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Luis de Narváez and Music Publishing in Sixteenth-Century Spain*

JUAN RUIZ JIMÉNEZ

DURING THE COURSE OF ARCHIVAL research at Simancas in the summer of 1993 concerning the musical chapels in Granada, I was fortunate to locate the privilege granted by Emperor Charles V for the publication of the Seys libros del Delphin (1538) by the vihuelist Luis de Narváez. Although Narváez was one of the most important vihuelists of the sixteenth century whose works were known far beyond Spain's territorial borders, the details of his life and the modes by which his music was transmitted are still shrouded in darkness. He likely entered the service of Francisco de los Cobos during his youth and it was probably on the death of his patron that he was appointed to the Capilla Real, thereby gaining the opportunity to accompany Phillip II in 1549 on his voyage to The Netherlands, after which all trace of him vanishes. The document that forms the subject of this study sheds new light on both Narváez's life and on the publication of the Seys libros del Delphin.

Born in Granada, Narváez was educated in the Granadine musical environment at the beginning of the sixteenth century, where the vihuela and the lute held positions of considerable importance. Other members of this Granadine circle were Luis de Guzmán (d. 1528), whose fame, having reached Italy, was praised by Paulo Jovio in his Historia Universal. Cited by Juan Bermudo in Bk. IV of his

* I would like to thank Michael Christoforidis and John Griffiths for their suggestions and assistance in the preparation of this article.
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Declaracion... (Osuna, 1555), Guzmán played a seven-course vihuela, an instrument appropriate “for music of a wide range.”¹ Other players include Hernando de Jaén, also praised by Bermudo as a “great vihuela player who was a musician of the king of Portugal” as well as “one of the best instrumentalists of his time,”² and Baltasar Ramírez, of whom the Granadine chronicler Bermúdez de Pedraza wrote the following anecdote:

Baltasar Ramírez was a more famous lutenist than any other Cimon, who after declining an invitation to play, he eventually agreed and was preferred to Themistocles. Once, Ramírez was at a gathering to listen to Sasa, a musician of Don Juan of Austria, who, after playing, saw a lute in a corner of the room and asked to whom it belonged, and in reply to the owner of the house who said it belonged to a servant, Sasa said that this was impossible, and looking at all of the guests said to Baltasar Ramírez, whom he did not know, that the lute was his and that he should play. Excusing himself on account of his old age, he eventually played, and Sasa, proclaiming his skill, said that he was the finest musician that he had encountered in Germany, Italy, England and France.³

¹ Chap. 62, f. 92r.
² An Hernando de Jaén was buried on 19 March 1551 in the Cathedral of Granada [Leg. 161, Archive of the Cathedral of Granada]. It is not known whether this person is the same celebrated musician.
³ Baltasar Ramírez, fue tan famoso tañedor de laúd que cual otro Cimon, rehusando tañer en un combite: al fin importunado tañó y fue preferido a Temístocles. Assí Ramírez estando en una junta para oyr tañer a Sasa, músico de don Juan de Austria: el qual después de a ver tañido, vio un laúd en el rincón de la sala: preguntó cuyo era, y respondiendo el señor de la casa, que de un lacayo: replicó Sasa, no es posible: y mirando a todos los circunstantes dixo a Baltasar Ramírez sin conocerle, que el laúd era suyo, que tañese: el se escusaua por viejo; pero al fin importunado, tañó: y Sasa hecho predicador de su destreza, dixo, que era el mejor músico que hauía conocido en Alemania, Italia, Inglaterra y Francia”. With the exception of the concluding one, these well-known and frequently cited references have been compiled by Pilar Ramos López, La Capilla de música de la Catedral de Granada en la primera mitad del siglo XVII: Diego Pontac (diss., University of Granada, 1992), pp. 93-98, which also draws on a new source not previously alluded to in the musicological literature: Bermúdez de Pedraza, Antiguiedades y Excelencias de Granada (1608). This is likely to be the source for the references to Granadine musicians cited in the anonymous manuscript Granada ó descripción historial del insigne reino y ciudad ilustrísima de
Another indicator of the vihuela’s popularity in Granada is the Ordenanza que los magníficos Señores de Granada manda que se tenga en el oficio de hacer cuerdas de vigüelas, a detailed ordinance for the manufacture of strings, proclaimed on 26 November 1541, which governed the string-making trade.4

The first printing privilege recorded in Spain was granted to Meinardo Ungut and Estanislao Polonio of Seville and consisted of an exemption from taxes. Not until 1480 were privileges granted to protect a printed work for a specific period of time.5 From this time, the printing privilege became simply a document giving authorization for the printing of a work, as required by the laws current in each Spanish kingdom, in order to secure exclusive publishing rights and to prevent others from publishing the same material. The privilege had to be petitioned from the king and was granted for a specific number of years and within a defined geographical area wherein no one else could publish the work. This privilege was always a royal concession and could be extended at the end of the period. The king granted privileges for the kingdoms of Castile, and in the other kingdoms viceroys acted on his behalf according to their respective jurisdiction. Through the Consejo de Aragón, the king granted privileges for all the kingdoms under the crown of

---

4 The tradesman was required to know “vna encordadura de vn tenor y otra de discante, y otra de harpa, y otra de viguela de arco, y otra de guitarra” [how to string a tenor, a discant, harp, viola da gamba, and guitar]. The lengths of gut had to be of three varas [1 vara = approx 33 inches], without knots, spun on a wheel, and were only allowed to be made from sheep gut. Las Ordenanzas que los muy ilustres, y muy magníficos señores de Granada amandaron guardar para la buena governación de su República, impresas año 1552. Que se han vuelto a imprimir..., año 1670. Añadiendo otras que no están impresas (Granada: Imprenta Real de Francisco Ochoa, 1672).

Aragón. Any author who wished to acquire a privilege for his work in all of Spain had to apply separately in each of the kingdoms that formed part of the Spanish monarchy.6 Following is a transcription of the privilege granted to Luis de Narváez for the publication of his work.7

The King
Inasmuch as on your behalf Luys de Narváez it has been brought to our attention that for many years you have studied the

---

7 Archivo General de Simancas, Cámara de Castilla, Libro de Cédulas, No.99, fols. 74-75: “El Rey, Por quanto por parte de vos Luys de Narbáez nos fue hecha relación que ha muchos años que estudias en el exercicio y arte de la música así de compor en canto de órgano obras para cantar como de cifras para tañer en la vihuela y que continuando nuestro dezeo auésys compuesto en canto muchas mytas y salmos y otras obras de las canta Nuestra Madre Santa Yglesia por estilo muy sabido y nuevo y asimismo otras obras de muchos mtores y villançios de cifras para poner en la vihuela por arte muy gençioso y claro y tan nuevo que fasta agora no se ha visto en España y que también teneys otras muchas obras de canto de órgano para cantar de muchos autores que no se an imprimido en estos reynos y otras de Francisco Milanés y de Luís de Gusmán para tañer vihuela, las quales vos auéys colegido e copilado porque no estauan çiertas y nos suplicaste y pediste por merced que pues la mayor parte de vuestra vida os auéys ocupado en lo susodicho en que auéys trabajado mucho y es cosa tan útil y provechosa fuesemos servido de daros licencia para que vos o quien vuestro poder obiese y no otra persona alguna pudieseis ynpremir las dichas obras en estos nuestros reynos y señoríos y venderlas por el tiempo que fuesemos servido o como la nuestra merced fuese. E nos acatando lo susodicho e por ser las dichas obras de la calidad susodicha auémoslo hauido por bien. Por ende por la presente vos doy licencia y facultad y mando que por tiempo y espacio de diez años que se cuenten desde el día de la fecha desta nuestra Cédula en adelante vos y las personas que tuuieren vuestro poder y no otras algunas podays y puedan ynpremir e impriman en estos nuestros reynos de la Corona de Castilla las dichas obras de canto de órgano y bialua así las que vos auéys compuesto como las que auéys corregido y copilado de los dichos otros autores so pena que cualquier persona o personas que sin tener para ello vuestro poder durante el tiempo de los dichos diez años lo ynprimieren o hizieren ynpremir y vender en estos nuestros reynos o traer a vender de fuera dellos perderan la impresión que hizieren y los moldes y aparejos con que la hizieren e los libros que de las dichas obras imprimieren siendo impresos y echos durante el dicho tiempo y incurran cada uno dellos en pena de dyex myll maravedís cada ves que lo contrario fizieren la qual dicha pena mando que sea repartida en esta manera: la terçia parte para el Juez que lo sentenciare y la otra terçia parte para nuestra Cámara y la otra terçia parte para la persona que lo acusare y por esta nuestra Cédula mando a los de nuestro Consejo, etc... Fecha el dicho día. A 18 de Mayo de 1537.”
practice and art of music, both composing works in measured notation for voices as well as in ciphers to be played on the vihuela and, following your own desires, you have composed many masses and psalms and other works that are sung by Our Holy Mother Church with learned style and novelty, as well as other works such as motets and villancicos in ciphers to play on the vihuela with such genius and clarity of art and with a novelty not previously seen in Spain, and that you also have many other works in measured notation for voices by many other authors which have not been printed in these lands, and others by Francesco da Milano and Luis de Guzmán for vihuela, which you have collected and compiled because they were not reliably available. You have petitioned us and asked our favor, that—since for the greater part of your life you have been dedicated to the aforementioned, in which you have worked arduously, and that it is both useful and beneficial—that we should grant you or whomsoever you nominate and not any other person, licence to print the said works in these our kingdoms and realms, and to sell them for the period that it might serve us or however it might appear to us. And in respect of the above-mentioned, and because the works are of the aforementioned quality, we have given our consent. Therefore, I hereby grant you licence and faculty and order that for the time and space of ten years from the date of this decree onwards, you and those empowered by you and no other person, may print in our kingdoms under the Crown of Castile the said mensural works and those composed by you for vihuela, as well as those by other authors that you have corrected and compiled under penalty that any person or persons who, without your authority within the time and space of the said ten years, should print, or cause to be printed, or sell in these realms, or take them beyond these lands to be sold will have the impression confiscated together with the moulds and other equipment they have used; and the books from which they were taken having been printed and made during the said period. Each person will incur a fine of ten thousand maravedis for each occasion that they have done the contrary; and the fine I order to be distributed in the following manner: one third shall go to the judge who sentences [the offender], another third for our Chamber, and the other third goes to the person who accuses him, and by this decree, I order those of our Council, etc.… Dated this said day, the 18th of May, 1537.

From this privilege it is possible to flesh out the historical and political contexts of Narváez’s 1538 tablature, chronicle
its publication history, as well as provide new information regarding the transmission of Narváez's music outside of Spain. It can be seen that the privilege was granted for the kingdoms under the Crown of Castile, but of all the vihuela publications, only the book of Narváez carries the following declaration on the title page: "With imperial privilege for Castile, and Aragón and Cataluña for ten years." This suggests that he also must have petitioned for a privilege for the kingdoms of Aragón, extending him exclusive rights to distribute his book throughout the whole nation. It is also to be assumed that preparation and editing of Narváez's book had been completed prior to the issue of the privilege on 18 May 1537. Only a period of eighteen month separates the granting of the privilege from the publication of the book on 30 October 1538. These dates serve to reduce to within a short period the date in which the printing contract would have been drawn up, and which—if it survives—should facilitate attempts to discover it.

Narváez's book is dedicated to Francisco de los Cobos, secretary to Charles V. It has been indicated on numerous occasions by Anglé, Pujol, and others that Luis de Narváez was a salaried musician of Francisco de los Cobos and probably a musician at the court of the Empress Isabel. This supposition is based mainly on the preface and the dedication to Los seys libros del Delphín, and the well-known anecdote narrated by Luis de Zapata, one of the empress's pages, in his Miscelánea regarding Narváez’s extraordinary musical skills which he had the fortune to witness in Valladolid. These hypotheses assume greater credibility when examined in relation to the detailed biography of Charles V's secretary by Hayward Keniston, which contains information that offers a plausible reconstruction of Narváez’s movements during the untraced period of his life.⁸ I have not been able to locate any

---

⁸ H. Keniston, Francisco de los Cobos, Secretario de Carlos V (Madrid: Castalia, 1980).
documentary evidence of Narváez in Granada, nor is it known when he might have left the city. In 1508, Francisco de los Cobos had been treasurer of the Granada (Contador mayor); in 1510, a juror; and from 1511 to 1526 a member of the city council (Veinticuatro). He had also served as an attorney (procurador) for the city of Granada at parliament (Corte), celebrated in Burgos in 1515. He did not reside in Granada during this period, however, travelling instead with the Emperor after being named his secretary in 1516. It appears likely that Narváez made contact with Francisco de los Cobos during the sojourn of the court in Granada in 1526, and that he entered his service at this time. The permanent residence of Cobos was in Valladolid, where he had his palace, and which was the hometown of his wife María de Mendoza, lady in waiting to the empress Isabel. The foreign diplomatic activity of Francisco de los Cobos took him to Germany, Flanders, and Italy throughout his life.

There are several details in the diplomatic career of Cobos that are of particular significance when considering the internationalism of Narváez’s work and his knowledge of the music of Francesco de Milano. The court, with Cobos as a member, had resided in Bologna and Mantua during 1529 and 1530 for the coronation of Charles V as Emperor. Subsequently, from 1531 to 1533 it travelled to Germany, Flanders, and returned once again to Italy. If Narváez accompanied Francisco de los Cobos, it must have been during the period from 1529 to 1533 that he would have become acquainted with the new Italian lute style that was developing in the 1530s. Cobos returned with the court to

---

9 The baptismal books preserved in the different parishes of Granada commence after the period in which Narváez would have been born. Another Narváez named Alonso was a musician at the Cathedral of Granada from 1565 (see J. López Calo, La música en la Catedral de Granada [Granada: Fundación Rodríguez Acosta, 1963]), but he appears not to be related to Luis de Narváez since he, his parents, and grandparents were born in Jaén (Archivo de la Catedral de Granada, Leg. 226, fol. 26).
Spain, and in 1536 made a journey to Rome in order to participate in discussions with Pope Paul III to persuade him to act as mediator between Charles V and Francis I. As is well known, Francesco da Milano enjoyed the patronage of Paul III, and it was precisely in this year that three books of Francesco’s works were published. For the greater part of 1537 and 1538, the years in which Narváez was granted the printing privilege as well as the year of the publication of his Delphin, Cobos resided in Valladolid, where Narváez’s book was published. The same year, 1538, Charles V and François I met in Nice in the presence of Pope Paul III, and it was also on this occasion that the two kings’ lutenists, Francisco da Milano and Alberto da Ripa, probably met. But Cobos, too, was in Nice preparing for this political summit, which was followed by numerous festivities and formal events, which begs the question as to whether Narváez might have accompanied Francisco de los Cobos to either of these historic meetings and whether, in addition to its political purpose, the Nice summit served to provide an encounter between the three greatest lutenists and vihuelists of the day. Even though the idea is plausible no documentary evidence survives to confirm it, and it can only be left as mere speculation. Francisco de los Cobos died nearly a decade later on 10 May 1547, and in September 1548 Luis de Narváez entered the service of the court as master of the mochachos cantorcicos, the boy singers.10

Returning to the privilege granted to Narváez, we can see that it recognises in equal proportion his talent as an instrumentalist and as a composer of “masses, psalms and other works” of religious character as well as secular works such as “motets and villancicos to be played on the vihuela.”11

10 Higinio Anglés, La Música en la Corte de Carlos V. Monumento de la Música Española (Barcelona: Consejo Superior de Investigaciones Científicas, 1944), I, pp. 104-5.

11 The preserved vocal works by Narváez are the motets De profundis clamavi, a 4, with the 2a pars Sustinuit anima mea, published in Lyon in 1589 by Moderne; and
These descriptions are clearly linked to those found in the author’s prologue to the Delphin. Additionally, Narváez is portrayed as a compiler of vocal and instrumental works by other composers “in mensural notation to be sung, by many other authors whose works have not been printed in these realms, as well as works by Francesco da Milano and Luis de Guzman.” Might these have been the works that Narváez was thinking to include in his next book? Narváez himself indicates in the prologue of Delphin: “If I see that [players] reap the fruit of this book (if it pleases God), I will publish other larger works of greater depth which, until I see the success of this one, I shall not publish; and if it be [a success], so will the others.” All of this indicates that the privilege granted to Luys de Narváez went far beyond the works included in the Delphin, and included perhaps his entire musical output.

