

MARCO GOZZI

On the text-music relationship in the Italian Trecento: the case of the Petrarchan madrigal *Non al so amante* set by Jacopo da Bologna*

One of the aspects that is most striking to anyone approaching the Italian Ars Nova repertoire is the close link one notices between the structure of the text and the musical construction. It is a link that seems to disappear in the 15th century, only to re-emerge in the late 16th century (sustained by new needs and new aesthetic ideals). Of course the close bond between music and poetry was an essential, indeed constituent element also of the very first known forms of European secular music: after all, the main secret behind the extraordinary success of the troubadour experience lay precisely in this inseparable and perfectly accomplished bond. Like their predecessors in the monophonic field, the Italian Trecento composers were uncommonly attentive to the literary text. Here, as there, the text came first, and it was on the meaning, sound and structure (rhythmic and formal) of the text that the refined melodic constructions were modelled. To be sure, at the moment of 'translating' the text into the musical dimension the attention of the medieval composer was almost exclusively directed to mastering the formal aspect. But one mustn't forget that the qualities that are still reductively attributed to the formal sphere of a text are also permeated by its meaning, and vice versa. In this regard, one need only think of the rhythmic aspects: the rhythmic weight of an accent within a poetic line is directly proportional to the semantic weight of the word or syntagma to which the accent belongs, as any expert in metrics knows very well.

The present paper aims to illustrate a possible methodological approach to the text-music relationship through the sample analysis of a madrigal by Jacopo da Bologna. This is an area that has so far received scant attention as regards the Middle Ages and hence deserves much closer consideration.

* The present contribution is an updated republication of the article "Il rapporto testo-musica nel madrigale di Petrarca 'Non al so amante' musicato da Jacopo da Bologna", in *Kronos. Periodico del Dipartimento Beni Arti Storia dell'Università di Lecce*, III, 2001, pp. 19-44. I thank the director of the department, Professor Lucio Galante, for allowing me to reissue the work. The following abbreviations are used in the article:

FA Faenza, Biblioteca Comunale, MS 117

FP Florence, Biblioteca Nazionale, MS Panciatichiano 26

Per Perugia, Biblioteca del Dottorato dell'Università degli Studi di Perugia, inc. Inv. 15755 N. F.

Pit Paris, Bibliothèque Nationale, *fonds italien* 568

PR Paris, Bibliothèque Nationale, *fonds nouv. acq. fr.* 6771 (Codex Reina)

SL Florence, Biblioteca Laurenziana, MS Archivio Capitolare di San Lorenzo, 2211

Sq Florence, Biblioteca Laurenziana, MS Mediceo Palatino 87 (codice Squarcialupi)

The relationship between the literary text and the music of any musical composition (i.e. not only for the medieval period) can be studied at three main distinct levels:

1) The syntactic-structural level. This investigates the ways in which the musical language respects the poetic and syntactic micro- and macro-structures; i.e. how it translates words, syntagmas, lines and strophes into motifs, semiphrases, phrases, musical periods ending either in cadences or in rests of greater or lesser length. It observes, therefore, whether the composer is careful about respecting, for example, the unity of the word or whether instead he breaks it up with rests. And it also studies the amount of attention he shows towards the metrical figures.

2) The rhythmic level. This verifies the correspondence (or otherwise) of textual and musical accents, of poetic and musical rhythm.

3) The semantic-expressive level. Stated very baldly: a sad text is best rendered by slow music and dark timbres, while a joyful text is given a sonorous setting, with lively rhythms and clear timbres. However, there are also other aspects to this level: for example, the emphasis on important words, the repetition of words or phrases, the use of chromaticism (or other harmonic-timbral-intervallic expedients) for expressive aims; the use of syllabic or melismatic melodies (melismas obscure the comprehension of the text); the use of 'rhetorical' inventions; etc.

As regards the third level (the musical rendering of the 'affects' expressed in the text) it is normally thought that this was alien to the medieval sensibility and was therefore never intentionally cultivated by composers¹, at least not in the way that we find it in the musical repertoire dating from the late 16th century. For example, regarding textual repetitions: in other contexts and periods the repetitions served to emphasize words or phrases, whereas in the Middle Ages they were used not for expressive purposes, but merely to fulfil formal requirements (suitable length of the phrases, etc.)². Recently, however, scholars have begun to draw attention to the possible presence of subtle links between the music and the expressive content of texts even in the medieval repertoire³.

¹ F. ALBERTO GALLO, *Musica e storia tra medio evo ed età moderna*, Bologna, Il Mulino, 1986, p. 24, writes: "La musica medievale è assolutamente indifferente ai significati concettuali e sentimentali del testo poetico che intona".

² See AGOSTINO ZIINO, "Ripetizioni di sillabe e parole nella musica profana italiana del Trecento e del primo Quattrocento: proposte di classificazione e prime riflessioni", in *Musik und Text in der Mehrstimmigkeit des 14. und 15. Jahrhunderts*, herausgegeben von Ursula Günther und Ludwig Finscher, Kassel [etc.], Bärenreiter, 1984 (Göttinger musikwissenschaftliche Arbeiten, 10), pp. 93-119.

³ See, for example, WULF ARLT, "Musica e testo nel canto francese: dai primi trovatori al mutamento stilistico intorno al 1300", in *La musica nel tempo di Dante*, edited by Luigi Pestalozza, Milan, Uricolpi, 1988, pp. 175-197 and relative discussion on pp. 306-321 (here, however, we must struggle to 'interpret' the text, which is seriously corrupted by the bad translation from the German).

Cases of onomatopoeia in the Ars Nova repertoire are certainly found here and there (see the horn calls in the final melisma of the ritornello of Gherardello's caccia *Tosto che l'alba*, at the words "e suo corno sonava"), as are certain 'madrigalisms' *ante litteram*, such as the tremulous repeated notes in hoquet style at the word "tremando" in the last line of Jacopo's madrigal *Tanto sovemente*.

The literary text

Of all the secular pieces belonging to the Italian Ars Nova repertoire, the only piece with a text that can be attributed with certainty to the greatest lyric poet of the Trecento, Francesco Petrarca (better known as Petrarch), is the madrigal *Non al so amante più Diana piacque*, set by Jacopo da Bologna. The poet included this madrigal text in the *Rerum vulgarium fragmenta*, as no. 50, and it is worth noting that the readings contained in MS Vaticano Latino 3195 – the version Petrarch himself considered as definitive⁴ – present numerous significant textual variants from the readings transmitted in the musical manuscripts, as has been shown by Pierluigi Petrobelli⁵.

The madrigal *Non al so amante* comes with notation in five manuscripts: the Codex Squarcialupi (Florence, Biblioteca Laurenziana, MS Mediceo Palatino 87, fols. 10v-11r)⁶, MS Panciatichiano 26 of the Biblioteca Nazionale of Florence (fol. 71r)⁷, MS *fonds italien* 568 of the Bibliothèque Nationale of Paris (fols. 4v-5r), the Codex Reina (Paris, Bibliothèque Nationale, fonds nouv. Acq. Fr. 6771, fol. 3v) and, in the form of keyboard tablature (hence textless), MS 117 of the Biblioteca Comunale of Faenza (fol. 78v-79r)⁸. The first three manuscripts are Tuscan in origin, the last two of northern origin. Finally, the *tenor* voice only of the madrigal is found in the palimpsest Florence, Biblioteca Laurenziana, MS Archivio Capitolare di San Lorenzo,

⁴ ETTORE MODIGLIANI, *Il Canzoniere di Francesco Petrarca riprodotto letteralmente dal Cod. Vat. Lat. 3195 con tre fotoincisioni*, Rome, Società Filologica Romana, 1904. The critical text is now in FRANCESCO PETRARCA, *Canzoniere*, edited by Gianfranco Contini, Turin, Einaudi, 1974.

⁵ See PIERLUIGI PETROBELLI, "Un leggiadretto velo' ed altre cose petrarchesche", *Rivista italiana di musicologia*, X, 1975, pp. 32-45.

⁶ Colour facsimile in *Il codice Squarcialupi, Ms. Mediceo Palatino 87, Biblioteca medicea laurenziana di Firenze*, edited by F. Alberto Gallo, Florence, Giunti Barbèra - Lucca, Libreria Musicale Italiana, 1992.

⁷ Black and white facsimile in *Il Codice musicale Panciatichi 26 della Biblioteca Nazionale di Firenze*, edited by F. Alberto Gallo, Florence, Olschki, 1981 (Studi e testi per la storia della musica, 3).

⁸ Black and white facsimile edited by Armen Carapetyan in *An Early Fifteenth-Century Italian Source of Keyboard Music: the Codex Faenza, Biblioteca Comunale, 117*. A facsimile edition, n.p., American Institute of Musicology, 1961 (Musicological Studies and Documents, 10).

