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EDITOR'S INTRODUCTION

In this issue we conclude the two-part series on the two Roman Cavalieri del liuto, one of whom was the famous Lorenzino, by Mariagrazia Carlone. Her contribution on the musical sources, translated by her husband Paul Beier, is supplemented by stylistic commentary by Mr. Beier.

Mariagrazia Carlone is known to members of the Lute Society of America through her lecture at an LSA summer seminar in 2004 and her article on Francesco da Milano in Volume XXXIV of this Journal. A former lutenist, she specializes in music iconography and historical research. Her publications include many articles and the book Iconografia musicale nell'arte biettese, vercellese e valsesiana (Rome 1995; Società Italiana di Musicologia). She is currently an archivist at the State Archive in Milan.

The American lutenist Paul Beier graduated from the Royal College of Music, London, where he studied with Diana Poulton. He has performed on four continents with a solo repertoire extending from the early Sixteenth Century to the music of Bach and Weiss. Founder and director of Galatea, he has taken part in productions of early opera in theaters such as La Scala. In 1981 he was invited to create the lute program at the Civica Scuola di Musica in Milan, Italy, where he now lives and teaches. He is founding member of the Italian Lute Society and a consulting editor of the Journal of the Lute Society of America.

In reviews by luthier and LSA director Daniel Larson and this editor, this issue of JLSA also welcomes two new museum catalogs partly or completely devoted to lutes.

—Douglas Alton Smith
The Knights of the Lute: Musical Sources
by Mariagrazia Carlone

III
Musical Sources

III.a. Comments on the Musical Sources

As far as is known, no autographic manuscript sources survive for either Lorenzino or Vincenzo Pinti, and it seems that neither of them were personally involved with the promotion of their music in printed publications. Nevertheless, there is a substantial body of work attributed to Lorenzino and to one “Cavaliere del Liuto”. A large part of this repertoire was printed in the well-known Thesaurus Harmonicus of Jean Baptiste Besard (BESARD 1), published in 1603, but works by the two lutenists are also found in seven other printed collections and twenty-six manuscripts. They are listed alphabetically in Section III.b.

These sources were produced in vastly different locations throughout the European continent, from Italy, Germany, France and the British Isles, confirming the depth and longevity of the fame and renown of both musicians. Characters such as Ernst Schele, who travelled widely throughout Germany and Italy collecting everything that they could gather into private anthologies played an important part in stimulating what must have been an intense traffic of musical dissemination at an international level. Naturally, the role of printed books, foremost among them the Thesaurus Harmonicus (the “treasure” of music by Lorenzino) must have been fundamental: certainly someone like Besard, who proudly proclaimed himself a student of Lorenzino and who became in his turn a master and teacher, was interested in propagating not just the theoretical teachings of his master, which he condensed into the didactic treatise De modo in testudine studendi libellus, but also his musical compositions, distributing them to his students.

1 Labels for musical sources refer to Section III.b; those for individual works refer to Section III.c
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Figure 1 — DONAUESCHINGEN, beginning of the piece n. 76

The manuscript DONAUESCHINGEN (1580 c.-1595) seems to be the earliest source, or at least among the earliest to contain compositions explicitly attributed to Lorenzino. The second of the two Lorenzino works included here, however (n. 76), contains a double attribution: “Fantasia di M. Lorenzino Romanese / Capriccio del Sr Santino da Parma / Kowalis [=Knight] Lorentio”. The last two words were written in Hebrew (as with other inscriptions in the course of the manuscript; the reason for the use of the Hebraic alphabet in this manuscript has yet to be ascertained).

Four slightly later manuscripts are DEN HAAG, ROMA, KRAKAU 2 and BASEL: the first three were compiled in Italy, the fourth probably in Basel. DEN HAAG, the so-called “Siena Lute Book”, is one of the most important sources of lute music compiled in the late 16th Century (c. 1590), and it contains one fantasia, anonymous in this source, that can be traced to Lorenzino.2 The manuscript at the Biblioteca Angelica in Rome (ROMA; 1590 – c.1615/1620) comes from the collection of Camillo Massimo, cousin of Vincenzo Giustiniani, and bears a dedication reading “To my most Illustrious lord, the right worshipful Signor Vincenzo Giustiniani Marchese of Bassano”.3 Victor Coelho has suggested that this book, which probably has a didactic orientation, contains a possibly “direct” influence by Lorenzino,4 but unfortunately also in this case only one work (n. 80 (2)) can be identified as being related, albeit remotely, to a work attributed to our composer. KRAKAU 2, the so-called “Naples lute book”, once thought lost in World War II, resurfaced in the 1980’s at Cracow in Poland. It has been recently re-baptized the “Barbarino Manuscript” by Dinko Fabris and

2 This piece (n. 71 D) is the seventh among a group of 11 anonymous fantasias in DEN HAAG, fol. 72 r. All of these pieces are in a similar florid toccata-like style and most use seven courses, unusual for this source; none has other concordances except for the piece by Lorenzino. The question arises as to whether the other 10 are also by Lorenzino.
3 “Al molto Illustissimo signore mio Osservandissimo il Signore / V[incenzo?] G[iustiniani] / M[archese?] d[i Bassano?].”
John Griffiths. The two scholars, who are preparing a critical edition of this manuscript, discovered the name of one "Jo. Barbarino" partially cancelled on the last page of the manuscript, ascertaining that this personage was a lutenist and castrato singer, thus a professional musician. Presumably the music contained here was his own repertoire, collected over a thirty year period (c. 1580-1611/1626) between Rome and Naples; the geographical and chronological discontinuities in the manuscript had previously led to the belief that it had been compiled by more than one person. Actually, it was written by a single scribe, whose handwriting varies considerably over time.\(^5\) KRAKAU 2 is one of the most important anthological sources of lute music; it contains a whopping nineteen works by Lorenzino, some of which are unique to this source, and it is still quite possible that some of the anonymous works in this text may eventually be attributed to Lorenzino or to Vincenzo Pinti (one of the composers included here is Jean de Macque, who, as we have seen, personally knew the "Cavaliere del liuto").\(^6\) BASEL was written by Emanuel Wurstisen, son of a famous Swiss mathematician, himself a physician and lutenist in Basel who graduated from the university of that city in 1596 (he is not known to have travelled to Italy). This source is a little disappointing: of the over five hundred compositions, only three can be attributed to Lorenzino and one to the "Eques Romanus".

From the last decade of the 16th Century come a small group of manuscripts produced in various parts of Europe: KRAKAU 1 in Cologne, CAMBRIDGE 1 probably in England, MONTRÉAL possibly in Lombardy, and VÉSOUL, whose provenance cannot be ascertained due to its loss during the Second World War. KRAKAU 1 is important not only for the quality of the music attributed, in this case, to "Eques Romanus", but also because one of the scribes of this source was probably Jean Baptiste Besard,\(^7\) who subsequently published in the same city (Cologne) his celebrated *Thesaurus Harmonicus* dedicated to Lorenzino, which includes one of the two works

\(^5\) This and the following information was delivered by John Griffiths on May 13, 2004 during the conference *Il manoscritto Barbarino, nuove tecniche, e nuove tecnologie per l'edizione della intavolatura di liuto* held by the University of Pavia, Dept. of Musicology, at Cremona. In a recent correspondence, Prof. Griffiths confirmed to me that "all the music and all the rubrics are by one compiler. The apparent differences in the handwriting come from the way this copyist's script changed during the long period (maybe 20–30 years) in which the manuscript was compiled."

\(^6\) See Section I.c.3, and Section II.b. n. 39.

\(^7\) KIRÁLY 1993: 63.
found in KRAKAU 1. MONTRÉAL was also compiled by more than one hand during a quite extensive span of time and probably with didactic intent. It contains just one galliard, anonymous (our n. 36), which is concordant with other testimony.

In 1598 Matthaeus Reymann published in Heidelberg his collection entitled *Noctes Musicae* (REYMANN). The opening work, *Preludij primi ad notam G sol re ut melos molle* (our n. 55 (2)) seems to have been inspired by a prelude traceable to the so-called “Cozens Lute Book” (CAMBRIDGE 1), which was probably compiled prior to Reymann’s publication, as well as to later sources, among which is the *Thesaurus Harmonicus*, in which it is ascribed to “Laurencini”. If this attribution is correct, the version by Reymann may have been conceived in homage to the recently deceased “maestro”.

From 1600 the anthologies containing at least one composition by Lorenzino and/or the Cavaliere are abundant. The *Thesaurus Harmonicus*, as we have seen, provides the richest testimony, although not all of its attributions can be considered trustworthy and in some cases they are definitely incorrect. For example, one of his “Laurencini” fantasies (n. 80 C), reprinted also by Robert Dowland (n. 80 D) with the descriptive title “Fantasie.4 Composed by the most famous and divine Laurencini of Rome” (and found anonymously in the COMO manuscript, n. 80 B), probably cannot be by Lorenzino. In fact, it was published nearly twenty years earlier by Vincenzo Galilei as *Ricercare a 4 di B. M.* (n. 80 A). To the various attempts to identify this “B.M.” (simply identified by Galilei as a “noble Florentine”), I would like to add here a new proposal: “B.M.” might stand for Bernardetto Medici, whose “infinite favors” (*infiniti benefitii*) Vincenzo Galilei acknowledges in the dedication of his first book of lute tablature to his son, Alessandro Medici. It does not seem possible, in any case, that

---

8 Observation by COELHO 1995: 105, on the basis of the presence of duets and annotations added throughout the manuscript.
9 This hypothesis does not necessarily imply a direct connection or student-teacher relationship between Reymann and Lorenzino. Reymann, born at Thorn (in present-day Poland), spent part of his youth in Bohemia in the service of the Czyklks brothers and graduated with a degree in law at Leipzig in 1582, after which he is found in Cologne in 1612 (see LOBAUGH 1968 and 2001 b). It is not known if he was ever in Italy or if he ever had occasion to meet Lorenzino, whose compositions were already widely circulated.
Lorenzino could be hiding behind the initials “B.M.”; on the other hand, it is quite possible that our lutenist may have made this work into one of his own work-horses, and that for this reason it was considered, by association, to be his own composition, and this would also explain the elevated number of concordances. Besard also ascribes to Lorenzino a Praeludium (n. 79 A) which appears as “Altro ricercare del primo tuono per [b-quadro]” in Vincenzo Galilei’s Fronimo (n. 79 B) and which seems to have been composed by Galilei himself.11 It is not known if Vincenzo Galilei ever met Lorenzino; on the other hand, it is probable that the latter possessed several compositions by Galilei, if not a copy of the Fronimo.12 Galilei himself certainly had contact

---

10 Bernardetto Medici (died after 1576), husband of Giulia Medici (who was the natural daughter of Alessandro, Duke of Urbino, 1519–1537), was a fervent patron of arts and letters. He is cited by, among others, Giorgio Vasari (Vite ..., passim), who describes him as an art collector and patron of artists, among whom he lists himself, and by Anton Francesco Grazzini “Il Lasca” (1504–1584) in his comedy La strega (1582): “nelle case dell’illustre signor Bernardetto de’ Medici, a un convito fatto da lui per onorare lo illustissimo ed eccellentissimo signor Don Francesco, allora Principe di Firenze e di Siena, ed al presente serenissimo Gran Duca di Toscana [...]” (“in the houses of the illustrious lord Bernardetto de’Medici, at a dinner given by him to honor the most illustrious and most excellent lord Don Francesco, then Prince of Florence and Siena, and of the present most serene Grand Duke of Tuscany [...”). It is therefore not unlikely that he was also a patron of the musical arts and perhaps an amateur lute player and composer. The dedication to his son Alessandro of Galilei’s first book of lute tablature (1563) comments on the “infiniti benefici” received “dal Signor Bernardetto vostro padre, essendo molto maggiori che da me non si saprebbe esprimere” (“infinite favors” received “from Signor Bernardetto your father, being so great that I would not know how to describe them”). Galilei may plausibly have paid a second tribute to this patron by including in his Fronimo one of Bernardetto’s compositions, hiding his name behind the initials since, being of the nobility, Bernardetto would not have appreciated seeing his name indicated as mere musician. For relations of a different nature between Galilei, who was once a cloth merchant, and Bernardetto Medici, to whom Galilei, in 1564, sold “sette pezze di seta di proprietà di Dorotea Ammannati, al prezzo di 230 scudi d’oro,” see Galileo e Pisa 2004: 13.

11 N.79 B follows a group of 24 ricercars in 12 modes. On page 80 of the Fronimo, Galilei maintains clearly that he himself was the author of the first 24 ricercari: “Eccovi prima ventiquattro brevi ricercari i quali per ischerzo gia feci, non per altro che per distinguere l’uno dall’altro Tuono. I dodici primi sono per [be] duro, & per b molle gl’altri che seguono appresso [...].” N. 79 B, which is not exactly “breve,” is the twenty-fifth, and Galilei does not specify in the text if he also composed this piece. Since it is not included in the edition of 1568, it may have been composed in or shortly prior to 1584; this date would not exclude the paternity of Lorenzino. However, in the table of contents of the 1584 edition (p. 80), the entire group is attributed to Galilei: “Ricercari a 4 voci dell’Autore, numero ventisei.” It is not clear why here the number of ricercari is given as 26 rather than the actual number, 25.

12 Galilei dedicated the first edition of Fronimo to Wilhelm Wittelsbach, prince of Bavaria, who made many efforts to engage Lorenzino in 1574–75. Note, too, that in the inventory of Lorenzino’s possessions at his death, 11 books of tablature, not more precisely identified, are cited (see Section I.a.5, and Section II.a, n. 28).
with the musical environment at Rome, which he probably visited at least on the occasion of the printing of his first book of lute tablature, which was undertaken in that city by Valerio Dorico in 1563.\textsuperscript{13}

The manuscript called “Herold” (HAMBURG 1) is an anonymous copy of a lost book for lute, owned by Christoph Herold, student at the University of Padua from 1601 to 1603. It is known that large numbers of foreign students from central Europe studied at the most prestigious Italian universities, such as those at Pavia and Padua, and it was especially the faculty of law that attracted them, as in the case of Herold. University students were expected to excel not only at their “studies” but also at activities such as fencing, dance and music, which were considered indispensable complements for well-rounded gentlemen.\textsuperscript{14}

Another former law student at Padua, Philipp Hainhoffer (1578-1647), who, after two years at the university (1594-96) visited various cities of the peninsula (among which were Siena, Bologna, Rome and Naples), has left us his ponderous “Lautenbuch” (WOLFENBÜTTEL), which comprises seven pieces attributed to Lorenzino, five to “Eques Romanus,” and a Praeambulum equitis aur[ati] Laurencinj cavis Romanj. Hainhoffer was a well-known merchant and connoisseur of art from Augsburg, and originally enriched his lute music collection with a series of beautiful engravings which were subsequently extracted from the book and dispersed. The art historian Sarah Davies has been able to trace them and is currently preparing a facsimile edition of the “Lautenbuch” with the images reintegrated.\textsuperscript{15} Hainhoffer was a personal friend of Jean Baptiste Besard from the time of his first studies of the liberal arts in Dôle. He subsequently remained in contact with Besard, helping him, in 1597, when he tried to obtain employment at the court of Moritz, Landgrave of Hesse in Kassel.\textsuperscript{16} It is not known if Besard succeeded in this attempt,\textsuperscript{17} but we do know that he did have many

\textsuperscript{14} See GRENDLER 2002 and, for a case study, CARLONE 2004.
\textsuperscript{15} Sarah Davies described her research at a conference in New York City, November 3, 2003 (DA-VIES 2003): the text of this lecture will be forthcoming in Music in Art: International Journal for Music Iconography (New York: CUNY).
\textsuperscript{16} See KIRÁLY 1995 and also ROBINSON 2000.
\textsuperscript{17} He probably did not. In fact, from 1598 the position was occupied by Victor de Montbuisson (see below the comments on the KASSEL manuscript).
students, among whom Hainhofer figured prominently. Strangely, however, only two of the compositions by Lorenzino or Eques Romanus found in WOLFENBÜTTEL are concordant with works in the *Thesaurus*; for the most part they are *unica*. Hainhofer evidently procured them by a different route with respect to Besard, possibly during the Italian sojourn mentioned above.

The *Libro de sonate diverse di Pietro Paolo Raymondo Comascho* (COMO) was compiled more or less during this same period. Raimondi was probably an amateur lute player. He had contacts with the Roman curia through his uncle, Ulpiano Volpi, Bishop of Novara, then Archbishop of Chieti and finally Apostolic Nuncio to Pope Paul V. Volpi knew Cardinal Luigi Caetani, whose family, as we have seen in Section I.c.2, had relations with Vincenzo Pinti. It is therefore possible that through his uncle, Raimondi was able to obtain music that circulated in the Roman milieu. 18 COMO is important for its many concordances with, apart from the inevitable *Thesaurus Harmonicus*, many printed books and manuscripts from both Italy and abroad, demonstrating how various and unpredictable were the paths of dissemination of lute music in this period. 19 This manuscript contains one of the three concordant intabulations of Lasso's madrigal *Susanne un jour*; here (our n. 6 C) it is attributed to the “Cavagliere”, whereas Besard (n. 6 A) declares it to be by “Laurencini,” and KRAKAU 2 (n. 6 B) leaves it anonymous. COMO also contains two galliards by the “Cavagliere” which are *unica*.

If it can be shown that it was the hand of Joachim van den Hove that scribed the manuscript BERLIN 1 and part of the lute book of Ernst Schele (HAMBURG 2), 20 containing, respectively, a “Transpositio Lorenzino

---

18 Thanks to Franco Pavan for this information.
19 See COELHO 1995, page 71: “A possible scenario is that *Siena* [DEN HAAG] and *Cavalcanti* [Brussels, Bibliothèque Royale de Belgique Albert 1er, Dép. De la Musique, Ms. II 275] spawned manuscript traditions of their own soon after their original compilation. These copies made their way through Como, perhaps via Raimondi's teacher. Likewise, the repertory in *Como* appears to have found its way into other later and more famous tablatures. Two works (nos. 16 and 21, the latter mistitled in *Como as Corrente Francese*) appear among the 125 anonymous fantasias in Mertel's *Hor- tus Musicalis Novus* (Strasburg, 1615). These concordances are not without importance, for along with the other rapporti that have been discovered between Mertel's fantasias and Italian tablature, they allow us to trace some of the international paths taken by Italian lute music of the seventeenth century.”
20 This hypothesis has recently been questioned: see ROBINSON 2001.
Romano” of Alessandro Striggio’s madrigal *Chi fara fede al cielo* (our n. 3) and a “Fantasia L.” (n: 71 B), one might think that van den Hove nurtured a certain interest for the works of Lorenzino, perhaps for didactic purposes (it is known that he was lute teacher to, among others, the Prince of Orange and the Count of Nassau).21

Victor Coelho has suggested that a single scribe may also have been responsible for the two manuscripts, PARIS 1 and PESARO, which share a general affinity of repertoire and various concordances between them, and contain “some of the most famous Italian lute composers active between the years 1590 and 1620”.22 In these two important manuscripts, possibly compiled in northern Italy, the one piece that interests us is a galliard (our n. 33) that both sources attribute to the Cavaliere del liuto. The same piece is also found in a third manuscript, BRUSSELS, compiled at Florence at around the same time as PARIS 1 (according to Coelho).

