in proper accentuation with the setting of the words "per destro" in mm. 75-77. The cantus, tenor, and bassus voices set "per" with a short note and the syllable "de-" with a longer note. The altus reverses this accentuation. With line 13, Rore sets up another evaded cadence to G, this time between the tenor (with the cantus role) and the altus (with the tenor role), which the altus avoids by resting at m. 81. The final line repeats four times, beginning at m. 79. Each repetition ends with a clearer cadence closing it (mm. 81-82, 84-85, mm. 87-88, and ending with mm. 90-91). Each repetition also becomes more homophonic, the voices beginning and staying in closer alignment until mm. 87, which builds to the final, clear cadence with near homophony and a return to five-voice texture.

The piece is in the relatively common plagal G Mixolydian mode, which Zarlino describes as having a softness and sweetness suitable for grave, profound, or divine subjects and regular cadences on D, B-natural, and G.⁶⁵ The cantus, quintus, and tenor voices are in plagal range, and the altus and bassus in authentic. As in Willaert's setting, the quintus and tenor in Rore's setting share almost exactly the same range, although in Rore's setting they also share the same clefs. Rore's setting emphasizes cadences to C, rather than the regular cofinal D. Several fairly strong cadences occur on C (mm. 20-21 and 30-31 in the *prima parte*; mm. 55-56 in the *seconda parte*), while the setting contains

⁶⁵ Zarlino, part IV, 165.

no cadential motion to D. The C cadence in the *seconda parte* ends the second quatrain, echoing the C cadence that ended the first. The F cadence that ends the first tercet, between the structural cantus and tenor voices (mm. 68-69) is also irregular in the G Hypomixolydian mode. The evaded cadence on G at mm. 73-74 moves the piece back to the G Hypomixolydian mode, where it concludes with a strong cadence to the final at the close of the piece. The underlying tension in mode from lines 2-12 echoes the duality of the narrator's thoughts between sacred and secular.

Willaert and Rore set “Quando fra l’altre donne” with different emphasis. Willaert’s setting emphasizes the circuitous thought processes of the narrator through a subtle undermining of standard madrigal tropes. Rore’s setting highlights the formal shift that occurs with the narrator’s apostrophe to the soul with an unusual division between the first and second stanzas. Willaert’s absent cadences and succession of fifth-related cadences express the underlying tension and duality of the narrator’s thoughts. Rore’s setting accomplishes a similar expressive effect by softening the G Hypomixolydian mode with references to the reciting tone C, common to the 8-mode system. Willaert’s setting tends to prioritize syllable alignment and subtle shifts more than Rore’s, which uses a more standard form of counterpoint prioritizing stricter imitation. Rore also repeats his texts much less often than does Willaert, and his setting moves at a faster pace, with ninety-one measures compared with Willaert’s one hundred twenty-two. Rore’s phrases are clearly defined, while Willaert’s are often undermined. Both composers read the ambiguity in Petrarch, but choose to emphasize it in quite different ways.

Chapter 4: Comparison by Common Latin Text: “O socii”

Although *Aeneid* settings were fairly common throughout the Renaissance, the particular setting from the *Aeneid* that both Willaert and Rore set as a secular motet, “O socii,” was not. The text is from Book 1 of the *Aeneid*, lines 198-207, after Aeneas and his crew are shipwrecked on the coast of Carthage. Aeneas encourages his crew to persevere.

198 “*O socii—neque enim ignari sumus ante malorum—*
199 *O passi graviora, dabit deus his quoque finem.*
200 *Vos et Scyllaem rabiem penitusque sonantis*
201 *accestis scopulos, vos et Cyclopea saxa*
202 *expertis: revocate animos, maestumque timorem*
203 *mittite: forsan et haec olim meminisse iuvabit.*
204 *Per varios casus, per tot discrimina rerum*
205 *tendimus in Latium; sedes ubi fata quietas*
206 *ostendunt; illic fas regna resurgere Troiae.*
207 *durate, et vosmet rebus servate secundis.*”

O comrades—for ere this we have not been ignorant of evils—O ye who have borne a heavier lot, to this, too, God will grant an end! Ye drew near to Scylla’s fury and her deep-echoing crags; ye have known, too, the rocks of the Cyclopes; recall your courage and put away sad fear. Perchance even this distress it will some day be a joy to recall. Through divers mishaps, through so many perilous chances, we fare towards Latium, where the fates point out a home of rest. There ’tis granted to Troy’s realm to rise again; endure, and keep yourselves for days of happiness.⁶⁶

This text was, as far as I have been able to discern, set solely by Willaert and Rore during the sixteenth century. Ignace Bossuyt traces the connection of the text to Cardinal

⁶⁶ Virgil, *Eclogues, Georgics, Aeneid, 1-6*, trans. H.R. Fairclough, rev. ed. (Cambridge, MA: Harvard University Press, 1986), 254-5.

Antoine Perrenot de Granvelle, who used the phrase “Durate” as a personal motto and who kept correspondance with both Willaert and Rore, among other composers. Bossuyt traces the origins of Willaert’s setting through an exchange of letters between the composer and the cardinal; Granvelle had probably requested the setting from Willaert at the same time as he gave Willaert one of his medals, during Willaert’s trip to Antwerp in 1557. The reverse of this medal features Aeneis’s ship tossed on a stormy ocean underlain by the word “Durate.” This motto, “Durate,” is set by Willaert as a *sogetto cavato*, isolated in the quintus and sextus voices; Rore uses a *sogetto cavato* isolated in the quintus. In addition to composing “O socii” at Granvelle’s request, Willaert apparently sent Granvelle a copy of the newly-printed *Musica nova* in October 1558. Whether Granvelle directly requested a setting of “O socii” from Rore is less certain, although Granvelle and Rore did correspond.⁶⁷

Aeneas’s speech is characterized by the dactylic hexameter typical of classical epic poetry. Latin verse varies from Italian in that its meter is determined by length of syllables, rather than accent, and, in fact, accent is often in tension with length. Lines 198 and 199 are connected by their parallel openings, although the early caesura that characterizes line 198 has moved to a more standard middle position in line 199. Lines 202 and 203 are both marked by an early caesura, along with similarities of accentuation shared by the first word of each line. The expressive nature and purpose of this text also differs from the sonnets that make up the majority of this study. Sonnets are lyric poetry, and Petrarch’s, especially, ruminate on the inner thoughts and feelings of their narrator. The *Aeneid* is, of course, epic poetry, which is narrative and less reflective by nature.

⁶⁷ Ignace Bossuyt, “O socii durate: A Musical Correspondance from the Time of Philip II,” *Early Music* 26, no. 3 (August 1998), 435-7.

This text, too, is overtly externally focused, as Aeneas addresses his troops; his phrasing is meant to inspire. In fact, there is tension between what Aeneas's outward manner and speech, and what he feels. The next two lines continue: "So spake his tongue; while sick with weighty cares he feigns hope on his face, and deep in his heart stifles the anguish."⁶⁸ Stopping the text excerpt before these lines has the result of removing the overt tension between outer speech and inner feelings. If the cardinal represents Aeneas, courageously telling supporters to persevere through adversity, the cut helps to render the dedicatee of the motet in a strong, assured light.

Virgil's reference to the soldiers of Aeneas founding a new Troy in Latium is a reference to the Roman Empire (recently transformed from the Roman Republic). The Italians of the sixteenth century could find their own heritage in the glory of the Roman Empire, and link themselves through Virgil back to Troy. The Mantuan Virgil would likely have had some local resonance to Willaert and Rore, who both worked in neighboring Ferrara, but the further link to Rome in particular is suitable for a Catholic cardinal. That Granvelle requested a setting of this particular text from Willaert, and had a motto referencing it, indicates that this text had particular significance to him. Rore's own connection to Granvelle probably comes from his time in his native Netherlands in 1558-1560, following his service in Ferrara. Granvelle served in the Netherlands as Prime Minister from 1559-1564. A possible further connection comes from Margaret of Parma, daughter of Charles V, who was regent of the Netherlands from 1559, as appointed by her half-brother Philip II of Spain. Margaret had married Ottavio Farnese of Parma in

⁶⁸ Virgil, trans. Fairclough, 255.

1538; Rore entered Farnese service in Parma in 1560, where he stayed until his death in 1564, with a small gap in 1563 when he took Willaert's position at S. Marco in Venice.

Rore's setting of "O socii" (Example 5) is found, along with Willaert's setting, in his posthumous *Quinto libro di madrigal à cinque voci*, published by Gardano in 1566. The inscription (reproduced by Meier in his edition) of "Illustrissimi et Reverendissimi Cardinallis Granvellani Emblema" occurs in every partbook. Whether this inscription was added by Rore or Gardano is, however, impossible to determine, especially considering that Willaert's piece on the same text immediately precedes Rore's in the collection. Willaert's piece has an identical inscription to Rore's. Rore's setting respects its classical text within a relatively normative madrigal structure. The listener's recognition of the points of the piece's deviation from typical madrigal inspires much of its meaning. Rore splits the text between lines 203 and 204, which results in an introductory sestet and a concluding quatrain. The split in text is thematically between the past and future, with the opening sestet focusing on the past hardships of the sailors, and the quatrain on their future as the founders of Rome. Rore's compositional techniques enhance this aspect of his text; the *seconda parte* emphasizes the ability of the narrator (and the Cardinal) to overcome the hardships pervading the *prima parte* and prevail.

The G Mixolydian mode that Rore chose to set "O socii" may be a common mode, but his usage of it is assuredly not. Whether it is in the plagal or authentic Mixolydian mode is somewhat ambiguous, but it is most likely plagal because of the C sonority at the beginning. The cantus has a D-D range, the altus and quintus have G-G ranges, and the tenor and bassus have ranges of C-F and F-C respectively. The motto in the quintus voice has the G-G range, but from Zarlino's descriptions of the seventh

(Mixolydian) and eighth (Hypomixolydian) modes, the eighth fits the subject matter of the motet much more closely. The seventh mode is associated with subject matter that is lascivious, cheerful, or angry. The eighth mode, on the other hand, is suited to subjects that are serious, civilized, and profound, and is far removed from vice.⁶⁹ Zarlino does associate the eighth mode with softness, which is literally at odds with Granvelle's motto "Durate," with its kinship to "duro," meaning hard. Regardless of the ambiguity between the seventh and eighth modes, both have, according to Zarlino's 12-mode system, regular openings and cadences on G, B-natural, and D. Rore's concluding cadential gestures tend toward G and, with the exception of an allusion to a cadence to C in m. 77, the entire *seconda parte* dwells around the final of G. The first cadence of *prima parte* is on C (m. 10), although cadences and cadential gestures to D and G pervade the piece. The prominent placement of C cadences in the *prima parte* adds an allusion to the 8-mode system.

The cadence that ends the *prima parte* is, in part, a culmination of the B-flat to A pull that appears periodically throughout the *prima parte* (mm. 7, 15-16, 20, 24, 55, 61-63). After the end of the *prima parte*, however, B-flat disappears from the piece altogether, and the entire *seconda parte* focuses on the final of G. One possible explanation of the presence of B-flat in the *prima parte* and not the *seconda parte* is that it is a reflection of the *prima parte*'s focus on preceding trials and hardships. Rore splits the speech between lines 203 and 204, so that the *prima parte* ends textually with the speaker declaring that "One day...even these will be grand things to look back on." After this statement, the speaker shifts toward the future of his audience and their destiny. This

⁶⁹ Zarlino, part IV, 160-5.

shift in focus between past and future, hardship and hope differentiates the *prima parte* from *seconda parte* textually, and the marked increase in modal clarity from the *prima parte* to the *seconda parte* amplifies this distinction.

The prominence of the soft B-flat throughout the *prima parte* forms a type of antonym pun on the hard *durus/Durate*. The persistent half-step pull downward is evocative of a lingering sense of impending defeat: Aeneas's true feelings despite his brave words. It also emphasizes the focus of the *prima parte* on the hardships of the past. One notable instance of this B-flat occurs in mm. 16-17, when the B-flat in the cantus in the first half of m. 16 immediately precedes an F-sharp in the cadencing altus. In fact, the cantus voice takes the tenor role in the cadence in mm. 16-17, descending to G via A. This prominent B-flat adorns the first cadence to the final G that marks the caesura in line 199. In fact, Rore repeats the first half of this line, with a deceptive cadence to the cofinal D occurring at mm. 13-14. Rore's repetition of the first half of the line in mm. 11-17 helps to reinforce the idea of past dangers, and the cadence at the caesura point separates these from an as-yet unrealized future in which God will alleviate the sailors' current troubles. A break at the caesura point of line 199 may be supported by the structure of the line, but a two-cadence repetition on modally important notes seems slightly excessive. Rore's cadences and repetition here are expressive devices that accompany the feeling of hope amid hopelessness further underscored by the B-flat in the cantus and F-sharp in the altus.

The *seconda parte*'s B-natural indicates the overcoming of adversity as a result of the persistence for which the text calls, and emphasizes the brighter future on which the *seconda parte* focuses. It also helps to emphasize the reciting tone C in the 8-mode

system. Perhaps it is also a rise to heaven in honor of the cardinal. The latter interpretation is bolstered by the treatment of the *sogetto cavato*, which rises sequentially over the course of the *prima parte*, and then again in the *seconda parte*. Its ascension in the *seconda parte* is accompanied by decreased rhythmic values, bolstering its intensity. The *sogetto cavato* used by Rore (and Willaert, for that matter), is based on the syllables of the word “Durate,” that is, Ut, Fa, Re. Its first iteration in Rore’s piece is G, C, A: Ut, Fa, Re in the hard hexachord (referencing “durus”). Each time it recurs, Rore sequences it up a step until it arrives at C, F, D (beginning at m. 52) in the natural hexachord, which then repeats at the end of the *prima parte*. In the *seconda parte*, Rore returns the *sogetto cavato* to the hard hexachord pitches of G, C, A, but its rhythms have been reduced from double whole notes to whole notes. The amount of time between iterations of the *sogetto cavato* also grows progressively shorter at regular intervals. The quintus waits three bars before entering in the *seconda parte*, and there are three bars between the next three iterations of the *sogetto cavato*. When the *sogetto cavato* reaches its C, F, D form at m. 85, it returns back down to G, C, A at m. 89, and the gap between iterations reduces to one measure. This change corresponds with the end of line 206 in the text, after which the other four voices have “durate” for the first time. After this version of the *sogetto cavato* reaches C, F, D, the meter of the quintus voice changes to *tempus perfectum* (along with the cantus at m. 103), and the *sogetto cavato* returns to G to begin the cycle again (m. 103). This time, there is no space between each iteration. The quintus continues in whole notes, but, due to the time change, they are worth half of what they previously were. For the final iteration of the *sogetto cavato* (m. 110), the quintus, which has once again reached C, F, D, switches back into *tempus imperfectum*. The overall effect of the *sogetto*

cavato, then, is one of a cycle of increasing speed. The *sogetto cavato* in the *prima parte* is slow and extended, with variable length of time between iterations. The *sogetto cavato* in the *seconda parte* recurs with regularity and goes through three cycles before the end of the piece. The buildup of excitement and intensity thus associated with the *sogetto cavato* is one that a listener can associate with increasing excitement and passion in the speaker, the overcoming of adversity and focus on the future, and persistent efforts that grow stronger with time. From an extramusical perspective, they also point toward the ascension of the listener to heaven, as inspired by the Cardinal.

Rore's compositional techniques in "O socii" are relatively conservative, with frequent sections of homophony and points of imitation that clarify and differentiate phrases. He makes frequent use of repetition, usually repeating entire lines or halves of lines. This level of repetition, which is slightly atypical of Rore, helps to build the cyclical feel of the whole, even though Stocker might liken it to stuttering.⁷⁰ In his setting, Rore tends to carefully observe line enjambment, moving directly between enjambed lines and pausing frequently at medial caesuras.

Homophony is particularly prominent from m. 52 to the end of the *prima parte*, setting line 204 after the caesura. The homophony in this case serves structurally to emphasize the last line of the *prima parte*. Expressively it underlies the idea of reflecting on the past from a more tranquil future, a future which is the focus of the upcoming *seconda parte*. In this instance, the homophony is accompanied by the cantus's B-flat in m. 56 and an F-sharp in the altus in the first half of m. 57 that leads to a G in the second half of that measure. Any sense of cadence is marred by the unlikely textual placement

⁷⁰ Stocker, 252-3.