2211 (fol. 45r), while six fragments belonging to the *superius* voice are found in the thin parchment strips used to strengthen the incunabulus Inv. 15755 N. F. of the Biblioteca del Dottorato of the University of Perugia⁹.

A precise record of the variants that distinguish the principal musical manuscripts from Gianfranco Contini's critical text based on the Vatican manuscript is offered by Pierluigi Petrobelli, along with considerations on the date of the madrigal's composition and on a possible meeting between Petrarch and Jacopo¹⁰.

Here it has been decided to focus on the variant readings of the four musical sources that transmit the literary text in both voices. In the Codex Reina analysis has revealed important *lectiones singulares* that set this manuscript apart from the rest of the tradition:

so amante (line 1), the others *su*
c'a mi (line 4), the others *me*
cun il sole (line 6, Reina), instead of *che 'l sole*
mi fici / tenor: *me fici* (line 7), the others *mi fece*
quando guard'el cello (line 7), the others *quando egli arde 'l celo* (or similar readings).

The reading 'so' for 'suo' (line 1) is a north-Italian form and surely closer to the environment in which the madrigal (both text and music) was written, whereas the version adopted by Contini ('suo amante') creates a synaloepha that runs together as many as three vowels, effectively spoiling the line and making it less suited to a vocal rendering.

The reading of line 6 is simply an error that creates a hypermetric line (perhaps originating from a copy that had *chi il sole*), while in the following line there is a *lectio facillior*, again explained by a misunderstanding of the sense and the calligraphy of the antigraph, which probably had very scanty pronounced ascenders ('quandegliarde' transcribed as 'quandoguarde').

The other *lectiones singulares* are less significant phonic variants in which an 'i' replaces an 'e' ('mi' instead of 'me', 'fici' instead of 'fece').

In the Codex Reina, moreover, one notices a very different (indeed almost always opposite) use of consonant doubling compared to the Tuscan manuscripts (*tuta* instead of *tutta*, *pasturela* instead of *pasturella*, *vello* instead of *velo*, *cello* instead of *celo*, *tuto* instead of *tutto*, *çello* instead of *çelo*) and less

⁹ The study *Frammenti musicali del Trecento nell'incunabolo Inv. 15755 N. F. della Biblioteca del Dottorato dell'Università degli Studi di Perugia*, edited by Biancamaria Brumana and Galliano Ciliberti, Florence, Olschki, 2004, indicates the presence of parts of the madrigal *Non al so amante* in only three strips, instead of six. I thank Dr Gianfranco Cialini and my colleague Biancamaria Brumana for kindly allowing me to consult the fragments.

¹⁰ PETROBELLI, "Un leggiadretto velo", pp. 33-40.

recourse to phono-syntactic doubling (abundantly present, instead, in Bibliothèque Nationale 568, for example). Evidently the copyist's northern linguistic inclinations strongly influenced the version used in the Codex Reina. Below is given a complete parallel comparison of the readings in the sources (in all the manuscripts the first tercet and the final distich are placed under the notes of the first section and ritornello respectively in both voices, while the second tercet is the *residuum* written at the end of one of the voices. In so far as the reading of the palimpsest permits, the version of SL con-cords perfectly with the *tenor* of *Sq*.¹¹ The singular readings are highlighted in bold type.

FP

Non al su amante più Diana piauque (T: piacque)
Quando per tal ventura tutta nuda
La vid'in meço delle gelid'acque
Ch'a me la pasturella alpestra et cruda
Post' a bangnare 'l suo candido velo
Che 'l sole **e** l'aura **il** vago chapel chiuda.
Tal che mi fece quand'egl'arde 'l celo (T: cielo)
Tutto tremar d'un amoroso çelo.

Pit

Nonn al su amante più Diana piacque
Quando per tal ventura tutta nuda
La vidi **nel** meço delle gelid'acque [verso ipermetro]
C'a mme la pasturella alpestra et cruda
fixa a bagnare un legiadretto velo
Che 'l sole all'aura el vago chapel chiuda.
Tal che mi fece quando egli arde 'l çelo
Tutto tremar d'un amoroso çelo.

Sq (superius)

Non al su amante più Diana piacque
Quando per tal ventura tutta **inuda**
La **vide** in meço delle gelid'acque,
Tal che mi fece quando egli arde 'l cielo
Tutto tremar d'un amoroso **gielo**.

PR

Non al **so** amante più Diana piauque
Quando per tal ventura tuta nuda
La vidi in meço delle gelid'aque
C'a **mi** la pasturela alpestra e cruda
Fix'a bagnare el suo candido vello
Cun il sole a l'aura el vago chapel chiuda. [ipermetro]
Tal che mi **fici** quando **guard'**el cello (T: me fici)
Tuto tremar d'un amoroso çello.

Sq (tenor)

Non al su amante più Diana piacque
Quando per tal ventura tutta **innuda**
La vidi **nel** meço delle gelid'acque, [ipermetro]
Come la pasturella alpestra et cruda
Fissa **al** bagnare un legiadretto velo
Che 'l sole all'aura el vago chapel chiuda.
Tal che mi fece quando egli arde 'l çelo
Tutto tremar d'un amoroso çelo.

Per (superius)

Non al [] amante più **Dianna** piauque
Quan[do per tal ventura tutta nu]da
La [...]
Ch'amai la pasturella alpestra

From a collation of the above sources (excepting the Codex Reina) we find the following singular readings (not counted are single or double consonants, the silent *h* and the spelling *cq* instead of *q*):

tutta inuda (2, *Sq*), the others *nuda*
la vide (3, *Sq superius*), the others *vidi*
Come la pasturella (4, *Sq*), the others: *Ch'a me*; *Per* (error): *Ch'amay*
post'a bangnare (5, *FP*), the others *fissa al bagnare* (*Sq*) or *fixa a bagnare* (*PR* and *Pit*)
e l'aura il (6, *FP*), the others *a l'aura el* or *all'aura el*
gielo (8, *Sq superius*), the others: *çelo*

¹¹ I owe the information to Oliver Huck, whom I thank.

As we can see, the three *lectiones singulares* of *FP* are confined to the lines of the *residuum* (the portion of text not underlaid). And that is also where we find the greatest discrepancy between the musical sources and the Petrarchan manuscript Vaticano Latino 3195 (which reads: *Ch'a me la pastorella alpestra e cruda / posta a bagnar un leggiadretto velo, / ch'a l'aura il vago e biondo capel chiuda*). More numerous and important are the singular readings of *Sq*, which make the text of the handsome Florentine manuscript closer to the version considered as definitive by the poet in the Vatican codex (e.g. *ignuda*, *la vide* and the final *gielo*); the *lectio faciliior* at the beginning of the *residuum* is almost certainly caused by an erroneous reading of an antigraph very similar to *Pit* (in *Sq* there is a sign of abbreviation over the *o* of *Come la pastorella*; *Pit* reads *Came la pasturella*, and also carries a sign of abbreviation over the third letter, probably to indicate the phono-syntactic doubling of the *m*). In this regard, it is also worth noticing the error in *Per*: this was perhaps caused by a northern antigraph that read *Cami* with the usual generic sign of abbreviation, here interpreted as an 'a' to be placed after the 'm', entailing a complete misunderstanding of the meaning. The readings of *Sq* are interesting in other respects as well. A superficial textual analysis would seem to suggest that the readings of the two voices were based on different antigraphs or on an antigraph that was already contaminated, having drawn on different copies for each of the voices. In fact similar oscillations between the spellings and textual readings of two or three voices in the same work are very frequent in the Italian Trecento manuscripts. The readings of the *tenor* text (and only those of the *tenor*) are surprisingly close to those of *Pit* (errors included). Note in particular the two following cases:

nel mezo (line 3, *Pit* and *tenor* of *Sq*) instead of *in mezo*, which creates a hyper-metric line;

celo (line 7, *Pit* and *tenor* of *Sq*), the others *celo* (*FP*), *cello* (*PR*) or *cielo* (*Sq*).

Apart from their general similarity, another strong resemblance between the texts of *Sq* (in particular the *tenor* voice) and *Pit* lies in the middle line of the second tercet (in the middle of the *residuum*, which appears at the end of the *superius* in *Pit*, and at the end of the *tenor* in *Sq*, which was probably the original position in the antigraph), for while *FP* and *PR* read *el* [or 'l] *suo candido velo*, *Sq* and *Pit* carry the different reading *un leggiadretto velo* (found also in Vaticano 3195 and adopted in the Contini edition)¹².

