THE COMMEMORATIVE MEDAL OF THE COMPOSER/THEORIST NICOLA VICENTINO AND THE QUESTION OF ITS ATTRIBUTION

HERBERT C. TURRENTINE

THE LITERATURE CONCERNING the Italian composer/theorist Nicola Vicentino is not extensive. This is not surprising as his extant works are not large in number, and his theoretical contributions, while extremely interesting and significant in terms of the humanistic involvement of music in the late Renaissance, are framed within a single treatise. As a result, contributions by twentieth-century scholars have been largely focused on specific aspects of his works or how they reflect and contribute to stylistic changes taking place in the second half of the sixteenth century. The single large-scale monograph devoted to Vicentino and his works is by Henry W. Kaufmann and dates from 1966.1 Summary accounts of his life and creative contributions are provided by music history texts devoted to the Renaissance period and by scholarly music encyclopedias and biographical dictionaries.

In regard to the commemorative medal executed in his honor (Figs. 1 and 2), the entry by H. Pearson in the fifth edition of Grove's Dictionary of Music and Musicians acknowledges that a "medal was coined in his honor as 'perfectae musicae divisionisque inventor'" and that "his opponents said the medal was his own device" (766).2 There is no attribution or speculation of attribution as to the executor of the medal, nor is there a reproduction of it. Moreover, no source is cited for the observation that "opponents said the medal was his own device."

The entry in the sixth and latest edition of this same encyclopedia (entitled The New Grove Dictionary of Music and Musicians) written by Henry W. Kaufmann reproduces the woodcut of Vicentino (Fig. 3) from his treatise issued in 1555 but does not mention that a commemorative medal was executed in his honor (699–701). The entry on Vicentino by Claude Palisca in the scholarly German encyclopedia Die Musik in Geschichte und Gegenwart includes the woodcut of 1555 but also makes no mention of the commemorative medal. The previously mentioned monograph devoted to the life and works of Vicentino by Kaufmann
includes on the frontispiece the obverse of the medal that shows the musician's portrait (Fig. 1). However, no attribution is cited and there is no discussion of the medal within the text of the monograph.

The Italian composer and theorist Nicola Vicentino was born at Vicenza in 1511. Although virtually nothing is known concerning his early years, he undoubtedly came under the influence of the humanist scholar Gian Giorgio Trissino in his native city. It was probably the proximity of Vicenza to Venice that provided the opportunity for Vicentino to have personal contact with the theoretical concepts and instruction of the celebrated “father of the Venetian school,” Adrian Willaert. This association was recognized on the title page of his first book of madrigals (1546), where he refers to himself as a “student of the one and only Adrian Willaert.” Sometime during this period he was ordained in the priesthood, but there is no doubt his primary interest was directed toward the theoretical examination of the Greek genera and their employment in musical practice.
Vicentino is subsequently found in Ferrara, and since the account books of the Ferrarese court do not reveal his name, he was undoubtedly employed by Cardinal Ippolito (II) d'Este, Duke Ercole's brother, who maintained a sizable private chapel, rather than by the court chapel. Although not officially a member of the ducal court, Vicentino was engaged to give musical instruction to several members of the ducal family, and Duke Ercole personally participated in the performance of Vicentino's music (Kaufmann, "Vicentino" 699). The event in his life that has received the greatest attention was the public debate in which he participated in Rome on June 11, 1551, with the Portuguese theorist and composer Vicente Lusitano. This disputa-