(starting at the repeat of line 203, a beat too late to conclude its first iteration) and the fact that the cantus rests after its descent to A, rather than continuing to G. The *seconda parte*, perhaps in reference to a hopeful, tranquil future, is marked extensively by homophony. The exact homophony beginning at m. 73 and extending to m. 91 highlights the proposed destiny of the sailors in Latium. This homophony only breaks off at “Durate,” the motto and *soggetto cavato* that has been repeating in the quintus.

Rore’s setting of “O socii” combines relatively straightforward counterpoint with an evocative, falling B-flat in the *prima parte* that sublimates into B-natural in the *seconda parte*. The B-flat tinges the transposed G mode with melancholy. Rore’s use of homophony emphasizes the peaceful future to which Aeneas and his soldiers aspire, while relatively frequent text repetition and an ascending *soggetto cavato* form a type of cyclical drive that illustrates Cardinal Granvelle’s motto of “Durate,” to hold on, endure. Rore’s *soggetto cavato* is, in its opening iteration, identical to the first iteration of the *soggetto cavato* in Willaert’s setting.

But this setting of “O socii” (Example 6) is complicated by the fact that Willaert does not set text as it appears in the *Aeneid*, or, in fact, in any version that I was able to locate. Whether Willaert or Granvelle was responsible for the changes in text is unclear, although if Granvelle directly commissioned a similar piece from Rore, the textual change would seem to be Willaert’s. The altered text reads as follows:

*O socii, durate.
 O socii, neque enim ignari sumus ante malorum;
 O passi graviores, dabit deus his quoque finem,
 Experti, revocate animos moestumque timorem
 Mittite; forsitan et haec olim meminisse iuvabit,
 Per varios casus, per tot discrimina rerum,
 Tendimus, ostendunt sedes ubi fata secundas.
 Durate, et vosmet rebus servate secundis.*

The opening statement “O socii, durate” does not exist in Virgil’s text. It does, however, essentially encapsulate the message of the following speech and effectively highlight the Cardinal’s motto. The altered text removes any traces of pagan mythology from the text, and also removes the specifics of the places of Latium and Troy. This also removes direct reference to Rome, as perhaps suited a composer working in the Venetian Republic in the late 1550s. Furthermore, removal of the direct references to place and mythology serves to universalize the text, allowing for a more directly spiritual reading of struggle against adversity, toward heaven.

Willaert opens his setting of this altered text with the first, encapsulating line, “O socii, durate” set in homophony between the cantus, altus, and bassus. The quintus and tenor give the first iterations of the *sogetto cavato*. The *sogetto cavato* is otherwise restricted to the quintus and sextus, but its placement in the structural tenor at the beginning of the piece serves to strengthen it. Willaert’s G Hypomixolydian mode is relatively clear, with the cantus and tenor being the structural voices, both in D-D ranges. Although the final (and only conclusive) cadence forms between the altus and tenor, the cantus plays a prominent role in every other whisper of cadential motion that occurs before the end. Considering that Zarlino characterizes the Hypomixolydian mode as being fit for civilized, grave, or profound subjects, Willaert’s choice of mode is apt.⁷¹ The mode has little opportunity to be confirmed via cadence; Willaert avoids and evades essentially all cadential motion until the end of the piece. Furthering this sense of propulsion, Willaert sets the piece in a single *parte*. Like Rore, Willaert makes frequent use of B-flat pulling down to A throughout his setting. Although this B-flat also evokes a

⁷¹ Zarlino, part IV, 160-1, 165.

sense of struggle, it actually comes from Willaert's treatment of the *sogetto cavato*, which cycles through the three hexachords: hard: G, C, A, neutral: C, F, A, and soft: F, B-flat, G.⁷²

Willaert's rhythmic setting of "durate," whole note, double whole note, double whole note (or, beginning at m. 60, half note, whole note, whole note) matches the accentuation of the word, but in terms of classical Latin poetic meter, it is backwards. The syllable "dur-" is long, and, in fact, begins the first dactyl of line 207. Every setting of "durate" in the piece has a similar Italianate rhythmic accentuation: the first syllable is shorter than the second, while the third is often short, although it can also be long to fit with the musical phasing. The interplay of accentuation and long/short syllables is an important component of Latin classical poetry, which Willaert's setting of the accentuation over the syllable length does help to expose. This privileging of accentuation over syllable length possibly sheds light on Stocker's fifth discretionary rule of younger composers: that short notes are to be given to short syllables, and long notes to long syllables ("Syllabis brevibus notae breves, longis longae tribuendae sunt.")⁷³ Because the role of long and short syllables in classical Latin meter is generally taken by accented syllables in the poetry of other languages (including Italian), the Latin terminology of a long or short syllable could conceivably refer to a heavy or light syllable in a modern language or in terms of modern poetic meter. Because Stocker wrote in Latin, the distinction remains ambiguous, especially since the extant portion of his treatise stops at the very beginning of chapter thirty-one, in which he begins to elaborate

⁷² Noted by Bossuyt, 441.

⁷³ Stocker, 238-9.

on the fifth discretionary rule of younger composers.⁷⁴ Willaert's prominent, repeated setting of "Durate" according to accent, rather than syllable length, however, raises the distinct possibility that long and short syllables in Latin could translate to stressed and unstressed syllables in practice.

Another interesting example of this is the varying lengths to which Willaert sets the "O" that begins lines 198 and 199. It is unaccented, but long. Willaert sets it as long in the opening, homophonic "O socii durate," but short in the following iteration of line 198. Roughly the same thing happens in setting of line 199. The "O" is elongated in the first iteration of the first half of the line before the caesura at mm. 13-15, except in the *altus*. The subsequent repetitions of the first half of the line, however, vary in the agogic and metric accent given to that first syllable. Perhaps this is Willaert emphasizing the tension between long syllable and unaccented meter. The difference between Latin long syllables and Italian accented syllables is, after all, essentially one of agogic versus metric accent.

Following the opening five bars of homophony, Willaert's setting of Virgil generally consists of a texture of parts shifting against one another. In this way, as well as in its extreme level of evaded cadences, it epitomizes Willaertian style. Parts align briefly, but quickly diverge. Openings of lines are generally marked by rhythmic motivicity, or, in some cases, more strict imitation, which is rarer in Willaert's style, if more common generally. For example, in mm. 5-8 the opening of line 198 is rhythmically identical in all voices, all of which stay on the same note. In mm. 34-35, line 202 opens in a similar manner. In both cases, the imitation, though exact in rhythm and

⁷⁴ *Ibid.*, 255.

pitch, is also very short, lasting only a few syllables. This similarity, even if it is only rhythmic, as in mm. 46-47 setting line 203 following the caesura, allows the listener or singer to catch the opening of a line in each voice part as it flits by. The opening of the sixth line of text is set in rhythmic imitation at mm. 56-57.

Measures 46-47 illustrate Willaert's attention to enjambment; the opening word of line 203, "mittite," is separated from the rest of the line by a caesura, and it also is enjambed with line 202. Willaert sets it so that it seamlessly blends with line 202. The rest of line 203 follows "mittite" after brief rests in the cantus and altus and a longer one in the bassus, although the staggering of voices makes the piece overall never lose momentum. Line 203 after the caesura receives its own opening rhythmic motive that helps the listener identify it; this motive recurs when it repeats at m. 51 in the cantus, altus, and tenor. The tenor and bassus are exactly aligned from mm. 47-50, and the cantus and altus briefly rhythmically align with them in mm. 49 and 51, although the texts in either case do not match. The repetition of line 203 illustrates Willaert's attention to enjambment; the part of the line after the caesura repeats only "meminisse iuvabit," which is appropriate, in some ways, to memory.

Willaert's enjambment of lines 199-202 is seamless, belying the omission of lines 200-201. The bassus takes the tenor role of a possible cadence to G, but the cantus role is missing entirely. Because of the surrounding B-flats, furthermore, an F-sharp would be extraordinarily unlikely. The tenor continues from line 199 to line 202 without rhythmic pause over extended notes in the sextus and bassus. The cantus, altus, and bassus have extended pauses separating the end of line 199 from the beginning of line 202, but the tenor and the staggering of voices maintains continuity over the omitted two lines. It then

continues into a heavily ornamented repetition and fragmentation of an unadulterated line 207, which, beginning with “durate,” and summarizing the message of retaining hope, is the climax of the piece. The concluding cadence at mm. 102-103 is especially strong given its status as sole cadence of the piece. In that sense, it is the culmination of Willaert’s “O socii” and its clearly-reached goal. The struggle implied by the lack of cadential closure has a sound, victorious ending on the final G. This type of conclusive end is rare in Willaert’s style: Willaert’s final sonorities are rarely clear cadences.

The final cadence is marked by an F-sharp in the altus (performing the cantus role in the cadence) and a B-flat in the tenor two beats earlier (m. 101). The tenor then descends to A and to G in stepwise motion, fulfilling its cadential role. The B-flat originates with the “Durate” motive (Ut, Fa, Re: ascending perfect fourth, descending minor third), which the tenor completes in mm. 101-102, with the intermediary of the cadential A. This is the “durate” motive on the soft hexachord that has been cycling through the quintus and sextus voices throughout the piece. The bassus has the same motive (independent of the hexachordal cycling) at mm. 97-98. The motive pervades the end of the piece, beginning at m. 71, the first iteration of “Durate” since the opening line, outside the *sogetto cavato*. Intriguingly, when Willaert sets the “durate” of the opening line, he uses the short-long-short rhythmic pattern, but not the Ut-Re-Fa pattern, which he saves for the *sogetto cavato*. The “durate” motive occurs before the final line of text most notably at mm. 66-68 setting “Tendimus;” see especially the inversion in the tenor in m. 67, which is mirrored at a fifth in the cantus (which also has an inversion of the “durate” rhythm). “Tendimus” is also marked by its own particular rhythmic motive wherever it

occurs. A more isolated instance of the inverted Ut-Fa-Re motive occurs at m. 42 in the tenor.

The cadential gestures before the close of the piece are relatively few, but they do merit mention here. The bassus in mm. 32-33 has a descent from B-flat to A to G that could be cadential if supported by another voice; it is, however, isolated. The sextus, were it not singing the fixed pitches of the *sogetto cavato* could have sung an F-sharp in m. 32, resolving to G, instead of B-flat, in m. 33. The strongest cadential motion apart from the end of the piece occurs at m. 60 between the altus and cantus. This is, in fact, a proper cadence, but it is weakened by the fact that it is upside-down (with the altus in the cantus role and the cantus in the tenor role) and by the rhythmic profile of the cantus, which has a mere quarter note on G at m. 60. This note repeats, however, into the first half of m. 61, sustaining G as a pitch. The sextus supports this sonority with a G at the second half of m. 60. If this were a cadence, the first cadence of the piece would be placed at the caesura of line 6 of the 8 in the text. A moment at mm. 70-71 marks the end of line 7 in the text of the cantus and bassus; the cantus ascends from F to G, but is weakened by the quarter note value of the G resolution, which then moves immediately to D. The bassus descends from B-flat (against F, preventing an F-sharp) to G, skipping A. Any cadences that Willaert alludes to are on G, staying solidly within the Hypomixolydian mode. For the most part, however, all cadential closure builds to the end of the piece.

Willaert's Christianized setting of "O socii" and Rore's classical one share a patron and a *sogetto cavato*, as well as a predilection for B-flat to A motion. However, their settings are otherwise as different as their versions of the text. By splitting his

setting into two *partes*, Rore references the more traditional form for secular settings, with a clear divide between past tribulations and future triumph. His use of the 8-mode system's G Hypomixolydian mode is supported by cadences to C, which is related to the prevalence of B-flat in the *prima parte*. His notable use of homophony underlies his setting of future tranquility. His treatment of the *sogetto cavato* builds momentum toward the end of the piece by sequentially higher and rhythmically shorter repeats. In his Christianization of the text, Willaert sacrifices local meaning to broader meaning. His *sogetto cavato* cycles through the natural, soft, and hard hexachords. From the soft hexachord comes the B-flat and its descending motion to A that pervades his single *parte* composition and complicates the otherwise straightforward G Hypomixolydian mode. Also from the *sogetto cavato* is the Ut-Re-Fa motive that gradually infuses all of the voices of the piece. In as much as it represents Granvelle, it illustrates how his influence seeps into all the circles around him. By avoiding a clear cadence until the end of the work, Willaert builds tension and drive that illustrate a struggle, only finally resolved at the piece's close.

Whether Willaert and Rore knew each other's settings, which setting was first, and if one influenced the other is impossible to say. The most common shared stylistic feature between them is the prevalence of B-flat (which disappears from Rore's piece in the *seconda parte*). We have documentary evidence that Willaert's piece was directly solicited by Granvelle; no such evidence currently exists for Rore's version. Gardano's publication from which we know the pieces was posthumous for both Rore and Willaert. As far as I have been able to find, no other composer of the mid-sixteenth century set this text, including Lassus, who was also in correspondence with Granvelle. The *sogetto*

cavato is the same set of pitches in both, but the idea of using a *sogetto cavato* on a motto for a tribute piece is hardly unusual. Rore's B-flat is the most compelling piece of evidence for a link between the pieces, as Willaert's B-flat grows naturally from the soft hexachord. Rore's B-flat, however, also would also develop fairly naturally if Rore wanted a downward pull to indicate struggle. Willaert's setting, with its altered text and motive that suffuses the entire piece in its influence, is ultimately the more particularized.

Chapter 5: Rore's Fifth Book, "Concordes adhibite animos" and Willaert's F Ionion Pieces

Rore's *Quinto libro di madrigali à cinque voci* was a posthumous publication.

Whatever his influence on the earlier publications that carried his name, this book was a creation of its publisher, Antonio Gardano. Gardano claims this responsibility in his dedication, which also suggests that Rore may have been a student of Willaert.

All'illustrissimo et eccellentissimo signore. Il signor Ottavio Farnese Duca di Parma & Piacenzia. Mio Signore osservandissimo.

Dovendo io mandare in luce Illustrissimo & Eccellentissimo Signore, alcuni Madrigali del Unico Cipriano de Rore, alla cui anima Iddio dia l'eterno riposo & sia grata in Paradiso, si come è stata gratissima la presentia sua a tutti de virtu amatori in terra, come veramente quello che ha hauto li rarissimi doni da i cieli solo, che a diversi erano solire di concedere, percioche si come i piu periti di questa arte Musicale, *hano giudicato essere veramente stati tre soli, che hano dato vero essemplio di qualche parte di perfettione in questa professione, attribuendo a Iosquino la delettevole invention della mod[u]latione & il bel cantare, a Moutone la vera arte della variatione de Contrapunti, & ad Adriano Vuillaert la continuatione della dolce harmonia, pare che i cieli habbiano voluto dotare l'Unico Cipriano di tutte tre queste Virtu unitamente insieme, conciosia cosa che nelle sue compositioni si trova e l'uno e l'altro, tanto ben osservato, & con tanta arte posto, che avanti di lui, non sia stato alcuno, & che per l'avenire si dubita che alcuno vi possa arrivare, Considerando adunque quanto lui e stato caro a V. Eccellenza & quanto egli l'amava, non ho voluto che questi suoi canti, habbiano da uscire in stampa, sotto altro nome che di V. Eccellenza Illustrissima; sapendo certo che la piu parte siano fatte ad istanza di lei, per darle diletto e contento, supplico che non si sdegni di accettar quello mio picciol dono, con quella rarissima benignita sua solita, alla quale con ogni riverenza, inchinandomi bascio le mani, & con ogni humilta di core mi raccomando.*

Di V. Eccellenza affettionatissimo Servitore
Antonio Gardano.⁷⁵

⁷⁵ Rore, *Quinto libro* (1566), 1v ; italics mine.