Narváez clearly had extensive knowledge of contemporary music—in some measure probably due to his patron Francisco de los Cobos—prior to his contact with the Spanish court, and which further provided him with first-hand knowledge of European music on his journeys through Italy, Flanders, and Germany in 1548 in the retinue of prince Phillip. The cosmopolitan character of his musical taste is


12 It seems unlikely that Luis Milán’s book would have been unknown in the court, since—as in the case of Narváez’s book—it had also been given imperial privilege granted by Charles V himself. It is therefore more likely that the qualifier “new” used in Narváez’s book might refer to the innovative nature of the works it contains.


14 Narváez entered the service of the Royal Chapel in 1548. He travelled in the same year to Italy and, in 1549, resided in Flanders where he is documented for the last time. See Anglés, La música en la corte de Carlos V..., pp. 104 ff.
evident in the Delphin through his inclusion of works by Josquin, Gombert, and Richafort.\textsuperscript{15} Even though this became the norm in later instrumental collections in Spain, there is no precedent to this aspect of Narváez’s anthology.

His knowledge of Italian lute music is suggested in the first instance by the type of tablature he used, different in its layout to that used in Valencia by Luis Milán in 1536.\textsuperscript{16} This is confirmed by the unequivocal new reference in the printing privilege to the works of Francesco da Milano, and the depth of his knowledge of the Italian’s music is suggested by the fact that he felt sufficiently sure of his ability to offer what he believed to be authoritative versions of the works that he claims to have collected. Other characteristics shared by the fantasias and ricercars by both Narváez and Francesco are the use of similar—at times, identical—musical figures, the frequent use of sequences of short motives, and sometimes

\textsuperscript{15} It is noteworthy that the 1535 inventory of books of polyphony at the Cathedral of Granada lists “a medium-sized book of motets, foreign, bound in paper and covered in white leather” (“un libro de marca mediana de motetes, estranjero, encuadernado en tablas de papel y guarnecido en cuero blanco”) and “a medium-sized book containing fifteen masses by Josquin, bound in paper and covered in tawny leather” (“un libro de marca mediana, que tiene quince misas de Josquin, encuadernado en tablas de papel y guarnecidos en cuero leonado”). The book of masses had been purchased by the Cathedral in 1529 (López Calo, \textit{La música en la Catedral de Granada}, pp. 125-126). In the inventories of the Royal Chapel, the one dating from 1536 does not indicate the authors although it includes “a small book of polyphony with French chansons bound with its covers in old red leather” (“un libro de canto de órgano pequeño con unas canciones francésas guarnecido con sus tablas y cuero colorado viejo”); the first detailed inventory of 1592 includes “four books by Nicholas Gombert, which appear to have been five, missing one which is the superius” (“cuatro libros de Nicolás Gonuerto, parece por ellos que avían de ser cinco, falta uno que es el de tiple”); see J. López Calo, “El Archivo de Música de la Capilla Real de Granada,” \textit{Anuario Musical} 13 (1958), pp. 121-22. Additionally, according to the \textit{Rolles des benefices} drawn up in Granada on October 2, Nicolás Gombert must have visited Granada at least from 1526 accompanying Charles V; see Anglés, \textit{La música en la Corte de Carlos V}, vol I, p. 24.

\textsuperscript{16} Specifically, the use of tablature with the lowest of the six lines representing the first string of the vihuela in the same way as used by Italian lutenists, a practice which was later adopted in all subsequent vihuela publications, and the opposite to that used by Luys Milán. See Narváez, \textit{Los seis libros del Delphin…}, ed. Pujol, p. 27.
similar codas, which also later appeared in the works by other Spanish vihuelists, particularly Mudarra and Fuenllana.17

It does not appear plausible that such an innovative style could have been assimilated by Narváez in the short time that separates the first publication of Francesco's music in 1536 and the privilege for Los seys libros del Delphín of May the following year. Rather, if we consider the nature and quality of the music in Narváez's volume, as well as the references in both the privilege and the prologue of the Delphín, a considerably longer process of gestation must be allowed for. The travels of Narváez's patron coincide fortuitously with these stylistic observations, and it now becomes clearer to understand how Narváez might have had direct contact with Italian lute music from the beginning of the 1530s.

Further conclusions can be drawn by examining the publication history of Narváez's book within the context of the other vihuela books printed during the sixteenth century. As shown in Table I, all of the vihuela books, from Milán's El Maestro (1536) onwards, but with the exception of Mudarra's Tres libros, include a statement of royal authorization on their title pages. However, it is not until the publication of Valderrábano's Silva de sirenas (1547) that the licences were reproduced in the books themselves, a practice followed in all subsequent vihuela publications.18 In comparing these with other sixteenth-century books of music and music theory, we can see that beginning with the first edition of Bermudo's treatise (1549), all include the privilege inside the book with the only exception of the Libro de cifra nueva (1557) of Venegas de Henestrosa. The interval of time between the granting of the privilege and the publication of these books was indeed variable, with a minimum of hardly three months

---

18 The inclusion of the printing licence, the valuation of the book, and the privilege was decreed mandatory in 1558. As is seen in Table I, this practice had come into use prior to the date of the decree.
for Valderrábano’s book and nineteen months for Pisador’s *Libro de música* (1552). This delay was probably due to problems beyond the printing itself.¹⁹ For Santa María’s *Arte de Tañer fantasia*, for example, only three months elapsed between the granting of the *Privilegio Real* and the signing of the contract between the author and the printer, but that a further sixteen or seventeen months elapsed before the eventual publication.²⁰ With the exception of the Narváez privilege, no documents have surfaced concerning other vihuela books published prior to the mandatory inclusion of the privilege in the body of the book (see Table 1), although we do know in a number of instances the period of time that elapsed between the signing of printing contracts and the date of publication. Five months elapsed in the case of Fuenllana’s *Orphénica Lyra*,²¹ and only three months for Daza’s *El Parnasso*.²²

---

¹⁹ The royal licence for the *Arte de tañer fantasia* was granted on 28 November, 1557. Tomás de Santa María petitioned a new licence since six years of the ten had already elapsed, and “due to a lack of paper and for many other obvious reasons you had not been able to print the said book, and that now you have the disposition to do so” (“por auzer auiduo gran falta de papel, & por otras muchas y euidentes causas no auidues podido imprimir el dicho libro, & que agora teniades dispusición para le hazer imprimir”), he was granted another licence for a further ten years as of 11 April 1563. This quote is taken from the unidentified copy reprinted by Arte Trífarfa, ed. Rudesindo F. Soutelo (Madrid, 1982). The location of existing copies of the original are given in Griffiths and Hultberg, “Santa María and the Printing of Instrumental Music,” p. 53.


In addition, the privileges contained in the body of the other vihuela books reveal that they were written according to a standardized format with minor differences as follows:

- With the exception of the privilege granted to Narváez, the document begins by stating the residence of the author and also gives a short and imprecise description of the work. The Narváez privilege describes his music with greater precision than any other. In some of the privileges, as if to defend the merit of the particular work, there is a statement of the time taken in the preparation of the

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Author</th>
<th>Work (date of publication)</th>
<th>Title page: declaration of privilege</th>
<th>Privilege documents</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Luis Milán</td>
<td><em>El Maestro</em> [4 December 1536]</td>
<td>With royal privilege</td>
<td>Unknown</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Alonso de Mudarra</td>
<td><em>Tres libros de Música</em> [1546]</td>
<td>Not indicated</td>
<td>Unknown</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Enríquez de Valderrábano</td>
<td><em>Silva de Sirenas</em> [28 July 1547]</td>
<td>With imperial privilege</td>
<td>Issued by Prince Philip, 6 May 1547. Reproduced in book</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Esteban Daza</td>
<td><em>El Parnaso</em> [12 April 1576]</td>
<td>Printed by Diego Fernández de Córdoba, printer to His Majesty</td>
<td>Issued by Philip II, 29 June 1575. Reproduced in book</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
book: more than twelve years in the case of Valderrábano, and more than fifteen years in the case of Pisador.

- In his *Silva de sirenas*, Valderrábano explains that the book could not be sold until it was evaluated and priced by the Royal Council. Subsequent privilege documents state towards the end that the book should be sold at the price established by the Council. This price is stated on the title page, added by hand in the books of Pisador and Daza, and printed in Fuenllana’s *Orphénica lyra*.

- The license-related documents then address the matter of privilege, given, in most cases, for a period of ten years with the exception of Fuenllana who was granted privilege for fifteen years. Daza petitioned privilege for twenty years, but was granted the customary decade.

- The remainder of the privilege documents deal with the penalties imposed upon those who breach the law. Firstly, in the event of a pirate edition, all the copies were to be collected and, with the exception of Valderrábano’s book, the “forms and apparatus [*moldes y aparejos*] from which they were made” confiscated. Additionally, a fine was imposed, ranging between 10,000 maravedís for Narváez’s book and 50,000 maravedís for those of Pisador and Daza, to be dispersed in the following manner: one third would go to the accuser, a third for the judge who sentenced the culprit, and a third for the general revenue of the Royal Chamber. Unusually, the privilege granted to Daza indicates that half of the fine would go to the Royal Chamber and the other half to the author himself. Starting with Valderrábano’s book and for subsequent publications excepting that of Daza, an additional fixed fine of 10,000 maravedís was to be paid to the legal representatives who handled the proceedings.

We can see that as a means of communication, the book was subject to varying levels of bureaucratic control in Hapsburg Spain regarding both its content and
dissemination—a product of the administrative and political structure of the nation. Initially not limited in any way, the rapid multiplication and distribution of printed works, came under increased control. In 1502, the first law requiring pre-publication censorship came into force in the kingdoms of Castile, decentralized in diverse organizations and individuals within the administration. But it was to be the decree of 1558, promulgated in Valladolid on 7 September, and later modified by more restrictive amendments, that remained in effect until the fall of the Old Regime, with its limits of jurisdiction extended in the early eighteenth century also to encompass the kingdoms of the Crown of Aragón.

The privilege was not simply considered a mere legal formality, but proved to be an effective means of legal protection. In the period under discussion, only one case of musical piracy has come to light, the fraudulent publication in 1555 of Miguel de Fuenllana’s *Orphénica Lyra.*23 Further archival research will be necessary in order to extend our knowledge, particularly in the early part of the sixteenth century. The eventual discovery of the privilege issued to Luis Milán and the contracts for the printing of his and Narváez’s books should be able to contribute, in the same way as the document I have presented here, important new information regarding the printing of instrumental music in sixteenth-century Spain.24

GRANADA, SPAIN
*translated by John Griffiths*

---

23 Wagner, *Martín de Montedosca y su prensa,* p. 112.

Luys de Narváez and the Intabulation Tradition of Josquin's *Mille regretz*

WALTER AARON CLARK

Of the several instrumental versions that exist of Josquin's *Mille regretz*, Luis de Narváez's 1538 intabulation is by far the best-known arrangement of Josquin's chanson, and the one that is most commonly found in modern edition. The lesser-known intabulations are contained in two lute manuscripts in the Bavarian State Library in Munich.¹ One of them was transcribed by Arthur Ness in his doctoral dissertation on the Herwarth lute manuscripts,² but no discussion of this chanson or its intabulations mentions them. The purpose of this article, then, is twofold: first, to discuss the chanson itself and its background; and second, to present for the first time all the various versions together and attempt a comparative study—one that is intended to help us appreciate anew the creative possibilities inherent in the process of intabulation and Narváez's superior skills as an intabulator.

In a seminal study, Howard Brown described *Mille regretz* as "one of the most subtle and perfect of Josquin's

---


chansons.”\(^3\) Ironically, though this is one of Josquin’s most famous chansons—one which occurs in several instrumental sources dispersed over a geographical area encompassing Nuremberg, Valladolid, and Louvain—it remains textually and chronologically of uncertain origins, a fate shared by many of the composer’s polyphonic songs.\(^4\) Helmut Osthoff states that *Mille regretz* is probably a late work, perhaps penned only a year before Josquin’s death in 1520.\(^5\) In September of that year, the young Emperor Charles V was visiting the Netherlands and was presented by Josquin with a volume of “aucunes chansons nouvelles” (“some new songs”) for which the composer received “ein stattliches Geldgeschenk” (“an official monetary gift”). Very possibly *Mille regretz* was part of this collection. Luis de Narváez subtitled his arrangement “La canción del Emperador” (“The Song of the Emperor”). It is chiefly on the basis of this association that Osthoff asserts a date of 1520 for the original. Edmond Vander Straeten suggested that the chanson was a favorite of Charles V, in whose service Narváez was employed in 1538,\(^6\) and believes that Narváez dedicated and presented his arrangement to Charles V when the emperor passed through Valladolid in that year. Vander Straeten even conjectures that it was Charles V himself who commissioned Josquin to make the four-part

---


4 *Ibid.*, p. 11, “Unfortunately, little is known about the chronology of his chansons, and it is hazardous to state when or where any one of them was written.” On the impact of *Mille regretz* on other chansons of the sixteenth century, see Owen Rees, “Mille regretz as model: possible allusions to The Emperor’s Song in the chanson repertory,” *Journal of the Royal Musical Association* 120 (1995), pp. 44-76.


version of *Mille regretz* from a favorite, pre-existing melody.\(^7\)

Though we can surmise a date for *Mille regretz* and speculate about the circumstances of its genesis, the origins of the text have yet to come to light. As Brian Jeffery has pointed out, Josquin’s chanson texts rarely form complete poems, are not always of the highest literary quality, and are difficult of attribution.\(^8\) Jeffery asserts that the verse is “usually short, unpretentious, and less complex. Its content is generally abstract, its imagery pale.”\(^9\) Pierre Attaingnant’s publication of this chanson as an instrumental arrangement in the *Chansons musicales à quatre parties* of 1533 is accompanied by an attribution to “J. lemaire.” Geneviève Thibaut assumes this to be the name of the intabulator;\(^10\) Jeffery, on the other hand, takes this as a reference to the eminent French poet of the early sixteenth century Jacques Lemaire de Belges. However, he finds no corroboration of this attribution in any literary source, and considering the late date of the publication, doubts its accuracy.\(^11\) All writers agree with Osthoff that this stanza was probably taken from a longer poem, but that poem and its author remain unknown to us.\(^12\)

Nonetheless, the text is hardly devoid of interest and merits a brief discussion:

1. Mille regretz de vous habandonner
2. Et d’eslonger vostre fache amoureuse
3. J’ay si grand dueil et paine douloureuse
4. Qu’on me verra brief mes jours definer.

---

The stanza employs decasyllabic lines in the form AABA, a scheme known as *rimes embrassées*, because the outer, “masculine” rhymes “embrace” the inner “feminine” ones. The isometric strophes are actually not of equal length, as the weak endings include an extra sounded syllable that is not counted in the analysis. Though this may indeed conform to Jeffery’s description as “unpretentious” and of “pale imagery,” it became a suitable vehicle for Josquin’s musical genius.

In keeping with the character of the text, the chanson uses the Phrygian mode, which was associated with intense emotion. The opening bars present an unequivocal affirmation of E Phrygian in the bass. The final of the piece, which all theorists counted as crucial in modal determination, is also E. The problem with this analysis is that Narváez states that the piece is in the “quarto tono,” or fourth mode, i.e., Hypophrygian. It is beyond the scope of this article to give a detailed discussion of the application of modal theory to sixteenth-century polyphony, but it is a well-established fact that such application is problematical. The distinctions between authentic and plagal modes, traditionally based primarily on ambitus, break down in a polyphonic setting. The medial cadences offer no basis for positng the plagal over the authentic in this chanson. Narváez’s rationale must be sought out in the equally murky realms of modal ethos. Mosquera de Figueroa, in his prologue to the *Canciones y villanescas espirituales* (1589) of Francisco Guerrero, states that it is “the Phrygian which

---

distracts and harasses the mind." By contrast, "there are some who use Tone IV (which is suited for laments), saying that it assuages... the sorrow of those who by nature are merry." Thus, in the absence of any other objective criteria, Narváez's modal designation must be principally related to the purported affect of the Hypophrygian mode. This may also be one reason why he chose this particular chanson for intabulation.

Josquin's musical setting of the text is in every way indicative of his mature style. The voices were composed simultaneously, and the old tenor-superius framework no longer holds. As we would expect, pairs of voices appear at points of imitation (mm. 20-24), there is abundant contrast of homorhythmic and polyphonic textures (mm. 30-end), and he makes use of "vocal orchestration" (mm. 30-34). Josquin reworks a simple downward tetrachord (mm. 7-9) through varied repetition (mm. 10-12), reharmonization (mm. 13-14), and transposition (mm. 15-16). What Brown labels as a "master stroke," however, is Josquin's "condensed summary at the end of much that has gone before" (mm. 5-6/32-33 and 13-17/34-end). Through all the above-mentioned devices, Josquin achieves an effect that is economical and thematically "tight" on the one hand, and rich in color and contrast on the other.