tion occurred in the presence of the entire Papal Chapel and a few "princes of the Church," including Vicentino's patron, Cardinal Ippolito d'Este (Lowinsky 131). Vicentino's and Lusitano's controversy arose over the question whether music of their own time was exclusively diatonic or was a mixture with the chromatic and enharmonic genera of
The two figures who were chosen by Vicentino and Lusitano to pass judgment on their dispute were the Spanish composer and member of the papal choir Bartolomeo Escobedo and the Netherland composer, theorist, and member of the papal choir Ghisselin Danckerts. Undoubtedly influenced to some extent that Lusitano was a colleague in the papal choir, they decided in favor of him. On the other hand, the decision was somewhat strange in terms of contemporary thought, for Vicentino’s assertion that this new style of music was a revival of Greek ideas was a commonly accepted Renaissance tenet. This verdict, however, did not discourage Vicentino from his investigations nor from completing his treatise *L'antica musica ridotta alla moderna prattica* in which his theories were more completely explained. The treatise, as might be expected, is dedicated to his patron Cardinal Ippolito, who undoubtedly funded the publishing of the sumptuously issued work. Vicentino further recognized the Cardinal by placing at the head of Book Three of the treatise a setting of an ode (*Musica prisca caput*) in honor of him (Lowinsky 133).

Vicentino’s activities of the next few years are enumerated in his treatise. He returned briefly to Ferrara in the entourage of Cardinal Ippolito, then was in Siena for nearly two years, and subsequently moved frequently between Rome and Ferrara (Kaufmann, “Vicentino” 699).

By 1561 Vicentino had not only completed the construction of an *arcicembalo* that had six manuals capable of producing thirty-one tones to the octave, but had also built an *arciorgano* along similar lines and capable, like the *arcicembalo*, of producing the pitches of all three Greek genera. In a broadsheet he published at Venice on October 25, 1561, the instruments are described by Nicolo Bevilacqua, who makes a special point that it is a portable instrument. Bevilacqua indicates that “by means of the present document” the Reverend Don Nicola Vicentino de Vicenti is announcing “for the universal benefit of music” that he has “invented and recently put into practice an *Archiorgano* of the most wonderful *artifici* and harmony which one sees manifestly to have made up for many imperfections that are found in ordinary organs and to have constructed the perfect organ” (qtd. in Kaufmann, “Vicentino” 600). The instrument, actually built by Vicenzo Colombo, is then described in detail (Kaufmann, “Vicentino’s Archiorgano” 32–33). It remained in the famous collection of the Dukes of Ferrara until at least the end of the century, for the Bolognese scholar and *nobile dilettante* Ercole Bottrigari
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gives an account of the instrument in his treatise *Il Desiderio* of 1594 (40).²⁰

By 1563 Vicentino had left the service of Cardinal Ippolito as he had assumed the position of *maestro di cappella* at the cathedral of Vicenza during that year (Kaufmann, “Vicentino” 699). For reasons unknown, he remained at this post only until the end of the following year (1564). His activities and whereabouts for the next few years remain unclear. It is possible that he was in Milan the next year (1565), but the first documentation of a position in that city dates only from 1570 (Kaufmann, “Vicentino” 699).²¹

In 1571 his fourth book of motets was published by the Milanese printer Paolo Gottardo Ponzio,²² and in the following year his fifth book of madrigals, *Madrigali a cinque voci*, was issued by the same firm.²³ The same year (1572) a madrigal, *Passa la voce mia calma d’oblio*, was included in an anthology, *Mélanges de chansons*, issued at Paris by the renowned firm of Le Roy and Ballard. As it is the sole Italian composition in the collection, one can deduce the esteem held by the French for Vicentino’s works. According to the previously mentioned Ercole Bottrigari, Vicentino died in Milan during the plague of 1575–76 (41).²⁴

Although Vicentino wrote five volumes of madrigals²⁵ and numerous other compositions, his fame rests on the treatise *L’antica musica ridotta alla moderna prattica*. It was upon recognition of this work that a medal was executed in his honor as “*perfectae musicae divisionisque inventor*.”

The portrait on the medal is not derived from the anonymous oval woodcut of Vicentino that appears on the reverse of the title page of his *L’antica musica ridotta* of 1555 (Fig. 3). In this woodcut he is depicted wearing a scholar’s cap, and while the nose is long and pronounced, it is not aquiline as shown on the medal. In addition, the beard and hairline are different, as is the cloak around his shoulders.