The most salient aspect of this dedication is Gardano's positioning of Rore in a lineage that goes through Willaert and Mouton back to Josquin. In the course of this positioning, Gardano ascribes specific musical characteristics to Rore, Willaert, Mouton, and Josquin. My translation of this segment follows:

The most learned in this musical art have judged that truly three alone have given a true example of each part of perfection in this profession, attributing to Josquin the delightful invention of modulation and of beautiful singing, to Mouton the true art of variation of counterpoints, and to Adrian Willaert the continuation of sweet harmony, such that the heavens have wished to unite in the one and only Cipriano all three of these virtues together, given that one and all can be found in his compositions, well observed, and placed with such great art....

Gardano's account is hardly disinterested, of course. The three attributes that comprise perfection in music, melody, counterpoint, and harmony, are assigned to Josquin, Mouton, and Willaert in such a way that they build chronologically. The musical elements even build upon themselves. Josquin perfects melody, Mouton adds another line and perfects counterpoint, and Willaert extends this further still in a perfection of harmony. Rore, the man whose madrigals Gardano is, after all, trying to sell, then perfects all three of the concentrations of his predecessors. Gardano's account is thus more rhetorical than analytical, and Rore is at its culmination. The composers on Gardano's list are also connected, in some instances spuriously, by being teachers and students. Mouton was Willaert's teacher in biographical fact. Josquin, however, probably did not actually teach Mouton, just as Willaert likely did not teach Rore. Pierre de Ronsard in 1560 listed Mouton as a student of Josquin, and Mouton was otherwise compared to Josquin in other contemporary sources. The link between Mouton and Josquin might therefore be similar to the link between Rore and Willaert; Mouton and

Rore were figurative disciples of Josquin and Willaert, the prestige of the older composers lending credit to the younger. That Gardano enhances and builds this lineage exemplifies the way in which Rore is regarded as a student of Willaert. That impression and its expression, as understood by the people who used it, were contemporary to the composers. The link is not, however, necessarily biographical or even, upon analysis, extensively stylistic.

Among the pieces Gardano included in Rore's *Quinto libro di madrigali* are both Rore's and Willaert's settings of "O socii." Also included is Rore's so-called deploration on the death of Willaert, "Concordes adhibete animos" (Example 7). This book is the only source for all three of these pieces. By placing "Concordes adhibete animos" in Rore's posthumous *Quinto libro*, Gardano imbues it with a subtext of mourning for both Willaert and for Rore. For the purpose of this study, Rore's piece serves as a possible record of Rore's reading of and reaction to Willaert's music. The text of "Concordes adhibete animos" runs as follows:

*Concordes adhibete animos Musae, inclita turba,
Aetherei patris sacra propago Jovis:
Laude Pannopheum summa decorate Adrianum,
Intulit ut vestro munera summa choro.
Harmonicos magis ac suaves nemo edidit unquam
Cantus, per quem nunc musica vera viget,
Ergo aetas omnis, colat hunc, laudetur origo:
Felix quae hunc genuit Flandria in orbe virum.*

Vive Adriane, decus Musarum, vive Adriane.

In English translation, the text is:

Call up your harmonious dispositions, Muses, illustrious throng,
holy offspring of the heavenly father Jupiter:
adorn the all-wise Adrian with the greatest praise,
so he might confer the greatest gifts on your choir.
No one ever produced more harmonious or sweet

songs, through whom true music now thrives.
Therefore let every age venerate him, the source to be praised:
happy is the Flanders which brought him into the world of men.

Live on Adrian, glory of the muses, live on Adrian.⁷⁶

The final line exists outside the structure of the poem. In the musical setting, no voice other than the quintus carries the text, and the both the quintus and the final line of poetry are isolated from the rest of the piece, to the extent that the piece is nearly intact without the quintus voice. The musical setting of “Adriano” in the final line is derived from solfège: fa, mi, la, sol, and this intervallic profile suffuses the piece. In this respect, it could be called a *soggetto cavato*, but the pitches that set the rest of the text are not similarly defined. In this study, the complex of the poetry and music of “Live on Adrian, glory of the muses, live on Adrian” is referred to as an exhortation.

The poem as a whole is a clear homage, with abundant classical references. It is also not particularly sad; if it is a lament, it celebrates Willaert’s legacy, rather than grieving his loss. This relative lack of gravity led Bernhard Meier, in the foreword to Rore’s *Opera omnia*, to speculate that this piece was missing its more somber second half.⁷⁷ Meier also cites the piece’s unusual modal characteristics, as it is an F Ionian piece ending on a C sonority, as justification of this hypothesis. Although Meier’s edition of Rore’s music indicates that it is missing a second half, there is no similar indication in

⁷⁶ Adriano Willaert, *Willaert: Missa Mente tota & Motets*, Cinquecento, Hyperion CDA67749, 2010, compact disc, liner notes, 19. As Katelijne Schiltz notes in “Giunto Adrian fra l’ Anime Beate: Une Quintuple Déploration sur la Mort d’ Adrien Willaert,” *Musurgia: Analyse et Pratique Musicales* 10 (2003): 16, “Pannopheum,” as found in Rore’s *Quinto libro*, but not in the above translation, is a reference to the origin of all oracles.

⁷⁷ Bernhard Meier, foreword to Cipriano de Rore, *Opera Omnia*, vol. 5, ed. Bernhard Meier. *Corpus Mensurabilis Musicae*, vol. 14, ed. Armen Carapetyan. Rome: American Institute of Musicology, 1971, xv.

Gardano's version of 1566. Meier's conclusion is disputed by Katelijne Schiltz, on the basis of her analysis of the poetry and internal structure of Rore's piece.⁷⁸

In his foreword, Meier identifies Rore's lament on the death of Willaert as one of four tributes written in honor of the composer, along with a madrigal from Lorenzo Benvenuti, and *greghesche* by Andrea Gabrieli and Alvisse Willaert.⁷⁹ The *greghescha* is a light piece associated with Venice at the end of the sixteenth century; the collection in which Gabrieli's and Alvisse Willaert's pieces appear also contains pieces by Rore and by Adriano Willaert himself. Katelijne Schiltz adds to Meier's list of deplorations a madrigal by Giovanni Battista Confortis.⁸⁰ Her study of artistic tributes on Willaert's death further includes a poem published in 1555 by Nicolaus Stopius, which celebrates Willaert's life and musicianship in similar terms to Rore's text. Stopius's poem was clearly written while Willaert was still alive; it is an encomium rather than a deploration. Its form as a dialogue between the Muses and Apollo offers a precedent for the classical allusions in Rore's text; it gives credit to Flanders as the place of Willaert's birth; and its final two lines, spoken by a chorus of Muses, echo the text of Rore's exhortation: "Vivat perpetuo felix cum ADRIANUS/vivat, ut est clarum nomen et usque suum."⁸¹ Stopius, who proclaimed his own Netherlandish heritage in the title of his poetry collection,

Panegyricum Nicolai Stopii Alostensis Flandri carmen, was active in Venice in the same

⁷⁸ Katelijne Schiltz, "'Harmonicos magis ac suaves nemo editit unquam cantus': Cipriano de Rore's Motette *Concordes adhibete animos*," *Archiv für Musikwissenschaft* 62 (2005): 111-36.

⁷⁹ Rore, *Opera Omnia*, vol. 5, ed. Meier, xv.

⁸⁰ Schiltz, "Harmonicos magis," 112.

⁸¹ *Ibid.*, 118-20.

circles as Willaert as a representative of Albert V. Rore's motet "Mirabar solito," on the death of Albert V, uses a text by Stopius. Schiltz argues that the textual precedent of Stopius's poetry, and its lack of mourning character, argue in favor of the piece consisting solely of its extant part.⁸²

The *greghesche* of Alvise Willaert and Andrea Gabrieli are part of a larger collection of this idiosyncratic genre. The *greghescha* is a parodistic genre that sets texts by Antonio Molino that are created from a mixture of languages and dialects, most notably Venetian dialect and Greek. The texts mock the conventions of poets, like Petrarch, more commonly set to music. The music is, likewise, not serious.⁸³ This genre seems an odd choice for a deploration on the death of Willaert. Schiltz argues that this choice of genre furthers a tradition, started while Willaert was alive, of contrasting the serious views of him as *maestro di cappella* of S. Marco with more lighthearted, almost mocking depictions.⁸⁴ Additionally, both *greghesche* are part of a larger collection printed in 1564, *Greghesche, libro primo*, with texts by Manoli Blessi (Molino's pen name).⁸⁵ Adrian Willaert has a *greghescha* in this collection, which is followed by the

⁸² Schiltz, "Giunto Adrian fra l'anime beate," 17-19.

⁸³ Major literature specifically on the *greghescha* includes Alfred Einstein, "The *greghescha* and *giustiniana* of the sixteenth century," *Journal of Renaissance and Baroque Music* 1 (1946): 19-32; and Paolo Fabbri, "Fatti e prodezze di Manoli Blessi," *Rivista Italia Musicologia* 11 (1976): 182-96; Manoli Blessi, *Greghesche, libro primo*, ed. Siro Cisilino (Padua: G. Zanibon, 1974).

⁸⁴ Schiltz elaborates this idea in detail in "Tod in Venedig: Adrian Willaert als Rezipient burlesker Lamenti," in *Tod in Musik et Kultur: Zum 500. Todestag Philipps des Schönen*, ed. Stefan Gasch and Birgit Lodes, *Wiener Forum für Ältere Musikgeschichte* 2 (Tutzing: Hans Schnieder, 2007): 359-76.

⁸⁵ It was published by Gardano in Venice and dedicated to three of the musicians who set texts: Paulo Vergeli (Vergelli), Claudio da Currezo (Claudio Merulo), and Francesco Bunaldi (Bonaldi).

deplorations of his nephew and Gabrieli. Willaert's piece is at the center of the collection: fifteenth out of a total of thirty. *Greghesche* in general and this volume particularly, belong to Venice; this collection features composers either associated strongly with Venice or who would have been in the city for one reason or another on business; for example, Giaches de Wert published his work in Venice. Adrian Willaert apparently made his contribution to this Venetian project shortly before he died, after which Alvise Willaert and Gabrieli wrote their deplorations in tribute, and the volume published two years later, after a decent period of mourning.⁸⁶

Meier's other argument for the existence of a missing part is the modal irregularity of "Concordes adhibete animos." The piece is in F Ionian mode, but it ends on a C sonority (the cofinal). Willaert used the F Ionian mode, authentic and plagal, regularly in his madrigal settings. Of the twenty-five madrigals in the *Musica nova*, five of them are in F Ionian mode, as are seven of the thirty madrigals published in other collections.⁸⁷ Of the authentic eleventh mode, Zarlino writes that it is lascivious and happy, suitable for dance music. He also notes that contemporary composers change pieces formerly written in the fifth mode (F Lydian) into the eleventh mode, F Ionian, by adding B-flat. He makes a similar observation of the plagal twelfth mode; compositions which used to be in the sixth mode are transformed into pieces in the twelfth mode by the addition of B-flat. The twelfth mode is, however, suited to subjects of love and of

⁸⁶ For a thorough discussion of mourning practices in Renaissance Italy, see Margaret King, *The Death of the Child Valerio Marcello* (Chicago: University of Chicago Press, 1994).

⁸⁷ See Feldman, 201-2.

sadness, as a lament.⁸⁸ The suitability of the twelfth mode for lovelorn subjects makes it attractive for setting Petrarch, which could partially account for its presence in the *Musica nova*. Rore's piece, however, has three of five voice parts (quintus, tenor, and bassus) with ranges primarily from F-F, indicating the eleventh mode; the cantus has a range from C-C, and the altus A-A. The more cheerful character suggests the celebration of accomplishments presented by the text, as well as serving as a possible nod to Willaert's own frequent use of the mode. The concluding sonority on C lacks a cadence; the last cadential moment in the piece occurs at m. 69 to C, which follows a G sonority. The modally open end allows for a more literal interpretation of the piece's repeating line; without a clear ending, Willaert's legacy continues to live.

In favor of Meier's hypothesis that "Concordes adhibete animos" is missing a *seconda parte*, its ending closely resembles that of the *prima parte* of Willaert's setting of "Quando fra l'altre donne." Both are sonorities on C. Willaert's expressive use of this inconclusive end to the *prima parte* was explored in Chapter 3; it expresses the conflict between the narrator's asserted aspirations toward higher morality and his worldly longing for Laura. Expressively, Rore's open conclusion to "Concordes adhibete animos" leaves Willaert's legacy open to the future. The lack of firm cadential closure is also a stylistic tribute to Willaert; Rore's cadences are relatively clear. There is no conclusive evidence whether or not Rore knew Willaert's setting of "Quando fra l'altre donne," but the fact that Rore concludes his piece in a nearly identical way to the *prima parte* of a piece by Willaert in the same mode also signifies stylistic homage. Absent other evidence for an additional *parte*, the cofinal ending must mainly be considered as an expressive

⁸⁸ Zarlino, part IV, 185-92.

device, one that pays stylistic tribute to Willaert, as well as literally expressing the exhortation of the piece: lacking a concrete end, Willaert's music will live on.

Meier's argument for a *seconda parte* due to lack of a mournful tone is far less strong. As an indication that the extant part of "Concordes adhibite animos" had at least some degree of a sorrowful character, Meier attests that Rore used the *tonus lamentationis*. The apparent usage of this tone is marked in Meier's edition of "Concordes adhibite animos," found in Rore's *Opera omnia*. The *tonus lamentationis* is used in the first lesson at Matins in Tenebrae, the three final days of Lent. The tone sets excerpts from the Lamentations of Jeremiah. Its opening pitches are F, G, A, B-natural, A, G, A, A, A, A, G, F, G, F, F. The following example is from its first appearance, during the Matins of Maundy Thursday, but it retains its form throughout Tenebrae.⁸⁹



The reciting tone of this chant is on A, which is a regular cadence in F Ionian mode, but not the cofinal C. Its prominence in the *tonus lamentationis* would suggest the increased importance of A in any piece quoting it. Although the quintus would be a logical place to expect to find the *tonus lamentationis*, Meier does not locate it there, but rather, scattered through the other four voices. Meier marks its fullest presentation in a single voice at mm. 8-12 in the cantus (a similar, unmarked example occurs in the tenor in mm. 24-27).

⁸⁹ Reproduced from *The Liber Usalis*, ed. the Benedictines of Solesmes (Tournai: Desclee Company, 1961), 631. Online publication provided by the Church Music Association of America, <http://media.musicasacra.com/liberusualis.pdf>.

He also indicates the opening stepwise rise by third in the tenor (mm. 1-3) and cantus (mm. 3-5). Rore uses this same segment transposed in the cantus and altus in mm. 1-3. Meier's markings are rather confusing; the bassus in mm. 5-7 does not seem to fit at all, either in the chant's introduction as quoted, or in the rest of the piece. The gentle, stepwise rise and fall of the altus in mm. 24-28 mimics the overall texture of the opening of the chant, but this gesture is neither unusual, nor on the appropriate pitches of the chant. Meier seems to have made his conclusion based on the opening three pitches of the tenor, but that is not an unusual gesture, either, especially considering the imitation of that gesture across the cantus, altus, and tenor in the opening measures. The inclusion of a lamentation tone is appealing in this context because it provides Rore's setting with some of the mourning that it seems to be missing, but neither the Biblical context (dwelling on the destruction of Jerusalem and how it was deserved), nor the liturgy of the end of Holy Week seem to fit with Rore's text or his memorialization of Willaert.⁹⁰ If Rore did include the lamentation tone, he did it in a way that involved extensive fragmentation and transposition, so that whispers could be heard in various voices. The tone of the lament would then suffuse the entire piece in a similar manner to the "Durate" motive in Willaert's setting of "O socii." The problem with this hypothesis lies in the fact that the lamentation tone is nowhere clearly stated in "Concordes adhibete animos." The reciting tone A receives no special emphasis. The lamentation tone is, as previously mentioned,

⁹⁰ One of the difficulties in working with Meier's edition and the interpretive work presented there is that the critical apparatus, promised in the forewords to the music volumes, was never published. Textual information and further justification for the existence of the proposed lamentation tone are thus missing, as is a great deal of information about how Meier edited Rore. I am indebted to Philip Vandermeer, the chief administrator of the UNC Chapel Hill Music Library, for assistance in obtaining this information.

inappropriate for Rore's text, and the gestures involved are so commonplace as to render their inclusion inconclusive. Any reference to the tone would be nearly inaudible to a listener, as it is difficult to find for the analyst.