The presence of a fantasia attributed to Lorenzino, and one to the “Knight of the Lute”, in the *Varietie of Lute Lessons* published in 1610 in London by Robert Dowland (DOWLAND) is probably fruit of the admiration of Robert’s father, John, for Lorenzino. In 1594 John Dowland traveled to Italy with the intention of studying with Luca Marenzio in Rome; although he never realized this ambition, he nevertheless visited various Italian cities during his trip and would certainly have had the opportunity of collecting lute music.23 Dowland did know the *Thesaurus Harmonicus*, and made a translation of the didactic treatise of Besard, based on the teaching of Lorenzino, which was included in the book published by his son Robert.

Another Englishman, Edward, Lord Herbert of Cherbury and Castle Island, collected a large quantity of music during his lengthy European sojourn, which he had inscribed after his return into his “Lutebooke [...] containing diverse selected Lessons of excellent Authors in several Cuntreys, Wherein also are some few of my owne Composition Herbert” (CAMBRIDGE 2). Of 248 compositions, two are attributed to Lorenzino and two to the “Cavallieri di Liuto” [sic].

---

23 On Dowland’s Italian trip see POULTON 1972: 35–37. As Dinko Fabris has observed, “the great English lutenist shows in his music a formal structure in common with that of Lorenzino, although transfigured by his personalized ‘poetry of melancholy’” (“il grande liutista inglese mostra nella sua musica un formulario comune a quello di Lorenzino, pur trasfigurato nella sua personalissima ‘poetica della malinconia’”; FABRIS 1987: 24).
In the private Dolmetsch library in England there is another copious but until recently little studied manuscript (HASLEMERE). Written partially in Italian and partially in French tablature, it seems to have originally come from Austria at around 1620. It holds two compositions traceable to Lorenzino thanks to the concordances with Besard. The second one, a *fantasia* (n. 55), bears the title "Praeludium" in Besard, in the "Lautenbuch des Johannes Nauclerus" (BERLIN 2), in the "Cozen lute book" (CAMBRIDGE 1) and "prelude" in an Italian tablature manuscript compiled in 1623 by a certain "Joannes Aegidius Berner De Retten Werdt Jn Lampotin" (PRAHA). Apart from the proximity of time and date (PRAHA was also compiled in Austria), and the concordances they share, HASLEMERE and PRAHA may have something more in common: in fact, the scribal handwriting responsible for this *preludio / fantasia* seems to me to be the same in both sources.

Figure 2 — Comparison between 55 C, from HASLEMERE (left) and 55 D, from PRAHA (right), the first three bars

Figure 3 - An intermediate passage and final chord (note the similarities in the flourish after the last chord)

The Avignonese lutenist Victor de Montibusson, who obtained in 1598 the post at the court of Kassel so ardently desired by Besard, compiled

---

24 See KLIMA 1975 for a short biography of this nobleman (1600–1663).
in a span of nine years (1611-1620) a “Livre de tableture de lhut [sic] pour Madame Elisabett princesses de Hessen” (KASSEL). Montbuisson gathered for his princess a heterogeneous collection of pieces, predominantly dances, especially courantes. Two anonymous preludes in KASSEL are by Lorenzino, as indicated by the concordances with Besard. The first of these (n. 73) is found in manuscript CAMBRIDGE 1 and in the Hortus Musicalis Novus (MERTEL). The second prelude (n. 61) is concordant both with BESARD 1 and with MERTEL; this is testimony to the popularity of these two particular preludes, but may also indicate a direct familiarity on the part of Montbuisson with those two important prints.

An even greater time span (1607 to 1620/25) was required for the compilation of the “Lautenbuch” (BERLIN 2) of one Johannes Nauculerus, about whom nothing is known, except that he probably came from northern Germany. The manuscript contains, apart from a “Praeludium Laurencini” (n. 55) concordant with Besard and other sources, a “Galiarda Gregorij”, whose first strain corresponds to bars 1-8 of a piece which Philipp Hainhofer (WOLFENBÜTTEL) attributed with admiration to Lorenzino (“Gagliarda bella Laurencini”, our n. 30). The “Gregorius” to whom Nauculerus refers was certainly Gregory Huwet (or Huet), the well known Flemish lutenist at the court of Wolfenbüttel who was much appreciated by the likes of, among others, John Dowland. The two of them played together in 1590 at the court of the Landgrave of Hesse in Kassel, and a fantasia by him appears in the book (DOWLAND) published by Dowland’s son, Robert. It is difficult to establish if Huwet’s galliard was inspired by the work by Lorenzino, or viceversa.

Elias Mertel, another renowned lutenist active in Germany in this period, published in 1615 at Strassburg his Hortus Musicalis Novus (MERTEL), a gigantic collection of music for lute completely lacking in indications of names of authors. In the same year in Germany, at Nurnberg, another important international anthology of lute music was printed, the Testudo Gallo Germanica of Georg Leopold Fuhrmann (FUHRMANN). Both books contain works by Lorenzino (and, in MERTEL, a fantasia - n.

---

25 See LOBAUGH 2001a. Besard certainly knew the music of Montbuisson: three of his galliards were inserted into the Thesaurus Harmonicus, and he describes the composer as “Avenionensis.”
26 Not to be confused with the homonymous author of the chronicle published in Cologne in 1516 (Memorabilium omnii aetatis et omnium gentium chronici commentarit).
82 (2) - inspired from one by Lorenzino and the “Eques Romanus” – n. 82), but none of the Lorenzino concordances are shared between the two prints.

A few years later the “Lautenbuch” of Wojciech [Alberto] Długoraj (LEIPZIG) was compiled in Leipzig. Długoraj was a Polish lutenist who fled to Germany after having contributed to the decapitation of his previous patron, the brutal Samuel Zborowski, by revealing to the king of Poland certain of his compromising letters.28 Here, too, of 582 compositions collected, only one is by Lorenzino. Leipzig was also the probable venue for the production of the “Lautenbuch des Johann Joachim Loss” (DRESDEN), formerly in Dresden and lost during the Second World War. It is thought that this manuscript was compiled around 1620, although the decade between 1580 and 1590 has also been suggested; the destruction of the manuscript rules out further analysis, but the more recent date seems most probable, since Loss attended university in Leipzig in the summer of 1619.29 Fortunately part of this “Lautenbuch” was copied in the 19th Century by Wilhelm Tappert, the German musicologist noted especially for his Wagner studies. Among Tappert’s copious manuscript notes, amassed without cataloging in cases at the Deutsche Staatsbibliothek in Berlin, we find a copy from the lost manuscript of a brief “Praeambulum del Cavaglier del liuto,” for which no concordances are known.30

Two final works by Lorenzino are found in another two printed books: Besard’s Novus Partus (Augsburg 1617 - BESARD 2) and Alessandro Piccinini’s Primo libro di Intavolatura di liuto et di chitarone (Bologna 1623 - PICCININII). In both cases, we are dealing with idiosyncratic re-writings on the part of the authors of these books of material by Lorenzino. Besard published the Novus Partus fourteen years after his first lute anthology (the Thesaurus Harmonicus); while the earlier book was specifically dedicated to Lorenzino and included a major part of his musical corpus, the new book contains a more modern repertoire, such as two toccatas and a ricercar by

---

30 A summary exploration of these cases was undertaken by Arthur Ness, who has generously supplied me with a reproduction of the page containing the “Praeambulum.”
Michelangelo Galilei (son of Vincenzo), and about thirty of Besard’s own compositions. On page 48 we find a Branle quondam Laurencini nuncupatum nunc vero a I. B. B. ad usum novae suae testudinis accommodatum (‘Branle once considered to be by Lorenzino, but now adapted by J[ean] B[aptiste] B[esard] for use on his new lute’; n. 42).

The “nova testudo” of Besard was, as he explains on the first page of his new book, a normal lute of small dimensions in which the first two courses were tuned an octave lower than usual, similar to theorbo tuning, and all courses were tuned in unison. While admitting that this tuning resembled that of the theorbo, Besard claimed that he invented it “before any notice about that one” reached him. Its invention was the fruit of his search for a new, more brilliant, lute sound derived from the high string tension of the third through tenth courses, tension too high to maintain for the first two courses, which would exceed their breaking point if tuned normally. In practice, the “nova testudo” of Besard had the same tuning as the “tiorbino” of Bellerovente Castaldi but differed in form, lacking the theorbo-style neck extension. The original version of the branle “once considered to be by Lorenzino” has not survived and thus we do not know how much the “adaptation” by Besard for use with his new lute transformed it musically. There are certainly a few strange passages in this work, possibly errors on the part of Besard. Many years separate the publication date of

---

31 As is well known, Michelangelo Galilei was an accomplished lutenist whose works are found scattered among early 17th-century sources and in his own “first book of tablature,” printed in Munich in 1620. He spent most of his life away from his native Italy, in Poland in the service of the Radziwiłł family from 1593 to 1606, and later at the court of Bavaria in the service of Maximilian I Wittelsbach (the son of the Wilhelm Wittelsbach, who had tried to engage Lorenzino and to whom Vincenzo Galilei had dedicated the first edition of Fronimo: see Section 1.4). Michelangelo’s son, named Vincenzo after his grandfather, was also a professional lutenist, and his brother, the famous Galileo Galilei, played “li tarsi e le leuto” (cf. SMITH 1981, CHAUVEL 1988, FABRIS 1990, and LUNDBERG 1992, particularly page 211; the citation is from Vincenzo Viviani, Racconto istorico della vita del Sig.r Galilei, autograph manuscript dated April 29, 1654 [Florence, Biblioteca Nazionale], in Edizione Nazionale delle Opere di Galileo Galilei, ed. Antonio Favaro, Florence, 1890–1909, vol. XIX: 602).


33 Bellerovente Castaldi, Capricci a due Strumenti cioe Tiorba e Tiorbino, Modena 1622.
this work (1617) from Lorenzino's death (1590), and this too might have influenced the final shape of the piece as we find it in Besard's publication. For these reasons it has been included in our catalogue as a spurious work. Besard was not alone in experimenting with the lute's tuning, in a period which saw the classic Renaissance lute transformed into an extraordinary variety of new lute types by altering the tuning and number of courses and even radically changing the instrument's construction.34 We have already seen, in the first part of this article, how Alessandro Piccinini claims to have invented the archlute, an instrument in normal Renaissance tuning but enriched by two "sonorous basses" and a neck extension to contain them.35 It is for this instrument, now expanded to include a total of 13 courses, that Piccinini adapted a Gagliarda (n. 36), concordant with an anonymous galliard in the Montreal manuscript (MONTREAL), in Herold (HAMBURG) and, under the name of "Eques Romanus," in the Thesaurus Harmonicus. Piccinini's version of this piece makes use of the entire range of his archlute and, with respect to the concordances, is the most elaborate and virtuosic: perhaps it was his way, at a distance of so many years, to render homage to one of the most important and influential maestri of the 16th Century.

34 On experimentation with lute tunings, see SAYCE 2001.
35 See Section II.b, Piccinini 1623.
III.b. List of Musical Sources

In the following list, the selected bibliography indicated for each source is not intended to be exhaustive.

• **BASEL**
  Basel, Öffentliche Bibliothek der Universität Basel, Musiksammlung Ms. IX. 70

  Basel. 1591 and 1594 (dated).
  German tablature. 341 pages. 500 works.

  See Section III.c: 10, 10 (2), 77, 85.

• **BERLIN 1**
  Berlin, Staatsbibliothek - Autograph ms. of Joachim Van den Hove I

  Netherlands (Leiden). 1615 c. Autograph manuscript of Joachim van den Hove (this hypothesis has recently been put into doubt: see ROBINSON 2001).
  French tablature. 178 ff. 108 works for 7 and 8 course lute.

  See Section III.c: 3.

• **BERLIN 2**
  Berlin, Deutsche Staatsbibliothek Mus. ms. 40141 called “Lautenbuch des Johannes Naucerus”

  f.1: “Johannis Naucerus T. Hols./sum ab a° 1615/12 Aug”
  French and German tablature. 255 ff. 133 works for 6 and 7 course lute, and 4 works for cittern.

  See Section III.c: 55.

• **BESARD 1**
  Jean Baptiste Besard, *Thesaurus Harmonicus divini Laurencini Romani, nec non praestantissimorum musicorum, qui hoc seculo in diversis orbis*
partibus excellunt, selectissima omnis generis cantus in testudine modulamina continens ..., Cologne 1603.

French tablature. 172 ff., 403 works. Includes didactic treatise De modo in testudine studendi libellus.

See Section III.c: 1, 2, 4, 5, 6, 11, 12, 14, 19, 20, 21, 22, 23, 24, 25, 26, 36, 41, 42, 44, 47, 48, 49, 50, 51, 52, 53, 54, 55, 56, 57, 58, 59, 60, 61, 62, 63, 66, 68, 71, 72, 73, 74, 75, 77, 78, 79, 80, 81, 82, 86, 87.

• BESARD 2
Jean Baptiste Besard, Novus Partus (Augsburg 1617)

Germany (Augsburg). 1617.
French tablature. 49 ff. 59 works: 24 for three lutes and voices (Maior, Minor and Nova Testudo); 35 for solo 10 course lute.
Contains an expanded version of the treatise already included in BESARD 1 (Ioh. Bapt. Besardi Vesontini, ad artem testudinis, brevi, circaque magnum fastidium capescendam, brevis & methodica Instituto).

See Section III.c: 42.

• BRUSSELS
Brussels, Bibliothèque du Conservatoire Royale de Musique, Ms. Littera S. No. 16.663

Back of front cover: "Al Ill.mo P.I." [or "P.T."]
Italy (Florence?). 1600-1610. Two scribes, the second only on f. 20. Manuscript possibly intended for professional use and not didactic.
Italian tablature. 56 ff. 18 works for lute and four works for voice and 9 course lute.

See Section III.c: 33.

• CAMBRIDGE 1
Cambridge University Library Ms. Add 3056 called "Cozens Lute Book"

England? 1595 c.
French tablature. 187 ff. 7 course lute.

See Section III.c: numbers 47, 49, 55, 73, 77, 81.
• CAMBRIDGE 2
Cambridge, Fitzwilliam Museum Ms. 689

Ii v: “The Lutebooke of Hedward Lord Herbert, of Cherbury and Castle Island, containing diverse selected Lessons of excellent Authores in severall Cuntreys, Wherein also are some few of my owne Composition Herbert”.
France? 1619 c. –1640; after 1626 (Goy).
French tablature. iii, 94 ff., 248 works for 10 and 11 course lutes.

See Section III.c: 70, 82, 83, 84.

• COMO
Como, Biblioteca Comunale, Ms. 1.1.20. Libro di sonate diverse di Pietro Paolo Raymondo Comasco

Como. 1601, 1609.
Two or three hands; the second hand is probably that of P. P. Raimondi. [ii]: “Io Gio: Durone Bottigella / Durone” (this may refer to the first scribe).
Italian tablature. 94 ff. + [i,ii,iii,iv], 69 works for 8 course lute.

See Section III.c: 6, 34, 35, 50, 80.

• DEN HAAG
Den Haag, Gemeentemuseum, 20.860 (olim ms 28. B. 39), called the “Siena Lute Book”

Italy: Siena. Late 1580’s and early 1590’s (NESS 1988 a/b); 1590 c. (COELHO 1995).
Italian tablature. 118 ff. 156 works for 6 and 7 course lutes.

See Section III.c: 71.

• DONAUESCHINGEN
Donaueschingen Fürstlich Fürstenbergische Hofbibliothek, Ms. G I.4

Germany. 1580 c.-1595. A single editor. The titles of 6 works are in Hebraic script or are supplemented by text in Hebraic script.
The Knights of the Lute: Musical Sources

German tablature. 3 volumes of 74, 81 and 62 folios. 412 works.


See Section III.c: 7, 76.

- **DOWLAND**
  Robert Dowland, *Varietie of Lute Lessons* (London 1610)

  French tablature. 32 ff. not numbered. 42 works.
  Includes the didactic treatises: *Necessaire Observations belonging to the Lute, and Lute playing, by John Baptisto Besardo of Visonti* [2r-5v]; *Other Necessary Observations belonging to the Lute, by John Dowland, Batcheler of Musicke* [6r-9r].


  See Section III.c: 80, 82.

- **DRESDEN**
  Formerly in Dresden, Sächsische Landesbibliothek Ms. Mus. 1-V-8 (*olim* Ms. Mus. B. 1030) called "Lautenbuch des Johann Joachim Loss."

  Lost (SMT II 1994: "brulé") during the Second World War. A partial copy made by Wilhelm Tappert survives.\(^\text{x}\)

  f. 1: "Johann Joachim Losses, dem edlen gestrengen Herrn"
  Germany? (Leipzig ?). 1580-90 (Boetticher) /1620 c.? (SMT II).
  German tablature. 102 (?) ff. 73 (?) works for 8 course lute.


  See Section III.c: 88.

- **FUHRMANN**
  Georg Leopold Fuhrmann, *Testudo Gallo Germanica hoc est: novae et nunquam antehac editae recreationes musicae, ad testudinis usum et tabulaturam, tam Gallicam quam Germanicam accomodatae...* (Nürnberg 1615)

  Germany (Nürnberg). 1615.
  French tablature. [vi] + 190 pages. 2 duets, 178 works for solo 9 course lute.


\(^{\text{x}}\)This copy was examined by Arthur Ness, who kindly provided me with a photocopy of the microfilm corresponding to f. 75 r.-v.
See Section III.c: 7, 46, 47 (2), 63, 64.

• GALILEI

Dedication: “Al molto Magnifico Sig. et mio padrone osservandissimo il signore Iacopo Corsi” [...] “Di Fiorenza al di ultimo di Aprile. 1584”.
Italy (Venice), 1584.
Italian tablature. 182 pages, 108 works.
Bibliography: BROWN 1967: 331-334; CANGUILHEM 2001; PALISCA 2001; Fronimo AIM.

See Section III.c: 79, 80 (works not included in the first edition, Venice 1568).

• HAMBURG 1
Hamburg, private collection of Hans von Busch, called the “Herold” manuscript

Padua/Leiden. 1602. “Copie anonyme réalisée à partir du livre de luth (aujourd’hui perdu) de Christoph Herold de la Halle” (SMT II 1994: 122)
French tablature. 48 ff., 42 works.

See Section III.c: 32, 36.

• HAMBURG 2
Hamburg, Stadt und Universtitätsbibliotek Ms. M B/2768 (olim ND VI 3238), called the “Scheele Manuscript”

p. I: “Tabulatur Buch / Musica et vinum laetificant cor hominis / Ernst Schele / anno 1619”
Netherlands (Leyden), Italy (Venice, Naples), France (Paris, Angers, Metz, Orleans),
Germany (Frankfurt), England? 1613-1619/20. Various dates inserted throughout the manuscript.
Two hands (?), which alternate throughout, and which each use different style rhythm signs. According to SMT II 1994, the first hand is the same as in BERLIN I, and thus would be that of Joachim van den Hove (whose works are found in this manuscript); this hypothesis has been put into doubt by ROBINSON 2001.
French tablature. II ff., 156 pages. 156 works for lutes with 6, 7, 9, 10 and 11 courses.


See Section III.c: 71.