The legend that appears on the medal—“*Nicolaus Vicentinus, perfectae Musicae divisionisque inventor*”—is also not the same one that appears on the woodcut. The border of the woodcut bears the legend in large letters, “*Incerta, et Occulta Scientiae Tuae Manifestasti Mihi*” (“You have made known to me the uncertain/unknown and secret [elements] of your knowledge/wisdom”), while inside the border in small letters the following legend appears: “*Archicymbali Divisionis Chromatico ac Enharmonici Generis Praticae Inventor*” (“Inventor of the archicembalo with the practical division of the chromatic and enharmonic genera”). And directly
below the portrait his name and age appear: "Nicholas Vicentinus Anno Aetatis Suae XXXIII" ("Nicolas Vicentinus at the age of forty-four").

The Latin phrase "Incerta, et Occulta Scientiae Tuae Manifestasti" is from verse 8 of Psalm 50 in the Vulgate. In the English Bible this phrase appears in verse 6 of Psalm 51, and the translations vary considerably in different editions. Hans-Joachim Kraus in his commentary on Psalm 50 (51) observes:

The statement of v. 6 has been called very enigmatic. It is obvious, however, that v. 6 should be related immediately to the context of v. 5. This connection is suggested by the fact that both verses are introduced by the word "Behold." The petitioner calls attention to special insights and perceptions in vv. 5 and 6. He has looked into
abysses that are opened only to penetrating sight. Verse 6 could denote the reliable knowledge of wisdom that forges ahead to discover the causes of things, a knowledge that Yahweh grants in the area of what is hidden and concealed. 

This interpretation indicates that the verse refers to Vicentino’s inquisitive mind in regard to his theoretical investigations and acknowledges that God has revealed “hidden and concealed” concepts to him. The “enigmatic” nature of this verse is reflective of the poetic allusions or coded play upon words found on the reverses of Renaissance medals. The counterpart of this concept in music is musica reservata, an enigmatic term referring to the technical secrets “reserved” for themselves by the composers of advanced music c. 1550 and to an exclusive, “in-the-know” audience for which the music was intended. Vicentino’s music epitomizes these stylistic innovations from which emerged the seconda prattica in the opening decades of the seventeenth century.

That the medal had been in circulation before 1567 is made evident by the fact that the manuscript of his six-voiced motet *Heu mihi domine* was added, in an unknown hand, after the final pages of the six part-books of Orlando di Lasso’s *Magnificat octo tonorum* published in Nuremberg in 1567, and the copyist, well aware of Vincentino’s reputation, inscribed the same legend that appears on the medal on the bassus part of this motet.

The commemorative medal of Vicentino has been dated c.1555 (Wilson 130), the year of the appearance of his treatise. As we have seen, the obverse of the medal displays a bust portrait of Vicentino with his identifying name. The reverse side (Fig. 2) reveals depictions of an arcioniorgano (ARCIORGANVM incised) and an arciembalo (ARCHICEMBALVM incised) around which appears the previously referenced legend: PERFECTAE MVSCICAE DIVISIONISQ (ue) INVENTOR. However, the instruments (arciciembalo and arciorgano) had not actually been constructed until 1561, and it is unlikely that any artist would have depicted similitudes of the instruments on a commemorative medal without knowing of their actual existence. In regard to the public awareness of the instruments, we do know that shortly after the construction of the instruments Vicentino began an educational campaign on behalf of his interpretation of the enharmonic genus. This campaign took him to many of the more culturally oriented cities of Italy, and these presentations required his use of the portable arciorgano (Kaufmann, “Vicentino’s Archiorgano” 41). Thus the instrument would have been familiar to those artistic circles by 1563.
The medal of Vicentino has been attributed by George F. Hill to the celebrated Italian sculptor and architect, Alessandro Vittoria (1525-1608) (Scher, Renaissance 72). Born in Trent, Vittoria came to Venice in 1543 and entered the workshop of Jacopo Sansovino. He subsequently executed works for Palladio and, after 1577, made extensive repairs on the Doge Palace. Vittoria was gradually assimilated into the artistic life of Venice, came under the influence of Michaelangelo, and “practiced a refined form of Mannerism” (Rachum 566). During the second half of the sixteenth century, portrait sculpture in Venice was dominated by the imposing and lifelike busts fashioned by Vittoria. Perhaps his finest portrait is the terracotta bust of Doge Nicolo da Ponte executed c. 1584 for Santa Maria della Carita in Venice (Martin 649). His medals, like these works, project an insightful observation of character and attention to subtle surface modeling (Wilson 130).