The *superius* of *Sq* seems instead to have an independent tradition, as shown by the important readings 'inuda', 'vide' and 'gielo', not found in any

¹² PETRARCA, *Canzoniere*, p. 71.

of the concordant musical sources, yet given in Petrarch's version of Vaticano Latino 3195. These readings show a particular attention to the meaning of the text not found in the other musical sources: that 'vide' in the third person is clearer and more correct than 'vidi', which is perhaps caused by an assimilation of the vowel with the "in" immediately following (prompted by the tendencies of the musical setting to favour elision in synaloepha). The same can be said for the differentiation between 'cielo' and 'gelo', which in *Pit* and in the *tenor* of *Sq* are identical rhyme-words ('çelo'), which are less significant than the distinction (also graphical) between 'cielo' and 'gielo'. Besides, 'gelo amoroso' is a very different thing (also semantically) from 'zelo amoroso'.

The close kinship between the readings of *Pit* and *Sq* can be observed in nearly all the works shared by the two Florentine manuscripts. It also extends to the musical readings (though it never proves a direct dependence of *Sq* on *Pit*). Moreover, analysis of the musical variants between the two manuscripts will enable us either to confirm or reject the hypothesis of a contamination of *Sq*; i.e. whether or not the *superius* voice was copied (after the original version) from a different antigraph from that of the *tenor* voice.

The exploration of the textual variants not only reveals interesting aspects of the tradition and makes a substantial contribution to restoring the texts (as in the present case), but it also helps us to understand the different approaches of the copyists and the authority of the sources, even to the extent of suggesting hypotheses of contamination. All of these investigations call for similar work on the musical variants, for any new findings in the musical sphere can help to confirm or reject the hypotheses and ideas suggested by study of the textual variants.

From the metrical point of view this piece is a typical 14th-century madrigal. The scheme used, ABA BCB CC, is similar to that of the *ottava rima* (excepting the fifth line) and appears neither in any other madrigal of Petrarch's *Canzoniere* nor in any other madrigal set to music by Jacopo da Bologna¹³.

L'aura in the sixth line conceals the customary *senhal* of Laura, as is frequent in Petrarch's poetry.

From the semantic point of view there is a marked parallelism of sense between the two tercets: in the first tercet the protagonists is Acteon, in the second the narrating 'I' (*al so amante / a me*); and likewise with the figures of Diana and Laura (the *pasturella alpestra e cruda*). The final distich, as in nearly all the madrigals of the period, summarizes the situation icastically.

Regarding the relationship between syntactic structure and line endings, we find a very strong cohesion of sense throughout the lines of the two tercets and the *enjambements* created in the first six lines.

¹³ See GIUSEPPE CORSI, *Poesie musicali del Trecento*, Bologna, Commissione per i testi di lingua, 1970, pp. 29-59.

Regarding the phonic texture, only few alliterations can be identified: *ventura/tutta/nuda*; *pastorella / alpestra* (almost an anagram).

The regular prevalence of iambic metre in the hendecasyllables (above all the final hemistichs of each line) and the absolute rarity of the clashes of arsis (the only case of contiguous ictuses occurs at the end of the sixth line) give the madrigal a fluent and pleasantly rhythmic fluency, distinct from the frequent rhythmic harshness of Petrarchan versification. This is clarified by the following scansion chart based on the readings of the Vatican codex. The + sign indicates a position in arsis or weighted by an ictus, the - sign means a position in thesis. Although we must remember that the concept of position does not coincide with that of syllable and that the concept of ictus does not coincide with that of accent, with some simplification one could nonetheless speak about tonic, or accented syllables (+), and atonic syllables (-).

—	—	—	+	—	+	—	+	—	+	—
+	—	—	+	—	+	—	+	—	+	—
—	+	—	+	—	—	—	+	—	+	—
—	+	—	—	—	+	—	+	—	+	—
+	—	—	+	—	—	—	+	—	+	—
—	+	—	+	—	+	—	—	+	+	—
+	—	—	+	—	+	—	+	—	+	—
+	—	—	+	—	—	—	+	—	+	—

The middle lines of the tercets and those of the final distich present an inversion of the first ‘foot’ (from iambic into trochaic), with an attack ‘on the beat’ and accents in first and fourth positions. The prevailing rhythm is nonetheless iambic (with the ictus in the 4th, 6th and 8th positions, sometimes only in the 4th and 8th). Note that the poet is careful about conferring a very similar rhythm to the two tercets, which must be sung to the same melody and therefore need a rhythmic structure that corresponds as closely as possible.

The textual variant in the attack of the *residuum* (second tercet) in *Sq* (*come* instead of *ch’a me*) also introduces a rhythmic variant, by shifting the accent to first position. This ‘on the beat’ start to the line has a limited effect on the musical rendering, however, since the long melisma effectively weakens the textual accents.

In *FP* and *PR* the second line of the second tercet reads respectively “Post’a bagnare ‘l suo candido velo” (*FP*) and “Fix’a bagnare el suo candido vello” (*PR*), thus presenting a dactylic rhythm (with accents in 1st, 4th and 7th positions), in contrast with the rest of the tradition (*fissa a bagnare un legiadretto velo*, with accents in 1st, 4th and 8th positions). Most likely, the dactylic rhythm is a departure from Petrarch’s original intention, given that it creates a strong rhythmic asymmetry between the two tercets.

A close knowledge of the rhythmic structure of the text, which is after all the material onto which the composer grafts the rhythmic aspect of the musical setting, is naturally important if we wish to understand how much attention

he gives to sustaining the syntactic construction and rhythm of the lines set.

It is difficult, however, to establish if Jacopo had used a literary text close to that intended by the poet (like that transmitted by the Vatican codex) or alternatively a somewhat corrupt text like those of *PR* and *FP*. Nonetheless, at least the readings of the *superius* of *Sq* (which also represent the most recent versions of the entire tradition of musical codices!) and the *residuum* of *Pit* (which is very similar to that of the *tenor* of *Sq*) suggest that the text Jacopo used was not very different from that of Vaticano 3195, given that we find a strong similarity even in the more recent sources.

The modern edition proposed in the Appendix is based on *Pit* for reasons that will be explained below. The spelling of the Florentine manuscript has been slightly modernized ($\zeta = z$, $x = ss$, $c'a me = ch'a me$). From other sources it incorporates the more correct readings *so amante* (instead of *su' amante*), *vide* (instead of *vidi*), *cielo* and *gelo* (instead of the undifferentiated ζ elo). And finally, the hypermetry of the third line (*la vide nel mezo delle gelid'acque*) has been corrected to *la vide in mezo delle gelid'acque*.

The musical text and the notation

To date, the philological and semiological problems of the early Italian Ars Nova repertoire (i.e. those concerning the criticism of the musical text and the meaning of the notational signs used to transmit the individual pieces) have still to be tackled in a comprehensive study. Moreover, the madrigals and caccias of Piero, Jacopo and Giovanni still await a critical edition worthy of its name¹⁴. Of Jacopo's works there are as many as three complete editions in modern transcription¹⁵. None,

¹⁴ A new edition of the entire corpus of compositions with concordances is now in press: *Die mehrfach überlieferten Kompositionen des frühen Trecento*, herausg. von Oliver Huck und Sandra Dieckmann unter Mitarbeit von Evelyn Arnrich und Julia Gehring in Verbindung mit Marco Gozzi, Hildesheim, Zürich und New York, Olms (Musica mensurabilis, 2).

¹⁵ W. THOMAS MARROCCO, *The Music of Jacopo da Bologna*, Berkeley and Los Angeles, University of California Press, 1954 (University of California Publications in Music, 5); NINO PIRROTTA, *The Music of Fourteenth-Century Italy*, vol. 4: *Jacobus de Bononia; Vincentius de Arimino*, Roma, American Institute of Musicology, 1963 (Corpus Mensurabilis Musicae, 8/4); W. THOMAS MARROCCO, *Polyphonic Music of the Fourteenth Century*, vol. 6: *Italian Secular Music by Magister Piero, Giovanni da Firenze, Jacopo da Bologna*, Monaco, Oiseau-lyre, 1967. The unpublished work by MARTA SENATORE, *Il corpus di Jacopo da Bologna: edizione critica*, degree dissertation, Cremona: Scuola di Paleografia e Filologia Musicale dell'Università di Pavia, 1996-1997, though based on more solid critical foundations, presents many errors in the spelling and positioning of the syllables of the literary texts and certain oddities in the choice of metre (the *senaria perfecta*, for example, is translated into bars of 3/4, each incorporating two of the original *divisiones*). Other transcriptions of the madrigal *Non al so amante* have been edited by JOHANNES WOLF, *Der Squarcialupi Codex Pal. 87*, Lippstadt, Kistner & Siegel, 1955 (from *Sq*) and DRAGAN PLAMENAC (from *FA* and *FP*), *Keyboard Music of the Late Middle Ages in Codex Faenza 117*, American Institute of Musicology, 1972 (Corpus Mensurabilis Musicae, 57).

however, are satisfactory, for they all predate the in-depth studies on the Trecento sources¹⁶. In such conditions it is difficult to carry out any kind of analysis, given that we have no reliable critical musical text (or an equally reliable corpus with which to compare it). So a reliable text needs to be prepared.