• HASLEMERE
Haslemere (Surrey), Private Library of Carl Dolmetsch, Ms. II. B. 1

Austria? 1620 c.
French / Italian tablature. 285 ff. 323 works for lutes of 6 to 10 courses.


See Section III.c: 22, 55.

• KASSEL
Kassel, Landesbibliothek und Murhard’sche Bibliothek der Stadt Ms. 4° Mus. 108 I

f. 54: “Livre de tableture de lhut [sic] pour Madame Elisabett princesse de Hessen/Commence par Victor de Montbuysson le dernier janvier 1611.”
Hesse. 1611 (with additions up to 1620 c.).
French tablature . 131 ff. 196 works for 10 and 11 course lutes and 14 works in staff notation.


See Section III.c: 61, 73.

• KRAKAU 1
Krakau, Biblioteca Jagiellonska Mus. Ms. 40143

Cologne. 1594 –1603. Many of the pieces bear dates (from May 1601 to December 1603). Various hands, the third is almost certainly that of Jean Baptiste Besard (ff. 23v-50v, including two works listed here).
French tablature. 100 f. 87 works for 6, 7 and 8 course lutes.


See Section III.c: 86, 89.
• KRAKAU 2
Krakau, Biblioteka Jagiellonska Mus. Ms. 40032, called “Naples Lute Book”, or, more recently, “Barbarino manuscript.”

Italy (Naples?). 1580 c. – 1611/1626 (?).
Italian tablature. 160 ff. 404 works.

See Section III.c: 1, 2, 6, 8, 9, 17, 18, 39, 43, 45, 58 (2), 65, 66, 67, 68, 69, 71, 72, 78.

• LEIPZIG
Leipzig, Musikbibliothek Ms. II. 6. 15 called the “Lautenbuch des Albert Dlugorai”

Germany (Leipzig?). 1619.
German tablature. Vii, 277 ff. 582 works for 6 course lute.

See Section III.c: 46.

• MERTEL
Elias Mertel, Hortus Musicae Novus (Strassburg 1615)

France (Strassburg). 1615.
French tablature. 278 pages. 355 works for 7, 8 or 9 course lutes.

See Section III.c: 49 (2), 61, 73, 82 (2).

• MONTRÉAL
Montréal (Québec), Conservatoire de Musique et d’Art Dramatique (without shelf number)

“Intavolatura di liuto: Orazio Vecchi e Discépolo” written in a recent hand on a blank page at the end of the volume.37

37 This caption may have been added in order to make the manuscript more attractive to potential buyers.
The Knights of the Lute: Musical Sources

Lombardy (Bergamo?). c. 1588-c. 1599 (DESAUTELS 1986); 1595-1610 (COELHO 1995). Three, or possibly four hands.

Italian tablature. 119 ff. 112 works: 97 for solo 8 course lute, two duets and 13 canzonette and napolitane for lute and voice.


See Section III.c: 36.

- **PARIS 1**
  

  Italy (Florence?). 1600-1620.
  
  4 hands, one of which (the second and main hand) may be the same as in PESARO (according to COELHO 1995).
  
  Italian tablature. 23 ff, 78 works for lutes of 7, 8 and 9 courses (8 course lute used twice, 9 course lute used only once).
  

  See Section III.c: 33.

- **PARIS 2**
  
  Paris, Bibliothèque Nationale de France Ms. Rés. Vm7. 674-675, called the “Bauyn Manuscript.”

  Paris. After 1676 (1690 c.). 1 unidentified professional hand.
  
  Staff notation. 3 volls. 344 works for harpsichord.
  
  

  See Section III.c: 83.

- **PESARO**
  
  Pesaro, Biblioteca Musicale Statale del Conservatorio di Musica “G Rossini”, Rari Ms. B. 10 - P 40a/7346

  Italy. 1610-1640.
  
  Two hands according to NENSI 1989, a single hand, the same as in PARIS 1, according to COELHO 1995.
  
  Italian tablature. 32 ff., 68 works for 11 course lute and 4 for 12 course theorbo.
  
  Bibliography: PAOLONE 1942: 186; BOETTICHER 1978: 282-3; CAVALLINI

See Section III.c: 33.

- **PICCININI**
  Alessandro Piccinini, *Intavolatura di liuto et di chitarrone, libro primo* (Bologna 1623)

  Italy (Bologna). 1623.
  Includes the didactic treatise: *A gli studiosi del Liuto* [1-8].
  Italian tablature. 133 pages. 62 works for archlute, 32 for chitarrrone, one for two lutes, one for three lutes.
  *Bibliography*: CRISTOFORETTI 1983.

  See Section III.c: 36.

- **PRAHA**
  Praha, Národní Muzeum, Hudební Oddělení, MS. IV G. 18

  f. 1 r: “Joannes Aegidius/Bernet/De RettenWett/ Jn / Lampotin /1623”.
  f. 179 v: “12. di Marzo 1.6.2.7”.
  Salzburg. 1623-37 c.
  Italian and French tablature. 218 ff. The pages have two sets of numbering: an older series from 1 to 216, and a more recent one from 1 to 218. 318 works.

  See Section III.c: 55, 59 (2).

- **REYMANN**
  Matthaeus Reymann, *Noctes Musicae. Studio et industria Matthaei Reymani Toronensis Borussi concinnatae* (Heidelberg 1598)

  Germany (Heidelberg) 1598. French tablature. 100 ff. 73 works.

  See Section III.c: 55 (2).

- **ROMA**
  Roma, Biblioteca Angelica, Ms. Mus. 1608

  Italy (Rome?) 1590 – 1615 c. / 1620.
  Two hands, the second possibly the same as in the second fascicle of Krakau, Bibl. Jagiellonska Mus. Ms. 40591 (c. 1605-1620). This manuscript was compiled over a long
period of time, or it is the result of two originally unrelated fascicles bound together. Italian tablature. 44 ff. 34 works for 7 course lute, 1 for lute and voice, several tablature fragments including one for 9 course lute.


See Section III.c: 80 (2).

- **VÉSOUL**
  Vésoul, Bibliothèque municipale Ms 711.

Ex-libris: “Laurent Reismiller d’Augsbourg”
Lost since 1945.38
Augsburg or Württemberg (?). 1598 and after. On f. 20v was the date “Aoust 1598”. French and Louis Milan’s style tablature. 96 ff. 119 works for 7 course lute and a fragment of a “Credo” for 4 voices in staff notation.

Bibliography: BRENET 1900; BRENET 1901.02; SMT I 1991: 166-170.

See Section III.c: 41.

- **WOLFENBÜTTEL**
  Wolfenbüttel, Herzog-August-Bibliothek, Musikabteilung, Ms. Codex Guelferbytanus 18.7 / 18.8. Augusteus 2°, called the “Philipp Hainhofer Lautenbuch“

c. 1 r.: “Erster thail Philippi Hainhoferi Lautenbuecher [...] Anno 1603.”
Germany (Augsburg). 1603, 1604.
The manuscript was produced by Philipp Hainhofer (1578 – 1647). Staff notation (ff.98v-99). Italian, German (f. 8v) and French (f. 10v) tablature. 245 ff., 254 works for 7 course lute, organized in 12 sections, or “books.”


See Section III.c: 13, 15, 16, 27, 28, 29, 30, 31, 37, 38, 40, 41, 81.

- **ZARY**
  Zary (Sorau), Bibliothek der Marienkirche: “Intabolatura de Lauto de [...] diversi maestri [...]”

---

Manuscript additions to eight Gardano lute prints: S. Gintalet (Libro I, 1547), F. Vindella (Libro I, 1546), Francesco da Milano (Libro I, 1546), Francesco da Milano and Perino Fiorentino (Libro III, 1547), J. Maria da Crema (Libro I, 1546), M. A. de Pifaro (Libro I, 1546), D. Bianchini (Libro I, 1546), A. Rotta (Libro I, 1546). According to BOETTICHER 1978, there was a "Besitzvermerk" [note of possession] on the cover: "Cavaliero maestro di Roma". Lost since 1942.

Poland. First decade of the 17th Century. Compiled by a Polish student. Italian tablature. 21 ff. 10 (?) works for lute, including a Polish Psalmus (Tobie nie smiertelny Panie), a dance (Nie rano wstai Taniecze), an Alamana, Praeambulum, Corente francese, Ballo pollachos and Final. Included a didactic treatise, "Instructio tradens eiusmodi Tabellatura intelligentam, quod tactum Testudinis," in Latin and Polish.


See Section III.c: [90].

III.c. List of works³⁹

1. Vestiva i Colli – intabulation of a madrigal by Giovanni Pierluigi da Palestrina

2 sources:
1A. BESARD 1, p. 43v-44: "Vestiva i colli / Transpositio Laurencini"
1B. KRAKAU 2, p. 287: "Vestiva i Colli"

1B is incomplete: the opening page of the piece was written on page 286, which is now missing. The first bar of page 287 corresponds to bar 23 of 1 A. On the bottom of this page is a cancelled inscription reading Ricercata del Lorenzino. The second part of the madrigal is found on the following pages (p. 288-9): Cosi le chiamo mie seconda parte de Vestiva i colli (see n. 2).

The barring in 1 A is double the length of that in 1 B; bars 22 and 46 are of irregular length. Several sections of the two versions are essentially identical, with minor differences (as, for example, when a note is repeated or not) and, at times, a few errors in one or the other source. Other sections show strong differences, which may regard: the number of voices; the harmony (at times completely changed, at times the same but with a different disposition of the voices or with a different number of notes); the type of diminution (different, added or subtracted, or given to different voices); differing idiomatic solutions (repeated notes, octave leaps).

³⁹Musical sources are indicated here by the labels assigned to them in Section III.b.
2. **Così le chiome** – intabulation of the second part of *Vestiva i colli* by Giovanni Pierluigi da Palestrina

2 sources:
2 A. BESARD 1, p. 44v-45: “Così le chiome Secunda pars”
2 B. KRAKAU 2, p.288-289: “Così le chiome mie seconda parte de Vestiva i colli”

Both sources bear cut-time tempo indications but adopt different rhythmic symbols: those of 2 B correspond to vocal notation, and are quadrupled with respect to those of 2 A. One bar of 2 A corresponds to two of 2 B. For about a third of the work there are notable differences between the two sources. After an identical beginning, they proceed similarly: there are occasional identical bars, but more often minor variants are found, and some passages are decisively different. The most evident difference consists in the presence of a virtuosic “coda” in 2 B which is missing in 2 A. Also, bar 78 of 2 B is omitted in 2 A. Bars 5-6 of 2 B have their rhythmic values halved in 2 A.

3. **Chi farà fede al cielo** – intabulation of a madrigal by Alessandro Striggio

BERLIN 1, p. 71v-76v: “Chi farà fede al cielo / A 5. Allessandro Striggio fecit / Transpositio Lorenzino Romano”

4. **Poi che m’invita Amore** – intabulation of a madrigal by Cipriano de Rore

BESARD 1, p. 37v: “Poi che m’invita amor / Transpositio Laurencini”

Until bar 18 (which corresponds to bar 36 of the vocal model) the tablature is substantially faithful to the original polyphony, and maintains all five voices with few omissions or additions. After that point, and especially in the ending, there are more significant changes:

- When the text of the madrigal twice repeats the words “Da voi dolce mia vita” (bars 34-36 and 37-40), the repetition is not included in the tablature.
- Towards the end of the work, where the text repeats three times the words “Nè senza veder voi già mai vivrei”, the tablature seems to eliminate one of the repetitions. This ending is not always coherently traceable to the vocal model, partly on account of numerous errors.
- The dotted rhythmic motive, which appears on bar 47 of the vocal model and is then repeated on bars 51 and 55, is doubled in length in the tablature. This slowing down may have been deliberate in order to allow the chords accompanying the motive to be better appreciated, but it seems more probable to me, instead, that we are dealing with an error.
- A comparison with the original vocal model reveals numerous errors in the indications of rhythmic signs, and also in the placement of bar lines. The fact that most of the errors are found in the second half of the piece suggests that the original source from which it was copied by Besard was damaged from that point on.
5. *E se pur mi mantien* - intabulation of the second part of *Poi che m'invita Amor* by Cipriano de Rore

BESARD 1, p. 38: “Secunda pars”

The second part of this madrigal also omits substantial sections of the vocal original. In addition, there are bars of irregular rhythm due to errors in the indications of rhythm signs. In several places, corresponding to the gaps where material from the vocal model was omitted, the tablature seems particularly confused. On the second half of bar 17 is a passage which seems to have no connection to the vocal model.

6. *Susanne un jour* - intabulation of a Madrigal by Orlando di Lasso

3 sources:

6 A. BESARD 1, p. 57v-58: “Susanne un jour / Transpositio Laurencini”

6 B. KRAKAU 2, p.120-122: “Susana”

6 C. COMO, p. 58v-63r: “Susanna del Cavaglieri”

The oldest version, 6 B, is also the most faithful to the original 5 part vocal polyphony. Exceptions, where the vocal model is not rigorously respected, occur where it is impossible to play all five voices contemporaneously on the lute, or where, because of the technical impossibility of playing a note, it is postponed, anticipated or displaced by an octave. Diminutions are occasionally added which connect notes of two different voices, or which operate on notes which are shared by two voices, but the musical perception of distinct complete voices is always maintained. Other modifications derive from the adaption of idiomatic solutions, as for example the use of repeated notes or notes doubled an octave higher or lower. Notes not found in the vocal model have been occasionally added. The last section of the madrigal (bars 105 to 113) is repeated with variations on bars 114 to 122. 6 A is slightly shorter than 6 B in that it omits the repetition of the final section of the madrigal. In addition it is markedly different from 6 B in its final section, from bar 54 to the beginning of bar 57 (corresponding to bars 110 to 114 of 6 B). In general, with respect to 6 B, 6 A is richer in diminution and strays further from the vocal model; there are more frequent octave displacements, eliminated notes and added notes that do not correspond to the vocal original. There is also one error in the indications of rhythmic signs, so that bar 38 corresponds to three bars of 6 B rather than two. 6 C seems to represent a middle solution between 6 A and 6 B: it contains many of the diminutions present in 6 A but is more similar to 6 B in the inclusion of the repeated last section. On stylistic grounds it can be suggested that 6 A and 6 C represent slightly later elaborations of 6 B.

7. *Passomezzo*

2 sources:


7 B. FUHRMANN, pp. 68-74: “Passomezo D. Laurentzini Romani. in F. fa ut B. Dur”
7 A comprises nine passemezzo variations, 7 B has 11; only variations 2, 3, 4, 5, and 7 of 7 A are concordant with 7 B, and both sources contain unique non-concordant material. Where there is concordance, there are also variants. In general, 7 B contains simplifications with respect to 7 A; for example, many chords are made up of fewer notes, and 7 A maintains greater imitative coherence in melodic figuration. A few brief passages are lacking in one or the other source, and a few diminutions or rhythmic values are slightly modified. Passemezzo variations 5 and 7 of 7 A, corresponding to variations 6 and 9 of 7 B, contain more extensive changes. While they begin in a similar fashion, they have different conclusions. 7 B contains numerous errors, while 7 A has very few, and never in the same places; thus 7 A can be considered the more authoritative source, as well as the earliest, considering that Fuhrmann's book (7 B) was published in 1615, while the Donaueschingen manuscript (7 A) is one of the earliest sources to contain works by Lorenzino, and was possibly compiled during his lifetime. The scribe of 7 A may well have been a professional lutenist and possibly a teacher: his didactic approach might be revealed in a small but significant detail. Corresponding to three brief passages using the eighth course at bars 85, 89, and 117, there are marginal annotations containing the same passages with alternative positions of the bass notes transcribed an octave higher, in case, apparently, an instrument with eight courses was not available.

8. **Passemezzo**
   KRAKAU 2, pp.150–52: “Passo e mezzo de Lorenzino en Bassus b.moll”

9. **Passemezzo**
   KRAKAU 2, pp.175–76: “Passo e' mezzo di Lorenzino”

Corrections and cancellations are visible in places. There is a repeat sign at the end of the first section and a fermata at the end of the second, followed by a virtuoso coda that uses a different style of rhythm signs, and calls for a different tuning of the seventh course of the lute. The coda may have been added later, perhaps copied from a different source, and its authorship is uncertain.

10 – 10 (2) **Passemezzo**

2 sources:
10: BASEL, p. 118: “Passomezo Laurentii”

Two versions of the same passemezzo occur in different parts of the Basel manuscript (pp. 118 and 232). The second version (10 (2)) is generally more correct, although not perfect. It is for a lute of seven courses with the seventh course in D, while the first version (10) is for eight-course lute, with the eighth course in D. Both titles contain the name of Lorenzino ("Laurentij" e "Laurenz.") but 10 (2) also contains the initials "A.F." These initials occur 16 times throughout the manuscript, and it has been proposed to interpret them to indicate authorship by Alfonso Ferrabosco. For this passemezzo, however, the presence of the first version, n. 10, would seem to contradict an attribution
to Ferrabosco of 10 (2). Neither can 10 (2) be considered a re-elaboration of 10 by Ferrabosco, since the two versions are nearly identical. It is also possible that, at least for this work, the initials "A.F." might signify "Alio Folio," as if the scribe, Emanuel Wurstisen, had wanted to copy two versions of the same passemezzo that he had received from separate sources. It is also possible, of course, that the passemezzo, being part of Lorenzino's repertoire, was attributed to Ferrabosco in the second version.

11. **Passemezzo**

BESARD 1, p. 83v: "Pass'e mezo Laurencini in G sol re ut per b molle"

12. **Passemezzo**

BESARD 1, pp. 101v–02: "Pass'emezo Laurencini in b fa b mi per b molle"

13. **Passemezzo**

WOLFENBÜTTEL, 18.8 / Fünffter Thail [Part V] – p. 84 r: [Passemezzo]

"Decima sesta parte Laurencino"

This passemezzo occupies 24 pages and includes a total of 25 passemezzo variations, of which only four are attributed to composers: the first to "Nicolaj" [Dlugorañ?], the sixth to "J.B. Besardi," the eleventh to "Alfonso de ferrabosco," and the sixteenth to "Laurencino." All the other variations are anonymous, as is the reprise and galdiard in 12 parts with reprise that follow.

14. **Passemezzo**

BESARD 1, pp. 84–84v: "Pass'emezo eiusdem toni ab Equite Romano compositum" (in two parts).

15. **Passemezzo**


This passemezzo is made up of four parts, followed by a Gagliarda del passo e mezzo (see n. 16). If transcribed for a lute in G, the first three parts and the gagliarda would use b-flat, the fourth, b-natural. A number of errors throughout the piece seem to be the result of numbers indicated on the incorrect tablature lines, giving rise to dissonant intervals and chords. In the third part of the passemezzo, almost all chords are written

---

entirely with zeros on the first three courses. Perhaps the scribe, copying from an illegible source, simply wanted to indicate the presence of a chord on the first three courses, leaving to the performer the task of filling in the right notes. In general, this piece seems to be inspired by a passemezzo in 10 parts by Simone Molinaro (Intavolatura di liuto di Simone Molinaro Libro Primo, Venice 1599, pp. 21–29) and includes diverse, simplified passages from that work.

16. Gagliarda
WOLFENBÜTTEL, 18.8 / Fünffter Thail [Part V] – pp. 127 r-v: “Gagliarda del passo e mezzo”

See n. 15.