There is no documentation of any direct contact between Vicentino and his circle and Vittoria and his circle. It is known that by December, 1551, Vittoria was in Vicenza, where he remained until early in 1553, and it was at this time he made a series of portrait medals (Martin 647), including two of the celebrated writer Pietro Aretino, and one of his wife Caterina Sandella (Wilson 130). However, this time frame clearly would have been too early for the execution of Vicentino’s medal, for his treatise, as previously indicated, did not appear until 1555 and the instruments not built until 1561. Moreover, after the 1550s, Vittoria apparently devoted himself primarily to architectural and sculptural projects. These factors, along with the lack of any specific stylistic features being identified by specialists in this genre, make the attribution of the medal to Vittoria a questionable one.

The art historian Fritz Dworschak attributes the medal to Antonio Abondio (Scher, Renaissance 72). According to Stephen K. Scher, “the refined court style as developed in Milan finds its fullest expression in the works of Antonio Abondio” (Currency 23). In this regard he reflected the work of Leone Leoni, but he was also influenced by medals of Alessandro Vittoria. Since Vicentino spent his late years in Milan and both Leoni and Vittoria are possible candidates for the execution of the medal, it would appear that Abondio would also warrant consideration. However, Abondio’s earliest dated medal is of 1561, six years after the appearance of Vicentino’s treatise of 1555. If the medal was executed at this date, Abondio would have been only seventeen at the time—an unlikely age for such a significant commission. If the medal was executed sometime between 1560 and 1563, as this writer has suggested, he would
have been twenty-eight to thirty-one years old, but there is no evidence of any contact between him and Vicentino or his patrons, the Este family.

Abondio left Italy in 1565–66 for a position with the Holy Roman Emperor Ferdinand II in Innsbruck and Abras, was subsequently called to Vienna by Emperor Maximilian II in 1566, and ultimately appointed court medallist at Prague in December of that year (Pollard 35). He remained in this capacity under Rudolf II and apparently did not return to Italy during the remainder of his life.

From a stylistic viewpoint, there are positive and negative elements in regard to attributing the Vicentino medal to Abondio. Stephen Scher observes that his medals offer “accurate and dignified portraits and highly detailed renderings of armor and clothing” (Currency 23). These features reflect the portrait of Vicentino on the obverse of the medal; however, Scher adds that his “reverses are relatively simple and restricted to emblems or heraldic achievements” (Currency 23). This description of Abondio's work would not reflect the depictions of the arciembalo and arciorgano that appear on the reverse of the medal. This aspect of his work, coupled with the lack of evidence of any contact with Vicentino and his circle, particularly during the restricted time frame of 1555–63, does not eliminate Abondio as a possible maker of the medal but does make him an unlikely candidate.

The German scholar Georg Habich attributes the medal to Leone Leoni or his circle (Scher, Renaissance 72). It is probable that Leoni’s formative years were devoted to learning the trade of goldsmith, perhaps in Venice or Padua. It is Michael Mezzatesta’s opinion that the “classicism and idealism of this school formed the basis of his style” (200). His skill and connections obtained him a position at Ferrara, c. 1535, and through Pietro Aretino, to whom he was related, he obtained an introduction to the poet Pietro Bembo. Leoni is next found in Rome (Autumn 1537), where he remained for the next three years working as an engraver in the papal mint. Early in 1542 he moved to Milan where he was employed in the imperial mint. His career as a coiner and medallist flourished, and he created numerous impressive pieces, including one of Michaelangelo at the height of his career (1560). In 1546 Leoni was briefly employed as master general of the mint for Pier Luigi Farnese, Duke of Parma and Piacenza, and widely recognized for his medallion portraits. However, he was soon brought back to Milan by the new imperial governor, Ferrante Gonzaga.
In 1548–49, Leoni was commissioned by Charles V to execute medals of himself and his former empress. As a result of this relationship, Charles V awarded him a house near the Cathedral of Milan, ennobled him, and made him an imperial knight. Here, the artist worked on imperial commissions for the next seven years (1549–56) (Attwood 151).