Philological work on the musical text should not limit itself to merely 'recording' the variants; it should also 'evaluate' them carefully. In this brief paper the edition used (see Appendix) serves essentially to conduct our analysis of the text-music relationship and does not need a complete commentary (which, as a rule, simply records the variants, without distinguishing them from the errors). Instead of the 'critical commentary', therefore, I shall here offer a succinct discussion and evaluation of the main variants and errors discovered in the collation.

First of all it is worth noting that the readings of the four codices considered (as well as the concordant *tenores* of *SL* and *FA* and the fragment *Per*) are surprisingly close, especially considering that the madrigal was about half a century old when it was copied.

The greatest differences between the four versions are found in *FP*, which, as well as having numerous *lectiones singulares*, uses a different type of notation from that used in the other sources: the so-called *Longanotation* (*quaternaria* with *modus*). *Sq*, *Pit* and *PR*, on the other hand, use the Italian notation with regular *pontelli*; the Squarcialupi codex also clearly indicates the *mensurae octonaria* and *duodenaria* in the *superius* by using the *divisio* letters *o* and *d*. EXAMPLE 1 concisely illustrates the notational types of the two sections of the madrigal in the version of *FP* and *Sq*. The same type of notation as *Sq* is used in *Pit*, *PR*, *SL* and *FA*, though without the indicators of *mensura* (*divisio* letters are found only in *Sq* and *Per*).

The numerous variants of *FP* that distinguish it from all the other sources are essentially rhythmical (in the *tenor* the values of the two final notes of the groups at bb. 41 and 52 are inverted; in the *superius* we have note-rest instead of a whole note at bb. 43 and 49), ornamental (triplets instead of paired minims, or vice versa, at bb. 2, 29, 46, or the semibreve E instead of the minims E-F before the final longa in the *superius*) and purely notational (many more *ligaturae* in both the *tenor* and *superius*). *FP* is also the only manuscript to provide accidentals: a flat for the B at the second note of the *superius* (which is also a melodic variant) and a sharp for the G beginning the ritornello (b. 40). Finally, there are three musical variants in the *tenor* caused by a different literary text, two of which are shared also by *PR* (see EXAMPLE 2).

¹⁶ Beginning with the study by JOHN NÁDAS, *The Trasmission of Trecento Secular Polyphony: Manuscript Production and Scribal Practices in Italy at the End of the Middle-Ages*, Ph.D. diss., New York University, 1985.

We have already noticed how *PR* differs from the Florentine codexes in the writing of the literary text. In the musical text there are eight *lectiones singulares* (four rhythmical and four melodic), often concerning single notes and only minimally affecting the musical substance of the piece¹⁷.

The notation contained in the fragment *Per*, which has been completely disregarded by the editors of the facsimile, accounts for almost the entire *superius* of *Non al so amante*. The main nucleus of the Perugia fragments (in other words, everything excluding Strips I and IX), copied in the same hand, can be dated c.1390 (and not 1349-1354 as proposed by Ciliberti). The readings of *Non al so amante*, found on Strips III, IV, V, VI, VII and VIII (Ciliberti's numbering), probably derive from a northern antigraph, given the presence of triplet flags pointing to the right¹⁸. The variants of the musical text in *Per* are often shared by *PR*, except at two points of the cadence of the second line and in a passage from the opening melisma of the third line, where the concordance is with the Tuscan *FP*. Given that the *tenor* and a large portion of the literary text are missing, there is little else one can say, but the fragment certainly deserves further study.

More interesting is the behaviour of *Pit* and *Sq*, in which the *tenor* voice is almost identical (even in the line break of the first line). The only notational divergence is at the syllable *pia-* of *piacque* where *Pit* gives a same-pitch *ligatura* for the *semibrevis maior* and following *semibreve*¹⁹, whereas the copyist of *Sq* separates the notes (as he does throughout the codex); the variant is almost completely insignificant from the point of view of performance. A further feature of *Sq* (though it is not a variant of the musical text) is a different arrangement of the text at the beginning of the ritornello in the *tenor*. In all the other codices the syllables *che mi* lie on the two pairs of descending minims at the end of the *divisio* (b. 42); in *Sq*, on the other hand, *che* occurs at the beginning of the *divisio* and *mi* on the quadruplet of descending minims.

In *Sq* the *superius* behaves very differently from the *tenor*: it contains as many as four *lectiones singulares* that distinguish it from the rest of the tradition (including *Pit*), which supports the hypothesis already suggested by our analysis of the textual variants: that this voice derives from a different antigraph from the source of the *tenor*.

¹⁷ Pirrotta's transcription in CMM 8/4, pp. 15-16 is based on *PR*; it can be easily compared with the version of *Pit* published here.

¹⁸ On the direction of the triplet flags, see KURT VON FISCHER, *Studien zur italienischen Musik des Trecento und frühen Quattrocento*, 2 vols., Bern, Haupt, 1965 (Publikationen der Schweizerischen Musikforschenden Gesellschaft. Serie II, 5), p. 119: "Als besonders aufschlussreich für die Herkunft der verschiedenen MSS erweist sich die Triolennotierung...".

¹⁹ A similar equal-pitch ligature is found in the *superius* of *Pit* at the beginning of the second line of text.

EXAMPLE 3 shows the four variants in a modern transcription, along with the fragments of the *tenor* voice (to clarify the harmonic context).

The first is a very ordinary rhythmic variant, but the dotted figure that opens the *divisio* appears at no other moment of the madrigal and is probably not original. The second and third variants could be mere slips made by the copyist: in the first case the triplet has been erroneously raised by a tone, in the second lowered by a third. Also suspect are the final minims of the third-last *divisio* (A G instead of F G) because they do not match Jacopo's normal ornamental figures.

For the modern edition (see Appendix), on which the analysis of the text-music relationship will be conducted, I have therefore chosen to favour the readings of *Pit*, while correcting the errors by a collation with the other sources. *Pit* is the least corrupt codex of the entire tradition and its readings perhaps derive from an antigraph that is earlier than that used by the copyists of *FP*. In this way the reader has at least a complete version of the piece that has some likelihood of having been performed in the early years of the 15th century. *FP* is certainly the earliest source, but some of its readings (both musical and textual) indicate that the scribes of the codex (or its antigraph) made substantial changes (not always judiciously) during the copying stage, as also seems to have happened with many other works of the earliest masters contained in this manuscript. *Sq*, which is later than *Pit*, has the problem of having a contaminated text: while one voice (the *tenor*) derives from a copy very close to *Pit*, the other is from a (presumably earlier) antigraph that is devoid of links with the rest of the tradition and contains four dubious variants in the musical text (the literary text, however, is excellent). The readings of *PR* (northern codex) probably derive from a northern antigraph, but they are mixed with, and corrupted by, certain strongly 'dialectal' traits. About *SL*, finally, unfortunately only the *tenor* voice survives, but its readings are almost identical to those of *Sq* and *Pit*.²⁰ The transcription from *Pit* is given at the end of this article.

The corpus of Jacopo's compositions (see TABLE 1 for the complete list of surviving secular works) turns out to be stylistically fairly consistent, above all with respect to their rhythmic structure). Regarding the *ordo mensuralis* used, we notice that *senaria imperfecta* is rarely used and *novenaria* very rarely used, to the extent that there is cause to think that the madrigal *Lucida petra* is not by Jacopo at all.

²⁰ *SL* is notated in a different clef from *Sq* (C3 instead of C4 – a difference often found between *Sq* and *SL* and which perhaps depends on an antigraph of only five lines); the line breaks correspond exactly with those of *Sq*. Of the significant variants the only decipherable ones are: bb. 12 and 22: oblique *ligatura cum opposita proprietate*; b. 36 *SL* like *Sq*. I thank Oliver Huck for this information.

In all likelihood the works of Jacopo have not come down to us in their original notational form, but in modernized versions²¹. The ‘modern’ *divisiones octonaria* and *duodenaria* are a new notational form for an original mensural structure in *tempus imperfectum*: with imperfect *modus* in the former case, perfect *modus* in the latter. The possible original form of the first line of the madrigal is therefore that shown in the second line of EXAMPLE 4.