The quintus voice, setting the text's exhortation, is comprised of three segments in text and melody, and it is repeated four times over the course of the piece. It rises by a third after its first and second iterations; aside from a few changes in rhythm due to the meter shift at m. 65, the fourth is an exact and immediate repeat of the third. The third segment, the second statement of "Vive Adriane," overlaps its first four notes with the last four notes of the second segment, which gives the quintus an interlocking character. This also results in a drop of a third between the first iteration of "Vive Adriane" in the exhortation and the second. Schiltz has diagrammed these segments, both with solfège and note names, and discussed the internal structure of the *quintus* in extensive detail.⁹¹ The treatment of the exhortation here is reminiscent of that of the "Durate" *soggetto* in Rore's setting of "O socii." Both are isolated in the quintus voice. Due to the segmented nature of the exhortation, as well as the drop between the first segment and the third, only one of the statements of "Adriane" has the appropriate solemnization in each iteration of the exhortation; segment one has it in the first, third, and fourth iterations, while segment three does in the second iteration. This solemnization pattern is minor, but significant; it is apparently the source of the music setting "Adriane" in the quintus; it appears at the first mention in the quintus of Willaert's name, as well as occasionally outside of the quintus (see, for example, m. 36 in the bassus, and the inversion contour in the cantus). Another similarity of this piece to "O socii" is that both quintus parts sequence upward

⁹¹ Schiltz, "Harmonicis magis," 126-9.

on repetition, and the final repetition, at the end of the piece, is both exact and immediate. This immediate repetition, at the top of the quintus range, also makes it somewhat less likely that the piece has a missing second part, as the quintus line has already reached a sense of climax. Schiltz argues, along similar lines, that the jubilant text of the exhortation, repeated under the mournful text proposed by Meier, would prove odd. Additionally, to her, the shift of the piece into a perfect tempus at m. 65 is a concluding gesture, and once the piece has shifted into this perfect time, it is unlikely to have a second half which shifts it back into imperfect time.⁹² Both the *quintus* and the tempus shift create a sense of climax that a second half would retroactively undo.

The only piece of evidence that ties Rore's piece concretely to the death of Willaert is the subtitle: "In mortem Adriani Willaert." This subtitle could easily have been added by Gardano, especially considering that the overall collection was published after Rore's own death. As positioned in the collection, it comments on the deaths of both composers; this could have influenced Gardano to add the subtitle. From Rore's perspective, though, it is entirely possible that this piece was an encomium to Willaert while he was still alive, rather than a deploration. Recall that Stropius's poem, on which the text is based, was published in 1555, seven years before Willaert's death in 1562. In any case, Rore offers musical tribute to Willaert, as well as textual.

Aside from the issues already discussed, Rore's style in "Concordes adhibete animos" pays musical homage to Willaert in three significant ways: in the treatment of cadences, in the loosening of imitation to resemble Willaert's motivicity, and in the special attention paid to the alignment of syllables of text. Schiltz covers the latter of

⁹² Schiltz, "Giunto Adrian," 16.

these methods in her article in *Archiv für Musikwissenschaft*.⁹³ The piece opens with homophony in the cantus, altus, tenor, and bassus, which Rore gradually interrupts, voice by voice, via repetition (mm. 8-10 in the cantus), adjusted rhythmic values (mm. 4-5 in the tenor), and concluding lengthened syllables (mm. 7-9 in the altus and bassus). All of these devices are examples of those used by Willaert to shift the alignment of his text and music. Rore's isolation and repetition of the first phrase of his first line: "Concordes adhibete animos Musae" is also reminiscent of Willaert, as Rore more often eschews text repetition in his settings, especially the type of protracted repetition found in mm. 1-17. The continuation of the text is marked in mm. 17-18 by homophony in the altus and bassus. A repetition of "inclita turba," the final two words of the first line, leads to a brief alignment in mm. 20-21 of the cantus and bassus, which Rore dissolves by the end of m. 21. Line two starts in vastly different places in the four non-quintus voices, but they are made slightly more audible via motivicity. In the cantus (mm. 23-24), altus (mm. 22-23), and bassus (mm. 22-23) voices, the second line begins with a rising third, a repeated note, and another rising third. At m. 24 the altus, tenor, and bassus are in brief musical (but not textual) alignment, as are the cantus and altus a measure later at m. 25. The decoration that the altus has here to adorn "Jovis" becomes a kind of motive for setting the same text in mm. 28-29 in the cantus and tenor. After m. 25, the altus repeats its segment of line 2, bringing it into alignment with the cantus, which has that text for the first time. The beginning of line 3 is ever so slightly staggered between voices at m. 30, adorned by a flicker of motivicity between the cantus and tenor in mm. 30-31. The voices all realign in time for the first iteration of Willaert's name in the main text at the end of line 3 and in

⁹³ Schiltz, "Harmonicos magis," 129-31.

mm. 36-37. At this point, the quintus is finishing the first segment of the second iteration of the exhortation, and the bassus carries the “Adriano” motive from the quintus.

Rore made frequent use of homophony in this piece. He especially distinguished the beginnings of new phrases with homophony (see mm. 33-34, 37, 42, 48, 65, and 69). The points of imitation that Rore often used to begin his musical phrases are absent in this piece. Instead, Rore used a more fragmented type of imitation, or a type of motivicity. The shifting alignments of the voices, all with similar rhythmic and melodic profiles, at mm. 12-13 comprises one example. At mm. 24-25, the music of the voices is in homophony while the text is not. The cantus and altus have almost direct imitation in sequence from mm. 56-57 and 58-59. Ultimately, however, this gesture is extremely short and of a cadential nature that makes it somewhat generic. The imitation is gone almost before the listener has time to recognize it.

From a cadential perspective, the piece begins clearly with fairly unobscured cadences regular to the F Ionian mode, but moves toward obscured, less frequent cadences as the piece continues, culminating in the lack of a concluding cadence. The first cadence, though evaded, is on the regular F between the cantus and tenor in mm. 9-10; it is weakened by the textual placement in the cantus. A relatively clear cadence to C can be found in mm. 13-14 between the cantus and quintus, which is weakened by its placement in the text (preceding a repetition in the cantus and after the first segment of the first iteration in the quintus). A relatively strong cadence at mm. 19 between the tenor and bassus confirms the piece’s mode. Subsequent cadences, those that correspond to the rest of the text after line 1, are far less clear in both mode and gesture.

At mm. 24-25, the cantus has a clear gesture to A against the tenor. This is a very odd place textually for a cadence, however, and the tenor does not rhythmically emphasize A at all. In fact, the cantus gesture rhythmically mirrors the gestures on “Jovis” that occur at mm. 28-29 in the cantus and tenor at the proper end of the text phrase. The altus sings “Jovis” to the characteristic cadential rhythmic pattern from mm. 25-26, a beat and a half behind the cantus. Thus the cantus’s early use of this motive is an anticipation of its later use and an interplay with the altus. From mm. 28-29, the cantus and tenor have an evaded cadence to G. This area is also marked by small snatches of motivic activity that denote certain words: “Jovis” in the cantus, altus, and tenor. “Jovis” in the bassus at m. 26 is accompanied by a different motive, which is echoed in the tenor following its evaded cadence to G at m. 29.

From mm. 32-33, the tenor forms a potential unison cadence on C, which is thwarted when the cantus drops out, rather than moving from D down to C. The cantus is further marked as a potential cadential voice by its usage of the “Jovis” rhythmic motive. Its movement to C is completed after a quarter rest, but it jumps up a seventh instead of descending by second. The bassus supports this mirage of a cadence by descending from G. None of this cadential movement is accompanied by appropriate text, as it is in the middle of the third line. The end of line 4 features a relatively clear cadence to F between the tenor and bassus voices, although the tenor lacks rhythmic preparation and textually offset by a syllable. The end of line 6 is clearly marked by texture and by a relatively strong evaded cadence to the confinal C at mm. 52-53. The tenor has the cantus role, while the altus takes the tenor role and evades the cadence. The hinted C cadence appears to have occurred mm. 56-57; the cantus is quite clear in its cadential gesture, at the first

pause in line 8. It does cadence musically against the altus on C, but the altus has already begun its repetition of the first segment of line 8 when it sings C. The altus goes on to sing the cantus's cadential gesture in sequence to D at mm. 59-60 (again to the end of the first segment of line 8, ending "omnis"). The bassus has A-D support for a D cadence, but the altus is the only cadential voice. The lack of rhythmic support in the other voices makes this cadential moment relatively weak.

The last cadential movement to the final F occurs at m. 64, at the conclusion of the penultimate line, setting up the brief shift into triple meter that marks the final line's first iteration. The tenor moves to F from E, but there is no second cadential voice. The supporting movement in the bassus lends this moment strength, but the tenor's short preparation and the lack of participation in the cadence by the other voices ultimately leave the piece without a conclusive cadence to the final near the end of the piece. The repetition of the final line at m. 69 features movement from a G-sonority to a C-cadence. This cadence would be very strong if it were not for awkward text placement; the second syllable of the first word of line 8 is a textually awkward place for a cadence. Both the first and second notes of line 8 are of extended duration and presented homophonically. They are, in other words, emphasized by Rore's setting, with a rhythmic length that suggests a cadence. Yet, their position in the overall text phrase and musical flow argues against that interpretation.

The frequency of cadential gesture is a hallmark of Rore's, but the lack of clarity surrounding the cadences is one of Willaert's, as is the lack of closure at the conclusion of the piece. Rore's exaggeration here almost falls into gentle satire, as does his fragmentation and repetition of text that accompanies his gestures of motivicity and his

alignment and disalignment of text. As previously discussed, Rore rarely repeats or fragments his texts, while Willaert fragments and repeats text in this way in service of his syllable alignment or motives or his expression of the text. He does not fragment his text to the excessive extent that Rore has done here. While Rore usually sets apart his text phrases using devices such as texture or points of imitation (and often closed with a cadence), here he lets his text phrases meld into each other, after a more Willaertian model. The amount of homophony in the piece (especially noticeable at mm. 65, 67, and 69), often used as a means of emphasis, is more of a hallmark of Rore than Willaert, although it also functions to lend solemnity to the piece. Overall, “Concordes adhibete animos” represents a blending of styles between Rore and its honoree, Willaert. Rore is, perhaps, even gently poking fun at the older composer. This comedic musical treatment of Willaert is not without precedent; as Schiltz argues in context of the *greghesche*, there was an ongoing musical joke contrasting Willaert’s general staid persona of musical master of S. Marco with humorous depictions.

Conclusions

Willaert’s overall compositional principles in his madrigals seem to be an interest in text alignment and misalignment (and thus perhaps pronunciation), the avoidance of cadences, and a fondness for rhythmic and melodic motives or profiles that he can move between voices, repeat, or obscure. His treatment of motives proves to be challenging and subtle, but also rewarding in that its complexities continue to unfold during the piece and upon multiple performances. His modal treatment can be described similarly. Most of his pieces can be solidly placed within a single mode, but Willaert also tends to evade the

final and medial cadences, leaving hints of cadential motion to the regular pitches, but often lacking a solid, firm medial or concluding cadence. In “O invidia,” Willaert’s use of transposed Aeolian mode focuses on internal characteristics of that mode and elaborates its intricacies, even while it avoids a solid final cadence to D. In accordance with Stocker’s description, Willaert’s text setting is mostly syllabic, and most, not all, of his long notes and runs decorate accented syllables. Most of his repeated phrases make some sort of textual or expressive sense within the context of the composition, but he does tend to fragment and repeat phrases, which often serves expressive or musical ends, or enhances the interplay of syllables. However, he is not only concerned with text setting, and it often takes lower priority to factors of text alignment and motivicity. Willaert frequently sets multi-syllable words to notes of the same duration, regardless of syllable accent, and he even occasionally sets an unaccented syllable with a long note or run. These are lapses in perfect text underlay as described by Stocker and Zarlino. Furthermore, although Willaert is not a specifically dramatic composer, his style opens plenty of expressive possibilities for interpretation by listeners and singers.

Willaert, in other words, is not the man so purely focused on text that Zarlino and especially Stocker seem in places to describe. His music is exemplary in many ways, complex and subtle, and, in a majority of instances, does follow the guidelines they created to describe it. Neither of their treatises makes a claim to describe Willaert’s style with exact subtlety. They do not. They describe the general elements of good text setting as they observe it in Willaert. Stocker, on the other hand, is very emphatic about his discretionary rules for younger composers and states that these composers, with Willaert as their leader, follow the discretionary rules so perfectly as to essentially make them

necessary rules. The fact that Willaert's text underlay does not quite reach the heights claimed for it by Stocker begs the question why Stocker would make such a point of naming Willaert and his music in his treatise. Stocker had apparently heard of Willaert and heard of *Musica nova* in some form, but could possibly have never seen or heard either in their specifics. Stocker does describe text underlay to impressive detail in his treatise, and most of these rules apply to Willaert's music. But they are not unique to Willaert's music. Howard Mayer Brown identifies the literary theorist Pietro Bembo as adding to sixteenth century literary discussion an emphasis on the relationship between the actual sound of words to and the meaning of those words. This is, as Howard Mayer Brown says, "the really new element in Bembo's poetics."⁹⁴ It is very tempting to identify the "new" in *Musica nova* with the new in Bembo's theory.⁹⁵ After all, Willaert's emphasis on alignment of texts seems to have some relationship to the sounds of particular words, especially when he uses perfect alignment to highlight assonance. But Willaert's interest in text alignment does not seem particularly new in this collection, either, even to him.

So what *is* new about *Musica nova*? Possible answers abound, but the title perhaps misleads emphasis toward the search for novelty, just as the rules of Zarlino and Stocker encourage an analyst to discover them perfectly embodied in Willaert's music. *Musica nova* was a common title throughout the Renaissance, used often to title new

⁹⁴ Howard Mayer Brown, "Words and Music: Willaert, the Chanson, and the Madrigal about 1540," in *Florence and Venice: Comparisons and Relations*, vol. 2, ed. Christine Smith and Salvatore I. Camporeale (Florence: La Nuova Italia Editrice, 1980), 229.

⁹⁵ Martha Feldman compares Willaert and Petrarch to Bembo in "Rore's 'Selva Selvaggia': The *Primo libro* of 1542," *Journal of the American Musicological Society* 42, no. 3 (1989): 547-603.

collections of music. Considering how hard Alfonso II d'Este fought to keep the exclusivity of his print, he could very well want to emphasize that the pieces in this volume had appeared nowhere else. Stocker's dubbing of Willaert as founder of a new style of text underlay comes under suspicion that he never saw *Musica nova* at all, at least in its entirety. Even Stocker's connection of Willaert with a new kind of music could here come, unknowingly to Stocker, from the title of a highly-regarded edition. Zarlino never claims particular invention from Willaert, only particular skill. Antonfrancesco Doni claims novelty for Willaert, although not necessarily for the pieces that later appeared in *Musica nova*. Doni's description should not be taken at face value, however. To quote James Haar, "He [Doni] was a good observer; but one should remember that he wrote these words in a dedicatory letter of hyperbolic character, that he was doubtless impressed by the exalted company he had been in, and that he said similar things, in less excited tones, about the miscellany of pieces he collected in his *Dialogo della musica*."⁹⁶ Willaert was a fine composer and subtle contrapuntalist who set his texts with a concern for their expressive and thematic meaning, as well as their poetic form and sound. He was also an influential teacher. These are all reasons to study his music, as well as reasons for contemporary theorists to cite his music as exemplary. They are also tempting reasons for contemporary theorists to cite Willaert's music as a perfect support of their rules and theories, even if it does not fit perfectly. As such, modern musicologists and scholars of Willaert's music should be careful to avoid relying too heavily upon the claims made by contemporary theorists when constructing their own analyses. To do otherwise is to risk

⁹⁶ James Haar, Review of *City Culture and the Madrigal at Venice*, by Martha Feldman, *Early Music History: Studies in Medieval and Early Modern Music* 16 (1997): 320.

missing the intricacies of Willaert's music in favor of turning it into a simplified example of the theory that purports to describe it.