Turning to the overall architecture of the chanson, it is the text that plays the decisive role. The first three verses are set in homophonic style and take up a little over half the chanson. After reaching a highpoint on the word "paine" in m. 20 (which is further accentuated through duration), the generally downward melodic motion reaches its nadir on the word "douloureuse" in the tenor-bassus duet in mm. 22-24. Here, there occurs a cadence on A, a confinal in E
Phrygian and a note that was already singled out for importance in the opening interval of the piece in the superius. This cadence forms a major seam in the structural fabric of the chanson that sets off the very poignant final line in the remaining seventeen measures. The section through m. 33 is, by contrast, more polyphonic than the preceding material and sets the stage for the striking homorhythmic chordal statements commencing in m. 34. These initiate a threefold repetition of the words “brief mes jours definer” (“soon end my days”).\(^{19}\) Not only do these chords represent the first time that all four voices have moved together, but the chordal-syllabic style also gives emphasis and clarity to this most important part of the text. In fact, throughout the piece the declamation has been chiefly syllabic, and Josquin has carefully aligned textual accentuations with points of melodic and rhythmic stress.

We can now consider the various known intabulations for solo lute, which form the substance of this discussion. As John Ward has stated:

> Works intabulated many times were chosen, not on reputation alone, but also because they were particularly apt for instrumental performance. That the music of Josquin and his immediate followers appears so often in tablatures... is certainly due in part to the extensive use of sequence and paired imitation, characteristics of the Josquin style.\(^{20}\)

This helps explain why the chanson *Mille regretz* was chosen for intabulation by several musicians over a large geographical area. Its mood and compositional style were eminently adaptable to the character and technique of the lute or vihuela. According to Brown, between 1503 and

---

\(^{19}\) Congleton, *Chansons*, p. 186, suggests that this threefold repetition has theological associations with the Trinity and that these contrast with the twofold statement of earthly sorrow in mm. 20-24. She also speculates that the decrease of rhythmic activity towards the end corresponds with the words “end my days,” and that the shortening of points of imitation directly before this connotes the short time left to the poet.

1545 only a handful of Josquin’s chansons were printed.\textsuperscript{21} The first instrumental arrangements of \textit{Mille regretz} appeared in two sources in 1533, thirteen years after its putative composition.\textsuperscript{22} One of these was the set of four partbooks entitled \textit{Chansons musicales a quatre parties}, published by Pierre Attaingnant in Paris, of which only the superius now survives.\textsuperscript{23} These were intended for performance on transverse flute and/or recorder. This version was already referred to in connection with the somewhat enigmatic attribution to “J. lemaire” that it contains.

Other, later instrumental versions are as follows:

1) Wolff Heckel’s intabulation for lute duet in his \textit{Discant} (Strasbourg, 1562), consisting of 120 folios in German lute tablature (Brown, \textit{Instrumental Music}, 1562\textsuperscript{3}).

2) Antwerp printer Tilman Susato’s 1551 publication of works for instrumental ensemble, in which \textit{Mille regretz} appears in the form of a pavane (Brown 1551\textsuperscript{8}).

Listed below are the known printed sources for lute or vihuela solo, in chronological order:

1) Hans Gerle, \textit{Tabulatur auff die Laudten} (Nuremberg, 1533), consisting of ninety-five folios printed in German lute tablature, all for solo lute (Brown 1533\textsuperscript{1}). This same arrangement is found transcribed into French tablature in \textit{Des chansons reduictz en tabulatur de luc a trois et quatre parties libre deuxi\`eme} published by Pierre Phalèse (Louvain, 1546; Brown 1546\textsuperscript{18}).

\begin{thebibliography}{9}
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2) Hans Neusidler, *Der ander theil des Lautenbuchs* (Nuremberg, 1536), consisting of 120 folio sheets in German lute tablature, all for solo lute (Brown 15366).

3) Luis de Narváez, *Los seys libros del Delphin de música*, published in Valladolid in 1538. 102 (plus four additional) folio sheets printed in Italian lute tablature, consisting of compositions for solo vihuela and vihuela and voice.\(^{24}\)

4) Pierre Phalèse, pub. *Hortus Musarum*, printed in Louvain in 1552 (Brown 155211), containing fifty-six folio sheets in French tablature. All compositions are for solo lute or lute duet. The anonymous intabulation of *Mille regrez* is number 64, p. 52. This same intabulation reappears in the *Theatrum Musicum* by the same printer published in 1563 in Louvain, containing seventy folio sheets in French tablature (Brown 156312). All but seven of the 142 pieces are for solo lute.

In addition to these, there are the two manuscript sources already mentioned that are now located in the Bavarian State Library in Munich:

1) Ms. mus. 272 (Maier Nr. 253). Written on paper in German lute tablature; origin and author unknown. Two hands are detectable. It probably dates from the third quarter of the sixteenth century.\(^{25}\)

2) Ms. mus. 266 (Maier Nr. 248). Written on paper in Italian lute tablature. The manuscript is from the Bibliothek Herwart, around 1555-1575, and was assembled by Johann Heinrich Herwart, a town councillor in Augsburg; it came into the library of Duke Wilhelm V of Bavaria in 1586 after Herwart’s death. The provenance and date of entries vary as indicated by the variety of script types. Göllner states that the majority of the watermarks are of paper mills in the vicinity of Augsburg, in Schwaben; Ness places the origin of

---

\(^{24}\) Narváez’s intabulation of *Mille regres* is subtitled *La canción del Emperador del quarto tono de Josquin* and is located in Book 3; for a listing of the contents, see Brown 15381.

\(^{25}\) *Mille Regres mit 4 Stimmen sequitur* is number 25, fol. 47v. Göllner, *Kataloge*, p. 46.
the paper on which *Mille regres* is written in Bern, Switzerland.²⁶

Taken together, these arrangements form a comprehensive overview of the various types of tablature (French, Italian, German) and styles of intabulation current in the sixteenth century, from the rather bland and unimaginative of Ms. 272 to the highly ornamented version of Neusidler.

Our principal source of information concerning embellishment in the first half of the sixteenth century is Silvestro Ganassi’s *Fontegara* (1535), and even a cursory overview of Ganassi’s ornamental and cadential patterns reveals formulas commonly found in all of these arrangements (except for Ms. 272). We can say that, except for regional and personal stylistic differences, these intabulations are not unusual or extraordinary for their time, though there is a perceptible difference in quality among them.

Intabulators often included more accidentals than are found in the original, a phenomenon observed by both Brown and Göllner.²⁷ Whether this is a form of ornamentation or whether it represents the actual, unspecified treatment of *musica ficta* in the original is a moot point. It must represent some of both. Certainly the intabulations can be used to corroborate the application of *musica ficta* in modern editions, but they constitute no hard and fast “proof,” insofar as their use varied even amongst the intabulators themselves. That is certainly evident here, as a glance at the major cadence points (mm. 9, 12, 21, and 24)

---

²⁶ The intabulation appears as number 56, on folio 41r. See Göllner, *Kataloge*, 27, and Ness, “Herwarth,” 1, p. 278.
reveals. For it was especially at such points that intabulators often embellished the cadence through chromaticism.\textsuperscript{28}

The first lute intabulation of \textit{Mille regretz} to appear was by Hans Gerle. It constitutes a miniature compendium of available ornamental figurations and proceeds in a very methodical, almost mechanical way. As Thibaut put it, Gerle seems not "to have felt the beauty of the melodic line that almost disappears under the profusion of runs, scales, and trills."\textsuperscript{29} Although Gerle uses, in fact, no trills, her assessment is not far off the mark. Gerle is especially fond of surrounding notes with upper and lower neighbors (mm. 1, 4). He also makes such frequent use of one rhythmic figure—two semiminims (two beams or flags) followed by four fusae (three beams or flags)—that it becomes something of a cliché. It appears already in m. 1 and is imitated in another voice in the following measure. The use of this figure is common to all of the others (except Ms. 272 and Neusidler), as is a predilection for ascending scales, often beginning on a lower-neighbor figure (m. 7). An interesting feature of this intabulation is its use of a strictly three-voice texture, which persists throughout the work except where only two voices are called for in the original. This tends to obliterate the wonderful textural contrasts of the chanson, especially in the final section where Josquin’s striking four-voice chords at m. 34 are ritually sacrificed on the altar of Gerle’s resistless virtuosity.

Gerle’s technical accomplishments seem to have been exceeded only by those of his countryman Hans Neusidler. To cite Thibaut once again: “It seems almost a pity to hear Newsidler prattling along gaily, dispersing generously the too-well known ornamental motives, and seeming to enjoy his own virtuosity.”\textsuperscript{30} It can be safely said that Neusidler

\textsuperscript{28} For an in-depth treatment of accidentals in this repertory, see Robert Toft, \textit{Aural Images of Lost Traditions: Sharps and Flats in the Sixteenth Century} (Toronto: University of Toronto Press, 1992). Toft refers on p. 59 to the use of cadential chromaticism in Neusidler’s arrangement.

\textsuperscript{29} "Instrumental Transcriptions," p. 464.

\textsuperscript{30} \textit{Ibid.}, p. 466.
was merely using Josquin's chanson as a starting point for the exposition of his own considerable technical abilities. Some of his rhythmic figuration is idiosyncratic, such as the use of dotted rhythms, Narváez being the only other one to use them at all. He is the only one of the intabulators to resort to semifusae (four beams or flags), and this he does frequently. Generally, they are used to fill in otherwise stock figuration (mm. 2, 7). Moreover, his embellishment, which is mostly in the form of rapid, arabesque scale passages, is normally confined to the upper voice while the lower voices accompany it. Thus, it is not used in the imitative way we observed in Gerle. But Neusidler does demonstrate some economy by sequencing his ideas, as in the first two measures. Unlike Gerle, who embellished every cadence, Neusidler is sometimes content to leave a cadence unadorned (mm. 4, 9). Also unlike Gerle, though he uses a principally (but not exclusively) three-voice texture, he is sensitive to the dignified pathos of the closing section and treats it in a more homorhythmic manner.

The last example in German tablature represents a radical departure from the "colored" style of Gerle and Neusidler. The anonymous intabulator of Ms. 272 employed no embellishment at all and followed the original as closely as possible. This arrangement might have been intended for lutenists of limited technical means. Another possibility is that it was an exercise in intabulation, one representing merely the first step in the process. Perhaps it was simply a score arrangement to which a performer would have added extemporaneously his own embellishment and ficta. We do not as yet know.

The other intabulation in manuscript form, Ms. 266, in Italian tablature, is similar to Gerle's in the kind of embellishment it uses, but the intabulator was somewhat more sensitive to the vocal textures of the original. Such characteristic figures as a semiminim followed by six fusae (or less often, two semiminims and four fusae) and ascending scales in fusae are frequently used. As in Gerle's arrangement, ornamental motifs are sometimes exchanged
between voices (m. 8) to create an imitative texture. The manuscript contains a number of mistakes in the rhythmic signs. The intabulator wrote in several corrections of his own, but some errors persisted. These have been marked in the transcription with an asterisk and a number; the modern equivalent of the original values appears in the corresponding footnotes. These were, no doubt, simply careless errors and could mean that the intabulation was done in haste, though Ness states that this manuscript was prepared with uncommon care and presents far fewer mistakes in copying than normal for manuscripts of this time.³¹

Another anonymous intabulation is to be found in the Hortus Musarum, this time in French tablature. Next to that of Narváez, this is clearly the most artful of the arrangements, and that must account, in part, for its reissue by Phalèse in 1563. Here the stately grace of the chanson is not smothered in mechanical ornamentation, and textures of two, three, and four voices alternate. What embellishments are used resemble those found in Gerle and Ms. 266, especially the now-familiar pattern of a semiminim and six fusae. The intabulator skillfully weaves his embellishments throughout the various voices, sometimes inverting the original pattern in an imitating voice (m. 25). This intabulation is occasionally referred to in the literature, but it has never appeared in a modern edition. It certainly deserves a revival, as it could provide a welcome contrast to the oft-performed Narváez work.

If Narváez's intabulation is the only one ever played in concert, that is because it is not only the most famous of the arrangements but also the finest. His manipulation of the three-voice texture is perhaps most notable. Already in the second measure the ornamental pattern in the middle voice is answered in the bass, whose motive is immediately sequenced up a step. This movement is directly followed by an intriguing bit of interlace between the upper voices, producing greater harmonic interest than the Phalèse

version, whose intabulator was satisfied to ornament solely the upper voices and place the elaborations strictly on the downbeat. Indeed, by m. 3 Narvaez has created a fully polyphonic texture in which all three lines are rhythmically independent. This emphasis on textural and harmonic complexity, not merely on melodic elaboration, sets his version apart from the others. Yet, when his concern is chiefly melodic ornament, Narvaez weaves his embellishments into the original so that they seem a natural outgrowth of, rather than a graft onto, the chanson. He accomplishes this by the repetition and reworking of ornamental motives, such as those in the bass in mm. 2-3 and in the superius in mm. 7-8. Through such repetition they become an integral part of the original and exhibit the same economy that we have already noted in Josquin’s style. Narvaez employs many of the stock figures found in the other sources, but their application is neither so formulaic (as in Gerle) nor so profuse (as in Neusidler). Moreover, he makes use of a very graceful figure not found in the other intabulations, i.e., eight semiminims commencing with two upper neighbors and followed by a descending scale, as in m. 8. He also often repeats the same ornamentation with restatements of ideas in the original, as in m. 11. This technique, as developed by Narvaez and his Spanish successors, is not without some historical significance, as noted by Brown:

Some sixteenth-century musicians began to use graces motivically to enhance the decorated surface of their intabulations; they repeated the same embellishments over and over again within one composition to form a network of motives independent of the original part-writing. Spanish musicians may have been the first to exploit this technique. Ortiz is a master at it, and traces of it can even be found in the works of Luis de Narvaez.32

---

To be sure, part of Narváez’s skill lies in knowing when not to embellish. Ultimately, the need for embellishment arises out of the simple acoustical fact that the attack-decay envelope of plucked-string sound is short and steep. Embellishment helps to sustain sound, particularly when in the original there are chords held for a half measure or more. But in m. 10, for example, while all other sources (except Ms. 272) insert passage work in the second half of the measure, Narváez contents himself with simple chordal articulations to sustain the sound. This pattern persists to m. 14, at which point he generates a drive towards the cadence in m. 17 through increasing rhythmic animation. This is precisely the opposite approach of the other arrangers, whose embellishment actually decreases from mm. 10 to 14, conducing to a sensation of anticlimax. Narváez’s keener sense of architecture is readily apparent in such passages. Another example is his approach to the crucial cadence at m. 23, on “douloureuse.” Here his varied repetition of ornament between mm. 20-21 and mm. 22-23 clearly conveys the parallelism in the paired imitation of the chanson in those bars. This architectonic treatment of embellishment illustrates a deeper sensitivity to the vocal model than that possessed by Narváez’s competitors. And how welcome is the absence of noodling in the first half of m. 25, where the mood demands a moment of repose. This is something the Phalèse intabulator, for instance, would not allow us.

To conclude, these six intabulations present a useful survey of the genre, for both practical and theoretical purposes. Several of them, in particular Ms. 266 and the example from the Hortus Musarum, are worthy of performance and present viable alternatives for the modern player. The contributions of Gerle and Neusidler, though usually discussed in a disparaging way in the musicological literature, are also not without artistic merit. They simply require a certain technical flair from the performer and an acceptance on the listener’s part of their intent to stimulate rather than satisfy. This survey also enhances our
appreciation of the superior achievements of Narváez (and of the Spanish vihuelists in general) in this genre.

(A note on the transcriptions: To facilitate comparison with the vocal model, the following transcriptions have been rendered in the tonality of the chanson, not necessarily of the original instrument. Although each transcription is on two staves, the actual note durations correspond to what is possible on the lute or vihuela, not the keyboard. In order to convey to the modern reader the appropriate sense of tempo, all note values have been lengthened by a ratio of 2:1 over the original (e.g., a minim, with one flag, becomes a quarter note). Bar lines are employed for visual orientation and do not necessarily represent the placement of vertical lines in the tablature.)
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Science, Lute Tablature, and Universal Languages: Thomas Salmon’s *Essay to the Advancement of Musick* (1672)*

ROBERT E. LAWRENCE

The lute’s steady decline as a solo instrument during the seventeenth century can be attributed to a combination of factors: changes in musical taste and compositional style, shifting courtly ideals, the increasing popularity of the violin and harpsichord, and the relative softness of the instrument’s sound. “[It] is a Closett Instrument,” writes the anonymous informant of Mary Burwell’s lute book, “that will suffer the Companye of but few hearers and such as have a delicate Eare....”1 Yet another reason was tablature notation, whose primary purpose of making the instrument accessible was by the end of the seventeenth century seen as little more than a bothersome, recalcitrant, and complicated hindrance. As David Ledbetter states:

There is no doubt that the inaccessibility of tablature notation played a part in the lute’s decline ... Tablature in fact limited the instrument to initiates, and it was this notion of a connoisseur’s instrument, with a playing style of rarefied preciousness, which went out of fashion as the century drew to a close.2

One contemporary English musical theorist who recognized this problem and sought to rectify it was Thomas Salmon (1648-1706). Although not a professional

---

* This essay is respectfully dedicated to Gerald A. Milette.

lutenist, he held the instrument in high regard, as he clearly indicates in his Essay to the Advancement of Musick (1672):

The lute hath always had an undeniable sovereignty [sic] over other instrumental music, since that it self [sic] is a compleat [sic] consort sounding with such a soft but powerful sweetness, as if it were well acquainted with all the intrigues of the mind; sometimes disarming anger, and with its gentle breath, cooling a revengeful rage; sometimes, by contrary power it kindles a delightful flame; and raises a kinder, but no less fiery passion . . .