17. Gagliarda
KRAKAU 2, p. 304: “Gagliarda di Lorenzino”

The work is incomplete: the page in the manuscript is torn, with the final part of the piece missing.

18. Gagliarda
KRAKAU 2, p. 361: “Gagliarda di Lorenzino / Santino”

Because of the double attribution of this brief and simple piece, its inclusion in Lorenzino’s corpus is uncertain and probably erroneous. According to John Griffiths, who examined the manuscript very closely, “Lorenzino” is struck out with a line, and “Santino” is superimposed.

19. Gagliarda
BESARD 1, p. 117: “Galliarda Laurencini”

20. Gagliarda
BESARD 1, p. 121 (b): “Galliarda Laurencini”

21. Gagliarda
BESARD 1, p. 124v (a): “Galliarda Laurencini”

22. Gagliarda
2 sources:
22 A. BESARD 1, p. 124v (b): “Galliarda Laurencini”
22 B. HASLEMERE, pp. 89v–90: “Galliarde”

With respect to 22 A, 22 B is a simplified version, as it often omits one or two internal voices, thinning out many chords. There are also a few small differences in harmony and subtle changes in melody, due mostly to the shifting of notes from one voice to another.
23. **Gagliarda**  
BESARD 1, p. 125v: “Galliarda Laurencini”

24. **Gagliarda**  
BESARD 1, p. 126v: “Galliarda Laurencini”

25. **Gagliarda**  
BESARD 1, p. 127: “Galliarda eiusdem” [Laurencini]

26. **Gagliarda**  
BESARD 1, pp. 127v–128: “Galliarda eiusdem” [Laurencini]

27. **Gagliarda**  
WOLFENBÜTTEL, 18.8 / *Sechster Thail* [Part VI] – pp. 177v–178r:  
“Gagliarda bella Laurencinus”

28. **Gagliarda**  
WOLFENBÜTTEL, 18.8 / *Sechster Thail* [Part VI] – p. 183r:  
“Gagliarda bella Laurencinj”

29. **Gagliarda**  

30. **Gagliarda**  
WOLFENBÜTTEL, 18.8 / *Sechster Thail* [Part VI] – pp. 183v–184r:  
“Gagliarda bella Laurencinj”

The first eight bars of this *gagliarda* correspond, with a few small differences, to the first strain of a galliard found in a manuscript compiled slightly later, BERLIN 2, attributed to “Gregorius” (Huwet). The similarities between the two works end here, and in fact the “Galiarda Gregorij” is shorter by more than half, and continues in a completely different direction after the initial section.

31. **Gagliarda**  

32. **Gagliarda**  
HAMBURG 1, pp. 22r–23r: “Galliarda”

33. **Gagliarda:**
3 sources
33 A. BRUSSELS, pp. 3v–5: [Gagliarda]
33 B. PARIS 1, pp. 5v–6: “Gagliarda del Cavaliere”
33 C. PESARO, pp. 11v–12r: “Gagliarda dell’ Cavaliere del liuto”

33 A seems to be the most complete of the three sources. While all of the rhythm signs are present, bar lines are inserted only at the beginnings of strains. With a few corrections to the rhythm signs, the bar lines coincide almost always with those of 33 B. Notes at the ends of two of the tablature staves are no longer visible. One passage contains right hand fingering dots indicating weak beats to be played with the index finger. 33 B contains barlines throughout, but no rhythm signs. In 33 C there are no barlines, except for one which seems incorrect; there are three repeat signs corresponding to strains of the galliard; and there are a few rhythm signs, some of which seem incorrect and do not always coincide with those in 33 A. Right hand fingering dots are present in several passages, including the one indicated in 33 A. The style of rhythm signs employed in 33 A and 33 C is different: 33 A uses stems with note heads, 33 C uses only stems. 33 C omits the last strain, present in the other two sources. There are small differences between the three sources, primarily in the voicing of chords, in the type of diminution at cadences, and in the melody of the soprano voice. The most extensive differences are found at cadences at the ends of strains. According to Victor Coelho,\footnote{COELHO 1995, pp. 121–22 and 135–38: “[there is] important scribal concordance between this book [Paris] and Pesaro b.10. Both books were undoubtedly copied by the same scribe at the same time, as there are sixteen duplications of pieces between the two manuscripts, sometimes in a page-by-page sequence [...] and both manuscripts contain the same gagliarda by the Cavaliere del liuto” (121); “the level of sophistication in Paris 29 is inconsistent, suggesting several layers of personal and possibly chronological activity” (p. 122); “Pesaro b. 10 is copied in the same hand as Paris 29” (p. 135), “the works in Pesaro b.10 were intended for personal use, not public performance [...] an amateur” (p. 137). “Like Paris 29, many of the pieces in Pesaro b. 10 lack rhythmic indications and barlines [...] given the general sophistication of the music, however, perhaps this does not so much point to an unskilled copyist as to a player who was familiar with the stereotyped rhythms of much of the music” (p. 138).} the same scribe copied both 33 B and 33 C, and, in effect, the handwriting looks very similar. This scribe would be an amateur lute player\footnote{This consideration is inspired by the fact that all of the works in PESARO are adapted to the lute, including those that should instead have been reserved for the theorbo, according to other testimony. An amateur, reasons Coelho, may not have had a theorbo available.} who nevertheless had sufficient mastery of the repertoire to be able to dispense with bar lines in 33 C. Coelho also suggests that all three sources are of Italian provenance and that 33 A is slightly older than the other two (1600–1610).\footnote{COELHO 1995: 66.} He finds “much ambiguity” in the rhythmic indications in 33 A: “the sophistication of the music, along with the haste in which the manuscript appears to have been copied, suggest that the book was intended for professional rather than pedagogical purposes,” notwithstanding the fact that there are a number of blank pages, unusual in a book used by a professional musician. In this particular work (33
A), however, there are few rhythmic ambiguities, apart from a few evident errors. 33 A appears to be the oldest and most complete version of the piece, 33 B is a successive simplification or elaboration, and 33 C is an ulterior reelaboration that at times simplifies (to the point of eliminating the final strain) and at times varies (as for example when the soprano line of the opening phrase rises to C).

34. Gagliarda

COMO, pp. 63v–65: “Gagliarda del Cavaglierie”

35. Gagliarda

COMO, pp. 85v–87: “Gagliarda del Cavaglierie”

36. Gagliarda

4 sources:
36 A. BESARD 1, p. 107v: “Galiarda equitis Romani”
36 B. MONTRÉAL, pp. 61v–63r: “Gagliarda”
36 C. HAMBURG 1, pp. 32v–33v: “Galliarda”
36 D. PICCININI, pp. 60–61: “Gagliarda VI”

36 B is for a 7-course lute. Spots on this manuscript render deciphering of the tablature difficult in places. A rhythmic error occurs in bar 1, and there is an error in the tablature in bar 34. Right hand fingering and left hand tenuto signs are frequent. 36 C is for 8-course lute. There are occasional corrections and cancellations. Here, too, there are frequent signs for right hand fingering and left hand tenuto. 36 A is also for 8-course lute, but the tuning of the bottom two courses is different from 36 C. There are a few rhythmic errors, and no signs for fingering. Finally, 36 D is a version for 12-course archlute. There are two small imprecisions in the rhythm, and fingering for the right hand is present. The attribution to the “Eques Romanus” is found only in 36 A, and there is no attribution given in 36 B and 36 C. The presence of 36 D in the book by Piccinini could indicate that Piccinini is the author, or that he claims authorship. On the other hand, Piccinini may only be the responsible for this particular version using his diminutions, and not the underlying galliard framework which evidently circulated in various elaborations for some time. 36 B is the most extensive version, based on the structure a a' b b' c c'; d, and coda (the coda is a brief reprise of the final part of d). No particular signs, such as double bar lines, indicate the passage from one strain to another. The repeats of the various strains are always embellished with more or less elaborate diminutions. 36 D follows the same structure but omits strain c'. Here, too, there are no signs to indicate the passage from one strain to another. C omits strains b and b'; a' and c' are not written out, but indicated by a repeat sign. There is a rhythmic error in bar 7 of 36 C, which compresses two bars into one, thus shortening the strain by one bar with respect to the other sources. 36 A comprises strains a, b, c, d; there is a double bar line separating a from b, no other indications separate the other strains. Besard utilizes double length bars with respect to the other three sources. In both the varied repeats and in the base strains a, b, c, and d, there are evident differences between the sources, including differences in the voicing of chords, the use of bass notes and available diapasons, rhythm and melody. The two most similar versions are 36 B and 36 D; in general 36 D is the richest and most elaborate version.
37. **Gagliarda**  
**WOLFENBÜTTEL, 18.8 / Sechster Thail [Part VI] – pp. 168 v–169r:**  
"Gagliarda Equitis Romanj”

38. **Gagliarda**  
**WOLFENBÜTTEL, 18.8 / Sechster Thail [Part VI] – pp. 172r–174r:**  
"Gagliarda Romanescha Equitis Romanj”

39. **Romanesca**  
**KRAKAU 2, p. 168:** “Romanesca di Lorenzino”

40. **Romanesca**  
**WOLFENBÜTTEL, 18.8 / Achtender Thail [Part VIII] – p. 248 v:**  
“Romanescha in tenore Equitis Romanj”

41. **Branle**  
3 sources:  
41 A. **BESARD 1, pp. 140v–141:** “Branle de Laurencin”  
41 B. **WOLFENBÜTTEL, 18.8 / Ailffier Thail [Part XI] – p. 278 r–v:**  
“Une brande du seigneur Laurenzis”  
41 C. **VÉSOUL, p. 45 v:** “Branle simple premier/Primo Brando del Lorenzino” (lost since 1945)

Versions 41 A and 41 B are substantially identical. Small differences include chords with different numbers of voices, and a few small errors in the placement of rhythm signs in 41 B. The concordance between 41 A and the lost manuscript formerly at Vésoul (41 C) is indicated in SMT I on the basis of a “hand written note left by M. Brenet (F Pn [Paris Bibliothèque nationale] Ms. nouvacq. fr 1141)”: it was, obviously, not possible to verify this.

42. **Branle**  
**BESARD 2, p. 48:** “Branle quondam Laurencini nuncupatum nunc vero a I. B. B. ad usum suae testudinis accomodatum”

The title states that this piece by Lorenzino was treated to an “accommodation” by Besard himself. Since the original work has not survived, we cannot know the extent of Besard’s transformation. For this reason, the work has been included in our catalogue as a spurious work.

43. **Mattaccino**  
**KRAKAU 2, pp. 352–53:** “Mattachin con sus diferencias di Lorenzino”
44. *Ripresa*
   BESARD 1, p. 101: “Ripresa ex Laurencino”

45. *Tenore*
   KRAKAU 2, p. 37: “Tenore di Lorenzino”

46. *Courante*
   2 sources:
   46 A. FUHRMANN, p. 169: “Courante Laurentzini”
   46 B. LEIPZIG, p. 256: “Courante Laurenzini”

46 B corresponds to the first 36 bars of 46 A, which is more extensive. Numerous chords (the first chord in bars 1, 5, 13, 14, and 17 and the second chord in bars 3 and 15) are of three or four voices in 46 B but of only two voices, bass and soprano, in 46 A. At bars 10 and 12, two chords which are correct in 46 A contain simultaneous B natural and B flat in 46 B.

47. *Prelude*
   2 sources:
   47 A. BESARD 1, p. 11: “Praeludium Laurencini”
   47 B. CAMBRIDGE 1, p. 30 (b): “Exercitium”

Apart from the following observations, the two sources are substantially identical. There are generally more errors in 47 B: tablature letters are positioned on the wrong lines, rhythmic signs cause metric irregularities. In 47 A the first bar is too long on account of an erroneous rhythmic sign on the first chord, while bar 7 is too short on account of a missing rhythmic sign for the last four notes (present in 47 B). The metric subdivision in 47 A is generally correct, but several brief passages are missing, possibly eliminated in order to square the rhythm in the affected bars. Also, the final coda in bars 47-48 of 47 B is completely missing in 47 A, in which the final bar was modified to leave a single chord, giving it a more conclusive ending with respect to 47 B, whose final measure ends with two notes which seem to suggest a continuation, or bridge to another piece.

Compare with n. 47 (2).

47 (2). *Prelude*
   FUHRMANN, p. 3: “Praeludium incerti Autoris”

This piece is possibly not by Lorenzino, although it begins in the same way as one of his known preludes: n. 47. There is a certain irregularity with respect to the metric division of the bar lines, resulting in some bars being shorter than others. At bar 5 there is a passage which is rhythmically unconvincing, probably due to erroneous rhythmic signs.

48. *Prelude*
   BESARD 1, p. 2v (a): “Praeludium Laurencini”
49. Prelude

2 sources:
49 A. BESARD 1, p. 7v: “Praembulum Laurencini”
49 B. CAMBRIDGE 1, pp. 28v-29: “Preludium”

The two sources substantially coincide, although in 49 B there are numerous variants, for the most part in the rhythm.
Compare with n. 49 (2) and n. 32.

49 (2). Prelude

MERTEL, pp. 43-44: [Praeludium] 93

This anonymous work begins like n. 49 and then proceeds differently, and it is much shorter. The attribution to Lorenzino, therefore, is disputable.

50. Prelude

2 sources:
50 A. BESARD 1, p. 12v (b): “Praeludium Laurencini”
50 B. COMO, p. 15: “Preludio”

50 B is shorter than 50 A and does not include the final coda. The two sources differ in numerous places, mostly on account of differences in rhythm signs, where the values are halved in one source with respect to the other.

51. Prelude

BESARD 1, p. 1: “Praeludium Laurencini”

52. Prelude

BESARD 1, p. 1v (a): “Praeludium Laurencini”

53. Prelude

BESARD 1, p. 1v (b): “Praeludium Laurencini”

54. Prelude

BESARD 1, p. 2 (a): “Praeludium Laurencini”

55. Prelude

5 sources:
55 A. BESARD 1, p. 2 (b): “Praeludium Laurencini”
55 B. BERLIN 2, f. 27: “Praeludium Laurencini”
55 C. HASLEMERE, p. 262: “Fant[asia]”
55 D. PRAHA, p. 204: “Prelude”
55 E. CAMBRIDGE 1, p. 26 (a): “Preludium”
The five sources are essentially concordant. In particular, 55 C and 55 D, despite being in different tablature systems (55 C in French and 55 D in Italian), are identical with the exception of a single note. 55 B is also an almost exact copy of 55 A. The bars in 55 A are twice as long as those in 55 B, 55 C, and 55 D, so that it has a total of 10 bars as opposed to 19 in the other sources. In 55 E, there is a reduced note value, probably an error, for four notes in bar 10 which causes the bar lines to be out of phase until the end of the piece, where the rhythm has been adjusted and shortened before the final chord, giving the piece a total of 17 bars. The only significant difference between the sources comes at the end of bar 8 of 55 A, at which point two notes are omitted in 55 C and 55 D. 55 E omits only the first of these notes, but eliminates another note further on. Compare with n. 55 (2).

55 (2). Prelude
REYMANN, p. A 1: "Preludij primi ad notam G sol re ut melos molle"

This work is presented as an original composition by the author of the book, Matthias Reymann. It is an elaboration of n. 55, but much longer due to an added section shortly after the beginning and a cadence before the final chord. At the point of divergence of the five sources of n. 55 (i.e., at the end of bar 8 of 55 A), this work is identical to 55 A regarding the note pitches, whereas the rhythmic values are slightly different, while not interfering with the overall meter.

56. Prelude
BESARD 1, p. 2v (b): "Praeludium Laurencini"

57. Prelude
BESARD 1, p. 3: "Praeludium Laurencini"

58. Prelude
BESARD 1, p. 6v: "Praeludium Laurencini"

The Genova copy of BESARD 1 attributes this piece to "Alb[ert] Dlug[oraj]."
Compare with n. 58 (2).

58 (2). Prelude
KRAKAU 2, p. 243: "Preludio"

" Page 22 under the new numbering.
With respect to n. 58, which is rich with points of imitation and fast diminution, this work presents a mere skeletal reduction, barely traceable to the highly embellished version of 58. The correspondence between the two sources can be recognized only partially: bars 1–10 of 58 (2) correspond to bars 1–5 of 58, and the eight final bars of 58 (2) correspond to bars 16–19 of 58. The central section of 58 (2) (bars 11–12) cannot be traced to 58 (bars 6–15), possibly because it is here that the virtuoso display in the version by Besard finds its fullest expression.

59. Prelude
   BESARD 1, p. 7: “Praeludium Laurencini”
   Compare with 59 (2).

59 (2). Toccata
   PRAHA, p. 4545: “Tocata”
   This brief Tocata, the only piece in the manuscript written in French tablature, corresponds exactly to the final bars (25–27) of n. 59.

60. Prelude
   BESARD 1, p. 8v: “Praeludium Laurencini”

61. Prelude
   3 sources:
   61 A. BESARD 1, p. 9: “Praeludium Laurencini”
   61 B. KASSEL, pp. 67v–68v: “Prelude”
   61 C. MERTEL, pp. 31–32: [Praeludium] 73
   Bar lines are absent in 61 B. One bar of 61 A corresponds, apart from irregularities, to two bars of 61 C. The first section of the work, corresponding to bars 1 and 2 of 61 A, is missing in 61 C. 61 A is slightly simplified with respect to the other two versions, for example in the simplification of rhythmic signs at the beginning (which in 61 B are dotted), and in the elimination of part of the final diminution. There are two points at which all three sources differ: the end of bar 5 of 61 A and the section corresponding roughly to bars 12–13 of 61 A. At the beginning of bar 13 there is an incorrect rhythmic sign in 61 A: it is a repetition of the previous rhythmic sign (and therefore it would be redundant, since this is not the beginning of a new line) and, if taken at face value, it would make the bar too long. At this point in 61 B and 61 C,

45 Page 45 under the new numbering.
there is a different melodic figure, contracted with respect to 61 A. This section of the work is problematic, and in 61 C a brief but crucial passage is missing; it is possible that all three sources derive, perhaps indirectly, from a preceding model which was also unclear at that point.

62. **Prelude**

   BESARD 1, p. 12 (a): “Praeludium Laurencini”

63. **Prelude**

   2 sources:
   63 A. BESARD 1, p. 12v (a): “Praeludium Laurencini”
   63 B. FUHRMANN, p. 29: [Praeludium (“Subplementum folii”)]

   The two sources contain numerous, but for the most part unsubstantial, variants. There are also a number of errors in 63 B. Normally one bar of 63 A corresponds to two of 63 B; the only irregular section is that which corresponds to the first three bars of 63 A and the first six of 63 B.

64. **Prelude**

   FUHRMANN, pp. 1–2: “Praeludium Laurencini Romani”

65. **Ricercar**

   KRAKAU 2, pp. 277–78: “Ricercata del Lorenzino”

66. **Fantasia**

   2 sources:
   66 A. BESARD 1, p. 20: “Fantasia Laurencini”
   66 B. KRAKAU 2, p. 209: “Tiento de sesto tono”

   In both sources the first bar is twice as long as the other bars in the piece. In 66 B, bars 11–12 are half as long as the other bars. 66 B is longer than 66 A, because of an added section of 10 bars in the middle of the piece at bars 14–23. After this episode, the two sources are perfectly concordant, with the exception of a single note. Before, however, there are a number of variants, caused by the addition or elimination of notes, and by differences in rhythm. For example, a short passage in 66 B at bar 9 is missing in 66 A. An errant rhythm sign in the second bar of 66 A causes a disparity of bar lines between the two sources.