Rore's own compositional principles are similar enough to Willaert's to mark them as composers of the same time period who worked in many of the same places. Overall lack of certainty with regard to composition history inhibits a clear timeline of stylistic evolution for Rore just as surely as it does for Willaert. Regardless, Rore does have specific stylistic tendencies that have been demonstrated in the pieces selected for this study. As I mentioned in the introduction, one selection criterion for these pieces was later publication dates, in order to counterbalance the idea of a "later style" in Rore that points more clearly to the *seconda pratica* than whatever may be gleaned from the "early style." These pieces were selected for having points of intersection with Willaert pieces: in mode, Italian text, Latin text, and direct tribute.

Rore's compositional method hearkens back to Josquin in its phrasing: it observes clear cadences at the end of text-phrases and clear openings that are often delineated by imitation. Individual text phrases are often marked by similarity in texture, from imitation to homophony. The final cadences (whether at the ending or near it) are similarly clear and almost always are what Zarlino would call regular cadences to the overall mode. Rore's engagement with mode, at least with the transposed Dorian mode of "Mia benigna fortuna" exhibits a formidable knowledge of how the modes interact and intersect, and a willingness to draw on these intersections in his settings. To be sure, his pieces are best understood within the modal framework, and the pieces themselves as being in a single, specific mode. In fact, many of Rore's pieces are best understood as being in the traditional eight-mode system, rather than the twelve-mode system of Zarlino and

Glarean. “Mia benigna fortuna” is an example of a standard Phrygian piece in the eight-mode system that makes use of systemic borrowing from a yet-undefined Aeolian mode (a characteristic of the Phrygian mode that Zarlino notes). Rather than setting this piece in an Aeolian mode in the new twelve-mode system, however, Rore uses the Phrygian mode from the same eight-mode system that he used to organize his *Primo libro di madrigali à cinque voci*.

As far as text setting is concerned, Rore demonstrates all of Stocker’s rules for newer composers, especially the one about text repetition. He fragments his texts only rarely; in cases where he does repeat text, it is almost always in context of a longer line. Like Willaert, he occasionally uses different agogic accents on the syllables of repeated words; most of these are in service to the surrounding musical events. Rore splits his texts into a *prima* and *seconda parte* in relatively normative ways; “Quando fra l’altre donne” is the exception, split after the first quatrain, which enables the rhetorical device of the narrator’s apostrophe to his soul to remain unsplit. “Mia benigna fortuna” is set as if it were a sonnet, reduced to two stanzas and split between them (whether or not there were more parts to this piece, if it was a cycle like “Vergine bella,” is impossible to know; however, the modal and compositional characteristics of the piece do not seem to imply that it is in any way incomplete). Rore’s tribute to Willaert, “Concordes adhibite animos,” is a single part, marked by unclear cadences, ambiguous phrasing, and the F Ionian mode. Meier’s insistence that there is a missing second part to this piece is largely unsubstantiated, other than the modal irregularity of its solid ending on the cofinal C. This ending does present the expressive idea of Willaert’s music enduring forever, rather

than stopping on the final (or with his life); the recurring motive of the poem that Rore set is “Vive Adriane, decus Musarum, vive Adriane.”

Rore does not receive as much mention in Zarlino or Stocker as Willaert; he was not Zarlino’s teacher, and the extent of Stocker’s personal knowledge of the music of the Venetian school is subject to some question. Both composers operate in distinct styles that are situated firmly within the surrounding musical tradition. In Rore there is no evidence of blind eschewing of contrapuntal or modal rules to express extreme emotions; to disregard these rules, in fact, would be to miss the subtlety of his settings. Willaert is not the emotionally-staid, mannerist, conservative composer that his connection to Artusi implies. Neither is circumscribed stylistically by Zarlino or Stocker; neither Zarlino nor Stocker wrote their treatises to circumscribe existing styles. If there is such a thing as a “*prima pratica*” and a “*seconda pratica*” based on stylistic features, rather than merely the political expediencies of Monteverdi and Artusi, both Rore and Willaert remain in the *prima pratica*, with Willaert the more progressive of the two. What truly comprises a “new style” in music is always changing, often depends on the writer, and does not follow a uniform *zeitgeist*. From the view of Stocker and the title of the *Musica nova* it was Willaert, not Rore, who championed a “new style.” Rather than contorting Rore to try to fit him into Monteverdi’s idea of a “new style,” modern music analysts would be better served to analyze his music with reference to his own contemporaries, rather than using it to predict the style of forty years later.

Example 1: "Mia benigna fortuna" by Cipriano de Rore

As transcribed in Cipriano de Rore, *Opera omnia*, vol. 4, ed. Bernhard Meier, Corpus Mensurabilis Musicae, vol. 14, ed. Armen Carapetyan ([Rome]: American Institute of Musicology, 1969), 79-81.

Mia benigna fortuna - Crudele acerba

RISM 1557²⁴, No. 9

5

C Mia be - ni - gna for - tu - na

A Mia be - ni - gna for - tu - na e'l

T Mia be - ni - gna for - tu - na

B Mia be - ni - gna for - tu - na e'l vi -

10

e'l vi - ver lie - to, I chia-ri gior -

vi - ver lie - to, e'l vi - ver lie - to, I chia-ri gior -

e'l vi - ver lie - to, I chia-ri gior -

ver lie - to, e'l vi - ver lie - to, I chia-ri gior -

15

ni e le tran-quil - le not - ti Ei so -

ni e le tran-quil - le not - ti Ei so -

ni e le tran-quil - le not - ti Ei so - a -

ni e le tran-quil - le not - ti Ei so -

20

a - vi so-spi-ri, e'l dol - ce sti - le Che so-lea re-so-nar in ver-sie

a - vi so-spi-ri, e'l dol - ce sti - le Che so-lea re-so-nar in

- vi so - spi-ri, e'l dol - ce sti - le Che so-lea re-so-nar in ver-sie

a - vi so - spi-ri, e'l dol - ce sti - le Che so-lea re-so-nar in ver-sie

25

ri - me, Vol - ti su - bi-ta-mente in do - glia e'n pian - to

ver-sie ri-me, Vol - ti su - bi-ta-men-te in do - glia e'n pian -

ri - me, Vol - ti su - bi-ta-men-te in do - glia e'n pian - to

ri - me, Vol-ti su-bi-ta-mente in do - glia e'n pian - to

30

O - diar vi - ta mi fan - noe bra-mar mor - te,
to O - diar vi - ta mi fan - noe bra-mar mor - te,
O - diar vi - ta mi fan - noe bra-mar mor - te,
O - diar vi - ta mi fan - noe bra-mar mor - te,

35 40.

O - diar vi - ta mi fan - noe bra-mar mor - te,
O - diar vi - ta mi fan - noe bra-mar mor - te,
O - diar vi - ta mi fan - noe bra-mar mor - te,
O - diar vi - ta mi fan - noe bra-mar mor - te,

SECONDA PARTE

45

Cru - de - - lea - cer - bain - e - so - ra - bil mor - te,
Cru - de - - lea - cer - - bain - e - so - ra - bil mor - -
Cru - de - - lea - cer -
Cru - de - - lea -

50

in - e - so - ra - bil mor - te, Ca - gion mi dai di
te, in - e - so - ra - bil mor - te, Ca - gion mi dai, ca - gion mi dai
- bain - e - so - ra - bil mor - - te, Ca - gion mi dai di mai non
cer - bain - e - so - ra - bil mor - - te, Ca - gion mi dai di mai

55

mai non es - ser lie - to, Ma di me - nar tut - ta mia vi - tain pian -
di mai non es - ser lie - to, Ma di me - nar
es - - ser lie - to, Ma di me - nar, ma di me - nar
non es - - ser lie - to, Ma di me - nar tut - ta

60

to, Ei gior-nio-scu - ri e le do -
 tut - ta mia vi - tain pian - to, Ei gior-nio-scu - ri, ei
 tut - ta mia vi - tain pian - to, Ei gior-nio-scu - ri e le do -
 mia vi - tain pian - to, Ei gior-nio - scu - ri

65

glio - se not - ti; I miei gra - vi so-spir
 gior-nio-scu - rie le do-glio - se not - ti; I miei gra - vi so-
 glio - se not - ti; I miei gra - vi so-spir
 e le do-glio - se not - ti; I miei gra - vi so-

70 75

non van-noin ri - me E'l mio du - ro mar-tir, e'l mio du - ro
 spir non van-noin ri - me E'l mio du - ro mar-tir, e'l mio du -
 non van-noin ri - me E'l mio du - ro mar-tir, e'l mio du -
 spir non van-noin ri - me E'l mio du - ro mar-tir

80

mar-tir vin-ceo-gni sti - le, E'l mio du - ro mar-tir, e'l mio du-
 ro mar-tir vin-ceo-gni sti - le, E'l mio du - ro mar-tir, e'l mio
 ro mar-tir vin - ceo-gni sti - le, E'l mio du - ro mar-tir, e'l
 vin - ceo-gni sti - le, E'l mio du - ro mar-

85

ro mar-tir vin-ceo-gni sti - le.
 du - ro mar-tir vin-ceo-gni sti - le, vin-ceo-gni sti - le.
 mio du - ro mar-tir vin-ceo-gni sti - le, vin-ceo-gni sti - le.
 tir vin - ceo-gni sti - le, vin - ceo-gni sti - le.

As transcribed in Adriano Willaert, *Opera omnia*, vol. 13, ed. Hermann Zenck and Walter Gerstenberg, *Corpus Mensurabilis Musicae*, vol. 3, ed. Armen Carapetyan (Rome: American Institute of Musicology, 1966), 14-19.

W 1559 b No. 5

C

A

T

V

B

10

a ne-mi - ca di vir - tu - te, Ch'a bei prin - ci - pi vo-len - tier con-tra - sti, ch'a bei prin -
 ca di vir - tu - te, Ch'a bei prin - ci - pi vo-len - tier con - tra - sti, ch'a
 mi - ca di vir - tu - te, Ch'a bei prin - ci - pi vo-len - tier con - tra - sti, ch'a
 ne - mi - ca di vir - tu - te, Ch'a bei prin - ci - pi vo-len - tier con - tra - sti,
 mi - ca di vir - tu - te, Ch'a bei prin - ci - pi vo-len - tier con -

15 20

ci - pi vo-len - tier con-tra - sti, Per qual sen - tier co -
 bei prin - ci - pi vo-len - tier con - tra - sti, Per qual sen - tier co - si - ta - ci-tain-tra -
 bei prin - ci - pi vo-len - tier con - tra - sti, Per qual sen - tier, per qual sen -
 ch'a bei prin - ci - pi vo-len - tier con-tra - sti, Per qual sen - tier co - si - ta -
 tra - sti, vo - len - tier con-tra - sti, Per qual sen - tier co - si - ta - ci-tain-

25

si - ta - ci - ta in - tra - sti In quel bel
 sti, co - si - ta - ci-tain-tra - sti, co - si - ta - ci-tain-tra -
 tier co - si - ta - ci-tain - tra - sti, ta - ci-tain-tra - sti
 -ci-tain-tra - sti, ta - ci-tain-tra - sti In quel bel pet -
 tra - sti, co - si - ta - ci-tain-tra - sti In quel bel pet -

30

pet - to, e con qua - liar - tiil mu - te, e con qua - liar - tiil mu - te,
 sti In quel bel pet - to, e con qua - liar - tiil mu - te, e
 In quel bel pet - to, e con qua - liar - tiil mu - te, e con qua - liar -
 to, e con qua - liar - tiil mu - te, e con qua - liar - tiil mu - te, e
 to, e con qua - liar - tiil mu - te, e con qua - liar - tiil mu - te?

35 40

con qua - liar - tiil mu - te? Da ra - di - ce n'hai

con qua - liar - tiil mu - te? Da ra - di - ce n'haisvel - ta mia sa - lu -

- tiil mu - te? Da ra - di - ce n'hai svel - ta mia sa - lu - te, da ra -

con qua - liar - tiil mu - te? Da ra - di - ce n'haisvel - ta mia sa -

Da ra - di - ce n'hai svel - ta mia sa - lu - te:

45

svel - ta mia sa - lu - te, n'haisvel - ta mia sa - lu - te:

te, n'hai svel - ta mia sa - lu - te: Trop - po fe - li - cea - man - te mi mo - stra -

di - ce n'hai svel - ta mia sa - lu - te: Trop - po fe - li - cea -

lu - te: Trop - po fe - li - cea - man - te, trop - po fe - li -

Trop - po fe - li - cea - man - te mi mo - stra -

50 55

Trop - po fe - li - cea - man - te mi mo - stra - sti A quel - la, ch'i miei prie - ghi

sti A quel - la, ch'i miei prie - ghi hu - mi - lie ca - sti Gra - di al - cun

man - te mi mo - stra - sti A quel - la, ch'i miei prie - ghi hu - mi - lie ca - sti Gra -

- cea - man - te mi mo - stra - sti A quel - la, ch'i miei prie - ghi hu - mi - lie

sti A quel - la, ch'i miei prie - ghi hu - mi - lie ca -

60

hu - mi - lie ca - sti Gra - di al - cun tem - po; hor par, ch'o -

tem - po, gra - di al - cun tem - po; hor par, ch'o - di' e re - fu -

di al - cun tem - po, gra - di al - cun tem - po; hor par, ch'o - di' e re - fu - té, hor

ca - sti Gra - di al - cun tem - po, gra - di al - cun tem - po; hor par, ch'o - di' e re - fu -

- sti Gra - di al - cun tem - po; hor par, ch'o - di' e re - fu - te,

65

di'e re - fu - te, hor par, ch'o-di'e re - fu - te. te, hor par, ch'o-di'e re - fu - te, hor par, ch'o-di'e re - fu - te. par, ch'o-di'e re - fu - te, hor par, ch'o-di'e re - fu - te. te, hor par, ch'o-di'e re - fu - te, hor par, ch'o-di'e re - fu - te. hor par, ch'o-di'e re - fu - te, hor par, ch'o-di'e re - fu - te.

Seconda parte

70 75

Né pe - rò che con at - tia - cer - bie re - i, con at - tia - cer - bie re - Né pe - rò che con at - tia - cer - bie re - i, con at - tia - cer - bie Né pe - rò che con at - tia - cer - bie re - i, con at - tia - cer - bie Né pe - rò che con at - tia - cer - bie re - i.

80 85

i Del mio ben pian - ga, del mio ben pian - i Del mio ben pian - ga, del mio ben pian - ga e del re - i Del mio ben pian - ga, del mio ben pian - ga, i Del mio ben pian - ga, del mio ben pian - Del mio ben pian - ga, del mio ben pian -

90

ga, e del mio pian - ger ri - da, Po - ria can - giar sol - mio pian - ger ri - da, e del mio pian - ger ri - e del mio pian - ger, e del mio pian - ger ri - da, e del mio pian - ger ri - ga, e del mio pian - ger ri - da, Po - ga, e del mio pian - ger ri - da, Po -

95

un de' pen - sier mie - i, po - ria can-giar sol un de' pen -
da, Po-ria can-giar sol un de' pen-sier mie - i, po-ria can -
da, Po-ria can-giar sol un de' pen-sier mie - i, po-ria can-giar sol
ria can-giar sol un de' pen-sier mie - i, po-ria can-giar sol un de' pen-sier mie - i.
ria can-giar sol un de' pen-sier mie - i, po-ria can-giar sol un de' pen-sier

100 105

sler mie - i. Non per-ché mil - le vol -
giar sol un de' pensier mie - i, Non per - ché mil - le vol-te il di m'an - ci -
un de' pen-sier mie - i. Non per-ché mil - le vol-te il di m'an - ci - da, Fia, ch'io non
Non per-ché mil - le vol-te il di m'an ci - da, Fia, ch'io non l'a -
mie - i. Non per-ché mil - le vol - te il di m'an - ci -

110

te il di m'an-ci - da, Fia, ch'io non l'a - mi, e ch'io non spe - ri in
da, Fia, ch'io non l'a - mi, e ch'i non spe-ri in le - i:
l'a - mi, non l'a-mie ch'i non spe - ri in le - i, ch'i non spe -
mi, fia ch'io non l'a - mi, e ch'i non spe - ri in le - i, ch'i non
da, Fia ch'io non l'a - mi, e ch'i non spe - ri in le - i:

115 120

le - i: Chés'el - la mi spa - ven - ta, A -
Chés'el - la mi spa - ven - ta, A-mor m'af - fi - da, A - mor m'af -
ri in le - i: Chés'el-la mi spa - ven - ta, A - mor m'af - fi - da, A - mor m'af -
spe-ri in le - i: Ché s'el - la mi spa - ven - ta, A - mor m'af -
Ché s'el - la mi spa-ven - ta, A - mor m'af - fi - da,

125

morm'af-fi - da, ché s'el - la mi spa -
fi - da, ché s'el-la mi spa - ven - ta, A - mor m'af -
fi - da, ché s'el - la mi spa - ven - ta, A - mor m'af - fi -
fi - da, A - morm'af-fi - da, ché s'el - la mi spa - ven - ta,
A - morm'af - fi - da, ché s'el-la mi spa-ven - ta, A - mor m'af -

130

ven - ta, A - mor m'af-fi - da
fi - da, A - morm'af - fi - da, A - mor m'af - fi - da, A - mor m'af - fi - da.
da, A - morm'af - fi - da, A - mor m'af - fi - da.
A - mor m'af - fi - da, A - morm'af - fi - da, A - morm'af - fi - da.
fi - da, A - morm'af - fi - da, A - morm'af - fi - da.