Lute tablature notation, on the other hand, was "some private conjuring of a lutenist" and an obstacle standing before those wishing to gain proficiency with the instrument. Despite these views, Salmon's championing of the lute and his attempt to revive it have been largely ignored. Scholars have normally dismissed him as an eccentric who merely waged a pamphlet war—albeit "the most celebrated musical pamphlet war of the seventeenth century"—defending his idiosyncratic notational system (initially explained in his Essay) against the attacks of the well-known composer Matthew Locke (ca. 1621-1677). In this article, I will discuss Salmon's attempt at rejuvenating the lute through the abolition of tablature notation and the interesting context of this attempt within the musical and intellectual climate of Restoration-era England.

---

4 Ibid., 66.
5 The declining knowledge of tablature notation toward the end of the century led several French composers to issue lute collections in staff notation. See Ledbetter, p. 12.
Thomas Salmon was born on 24 June 1648 in what is now the London borough of Hackney. The Dictionary of National Biography describes Salmon's father, also named Thomas, simply as a gentleman.\(^7\) His mother was reportedly the sister of the Regicide Colonel John Okey (?-1662).\(^8\) Salmon entered Trinity College, Oxford, in April 1664, receiving the Bachelor of Arts degree in 1667, and the Master of Arts degree in 1670.\(^9\) It is unknown whether Salmon had any musical training prior to arriving in Oxford. Since sacred music beyond the most rudimentary kind was prohibited during the Commonwealth (1649-1660), it is doubtful that Salmon had much exposure to choral music during his youth. He possibly received private instruction on some instrument—Oliver Cromwell and his Puritan followers were not opposed to secular music—\(^10\) but this has not been conclusively documented. There was, in fact, an explosion of interest in “private musick” among the middle-classes, which is attested to by the large number of instruction books for amateurs that appeared during the 1650s. Salmon’s earliest musical training likely came as part of his university studies at Oxford, in which case his first introduction to music would have consisted of readings and lectures from Boethius and other ancient authors.\(^11\) Given that it was the theoretical and mathematical aspects of music that formed what was presumably Salmon’s earliest


exposure to music, his early training and his interest for the lute were thus firmly linked.

At Oxford, Salmon became closely acquainted with the respected mathematician John Wallis (1616–1703), whose *Arithmetica Infinitorum* greatly influenced Isaac Newton. Wallis was appointed Savilian Professor of Geometry in 1649 by parliament at a time when most Royalist professors and Heads of Colleges were replaced by academics who sought knowledge through experimentation and observation.¹² During his pamphlet war with Matthew Locke, Salmon directed his initial response to Locke’s criticism, *A Vindication of an Essay to the Advancement of Musick* (London, 1672), in the form of a letter addressed to Wallis, and the two corresponded for a considerable time.¹³ In 1688, Salmon published his treatise *A Proposal to Perform Musick in Perfect and Mathematical Proportions*, which included a commentary by Wallis. Wallis’ lectures may well have included a lute to demonstrate acoustical properties, similar to Vincenzo Galilei’s and Marin Mersenne’s use of a

---

¹² According to Phyllis Allen, “The Puritans ‘intruded’ men of liberal tendencies into the faculties of the universities. Oxford, rather strongly Royalist during the Civil War, suffered from a general turning out of all the King’s men. In return, widespread Puritan reforms brought brilliant men to the University from Gresham College in London. Cromwell had heard of the club that had been meeting regularly at Gresham College, and from it he made his new appointments.” See Phyllis Allen, “Scientific Studies in the English Universities of the Seventeenth Century,” *Journal of the History of Ideas* 10 (1949), p. 231. Charles Edward Mallet, *A History of the University of Oxford*, vol. 2 (London: Methuen and Co., 1924), p. 416. Thomas Sprat stated that “The University [Oxford] had, at that time, many members of its own, who had begun a free way of reasoning; and was also frequented by some Gentleman, of Philosophical Minds, whom the misfortunes of the Kingdom, and the security and ease of a retirement among Gown-men, had drawn thither.” Thomas Sprat, *The History of the Royal Society of London* (London, 1667), pt. II, p. 53. It is important to note that many of these men formed the nucleus of The Royal Society when it was founded in 1660.

¹³ In the only extant letter between the two (Oxford, Bodleian Library Ms. English Letters, C. 130 ff. 27–28, dated 31 December 1685), Salmon makes reference to several earlier letters from Wallis.
lute in the same vein.\textsuperscript{14} If so, such use of the instrument may have been the initial source of Salmon's interest in it.

Salmon began to devote his exclusive attention to music shortly before completing his M.A. in 1670. The most likely explanation for this sudden intense interest in music is that Salmon, who may have had little or no previous training in practical music, found himself outside the mainstream of the more refined elements of Restoration society, where the ability to read and perform music was still considered a singular virtue. Although written many years prior to the onset of the Civil War, Henry Peacham's \textit{The Compleat Gentleman} was widely consulted throughout the Restoration and it explicitly advised would-be gentlemen to become proficient in music:

\begin{quote}
I avouch it a skill worthy the knowledge and exercise of the greatest prince . . . I desire no more in you than to sing your part sure and at the first sight withal to play the same upon your viol or the exercise of the lute, privately, to yourself.\textsuperscript{15}
\end{quote}

Salmon may have felt compelled to rectify possible shortcomings in his previous musical training when he approached Matthew Locke to procure lessons in composition. But Locke was uninterested in instructing

\begin{flushright}
\end{flushright}
Salmon and referred him instead to “Mr. Simpson’s Compendium of Practical Musick [London, 1667] for the first rudiments, and to Mr. Birchensha for his further advance....” Salmon followed these instructions, and began studying composition under the tutelage of the composer and musical pedagogue John Birchensha (ca. 1605-1681) in 1670.

Birchensha himself sought to simplify compositional procedures, and to develop what he described as a “scientific” system of music theory that would allow, so he claimed, even those with very limited musical training to “make good Air and compose 2, 3, 4 or more parts....” Indeed, in Shadwell’s play The Humourists, Birchensha is characterized as “a rare fellow,” who “can teach men to compose that are deaf, dumb, and blind.” Samuel Pepys engaged Birchensha as a music master for a short time and initially believed his rules for composition to be “very good, and the best I believe ever yet were made.” The Royal Society, too, welcomed Birchensha’s ideas and showed considerable interest in his plan to produce a treatise that would revolutionize music. Birchensha insisted that with

---

17 Royal Society Letter Book Copy I, pp. 166-73, April 26, 1664.
19 Samuel Pepys, The Diary of Samuel Pepys, ed. R. Latham and W. Matthews (Berkeley and Los Angeles: University of California Press, 1976), III, p. 9. Later, Pepys recanted, stating that Birchensha’s pedagogical method was in the end not “so easily to be understood as he [Birchensha] and others make of it.” Samuel Pepys, The Diary, vol. 5, p. 174. Pepys was also concerned with reforming musical practices and left behind a set of notes in which he 1) set forth what he considered to be the fundamental principles of music, and 2) indicated how he would proceed in reforming music theory. This material is contained in Oxford, Bodleian Library, Ms. Rawlinson A 312 ff. 143-46.
20 The early members of the Royal Society found Birchensha’s schemes most appealing. See Penelope Mary Gouk, “Music in the Natural Philosophy of the Early Royal Society,” Ph.D. diss., The Warburg Institute, London, 1982, and
this work, which was to be entitled *Syntagma Musice*, he would “reduce all ye parts of Musick to a regular way and just order.”²¹ Birchensha did achieve some progress in this regard, but he was still a considerable distance from achieving his final objective of completely overhauling music theory at the time of his death in 1681. The remnants of his work comprise a set of instructions for composing simple two-part instrumental works.²² As for the quality of these works, The diarist John Evelyn later remarked that Birchensha had “invented a mathematical way of composure very extraordinary: true as to the exact rules of art...,” but his works “were without much harmonie.”²³

Although Birchensha never completed his “grand scheme” for the simplification of music theory, Salmon likely derived his proposed reforms from Birchensha’s own views regarding notational practice. Birchensha may even have intended to incorporate Salmon’s notational system into the larger reforms he wished to institute. In the preface to Salmon’s *An Essay*, Birchensha endorses Salmon’s proposal, defending it through his description of contemporary musical practice: “There is not any art which

---


²¹ Royal Society, Classified Papers (1660-1740) Accounts of Books, XXII (I) Section 7.

²² Birchensha’s rules for composing two-part instrumental works are contained in British Library Add. Ms. 4910, ff. 39-60. Few of Birchensha’s compositions have survived to the present. Those located in Oxford, Bodleian Library Ms. Music School E 411, are discussed in Tim Crawford, “An Unusual Consort Revealed in an Oxford Manuscript,” *Chelys* 6 (1975-76), pp. 61-68. Royal Society Ms. The Boyle Papers: XLI, no. 1 (after 1664, before 1672), may be an early draft of *Syntagma Musicae*. See Leta Miller, “John Birchensha and the Early Royal Society,” p. 65. Interestingly, Birchensha attempted to raise money to publish his scheme by selling subscriptions (at twenty shillings each) to his *Syntagma Musicae*. The manuscript British Library Additional Ms. 4388, f. 69 contains Birchensha’s attempt at inducing the populace to pre-purchase his forthcoming (though never completed) work.

at this day is more rude, unpolish'd and imperfect in the writings of most of the ancient and modern authores, than musick; for the elementary part thereof, is little better than an indigested mass, and confused chaos of impertinent characters and insignificant signs. It is intricate and difficult to understand... and consumeth much time before the knowledge thereof can be attained.”

The significance of Salmon's system from a theoretical perspective does not lie solely with the fact that it was an offshoot of Birchensha's work. Salmon's treatise must also be considered within the larger context of the gradual transition from modal theory to one based upon tonal principles. Salmon's treatise, like those of many English theorists of the period, was therefore in the vanguard with respect to abandoning modal procedures and nomenclature. Salmon specifically believed that the contemporary system of music instruction placed significant obstacles before those who aspired to become musicians. Chief among these was music theory itself. At the core of this system stood the Gamut—a graphic representation of the various hexachords. Since hexachords overlap, the same note could appear as la in one hexachord, mi in another, and re in a third. Notes were thus designated by long and cumbersome names such as F fa ut or A la mi re. To become

24 Salmon, An Essay, p. [i].
26 Salmon, An Essay, p. 5.
fully conversant with basic music theory, student musicians were required to memorize the entire Gamut. For Salmon, however, the Gamut was "a long discourse of gibberish... a fardle of hard names and fictitious words... [that terrified] the beginner... [and was] akin to conjuring." In place of the bothersome Gamut, Salmon recognized only seven notes: G, A, B, C, D, E, and F. Since all musical pitches recur in identical places at the octave, the long names were confusing, rendering them meaningless, or as Salmon stated, "An octave therefore being the same in all respects with its original note, like some beloved son, who is the pretty picture of his parent." This dislike of the Gamut was shared by others. Samuel Pepys called it "ridiculous and troublesome," and John Pell (1611-1685), like Pepys an early member of the Royal Society, considered the Gamut to be an impediment to those wishing to learn about composition. Like William Bathe before him and Salmon after, Pell desired a theoretical system based on the octave rather than on hexachords, stating that "the naming of your notes ut re mi fa sol la is arbitrary... Therefore ye keyes and cliffs of ye Gam[ut]... are arbitrary and needlesse... Seeing the greater agreement of tones is in 8s it were not amiss to have seven notes to be placed repeated as often as is necessary."

It is noteworthy that such reforms attracted support from the Royal Society (founded 1660), and this support proved to be of considerable importance. Among the

27 Ibid., p.11.
28 Salmon was not the first English theorist to recommend the adoption of a system based on the octave. William Bathe, in A Briefe Introduction to the Skill of Song (London, 1600), described a system of sight-singing based on the octave instead of the Gamut.
30 The Diary of Samuel Pepys, IX, pp. 157-58.
32 An endorsement of Salmon's system is contained in the Philosophical Transactions of the Royal Society of London 80 (1671/72) p. 3095.
Society’s members were some of the greatest scientific minds and political figures of the late seventeenth century: Samuel Pepys, John Evelyn, Robert Boyle, Christopher Wren, Robert Hooke, John Wallis, and Isaac Newton. As the Society was strongly influenced by the writings and beliefs of Francis Bacon, one of its key aims was to promote the New Science, or the investigation of nature based on empiricism rather than on pure reason alone. It is not surprising that various members of the organization were interested in the mathematical principles of music and conducted numerous acoustical experiments.

Although many of the Society’s members were active amateur musicians, there were additional reasons for such interest in Salmon’s and Birchensha’s proposals to simplify musical practices. According to Bronowski and Mazlish, members of the Society “were willing to be interested in anything[,] ... they liked... having a finger in every intellectual pie.” More specifically, many of the Society’s members adhered to the philosophy of Pansophism, an ideal codified in the writings of the Bohemian philosopher Jan Amos Komensky (better-known by his Latinized name Comenius) (1592-1670), that being a “single and comprehensive system of human omni-science... a system

33 The Society’s full name was The Royal Society of London for the Promotion of Natural Knowledge, and it received its Royal Charter from Charles II in 1662. Although it did not formally exist until 1660, some of its founding members, notably Christopher Wren and John Wallis, had been meeting regularly at Gresham College in London since the 1640s to discuss scientific matters. Other notables, such as Robert Boyle, had also formed what was termed the Invisible College during the 1640s. The amalgamation of these two groups resulted in the Royal Society.


of all things under heaven, which we can know, say, or do.”37 One aspect of Pansophism that was particularly attractive to such Society members as Robert Boyle, Samuel Hartlib, John Evelyn, and John Wilkins, was the idea of universal education. These four individuals in fact established and administered the so-called Agency for the Advancement of Universal Learning. Music was included in the ideal system of universal education, but since this was to be an all-encompassing educational method, directed at even the meanest intellect, everything was, by necessity, reduced to its simplest form.38 Another manifestation of Pansophistic influences on the Society’s membership was an interest in the creation of universal languages. Here, Salmon acknowledged a debt to the natural philosopher and Royal Society member John Wilkins (1614-1672) and his recently developed universal language. In his Essay Towards A Real Character and a Philosophical Language, Wilkins explained and set forth a symbolic language based on “real characters” which, he asserted, could be instantly understood regardless of the reader’s native tongue. Conventional languages based on words that were prone to misinterpretation would be eliminated with “real characters.”39

Drawing then upon Comenius’s and Wilkins’s shared ideas of universality, simplicity, and “real characters,”

38 The pansophists were closely aligned with Protestant Millenarianism. The Millenarianists believed that a prerequisite for establishing Christ’s kingdom on Earth was the dissemination of knowledge to all people. One of the principal founders of this movement was Johann Heinrich Alsted, whose writings on music were translated by Salmon’s mentor Birchensha as Templum Musicum (London: Roger L’Estrange, 1663). It is extremely likely that Birchensha also had Millenarian beliefs, and that the source of his involvement in the reform of music was essentially religious. See R.G. Clouse, “The Rebirth of Millenarianism,” in Puritans, the Millenium and the Future of Israel, ed. Peter Toon (Cambridge: James Clarke, 1970), pp. 42-65
39 See Knowlson, Universal Language Schemes, p. 36.
Salmon claimed that his system of musical notation would enable musicians to understand it immediately regardless of the instrument they play.\textsuperscript{40} In other words, it allowed a musician who played the harpsichord to perform immediately music written for the lute. His system emulated Wilkins’s universal language, since:

The Players, indeed, will find it [Salmon’s system] ... everyone’s Native Language ... Like that late ingeniously invented Universal Character, which, expressing things and not words, is common to all countries; and may be read by those who agree not in speaking, neither at all understand one another’s discourse.\textsuperscript{41}