67. **Toccata**

   KRAKAU 2, p. 215: “Tochata del Laurenzino”

68. **Prelude**

   2 sources:
   68 A. BESARD 1, p. 2v (c)–3: “Praeludium Eiusdem” [Laurencini]
   68 B. KRAKAU 2, p. 216 (a): “Tiento over Tochata”
The two versions coincide substantially, apart from minor variants and a certain amount of simplification in 68 A.

69. *Toccata*

KRAKAU 2, pp. 280–81: “Tocata di Lorenzino”

There are numerous manuscript corrections, the most noticeable of which occurs on page 280 where an entire line is cancelled and then rewritten underneath (bars 18–23) with a minor change in rhythm on bar 20. The fact that the scribe elected to rewrite the whole line rather than to simply correct the rhythm signs (and regularize the subsequent bar line on bar 22) may indicate that he only noticed the error when he realized that the bar line should come after the G chord, and not before as in the cancelled version. The particular cursive style of rhythm signs in the second version of this line is also of interest. Another noticeable correction is on the next page, where two bar lines have been cancelled on bars 67 and 68, respectively.

70. *Toccata*

CAMBRIDGE 2, p. 58v: “Toccata Lorenzino”

71. *Fantasia*

4 sources:

71 A. BESARD 1, p. 22: “Fantasia Laurencini”
71 B. HAMBURG 2, p. 137: “Fantasia L.”
71 C. KRAKAU 2, p. 130: [Fantasia]
71 D. DEN HAAG, p. 72r (a): “Fantasia”

There is much similarity between 71 A and 71 B. The latter is very probably modeled on *Thesaurus Harmonicus*: in 71 A, there is a new rhythm sign at the beginning of each line even if technically redundant; this rhythm sign is copied into 71 B at the same locations (except in one case), despite the fact that the lines change in different places. There is an erroneous rhythm sign on bar 8 of 71 A, in 71 B, there is a blank space in its place.

71 C and 71 D are very similar, but not identical. 71 D has no bar lines, a different style of rhythm signs, certain rhythmic and melodic differences, and occasionally fuller chords than 71 C.

71 C contains a passage on bar 18 that is missing in the other three sources. 71 C and 71 D are substantially different from 71 A and 71 B in that they exclude the long initial diminution on bars 1–4 and the final diminution at bar 15. They also contain an almost identical repetition of a passage that is given only once in 71 A and 71 B (71 C: bars 12–13, 71 A and 71 B: first half of bar 11). In the first exposition of this passage, 71 D contains an error not present in 71 C. On bar 6 of 71 A and 71 B, there is a small passage not present in 71 C and 71 D. Following this is a problematic passage (bar 7 of 71 A) in which all four sources contain differences. In general, 71 A and 71 B are technically less difficult than the other two sources.

72. *Fantasia*

2 sources:
This fantasia is characterized by an imitative subject which enters at different pitches. Both sources contain a cut-time indication and similar style rhythm signs, but bar lengths are different. In 72 A the bars are generally twice as long as in 72 B, but some are irregular (bars 8, 11, 12, and 13). Apart from this, there are numerous other differences between the two sources. A long section (bars 47-62) of 72 B is missing in 72 A, substituted by a single bar (22) of new material. Other shorter passages of 72 B are also missing in 72 A, and in almost all of these cases the integrity of the subject is compromised. There are also rhythmic differences between the two sources. At the end of the fantasia there is a two bar coda in 72 A that leads to a different cadence. 72 A is more problematic than 72 B, although 72 B is not without difficulties either. It seems improbable that one of the two versions derives from the other. But apart from the numerous differences, it is clear that 72 A and 72 B do represent the same musical work. This cannot be said for the "[Phantasia] 59" published by Elias Mertel on pp. 195-96 of his Hortus Musicalis Novus (Strassburg 1615). This work begins with an identical presentation of the same subject in imitation, transposed down a tone, but soon evolves in a completely different direction.

73. Prelude
4 sources:
73 A. BESARD 1, p. 8: "Praeludium Laurencini"
73 B. CAMBRIDGE 1, p. 31v: "A Fancye"
73 C. KASSEL, pp. 19v-20: "Prelude"
73 D. MERTEL, pp. 46-47: "[Praeludium] 99"

73 B has some irregular bars (7, 16, and 23) and there is an erroneous rhythm sign in bar 22. In 73 A bar 13 is too short by half. The best version generally seems to be 73 D, in that it has fewer errors, but it is also slightly simplified due to the elimination of internal voices. 73 C, apart from the lack of bar lines and some light differences, is substantially identical to 73 A, but it also contains numerous indications for the fingering of the right hand. There are numerous small differences between 73 A, 73 B, and 73 D: bass notes displaced by an octave, passing notes or short passages of up to six notes added or subtracted, and the like. Since these differences often coincide with apparent errors in the placement of the bar lines, it could be that the three sources derive from a missing original which was also unclear at those same points.

74. Fantasia
BESARD 1, pp. 18v-19: Fantasia Laurencini

75. Fantasia
BESARD 1, p. 19: Fantasia Laurencini

This is a parody fantasia on Claudin de Sermisy's chanson C'est à grand tort.
76. Fantasia


The paternity of Lorenzino is not certain, due to the double attribution. The inscriptions “Fantasia di M Lorenzino Romanese” and “Kowalis Lorentio” may be later additions. “Kowalis Lorentio” is written in Hebrew, which is also used in other inscriptions throughout the manuscript. Many areas of the manuscript are difficult to decipher because of its less than excellent condition and because the script utilized contains several letters which are nearly indistinguishable. Furthermore, there are a number of errors both in the alphabet letters and in the rhythm signs.

77. Fantasia

3 sources:
77 A. BESARD 1, p. 14: “Fantasia Laurencini”
77 B. BASEL, p. 47: “X Fantasia M N”
77 C. CAMBRIDGE 1, p. 21v: “Fantasia Laurencini”

The inscription “Fantasia M.N.” in 77 B seems to indicate an attribution to “M.N.,” possibly Melchior Neusidler. The other two sources attribute the work to Lorenzino. The three versions substantially coincide. In particular, 77 C seems to be based on 77 A, or very probably derives from the same original source (seeing that 77 C probably predates 77 A). There are a number of errors in 77 C, some of which were corrected by the scribe, and there are a few differences with respect to 77 A. Furthermore, bar lines in 77 C are irregular, particularly in the first half of the work, and seem to be missing in lengthy passages (or at least so it appears in the microfilm with which I examined the work: they may be present but barely visible in the manuscript itself). In 77 C the following errors are encountered: a passage starting on the second half of bar 4 is repeated in bar 5; another erroneous repetition, in part cancelled out, of the beginning of bar 10 is found at bar 11; a long series of rhythmic signs at bar 9 are incomplete; other incorrect and corrected rhythm signs are found on bars 7 and 8. In 77 B, the only error is apparently on bar 34: if the indicated rhythm is maintained, the bar would be incomplete. Furthermore, the final cadence is indicated as being twice as slow with respect to 77 A.

78. Fantasia

2 sources:
78 A. BESARD 1, p. 29v: “Fantasia Diomedis”
78 B. KRAKAU 2, pp. 206–07: “Fantasia di Lorenzino”

The two versions are nearly identical. Nevertheless, 78 A contains a number of simplifications with respect to 78 B, due to the elimination of inner voices. There are a few differences in rhythm between the two sources. The most significant difference is in the final section: bars 79–81 of 78 B are eliminated in 78 A, and the final chord is modified.
79. **Fantasia**  
2 sources:  
79 A. BESARD 1, p. 12 (b): “Praeludium Laurencini”  
79 B. GALILEI, p. 88: “Altro Ricercare del primo tuono per 4”  

This Ricercare does not appear in the first edition of *Fronimo* (1568). Vincenzo Galilei does not specify the authorship of this work, and its context and lack of attribution seem to indicate Galilei himself as the composer. Besard reprints the piece 19 years after its publication by Galilei, attributing it to Lorenzino. The date of the second edition of *Fronimo* (1584) would not, however, exclude the possibility of Galilei’s having obtained the work from Lorenzino for inclusion in his book. The two versions are substantially identical; however, in 79 A, two brief passages are missing, several chords have been simplified, one chord has been expanded, and there are several rhythmic differences. The penultimate bar in 79 A is overlong.

80. **Fantasia**  
4 sources:  
80 A. GALILEI, p. 116: [“Ricercare a 4 voci di B. M.”]  
80 B. COMO, pp. 46v–49: “Fantasia”  
80 C. BESARD 1, pp. 26v–27: “Fantasia Laurencini”  
80 D. DOWLAND, p. 2v: “Fantasie.4 Composed by the most famous and divine Laurencini of Rome”  

80 B is almost identical to 80 A, but two passages have been added (at bars 105–106 and at the end). These two passages are also missing in 80 C and 80 D, which are also almost identical, but contain ulterior lacunae with respect to 80 A and 80 B, and halve the rhythmic values of a brief passage. Finally, two passages in 80 A (part of bar 12 and from bar 41 to 43) are missing in the other three sources. Compare with 80 (2).  

*Note.* The *Fantasia septima* published by Joachim van den Hove in *Florida* (1601), f. 6 r–v, which begins similarly to 80 but then proceeds independently, is a parody of the *Canzone spiritata* by Giovanni Gabrieli; another version of van den Hove’s *Fantasia septima* (which, however, contains numerous variants and errors) is found on pages 8r–9v of HAMBURG 1.

80 (2). **Fantasia**  
ROMA, p. 17v: [fantasia]  

---

46 Thanks to Francesco Pavan for this information.
Although it begins like 80 and was perhaps inspired by that work, it proceeds completely differently after a few bars. A very brief work, possibly incomplete, it occupies only half a page, leaving the other half blank.

81. **Prelude**

3 sources:
81 A. BESARD 1, pp. 10v–11: “Praeludium Equitis Romani”
81 B. CAMBRIDGE 1, pp. 29v–30: “Exercitium Equitis Romani”

The three sources are almost identical and all three attribute the piece to *Eques Romanus* (who, in 81 C, is qualified as *Lorenzino citizen of Rome*). Small variations between the sources, mostly rhythmic, can be seen. The first bars of 81 C use different diminutions to connect the principal chords, and on three occasions (bars 10, 12, and 29) introduce altered notes. 81 B. after bar 7, omits a passage present in the other two sources, and at bar 28 halves the rhythm, which produces an irregular bar. There are repeated notes and many errors in the writing of rhythmic signs in 81 C, and a number of bars are too long. There is a rhythmic error at the end of 81 A, which produces an elongation of the rhythm and metric irregularity. Also, the lowest note of the third to last chord is improbably indicated as a “b” on the seventh course.

82. **Fantasia**

3 sources:
82 A. BESARD 1, p. 27v: “Fantasia Equitis Romani”
82 B. DOWLAND, pp. 1v–2r: “Fantasie.2 Composed by the most famous, the KNIGHT of the Lute”
82 C. CAMBRIDGE 2, pp. 14v–15: “Fantasia Lorenzino”

82 A and 82 B are essentially equivalent, apart from minor variants. Toward the end of the work there is a section in ternary time, returning to cut time for the conclusion. In 82 C the ternary section is incorporated into the tablature without time signatures to indicate the tempo changes. In 82 A and 82 C the return from ternary to cut time is not indicated by a new bar line, as it is in 82 B. Shortly before the ternary section in 82 A there is a rhythmic error that causes some irregularity in the length of bar 33. At precisely this point in the piece there are two brief passages added in 82 C which correct the anomaly. This source contains other additional passages, one at bar 23 and a long insertion at bar 40, as well as a more elaborate finale. Compare with 82 (2).

---

47 Page numbering follows those suggested in SMT II 1994.
82 (2). Fantasia

82 (2) begins similarly to the three sources of 82, but after the first six bars it proceeds on an autonomous course, although some echoes of 82 remain: bar 9 is identical to bar 14 of n. 82 C. Considering the substantial length of the piece and the fact that most of it is not concordant with 82, it should be considered an independent fantasia. Furthermore, since there is no attribution to either Lorenzino or the Knight of the Lute, it is by no means certain that it can be incorporated into the corpus of works by either of these two composers.

83. Fantasia
2 sources:
83 A. CAMBRIDGE 2, p. 75v: “Fantasia Cauallier du Luth”
83 B. PARIS 2, f. 34 r–v: “Fantaisie de Mr de Lorency”

83 B is a French keyboard manuscript from the second half of the 17th century. With respect to 83 A, 83 B has less regular bar lines, with numerous double length bars, and is missing bar 45 of 83 A. The differences mostly consist of octave displacements of single notes or brief melodic passages, and a few added passing notes. In the final section, corresponding to bars 57–58 of 83 A, a few rhythmic values have been halved and then doubled, but in such a way as to preserve the metric regularity.

84. Fantasia
CAMBRIDGE 2, pp. 78v–79: “Fantasia Cauallier du Luth”

85. Prelude
BASEL, p. 15: “Praeambulum Equitis Romani”

The manuscript is not in a good state of preservation (at least in the microfilm edition available to the author) and some of the letters in the German tablature are difficult to interpret. A few corrections are present in bars 10 and 12, and there seem to be errors in the choice of letters on bars 4, 6, 9, and 17, which would cause notes extraneous to the harmony or melodic line. One has the impression that some of these errors might be due to an incorrect transcription from French or Italian tablature to the German.

86. Fantasia
2 sources:

---

48 I wish to thank François-Pierre Goy for bringing the concordance of this piece to my attention.
86 A. BESARD 1, pp. 3v–4: “Praeludium Equitis Romani”
86 B. KRAKAU 1, pp. 39v–40v: “Fantasia equitis Romani excellentissima”

The two sources substantially coincide for the first 27 bars, although 86 B sometimes omits some notes. 86 B ends on bar 27 with a final chord, while 86 A continues with an extended final section missing in the second source.

87. Fantasia
BESARD 1, pp. 28v–29: “Fantasia Equitis Romani”

88. Prelude
DRESDEN, p. 75v: “Praeambulum del Cavaglier del liuto”

89. Fuga
KRAKAU 1, pp. 33v–34: “Fuga equitis Romani”

[90]. Final
ZARY, [p. ?]: “Final – Cavaliero maestro di Roma”
Some Observations on the Music of Lorenzino and the Knight of the Lute*

BY PAUL BEIER

I. Introduction

U ntil recently, it was commonly thought that the composers veiled under the names “Lorenzino” (diminutive of Lorenzo and always absent a surname in musical sources) and “Knight of the Lute” (or one of its many variations such as “Cavaliere del Liuto” and “Eques Romanus”) were interchangeable and probably referred to one and the same person, the “Laurencinus Romanus” who figures so prominently in Jean Baptiste Besard’s massive Thesaurus Harmonicus of 1603. Recent research, culminating in Mariagrazia Carlone’s article on Lorenzino in this journal, has proved received wisdom to be false: there were two lutenist knights who lived and worked in Rome during the second half of the 16th century to whom the title “Knight of the Lute” could be applied, and one of them was, in fact, called Lorenzino. This was Lorenzino Tracetti, servant of Cardinal Ippolito II d’Este until 1572, after which he seems to have worked freelance and taught in Rome until his death in 1590. The other was the pious Vincenzo Pinti, resident at the palace of the Vatican vice-chancellor under Cardinals Alessandro Farnese and Montalto (Alessandro Peretti) until his death in 1608.

To my knowledge, neither of these composers was ever involved directly in the publication or dissemination of his works. For Vincenzo Pinti this was a matter of principle: being a man of faith, his music was dedicated to the glory of God, and, in the words of Giovenale Ancina, he was famously “reticent in communicating his works to the virtuosi.”

---

* I would like to thank Dinko Fabris, Arthur Ness, Peter Király, and the other scholars who read and commented on the 1994 draft of this essay, and above all Philippe Canguilhem and John Griffiths, whose severe but constructive criticism stimulated me to reconsider several aspects of my original paper.

1 Jean Baptiste Besard, Thesaurus Harmonicus Divini Laurencini Romani, Cologne, 1603, ed. facs. Minkoff, Geneva, 1975 (hereafter Besard). This is the main source of works attributed to both “Laurencinus” (45 works) and the “Eques Romanus” (6 works).

While Lorenzino Tracetti acquired considerable international fame during his lifetime, he seems to have been extremely attached to his family and to his city, hesitating to accept offers of lucrative positions with the King of France and the Duke of Bavaria, but nevertheless becoming wealthy through his teaching and, perhaps, his freelance musical activities among the pleasure-loving Roman nobility. Among his students was the aforementioned Jean Baptiste Besard, to whom he apparently gave a considerable amount of his music, but Besard waited 13 years after Lorenzino's death before publishing it. This fact may not be of any significance, yet it may imply a certain deference on the part of Besard, at least for a while, to the wishes of his maestro not to publish or disseminate his works.

Of the 90 musical compositions attributed to Lorenzino and the Knight, very few are found in manuscripts compiled before the death of Lorenzino, and relatively few are found in sources geographically close to either composer's area of activity. There are no autograph musical sources for either Tracetti or Pinti, and the vast majority come from posthumous manuscripts and a few printed books that were compiled and published throughout Europe, especially in the German-speaking lands and mainly in the first two decades of the 17th century. None of the musical sources, therefore, represent what may be described as an *urtext*, a source representing with certainty the "original intention of the composer as exactly as possible." In addition, there is confusion in the concordances regarding attributions to the Knight of the Lute. For instance, Besard's "Susanne un jour Transposito Laurencini" appears as "Susanna del Cavagliere" in the lute book of Pietro Paolo Raymundo. Another source, the lute book of Philipp Hainhofer, actually conflates the two names in the verbose title "Praeambulum equitis aur[ati] Laurencijn civis Romanj," underlining the

---


4 The latest research indicates that he may have gone to Bavaria for six months in 1575. As to the King of France, he was waiting for a reply to his proposal when Charles IX died in May 1574. See *Carlone 2009*, chapter 1.

5 For a detailed discussion of the musical sources of Lorenzino and the Knight of the Lute, see *Carlone 2009*, chapter IIIc.


fact that Lorenzino Tracetti was also a knight. But the same piece appears in Besard as “Praeludium Equitis Romani.”\(^8\) This source also contains pieces attributed separately to “Laurencinus” and “Eques Romanus,” and we are always left wondering as to the true intentions of these attributions. Furthermore, attributions in Besard and many other sources of the period are notoriously unreliable.\(^9\)

For the analyst of musical style, perhaps with the idea of investigating a sort of stylistic musical “fingerprint” with which one might be able to distinguish the music of Pinti from that of Tracetti, these facts raise a fundamental stumbling block. Haydn and Mozart worked in the same city during the same years, and modern listeners can tell them apart. Why should this not be possible with the composers under consideration here? For one thing, given the unreliability of the sources and their distance both in time and geography from the lives of the composers, we are never certain who composed what. Pieces attributed to Lorenzino are presumably by him, but the works of the Knight are by no means presumably by Vincenzo Pinti, whose name never appears in any musical source.\(^10\) And with Haydn and Mozart, the publication of their music was often supervised directly by the composers, and we have autograph sources. This is far from the case with Tracetti and Pinti. Yet there is something about this body of work, taken as a whole, which does set it apart from other contemporary lute music. The experienced listener can indeed distinguish between a piece by Lorenzino and, say, Simone Molinaro or Giovanni Antonio Terzi, not to mention John Dowland, Antoine Francisque, or Melchior Neusidler, all contemporaries of our Roman composers. Nevertheless, at the present state of knowledge, it does not seem possible to clearly distinguish stylistically between works attributed to Lorenzino and to the Knight, or between mu-

---

\(^8\) Phillip Hainhofer Lautenbuch (hereafter Hainhofer) conserved in Wolffenbutel, Cod. Guelf. 18.7-8 Aug. 20, Dritter Thail, f. 7v and Besard, f. 10v. The two versions are sufficiently different as to suggest that they might have been copied from independent sources. The opening sequence of three bars is completely different, with an opening flourish of rhythmically free diminution in Hainhofer, and a more sober, imitative opening in Besard. The rest of the piece is a fairly close concordance.