Example 3: “Quando fra l’altre donne” by Adrian Willaert
 As transcribed in Adriano Willaert, *Opera omnia*, vol. 13, ed. Hermann Zenck and
 Walter Gerstenberg, *Corpus Mensurabilis Musicae*, vol. 3, ed. Armen Carapetyan (Rome:
 American Institute of Musicology, 1966), 23-27.

Quando fra l’altre donne - Da lei ti vien

W 1559 b No. 7

C
 A
 T
 V
 B

Quan - do fra l'al-tre don - ne ad-ho-ra ad-ho - ra A-mor vien

Quan - do fra l'al-tre don - ne ad - ho - ra ad - ho - ra

Quan - do fra l'al - tre don-nead-ho - ra ad - ho - ra

Quan-do fra l'al-tre don - nead - ho - ra ad - ho - ra

Quan - do fra l'al-tre don - nead-ho - ra ad - ho - ra A-

10

nel bel vi - so di co - ste - i, Quan - to cia - scu - na è men - bel -
 A - morvien nel bel vi - so di co - ste - i, Quan - to cia - scu - na è men - bel -
 A - morvien nel bel vi - so di co - ste - i, Quan - to cia - scu - na è men - bel -
 A - morvien nel bel vi - so di co - ste - i, Quan - to cia - scu - na è men - bel - la di
 morvien nel bel vi - so di co - ste - i, Quan - to cia - scu - na è men - bel -

15 20

to cia - scu - na è men - bel - la di le - i, Tan - to cre - sce'l de - sio, che m'in - na - mo -
 - la di le - i, cia - scu - na è men - bel - la di le - i, Tan - to cre - sce'l de - sio, che m'in - na - mo -
 la di le - i, cia - scu - na è men - bel - la di le - i, Tan - to cre - sce'l de - sio, che m'in - na -
 le - i, cia - scu - na è men - bel - la di le - i, Tan - to cre - sce'l de - sio, che m'in - na -
 la di le - i, Tan - to cre - sce'l de - sio, che m'in - na - mo -

25

to cre - sce'l de - sio, che m'in - na - mo - ra, I be - ne - di - coil lo - co, i be - ne - di - coil lo - co, e'l tem - po, e'l ho - ra Che si al - to mi -
 - ra, tan - to cre - sce'l de - sio, che m'in - na - mo - ra, I be - ne - di - coil lo - co, i be - ne - di - coil lo - co, e'l tem - po, e'l ho - ra Che si al - to mi -
 mo - ra, tan - to cre - sce'l de - sio, che m'in - na - mo - ra, I be - ne - di - coil lo - co, i be - ne - di - coil lo - co, e'l tem - po, e'l ho - ra Che si al - to mi -
 mo - ra, tan - to cre - sce'l de - sio, che m'in - na - mo - ra, I be - ne - di - coil lo - co, i be - ne - di - coil lo - co, e'l tem - po, e'l ho - ra Che si al - to mi -
 ra, tan - to cre - sce'l de - sio, che m'in - na - mo - ra, I be - ne - di - coil lo - co, i be - ne - di - coil lo - co, e'l tem - po, e'l ho - ra Che si al - to mi -

30 35

I be - ne - di - coil lo - co, e'l tem - po, e'l ho - ra Che si al - to mi -
 lo - co, i be - ne - di - coil lo - co, e'l tem - po, e'l ho - ra Che si al - to mi -
 co, i be - ne - di - coil lo - co, e'l tem - po, e'l ho - ra Che si al - to mi -
 lo - co, i be - ne - di - coil lo - co, e'l tem - po, e'l ho - ra Che si al - to mi -
 co, e'l tem - po, e'l ho - ra Che si al - to mi -
 co, e'l tem - po, e'l ho - ra Che si al - to mi -
 co, e'l tem - po, e'l ho - ra Che si al - to mi -
 co, e'l tem - po, e'l ho - ra Che si al - to mi -

60

Che fo-stia tan-to ho-nor de - gna - ta al-lho - ra, de-gna-ta al - lho - ra, che fo-stia tan-to ho-

i, Che fo-stia tan-to ho-nor de - gna - ta al - lho - ra, che

gra - tiar de - i, Che fo - stia tan - to ho-nor de-gna - ta al-lho - ra, che

i, Che fo-stia tan-to ho-nor, che fo-stia tan - to ho - nor

de - i, Che fo-stia tan-to ho - nor de - gna-ta al-lho - ra, de-gna-ta al - lho - ra, che fo-stia tan-to ho-

65

95 100

quel, ch'ogn'huom de-si - a. Da lei vien l'a - ni-mo - sa leg - gia - dri -
 quel, ch'ogn'huom de-si - a. Da lei vien l'a - ni-mo - sa leg - gia - dri - a,
 gn'huom de-si - a. Da lei vien l'a - ni-mo - sa leg -
 zan-doquel, ch'ogn'huom de-si - a. Da lei vien l'a - ni-mo - sa leg - gia -
 ch'ogn'huom de-si - a. Da lei vien l'a - ni-mo - sa leg -

105

a, Ch'al ciel ti scor-ge, ch'al ciel ti scor - ge per de - stro sen-te -
 Ch'al ciel ti scor - ge, ch'al ciel ti scor - ge per de - stro sen - te -
 - gia-dri - a, Ch'al ciel ti scor - ge per de - stro sen -
 dri - a, Ch'al ciel ti scor - ge, ch'al ciel ti scor - ge per de - stro sen-te - ro:
 - gia-dri - a, Ch'al ciel ti scor - ge per de - stro sen-te - ro: Sì,

110 115

ro: Sì, ch'i vo già de la spe-ran-za al-te - ro, de la spe-ran-za al-te - ro,
 ro: Sì, ch'i vo già de la spe-ran-za al-te - ro, de la spe-ran-za al-te -
 - te - ro: Sì, ch'i vo già de la spe-ran-za al-te - ro, sì,
 Sì, ch'i vo già de la spe-ran-za al-te - ro, de la spe-ran-za al-te - ro,
 ch'i vo già de la spe-ran-za al-te - ro,

120

sì, ch'i vo già de la spe-ran-za al-te - ro.
 ro, sì, ch'i vo già de la spe-ran-za al-te - ro, de la spe-ran-za al-te - ro.
 ch'i vo già de la spe-ran-za al-te - ro, sì, ch'i vo già de la spe-ran-za al-te - ro.
 sì, ch'i vo già de la spe-ran-za al-te - ro, de la spe-ran-za al-te - ro.
 sì, ch'i vo già, sì, ch'i vo già de la spe-ran-za al-te - ro.

Example 4: "Quando fra l'altre donne" by Cipriano de Rore

As transcribed in Cipriano de Rore, *Opera omnia*, vol. 3, ed. Bernhard Meier, Corpus Mensurabilis Musicae, vol. 14, ed. Armen Carapetyan ([Rome]: American Institute of Musicology, 1961), 64-67.

Quando fra l'altre donne - Io benedico'l loco

RISM 1548¹⁰, No. 21
5

C: Quan - do fra l'al-tre don - ne ad hor ad ho -

A: Quan - do fra l'al-tre don - ne ad hor ad ho - r'A-mor vien nel bel

Q: Quan - do fra l'al-tre don - ne ad

T: Quan - do fra l'al-tre don-ne ad hor ad ho - r'A-mor vien

B: Quan - do fra l'al-tre don-ne ad

10

ra Amor vien nel bel vi - so di co - ste - i,

vi - so di co - ste - i, Quan-to cia - scu - na è men bel -

hor ad ho - r'A-mor vien nel bel vi - so di coste - i,

nel bel vi - so di co - ste - i, Quan-to cia - scu - na è

hor ad ho - r'A-mor vien nel bel vi - so di co - ste - i, Quan-to cia - scu -

15

Quan - to cia - scu - na è men bel - la di le - i, Tan-to cre - sc'il de -

la di le - i, Tan - to cre - sc'il de - sio che m'in - na - mo -

Quan - to cia - scu - na è men bel - la di le - i, Tan -

men bel - la di le - i, Tan-to cre - sc'il de - sio che m'in - na - mo -

- na è men bel - la di le - i, Tan - to cre - sc'il de - sio che m'in - na -

20

sio che m'in-na - mo - ra, Quan-to cia - scu-na è men bel - la di
 - ra, Tan - to cre-sc'il de - sio che m'in-na - mo - ra, Quan-to cia - scu-na è men bel - la di le -
 to cre-sc'il de - sio che m'in-na - mo - ra, Quan-to cia - scu - na è
 ra, Quan - to cia - scu-na è men bel - la di le - i, Tan -
 mo - ra, Quan - to cia - scu-na è men bel - la di le - i,

25 30

le - i, Tan-to cre-sc'il de - sio che m'in-na - mo - ra.
 - i, Tan - to cre-sc'il de - sio, tan - to cre-sc'il de - sio che m'in-na - mo - ra.
 men bel - la di le - i, Tan - to cre - sc'il de - sio che m'in-na - mo - ra.
 to cre-sc'il de - sio che m'in-na - mo - ra, Tan-to cre-sc'il de - sio che m'in-na - mo - ra.
 Tan - to cre-sc'il de - sio che m'in-na - mo - ra, che m'in-na - mo - ra.

SECONDA PARTE

35

lo be - ne - di - co'l lo - co e'l tem - po e l'ho -
 lo be - ne - di - co'l lo - co, io be - ne - di - co'l lo - co
 lo be - ne - di - co'l lo - co, io be - ne - di - co'l lo - co e'l tem -
 lo be - ne - di - co'l lo - co e'l tem - po e l'ho -
 lo be - ne - di - co'l lo - co e'l tem - po e l'ho - ra

40

ra Che sì al - to mi - ra - ron gli occhi me -
 e'l tem - po e l'ho - ra Che sì al - to mi - ra - ron gli oc - chi
 po e l'ho - ra Che sì al - to mi - ra - ron gli occhi me -
 ra Che sì al - to mi - ra - ron gli occhi me -
 Che sì al - to mi - ra - ron gli oc - chi me - i,

45

i, E di - co: a - ni - ma, as-sai rin - gra - tiar de - i, rin -

50 55

ma, as-sai rin - gra - tiar de - i, Che fo - stia tan - t'ho - nor de - gna - t'al - ho - ra; Da

60

ra; Da lei ti vien l'a - mo-ro - so pen - sie - ro, Che men-tr'il se - gui al'

65

se - gui al som-mo ben t'in - vi - a, Po - co pre - zan - do quel ch'ognunde-si - a, Po - co pre - zan - do quel ch'o -

70

ch'ognun de-si - a; Da lei vien l'a - ni-mo - - sa
si - a; Da lei vien l'a-ni-mo - sa leg-gia-dri - a, Da lei vien l'a-ni-mo - sa
ch'o - gnun de-si - a; Da lei vien l'a - ni-mo - sa
gnun de-si - a; Da lei vien l'a - ni-mo - sa leg - gia-dri - a
a; Da lei vien l'a - ni-mo - sa leg - gia-dri - a

75

leg - gia - dri - a Ch' al ciel ti scor - ge per de - stro sen - tie - ro:

leg - gia - dri - a Ch' al ciel ti scor - ge per de - stro sen - tie - ro:

leg - gia - dri - a Ch' al ciel ti scor - ge per de - stro sen - tie - ro:

Ch' al ciel ti scor - ge per de - stro sen - tie - ro:

Ch' al ciel ti scor - ge per de - stro sen - tie - ro:

80

Si ch'io vo già de la spe-ran-z'al-tie -

Si ch'io vo già de la spe-ran-z'al-tie - ro, Si ch'io vo già de la spe-ran-z'al-tie -

ch'io vo già de la spe-ran-z'al-tie - ro, Si ch'io vo già de la spe-ran-z'al-tie -

ro: Si ch'io vo già, sì ch'io vo già de la spe-ran-z'al-tie - ro, Si

Si ch'io vo già de la spe-ran-z'al-tie - ro, Si

85

ro, Si ch'io vo già de la spe-ran-z'al-tie ro.

ro, Si ch'io vo già de la spe-ran-z'al-tie - ro, vo già de la spe-ran - z'al-tie - ro.

ro, Si ch'io vo già de la spe-ran-z'al-tie - ro, Si ch'io vo già de la spe-ran-z'al-tie - ro.

ch'io vo già de la spe-ran-z'al-tie - ro, Si ch'io vo già de la spe-ran-z'al-tie - ro.

ch'io vo già de la spe-ran-z'al-tie - ro, vo già de la spe-ran - z'al-tie - ro.

90

Example 5: "O socii" by Cipriano de Rore
 As transcribed in Cipriano de Rore, *Opera omnia*, vol. 5, ed. Bernhard Meier, Corpus Mensurabilis Musicae, vol. 14, ed. Armen Carapetyan ([Rome]: American Institute of Musicology, 1971), 110-115.

O socii - Per varios casus

Illustrissimi et Reverendissimi Cardinalis Granvelli Emblema RISM 1566¹⁷, No. 17

C

A

Q

T

B

5

10

ne - que e - nim i - gna - ri su - mus an - te ma - lo - - - - rum, O

ne - que e - nim i - gna - ri su - mus an - te ma - lo - - - - rum, O pas -

te,

ne - que e - nim i - gna - ri su - mus an - te ma - lo - - - - rum, O

i, ne - que e - nim i - gna - ri su - mus an - te ma - lo - - - - rum,

15

pas - si gra - vi - o - ra, o pas - si gra - vi - o - ra, da -
 - si gra - vi - o - ra, o pas - si gra - vi - o - ra, da -
 du - ra - te,
 pas - si gra - vi - o - ra, o pas - si gra - vi - o - ra, da -
 O pas - si gra - vi - o - ra, da -

20

- bit de - us his quo - que fi - nem, da - bit de - us his quo - que fi -
 - bit de - us his quo - que fi - nem, da - bit de - us his quo - que
 - bit de - us his quo - que fi - nem, da - bit de - us his quo - que
 - bit de - us his quo - que fi - nem, da - bit de - us his quo - que

25

nem. Vos et Scyl - lae - am ra - bi - em pe - ni - tus -
 quo - que fi - nem. Vos et Scyl - lae - am ra - bi - em, vos et Scyl - lae -
 du
 fi - nem. Vos et Scyl - lae - am ra - bi - em pe - ni - tus -
 fi - nem. Vos et Scyl - lae - am ra - bi -

30 35

que so - nan - tes A - ce - stis sco - pu - los, vos et Cy - clo - pe -
 am ra - bi - em pe - ni - tus - que so - nan - tes A - ce - stis sco - pu - los, vos et Cy -
 ra - te,
 - que so - nan - tes A - ce - stis sco - pu - los, vos et
 em pe - ni - tus - que so - nan - tes A - ce - stis sco - pu - los, vos et Cy - clo - pe - a

40

a sa - xa Ex - per - ti: re - vo - ca - te a - ni - mos, re -
 clo - pe - a sa - xa Ex - per - ti: re - vo - ca - te a - ni - mos, re -
 Cy - clo - pe - a sa - xa Ex - per - ti: re - vo - ca - te a - ni - mos,
 sa - xa Ex - per - ti: re - vo - ca - te a - ni - mos, re -

45

- vo - ca - te a - ni - mos,
 - vo - ca - te a - ni - mos, moe - stum -
 re - vo - ca - te a - ni - mos, moe - stum - que ti - mo - rem Mit -
 - vo - ca - te a - ni - mos, moe - stum - que ti - mo - rem Mit - ti -

50

moe - stum - que ti - mo - rem Mit - ti - te; for - san et
 que ti - mo - rem Mit - ti - te; for - san et
 du -
 te, ti - mo - rem Mit - ti - te; for - san et haec
 te; for - san et

55

haec o - lim me - mi - nis - se iu - va - bit,
 haec o - lim me - mi - nis - se iu - va - bit, for -
 ra - te,
 o - lim me - mi - nis - se iu - va - bit, for -
 haec o - lim me - mi - nis - se iu - va - bit, for -

60

for - san et haec o - lim me - mi - nis - se iu - va - - bit.