The letters *G* and *Y* indicate, respectively, the French (*Gallicum*) and Italian (*Italicum*) systems of subdividing imperfect time, as Marchetto da Padova explains in the section devoted to the ‘cantus de divisione temporis imperfecti secundum Gallicam et Italicam divisionem mixte’ at the end of the *Liber secundus* of the *Pomerium*²²: the distinction is the same as that between *senaria gallica* (or *imperfecta*) and *quaternaria* (or *octonaria*), using the terminology of the subsequent theory (for example, that of the *Rubricae breves*)²³. In this regard, the version of *FP* in *quaternaria* with *modus* is not a translation of a hypothetical original in *octonaria* and *duodenaria*, but the direct modernized transcription (with the elimination of the *pontelli*) of the original readings in *tempus imperfectum*.

Given that Jacopo’s production is numerically large and fairly varied from the point of view of its *mensurae*, his works (if compared to those of Piero and Giovanni) offer an excellent opportunity for studying the relationship between notation and rhythmic thinking.

In spite of the very varied tradition of his compositions, Jacopo’s rhythmic approach can be reduced to three main *mensurae* (see TABLE 1). Two can be traced to Marchetto’s system: perfect time (‘Tp’) and imperfect time (‘Ti’), with only imperfect time contemplating the three possibilities of *modus cantandi*: i.e. *italicum*, *gallicum* or *mixtum* (‘Ti’, ‘Tig’ or ‘Tim’). The third *mensura* is *tempus perfectum minus* (‘P’), in other words, a perfect time with a swift beat, in which the minim corresponds to that of imperfect time divided into eight and the breve is half that of perfect time²⁴.

Jacopo never uses *tempus perfectum mixtum* (i.e. a *duodenaria-novenaria* alternation, according to the terminology used in the *Rubricae breves*) or even *tempus perfectum* divided into nine (*novenaria*). As the madrigal *Lucida petra* is a *unicum* in *Sq* and appears in the section dedicated to Jacopo (fol. 19v) devoid of *residuum*, it was most likely a piece of dubious attribution also for the copyist of *Sq*.

²¹ On the problem see the recent MARCO GOZZI, “New Light on Italian Trecento Notation – Part I”, *Recercare*, XIII, 2001, pp. 5-78.

²² Edition of the treatise by GIUSEPPE VECCHI, *Pomerium Marcheti de Padua*, [Rome], American Institute of Musicology, 1961 (*Corpus scriptorum de musica*, 6). The suggestion on the use of the letters is on p. 180 of Vecchi’s edition.

²³ See GIUSEPPE VECCHI, “Anonimi Rubricae breves”, *Quadrivium*, X 1969, pp. 125-134.

²⁴ See GOZZI, “New Light”, p. 39

In the concordant sources one often notes, in the works of the earlier masters, an oscillation between a triplet (plus two minims) and a group formed by two semiminims and a minim (plus two minims). The two possible rhythmic patterns are most likely nothing but translations of the same group of five *semibreves aequales* in the original notation in imperfect time that can be traced to Marchetto's theory²⁵.

Non al so amante belongs, therefore, to a group of Jacopo's madrigals that was originally written in *tempus imperfectum* with an alternation of the two subdivisions: the Italian (binary) and French (triple, with up to six semibreves per *divisio*). The first section of the madrigal has *modus imperfectus*, the second *modus perfectus*. The *cantus italicus*, however, never reaches the full eight *semibreves minimae*; at most it has five; in this case only the first two notes of the group of original five *semibreves aequales* are to be considered as minims, as Marchetto explains; the others are *semibreves minores*.

The very same *ordo mensuralis* of *Non al so amante* is also found in the madrigals *O dolz'appresso*, *Sotto l'imperio* and *Tanto che siat*, as also in Jacopo's caccia *Oselletto*. The same *tempus imperfectum* with *modus imperfectus* turns out to be the original *mensura* of the madrigal *Prima vertute*, the lauda *Nel mio parlar* and the opening sections of *Con gran furor* and *Un bel sparver*. The mathematical ratio most commonly used between the groups of minims in these pieces is not *proportio sesquiertia* (four minims in the place of three), as frequently found in Giovanni da Cascia, but *proportio sesquialtera* (three in the place of two).

It is probable that the original notational form of these pieces conformed to the description outlined by Marchetto in his *Pomerium* (with the *semibreves* undifferentiated and *sine filo aliquo* and the letters *G* and *Y*), as we see in EXAMPLE 4: in this case a breve of imperfect time with *modus* would have a value of around MM 54.

Other madrigals by Jacopo (like *Aquila altera*, *Di novo è giunto*, *Entrava Febo*, etc., listed as *Group C* in TABLE 1), on the other hand, show a different theoretical-structural frame of reference, with *mensurae* adopting a semibreve beat. The theoretical picture that best describes this system is that expressed in the above-cited anonymous treatise of c.1350 known as *Rubricae breves*.

In all likelihood the copyists of *FP*, *Pit*, *Sq* and *PR*, instead, refer to yet another framework of rules, which we do not find in any theoretical treatise of the 14th or 15th century, yet which can be deduced from a study of the densities of Landini's *tenores*²⁶:

²⁵ VECCHI, *Pomerium*, p. 176.

²⁶ See GOZZI, "New Light", ch. II.

<i>Tempus imperfectum cum prolatione perfecta</i> (i)	SB = MM 104
<i>Tempus perfectum cum prolatione perfecta</i> (n)	SB = MM 104
<i>Tempus imperfectum cum prolatione imperfecta</i> (p)	SB = MM 104
<i>Tempus imperfectum cum prolatione imperfecta</i> (q)	SB = MM 104
<i>Quaternaria con modus</i> (Longanotation)	SB = MM 72
<i>Octonaria</i>	SB = MM 72
<i>Duodenaria</i>	SB = MM 72

The meanings of the notational signs changed profoundly, therefore, over the period of fifty-plus years and the task of the scholar is to try and reconstruct the pace of the original tempo wanted by the composer. That's why it has been decided to provide also a metronomic indication in the transcription, which attempts to suggest to the performer a (presumably correct) value for the original tempo (semiminim = MM 54). In any case it is likely that in the early years of the 15th century Jacopo's madrigal was taken at a swifter pace, with a basic *mensura* (the *semibrevis maior* of the *ottonaria* and *duodenaria*, corresponding to the semiminim of the transcription) of 72 beats per minute and not 54, as originally.

After dealing with mensural matters, we must pay some attention to the actual musical text itself. The madrigal has some structural features that are worth observing: principally the solo-voice attack of the *superius* for three breve measures. A very similar situation is found in Jacopo's madrigals *Di novo è giunto*, *Fenice fu*, *O dolz'appress'un bel perlaro* and *Tanto che siat*, but is never found in Piero's madrigals, nor in those of Giovanni da Cascia nor even in those transmitted in the Rossi codex. Hence it is characteristic of Jacopo's style (in the Rossi codex the madrigal *Cum altre ucele* has a similar solo-voice opening, though in the *tenor* and not the *superius*, as does Gherardello's madrigal *Intrando ad abitar*). This type of writing is accompanied by a particular density of the *tenor*, which by acquiring a certain melodic independence and assuming moments of syllabic prominence, not matched by the higher voice, assumes an unusual rhythmic vitality.

In *Non al so amante* the melody of the solo entry of the *superius* is echoed at the start of the ritornello, where however the *tenor* enters right from the start together with the upper voice.

Certain recurrent rhythmic schemes can be noticed in the musical texture; in the *tenor* one notes as many as seven returns of the 'crotchet, quaver, quaver rest' pattern (see the transcription at bb. 4, 16, 19, 21, 30, 34, 45); combined with these figures in the *tenor* the *superius* almost always has 'crotchet, quaver rest, two semiquavers' or slight variations of this pattern. The function of these moments, which present a hoquet procedure at the second cro-

chet of the bar, is that of re-launching the musical discourse after an important moment (generally at the end of sections of syllabic text or the opening melismas of the line), or to give breadth to the melisma (bb. 21 and 30), in such a way that there are no more than two bars without interruptions. In two other cases (bb. 37 and 47) the same pattern is inverted in the two voices, but the function is identical.