\(^9\) The most clamorous errors of attribution in Besard are perhaps the five fantasias first published by Melchior Neusidler in his books of 1566 and 1574 and thus presumably by him, attributed by Besard to Fabrizio Dentice and Jacobus Reys. Besard attributes to Lorenzino two pieces first published by Vincenzo Galilei in Frontino Dialogo in 1584: the “Alto Ricercare del primo tuono per [b-quadr]” (f.88 = Besard f.12r) and the “Ricercare a 4 di B.M.” (f.116 = Besard f.26v). In addition, he attributes to Diomedes Cato (f. 29v) a fantasia that is almost certainly by Lorenzino: it appears as “Fantasia di Lorenzino” in Barbarino, p. 206.

\(^10\) See the introduction to chapter III in Carlone 2009 for a review of the problems of attribution.
sic written by Tracetti and Pinti. A future discovery, a sheaf of tablature in some dusty Roman attic bearing the name of Pinti perhaps, could change this situation.

In this essay I will consider the corpus of music attributed to Lorenzino and the Knight of the Lute as a single entity. References to the musical style of "Lorenzino" tacitly include the music of Knight of the Lute, and the real subject of this essay may be described as the "Roman lute style of the late 16th century." In order to understand how Lorenzino and the Knight fully inhabited the traditions of lute composition as they existed in Rome during their youth, and to appreciate how they subtly subverted and transformed those traditions, a discussion of the lute styles of their predecessors Francesco da Milano and Fabrizio Dentice is in order.

II. Lorenzino's Musical Inheritance

In the second decade of the 16th century, the extravagant patron of the arts, Pope Leo X, brought a young lute prodigy from Milan, Francesco Canova, to his court at the Vatican. Francesco remained in the eternal city for most of his life, working under Popes Leo, Clement VII, and Paul III, where his brilliant musical career earned him international renown. He lived during a period in which lute playing was transformed from virtuosic improvisation of melodic lines in the style of Pietro Bono and sophisticated accompaniments of improvised verse, such as the strambotti of Serafino dall'Aquila, to the composition of highly structured polyphonic works by way of the recently arisen system of musical notation called lute tablature.11 Francesco's contribution to musical style in lute music is comparable to that of his contemporary at the court of Leo X, Raphael, in painting: it cast a transformative shadow on the European stage that lasted for well over a century. Francesco's activities at the court of Pope Paul III included teaching, and his most illustrious pupil was Perino Fiorentino, who was hailed, at Francesco's death in 1543, as his successor in the art of lute playing.12


In 1547 another young lute virtuoso, Fabrizio Dentice, and his father Luigi came to Rome after being expelled from their native Naples and condemned to death in absentia for sedition against the Spanish viceroy. Fabrizio probably studied with Perino Fiorentino and was certainly directly influenced by him. Luigi Dentice published a treatise, *Duo Dialoghi della Musica* (Rome 1552), in which he praised Perino as being the preeminent lutenist of his time. With Perino's untimely death in 1552, Fabrizio Dentice emerged as one of the most important lutenists of his generation. His fame, like that of Francesco and, later, Lorenzino, reached as far as England, where "the manner of Fabrizio Dentice the Italian, and other his followers" is remarked upon in the English translation of the *Briefe and plaine instruction* of Adrian Le Roy in 1574. Was Dentice the founder or *caposcuola* of a school of lute playing during the third quarter of the 16th century? Certainly Le Roy's phrase "and other his followers" seems to indicate this, as does an analogous comment by Giovanni Paolo Lomazzo in his *Rime* of 1587. Dentice's most illustrious student (once described as "the maestro of Fabrizio Dentice") was Giulio Severino, who may have been the *maestro* of Giovanni Battista Dalla Gostena, who in turn taught lute playing to Simone Molinaro. Another possible member of Dentice's circle in Rome at mid-century may have been the Florentine lutenist Vincenzo Galilei, who was intimately involved with the Roman and Neapolitan musical environment as a young man.

---


15 Severino "fu chiamato Scimia del Signor Fabritio Dentice per il suo bell'ingegno [. . . ]" in *L'esercizio de Nicolò Taglia Ferro [. . . ]* cited in Fabris 1992, doc. A. 17. Severino is the only other lutenist besides Dalla Gostena represented in Molinaro's *Intavolatura di Liuto [. . . ] libro primo*, Venice, 1599. Dentice was probably also the teacher of Santino Garsi, who took over Dentice's post at the Farnese court in Parma at his death in 1581. Garsi was born in Parma in 1542 but studied the lute in Rome with an unidentified master: see Fabris 1992, p. 74 and fn. 38.

16 Galilei would have been in his late twenties in 1550. See Howard Mayer Brown, "Vincenzo Galilei
Whether or not Fabrizio Dentice was the actual founder of a school of lute playing, he nevertheless had considerable influence on contemporary lutenists in Italy, Spain, France, and England, and, of course, on the musical environment in Rome and Naples. It was into this environment that Vincenzo Pinti, born in 1542, came of age, and to which the young choirboy, Lorenzino Tracetti, was brought in the late 1550s. While there is no proof that Pinti or Tracetti studied with Dentice, there is considerable indirect evidence, and all three lutenists were patronized by members of the Farnese dynasty. Evidence of the musical influence that Pinti and Tracetti absorbed from Fabrizio Dentice and Francesco da Milano is found in their music, as we shall see.

### III. Texture

Compare, for example, the ending of Francesco’s “Fantasia de mon triste” with the following fantasia by Dentice from the *Siena Lute Book*.

![Example 1-A Francesco da Milano: Fantasia de mon triste, Dorico 1547, no.10, mm.55-58](image)

Examples 1-B Fabrizio Dentice: [Fantasia] Fab. Den., *Siena* f. 11v, mm. 62-66

(Bar values have been equalized for comparison.)
In Example 1.A, Francesco "implies" counterpoint in four parts without actually giving a chord of more than three notes until the pen-ultimate bar. This is entirely typical of Francesco's style of working with a minimum of notes for maximum effect. While his works do contain episodes of dense four- or implied five-part writing, these are fairly rare; the norm is two or three. Francesco demonstrated that compositions rivaling the structural complexity of the greatest masters of vocal polyphony of his age were possible on the lute, yet he achieved this by using the most economical means, which is perhaps one measure of his genius. The following generation, however, having been shown the possibilities, seems to have been guided by the belief that these possibilities were best expressed by exploiting the technical resources of lute playing to the maximum. This is already evident in the four massive fantasias by Francesco's student Perino Fiorentino, published alongside Francesco's compositions in Rome in 1546, in which, when Perino cited a passage by his master, he always took it to a higher level of complexity.\^19 Such a process is also evident in Dentice's fantasia shown in Example 1.B. Here, although the musical idea is very similar, Dentice is strikingly consistent in his use of extremely dense textures, with four-part writing, technically very demanding, being the norm. Indeed, the texture of much of his music more closely resembles that of Francesco's vocal intabulations than his freely composed works.\^20 Yet Dentice often goes beyond the composers of Francesco's generation in exploring the possibilities of harmonic tension in the music.

---

\(^{19}\) I discuss this at greater length in the notes to my CD Quanta Belà (Stradivarius STR 33787). For an extended discussion of Perino's style, see Richard Keith Falkenstein, The Lute Works of Pierino Degli Organi, master's thesis, University of New York at Buffalo, 1987, chapter 3: "The dense textures and the avoidance of strong internal cadences that characterize Pierino's compositions reflect the influence of composers such as Gombert and Willaert. Thus, while Pierino continued to cultivate his master's style, he added an element of his own by incorporating the procedures of vocal music in his day" (p. 62).

\(^{20}\) At least two of Dentice's fantasias, found paired together in Siena (ff.30-30v and ff.30v-31v), bear every indication of being vocal intabulations themselves, replete with consistent four-part writing, almost no diminution, and the sort of awkward, almost unplayable chord forms that come from too
The creation and resolution of dissonant suspensions was one of the most effective devices in the Renaissance polyphonist’s toolbox, and Francesco da Milano employed it with perhaps greater assurance than any of his contemporaries. A good example can be seen in the last eight bars of Fantasia 39, in which whole-tone dissonances of exposed fourths and minor sevenths are resolved to their respective sixths and thirds at a frequency of about once per bar.²¹ The dissonant intervals are carefully set up one at a time and arise as a consequence of the natural interplay of equal-voiced polyphony. As might be expected, Perino Fiorentino makes even more frequent and daring use of this technique in his music, but in Denticè there are passages where the musical focus is less on the polyphonic interplay than on the harmonic tension produced by the creation and resolution of dissonant suspensions (see Example 2.A). This style was integrated and further developed in the music of Lorenzino and the Knight of the Lute, and became an important trait of the Roman madrigralists of their generation.²² It is superbly demonstrated in the well-known fantasia from Besard and Robert Dowland’s Varietie of Lute Lessons (London 1610) attributed to the

---


²² “[…] slow imitative passages that use scalar ascending or descending subjects and build dissonance through single and double suspensions […] This kind of writing is common in Roman madrigals of the 1580’s.” Anthony Newcomb, The Madrigal at Ferrara 1579-1597, Princeton University Press, 1980 (hereafter Newcomb 1980), p. 146 and fn. 60, p. 147. The attribution to the Polish lutenist Diomedes Cato in Besard 1603 f.29v of the “Fantasia di Lorenzino” (Barbarino, p. 206) is surely mistaken: its presence in Barbarino, where there are no works by Cato represented, and which is a much earlier
Knight of the Lute, but is well in evidence in the "Fantasia di Lorenzino" in Example 2.B.

**IV. Homophony**

It is no surprise to find homophonic passages being given special importance in the fantasias of Dentice, a composer who was particularly close to the founding of the Neapolitan villanella and madrigale arioso, for, as Dinko Fabris has observed, "Fabrizio also played, in fact, a key role in the development of the so-called villanella alla napolitana." To be sure, homophonic writing is to be found in the works of Francesco, but its infrequent appearance is more related to the "polyphonically animated homophony" of the French chanson (which served as the subjects of many of his intabulations) rather than to the newly developing southern Italian usage.\(^\text{23}\) Alberto da Ripa's use of homophonic textures is even rarer, perhaps even nonexistent, if one discounts the pseudo-homophony sometimes produced as a result of very dense polyphony that, on the lute, can sound like a succession of chords. Such a passage can be found, for instance, on mm. 57-67 of Fantasia VII (page 52 of the CNRS edition) where the three voices never quite lose their identity and sense of independence, especially since a harmonically felt bass, essential in truly homophonic writing, is lacking. Homophony in Dentice differs from that of Francesco's generation in two important respects: 1) the rhythmic, dance-like quality that brings the villanella alla napolitana readily to mind, with its ternary dotted and hemiola rhythms, and 2) the harmonic quality which, while never fully leaving the realm of modal counterpoint, seems to strive for a liberation of the instrumental chordal texture from the restraints of a purely polyphonic interpretation:

---

\(^{23}\) Such passages can be found in Fantasias 24, mm. 42ff, 28, mm. 90ff, and 55 of *Nus 1970*. For Dentice's role in the development of the villanella, see *Fabris 1992*, p. 68. The phrase "polyphonically animated homophony" is used by Howard Mayer Brown to describe the homophony found in French chanson and also in madrigals of the Willaert generation in Howard Mayer Brown, *Music in the Renaissance*, Prentice-Hall, 1976, chs. 7 and 8.
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Example 3-A Fabrizio Dentice: [Fantasia] Fab. Den., Siena f. 13, mm. 27-34

Example 3-B Fabrizio Dentice: [Fantasia] Fab.o Dentice, Siena f. 3r, mm. 33-45

In Example 3.B Dentice places chords of two, three, four, and five notes in the space of three measures (mm. 35-37). The two imposing five-note chords at the beginning of the ternary section—Dentice also places two grand five-note B♭ minor chords in the penultimate bar of the fantasia—are especially striking as they cannot be explained within Dentice's normally rigorous polyphonic fabric. A purely instrumental texture has been created, a "going for effect" that, together with the hemiola rhythms, daring chromatic harmonies, and extreme contrasts of extension (cf. mm. 39), gives an impression of great novelty, a radical departure from the music of Dentice's predecessors. Of the nine Siena fantasias by Dentice, three have homophonic ternary sections of villanella-like hemiola rhythms, and three others have rhythmically animated homophonic sections in the binary fabric (as in Example 3.A), a significantly high percentage considering the rarity of such passages in music of the preceding generation.²⁴

²⁴ Vincenzo Galilei's Intavolature di istruo . . . libro primo, Rome, Valerio Dorico, 1563, is also imbued with the Roman and Neapolitan homophonic style of the madrigale arioso: see Brown, Vincenzo Galilei in Rome . . . , op. cit., p. 168: "Galilei set precisely the sort of 'classical' Italian poetry favored by Antonio Barré in his anthologies of madrigali ariosi and by Rocco Rodio in the Neapolitan collection of arias of
The abandonment of rigorous polyphony and the liberation of purely instrumental textures, plus the achievement of effects of powerful expressiveness on the lute, were later to become hallmarks of Lorenzino's style. In the Praeambulum in Besard, f. 7v shown in Example 4.A, a long section of diminution counterpoint in two parts, occasionally interrupted by short, mostly cadential chordal episodes, reaches an expressive climax in measure 12, with an extended outburst of sweeping four-, five-, and six-note chords whose contour forms a regular pattern of steps and leaps, first descending and then accelerating and ascending back to the point of departure in a display of accumulating energy and expressiveness. The chords are carefully formed for maximum power and sonority, and then subtly thinned out to two and three notes to give greater focus to the movement of the ascending canto.

Example 4.B highlights another technique typical of Lorenzino's homophonic style (seen in measure 15 of Example 4.A as well) in which a slowly moving chordal bass supports a single, rhythmically independent melodic voice, usually in the treble but which, as in measure 22, can also be in the bass. While it would be too much to say that this is an instrumental equivalent of the madrigale arioso style, in which solo diminutions were performed over a simple, harmonically motivated, and often formulaic chordal support, it is nevertheless evocative of it:

Example 4-A Lorenzino: Praeamb. Laur., Besard, f.7v, mm. 12-16

1577" (Rodio contains one of Fabrizio Dentice's only published madrigale arioso, "Empio cor cruda voglia e fera mano"); and p. 173: "In style, [Galilei's intabulations from the libro primo] might best be described as loosely polyphonic, with few clear-cut points of imitation; moreover, the animated polyphony that dominates their textures appears to be based on chordal progressions resembling those of the recitation formulas commonly used in the sixteenth century to declaim poetry. [...] Arias were of course cultivated everywhere in Italy in the sixteenth century, but nowhere more than in Rome and Naples." Note, however, that Brown is not speaking here of Galilei's compositions, but of his intabulations of vocal music by other composers.
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Example 4-B Lorenzino: Praelud. Laurenc., Besard, f.2 (1), mm. 17-23

In his free-form pieces Lorenzino no longer employs the dance-like, rhythmic homophony of Dentice. His approach is closer to what Anthony Newcomb describes as characteristic of the "New Ferrarese style:"

"Both Luzzaschi and Gesualdo use homophony, but they usually use it with a clear expressive purpose and rarely with such explicit, hemiola dance rhythms." (This is a point to which I shall return below.) But the distinctive and important contribution of Lorenzino to this style is his abandonment of the polyphonic decorum so meticulously observed in nearly all lute composition up to his time, and the exploration of expressive means in a purely idiomatic, instrumental, "lutenistic" medium.

V. Musica Ficta

As we have seen, Dentice employed dissonance and chromatic harmonies to a greater extent than was usual before him. Melodic chromaticism, however, and use of musica ficta to chromatic effect, is something one does not associate with Dentice's style. Consider, for example, the beginning of the unusual fantasia shown in Example 5:26

---

25 Newcomb 1980, p. 145. For a concise description and history of the southern Italian madrigale arioso style, see Brown, Vincenzo Galilei in Rome, op. cit.

26 This remarkably beautiful piece is attributed to Dentice in Barbarino (pp. 258-59) and to Giulio Severino in Siena (f.16), which is a better version. It is unusually concise for Dentice and may well be by Severino ("Dentice's ape"), but displays, in any case, the main characteristic traits of Dentice's style: slow moving, rigorous polyphony in mostly four voices, thick textures (esp. mm. 32ff.), rhythmic homophony (mm. 55-62), and striking dissonance (esp. m. 20 [F-G-Ab] and the chromatic cross-relation in m. 48 [E-Bb]).
The brief appearance of melodic chromaticism found in the superius on mm. 10-12 is striking. This kind of effect was later developed above all by Giulio Severino's associates Giovanni Battista Dalla Gostena and Simone Molinaro. Lorenzino never employed melodic chromaticism of this kind. On the other hand, the kind of non-cadential *musica ficta* used in the bass line in mm. 2-3 and 7-8 is typical of a style that became central to Lorenzino's musical language. The frequent alteration of the notes F, B♭, and E♭ in Example 6.A helps create a feeling of tonality by emphasizing the dominant major chord (D-Major) while maintaining a basically "minor" texture, made all the more colorful by major-to-minor shifts (m. 10) and conspicuous cross-relations (E♭ to B-natural in m. 5, E-natural to B♭ in the bass in m. 6). Yet the harmonic logic of Example 6.A is so well conceived so as to imbue every instance of chromatic alteration with a sense of inevitability:

---

Example 6-A Lorenzino: Tochata del Lorenzino, *Barbarino* p.280 , mm. 1-12

---

27 See in particular Molinaro's Fantasia XV and Dalla Gostena's Fantasia XXV in Molinaro's *Intavolatura di Liuto . . . libro primo* (ed. facs. S.P.E.S., Florence 1978). Molinaro's biography has been substantially updated in Maria Rosa Moretti, "Simone Molinaro Maestro di Capella di Palazzo: Contributo per una nuova biografia" in *Musica a Genova tra Medio Evo e Età Moderna, Atti del Convegno di Studi Genova, 8-9 Aprile 1989*, ed. Giampiero Buzelli, Genova 1992, pp. 45-83, which shows that Molinaro was probably born around 1570 and died in or after 1634, thus making him considerably younger than Lorenzino and the contemporary of the likes of Alessandro Piccinini and Giovanni Girolamo Kapsberger. Dalla Gostena's death date, previously given as 1598, is shown by Moretti to be September 1593, when he was brutally assassinated by one Simone Fascia for reasons unknown (p. 50).
Example 6-B Eques Romanus: Praelud. Equitis Romani, Besard, f.10v, mm. 11-15

The even greater intensity of the *musica ficta* in Example 6. B also seems to be more harmonically than modally conceived. A sensation of tonality is again achieved by pushing toward a dominant-major “cadence” (A-major in m. 15: the piece is basically in D-minor). Lorenzino uses the chromatic alteration obtained by the application of the rules of *musica ficta* to destabilize the mode and define a harmonic environment. Similar examples might be cited from almost any of Lorenzino’s free-form works, and he liberally applies the technique in his vocal intabulations, not only devastating the modality of the original vocal models, but imbuing them with a stronger sense of tonality as well.