- - san et haec o - lim me - mi - nis - se iu - va - - bit.

du - - - - - ra - - - - - te.

san et haec o - lim me - mi - nis - se iu - va - - bit.

san et haec o - lim me - mi - nis - se iu - va - - bit.

Seconda parte

65

Per va - ri - os ca - - sus, per va - ri - os ca - - sus,

Per va - ri - os ca - - sus, per va - ri - os ca - - sus,

Du - - - - - ra - - - - - te,

Per va - ri - os ca - - sus, per va - ri - os ca - - sus,

Per va - ri - os ca - - sus, per va - ri - os ca - - sus,

70

sus, per tot dis - cri - mi - na re - rum Ten - di - mus in La - ti - um,

per tot dis - cri - mi - na re - - rum Ten - di - mus in La - ti - um, ten -

du - - - - - ra - - - - - te,

per tot dis - cri - mi - na re - rum Ten - di - mus in La - ti - um,

per tot dis - cri - mi - na re - rum Ten - di - mus in La - ti - um,

80

ten - di - mus in La - ti - um, se - des u - bi fa - ta qui - e - tas Os - ten -

di - mus in La - ti - um, se - des u - bi fa - ta qui - e - tas Os - ten -

du - - - - - ra - - - - - te,

ten - di - mus in La - ti - um, se - des u - bi fa - ta qui - e - tas Os - ten -

ten - di - mus in La - ti - um, se - des u - bi fa - ta qui - e - tas Os - ten -

110

dis, et vos - met re - bus ser - va - te se - cun - - dis.

et vos - met re - bus ser - va - te se - cun - - dis.

- te, du - ra - te, du - - ra - - te.

te, et vos - met re - bus ser - va - te se - cun - dis.

vos - met re - - bus ser - va - - te se - cun - dis.

Example 6: "O socii" by Adrian Willaert

As transcribed in Adriano Willaert, *Opera omnia*, vol. 14, ed. Hermann Zenck and Walter Gerstenberg, *Corpus Mensurabilis Musicae*, vol. 3, ed. Armen Carapetyan (Rome: American Institute of Musicology, 1966), 142-148.

O socii, durate
Illustrissimi et Reverendissimi Cardinalis Granvelli Emblema RISM 1566¹⁷, No. 16

C O so - ci - i, du - ra - te. O

Q

A O so - ci - i, du - ra - te.

T Du - ra - - -

VI Du - ra - - - te,

B O so - ci - i, du - ra - te. O

10

so - ci - i, ne - que e - nim i - gna - ri su - mus,

Du - ra - te,

O so - ci - i, ne - que e - nim i - gna - ri su -

te. O so - ci - i, ne - que e - nim i - gna - ri su -

so - ci - i, ne - que e - nim i - gna - ri su - mus an - te ma - lo -

15

an - te ma - lo - rum; O pas - si gra - vi - o - ra,

du - ra -

mus an - te ma - lo - rum; O pas - si gra - vi - o - ra,

- mus an - te ma - lo - rum; O pas - si gra - vi -

du - ra - te,

- rum; O pas - si gra - vi - o - ra,

20

o pas - si gra - vi - o - ra, o pas - si gra - vi -

te,

pas - si gra - vi - o - ra, o pas - si gra - vi -

o - ra, o pas - si gra - vi - o - ra, da -

du - ra

o pas - si gra - vi - o -

25

o - ra. da - bit de - us his quo - que fi - nem, da - bit

du - ra - te,

o - ra, da - bit de - us his quo - que fi - nem, da -

- bit de - us his quo - que fi - nem, da - bit

te,

ra, da - bit de - us his quo - que fi - nem, da -

30

de - us his quo - que fi - nem. Ex - per - ti,

- bit de - us his quo - que fi - nem. Ex - per -

de - us his quo - que fi - nem. Ex - per - ti,

du - ra -

- bit de - us his quo - que fi - nem. Ex - per -

35

re - vo - ca - te a - ni - mos, re - vo - ca -

du - ra - te,

ti, re - vo - ca - te a - ni -

re - vo - ca - te a - ni - mos,

te,

ti, re - vo - ca - te a - ni - mos, re - vo - ca - te

40

- te a - ni-mos, re - vo - ca - te a - ni-mos moe-stum-que ti - mo -

mos, re - vo - ca - te a - ni-mos moe-stum-que

re - vo - ca - te a - ni - mos moe - stum-que ti -

du - ra -

a - ni-mos, re - vo - ca - te a - ni-mos moe - stum-que ti - mo-rem Mit - ti -

45

rem Mit - ti - te; for - san et haec o - lim me - mi - nis - se

du - ra - te,

ti - mo - rem Mit - ti - te; for - san et haec o - lim me -

mo - rem Mit - ti - te; for - san et haec o - lim me - mi -

te,

te; for - san et haec o - lim me - mi -

50

iu - va - bit, for - san et haec o - lim me - mi - nis - se iu - va -

mi - nis - se iu - va - bit, for - san et haec o - lim me - mi - nis -

nis - se iu - va - bit, for - san et haec o - lim me - mi - nis - se iu -

du - ra -

nis - se iu - va - bit, me - mi - nis - se iu - va - bit.

55

bit. Per va - ri - os ca - sus, per va - ri - os

du - ra - te,

se iu - va - bit. Per va - ri - os ca - sus, per va - ri - os

va - bit. Per va - ri - os ca - sus, per va - ri - os

te, Per va - ri - os ca - sus, per va - ri - os

60

ca - sus, per tot dis - cri - mi - na re - rum, per tot dis - cri - mi -

du - ra - te,

ca - sus, per tot dis - cri - mi - na re - rum Ten - di -

- ri - os ca - sus, per tot dis - cri - mi - na re - rum Ten -

du - ra - te,

ca - sus, per tot dis - cri - mi - na re - rum, per tot dis - cri - mi -

65

na re - rum Ten - di-mus, o - sten - dunt se - des u - bi fa -

du - ra - te,

mus, o - sten - dunt, ten - di-mus, o - sten - dunt se - des u - bi fa -

- di-mus, o - sten - dunt, ten - di-mus, o - sten - dunt se - des u - bi

du - ra - te,

na re - rum Ten - di-mus, o - sten - dunt se - des u - bi fa -

70 75

ta se-cun - das. Du - ra - te, du - ra - te, du - ra -

ta se-cun - das. Du - ra - te et

fa - ta se-cun - das. Du - ra - te, du - ra - te, du - ra -

du - ra - te, du - ra -

ta se-cun - das. Du - ra - te, du - ra - te, du -

80

te et vos - met re - bus ser - va - te se - cun -
du - ra - te, du -
vos - met re - bus ser - va - te se - cun - dis, Du - ra - te,
te, du - ra - te et vos - met re - bus ser - va - te
te, du - ra - te,
ra - te et vos - met re - bus ser - va - te se - cun -

85

dis, Du-ra - te, du-ra - te, ra - te, du-ra - te, du-ra - te et vos-met se-cun-dis, Du-ra - te et vos-met re-bus ser-va-du-dis, Du-ra - te et vos-met re-bus ser-va-te se-

90

du - ra - te et vos - met re - bus ser - va - te se - cun -
 du - ra - te, du - ra - te,
 re - bus ser - va - te se - cun - dis, Du - ra -
 - te se - cun - dis, Du - ra - te et vos - met re - bus ser - va - te, du -
 ra - te, du - ra - te, du -
 cun - dis,

95

dis, Du - ra - te et vos - met re - bus ser - va - te se - cun - dis, Du - ra -
 du - ra - te, du - ra - te, du - ra - te,
 te et vos - met re - bus ser - va - te se - cun - dis, Du - ra - te, du - ra -
 ra - te et vos - met re - bus ser - va - te se - cun - dis, Du - ra -
 ra - te, du - ra - te, du - ra - te, du -
 Du - ra - te et vos - met re - bus ser - va - te se - cun - dis,

100

- te et vos - met re - bus ser - va - te se - cun - dis.
 du - ra - te, du - ra - te.
 te, du - ra - te et vos - met re - bus ser - va - te se - cun - dis.
 te, du - ra - te et vos - met re - bus ser - va - te se - cun - dis.
 ra - te, du - ra - te, du - ra - te.
 Du - ra - te et vos - met re - bus ser - va - te se - cun - dis.

Example 7: "Concordes adhibete animos" by Cipriano de Rore
 As transcribed in Cipriano de Rore, *Opera omnia*, vol. 5, ed. Bernhard Meier, Corpus Mensurabilis Musicae, vol. 14, ed. Armen Carapetyan ([Rome]: American Institute of Musicology, 1971), 118-121.

Concordes adhibete animos

In mortem Adriani Willaert *

RISM 1566¹⁷, No. 20

C
Q
A
T
B

Con - cor - des, con - cor - des, 5 +

Con - cor - des, con - cor - des ad - hi - be - te

Con - cor - des, con - cor - des ad - hi - be - te

con - cor - des ad - hi - be - te

Vi - ve

a - ni - mos Mu - sae, ad - hi - be - te a - ni - mos

- te a - ni - mos Mu - sae, ad - hi - be - te

a - ni - mos Mu - sae, con - cor - des,

15

a - ni - mos Mu - sae, ad - hi - be - te a - ni - mos Mu - sae,

A - dri - a - ne de - cus Mu - sa -

Mu - sae, ad - hi - be - te a - ni - mos Mu - sae,

a - ni - mos, ad - hi - be - te a - ni - mos Mu - sae, in -

con - cor - des ad - hi - be - te a - ni - mos Mu - sae,

20

in - cli - ta tur - ba, in - cli - ta tur - ba, Ae - the -

rum, vi - ve A - dri - a - ne.

in - cli - ta tur - ba, in - cli - ta tur - ba, Ae - the - re - i pa - tris

in - cli - ta tur - ba, in - cli - ta tur - ba,

in - cli - ta tur - ba, in - cli - ta tur - ba, Ae - the - re - i

* The liturgical „tonus lamentationis,” used at the beginning, is indicated by +

25

re - i - pa - tris sa - cra pro - pa - go Jo - vis: sa - cra pro - pa - go Jo - vis, sa - cra pro - pa - go Jo - vis: Ae - the - re - i pa - tris sa - cra pro - pa - go Jo - vis: pa - tris sa - cra pro - pa - go Jo - vis, sa - cra pro - pa - go Jo - vis:

30 35

Lau - de Pan - no - phe - um sum - ma de - co - ra - te Vi - ve A - dri - Lau - de Pan - no - phe - um sum - ma de - co - ra - te Lau - de Pan - no - phe - um sum - ma de - co - ra - te Lau - de Pan - no - phe - um sum - ma de - co - ra - te

40

A - dri - a - num, In - tu - lit ut ve - stro mu - ne - ra sum - ma cho - ro. a - ne de - cus Mu - sa - rum, A - dri - a - num, In - tu - lit ut ve - stro mu - ne - ra sum - ma cho - ro. A - dri - a - num, In - tu - lit ut ve - stro mu - ne - ra sum - ma cho - ro. A - dri - a - num, In - tu - lit ut ve - stro mu - ne - ra sum - ma cho - ro.

45

Har - mo - ni - cos ma - gis ac su - a - ves ne - mo e - di - dit un - vi - ve A - dri - a - ne. Har - mo - ni - cos ma - gis ac su - a - ves ne - mo e - di - dit un - Har - mo - ni - cos ma - gis ac su - a - ves ne - mo e - di - dit un - Har - mo - ni - cos ma - gis ac su - a - ves ne - mo e - di - dit un -

50

quam Can - tus, per quem nunc mu - si - ca ve - ra vi - get. Er -

- quam Can - tus, per quem nunc mu - si - ca ve - ra vi - get. Er -

- quam Can - tus, per quem nunc mu - si - ca ve - ra vi - get. Er - go.

- quam Can - tus, per quem nunc mu - si - ca ve - ra vi - get.

55

60

go ae - tas o - mnis, ae - tas o - mnis co - lat hunc, Vi - ve A - dri - a - ne

go ae - tas o - mnis, ae - tas o - mnis co - lat hunc,

ae - tas o - mnis, er - go ae - tas o - mnis co - lat hunc, lau -

Er - go ae - tas o - mnis co - lat hunc,

65

lau - de - tur o - ri - go: Fe - lix,

de - cus Mu - sa - rum, vi - ve A - dri -

lau - de - tur o - ri - go: Fe - lix quae hunc

de - tur o - ri - go: Fe - lix quae hunc

lau - de - tur o - ri - go: Fe - lix quae hunc

70

fe - lix quae hunc ge - nu - it Flan -

a - ne. Vi - ve A - dri - a - ne

ge - nu - it Flan - dri - a, fe - lix, fe - lix quae hunc

ge - nu - it Flan - dri - a, fe - lix quae hunc ge - nu - it Flan -

ge - nu - it Flan - dri - a, fe - lix quae hunc ge - nu - it Flan - dri -

75

- dri - a in or - be vi - rum, in or - be vi - rum.
 de - cus Mu - sa - - rum, vi - ve A - dri - a - ne.
 ge - nu - it Flan - dri - a in or - - be vi - rum.
 dri - a in or - be vi - - rum, in or - be vi - rum.
 a in or - be vi - - rum, in or - be vi - rum.

[Secunda pars deest.]