The text-music relationship

Regarding the melodic structure of the typical 14th-century madrigal, consisting of two sections (A and B, in which B is called the ‘ritornello’, even if no repeats are required, while A is used for setting the tercets) there is a significant description in the so-called *Capitulum de vocibus applicatis verbis* of c.1320:

Mandrigalia sunt verba applicata pluribus cantibus, quorum unus debet esse de puris longis, et hic appellatur tenor. Alter vel alii volunt esse de puris minimis, et unus specialiter vult ascendere ad duodecimam vel ad quintam decimam vocem et ire melodiando. Volunt etiam esse de tempore perfecto et aere italico. Si quis aliquando miscetur aliquod tempus aeris gallici, bonum esset; si vero in fine partium, esset melius. Partes verborum possunt esse de undecim et de septem sicut desiderio placet, sed vult retro unam partem omnibus aliis similem, quae fit tamquam rescinda(?), cuius verba volunt esse de villanellis, de floribus, arbustis, sertis, ubere et similibus, dummodo sit bona sententia, loquela et sermo²⁷.

The madrigals are words applied to more voices, of which one must be made up of long notes only and it is called *tenor*, the other or others are generally made up of minims only and one voice especially generally rises to the twelfth or fifteenth and proceeds melodically. Normally these voices are in perfect time and in the Italian system; if at times it is mixed with some measures of the French system, that is a good thing; and if that happens at the end of the line that is even better. The lines of the text can be of eleven or seven syllables, as one likes, but at the end they must have a line similar to the others that can act as an element of conclusion. The texts of the madrigal can be about shepherdesses, flowers, shrubs, garlands, fields and similar things, provided that they are in a good literary form.

²⁷ THORSTEN BURKARD - OLIVER HUCK, “Voces applicatae verbis. Ein musikologischer und poetologischer Traktat aus dem 14. Jahrhundert (I-Vnm Lat. Cl. XII.97 [4125]). Enleitung, Edition, Übersetzung und Kommentar”, *Acta Musicologica*, LXXIV, 2002, pp. 1-24: 18.

Certain aspects among those described in the short *Capitulum*, like the mixing of the French system with the Italian, can still be identified in *Non al so amante*, but the *tenor* of long notes only and the *superius* of minims only are phenomena not featured in the surviving 14th-century madrigals. It is very likely, however, that the expressions “de puris longis” and “de puris minimis” refer not only to the mensural values of the *longa* and *minima*, but also to a more general use of ‘long sounds’ and ‘short sounds’; in which the description perfectly matches the situation of the pieces preserved.

In almost all the approximately one hundred and fifty madrigals transmitted with notation in the Italian Ars Nova manuscripts and fragments, the textual and musical structure is very similar to that of *Non al so amante*, which suggests that the form was fairly rigidly defined.

As regards the macrostructure of the madrigal *Non al so amante*, we observe a complete respect of the end of the individual lines in the musical text, as for that matter in almost all the extant 14th-century madrigals. At the end of each hendecasyllable we find a concluding cadence, even where there is *enjambement* (see the words *piacque*, *inuda*, *acque*, *cielo*, *gielo* in the transcription); in the cases of *enjambements*, however, the *tenor* assumes the task of re-launching the discourse with a linking phrase (see above all bb. 12 and 23-24), the main aim of which is precisely to create musical continuity between the lines and to respect the semantic continuity. The formal segmentation of the musical text achieved by the cadences is also found in other points of the madrigal. During the musical setting, therefore, the literary text subjected to notation is split up according to the symmetrical scheme given below (the readings considered are those of *Pit* and the subdivisions are marked by a double slash):

Tercets:

Non al [cad. on D, b. 6] // su amante più Diana piacque [important cad. on D, b. 11] //

Quando [cad. on E, b. 16] // per tal ventura tutta inuda [inconclusive cad. on D, b. 23] //

La [cad. on D, b. 32] // vide in meço delle gelid'acque [important cad. on C, b. 39] //.

²⁷ THORSTEN BURKARD - OLIVER HUCK, *Voces applicatae verbis. Ein musikologischer und poetologischer Traktat aus dem 14. Jahrhundert (I-Vnm Lat. Cl. XII.97 [4125])*. *Enleitung, Edition, Übersetzung und Kommentar*, «Acta Musicologica», LXXIV, 2002, pp. 1-24: 18.

²⁸ La traduzione deriva dalla versione di F. ALBERTO GALLO, *Il Medioevo II*, Torino, E.D.T., 1977 (Storia della musica a cura della Società Italiana di Musicologia, 2), p. 121, con qualche variante.

Ritornello:

Tal che mi fece quando egli arde 'l cielo [important cad. on A, b. 47] //

Tutto tremar d'un amoroso gielo. [final cad. on D, b. 53].

The segmentation is a stereotyped one that can be observed in many madrigal of the early Ars Nova masters (as also in the ballatas). The opening syllable calls for a melisma, which must conclude on the final syllable of the first word, if it is bi-syllabic (*Quan-do*), or on the second syllable (*Non al*; *La vidi*).

In the literary text of the more carefully prepared musical codices there are always signs that indicate precisely the end of the lines (*Sq* and *Pit* use dots, *FP* uses slashes). These indications are precious above all for the correct division into lines of the caccia texts, which are often problematic; to these markings, however, the modern editors of the Trecento settings seem to have paid insufficient attention.

In the ritornello of *Non al so amante* the second line does not begin with a new *divisio*, as always occurs in the madrigals of his contemporary Giovanni da Cascia, but instead immediately follows the cadence of the first line, adopting an expedient also used elsewhere by Jacopo, one that allows him to ensure the semantic compactness of the distich. So though Jacopo does not depart from the tradition, he nonetheless innovates it with small, yet significant, variations.

In considering the text-music relationship in an Italian composition of the Trecento the second aspect to be investigated is the link between textual accent and musical accent. To date, there is still no overall study of this subject, but from research on sample cases we find considerable attention and a fertile imagination in the musical treatment of the texts, and especially a particular concern for the correct musical translation of the rhythm of the poetic lines (hendecasyllables, for the most part). Any study of the way the textual accents are respected in the music must necessarily be limited to the portions of text subjected to notation in the codices. Since almost all the 14th-century forms of poetry for music include musical sections that are repeated with different words, discrepancies occur if the residual portions of text do not coincide rhythmically with those set under the notes. But in such cases the absence of corresponding accents must be attributed not to the composer, but to the author of the text.

In the present madrigal, however, the phenomenon is well under control, given the high quality of the literary text. The two tercets show a sufficiently similar rhythmic structure, and the lines are prevalently iambic in metre. In both cases the first accent of the middle lines of the tercets is on the first (and not second) syllable, which ensures an even closer parallelism.

We fail to find such a close rhythmic symmetry in the tercets of the other

madrigals set by Jacopo, which confirms the superior skill of Petrarch over the other contemporary versifiers.

The problem of the strophic aspect of the tercets is a central problem in any consideration of the text-music relationship. The composer obviously works on the first tercet, and builds the musical text on the phonic, rhythmic and syntactic structure of the first three lines. The syntactic and rhythmic congruity of the *residuum* compared to the first hendecasyllables does not concern the musician; that's the task of the author of the text. If the poet is competent and tackles the problem correctly, the madrigal gains in coherence and compactness and few hitches are encountered in the setting of the second tercet. Some poets, like Dante for example, are very sensitive to the matter. In the *De vulgari eloquentia*, he returns several times to what in the *Convivio* he calls "the number which is necessary to the note"²⁸ (naturally referring not to the madrigal, but to the canzone); in other words, he is aware that there must be a close link between poetry and music in strophic forms. Right from his definition of poetry, he refers to music:

*... si poesim recte consideramus, que nichil aliud est quam fictio rethorica musicaque poita*²⁹.

... if we consider correctly the term 'poetry', which is nothing but an invention expressed according to the rhetorical and musical art.

Even more to the point, however, are the two passages referring to the melody of the canzone and to the definition and description of the 'stanza' (or strophe):

*Preterea disserendum est utrum cantio dicatur fabricatio verborum armonizatorum, vel ipsa modulatio. Ad quod dicimus quod nunquam modulatio dicitur cantio, sed sonus, vel tonus, vel nota, vel melos. Nullus enim tibicen, vel organista, vel citharedus melodiam suam cantionem vocat, nisi in quantum nupta est alicui cantioni; sed armonizantes verba opera sua cantiones vocant; et etiam talia verba in cartulis absque prolatore iacentia cantiones vocamus. Et ideo cantio nichil aliud esse videtur quam actio completa dictantis verba modulationi armonizata: quapropter tam cantiones quas nunc tractamus, quam ballatas et sonitus, et omnia cuiuscunque modi verba sunt armonizata vulgariter et regulariter, cantiones esse dicemus*³⁰.

²⁸ *Convivio*, Treatise II, ch. IX. Cfr. DANTE ALIGHIERI, *Tutte le opere*, edited by Luigi Blasucci, Firenze, Sansoni, 1965, p. 133.

²⁹ *De vulgari eloquentia*, Book II, ch. IV. See DANTE, *Tutte le opere*, p. 230.