VI. Diminution

There is nothing remarkable in the fact that Lorenzino, in line with lutenists from at least the time of Pietrobono, cultivated the art of diminution extensively. And there is nothing particularly noteworthy in the style of diminution cultivated by Lorenzino, who adopts the normal convention of notating *passaggi* in equal chromes or semichromes, whereas the conventions of performance called for a variety of rhythmic variation in the execution of such passages, as is made clear in almost every Italian diminution treatise of the period. As usual, Lorenzino tends to escalate the amount and intensity of diminution as a piece progresses, and he was particularly fond of the virtuosic end flourish.28 He also cultivated the style of diminution whereby a *passaggio*, sometimes stretched over many measures,

---

28 The anonymous fantasia found on f. 46v of *Raymondo*, concordant with the famous “Fantasia B. M.” of Vincenzo Galilei’s Fronimo Dialogo (op. cit., f. 116), contains the kind of virtuoso end flourish characteristic of Lorenzino. While B. M. and Lorenzino were not the same person (see Carlone 2009, chapter IIIc., where she suggests a possible identity for B. M. as Bernareggi Medici, and note that *Raymondo*, always ready to acknowledge compositions or intabulations by his beloved Cavaliere, does not do so in this case), this concordance suggests that the fantasia may well have been in Lorenzino’s (or the Knight’s) repertoire. It may be for this reason that *Besard*, followed by *Robert Dowland*, mistakenly took the piece as an original work by the “Knight of the Lute.”
is accompanied by a slower moving bass or treble part, most often in the proportion of four to one. While this kind of writing was normal in dance variation forms (typically *passemezzi* and *gagliarde*), Lorenzino is unusual in incorporating it in free-form pieces, such as the Praeambulum in *Besard*, f. 7v, mm. 5-10 and the Fantasia in *Besard*, f. 19, mm. 23-26.

There is one fantasia, however, that suggests that Lorenzino might have played a more innovative role in the development of diminution in lute composition. This is the highly florid fantasia attributed to Lorenzino in *Besard*, fol. 22, where it stands out as being the only "fantasia" composed entirely of diminutions imposed over a slow moving harmonic framework, a style that was later to be associated with the term "toccata":

A slightly abridged version of the same piece (the first five measures have been omitted) is also found in a group of four similar works without title or attribution in *Barbarino*, p. 130; what seems to be an even earlier version appears among a group of 11 related "fantasias" in *Siena*, fol. 72r. Given the unusual nature of these pieces, their collocation in pre-17th-century

---

29 The versions in *Siena* and *Barbarino* omit the first five measures of the *Besard* version. Arthur Ness seems not to have noticed the concordance with *Besard*, f. 22 in his table of contents in *Siena*, but he nevertheless notes the resemblance with Lorenzino's style: "At the end of the manuscript are fantasias and toccate for seven-course lute in the proto-baroque, virtuoso style cultivated by Lorenzino, Alessandro Piccinini and Girolamo Kapsberger." A further concordance is found in the *Schele Manuscript*, p. 137.
sources, their nearly tonal structure, and abandonment of any semblance of traditional polyphonic style, it seems that we are dealing here not, as one might think from the lone example in Besard, with an idiosyncratic, unique case, but with the birth of a new style of free-form lute composition, an event that, judging from the appearance of these pieces in Siena and Barbarino (Siena is a source not otherwise associated with Lorenzino), may have taken place in the 1580s.

Such an event might have coincided with the rise in Rome of one of the most impressive musical personalities of the Italian Renaissance, Luca Marenzio. Virtuoso diminution highly integrated into concise, harmonically conceived structures are qualities that earned for Marenzio the designation "leader" of what Anthony Newcomb terms the "luxuriant" madrigal style of the 1580s:

But the most influential single figure in this evolution was Luca Marenzio. [...] One sees to varying degrees his continuing preoccupation with the luxuriant style and with virtuosity in general. The word "virtuosity" as used here refers not only to the written-out diminution of the luxuriant style, but also to the exploration of new harmonic and textural effects. Marenzio was a leader in all these aspects during the early 1580's. [...] He seems to have formulated his style with the singing of such people as Peverara and Brancaccio in his ears.

And the virtuoso lute playing, perhaps, of the Roman lutenist Lorenzino Tracetti in his ears as well! Indeed, one could call this interesting group of pieces "the luxuriant lute fantasia style of the 1580's": given the attribution to Lorenzino of this piece in Besard, one is tempted to speculate that the 13 other anonymous works associated with it in the two manuscripts mentioned above are also by Lorenzino.30

30 Newcomb 1980, pp. 86-87. Lorenzino and the Knight also produced some very florid dance music; see in particular the "Gagliarda del Cavaliere" in Raymundo, f. 85v., and Lorenzino may be the author of the intabulation of "Anchor che col partire" on f. 38v of Besard, which contains nearly uninterrupted and usually florid virtuoso diminution throughout. For a discussion of Lorenzino's possible authorship of this intabulation, see Paul Beier, "Un Madrigale in Esame," Bollettino della Società Italiana del Liuto IV, No. 2 (April 1994): 11-15. There are many other pieces in Barbarino written in the "luxuriant lute style" described here, which makes one wonder if Lorenzino's participation in this important collection was greater than would seem from the attributions and concordances.
VII. Counterpoint

As one of the most prominent lutenists working during the 1570s and 1580s, Lorenzino is distinctive for his modernity. His music contrasts with that of other contemporary Italian lutenists such as G. B. Dalla Gostena and Simone Molinaro, whose fantasias are more reminiscent of mid-century masters such as Dentice. Dalla Gostena and Molinaro share with Dentice and Giovanni Antonio Terzi a predilection for expansive and weighty musical structure that is nothing if not long-winded. Terzi adds to this a particularly strong appetite for florid diminution and luxuriant textures. Alessandro Piccinini, who was active in Ferrara in the 1590s but only collected and published his work in 1623, shows an astonishing variety of styles in which it would be hard to determine a chronology, but in what are probably the earliest pieces, written for lutes of six and seven courses (especially the ricercars and canzonas), we encounter a style that is no less conservative than that of Terzi, and which also prizes lengthy and expansive structures and carefully articulated imitative counterpoint.

Lorenzino’s free-form compositions, on the other hand, are noteworthy for their brevity. He extensively cultivated a form that is variously called “preludium,” “tiento,” or “tochata,” and these types, more than twice the number of his fantasias, are usually about half their length. Yet even his fantasias rarely reach the typical length of fantasias by his main contemporaries. Far from implying poverty of invention, this predilection for concision, which extends from brevity of form to concision in the development of the musical material itself, seems to have been a consciously cultivated characteristic that Lorenzino shares with certain composers of secular vocal music in the last decades of the 16th century.31 In the following discussion I will compare Lorenzino’s style with aspects of the style described by Anthony Newcomb as “the new Ferrarese style.” I should emphasize here that this is not to imply a Ferrarese dimension to Lorenzino’s style, but simply to show how Lorenzino’s style reflects some of the most advanced musical thought of the period. Consider the following example from one of the most popular of Lorenzino’s preludes:32

31 Some parallels can be found here, too, with the progressive literary style of Giambattista Marino and the mannerist poets.
32 This prelude is found in four sources (see Carlone 2009, Table B). Lorenzino worked for the Ferrarese Cardinal Ippolito II d’Este in the early 1570s (Carlone 2008, chapter I). For “the new Ferrarese style,” see Newcomb 1980, pp. 113-59. Newcomb does not pretend that this style was an exclusively Ferrarese phenomenon, only that its origins were in some ways inspired by personalities and activities at the Este court.
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The short motive introduced in m. 13, itself a variant of a motive introduced earlier (in m. 11) after the only real cadence in the piece at its midpoint, hardly qualifies as a counterpoint subject; it is treated more as an arioso melody with chordal accompaniment and nevertheless only takes three repetitions before fading into a weak cadence on m. 16, in which the musical tension is not interrupted. Rather, the energy accelerates in a short transition to m. 17, where motive 1 is fragmented into motive 2 and treated to a nervous and very tight sequence of imitation between the outermost voices. This plays out in the space of two measures, ending in a sort of "evaporated" cadence on C on m. 19, on which is initiated yet another short motive also derived from motive 1, treated to close but slightly more relaxed four-part imitation, again lasting only two measures. This should suffice to illustrate what became one of the central characteristics of the style described by Newcomb: "quick nervous subjects in imitation at very close rhythmic intervals—a technique common to the Ferrarese style." Some parallels can be seen between Example 8 and aspects of Luzzaschi's style in the 1590s:

Luzzaschi's method is a dense way of developing musical material (i.e., much happens in a short time). [...] His individual vocal parts are often a patchwork of fragmentary subjects; his textures, because of the rapid appearance and disappearance of these fragmentary subjects all over the tonal space, are kaleidoscopic. [...] Luzzaschi avoids the danger of choppiness and extreme sectionality largely through another characteristic technique: in place of the normal cadence, he gives us a very
weak, an evaporated, or an interrupted cadence—or even no standard cadence formula at all.\textsuperscript{33}

VIII. Other Techniques

Examples of fragmentary subjects, weak or postponed cadences, and the use of contrasting and highly colorful instrumental textures are seen in the following example, where Lorenzino employs another technique typical of the "Ferrarese style," the "tension-filled general pause" (m. 26):

\begin{figure}[h]
\centering
\includegraphics[width=\textwidth]{example9.png}
\caption{Example 9 Lorenzino: Fantasia Laurenc., \textit{Besard}, f.18v, mm. 25-37}
\end{figure}

Rest signs are rarely used in tablature except at the beginning of dance movements, and an actual rest does not appear in the tablature of Example 9 (I have placed them in the transcription above for emphasis): a dotted quarter note rhythm sign is placed above the D-minor chord. Yet the dotted quarter is the longest rhythmic value in the piece. Its use here following an interrupted cadence leaves no doubt as to its dramatic expressive intention: "a general pause with enough unchecked momentum and unresolved tensions to send [the] listener stumbling eagerly across the silence into the beginning of the next phrase." This, too, is a technique reminiscent of the

\textsuperscript{33} Newcomb 1980, p. 120.
madrigal style of Luzzaschi, although Lorenzino uses it here quite differently from Luzzaschi.34

Of course Lorenzino could not have been directly influenced by Newcomb’s “Ferrarese style,” which was mostly a product of the 1590s, the decade following Lorenzino’s death. However, as Newcomb himself suggests, the origins of this style were largely Roman and Neapolitan: it was developed in the wake of the madrigals published by Luca Marenzio in the 1580s, and through contact at the court of Ferrara with Neapolitan musicians such as Carlo Gesualdo and the singer Giulio Cesere Brancaccio, whose work Lorenzino may well have encountered. My intent is merely to show how the music of Lorenzino, more than any of his contemporaries, was influenced by some of the most interesting and modern musical currents of his day. And at least one aspect of his style goes even beyond that of his contemporary madrigalists. In measure 13 of example 6.B above, there is an anticipation of the kind of instrumental texture, so often associated with lute music of the 17th century, called style brisé.35 In this passage the tactus of four minims to the bar, strongly felt until now, is temporarily if almost imperceptibly violated (m. 13-14), creating a momentary dream-like sensation of release or timelessness, to be reined back into the regular metrical structure on m. 15. (I have rearranged the bar lines in example 6.B to clarify its rhythmic structure.) Measure 13, with its chords of varying lengths of arpeggiation, serves to destabilize the steady two quarter note rhythmic pattern of the previous bars. The arpeggios then break out into interlocking three quarter note units in measure 14 that, while lasting two minims more than it should in the piece’s given meter, is perfectly logical in its unfolding of four regular groups of three. (I have to confess here, too, that my transcription of this passage in Example 6.B is slightly anachronistic: it should properly convey the inherent three-part polyphonic structure—I have redrawn it to emphasize its suggestion of style brisé.)

I would like to mention one last element of Lorenzino’s style, which also looks forward to later developments in Roman and Italian instrumental music. There was a tradition in Rome, recorded in manuscripts

34 Newcomb 1980, p. 122: Luzzaschi “is the master of the tension-filled general pause. It permits him to articulate his sections clearly, to point up the syntactical divisions of the poem, or to set off a dramatic exclamation. In addition, if it is prepared correctly, it can accomplish all this without stopping the forward motion of the piece. Luzzaschi has innumerable ways of moving into a general pause [. . .].”

35 Another good example of proto-style brisé in Lorenzino is found in Dinko Fabris, Andrea Falconieri Napolitano, Torre D’Orfeo, Roma 1987, p. 112, about which Fabris comments: “I tastieristi dovrebbero provare a leggere (e suonare) i preludi di Lorenzino per trovare un’ancor più tangibile anticipazione della nuova ideologia musicale seicentesca.”
such as the Ms. 156/1-4 of the Biblioteca Nazionale Centrale di Roma, in which melodic instruments improvise over a quasi-tonal structure of very long held bass notes normally played by an organ.\textsuperscript{36} This style is perceptible in the music of later Roman composers such as Paolo Quagliati, Stefano Landi, Girolamo Frescobaldi, and Lelio Colista; consider, for example, the beginning of Frescobaldi's Toccata 5 in the Chigi manuscript.\textsuperscript{37} Such a practice might have been in the ears of Lorenzino when he wrote the finale to the short fantasia found on folio 19 of Besard's anthology:

![Example 10 Lorenzino: Fantasia Laurenc., Besard f.19, mm. 25-28](image)

This point d'orgue is striking for the period, both for the tonal dominant-tonic structure it suggests and for the haunting effect created on the 6/5 chord of the second minim of the penultimate bar, where G is felt as the dissonant note: an unusually modern effect.

**IX. Musical Connoisseurship: A Trial**

"Connoisseurship" (the attribution of anonymous works to artists on the basis of stylistic "fingerprinting") has never been as important in music as in the visual arts, for the obvious reason that the attribution of, say, a simple canzonetta to Monteverdi does not command millions of dollars.\textsuperscript{38} On the contrary, musicologists are on the whole overly cautious about developing rules for and practicing connoisseurship, even at the expense of common sense. If, for example, a suite of dances are found grouped together in order, sharing thematic material and key, and bearing stylistic affinity to a particular composer whose name appears connected to only one or two of the pieces, then common sense would suggest that

\textsuperscript{36} See Marco Fodella, unpublished thesis on Ms. 156/1-4 of the Biblioteca Nazionale Centrale di Roma, for the diploma exam, Scuola Civica di Musica di Milano, 1993.

\textsuperscript{37} Biblioteca Vaticana, manoscritto Chigi Q IV 25.

\textsuperscript{38} A distinction should be made, however, between the two mediums: in the visual arts, the painting is also the performance, while a score is only a set of instructions for performance and not the performance itself.
all of the pieces in the suite might be considered to be the work of that composer. It is surprising how many compilers of "collected works" of lute music seem not to share this view.

Such clear-cut situations do not arise in the case of Lorenzino, but in reading through a manuscript such as Barbarino, one gets the distinct impression that the presence of Lorenzino is much greater than indicated. At least seven unattributed pieces are found to be concordant with Lorenzino's works in Besard, and many of the short preludes and tochatas bear great similarity to the type of prelude that Lorenzino was known to cultivate, even to the point of sharing known Lorenzino themes or points of imitation. The short "preludio" in F minor on p. 243, for instance, while not exactly concordant, seems to be a sort of sketch or first draft for the prelude of the same key found on f.6v of Besard. While shorter and lacking the elaborate embellishment found in the latter piece, it follows the same harmonic floor plan and shares some of the same thematic material.

There are also works that are completely original for which a good case, both circumstantial and musical, can be made for their inclusion in the Lorenzino opus. Barbarino contains three short prelude-type pieces called tientos. Of these, two are concordant with Lorenzino works in Besard. Thus, it would be reasonable to suppose, if evidence of Lorenzino's style can be found in the third tiento, that there is a good chance that it, too, is by Lorenzino. Let's have a look:
The *musica ficta* of the opening measures immediately recalls Lorenzino for the dramatic way in which it is used. See for example the opening of his tocha in Example 6.A, or of the other Lorenzino tocha in *Barbarino* on p. 215, in which the alteration of A to Ab is played upon in much the same way as it is here with E to Eb. The introduction quickly gives way to a section of homophony not unlike the passage cited in Example 4.A, except that here the chords are rather more uniform. The expressive way in which the homophony breaks out into running passages on measure 17 is not uncharacteristic of Lorenzino. To be fair, however, the qualities I have just mentioned could also just as easily pertain to the music of, say, Fabrizio Dentice. Lorenzino's style is most convincingly revealed in the short passage in mm. 14-17. Here is a good example of that dense, fragmentary contrapuntal style in which Lorenzino had few rivals. The passage begins in simple two-part counterpoint based on a three-note descending scale sometimes proceeded by an upward leap. The upward leap is also used by itself as a mini counter subject. The texture quickly builds in density as voices are added until the larger design of a chordal pattern subtly emerges. This chordal pattern resembles a fragment of the Romanesca ground. Lorenzino's free-form pieces sometimes make use of Romanesca or Passe-mezzo patterns: a notable example is to be found at the beginning of his short Praeludium on f.1v, no.2 of *Besard.* The piece moves on through several more fragmentary episodes of diminution, parallel tenths, and a brief dominant cadence that is not allowed to slow the forward movement toward the plagal ending.

All told, the style of this short piece does indeed conform quite well to that of our subject. To the evidence presented above, we may note one further detail having to do with the 16-note *passaggio* between (and including) the two G-minor chords starting on measure 7. It is interesting

---

that Lorenzino twice used an almost identical passage in his intabulation of *Vestiva i colli* (on measures 16 and 36). Lorenzino clearly had this particular embellishment "in his hands" and, while there is nothing especially "Lorenzinian" about it, its appearance here does seem significant. Finally, while there is no documentary evidence of Lorenzino's authorship of this piece, some of whatever doubt that remains may be eased by considering the significance of what looks like a small initial "L" written in the manuscript following the title of this piece.  

**X. Conclusion**

Lorenzino seems to have been one of those rare, restlessy inventive composers who, never satisfied with the status quo, are constantly extending the limits of musical style. He created a highly original musical style in his free-form works that reflects an extraordinary range and variety of influences. His contribution to the development of lute music was clearly appreciated in his own day and well into the 17th century. As the nature of this contribution comes into focus for modern listeners, the question of the influence he exerted on his contemporaries may begin to be considered. John Dowland travelled to Italy in the decade following the death of Lorenzino, and it is probable that he came into contact with music by the Roman virtuoso. But while Dowland's music in many ways represents the culmination of Renaissance lute style, the eruption of the radical musical style of Giovanni Girolamo Kapsberger in the first years of the 17th century has also fascinated scholars and musicians, and to some extent seems without precedent.  