Bibliography

- Agee, Richard. "Ruberto Strozzi and the Early Madrigal." *Journal of the American Musicological Society* 36 (1985): 1-17.
- Agee, Richard, and Jessie Ann Owens. "La stampa della *Musica nova* di Willaert." *Rivista italiana di musicologia* 24 (1989): 219-305.
- Artusi, Giovanni Maria. *L'arte del contrapunto*. Venice: Giacomo Vincenti, 1598. Reprint, Hildesheim: Georg Olms Verlag, 1969.
- _____. *L'Artusi overo Delle imperfettioni della moderna musica*. Venice: Giacomo Vincenti, 1600. Reprint, Bologna: Forni, 1968.
- _____. *L'Artusi overo Delle imperfettioni della moderna musica*. Translated and annotated by Malcolm Litchfield. M.A. thesis, Brigham Young University, 1987.
- _____. "Second Discourse." In *L'Artusi overo Delle imperfettioni della moderna musica*. Venice: Giacomo Vincenti, 1600. Translated by Oliver Strunk, revised by Margaret Murata in *Source Readings in Music History*, edited by Oliver Strunk and Leo Treitler. New York: W. W. Norton and Company, 1998.
- _____. *L'ombre de Monteverdi: La querelle de la nouvelle musique (1600-1638): Artusi, ou des imperfections de la musique moderne de Giovanni Artusi (1600)*. Translated by Xavier Bisaro and Giuliano Ciello with Pierre-Henry Frangne. Rennes: Presses Universitaires de Rennes, 2008.
- _____. [Antonio Braccino da Todi, pseud.] "Discorso Secondo Musicale." Venice: Giacomo Vincenti, 1608. Facsimile edition, Milan: Bollettino bibliografico musicale, 1934.
- Bent, Margaret. "The Grammar of Early Music: Preconditions for Analysis." In *Tonal Structures in Early Music*, edited by Christle Collins Judd. Criticism and Analysis of Early Music, edited by Jessie Ann Owens. New York and London: Garland Publishing, Inc., 1998.
- Bossuyt, Ignace. "O socii durate: A Musical Correspondence from the Time of Philip II." *Early Music* 26, no. 3 (August 1998): 432-44.
- Brauner, Charles S. "The *Seconda Pratica*, or the Imperfections of the Composer's Voice." In *Musical Humanism and its Legacy: Essays in Honor of Claude V. Palisca*, edited by Nancy Kovaleff Baker and Barbara Russano Hanning. Stuyvesant, NY: Pendragon Press, 1992.
- Brown, Howard Mayer. "Words and Music: Willaert, the Chanson, and the Madrigal about 1540." In *Florence and Venice: Comparisons and Relations*. Vol. 2. Edited

- by Christine Smith and Salvatore I. Camporeale. Florence: La Nuova Italia Editrice, 1980.
- _____. "Emulation, Competition, and Homage: Imitation and Theories of Imitation in the Renaissance." *Journal of the American Musicological Society* 35 (1982): 1-48.
- Bruno, Luca. "Theory and Analysis of Harmony in Adrian Willaert's 'Canzone Villanesche alla Napolitana.' (1542-1545)." Ph.D. diss., Università degli Studi di Trento, 2007.
- Burford, Mark Jon. "Cipriano de Rore's Canonic Madrigals." *The Journal of Musicology* 17 (1999): 459-97.
- Butchart, David. "'La Pecorina' at Mantua, *Musica nova* at Florence." *Early Music* 13 (1985): 358-66.
- Carapetyan, Armen. "The *Musica nova* of Adriano Willaert." *Journal of Renaissance & Baroque Music* 1 (1946): 200-21.
- Carter, Tim. "Artusi, Monteverdi, and the Poetics of Modern Music." In *Musical Humanism and its Legacy: Essays in Honor of Claude V. Palisca*, edited by Nancy Kovaleff Baker and Barbara Russano Hanning. Stuyvesant, NY: Pendragon Press, 1992.
- _____. "E in rileggendo poi le proprie note: Monteverdi Responds to Artusi?" American Musicological Society Southeastern Chapter Meeting. University of North Carolina-Chapel Hill, 25 September 2010.
- Cusick, Suzanne G. "Gendering Modern Music: Thoughts on the Monteverdi-Artusi Controversy." *Journal of the American Musicological Society* 46 (1993): 1-25.
- Einstein, Alfred. "The Greghesca and the Giustiniana of the Sixteenth Century," *Journal of Renaissance and Baroque Music* 1 (1946): 19-32.
- Farrell, Joseph and Michael C. J. Putnam, eds. *A Companion to Vergil's Aeneid and Its Tradition*. Chichester, UK: Wiley-Blackwell, 2010.
- Feldman, Martha. *City Culture and the Madrigal at Venice*. Berkeley, CA: University of California Press, 1995.
- _____. "The Composer as Exegete: Interpretations of Petrarchan Syntax in the Venetian Madrigal." *Studi Musicali* 18 (1989): 203-38.
- _____. "Rore's 'Selva Selvaggia': The *Primo libro* of 1542." *Journal of the American Musicological Society* 42 (1989): 547-603.

- Fromson, Michèle. "Themes of Exile in Willaert's *Musica nova*." *Journal of the American Musicological Society* 47 (1994): 442-87.
- Fenlon, Iain. *Music and Culture in Late Renaissance Italy*. Oxford: Oxford University Press, 2002.
- Fitzgerald, William. "Vergil in Music." In *A Companion to Vergil's Aeneid and Its Tradition*, edited by Joseph Farrell and Michael C. J. Putnam. Chichester, UK: Wiley-Blackwell, 2010.
- Haar, James. "Cipriano de Rore and the Seconda Pratica: Some Ferrarese Testimonials." In *Music, Ideas and Society: Essays in Honour of Ivan Supicic*, edited by Stanislav Tuksar. Croatia: Hrvatsko Muzikolosko Drustvo Zagreb, 1993.
- _____. "Notes on the 'Dialogo della Musica' of Antonfrancesco Doni." *Music & Letters* 47 (1966): 198-224.
- _____. "Rore's Setting of Ariosto." In *Essays in Musicology: A Tribute to Alvin Johnson*, edited by Lewis Lockwood and Edward H. Roesner. Philadelphia: American Musicological Society, 1990.
- _____. Review of *City Culture and the Madrigal at Venice*, by Martha Feldman. *Early Music History* 16 (1997): 318-28.
- Harràn, Don. "Rore and the Madrigale Cromatico." *The Music Review* 34, no. 1 (February 1973): 66-81.
- _____. *Word-Tone Relations in Musical Thought*. [Rome]: American Institute of Musicology, 1986.
- Haskell, Yasmin. "Practicing What They Preach?: Vergil and the Jesuits." In *A Companion to Vergil's Aeneid and Its Tradition*, edited by Joseph Farrell and Michael C. J. Putnam. Chichester, UK: Wiley-Blackwell, 2010.
- Hatch, Christopher and David W. Berenstein, eds. *Music Theory and the Exploration of the Past*. Chicago: University of Chicago Press, 1993.
- Judd, Cristle Collins. *Reading Renaissance Music Theory: Hearing with the Eyes*. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 2000.
- Judd, Cristle Collins, ed. *Tonal Structures in Early Music*. Criticism and Analysis of Early Music, edited by Jessie Ann Owens. New York and London: Garland Publishing, Inc., 1998.

- Kallendorf, Craig. "Vergil and Printed Books, 1500-1800." In *A Companion to Vergil's Aeneid and Its Tradition*, edited by Joseph Farrell and Michael C. J. Putnam. Chichester, UK: Wiley-Blackwell, 2010.
- LaVia, Stefano. "Cipriano de Rore and Reader and as Read: A Literary-Musical Study of Madrigals from Rore's Later Collections (1557-1566)." Ph.D. diss., Princeton University, 1991.
- _____. "'Natura delle cadenze' e 'natura contraria delli modi': Punti di convergenza fra teoria e prassi nel madrigale cinquecentesco." *Il saggiatore musical: Rivista semestrale di musicologia* 4 (1997): 5-51.
- Lewis, Mary S. "Rore's Setting of Petrarch's 'Vergine Bella': A History of Its Composition and Early Transmission." *Journal of Musicology* 4 (1985-1986): 365-409.
- _____. "Zarlino's Theories of Text Underlay as Illustrated in his Motet Book of 1549." *Notes* 42 (1985): 239-67.
- _____. "Twins, Cousins, and Heirs: Relationships among Editions of Music Printed in Sixteenth-Century Venice." In *Critica Musica: Essays in Honor of Paul Brainard*, edited by John Knowles. Amsterdam: Gordon and Breach, 1996.
- The Liber Usualis*, edited by the Benedictines of Solesmes. Tournai: Desclee Company, 1961. <http://media.musicasacra.com/pdf/liberusualis.pdf>.
- Lloyd, Angela Jane. "Modal Representation in the Early Madrigals of Cipriano de Rore." Ph.D. diss., University of London, 1996.
- Lockwood, Lewis. "Adrian Willaert and Cardinal Ippolito I d'Este: New Light on Willaert's Early Career in Italy, 1515-1521." *Early Music History* 5 (1985): 85-112.
- _____. "Text and Music in Rore's Madrigal 'Anchor che col partire.'" In *Musical Humanism and its Legacy: Essays in Honor of Claude V. Palisca*, edited by Nancy Kovaleff Baker and Barbara Russano Hanning. Stuyvesant, NY: Pendragon Press, 1992.
- Looney, Dennis. "Marvelous Vergil in the Ferrarese Renaissance." In *A Companion to Vergil's Aeneid and Its Tradition*, edited by Joseph Farrell and Michael C. J. Putnam. Chichester, UK: Wiley-Blackwell, 2010.
- Luoma, Robert G. "Relationships between Music and Poetry (Cipriano de Rore's 'Quando signor lasciaste')." *Musica Disciplina* 31 (1977): 135-54.

- Macey, Patrick. "Savonarola and the Sixteenth-Century Motet." *Journal of the American Musicological Society* 36 (1983): 422-52.
- MacKenzie, Pierre Henri Parnell. "Cipriano de Rore's Second Book of Four-Voiced Madrigals, 1557." M.A. thesis, University of Victoria, British Columbia, 1991.
- Maniates, Markia Rika. "The Cavalier Ercole Bottrigari and his Brickbats: Prolegomena to the Defense of Don Nicola Vicentino against Messer Gandolfo Sigonio." In *Music Theory and the Exploration of the Past*, edited by Christopher Hatch and David W. Berenstein. Chicago: University of Chicago Press, 1993.
- McClary, Susan. *Modal Subjectivities: Self-fashioning in the Italian Madrigal*. Berkeley, CA: University of California Press, 2004.
- McKinney, Timothy R. *Adrian Willaert and the Theory of Interval Affect: The "Musica Nova" Madrigals and the Novel Theories of Zarlino and Vicentino*. Burlington, VT: Ashgate Publishing, 2010.
- Meier, Bernhard. *The Modes of Classical Vocal Polyphony*. Translated by Ellen S. Beebe. New York: Broude Brothers, 1988.
- Miller, Jonathan Marcus. "Word-sound and Musical Texture in the Mid-Sixteenth-Century Venetian Madrigal." Ph.D. diss., University of North Carolina at Chapel Hill, 1991.
- Monteverdi, Claudio. Preface to *Il quinto libro de madrigali a cinque voci* (Venice: Ricciardo Amadino, 1605). Translated by Claude V. Palisca in *The New Monteverdi Companion*, edited by Denis Arnold and Nigel Fortune. London: Faber and Faber, 1985. Reprinted in Oliver Strunk, *Source Readings in Music History*. Rev. ed., edited by Oliver Strunk and Leo Treitler. 536. New York: W. W. Norton and Company, 1998.
- Monteverdi, Giulio Cesare. "Dichiaratione della lettera stampata nel quinto libro de' suoi madregali." In *Scherzi musicali a tre voci di Claudio Monteverde*, edited by Giulio Cesare Monteverdi. Venice: Ricciardo Amadino, 1607. Translated by Oliver Strunk in *Source Readings in Music History*. Rev. ed., edited by Oliver Strunk and Leo Treitler. New York: W. W. Norton and Company, 1998.
- Newcomb, Anthony. "Editions of Willaert's *Musica nova*: New evidence, new speculations." *Journal of the American Musicological Society* 26 (1973): 132-40.
- _____. *The Madrigal at Ferrara: 1579-1597*. 2 vols. Princeton: Princeton University Press, 1980.
- Owens, Jesse Ann. "Cipriano de Rora a Parma (1560-1565): Nuovi Documenti." *Rivista Italiana di Musicologia* 11 (1976): 5-26.

- _____. "The Milan Partbooks: Evidence of Cipriano de Rore's Compositional Process." *Journal of the American Musicological Society* 37 (1984): 270-98.
- _____. "Mode in the Madrigals of Cipriano de Rore." In *Altro Polo: Essays on Italian Music in the Cinquecento*, edited by Richard Charteris. Sydney: University of Sydney, 1990.
- Palisca, Claude V. "The Artusi-Monteverdi Controversy." In *The New Monteverdi Companion*, edited by Denis Arnold and Nigel Fortune. London: Faber and Faber, 1985.
- _____. *Humanism in Italian Renaissance Musical Thought*. New Haven, CT: Yale University Press, 1985.
- _____. "Mode Ethos in the Renaissance." In *Essays in Musicology: A Tribute to Alvin Johnson*, edited by Lewis Lockwood and Edward H. Roesner. Philadelphia: American Musicological Society, 1990.
- _____. "Vincenzo Galilei's Counterpoint Treatise: A Code for the *Seconda Pratica*." *The Journal of the American Musicological Society* 9 (1956): 81-96.
- Perkins, Leeman L. "Towards a Theory of Text-Music Relations in the Music of the Renaissance." In *Binchois Studies*, edited by Andrew Kirkman and Dennis Slaven. Oxford: Oxford University Press, 2000.
- Petrarch, Francesco. *Canzoniere (Rerum vulgarium fragmenta)*. Translated by Frederic J. Jones. 2 vols. Market Harborough, UK: Troubador Publishing, 2001.
- _____. *Petrarch's Lyric Poems: the Rime sparse and Other Lyrics*. Translated and edited by Robert M. Durling. Cambridge, MA: Harvard University Press, 1976.
- Rifkin, Joshua. "Miracles, Motivicity, and Mannerism: Adrian Willaert's *Videns Dominus flentes sorores Lazari* and Some Aspects of Motet Composition in the 1520s." In *Hearing the Motet: Essays on the Motet of the Middle Ages and Renaissance*, edited by Dolores Pesce. New York: Oxford University Press, 1997.
- Rivera, Benito V. "Finding the Soggetto in Willaert's Free Imitative Counterpoint: A Step in Modal Analysis." In *Music Theory and the Exploration of the Past*, edited by Christopher Hatch and David W. Berenstein. Chicago: University of Chicago Press, 1993.
- Rore, Cipriano de. *Opera omnia*, vols. 2-5, edited by Bernhard Meier. Vol. 14, *Corpus Mensurabilis Musicae*, edited by Armen Carapetyan. [Rome]: American Institute of Musicology, 1961-1971.

- _____. *Il quinto libro di madrigali a cinque voci insieme alcuni de diversi autori nouamente per Antonio Gardano stampato & dato in luce*. Venice: Antonio Gardano, 1566.
- Schiltz, Katelijne. "Giunto Adrian fra l'anime beate: Une quintuple déploration sur la mort d'Adrien Willaert." *Musurgia: Analyse et pratique musicales* 10 (2003): 8-33.
- _____. "'Harmonicis magis ac suaves nemo editit unquam cantus': Cipriano de Rores motette *Concordes adhibete animos*." *Archiv für Musikwissenschaft* 62 (2005): 111-36.
- _____. "Tod in Venedig: Adrian Willaert als Rezipient burlesker Lamenti." *Tod in Musik et Kultur: Zum 500. Todestag Philipps des Schönen*, edited by Stefan Gasch and Birgit Lodes. Tutzing: Hans Schnieder, 2007.
- Stocker, Gaspar. *De musica verballi, libri duo*. Translated by Albert C. Rotola. Lincoln, NE: University of Nebraska Press, 1988.
- Treloar, Stephanie Lyn. "The Madrigals of Giaches de Wert: Patrons, Poets, and Compositional Procedures." PhD. diss., Harvard University, 2003.
- Virgil. *Eclogues, Georgics, Aeneid 1-6*. Translated by H. Rushton Fairclough. Cambridge, MA: Harvard University Press, 1986.
- Vicentino, Nicola. *Ancient Music Adapted to Modern Practice*. Translated and annotated by Maria Rika Maniates. Edited by Claude V. Palisca. New Haven: Yale University Press, 1996.
- Weiss, Piero and Richard Taruskin. *Music in the Western World: A History in Documents*. Belmont, CA: Thomson Schirmer, 2008.
- Willaert, Adriano. *Opera omnia*, vols. 13-14, edited by Hermann Zenck and Walter Gerstenberg. Vol. 3, *Corpus Mensurabilis Musicae*, edited by Armen Carapetyan. Rome: American Institute of Musicology, 1966, 1977.
- _____. *Willaert: Missa Mente tota & Motets*. Cinquecento. Hyperion CDA67749, 2010.
- Zarlino, Gioseffo. *The Art of Counterpoint: Part Three of Le Istitutioni Harmoniche, 1558*. Translated by Guy A. Marco and Claude V. Palisca. New York: W. W. Norton and Company, 1968.
- _____. *Zarlino on Modes: An Annotated, Indexed Translation, with Introduction and Commentary of Part IV of Le Istitutioni harmoniche*. Translated and annotated by Vered Cohen. Ph.D. diss., City University of New York, 1977.