Salmon dispensed with the great variety of clefs then in use, and instead always placed a note, regardless of its octave, on the same line or space. Changes of octaves were to be designated by the signs, Tr (Treble) M (Mean) and B (Bass) (see Plate 1). Salmon believed that the bass was the foundation of music; hence, “all musick should conform itself to the writing of the bass”\textsuperscript{42} In effect, the notes on the staff should be placed as if they were in the bass clef with G on the lowest line and G in the uppermost space. By placing the same note always on the same space without regard for its octave, Salmon hoped that students would learn more quickly to sightread, thereby reducing the “drudgery of musick.”\textsuperscript{43} His system’s “universal character” would alleviate the need to learn more than a single clef, and provide all musicians with a “catholick knowledge of all instruments.”\textsuperscript{44} Composers would also find his system more convenient, as it enabled them to perceive consonances and dissonances at sight without first having to account for the effect of

\textsuperscript{40} Kassler, \textit{The Science of Music in Britain}, pp. 917-18.
\textsuperscript{41} Salmon, \textit{An Essay}, pp. 28-29.
\textsuperscript{42} \textit{Ibid.}, p. 46.
\textsuperscript{43} \textit{Ibid.}, p. 26.
\textsuperscript{44} \textit{Ibid.}, p. 30
different clefs. Tables for determining the proper intervals should then be rendered obsolete.45

Salmon illustrated how his system might be applied to both vocal and instrumental music by providing example works for voice, viol, harpsichord, and lute, all notated with his new system. The example Salmon provides for lute is a simple dance by the English composer and lutenist John Rogers (ca. 1607-76) entitled Arron’s Gigue (see Plate 2).46 With Salmon’s proposed reforms, tablature would be abolished and all lute music would eventually be notated using the new system, as shown by the middle two staves. The lower two staves contain a conventionally intabulated version of the same piece. Salmon compensated for his system’s inability to indicate where the bass notes should be played by entering note names at the bottom of each measure to mark their positions. Clearly, to anyone not intimately familiar with the lute and its notation Salmon’s notational system does appear simpler compared to what the uninitiated would perceive as little more than incomprehensible scribbles. Simple works, such as Arron’s Gigue, can indeed be notated accurately within the confines of Salmon’s system. On the other hand, more complex, contrapuntal works for the lute could not be effectively notated in this manner. Salmon’s knowledge of the existing lute repertory must therefore have been somewhat limited, for had he truly understood the polyphonic nature of lute music, he surely would have realized the handicaps inherent

46 Rogers was lutenist in The King’s Musick at the Restoration and was considered to be one of the most important English lutenists of the period; see Ian Spink, “Rogers, John,” The New Grove, 17, p. 104. He may have been the compiler of the Burwell Lute Book; see Wallace Rave, “Performance instructions for the seventeenth-century French lute repertory,” in Performance on Lute, Guitar, and Vihuela: Historical Practice and Modern Interpretation, ed. Victor Coelho (Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 1997), p. 151.
in his system. Secondly, Salmon recommended that a single method of tuning (to open G) be adopted (Plate 2), which he transcribed as D, G, B, d, g, b. According to Salmon, this tuning system was taught by John Rogers to his pupils.\(^47\) Since it is also found in the Burwell lute book, some scholars have speculated that Rogers was the author of this treatise.\(^48\)

Salmon's insistence upon the employment of a single tuning and the limited applicability of his notational system to the lute music of his period illustrate his insufficient grasp of the instrument's true potential. Rather than rescuing the instrument from its decline, Salmon would have seriously handicapped it. While he clearly had a great fondness for music in general and for the lute in particular, he was not a skilled or thoroughly trained musician, and his solutions were ultimately too simplistic and far too impractical to gain wide acceptance. Yet, Salmon was highly intelligent and idealistic, and recognized that contemporary musical practice bore little relationship to the theoretical concepts still being taught. All told, he was an amateur musician who unsurprisingly produced amateur suggestions for "improving" and "demystifying" notation. His system may have been quite suitable for those middle-class and aristocratic amateurs who, following Henry Peacham's advice, were content to play relatively simple works for their solitary enjoyment.\(^49\) For the professional and accomplished amateur, however, the system was simply too cumbersome. Despite its shortcomings, Salmon's system represents an earnest attempt at reforming musical practice to conform with pansophistic ideals. Although the principal stimulus for developing his system was, therefore, extramusical, Salmon managed to argue against the anachronistic nature of


contemporary musico-theoretical practices and procedures. He did not present a truly viable alternative, nor did he prevent the lute from its eventual decline in England, but he was able to show the need for serious musical reform.

ALBERTA INSTITUTE OF TECHNOLOGY
The New Scheme for the constant situation of the same Notes, and their Octaves, on the same Lines and Spaces.

This upper line has Liéger for the business of an higher Octave.

Plate 1: Salmon's system of clefs from *An Essay to the Advancement of Musick* (1672), p. 23.
Plate 2: The upper two staves contain Salmon’s recommended tuning. A conventionally intabulated version of Arrons Gigue is presented on the middle two staves, while Salmon’s version is presented in the lowest two staves. The tuning is given in the uppermost staves. From Salmon, An Essay, p. 60.
Regular Meantone Temperaments Applied to Francesco da Milano

JAMES BAILEY

MOST RENAISSANCE MUSICIANS STRUGGLED to reconcile themselves to an unfortunate acoustical fact. Two tones which are played at the same time sound in tune only if their frequencies are in the ratio of small integers. Taken in isolation this is fine, but when notes are tuned sequentially and then checked against each other, the cross checks are out of tune. For example, four perfect fifths result in an interval which is out of tune, wider than a major third by a syntonic comma. Modern listeners, accustomed to equal-tempered thirds, find this tolerable; but to Renaissance musicians, who were used to hearing thirds sung in tune, it was unbearable. Meantone temperaments were invented as a solution to this problem. In meantone systems, fifths are tuned narrow by varying amounts in order that the resulting thirds be better in tune. In this article we will look at how meantone systems can be implemented on the Renaissance lute and then observe their effect when they are applied to the lute fantasias by Francesco da Milano.

*Regular meantone temperaments on the lute*

Because of the physical layout of the lute, any tuning and fret placement in which octaves are in tune and frets are parallel to the nut will result in a temperament with the following property: all intervals of a given type will have the same size (which will be different for enharmonic

---

1 The fifths in a meantone temperament need not be all the same size; if they are, then all intervals of a given type (minor thirds, major thirds, perfect fourths etc.) must also be the same size, creating what is known as a regular meantone temperament. Here, we restrict ourselves to regular meantone temperaments.
spellings of that interval unless equal temperament is being used. All regular meantones share this property together with the added requirement that some intervals are "wolves."

One frequently asked question is whether frets were normally placed parallel to the nut. We can find evidence in the music. Octaves (and fifteenths) are always in tune. Frequent simultaneous use of the open first and sixth courses indicate that they were in tune with each other. Then, simultaneous use of the first and sixth courses stopped at the same fret show that that fret was parallel to the nut. Counts made from the ninety-two fantasias in Arthur Ness' edition of the works of Francesco Canova da Milano\(^2\) gave the following results:

\[
\begin{array}{cccccccc}
0 & 3 & 2 & 7 & 4 & 5 & 1 & 8 & 6 & 10 \\
\hline
170 & 113 & 69 & 25 & 21 & 12 & 6 & 5 & 2 & 1 \\
\end{array}
\]

These frequencies indicate that Francesco normally placed the second and third (and most likely all) frets parallel to the nut.

What about the tuning of the courses and the positioning of the frets? The following method might be called "tuning by octaves." It is based on interval frequencies found in Francesco's fantasias, but since any method of tuning requires that frequently used octaves are in tune, the end result of any tuning scheme must be the same as this one. The numbers below the intervals give the frequencies in which they are used in Francesco's fantasias as found in Ness' edition.

---

FRANCESCO DA MILANO AND MEANTONE TEMPERAMENTS

a. Tune the major third between the middle two courses. Any size of third may be used. If a just third is used then the resulting temperament will be the Aron 1/4 syntonic meantone; if an equal tempered third is used, then equal temperament will result. This is the only choice the tuner has; all other intervals are determined from this third.

b. Approximately position the second fret. Tune the first and sixth course so the octaves with the second fret of the fourth course are in tune.

\[
\begin{array}{c}
0 \\
22 \\
0 \\
485284
\end{array}
\]

c. Check the octaves:

\[
\begin{array}{c}
2 \\
00 \\
2 \\
9856
\end{array}
\]

They will, in general, be out of tune. If we were to reposition the second fret so these octaves are in tune, then the first ones would be out of tune. Reposition the second fret so the interval between these two positions is divided into two equal parts. (We want to split the acoustic interval into two equal parts; in terms of linear measurements, we want the geometric mean of the bridge-to-nut distances.) Repeat steps b and c, retuning the first and sixth courses and checking the octaves. If the interval was correctly split, these

---

3 A list of beat speeds for various sizes of possible major thirds is given in Appendix 1.
will be in tune; otherwise reposition the fret and repeat this step.\(^4\)

d. Approximately position the third fret. Tune the second course so stopping it at the third fret it produces an octave with the fourth course. Tune the fifth course so stopping it at the second fret makes an octave with the second course. Check the octave between the fifth course and the third course stopped at the third fret. In general this will be out of tune, but split the difference in the same way as was done in the previous step. Repeat this step, retuning the second and fifth courses, and checking the resulting octaves. If the interval was correctly split, the results will be in tune; otherwise reposition the third fret and repeat this step.\(^5\)

\[
\begin{array}{cc}
2 & 0 \\
0 & 3 \\
3 & 0 \\
\end{array}
\]

\[
465 \ 304 \ 557
\]

\(^4\) This will split the major third into two equal tones. To see why, suppose that the fret deviated from the correct location by \(n\) cents. The first course will also deviate from the correct pitch by the same amount, and so the first course stopped at the second fret will be out by \(2n\) cents; the \(n\) cents due to the initial tuning and another \(n\) cents due to the fret spacing. Adjusting the fret and retuning the first and sixth courses by \(-n\) cents gives the correct fret spacing and course tunings.

\(^5\) To see why this works, suppose that the third fret was initially out of tune by \(n\) cents. The second course stopped at the third fret is in tune (it was tuned to the open fourth course) but the open second course is out of tune by the same amount as the third fret, \(-n\) cents. Since the second fret is correctly placed, this means that the fifth course is also out of tune by \(-n\) cents. The third course stopped at the third fret will be out of tune because of the fret placement (by \(n\) cents) so the difference between the open fifth course and the third course stopped at the third fret is \(2n\) cents. This can be corrected by adjusting the fret by \(-n\) cents and retuning the second and fifth courses by \(+n\) cents. These two steps set the second and third frets and also determine the pitches of all the courses. It is easy to see that the octave has been split into three equal tones by the position of the second fret (F to G, G to A, and C to D) and two equal minor thirds by the position of the third fret (A to C and D to F).
e. Use one of the following intervals to position the first fret and the others as checks:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>3</th>
<th>1</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1</td>
<td>3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>170</td>
<td>134</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

f. Use one of the following intervals to position the fifth fret and the others as checks:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>0</th>
<th>2</th>
<th>3</th>
<th>5</th>
<th>5</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>3</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>0</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>133</td>
<td>114</td>
<td>81</td>
<td>77</td>
<td>74</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

g. Use one of the following intervals to position the fourth fret and the others as checks:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>4</th>
<th>2</th>
<th>4</th>
<th>4</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>4</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>88</td>
<td>52</td>
<td>27</td>
<td>27</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

h. Use one of the following intervals to position the seventh fret and the others as checks:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>0</th>
<th>5</th>
<th>7</th>
<th>7</th>
<th>0</th>
<th>4</th>
<th>7</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>0</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>7</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>7</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>35</td>
<td>23</td>
<td>22</td>
<td>16</td>
<td>15</td>
<td>11</td>
<td>10</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Continue to use one of the following intervals to position the appropriate fret and the other as checks:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Sixth</th>
<th>Eighth</th>
<th>Ninth</th>
<th>Tenth</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>3</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>9</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>9</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>0</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>10</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>7</td>
<td>10</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

This leaves three intervals that Francesco used but which do not appear here because they would produce wolves (more on this later):

| 4     | 11     |
| 6     | 5      |
|       |        |
| 4     | 11     |

This procedure could be improved by using checks which involve the first and sixth courses whenever a fret is placed in order to verify that the frets are parallel to the nut up to compensation. (Only intervals actually used by Francesco are used in the above procedure.)

If we identify the notes on the lute which have been used in this procedure, using the same symbol for notes which were set one or more octaves apart, we produce the results in Table 1. We can use this to show that the resulting tuning is in meantone. As stated in n. 5, the second step implies that G divides the major third F to A into two equal tones. The third step implies that the minor third D to F is the same size as the minor third A to C and the tone C to D is the same as the tones F to G and G to A. Consequently the octave is divided into two equal minor thirds (the interval determined by the nut and third fret) and
Table 1: Octaves used by Francesco in his fantasias

<p>| | | | | | | |</p>
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>G</td>
<td>A♭</td>
<td>A</td>
<td>B♭</td>
<td>B</td>
<td>C</td>
<td>D</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>D</td>
<td>E♭</td>
<td>E</td>
<td>F</td>
<td>G</td>
<td>A♭</td>
<td>A♭</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>A</td>
<td>B♭</td>
<td>B</td>
<td>C</td>
<td>D</td>
<td>E♭</td>
<td>E</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>F</td>
<td>G♭</td>
<td>A♭</td>
<td>A♭</td>
<td>B♭</td>
<td>C</td>
<td>D</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>C</td>
<td>D♭</td>
<td>D♭</td>
<td>E♭</td>
<td>E</td>
<td>F</td>
<td>G♭</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>G</td>
<td>A♭</td>
<td>A♭</td>
<td>B♭</td>
<td>B</td>
<td>C</td>
<td>D♭</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

three equal tones (half the original major third or the interval determined by the nut and second fret):

C - D - F - G - A - C

This is a pentatonic scale and we see that the perfect fourths G to C, C to F, and D to G are all the same size (a tone plus a minor third) so the fourths between courses are all the same size. The tone G to A on the first course and the fourth course force the interval between the nut and second course to be the same as the interval between the second and fourth frets, and the diatonic semitone A to B♭ on the third, first, and fourth courses implies that the first five fret spacings, proceeding from the nut towards the bridge, are a diatonic semitone, a chromatic semitone, a diatonic semitone, a chromatic semitone, and a diatonic semitone. We can fill in the missing notes from the previous table, as follows:

Table 2: Note usage as implied by Francesco’s use of octaves

Consequently, we have a circle of fifths, all of which are the same size.
The tuning will be a meantone temperament if the original major third was close enough to just tuning that notes cannot be used enharmonically. A regular well temperament results if notes can be used enharmonically but the original third was narrower than an equal tempered third. Equal temperament results if the original major third was equal tempered. Pythagorean tuning results if the original third was Pythagorean.

**Acoustic tonality and the lute**

As we said earlier, harmonious meantone thirds come at a price: no note can be used enharmonically. This means that not all harmonic intervals can be used and we must look at a new concept that helps us to talk about this limitation of meantone systems: the acoustic tonality of a temperament as discussed by Jorgensen. Acoustic tonality is a method of keeping track of which notes are available and which intervals are usable. For example, in the acoustic tonality of C major and A minor, the circle of fifths is

$$\text{C}^\flat - \text{G}^\flat - \text{D}^\flat - \text{A}^\flat - \text{E}^\flat - \text{B}^\flat - \text{F} - \text{C} - \text{D} - \text{A} - \text{E} - \text{B}^\# - \text{F}^\# - \text{C}^\#$$

while in the acoustic tonality of B, the circle of fifths runs from D♭ to F♯. The notes in four acoustic tonalities are listed in Table 3. Notice that only one note changes as we progress.