Kapsberger's originality is indeed stunning, but as we become familiar with works such as the two Lorenzini tochantas in *Barbarino*, written well over 10 years earlier than the appearance of Kapsberger's first book of 1604, some idea of the musical milieu in which Kapsberger was formed begins to emerge.

40 John Griffiths, who has examined *Barbarino* carefully and is preparing an edition of it with Dinko Fabris, notes that "these marks need to be looked at in a larger context. Several such marks are used throughout the ms and we have not yet been able to establish exactly what they mean, but they are more likely indicators of copying completed, or that the owner had memorized or completed learning the piece. They might also indicate something to do with the book as a source of didactic material for students" (private correspondence).

41 See Victor Coelho, "G. G. Kapsberger in Rome, 1604-1645: New Biographical Data," *Journal of the Lute Society of America* XVI (1983): 104: "ambiguous, often irrational musical ideas are mixed in with traditional techniques, resulting in a highly dramatic style that is present in the works of no other lutenist of Kapsberger's generation."

This stunning catalog presents a pictorial and descriptive summary of the largest extant collection of old European lutes, many of which can be described as among the most physically beautiful lutes in existence. The instruments are intelligently classified and commented upon by persons who recognize modifications and attempts to deceive made long after the original construction. In short, even at first glance, this is a landmark publication for the lute.

The team leader for the catalog project, Joël Dugot, is known to *JLSA* readers from his articles on some of the lutes in this catalog, published in this Journal, vols. XVI-XVIII (1983-1985). He currently serves as conservator at the Musée de la musique.

The collection of the Musée de la musique began to be assembled at the end of the French Revolution, from a base of more than 300 instruments confiscated from emigrants (presumably fleeing aristocrats) and prisoners condemned by revolutionary tribunals, deposited in the new Conservatoire de musique in 1796. Apparently none of these original acquisitions was of the lute family.

In 1861 the sale of the private Louis Clapisson collection brought four decorated theorboes (by Kaiser, Tielke, Stadler, and anonymous) into the fold. Later notable additions stemmed from purchases of instruments from the Italian Count Pietro Correr by the French traveler Julien Fau, who subsequently sold them to the state. The estates of Baroness Nathaniel de Rothschild (1902), and more recently Geneviève Thibault, Countess de Chambure (d. 1975), founder of the Société de la musique ancienne in 1926, were sources of other lute instruments. Most recently, a lute body Laux Maler and an ivory lute by Hans Fichtholdt of Füssen (originally built in 1627) were acquired by the museum in 1997. The museum's collection has been augmented by lutes deposited there by the Musée des arts décoratifs and the Musée de la Renaissance.

As Joël Dugot points out in his introduction, there are numerous rarities in the collection quite apart from the elaborate decoration on some of the instruments. Laux Boss or Bosch of Schongau, near the luthier center of Füssen, is represented by one, or perhaps two instruments. Several instruments of his appear in the Fugger instrument collection list of the late 16th century, an indication of his erstwhile prominence, but nearly none survive today.
The catalog section is divided into four parts which present 78 instruments in all. To avoid excessive parentheses I cite the sections in English translation:

Ancient lutes, 44
Lutes constructed in the 20th century, 10
Instruments of doubtful authenticity, 15
Instruments in the depot, 9

The instruments are presented in two-page spreads. Descriptive and explanatory text is accompanied by four to six, or as many as ten photographs depicting front, side, and rear views, as well as label(s), when possible, or brand mark, rosette, endclasp, or other interesting and important detail. This consistency in illustration and presentation is a great help to the reader who wishes to comprehend the scope of the museum’s possessions. A few instruments are granted four pages, while less significant or dubious instruments receive only one.

Textual descriptions focus on the condition and the authenticity of the instrument, and the history of modifications, as far as they can be determined. This is a very significant feature which was not part of classic catalogs such as Julius Schlosser’s of the Vienna collection. Not until relatively recently did organologists begin to be able to distinguish different types of repairs to old lutes.

Inevitably, the collection is not of uniform quality, neither in the instruments themselves nor their state of repair. The authors state clearly what most lute aficionados already know from our reading about or inspection of old lutes: almost none have survived unaltered. Many lutes from the actual period of use have undergone modifications that render much of the individual instrument marginal as far as its contribution to knowledge about ancient lute-making practice. Several truly beautiful shells from the Tieffenbrucker and other Renaissance or early baroque workshops now bear necks and pegboxes which tell us more about fantasy during the Romantic era than old lutes.

Some deceitful alterations in this collection are laughably mediocre. The “pseudo-luth” E.1523, acquired in 1895, has a body which initially appears to be shaded yew. But the text reveals that when the instrument is viewed up close -- and one can see this even in the relatively small photographs -- the brown tint representing sapwood is in fact brown stain. Several instruments in the “doubtful authenticity” section will be immediately spotted as at least partial fakes by virtually any reader of this Journal, due to their inelegant pegboxes.
Several 20th-century instruments in the Paris collection are probably most interesting for their place in the history of the revival of early music. Built by Hubert Isepp (Austria), Hans Jordan (Markneukirchen), Daniel Jourdain (Paris?), and Maurice Vincent (London), most stem from the collection of the Countess de Chambure.

Poignant as many of the instruments appear — shaded-yew bodies stemming from major luthiers now attached to mediocre or outright fraudulent necks and pegboxes — it is a joy to contemplate those that appear to have survived the centuries relatively unscathed. The large theorbo by Giorgio Sellas (E.1556, Venice, 1626) has a shell of 43 ribs of ebony with ivory spacers, a triple rose about 90 percent intact, and tasteful marquetry of ebony and ivory which adorns the front and back of the next and extension. While the bridge is old, it appears not to stem originally from this instrument. Yet, the authors write, “neither the neck, nor the double pegbox of which the pegs are still in place, seem to have been-replaced. The disposition of the barring appears well preserved...”

One happy case poses what the authors call “a serious problem of authenticity.” It consists of a lovely archlute body by Matteo Sellas (E.994.7.1, Venice, 1638) which ended up being fitted by the restorers with a neck and extension made in the same year by the same maker, Sellas, but for another (now lost) body. The instrument was brought years ago to the private restorers Daniel Sinier and Francoise de Ridder, bearing a guitar neck of 19th-century provenance. After they had researched and built an appropriate neck and pegbox extension, a historical one appeared for sale, so the owner had the Sinier de Ridder workshop replace their own neck replacement. The museum purchased the archlute in 1994. The story of its restoration can be found on the restorers’ website, whose current URL is //sinierderidder.free.fr/

Not infrequently, historical value may bear little relation to state of repair. One or another of the most significant, such as the Laux Maler (E.2005.3.1), whose soundboard rings were found by dendrochronology to date between 1350 and 1520, are in lamentable condition, though the soundboard is surprisingly intact for its age. The original neck (or necks, as it may have been once rebuilt into an 11-course baroque instrument), is missing. The museum staff compares this Maler lute with his known surviving lutes in other collections.

While composing this review it seemed to me a shame that most readers would not be able to appreciate these fine instruments other than in my sparse description. However, I discovered that apparently all the photos of these instruments, and more, can be found on the website of the Cité de la musique. While I am aware that the URL is likely to change over the
years, I will cite the current one for now. Future readers can likely find a relocated section by browsing.

At //mediatheque.cite-musique.fr/masc select
>Collection du musée
>Facteurs d'instruments.

Type the maker's name into the first field (Nom du facteur:) and the type of instrument into the second (Instrument fabrique:). Then click "Rechercher" (= search). One has to know some French to succeed, and to experiment even if one does know French. Looking for Matteo Sellas, I first typed "luth", then "arciluth," (sic! I should have spelled it archiluth), which yielded blank pages, before succeeding with "théorbe." The accent on the E is not necessary for the electronic search.)

For photos only, the easy path is to click on "Photos" (instead of Facteurs d'instruments), enter the inventory number or a maker's name in the search field, then click "Rechercher." The system seems somewhat eccentric, and I found at least one conflict in orthography. While the instrument E.980.2.318 is spelled as below in the book's index, the spelling fails to elicit a page in the online database. I found its photos online via the inventory number.

To ease the process of rechercher for readers, here below is a list of the entire lute collection in the museum, according to inventory number, type of lute, and maker.

E.24, théorbe Martin Kaiser
E.25, archiluth (?) anonyme
E.26, théorbe Jacomo Stadler
E.27, théorbe Joachim Tielke
E.528, archiluth anonyme
E.529, luth Johann Christian Hoffmann
E.540, luth Johannes Seelos (?)
E.541, luth Wendelio Venere
E.544, archiluth anonyme
E.545, théorbe Matteo Sellas
E.546, archiluth Christoph Koch
E.547, théorbe Matteo Sellas
E.548, théorbe Wendelio Venere
E.633, luth Sebastian Schelle
E.1028, archiluth Matteo Sellas
E.1184, luth (mandora) anonyme
E.1429, Colachon (?), anonyme
E.1523, pseudo-luth anonyme
E.1556, théorbe Giorgio Sellas
E.1557, théorbe Matheus Buechenberg
E.1560, luth Moises Tiefenbrucker
E.1563, petit colachon anonyme
E.1778, théorbe Magno Dieffopruchar
E.2053.1, luth Laux Maler
E.2062, mandora Francesco Testa (?)
E.2063, pseudo-archiluth (?) anonyme
E.2070, théorbe (?) anonyme
E.2346, théorbe Georg Aman
E.2410, archiluth Magno Dieffopruchar
E.979.2.69, luth Jean Des Moulins
E.980.2.317, angelique anonyme
E.980.2.318, luth Mathije Hofman
E.980.2.319, archiluth (?) anonyme
E.980.2.320, luth anonyme (Tiefenbrucker démonté)
E.980.2.321, théorbe Magno Dieffopruchar
E.980.2.322, pseudo-archiluth anonyme
E.980.2.323, théorbe Hubert Isepp
E.980.2.324, théorbe (attribué à) Hubert Isepp
E.980.2.325, pseudo-archiluth (?) anonyme
E.980.2.326, pseudo-archiluth anonyme
E.980.2.327, pseudo-théorbe anonyme
E.980.2.328, théorbe Jacomo Tieffenbrucker
E.980.2.329, pseudo-archiluth anonyme
E.980.2.330, pseudo-théorbe anonyme
E.980.2.331, pseudo-théorbe anonyme
E.980.2.332, luth Magno Stegher
E.980.2.335, pseudo-luth anonyme
E.980.2.337, archiluth Maurice Vincent
E.980.2.338, luth Laux Boss
E.980.2.367, pseudo-luth anonyme
E.980.2.368, luth Herman Hauser
E.980.2.369, luth Daniel Jourdain
E.980.2.370, luth (mandora) Magno Stegher
E.980.2.373, luth Hubert Isepp
E.980.2.374, luth Hubert Isepp
E.980.2.375, archiluth Matteo Sellas
E.980.2.376, pseudo-archiluth (?) anonyme
E.980.2.377, luth Hubert Isepp
E.980.5.1, luth Hans Henning Jordan

E.980.7.1, luth anonyme
E.983.10.1, archiluth Tomas Spilman
E.994.7.1, archiluth Matteo Sellas
E.998.2.2, luth Hans Fichthold
E.0243, mandora Gregori Ferdinand Wenger
E.0744, pseudo-archiluth (?) anonyme
E.0753, luth Wendelio Venere
E.0761, luth Armand Belot (?)
E.0771, archiluth (?) anonyme
E.0773, luth anonyme
D.E.Cl.7641, archiluth inconnu (Marchio)
D.E.Cl.7642, archiluth Laux Boss (?)
D.E.Cl.7688, mandoline (?) Matteo Sellas
D.AD.23456, luth anonyme
D.AD.32032, mandora Johann Blasius Weigert
D.AD.32667, guitare en luth (?) David Tecchler
D.AD.40381, luth Jacob Hes
D.AD.40382, mandora Gabriel Davit Buchstetter
D.AD.48483, luth Wendelio Venere (?)

— Douglas Alton Smith


Elizabeth Wells and Christopher Nobbs have contributed a great resource to the world of organology with the publication of this long-awaited catalog of the famous instrument collection. The entire catalog consists of four parts with Part I being dedicated to wind instruments, Part II focusing on keyboard instruments and Part IV detailing the collection of instrument bows. The first three catalogs are printed and available for purchase, but the fourth catalog of bows is available for view only on the web site at this time.

Like many of the objects described within the pages, the catalog is a masterpiece of the art form. The first thing that is apparent about the publication is the quality that has gone into the production of the book. Its 224 thick, glossy pages are well stitched into the heavy card cover and it weighs in at just over two and a quarter pounds. The contents of the
book include a fine introduction and complete information about the contributors as well as an explanation of the conventions used in the articles to explain the details of the instruments. In addition to the black and white pictures that illustrate the descriptions of each instrument there is a section of beautifully duplicated color plates at the front of the book showing many of the choicest instruments from the collection.

The book contains descriptions of one hundred twenty nine items grouped together into sections by type:

Zithers, dulcimers, psalteries, stringed drum and Aeolian harps (12)
Harps (8)
Lutes together with chitarrones, mandolinos, Neapolitan mandolins and regional lutes (25)
Citterns and English guitars (9)
Guitars, chitarra battente, guitar-cittern, lyre-guitar, and harp-lutes (19)
Viols, violas d’amore, baryton and hardanger fiddle (10)
Lira da braccio (1)
Violin, violas, cellos, philomeles, rebecchino and fiddles (21)
Pochettes, kits, and pochetto damore (13)
Trumpets marine (2)
Hurdy-gurdies and organized hurdy-gurdies (9)

Depending on the relative importance of each instrument, it is allocated one or two pages in the catalog with a few of the more highly decorated guitars receiving three pages and fully four pages are dedicated to the Belchior Dias guitar, (RCM 171), the Mango [sic] Dieffopruchar chitarrone, (RCM 26), and the Girolamo Campi cittern, (RCM 48). The information accompanying the pictures is complete enough to give a clear idea of the instrument’s size, history, condition and peculiarities and includes:

Inscriptions
Brief description
Dimensions, (including overall length, body length, width, depth and string length)
Extended description
Commentary
Provenance
References
Meticulous detail is given to the instruments in the long description down to the type of woods used in construction, number of ribs, (in the case of the lutes), decoration and purfling and many subsequent details of measurements such as the widths of the neck at the nut and joint, soundhole diameter and center distance from the tail, and the distance of the bridge from the tail.

Even though the photographs of the instruments were taken by several people over the span of many years the overall look and feel of the book is consistent and the similarities of views allow the feeling of being able to compare and contrast the different instruments. Two of the examples, a lute body by Vendelio Venere, (RCM 203) and a mandolino by Giovanni Smorsone, (RCM 107), were photographed with the tops removed so that the front baring and interior of the body may be seen, and three of the articles picture radiographs of the instruments: the chitar­rone by Mangus [sic] Tieffenbrucker, (RCM 26), the guitar attributed to René Voboam, (RCM 32), and the guitar RCM 22, considered to be of unidentifiable French construction. These, together with details of roses and decorations, give an expansive quality to the consideration of the instruments.

Of particular interest is the commentary that accompanies most articles. Here the authors are free to expand on the condition of the instrument and alterations that may have been made over the years since it was made. This is of fundamental importance when considering the lutes because so few remain in original condition as they came from the maker’s workbench that the only way to explain them and put them in historical context is to discuss the changes that have contributed to the current condition. Great care has been given to understand each instrument and many entries contain specific information about the materials and methods of construction and similarities with instruments found in other collections. An example of the commentaries being complete and up to date may be illustrated by the discussion of the Dias guitar, (RCM 171), where the authors explore the hypothesis that this instrument may have originally been made as a six course vihuela, comparing the similarities with the instrument in the Cité de la musique, Paris, no. E0748.

Each article contains a provenance section which is helpful in understanding the history of the instrument and how it came to be in the collection and the references together with the bibliography at the end of the book offer a path to further research.

The book ends with a table of translations giving the names of the parts of instruments in English, German, French and Italian, and indexes of instrument catalog numbers; makers, dealers and repairers; previous
owners; names; institutions and collections; and places of manufacture.

The RCM collection is not vast and some of the lutes are of the usual mixed heritage and questionable origin that confounds all lute enthusiasts, but it does contain some rare and unique examples that are true surviving gems. Notable in the collection are:

Lute: Adam Ulman, Venice, second half of the 16th century, RCM 13, probably the only surviving example from this maker.
Lute: Vendelio Venere, Padua 1600, RCM 203, may have originally been a chitarrone.
Chitarrone: Magnus Tieffenbrucker, Venice, 1608, the back consists of 51 ribs with spacers.
Lute: Domenico Sellas, Venice, mid 17th century, RCM 10, may have originally been a chitarrone and the back consists of 37 snakewood ribs with ivory spacers.
Mandolino: Antonio Preda, Madrid, 1778, RCM 17 and RCM 18, these are a matching pair of instruments with stunning, two-part ebon/y / ivory ribs in the backs.
Cittern: Girolamo Campi, Brescia (?), c. 1580, RCM 48.
Bell Cittern: Joachim Tielke, Hamburg, 1676, RCM 27.
Guitar: Belchior Dias, Lisbon, 1581, RCM 171.
Guitar: Attributed to Jakob Stadler, Naples, c. 1650, RCM 6.
Guitar: René Voboam, Paris, 1650, RCM 32.
Guitar: Joachim Tielke, Hamburg, early 18th century, RCM 16.
Treble Viol: English (?), c. 1600, RCM 184.
Baryton: Magnus Felden, Vienna, 1647, RCM 204.

The catalog is available for purchase from the museum web site at: www.cph.rcm.ac.uk at the sum of £35 and postage to the USA at £11. The direct link to the order form is: http://www.cph.rcm.ac.uk/Publicationsorderform.pdf

The museum also offers technical drawings of several of the instruments from the collection which may also be purchased through the web site. Of specific interest to lute enthusiasts are: RCM 171 Guitar by Belchior Dias; RCM 26 Chitarrone by Magnus Tieffenbrucker; RCM 48 Cittern by Gieronimo Campi; and RCM 32 Guitar, attributed to Jean Voboam.
Dues are $55 - 1 year, $100 - 2 years, $140 - 3 years, $50 - student 1 year, $500 - life. Members are entitled to receive the LSA Quarterly, the Journal, the Membership Directory, and to have borrowing privileges at the LSA Microfilm Library. To join the LSA, mail a check or credit card number and expiration date to: Lute Society of America, Garald Farnham -Treasurer, 255 West 98th #5C, New York, NY 10025 USA. Checks must be in US dollars drawn on a US bank.
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A New History of the Lute!

A History of the Lute is a complete history of the instrument, its players and composers, its music and its cultural significance from Greek antiquity to the end of the Renaissance. It includes the author’s evaluation and synthesis of previous lute scholarship by hundreds of writers as well as new research.

- 385 pages
- 75 illustrations
- 50 musical examples

$85.00 plus $14.95 S&H
Please allow 4 to 6 weeks for delivery.
Order from: Lute Society of America
P.O. Box 100182
Fort Worth, TX 76185-0182
or order on our website at

www.lutehistory.com