In 1560, Leoni was summoned to Rome, where Pope Pius IV commissioned him to erect a monument for his brother Gian Giacomo de’ Medici in Milan’s cathedral. The project was completed in 1563 and is considered one of Leoni’s finest works. Between 1565 and 1567 Leoni reconstructed his house in Milan, and it remains one of Milan’s most distinctive architectural works. Records of payment reveal that he was still employed at the mint in 1589, only months before his death on July 22, 1590 (Mezzatesta 201).

Again, there is no evidence of direct contact between Leoni and his circle with that of Vicentino and his circle. Nevertheless, Leoni’s periods of activity in Ferrara, Piacenza, Rome, and Milan (common cities to Vicentino’s career), his extensive activity as a coiner and medallist (Attwood 151), his numerous aristocratic patrons, and his widely recognized portrait medallions are significant factors that collectively make him a strong candidate for the creator of the Vicentino medal.

A medallist who has not previously been considered as a potential maker of the Vicentino medal is Pietro Paolo Galeotti, called Romano (1520–1584). This medallist, goldsmith, and sculptor is associated with the Italian traditions represented by Alessandro Vittoria, Antonio Abondio, and Leone Leoni and his circle. Benvenuto Cellini relates in his Vita how he discovered Galeotti in Rome in 1528 and brought him to Florence, c. 1530 (Cellini 97, 98, 107). Galeotti, after a sojourn in Paris, settled in Florence, c. 1552, entered the service of the Mint, and became a Florentine citizen in 1560. He apparently was an assistant engraver at the Papal Mint in Rome, replacing Lodovico Leoni in that position (Myers 3–4).

Galeotti was a very prolific medallist, producing around eighty pieces, many bearing his signature PPR, or PETRVS PAVLVS ROM, or a derivative (Scher, Currency 164). Eight of these are dated between 1552 and 1570, and it is significant that besides Florence, his sitters came from Genoa, Turin, and Milan (Myers 4). His cast medals “present elegant and imposing portraits coupled with detailed pictorial reverses” (Scher, Currency 164). He also produced a series of struck medals, dating from the late 1560s and early 1570s, depicting Cosimo I de’ Medici and
honoring his accomplishments. Vasari praised the series describing the medals as graceful and beautiful, particularly the portraits (5: 390; 6: 251; 7: 542–43). These qualities, in addition to his recognized position at Rome, his concentration on the genre of commemorative medals, his dated medals in the time frame corresponding to that in which Vicentino’s medal was undoubtedly issued (1555–65), his “detailed pictorial reverses,” and the fact that he had sitters from Milan where Vicentino had settled (1565?), support the attribution of the medal to Galeotti rather than to the previously suggested figures. Once more, unfortunately, there are no specific facts or stylistic features that would substantiate a definite assignment of the medal to him.

In summation, the conclusions of this study are as follows:

1. The medal reflects the Renaissance format of this genre as established by Antonio Pisanello (c. 1395–1455): on the obverse, a profile portrait with the figure’s name spelled out; on the reverse, an inscription combined with a symbolic image.

2. The medal, like most Renaissance medals, was apparently held privately and only a restricted number produced; nevertheless, it reflected the function of serving as an illustrated and annotated Who’s Who of the time.

3. The medal was probably commissioned by Vicentino’s patron Cardinal Ippolito II d’Este in response to the dedication of the composer’s/theorist’s treatise to him.

4. The portrait on the medal is not directly derived from the woodcut portrait of Vicentino found in the treatise of 1555. However, the legend that appears on the woodcut reflects the practice of including on medals a poetic allusion or a coded message. This message (Psalm 50:8) was surely of Vicentino’s selection.

5. Since the reverse of the medal depicts similitudes of the two keyboard instruments that were not constructed until 1561, the medal was probably issued in the time frame of 1561–65.