---

6 Our system of classifying intervals also helps to keep track of wolves in meantone. Major, minor, and perfect intervals are consonant while diminished and augmented intervals are wolves. For the purpose of the analysis in this article, minor thirds, major thirds, perfect fourths, perfect fifths, minor sixths, and major sixths were examined, and enharmonic spellings of these intervals were considered to be wolves. The exception is the augmented second which, in meantone, is close enough to the small ratio 6:7 minor third to be considered consonant.

around the circle of fifths, and that the sequence of diatonic and chromatic semitones is identical in each of them.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Acoustic Tonality</th>
<th>Sequence of Semitones</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>B♭</td>
<td>B♭ B♭ C B♭ D♭ D♭ E♭ F♭ G♭ A♭ A♭</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>F</td>
<td>F♭ F♭ G♭ A♭ A♭ B♭ C♭ D♭ E♭ F♭</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>C</td>
<td>C♭ D♭ E♭ F♭ G♭ A♭ A♭ B♭ B♭ C♭</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>G</td>
<td>G♭ A♭ B♭ C♭ D♭ D♭ F♭ F♭ G♭</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Table 3: Notes found in four acoustic tonalities

We can now discuss the implications of using meantone temperaments on the lute. The two different kinds of semitones are different sizes, and so imply different fret spacings (the diatonic semitone is wider than the chromatic semitone). But now we run up against a complication. If we tune the strings and position the frets for certain notes, others are automatically set which need not be in the desired acoustic tonality. The best we can do is try to minimize the number of these problem notes. This has been done in Tables 4 through 7 for a G lute in the acoustic tonalities of B♭, F, C, and G, and in Table 8 for an A lute in the acoustic tonality of C. In these tables the fret numbers are in the top row, and the second row indicates the size of the semitone: mi for a chromatic semitone and fa for a diatonic semitone. Notes not in the desired acoustic tonality have been marked with an asterisk.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>0</th>
<th>1 fa</th>
<th>2 mi</th>
<th>3 fa</th>
<th>4 mi</th>
<th>5 fa</th>
<th>6 fa</th>
<th>7 mi</th>
<th>8 fa</th>
<th>9 mi</th>
<th>10 fa</th>
<th>11 mi</th>
<th>12 fa</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>G</td>
<td>A♭</td>
<td>A</td>
<td>B♭</td>
<td>B</td>
<td>C</td>
<td>D♭</td>
<td>D♭</td>
<td>E♭</td>
<td>E♭</td>
<td>F♭</td>
<td>F♭</td>
<td>G♭</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>D</td>
<td>E♭</td>
<td>E</td>
<td>F♭</td>
<td>F♭</td>
<td>G♭</td>
<td>A♭</td>
<td>A♭</td>
<td>B♭</td>
<td>B♭</td>
<td>C♭</td>
<td>C♭</td>
<td>D♭</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>A</td>
<td>B♭</td>
<td>B♭</td>
<td>C♭</td>
<td>C♭</td>
<td>G♭</td>
<td>D♭</td>
<td>E♭</td>
<td>E♭</td>
<td>F♭</td>
<td>G♭</td>
<td>G♭</td>
<td>A♭</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>F</td>
<td>G♭</td>
<td>G♭</td>
<td>A♭</td>
<td>A♭</td>
<td>B♭</td>
<td>O♭</td>
<td>C♭</td>
<td>D♭</td>
<td>D♭</td>
<td>E♭</td>
<td>E♭</td>
<td>F♭</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>C</td>
<td>D♭</td>
<td>D♭</td>
<td>E♭</td>
<td>E♭</td>
<td>F♭</td>
<td>G♭</td>
<td>A♭</td>
<td>A♭</td>
<td>B♭</td>
<td>B♭</td>
<td>B♭</td>
<td>C♭</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>G</td>
<td>A♭</td>
<td>A♭</td>
<td>B♭</td>
<td>B♭</td>
<td>C♭</td>
<td>D♭</td>
<td>D♭</td>
<td>E♭</td>
<td>E♭</td>
<td>F♭</td>
<td>F♭</td>
<td>G♭</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Table 4: G lute, acoustic tonality of B♭ major and G minor
Table 5: G lute, acoustic tonality of F major and D minor

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>0</th>
<th>1</th>
<th>2</th>
<th>3</th>
<th>4</th>
<th>5</th>
<th>6</th>
<th>7</th>
<th>8</th>
<th>9</th>
<th>10</th>
<th>11</th>
<th>12</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>G</td>
<td>A♭</td>
<td>A</td>
<td>B♭</td>
<td>B</td>
<td>C</td>
<td>C♯</td>
<td>D</td>
<td>E♭</td>
<td>E</td>
<td>F</td>
<td>F♯</td>
<td>G</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>D</td>
<td>E♭</td>
<td>E</td>
<td>F</td>
<td>F♯</td>
<td>G</td>
<td>G♯</td>
<td>A</td>
<td>B♭</td>
<td>B</td>
<td>C</td>
<td>C♯</td>
<td>D</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>A</td>
<td>B♭</td>
<td>B</td>
<td>C</td>
<td>C♯</td>
<td>D</td>
<td>D♯</td>
<td>E</td>
<td>F♯</td>
<td>F♯</td>
<td>G</td>
<td>G♯</td>
<td>A</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>F</td>
<td>G</td>
<td>A♭</td>
<td>A</td>
<td>B♭</td>
<td>B</td>
<td>C</td>
<td>D</td>
<td>D♯</td>
<td>D♯</td>
<td>D</td>
<td>E♭</td>
<td>E</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>C</td>
<td>D</td>
<td>D♭</td>
<td>E</td>
<td>E</td>
<td>F</td>
<td>F♯</td>
<td>G</td>
<td>A♭</td>
<td>A</td>
<td>B♭</td>
<td>B</td>
<td>B</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>G</td>
<td>A♭</td>
<td>A</td>
<td>B♭</td>
<td>B</td>
<td>C</td>
<td>C♯</td>
<td>D</td>
<td>E♭</td>
<td>E</td>
<td>F</td>
<td>F♯</td>
<td>G</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Table 6: G lute, acoustic tonality of C major and A minor

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>0</th>
<th>1</th>
<th>2</th>
<th>3</th>
<th>4</th>
<th>5</th>
<th>6</th>
<th>7</th>
<th>8</th>
<th>9</th>
<th>10</th>
<th>11</th>
<th>12</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>G</td>
<td>G♯</td>
<td>A</td>
<td>B♭</td>
<td>B</td>
<td>C</td>
<td>C♯</td>
<td>D</td>
<td>E♭</td>
<td>E</td>
<td>F</td>
<td>F♯</td>
<td>G</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>D</td>
<td>D♯</td>
<td>E</td>
<td>F</td>
<td>F♯</td>
<td>G</td>
<td>G♯</td>
<td>A</td>
<td>B♭</td>
<td>B</td>
<td>C</td>
<td>C♯</td>
<td>D</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>A</td>
<td>A♭</td>
<td>B</td>
<td>C</td>
<td>C♯</td>
<td>D</td>
<td>D♯</td>
<td>E</td>
<td>F♯</td>
<td>F♯</td>
<td>G</td>
<td>G♯</td>
<td>A</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>F</td>
<td>F♯</td>
<td>G</td>
<td>A♭</td>
<td>A</td>
<td>B♭</td>
<td>B</td>
<td>C</td>
<td>D</td>
<td>D</td>
<td>E♭</td>
<td>E</td>
<td>E</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>C</td>
<td>C</td>
<td>D</td>
<td>E♭</td>
<td>E</td>
<td>F</td>
<td>F♯</td>
<td>G</td>
<td>G♯</td>
<td>G</td>
<td>A</td>
<td>B♭</td>
<td>B</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>G</td>
<td>G♯</td>
<td>A</td>
<td>B♭</td>
<td>B</td>
<td>C</td>
<td>C♯</td>
<td>D</td>
<td>D♯</td>
<td>D</td>
<td>E♭</td>
<td>E</td>
<td>F</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Table 7: G lute, acoustic tonality of G major and e minor

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>0</th>
<th>1</th>
<th>2</th>
<th>3</th>
<th>4</th>
<th>5</th>
<th>6</th>
<th>7</th>
<th>8</th>
<th>9</th>
<th>10</th>
<th>11</th>
<th>12</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>G</td>
<td>G♯</td>
<td>A</td>
<td>B♭</td>
<td>B</td>
<td>C</td>
<td>C♯</td>
<td>D</td>
<td>D♯</td>
<td>E</td>
<td>F</td>
<td>F♯</td>
<td>G</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>D</td>
<td>D♯</td>
<td>E</td>
<td>F</td>
<td>F♯</td>
<td>G</td>
<td>G♯</td>
<td>A</td>
<td>B♭</td>
<td>B</td>
<td>C</td>
<td>C♯</td>
<td>D</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>A</td>
<td>A♭</td>
<td>B</td>
<td>C</td>
<td>C♯</td>
<td>D</td>
<td>D♯</td>
<td>E</td>
<td>F♯</td>
<td>F♯</td>
<td>G</td>
<td>G♯</td>
<td>A</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>F</td>
<td>F♯</td>
<td>G</td>
<td>A♭</td>
<td>A</td>
<td>B♭</td>
<td>B</td>
<td>C</td>
<td>D</td>
<td>D</td>
<td>E♭</td>
<td>E</td>
<td>E</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>C</td>
<td>C</td>
<td>D</td>
<td>E♭</td>
<td>E</td>
<td>F</td>
<td>F♯</td>
<td>G</td>
<td>G♯</td>
<td>G</td>
<td>A</td>
<td>B♭</td>
<td>B</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>G</td>
<td>G♯</td>
<td>A</td>
<td>B♭</td>
<td>B</td>
<td>C</td>
<td>C♯</td>
<td>D</td>
<td>D♯</td>
<td>D</td>
<td>E♭</td>
<td>E</td>
<td>F</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
In studying these tables we notice several things. First, there are always six problem notes. This is because, as noted the discussion of Table 3, all acoustic tonalities have the same sequence of diatonic and chromatic semitones; the difference is where in the sequence we start. Second, the problem notes are in two groups of three each: those where the fret is a diatonic rather than a chromatic semitone from the previous note (so the fret spacing is too wide) and those where the fret is a chromatic rather than a diatonic semitone from the previous note (so the fret spacing is too narrow). In what follows I will refer to these as problems of the first and second type respectively. The first type is easier to correct since a small auxiliary fret or tastino can be glued in the appropriate position. The lute is then played as usual, stopping the courses on the nut side of the tied fret or tastino as appropriate. The same solution can be applied to problems of the second type, but then the player must be careful to stop the problem note between the tied fret and the tastino, so the technique for playing different courses at that fret will be different. The third thing which we notice is that Tables 4 and 8 have the same fret pattern. In general, we can arrive at a fret pattern either by keeping the lute the same and changing the acoustic tonality, or by keeping the acoustic tonality the same and changing the lute. Table 9 illustrates this correspondence.
Table 9: Correspondence between the acoustic tonalities given a G lute, and the lute size given acoustic tonality of C

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Acoustic tonality (lute = G)</th>
<th>Lute (acoustic tonality = C)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>B♭</td>
<td>A</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>F</td>
<td>D</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>C</td>
<td>G</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>G</td>
<td>C</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Figure 1 shows the information in the previous seven tables graphically by indicating fret spacings. The nut is at the top and the lowest (bass) string is on the left, similar to what is seen when looking at the lute's fingerboard. The locations of the problem notes are shown by short lines which indicate where the fret needs to be located for that string. In going between adjacent diagrams one fret is shifted as indicated by an arrow.

Francesco Canova da Milano's fantasias

So far our discussion has been theoretical, without reference to any music. The following method can be applied to any lute music, but in recognition of the 1997 anniversary of Francesco da Milano's birth I decided to apply it to the 92 fantasias found in Ness' edition of Francesco's music. In general the steps are:

- Determine the acoustic tonality of the piece which you are going to play. Only notes used harmonically need be considered since notes used melodically cannot produce wolves. The piece may work in more than one acoustic tonality, in which case each must be considered separately. If any note is used enharmonically then there is no acoustic tonality and it is not possible to use meantone.⁸

---

⁸ Strictly speaking, this statement is not true. Since the tastino leaves the fret in place, it is still possible to play both notes by fingering the course between the tastino and the fret for problems of the first type, or by fingering behind the fret for problems of the second type. This is the lute's equivalent of harpsichords with split notes (more than 12 notes per octave). It also means that microtones
Figure 1: Schematic of fret positions

The fret positions shown in the diagram are relatively easy on the lute, a possibility which contemporary composers could exploit in lute music.
• Set the frets and tastini for that acoustic tonality. If problem semitones remain then try to eliminate them by using a different acoustic tonality.

These steps were implemented for each fantasia using a computer to do the analysis. First the fantasias were entered into the computer using the format of Wayne Cripps’ tablature program.\(^9\) This format has the advantages that it is compact, it can be easily read by humans and computers, and it can be used to print tablature which can then be compared with the original or played in order to identify errors. (Ness’ suggested corrections were generally accepted.) Next, computer programs were written which determined the acoustic tonalities of each piece, and then looked for wolf intervals assuming various fret and tastino positions (tastini were used to correct only problems of the first type.) A few wolf intervals were judged to be acceptable. For example, several fantasias (listed in the notes to Table 11) contain augmented triads consisting of two major thirds and a wolf diminished fourth. This was judged to be acceptable, and possibly even desirable, since it adds a little extra bite to an already expressive chord.

Table 11 gives the results of this analysis. With the exceptions noted below, an ‘x’ indicates that no wolves are present when the fantasia is played on a lute in the given configuration. The first column gives the number of the fantasia. The first row gives the acoustic tonality assuming a G lute. The second row lists the number of tastini necessary. The order in which the tastini were placed is indicated in Table 10. The second tastini are not required for any of the fantasias when played in the acoustic tonalities of F or G. Of the fantasias which can be played in the acoustic tonality of C requiring tastini, only Fantasia 87b requires the second tastino; all others can be played using only the first. The playability of fantasias in B\(^b\) with no, one, or two tastini is indicated using separate columns.

Follow the link A tablature typesetting program for many computers.
### Table 10: Positions of tastini used for G lute in various acoustic tonalities

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Acoustic tonality</th>
<th>First tastino</th>
<th>Second tastino</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Fret</td>
<td>Strings</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>B♭</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>F</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>4,5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>C</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>G</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>4,5</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Fantasia</th>
<th>B♭ 0</th>
<th>B♭ 1</th>
<th>B♭ 2</th>
<th>F 0</th>
<th>F 1</th>
<th>C 0</th>
<th>C 1</th>
<th>G 0</th>
<th>G 1</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>6</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>7</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>8</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>9</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>10</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>11</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>12</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>13</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>14</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>15</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>16</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>17</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>18</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>19</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>20</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>21</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>22</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>23</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>24</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>25</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>26</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>27</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Referring to Table 11, the following fantasias contain wolf intervals (part of an augmented triad unless otherwise noted):

**Fantasia 21**: m. 49

![Musical notation image](image-url)
Fantasia 25: m. 168

Fantasia 27: mm. 16, 44, 46

Fantasia 36: mm. 22 (diminished fourth), 57

Fantasia 42: m. 13

Fantasia 64: mm. 13, 21, 88
**Other problems and observations**

**Fantasia 9:** This fantasia contains five augmented seconds A♭-B (in place of minor thirds) in bars 6, 8, 10, 29, and 33. These are not considered to be wolves since they are close to small ratio 6:7 minor thirds.

**Fantasia 18:** There are two alternatives for this fantasia. If the acoustic tonality of B♭ (two tastini) is used then Ness' correction at bar 80 results in a wolf diminished fourth; there is no wolf in the original. There is an augmented second in bar 33 which is not a wolf. The second possibility is to use the acoustic tonality of F (with or without tastini), in which case there is a wolf diminished sixth in m. 65. This
may be acceptable since it is a passing note resolving to a B♭ major chord.

*Fantasia 27:* This fantasia is not in the acoustic tonality of B♭ but works on the lute because the C♯ needed in m. 75 fourth fret, third string is one of the “problem” notes.

*Fantasia 77:* This works in a hybrid tuning: use the acoustic tonality of G major with a tastino on the third fret, but put the eighth fret where it is in the acoustic tonality of C major.

This leaves three fantasies with problems, all involving the fourth fret on the third course. All are in the acoustic tonality of B♭ and when two tastini are used there are wolf chords:

*Fantasia 24:* 13 wolf chords.

*Fantasia 49:* 2 wolf chords.

*Fantasia 66:* 14 wolf chords.

These are all problems of the second type and require the solution discussed above (a tastino at the fourth fret, third course, on the bridge side of the fret.)

We see that by far the greatest number of fantasies (81) can be played in the acoustic tonality of B♭ with two tastini. If we add to these the fantasies 18, 24, 49, and 66 (requiring a tastino on the bridge side of the fret), we see that 85 of the 92 can be played in this configuration. If we make the assumption that Francesco’s lutes were all put into the acoustic tonality of C major, this forces us to conclude that his favorite lute by far was the A lute. All but one of the remaining fantasies can be played in both the acoustic tonalities of C and G, corresponding to the G lute and the C lute respectively. The remaining fantasia is number 77 which requires the hybrid C-G tuning.
Concluding remarks

Octaves and unisons are never tempered: an octave or unison which deviates from just by any amount is considered a wolf and is not acceptable. This fact alone almost guarantees that some kind of meantone was used on the lute, regardless of how the tuning of the courses or placing of the frets was originally done. Minor adjustments made by the player to improve the tuning of the octaves discussed at the beginning of this paper necessarily move the lute towards a regular meantone.