³⁰ DANTE, *Tutte le opere*, p. 237.

It must also be explained if by the term ‘canzone’ one means the composition of words for the song or the song itself. In this regard we say that the song is never called a ‘canzone’, but ‘sound’, ‘tone’, ‘note’ or ‘melody’. In fact no player of the pipe, hurdy-gurdy or lute calls his melody a ‘canzone’ if not in so far as it is arranged to be sung to the text of a canzone; but those who compose words to be set to music call their works ‘canzoni’, and even such words, written on small sheets, without anyone uttering them, are called ‘canzoni’. It is therefore clear that ‘canzone’ is nothing if not a work accomplished by one who artfully composes words harmonized to receive a melody; and so we can call canzoni both the canzoni, about which we are here speaking, and the ballatas, sonnets and all the words that are harmonized in any metrical form in the vernacular and with regularity.

Quare [...] dicere possumus stantiam esse sub certo cantu et habitudine limitatam carminum et sillabarum compagem. [...] Dicimus ergo quod omnis stantia ad quandam odam recipiendam armonizata est. Sed in modis diversificari videntur; quia quedam sunt sub una oda continua usque ad ultimum progressive, hoc est sine iteratione modulationis cuiusquam et sine diesi (diesim dicimus deductionem vergentem de una oda in aliam; hanc ‘voltam’ vocamus, cum vulgus alloquimur) [...] Quedam vero sunt diesim patientes; et diesis esse non potest, secundum quod eam appellamus, nisi reiteratio unius ode fiat, vel ante diesim, vel post, vel undique. Si ante diesim repetitio fiat, stantiam dicimus habere pedes; et duos habere decet, licet quandoque tres fiant, rarissime tamen. Si repetitio fiat post diesim, tunc dicimus stantiam habere versus.

Therefore we can say that the stanza is a grouping of lines and syllables in the limits of a given melody and corresponding arrangement. Let us therefore say that each stanza is constructed in such a way as to receive a certain melody. But the stanzas differ in their melodic lines, since some remain under a sole continuous melody until the end, that is without the repetition of any musical phrase and without ‘diesis’ (the ‘diesis’ is the passage from one melody to another, sometimes commonly called ‘volta’). Others, on the other hand, involve the ‘diesis’; and there can be no ‘diesis’, according to the sense that is given to the word, if there is no repetition of a melodic phrase either before the ‘diesis’, or after, or in both parts. When the repetition occurs before the ‘diesis’, it is said that the stanza has ‘piedi’, and it is proper that it should have two, though sometimes (though rarely) it may have three. When the repetition is made after the ‘diesis’, then the stanza is said to have ‘volte’.

For Dante, canzoni, ballatas and sonnets must be composed with great attention to the melody that the musician will give them. In fact the poet must write in such a way that the canzone should be potentially suited to receiving a strophic melody, regardless of the specific setting of the piece. In the description of the canzone (a specifically strophic form) the accent is specifically placed on the need to respect the rhythmic-metric structure of the stanza and ensure that it is perfectly adapted to a melody that must be repeated. When, in addition, the stanza itself possesses strophic articulations within it (as with the *piedi* or *volte*) the recommendation is again to respect the metrical structure in such a way that there are no difficulties in the melodic repetition. Unfortunately the Second Book of the *De vulgari eloquentia* was left incomplete precisely at the point that concerned the number of lines and syllables and their relationship with the song. Nonetheless, here and there we find other references to the problem in Dante's work. One occurs in the *Convivio* (Treatise II, ch. XI), where the poet discusses the 'tornata', i.e. the lines of *congedo* of the canzone:

E acciò che questa parte più pienamente sia intesa, dico che generalmente si chiama in ciascuna canzone 'tornata', però che li dicitori che prima usaro di farla, fenno quella perché, cantata la canzone, con certa parte del canto ad essa si ritornasse. Ma io rade volte a quella intenzione la feci, e, acciò che altri se n'accorgesse, rade volte la puosi con l'ordine de la canzone, quanto è a lo numero che a la nota è necessario, ma fecila quando alcuna cosa in adornamento de la canzone era mestiero a dire, fuori de la sua sentenza³¹.

In order that this may be more fully understood, I say that in every canzone this is generally called a "tornata" because the poets who first made a practice of employing it did so in order that when the canzone had been sung they might return to it with a certain part of the melody. But I have rarely employed it with that intention, and so that others might perceive that this is the case, rarely have I composed it according to the metrical pattern of the canzone, with regard to the number that is required for the melody; but I have employed it for the adornment of the canzone when there was a need to say something lying outside its meaning.

³¹ DANTE, *Tutte le opere*, p. 133.

The remark “but I have rarely employed it with that intention” attests that Dante did compose some (rare) *tornate* in such a way that part of the melody for the canzone stanzas should be repeated in the final lines, but that more often he used the expedient of varying the metre of the tornata from that of the stanzas; in this way the singers would realize that it was not meant to be sung.

In any case these short extracts from Dante’s writings testify to the great poet’s deep sensitivity to the needs of music, even before the flowering of the Ars Nova, and suggest that the presumed divorce between music and poetry³² had not yet occurred in the early years of the 14th century.

For the performer (and naturally also for the editor of 14th-century music), the problem is to show how the text of the *residuum* should fit the music written above the first tercet. Some editors, like Pirrotta, avoided the problem by simply not putting the text of the second strophe under the notes; others did it, but not always with satisfactory results. The editor needs to be very careful about also correctly translating the nuances of the original text-music relationship. Though these nuances might seem marginal, taken together they substantially contribute to correct performance. Unfortunately, the modern editions (and hence also the performances) of 14th-century music are packed with errors concerning the positioning of the syllables and the correct translation of the metrical figures. Just one example: the copyists of the 14th and early 15th centuries were accustomed to setting the synaloephas to two distinct notes, or sometimes to a same-pitch *ligatura* (with the notes set close together to indicate the fusion of the two note values). The same phenomenon can also be regularly observed in the repertoire of the monophonic lauda (the Cortona Codex and Banco Rari 18 of the Biblioteca Nazionale of Florence are packed with synaloephas expressed as two notes of the same pitch). In a modern edition, however, the two values should be merged. A good performer will certainly know how to interpret the synaloepha correctly. In this regard, note EXAMPLE 5, which shows the opening of our madrigal both ways. If one follows the script of the codices (EXAMPLE 5A), which at b. 6 underline the synaloepha of the first line with a repeated note (“al so a – mante”), it is unadvisable to underlay the text of the *residuum* as a second strophe (given that at that point the *residuum* has no synaloepha and the performer would be induced to repeat the notes of the same pitch without cause). Then it is necessary either to transcribe the second tercet in its entirety, repeating the music,

³² AURELIO RONCAGLIA, “Sul ‘Divorzio tra musica e poesia’ nel Duecento italiano”, in *L’ars nova italiana del Trecento* Vol. 4 : *Atti del 3° Congresso internazionale sul tema “La musica al tempo del Boccaccio e i suoi rapporti con la letteratura”*, edited by Agostino Ziino, Certaldo, Comune di Certaldo, 1978, pp. 365-397.

or force the performer to adapt the text as required (which is often not easy to do). The best solution is to include the text of the second tercet in the modern edition as well (EXAMPLE 5B) and ensure that the musical rhythm of the transcription is uniform, i.e. by merging the two notes to form a single sound and making sure that the synaloepha is correctly executed. The attention of the medieval scribes towards synaloepha (graphically indicated by repeated notes of the same pitch) does not imply that in the 14th century the synaloephas were sung in a strictly measured way and that the two vowels were separated in performance or clearly distinguished. The custom of doubling is a purely graphic consideration, that can be correctly translated in all cases with the fusion of the two vowels to form a single note, as shown in Example 5B.

For the syllabic passages in the middle of the lines in section A of the madrigal *Non al so amante* Jacopo adopts the criterion of assigning to each syllable the value of a quarter of *divisio* in the measures of imperfect time, which generally means that the syllables are set to a *semibrevis minor* in *octonaria* (a quaver in the modern transcription). In the first line this rule is fairly clear (b. 6-8), but in the second line the four syllables of b. 18 (-tu-ra tut-ta) are preceded by two breve measures in which the syllables are exactly double the value (a syllable for every *semibrevis maior*), at least in the *superius*. In the third line we find a gradual acceleration: two syllables worth a semibrevis maior (*vi-de_in*, b. 32), then two worth a semibrevis minor (*mez-zo*, b. 33) and finally four that are set as four minims (*de le ge-lid-*). The custom of placing the syllables on the minims is reserved in Jacopo for those pieces that adopt a broader tempo than usual, in other words those conceived in imperfect time with *modus* (identified in TABLE 1 as groups A and B). In the works lacking *modus* (group C of TABLE 1) this does not occur.