6. Of the previously suggested creators of the medal (Vittoria, Abondio, Leone Leoni or his circle), Leoni is the most viable candidate.

7. Pietro Paolo Galeotti, an artist not previously considered as a possible creator of the medal, is presented as the strongest candidate.

8. Since the extant Italian medals of the Renaissance reflect a nearly unvarying format, and the work of the numerous gifted artists who contributed to his genre reflected similar stylistic features, a definite attribution of the Vicentino medal will probably not be made.
1 In the Preface Kaufmann states: "Despite the controversial position of Nicola Vicentino among sixteenth-century musicians, no full-scale inquiry into his life and works has been essayed previous to this study" (13).

2 Vicentino's theories met with considerable opposition, and it is not surprising that his critics state "the medal was his own device."

3 b. Vicenza, July 8, 1478; d. Rome, 1550. Trissino was on intimate terms with the physician/scholar Nicolo Leoncino, who had translated Klaudios Ptolemy's treatise *Harmonics* into Latin as an act of *hommage* to Pope Leo X (Mantese 27).


5 The association is confirmed in the preface to the same work.

6 This assumption is supported by documentary evidence of a later date (Kaufmann, "Vicentino" 699).

7 Both Duke Ercole and Cardinal Ippolito (1509-72) were active patrons of literature and the arts. It was Cardinal Ippolito who built the magnificent Villa d'Este at Tivoli and suggested to Cellini the project of executing his famous salt cellar (Hope 297).

8 Vicentino had moved to Rome with his patron (Kaufmann, "Vicentino" 699).

9 b. Olivenca, ?; d.? In his own country he was known as Vicente de Olivenca; but in Rome, where he appeared c. 1550 as a papal singer, has was called Lusitano (the Portuguese) (Trend 432). The debate and presentation of the arguments of both figures is thoroughly presented in Hawkins 1: 392-95. Giuseppe Baini describes the affair in a footnote that extends for six pages (2: 342-47). However, his authority should not be accepted without question.

10 Instead of considering the diatonic, chromatic, or enharmonic tetrachord as a unit, Vicentino maintained that the use of any one of its component members was sufficient to identify the gender. Thus, chromatic could be represented either by the complete series, minor 3rd-semitone-semitone, or by the minor 3rd alone, or by a semitone alone. Similarly, the use of the major 3rd could be interpreted as evidence for the existence of the enharmonic gender.

11 This is related in Chapter 43 of the fourth book of Vicentino's treatise. It was ultimately decided to elect a third judge, Giulio da Rozzi, should the two selected ones disagree (Kaufmann, *Life* 24).

12 Escobedo (Scobedo): b. Zamora, c. 1515; d. Segovia, 1563. He was admitted to the papal choir in 1536. In 1554 he left Rome and became *maestro de capilla* at Segovia (Trend 969).

13 Danckerts (Dankers, Dankerts): b. Tholen, Zeeland, ?; d.? He supposedly joined the Papal Chapel c. 1535 but was not officially enrolled there until 21 March 1538. Danckerts was obliged to defend his verdict against Vicentino in a scholarly and extended treatise, the original manuscript of which is preserved in the Vatican library in Rome (Sterndale Bennet 589-90).

14 Vicentino lost his wager of two gold crowns and much of his reputation on this debate (Hawkins 1: 394). Although he has been accused of not understanding the true nature of the Greek genera system, his chromaticism heralded the freedom of music from the diatonic restrictions of the modal system (Reese 329).
15 The entire title reads: *L'antica musica ridotta alla moderna prattica, con la
dichiaratione, et con gli essempi de i tre generi, con le loro speti, et con l'inventione di uno
nuovo strumento, nelquale si contiene tutta la perfetta musica, con molti segreti musicali
(Ancient music reduced to modern practice, with the explanation and illustration of the
three genera and their species, and with the discovery of a new instrument which contains
the whole perfect music, together with many musical secrets).