All but a very few of the pieces studied here can be played in meantone on a G-lute set in the acoustic tonality of either C or B♭. I suspect that this indicates not that two acoustic tonalities were used, but rather there were two lutes: a G-lute and an A-lute, both in the acoustic tonality of C. It seems desirable for modern lutenists to own at least one of each of these instruments.

In practical terms for the modern lutenist with only one lute, it is possible to set the lute in meantone and play all the pieces which require no tastini simply by moving the first and sixth frets to the appropriate position. While this is fine for the lutenist who just wants to try meantone, it quickly becomes too restricting and tastini must be added. All the tastini for both the acoustic tonalities of B♭ and C major can be placed on one lute. It is then possible to play any piece in those acoustic tonalities by moving the first and sixth frets as appropriate and by carefully placing the fingers of the left hand. For example, to play the A♭ on the fourth course in the acoustic tonality of B♭, the finger would have to be placed between the tastino (required for C) and the third fret. (This is not an historically correct solution to the problem.)

Equal temperament has the advantage of eliminating all wolves. This is also a disadvantage. Great composers have always found ways of exploiting the weaknesses of their instruments and turning them into strengths. Wolves can be used for expressive purposes and add extra tension to a chord. The musical examples given above show that wolves
are not always bad. Our present relationship to the music may be similar to the early revivers of Purcell. They decided that the false relations which we hear as adding piquancy to the music were mistakes to be corrected. We tend to hear wolves as mistakes to be corrected. We may also be throwing away much which adds to the beauty of the instrument and its repertoire.
Appendix 1

Beat Speeds for the Major Thirds Between the Third and Fourth Courses for Several Regular Meantone and Well Temperaments.

People who tune keyboard instruments generally judge how far an interval is out of tune by listening to beats. The following table lists beat frequencies for the major third between the third and fourth courses, F to A for a G lute or G to B for an A lute, for sizes major thirds found in various meantone temperaments. These are intended as a guide for setting the initial major third in the tuning instructions. Negative beat speeds indicate that the interval is tuned narrow; positive beat speeds indicate that the interval is wide. The first nine are considered to be meantone temperaments, the next three are well temperaments, and the 1/12 diatonic comma temperament is equal temperament.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Temperament</th>
<th>F to A</th>
<th>G to B</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1/3 syntonic comma</td>
<td>-3.62</td>
<td>-4.04</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3/10 syntonic comma</td>
<td>-2.17</td>
<td>-2.43</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1/8 Harrison comma</td>
<td>-1.95</td>
<td>-2.17</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2/7 syntonic comma</td>
<td>-1.55</td>
<td>-1.73</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1/4 syntonic comma</td>
<td>0.00</td>
<td>0.00</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2/9 syntonic comma</td>
<td>1.21</td>
<td>1.35</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1/5 syntonic comma</td>
<td>2.17</td>
<td>2.43</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1/6 syntonic comma</td>
<td>3.63</td>
<td>4.06</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1/7 syntonic comma</td>
<td>4.66</td>
<td>5.23</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1/8 syntonic comma</td>
<td>5.44</td>
<td>6.10</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1/9 syntonic comma</td>
<td>6.05</td>
<td>6.78</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1/10 syntonic comma</td>
<td>6.53</td>
<td>7.33</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1/12 ditonic comma</td>
<td>6.93</td>
<td>7.78</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Pythagorean</td>
<td>10.90</td>
<td>12.26</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Table 13: Beat frequencies for F to A major thirds in 14 temperaments
Appendix 2
Theoretical Placement of Frets.

For those wishing to check the fret spacings which result from the tuning procedure outlined in this paper, the following table gives the theoretical distances from the nut to the frets for the 1/8 Harrison comma, the Zarlino 2/7 syntonic comma, the Aron 1/4 syntonic comma, and the Ramarin-Beer 1/6 syntonic comma meantone temperaments. The distances are given as a fraction of string length; to get the distances for your lute, multiply by its string length. The table is constructed for a G lute, but the numbers are the same for all the Renaissance lutes.
The meantone temperaments listed here have the following characteristics:

1/8 Harrison comma meantone: Rhythmically harmonious major triads but rough minor triads

Zarlino 2/7 syntonic comma meantone: Rhythmically harmonious minor triads but rough major triads

Aron 1/4 syntonic comma meantone: Pure major thirds; the smallest number of total beat speeds for the musically usable major and minor triads. This is the most frequently used meantone.

Ramarin-Beer 1/6 syntonic comma meantone: an “average” meantone, half way between the Aron 1/4 syntonic comma meantone and well temperaments.

For those wishing to calculate distances for the other meantones, the following method was used: let \( p \) be the ratio of the frequencies of the fifth in the given meantone. For example, \( p = \frac{3}{4} \sqrt[80]{81} \) for the Aron syntonic comma meantone temperament. A chromatic semitone is \( c = \frac{p^7}{16} \)
and a diatonic semitone is given by $d = \frac{8}{p^5}$. Entries in the table are given by $1 - \frac{1}{c^m d^n}$ where $m =$ number of chromatic semitones and $n =$ number of diatonic semitones.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>1/8 Harrison</th>
<th>2/7 syntonic</th>
<th>1/4 syntonic</th>
<th>1/6 syntonic</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>G</td>
<td>0.000000</td>
<td>0.000000</td>
<td>0.000000</td>
<td>0.000000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>G♯</td>
<td>0.039239</td>
<td>0.040000</td>
<td>0.042977</td>
<td>0.049887</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>A♭</td>
<td>0.068005</td>
<td>0.067478</td>
<td>0.065407</td>
<td>0.060557</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>A</td>
<td>0.104576</td>
<td>0.104779</td>
<td>0.105573</td>
<td>0.107423</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>A♯</td>
<td>0.139712</td>
<td>0.140588</td>
<td>0.144012</td>
<td>0.151951</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>B♭</td>
<td>0.165470</td>
<td>0.165186</td>
<td>0.164075</td>
<td>0.161475</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>B</td>
<td>0.198216</td>
<td>0.198579</td>
<td>0.200000</td>
<td>0.203306</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>C</td>
<td>0.252742</td>
<td>0.252657</td>
<td>0.252326</td>
<td>0.251551</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>C♯</td>
<td>0.282064</td>
<td>0.282551</td>
<td>0.284458</td>
<td>0.288889</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>D♭</td>
<td>0.303559</td>
<td>0.303086</td>
<td>0.301229</td>
<td>0.296875</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>D</td>
<td>0.330887</td>
<td>0.330963</td>
<td>0.331260</td>
<td>0.331952</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>D♯</td>
<td>0.357143</td>
<td>0.357724</td>
<td>0.360000</td>
<td>0.365278</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>E♭</td>
<td>0.376390</td>
<td>0.376108</td>
<td>0.375000</td>
<td>0.372407</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>E</td>
<td>0.400861</td>
<td>0.401064</td>
<td>0.401860</td>
<td>0.403715</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>F</td>
<td>0.441605</td>
<td>0.441478</td>
<td>0.440983</td>
<td>0.439824</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>F♯</td>
<td>0.463516</td>
<td>0.463820</td>
<td>0.465008</td>
<td>0.467769</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>G♭</td>
<td>0.479579</td>
<td>0.479167</td>
<td>0.477547</td>
<td>0.473747</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>G</td>
<td>0.500000</td>
<td>0.500000</td>
<td>0.500000</td>
<td>0.500000</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Table 14: Nut to fret distances as a fraction of string length for various meantone temperaments
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A Monkey Business: Petrucci, Antico, and the Frottola Intabulation*

HIROYUKI MINAMINO

THE FRONTISPIECE OF Andrea Antico’s Frottole intabulate da sonare organi libro primo, published in Rome in 1517, depicts a man playing a harpsichord decorated with the arms of Leo X, while a female singer in the background holding a music book points to an ape with a lute crouching on top of the harpsichord (Plate 1). The depiction of a harpsichordist conforms with the instrumentation intended for Antico’s Frottole intabulate, a collection of twenty-six keyboard arrangements of pieces drawn mostly from his frottola publications. The woodcut, however, is not merely a depiction of actual performance practice but a symbolic mockery by Antico of Venetian publisher and rival, Ottaviano Petrucci.

Antico’s hostility towards Petrucci was acute from the beginning of Antico’s career as publisher, which began in 1510 when Antico published a collection of frottola, entitled Canzoni nove con alcune scelte de varii libri di canto. The collection was in direct competition with Petrucci but also, somewhat paradoxically, indebted to Petrucci since about half of its contents were drawn from his books. Antico’s

---

*A version of this paper was presented at the South-Central Renaissance Conference, Austin, Texas, March 1997. I am indebted to Frederick Noad for his valuable suggestions.


challenge to Petrucci reached a climax in December 1516 when Petrucci's exclusive right to print keyboard tablature for fifteen years, given to him in October 1513, was revoked. Leo X transferred the privilege to Antico, the main reason for the transfer being Petrucci's failure to print such music. Leo X may have suspected that Petrucci's method of printing was ill-suited for organ tablature, for Petrucci did not produce any keyboard publications even after he obtained from the Signory of Venice in 1498 a privilege that guaranteed an exclusive right to print organ tablature for twenty years.\(^3\) Political considerations on the part of Leo X may also have played an important role in the decision, for Petrucci's main business interests had been in the Venetian dominions (he moved to Fossombrone in 1511), while Antico had been active in the Papal states since 1510. No doubt, favoritism was also a factor, for a papal privilege of 1516 addressed Antico as "our beloved son Andreas Antiquus de Montona, cleric of the diocese of Parenzo now living in Rome."\(^4\) The negotiation between Antico and Leo X for the transfer of Petrucci's privilege was pressed to proceed because the *Frottola intabulate* had already been prepared for publication. A passage in the 1517 privilege confirms this: "You [Antico], by your method, have first executed and will soon publish organ tablatures, a work both useful and necessary for all who delight in this kind of art,

---


which is new and never before printed.”5 Less than a month after the expiration of Petrucci’s privilege, Antico issued the

Frottole intabulate, which became the first publication of Italian keyboard music notated in keyboard tablature.6

The woodcut in the Frottole intabulate is Antico’s advertisement of his success in publishing keyboard music, which Petrucci had failed to do. Antico expresses his superiority over Petrucci and symbolically mocks him with the illustration that utilizes some well-known allegorical allusions. Indeed, Renaissance readers would have easily understood Antico’s unsubtle and mocking intention in depicting the lutenist as an ape.7 Moreover, the keyboard player’s poised and dignified appearance is contrasted with the bestial look of the lutenist, evidence, perhaps of the suggestion that the harpsichordist is a resemblance of Antico.

5 For the translation see idem., The Motet Books of Andrea Antico, p. 3.
7 The depiction of an ape in the title page of a music publication to insult the rival publisher became a known practice in the sixteenth century. In the motet collection of 1539, for instance, Buglhat mocks Antonio Gardano’s motet collection of 1538. Gardano responded by issuing a motet collection whose title page contains a woodcut depicting a lion (Gardano’s new printer’s mark—the lion stood for St. Mark and was thus a personification of Venice) attacking an ape. See Mary S. Lewis, Antonio Gardano, Venetian Music Printer, 1538-1569: A Descriptive Bibliography and Historical Study (New York: Garland, 1988), p. 31.
and that the ape-lutenist is meant to be a portrait of Petrucci.\(^8\)

The symbolism of the ape was always negative, though its connotation had changed through the centuries.\(^9\) In the early Middle Ages the ape was a personification of the devil and a signifier of heresy and paganism. Later in the Gothic era an ape with an apple in its mouth came to signify the Fall. In Christian art of the late Middle Ages and the Renaissance, the ape symbolized sin, malice, cunning, and lust. The animal also epitomized the slothful soul of man as well as a distorted, degraded image of humanity. The ape denoted a sycophant, a trickster, a person of grotesque ugliness or excessively low morality. Furthermore, the ape betokened the attempt to imitate a noble ideal in vulgar and unworthy fashion. Therefore, the ape became a symbol of the art of painting and its executant, the artist. The artist’s skill was regarded as essentially (and epigonically) imitative, for the Creator was the only one who could create authentically. The ape’s symbolic linkage with the artist was summed up in a popular jingle “Ars simia Naturae” (“Art is the ape of nature”). Artists often portrayed themselves as apes in the act of painting, playing cards or musical instruments thus satirizing their own pretentiousness, folly, and vanity.

The female singer depicted in the frontispiece of Antico’s *Frottole intabulate* is not a mere mortal performer but a personification of Lady Music. Through antiquity, the Middle Ages, and the Renaissance, the seven liberal arts provided the cornerstone for education\(^10\) since they were a means of promoting human values. The seven liberal arts were divided into two disciplines, the *trivium* and the *quadrivium*. While the *trivium* comprised the linguistic arts of grammar, logic (or dialectic) and rhetoric, the *quadrivium*

---

8 Picker, *The Motet Books of Andrea Antico*, p. 3.
Petrucci, Antico, and Frottola Intabulation

consisted of the mathematical disciplines: arithmetic, geometry, astronomy, and music. Music dealt primarily with the harmonic proportions, and the mathematical proportions governing the numerical ratios of the musical notes, or as Cassiodorus comments: "Music is the discipline which treats of numbers in their relation to those things which are found in sounds."11

In the illustrations and paintings of the Middle Ages and the Renaissance, the seven liberal arts were often personified, according to their attributes. As early as the fifth century, Martianus Capella in his allegory, The Marriage of Mercury and Philology, figures Music in female form.12 The allegory represents the union of learning and eloquence through a symbolic wedding attended by gods and the ladies representing the seven liberal arts. Capella describes Music as having brought several musical instruments to the event, part of a traditional iconographic practice in the Renaissance. One of the fourteenth-century manuscripts that illustrates the seven liberal arts, for instance, depicts Lady Music in the act of tuning the lute and holding a gittern on her lap.13 She tunes the lute by singing the six solmization syllables of the hexachord—ut, re, mi, fa, sol, and la. Lady Music is accompanied by the Biblical figure Tubal who hammers on an anvil. This iconographical scheme alludes to the three-fold division of

musical sound: *musica harmonica, musica organica, and musica rhythmica.*

In the Renaissance, the lute was the most favored domestic musical instrument played by both professional musicians and amateur *dillettanti.* The dominant position the lute held during the early sixteenth century is documented from various aspects of secular life: the literary sources that praise the lute and its virtuosi, the court account books recording the salary of professional lutenists, the references to lute lessons taken by amateur *dillettanti,* and a number of extant printed and manuscript sources. Painters favored depicting the lute in the hands of saints and angels, princes and courtiers, clergy and merchants, courtesans and beggars, as well as professional musicians. The instrument was sometimes chosen to convey the symbolism associated with both cosmic harmony and earthly pleasures. Indeed, the lute became Lady Music’s chosen instrument in Renaissance iconography. In an illustration in Martin Agricola’s treatise on musical instruments, *Musica instrumentalis deutsch,* published in Wittenberg in 1529, for instance, a female figure is depicted playing a lute, surrounded by a viol, a harp, flutes, and a string keyboard instrument. The inscription “fraw musica” attached above the illustration reveals her identity.

Given the cultural context I have briefly mapped here, the ape holding a lute in the Antico frontispiece symbolizes

---

14 Boethius, a near contemporary of Cassiodorus, made the threefold division of his musical universe: *musica mundana* ("the harmony of the world"); *musica humana* ("the harmony of the body"); and *musica instrumentalis* ("the harmony of instruments"). St. Augustine’s threefold division of music in his *De ordine* was taken over by Isidore of Seville in his *Sententiae de musica*; see Brown, "St. Augustine, Lady Music, and the Gittern," p. 27.

an imitation of a noble subject in a vulgar and unworthy fashion. This is why Lady Music points her finger at or almost pokes the ape-lutenist’s head with an accusatory gesture, while the animal’s facial expression appears to be that of anger, annoyance, or dismay. She is accusing the animal of incompetency in music, both because it lacks practical skills in lute-playing and because of its illiteracy in theoretical matters. Antico’s fellow musicians and customers were well aware of the concept of the social hierarchy thought to exist among several types of musicians. Musical theorists considered themselves to be located at the top of the hierarchical ladder because of their self-acclaimed superior knowledge of the theory of music, the subject they regarded as foundational. Practitioners of the art were regarded as inferior, instrumentalists being the lowest in rank. Guido d’Arezzo’s prosaic poems made popular among Renaissance theorists the hierarchy of musicians: “Musicorum et cantorum magna est distantia, isti dicunt, illi scient, quae componit Musica” (“There is a great difference between musicians and singers. These merely perform; those know what music is.”)\textsuperscript{16} The theorists’ understanding of (and attitude towards) the intelligence of practical musicians may have been based not only on their snobbery over them but also on their observation of instrumentalists’ dependency on practical rather than theoretical knowledge.