To underline the principal moments of textual declamation Jacopo resorts to two musical expedients: homorhythm and movement in parallel thirds and sixths (see bb. 6, 32-33, 44, 49). The only line that is an exception to this rule is the second of the tercets, which however shows in the *tenor* (b. 17) the other constant feature of the moments of textual accumulation: the pairs of descending semiquavers (found also at bb. 7 and 33 of the *superius* and, in both voices in sixths, at bb. 33 and 49).

In the ritornello the textual accumulation (five syllables in the space of three or four crotchets) occurs at bb. 44-45 and 49, respectively for the second hemistich of the first line and the first hemistich of the second; the rest of the syllables are arranged in pairs in the two bars before b. 44 (*che mi fe-ce*) and the two following b. 49 (*a-mo-ro-so*). The normal placing of the syllables in *duodenaria* is in the first two crotchets of the bar; which explains the variants observed in the *tenor* part regarding the different placing of the text made by the copyists at bb. 42 and 51. The *superius* has an almost identical rhythmic design and all the codices place the first syllable on the first note and the

second after the rest. In the *tenor*, on the other hand, at b. 42 all the codices except *Sq* place the two syllables on the final quadruplet of minims in such a way that the syllable is changed on the short repeated note (as at b. 17), whereas *Sq* has the syllables on the first and thirds crotchets. At b. 51 *FP* and *PR* repeat the opening *D* in such a way as to have the two syllables on the first two crotchets, whereas *Sq* (which is internally consistent) places the syllables on the first and third crotchets and is concordant with *Pit*.

For its stylistic relevance to be assessed, this type of variant should be studied in relation to the rest of the *Ars Nova* tradition (or at least to the same composer's corpus of works). Only by distinguishing the intervention of the copyist from the intentions of the composer can one achieve a satisfactory text on which an effective stylistic analysis can be conducted³³.

For example, we have a clear instance of the composer's intentions concerning the metrical figures at b. 32, where Petrarch's text requires a synaloepha ("la vide_in mezzo") and the composer instead call for dialoepha with two distinct notes on fairly large note values ("la vide / in mezzo"), to the extent that the copyists – at a certain moment of the tradition – actually inserted a new syllable ("la vide nel mezzo") to clarify the sense, given that the musical context allowed it. It is surprising to observe that the phenomenon recurs in the second tercet, with absolute congruity ("che 'l sole_all'aura" set as "che 'l sole / all'aura"). The edition in the appendix perhaps recovers the composer's original intentions, and it is important to stress that similar subtleties are by no means rare in the secular production of the Trecento.

In this regard we must also stress Jacopo's respect for the important diaeresis in the word *Diana* (three syllables and not two), a metrical figure evidenced in both voices with the use of pairs of descending semiquavers (*superius* b. 6, *tenor* b. 7). The codex that is clearest in the correct positioning of the syllables of text (*Di-a-na*) is *FP*, while the other manuscripts (in particular *Sq*: see EXAMPLE 4) could suggest synaeresis (*Dia-na*), which is introduced by the copyists yet contradicted by the evident structuring of the musical rhythm. In all likelihood Jacopo intended to set the diaeresis correctly by distinguishing the three distinct positions of the word *Diana*.

In the Italian 14th-century manuscripts, when the *tenor* carries the text, we generally have a sure guide to the correct underlay of the syllables. It also helps the placing of the syllables under the notes of the *superius*, since the voices often procede homorhythmically. In the madrigal in question, however (see bb. 7-8, 17-18 of the transcription), there are significant exceptions to the principle of homorhythm, which is otherwise generally respected in the work of Jacopo.

³³ See OLIVER HUCK, "Comporre nel primo Trecento. Lo stile nei madrigali di magister Piero, di Giovanni da Firenze e di Jacopo da Bologna

The analysis of the text-music relationship in a composition of the Italian Trecento always evidences solutions that are interesting and not random, as well as a particular attention to the rhythm and syntax of the text: features that were unknown to the composers of the 15th century. On such matters the extensive Ars Nova repertoire still awaits a systematic and global investigation.

TABLE 1
Ordo mensuralis of the works of Jacopo da Bologna

<i>Title</i>	<i>Divisio</i>	<i>Original Mensura</i>	<i>Notes</i>
Group A			
Non al so amante	o / d	Tim / Tim	Section A with <i>modus imperfectus</i> ; B with <i>perfectus</i> : 2 Tim = o; 3 Tim = d.
Sotto l'imperio	o / d	Tim / Tim	2 Tim = o; 3 Tim = d. <i>Modus imperfectus</i> in sect. A, <i>perfectus</i> in the Rit.
Tanto che siat	o / d	Tim / Tim	2 Tim = o; 3 Tim = d. <i>Modus imperfectus</i> in sect. A, <i>perfectus</i> in the Rit.
O dolz'appress (<i>FP</i>)	o / d	Tim / Ti	2 Tim = o; 3 Ti = d. <i>Modus</i> in both sections. <i>Fc</i> and <i>Lo</i> have .o. in the Rit.
Oselletto (Caccia)	o / d	Ti / Ti	2 Ti = o; 3 Ti = d. <i>Modus imperfectus</i> in sect. A, <i>perfectus</i> in the Rit.
Giunge'l bel (caccia <i>unicum FP</i>)	i	Tig / Tig	Sez. A with <i>modus imperfectus</i> , B with <i>perfectus</i> . Without <i>tenor</i> (like Piero's <i>Ogni diletto</i>)
Nel mio parlar (lauda, <i>unic. FP</i>)	o	Tim	2 Tim = o
Prima vertute	o	Tim	Con <i>modus imperfectus</i> . 2 Tim = o
Group B			
Con gran furor (<i>unicum Sq</i>)	o / d	Tim / Tp	2 Tim = o. Section A with <i>modus imperfectus</i>
Un bel sparver	o / p	Tim / Tp	2 Tim = o. Section A with <i>modus imperfectus</i>
O in Italia	o / p	Ti / Tp	2 Ti = o. Section A with <i>modus imperfectus</i>
I' mi son un che	i / d	Tig / Tp	Section A with <i>modus imperfectus</i>
In verde prato	i / d	Tig / Tp	Section A with <i>modus imperfectus</i>
Quando veg'io	i / d	Tig / Tp	Section A with <i>modus imperfectus</i>
Si come al canto	i / d	Tig / Tp	Section A with <i>modus imperfectus</i>
Lo lume vostro	P	Tp	
Group C			
Di novo è giunto	o / d	Ti / Tp	Ti = o
Entrava Febo (<i>unicum Sq</i>)	o / d	Ti / Tp	Ti = o
Gridavan tutti (<i>unicum PR</i>)	o / p	Ti / Tp	Ti = o. Attribution of Von Fischer, 1958
Nel bel giardin	o / d	Ti / Tp	Ti = o
O cieco	o / d	Ti / Tp	Ti = o
Per sparverare (Caccia <i>Lo, FP</i>)	o / d	Ti / Tp	Ti = o. <i>FP</i> has the rit. in .d. (3q), then .p. (3.2).
Un bel pelaro (<i>unicum Lo</i>)	o / d	Ti / Tp	Ti = o
Vola el bel sparver (<i>unicum Sq</i>)	o / d	Ti / Tp	Ti = o
In su' be' fiori (<i>unicum FP</i>)	2q / i	Ti / Tig	Ti = 2q. Sez. B with <i>modus imperfectus</i>
Straccias'i panni		Ti	Ti = o
Tanto soavemente (<i>unicum Sq</i>)	o	Ti	Ti = o
Aquila / Uccel	o / p	Ti / P	Ti = o. Rit. With <i>modus imperfectus</i>
Fenice fu' e vissi	o / p	Ti / P	Ti = o. Rit. With <i>modus imperfectus</i>
I' senti' zà	p / d	P / Tp	Section A with <i>modus imperfectus</i>
Vestise la cornachia	p / o	P / Ti	Section A with <i>modus imperfectus</i> . Ti = o
Oselletto	p	P	Con <i>modus imperfectus</i>
Posando	p	P	Con <i>modus imperfectus</i>
Doubtful work			
Lucida petra (<i>unicum Sq</i>)	d / n	Tp/Tp gallicum	Probably not by Jacopo

Ti (*Tempus imperfectum modi italici divisum*) B = MM 54

Tig (*Tempus imperfectum gallicum*) B = MM 54

Tim (*Tempus imperfectum mixtum: gallicum/italicum*) B = MM 54

Tp (*Tempus perfectum ytalicum*) B = MM 36

P (*Tempus perfectum minus*) B = MM 72