16 Vicentino's treatise is essentially divided into two principal parts: the first
consists of a single book "della theorica musicale"; the second consists of five books
"della prattica musicale." This two-fold division of theory and practice dates back to
Greco-Roman antiquity, is reflected in the medieval distinction between *musica
speculativa* and *musica activa*, and was especially favored by Renaissance theorists.

17 The text of the ode, in Lowinsky's translation, is as follows: "Ancient music
has upheld her head, through long obscurity, Only that she, with the sweetness of
the old intervals, May send high up to the heavens the fame of your heroic deeds, O
Hyppolitis!" (133).

18 Discussed in the fifth book of *L'antica musica*. It is noteworthy that the
celebrated Italian theorist Gioseffe Zarlino (b. 1517; d. 1590) informs us that he too
had an instrument (gravecembalo), made for him by the Venetian instrument-maker
Maestro Dominico Pesarese, that allowed the performance of all three Greek genera
but only for purposes of demonstration (1st. harm. 2: 47).

19 Described in a publication dated 25 October 1561 (Kaufmann, "Vicentino"
600). His enharmonic system divides the whole tone into five parts, and it is
noteworthy that Rome and Milan each possessed an *archiorgano* (Reese 530).

20 Bottrigari places it among the instruments "not used," since it was seldom
played due to the difficulty of mastering it, tuning it, and maintaining it in tune.
However, he later states that Luzzasco Luzzaschi (1545-1607), the famous Italian
organist and composer, played it with skill and that he composed special works for
it.

21 In a letter to Duke Wilhelm V of Bavaria, Vicentino identified himself as
"reector" of St. Thomas, Milan, and requested a better position. The Bavarian archives
later record payments to Vicentino, but it is not clear whether for personal
appearances or for compositions sent to the court (Palisca 1584).

22 Unfortunately, only the quintus partbook is extant.

23 Ponzio was an active publisher in Milan from 1570–88.

24 Pearson (766) considers this a "rather questionable reference" by Bottrigari.
Thus he indicates Rome as the place of Vicentino's death.

25 Unfortunately, the fate of Volumes 2–4 is unknown.

26 The Catholic churches (Greek and Roman), respectively using the Septuagint
and the Vulgate, designate the psalms with numbers that differ at times from those
of the Hebrew tradition (respected by Jews and Protestants).

27 The source of the text is the Responsory for Second Nocturn, Matins of the
Dead. Translation: "Woe is me, O Lord, for I have sinned grievously all the days of
my life!"

28 Now in the University Library, Wroclaw, Poland. Kuhn gives a detailed
description of the partbooks and the handwritten additions thereto (26).

29 For an intense examination of the life and works of Vittoria see Serra.

30 Both lead. Munich, Staatsbibliothek, and Munich, Bayerische Staatsbibliothek.
It is noteworthy that the legend on the reverse of the medal is from Psalm 51.13 (50.15 in the Vulgate) as this is the same Psalm from which the legend on the Vicentino woodcut is derived. Moreover, the medal was modelled at Rome, one of which was sent to Michelangelo with a letter dated 14 March 1561. This places Leoni in Rome where Vicentino was active, and the date of the medal reflects the time frame suggested by this writer for the appearance of the Vicentino medal.

He was known as Romano after his birthplace in the Eternal City.

WORKS CITED

Vittoria, Alessandro. Doge Nicolo da Ponte. Bust, terracotta, 1.00 X 0.78 m, c. 1584. Venice, Seminario Patriciale.
LIST OF ILLUSTRATIONS

Fig. 1. Commemorative Medal. Obverse: Don Nicola Vicentino (1511–76). Reverse: Arcicembalo and Arciorgano. Samuel H. Kress Collection, National Gallery of Art, Washington. (Photo by permission of the National Gallery of Art, Washington)

Fig. 2. Commemorative Medal, reverse: Arcicembalo and Archiorgano. Samuel H. Kress Collection, National Gallery of Art, Washington. (Photo by permission of the National Gallery of Art, Washington)

Fig. 3. Woodcut of Nicola Vicentino, from his treatise L'antica musica, Rome, 1555. (Photo by permission of The British Library, London)