Hence, it was not a mistake or a mere fancy on the part of the engraver to depict the ape with a lute, but rather a calculated decision on the part of Antico to mock another of Petrucci’s publications, particularly the last two books of his

lute series, the frottola arrangements for voice and lute. Petrucci published Franciscus Bossinensis's two volumes of lute books, entitled *Tenori e contrabassi intabulati col sopran in canto figurato per cantar e sonar col lauto libro primo*, in Venice in 1509 and the *libro secondo* in Fossombrone in 1511. The title may roughly be rendered thus: "The Tenor and the Bassus parts of the frottole are intabulated to be played on the lute, while the Superius part, notated in mensural notation, is to be sung." Bossinensis proudly announced in the dedication in the *libro primo* that his publication was "rare and new." The claim that these books were novel innovations is legitimate. There is no extant printed source for instrumental arrangements of frottole until Antico published his *Frottole intabulate* in 1517. Antico's knowledge of this is the reason Bossinensis's lute books became the target of his mockery.

The putative inferiority of Bossinensis's lute books, symbolically expressed by Antico, refers not only to the medium of performance (solo keyboard versus ensemble of

17 Franciscus Bossinensis, *Tenori e contrabassi intabulati col sopran in canto figurato per cantar e sonar col lauto libro primo* (Venice, 1509); and idem., *Tenori e contrabassi intabulati col sopran in canto figurato per cantar e sonar col lauto libro secondo* (Fossombrone, 1511); facsimile edition of both volumes by Minkoff (Geneva, 1978 and 1983). For the modern transcriptions of the entire works, see Benvenuto Disertori, *Le Frottole per canto e liuto intabulate da Franciscus Bossinensis* (Milan: Ricordi, 1964).


voice and lute) but also to the skill in arranging vocal music, especially the intabulation techniques used in the lute accompaniment. Antico's keyboard arrangements are four-voiced versions with idiomantic instrumental features including the abundant use of ornaments and figurations. Antico treats the Superius of the vocal model much more freely than does Bossinensis—some of his Superius ornaments are not simple, fill-in ornaments but significant vehicles for changing the original melodic contour while adhering to the counterpoint of the lower three voices. On the other hand, although Bossinensis's arrangement retains the Superius intact (the part supposed to be sung by Lady Music), the accompaniment (the part intended for the simian) is a quasi-literal intabulation of the Tenor and Bassus with no elaborate ornaments, omitting the Altus altogether.

If Antico mocked Bossinensis's lute-song arrangements of the frottola published by Petrucci, there was a curious development a few years later. Antico published a collection of arrangements of frottola for voice and lute, Frottola de messer Bortolomeo [sic] Tromboncino & de messer Marchetto Cara con Tenori & Bassi tabulati & con soprani in canto figurato per cantar & sonar col lauto, in Venice in about 1520. Not only does the format replicate Bossinensis's

---

20 Seven pieces are transcribed in Disertori, Le Frottole, pp. 271-302. Three of Antico's keyboard versions are compared with the vocal originals and Bossinensis's intabulations; see ibid., pp. 271-89.

21 For Bossinensis's intabulation techniques, see ibid., pp. 89-99; and idem., “Contradiction tonale dans la transcription d'un 'strambotto' célèbre: 'Amando e Desiando' de Benedetto Cariteo, transcrit par Franciscus Bossinensis,” in Le luth et sa musique, edited by Jean Jacquot, reprint ed. (Paris: Centre National de la Recherche Scientifique, 1976), pp. 37-42. The intabulation of O mia ciecha e dura sorte in Bossinensis's first book (ff. 19-20) is in three voices up to the middle of the arrangement and then reduced to two voices for the rest.

22 Andrea Antico, Frottola de messer Bortolomeo [sic] Tromboncino & de messer Marchetto Cara con Tenori & Bassi tabulati & con soprani in canto figurato per cantar & sonar col lauto (Venice, c. 1520). For the volume, see Francesco Luisi, “Le frottole per canto e liuto di B. Tromboncino e M. Cara nella edizione adespota di Andrea Antico,” Nuova rivista musicale italiana 10 (1976), pp. 211-58. For facsimiles and transcriptions of several pieces, see idem., Frottole di B. Tromboncino e M. Cara 'per cantar et sonar col lauto' (Rome: Edizioni Torre
books but also the title is similar. Even the instructions for the lute headed “Regula per quelli che non sanno cantare” included in the volume are a revision of Petrucci’s “Regola per quelli che non sanno cantare” found in all of his lute books.\(^23\) Some of the spelling in Antico’s book differs only slightly from Petrucci’s but otherwise the two versions are almost identical. Considering that there were only several years between Bossinensis’s \textit{libro secondo} and Antico’s \textit{Tenori e contrabassi intabulati}, Bossinensis is the most likely source for Antico. Thus, Antico was in another competition with Petrucci, who ceased his publication of lute music after Bossinensis’s \textit{libro secondo}, by using, somewhat ironically, the exact format he had earlier denigrated through his portrayal of Petrucci as an ape.
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 Appropriately balancing the commemoration last year of the death of Johannes Ockeghem in 1497, was the international conference held in Milan celebrating the birth of Francesco da Milano (1497-1543). It was one of the most important Italian musicological conferences of 1997. Where Ockeghem was perhaps the great summation of the important fifteenth-century Burgundian School that laid the foundations of the Renaissance polyphonic style, Francesco was part of the transformation of that style during the High Italian Renaissance, when Northern and Italian styles merged, and in the hands of Francesco resulted in an autonomous instrumental idiom. He was the first Italian-born composer of the Renaissance to achieve international fame, and his music circulated in manuscript and print throughout Europe and England for almost 100 years. Born in Vimercate (a suburb of Monza, itself a suburb of Milan) in August, 1497, most of Francesco's career was spent in Rome, where he was lutenist to the popes Leo X, Clement VII, and Paul III, as well for the cardinals Ippolito de' Medici and Alessandro Farnese. By the time of his death in 1543 was considered as one of the greatest musicians of his time, which is attested to by numerous documents, letters, and accounts of his playing. Around 124 works from
Francesco’s hand are known to us, comprising fantasias, ricercars, and intabulations, in addition to many parodies of his works by other composers. An inscription in the Milanese church of S. Maria della Scala, which was destroyed in eighteenth century to make way for the famous opera house that bears its name, remembers Francesco, who was perhaps buried there. Appropriately, thanks to the organizers, the symposium brought together the major Francesco scholars in the field in order to present and discuss (and hear) the latest findings on the music and the life of “Il Divino.”

Arthur J. Ness’s now-famous edition of Francesco’s music has been indispensable to every performer and scholar interested in Francesco’s music for nearly the last thirty years. The edition was widely acclaimed for the balance it struck between providing an excellent, readable musical text, and its uncompromising scholarly rigor. Its bibliographical apparatus alone listed much valuable information about sources which were, in 1970, almost completely unknown. It was only to be expected that after three decades and a lute revival, many new sources and a few unique pieces have been discovered, such as those in the manuscript hidden in the Duomo of Castelfranco, in the now-catalogued lute manuscripts of the seicento, and in the ex-Berlin manuscripts, thought to have been destroyed during WWII, but rediscovered some years ago in Krakow.

---

In his paper, "The Sources of Francesco da Milano's Music," Ness discussed these and other discoveries, and spoke of some of the new editorial procedures that will guide the new critical edition of Francesco's complete works he is preparing.

H. Colin Slim, the author of the first major, in-depth study of Francesco,\(^5\) is perhaps the leading expert on musical inscriptions in Renaissance art—that is, paintings in which identifiable and/or accurate musical notation was included by the artist. In his paper, "Bartolomeo Veneto (ca. 1480-1531), pictoris mediolanensis: Copies of the Brera Lady Lutenist," he spoke about the numerous copies made of Bartolomeo Veneto's Lady Lutenist now housed at Milan's Brera Museum, which might have been painted during Francesco's youth. Slim has found twenty-six copies of this beautiful painting (the existence of yet another one in a church in Milan was signaled during the discussion by Prof. Elena Ferrari Barassi, in attendance), which sometimes transformed the unknown sitter into a saint (possibly St. Cecilia or St. Catherine of Alexandria), or other times added angels at her sides. The painting shows a music book in front of the lady lutenist, which contains a short, but complete and readable three-part untexted composition for cantus, tenor, and bassus. Slim showed that the music inscribed here is a simple dance arrangement, whose musical characteristics bring us back to the beginning of the sixteenth century, if not earlier. The large number of copies made of this painting in Milan offers more evidence of the importance of the lute and of music in the city then ruled by the Sforza dynasty.

The question, "why a symposium on Francesco da Milano" was asked, rhetorically, by Franco Pavan, the leading biographical scholar of Francesco whose initiative it was to convene the conference. Pavan, a lutenist and a doctoral student in musicology at the University of Milan, has spent more than a decade exploring archives both in

---

Italy and abroad for information about the composer. In his paper, “Francesco da Milano between Milan and Rome: The Current State of Francesco Research,” he surveyed recent discoveries made by himself and others regarding the life of Francesco and of his family, as well as on lute-related activity in Milan and Rome from ca. 1500-1540. Among other things, Pavan demonstrated that the “Lombardy” school of lutenists of the beginning of the sixteenth-century, which has often been hypothesized by scholars who supposed that Francesco Canova was its most important exponent, never actually existed. Instead, Rome (and not even Venice) was the most important center of lute activity in that period, thanks to important patrons of the arts in the Eternal City who created private chapels with a particular emphasis on instrumental music.

Francesco spent most of his career in Rome, a period for which we possess much information. However, for other periods of his life (especially during his youth) we have no documentary evidence whatsoever. In his paper “Francesco da Milano in Naples,” Dinko Fabris advanced a most intriguing hypothesis when he revealed that between 1512 and 1518 there are traces of a “D. Francisco de Milano” among the clerics at a church in Barletta, a small town near Bari in the south of Italy, which was under the authority of a bishop from Pavia (not far from Milano), Giovanni Maria Ciocchi Dalmonte, the future pope Julius III. Could “D. Francisco de Milano” have been our lutenist? In fact, Francesco Canova began his career as a cleric and remained in contact with the church throughout his life, even after quitting his religious orders and giving his ecclesiastical benefits over to his brother, Bernardino (presumably in

---

order to marry, a few years later, a rich and noble Milanese
woman, and leave an heir to the Canova fortune).

William Prizer’s paper, “Secular Music in Milan at the
Beginning of the Sixteenth Century: Florence, MS. Basevi
2441,” dwelt on the musical milieu in which Francesco
might have taken his first steps. According to Prizer, Basevi
2441 was probably written in Milan during the second
decade of the sixteenth century. It contains secular vocal
music and documents the interest in love songs of the young
noblemen and courtiers of the city, one of whom was
Massimiliano Sforza, known for his hedonistic nocturnal
diversions.

The contribution by Henri Vanhulst, “The Music of
Francesco da Milano published by Pierre Phalèse between
1546 and 1571,” illuminated the print culture of print
technology, audience, and distribution in the publications of
one of the most important printers of the Renaissance.
Francesco’s music had an extraordinarily wide diffusion, not
only in Italy but also abroad. When one lists all the
publications containing his music and divides them by
countries, it is immediately evident that two countries were
particularly important for him: Italy, of course, and the Low
Countries. But while the publications in Italy are divided
among four cities, the northern European prints that
appeared between 1546 and 1573 were largely the work of
the prolific editor Pierre Phalèse, who printed an enormous
quantity of music of all kinds that was especially sought
after by the cultured public of the University.

Francesco’s heritage was also at the center of another
interesting paper, Philippe Canguilhem’s “Francesco da
Milano as seen by Vincenzo Galilei” in which Canguilhem
analyzed the passages dedicated to the “Milanese” by
Vincenzo Galilei in his famous treatise, Il Fronimo. Galilei
wanted to teach lutenists how to intabulate vocal pieces for
the lute, and held up Francesco as the ideal model to
emulate, since he had been “eccellentissimo” in this art, and
demonstrated a profound knowledge of the rules of music.
Galilei, “following the examples of such a great man” [dagli
essempi di si grand'huomo mosso], also used Francesco's "method" of intabulating. Canguilhem showed that in Florence, thanks to Galilei, Francesco was remembered after his death not simply as a legendary performer, but as a musician, and that his music had a large influence on lutenists of the following generations.

Victor Coelho brought this idea to its extreme consequences in his paper, "The Reputation of Francesco da Milano: Historiography, Revival, and La Compagna." At first, he created a parallel between the transmission of a composer's style through concordances, and the evolving images of an iconographical tradition, using as an example the transformations of Leonardo da Vinci's self-portrait. Then, rather provocatively, Coelho proposed that one of the best known of Francesco's pieces today, Fantasia 34 (La compagna), which was never printed, appears only in posthumous manuscripts after 1570, and is unattributed in most of them, might actually be the result of an imitation of his style by an unknown later composer.7 A very vivacious and stimulating debate between Christopher Wilson and Coelho was inevitable at this point.

Francesco was undoubtedly one of the most illustrious musicians of the Renaissance, and so it is highly probable that he was celebrated in paint. My own contribution, "Images of Francesco da Milano," considered possible representations of Francesco and the circumstances in which they might have been commissioned. Only one portrait of Francesco survives that can be considered to represent him with any degree of probability. The portrait is one that was collected by the famous sixteenth-century cardinal, Federico Borromeo, for his gallery of famous men in the Ambrosiana Library in Milan, and is probably a copy made from a lost original. In my talk, I compared the Ambrosiana panel to the Lute Player at the Como Museum, which was

7 This was suggested in an earlier study by Coelho, "The Reputation of Francesco da Milano (1497-1543) and the Ricercars in the Cavalcanti Lute Book," Revue Belge de Musicologie 50 (1996), pp. 49-72.
discovered a few years ago. My research into the provenance of this beautiful painting, attributed to Giulio Campi, led me to the noble Milanese Parravicini family. Also, there are others images which could be, or could derive from, portraits of Francesco. Among these I found two small anonymous paintings now in Bourges to be particularly interesting. A man who looks very much like the musician in the Ambrosiana and the Como portraits is shown playing the lute and singing in the company of three women. Since the name of Francesco da Milano was a symbol of the lute perhaps his image, too, became a sort of icon of the ideal lutenist and performing musician.

Why Francesco? Perhaps the best response to Pavan’s question was provided by the huge audience of almost 500 people at the concert of Francesco’s music performed by lutenist Paul Beier on the first night of the symposium, and appropriately held at the Basilica dei SS. Apostoli e San Nazaro Maggiore, where Francesco himself was a canon. The concert was a logical and indispensable component of the conference: musicology has meaning when it allows us to discover and, above all, experience the music of the past. All the pieces in the concert program were taken from the Intavolatura di Liuto del Divino Francesco da Milano, probably the first publication dedicated to Francesco’s music (it precedes those of Marcolini, Casteliono and Sultzbachius) and included works that must have been particularly loved by Francesco’s contemporaries. Mr. Beier, at ease with this difficult repertoire, played with great originality of interpretation and style, cleverly linking the pieces within a set with cadential formulas. The sound of his

lute (especially built for this concert by Klaus Jacobsen and based on the engraving of the lutenist in the Marcolini print), entirely strung in gut, resounded clearly throughout the large basilica. The large and diverse public was enthusiastic about a repertory that revealed itself to be both contemporary and fascinating.

Far from being a sterile succession of monologues, the Francesco symposium was characterized by lively participation and a profitable exchange of ideas. Our knowledge of Francesco da Milano and his time has most definitely been enriched. In the spirit of the conference and concert, plans are now underway to coordinate the publication of the conference proceedings with the appearance of Arthur Ness’s revised edition of the music.

MILAN, ITALY
(translated by Paul Beier)
In Small Proportions
A Poetics of the English Ayre, 1596-1622
Daniel Fischlin

"This most impressive book is the first systematic study of the English solo song in which musicological and rhetorical concerns are related through the more legitimate concerns of contemporary literary theory ... Professor Fischlin has made a splendid contribution to critical discourse generally, and particularly to a realm of theory which for some decades has slighted, if not suppressed, the matter of voice, whether singing or speaking."
—John Hollander, Sterling Professor of English, Yale University

"Daniel Fischlin's study of the English Ayre is a remarkable combination of old-fashioned depth of learning and up-to-date conceptual refinement ... The book will be indispensable, not only to students of the English lyric, but also to anyone who wants to perform or hear the musical settings of the Ayres with real understanding."
—Lawrence Kramer, Fordham University
