FOREWORD

Volume III of CMM 8 continues the series of Florentine composers initiated in Volume I with Bartolo[1], Giovanni and Gherardello, and brings as its main new contribution the works of two slightly younger madrigalists. The sequence of volumes adopted for reasons indicated in the Foreword to Volume II proves to be not altogether devoid of advantages. The composers of the works included in the present volume probably knew some of the pieces by northern masters published in Volume II, particularly such pieces as represent the most successful experiments in the field of the *caccia*. Both Volumes I and II, therefore, as well as the works of Jacopo da Bologna, already available in modern editions, set the necessary background to this younger Florentine phase.

THE COMPOSERS

To speak of a younger phase, and of younger madrigalists, is, of course, to make an assumption mainly based on stylistic grounds, since dates and data are, as usual, almost completely missing. What is available would seem to indicate that the spans of life of the two composers here involved largely overlapped those of Giovanni and Gherardello. It is mainly their artistic conceptions that may be said to be either more recent, or more recently brought up to date. Definite conclusions are seldom possible as to the absolute date or the relative chronology of individual works.

Lorenzo "Masii" or "Masini" (either form meaning son of a Tommaso) is mentioned by Filippo Villani[2] as one of Landini's famous predecessors. The autograph manuscript of Sacchetti's poems (Florence, Bibl. Laurenziana, Ashb. 574) gives his name as the composer of one madrigal (no. X in the present volume) and two *ballate* (music lost), written, it would seem, by the poet not later than 1355, and set to music soon after they had been written (actually, one of the *ballate* is said by Sacchetti to be the first of his poems ever set to music). The next mention of Lorenzo is found in a later poem, again by Sacchetti (*Libro delle Rime*, no. CCXLV, to be dated ca. 1385), a poem of longing for past days and people; Lorenzo and Gherardello are there named among the dead. Lorenzo is said to be a priest in the manuscript London, British Museum, add. 29987 (Lo). The same source gives us also a hint that the title Magister (given in Italy, down to our own days, indiscriminately to most musicians) was justified in Lorenzo's case by his actual teaching either at the cathedral in Florence or in some other church school. The evidence for this consists of a monophonic piece of didactic nature in a somewhat plain-chant-like notation, seemingly a guide to solmization and *musica ficta* rules, called in the Ms. "L' Antefana di Ser Lo(re)renço" (facsimile on p. XV)[3]. There should be no hesitation in identifying its author with the madrigalist Lorenzo (who is consistently called Ser Lorenzo throughout the Ms.) since the latter's works show a concern for problems of tonality – including the use of "partial" or "conflicting" key signatures – which is rather

[1] The attribution of the Credo no. I of Vol. I to Bartolo da Firenze has been questioned by G. Reaney, "The Manuscript Paris, Bibliothèque Nationale, f. ital. 568" in *Musica Disciplina* XIV (1960), 40. Bartolo seems to Reaney too "shadowy" a figure to be author of one of the Mass settings included in that Ms. Were it necessarily true that the authors of those Mass settings should "belong among the Trecento musical celebrities", the question still would remain of how to judge about celebrity. Villani (see next note) mentions neither Gherardello nor Donato among the "memorable" Florentines in the field of music before Landini; but he does list Bartolo, along with Giovanni and Lorenzo, and gives a detailed report on his Credo, making clear that that piece (if not no. I of Vol. I) made history in fourteenth-century Florence. The editor's attribution may be questionable for other reasons, but under no circumstances can the composition be reassigned to Bartolino da Padova.

[2] *Liber de civitatis Florentiae famosis civibus*, Florence 1847. See, for better versions, E. Li Gotti, "Il più antico polifonista italiano del sec. XIV" in *Italica*, XXIV (1947).

[3] Here follows my reading of the text (brackets suggest missing letters to be added, parentheses redundant spellings to be ignored) which was probably to be memorized by would-be singers: "[D]iligenter aduertant c(h)anthor(r)es Ori(s) soni ne inanis presumptio(n) i(n)gn(i)oranter absorbeat mentem (Ms.: ntenter), cor et pectora. Sed me cantent ter et quater c(h)um timore tritoni; et si modum non exceda[n]t regule quae late(a)t, plane c(h)antus c[o]etui iungantur (Ms.: iunchantur) per secula. Am(m)en." I. e., in English: "Let the singers be most careful lest the empty boast of [their] mouth should through ignorance involve [their] mind, heart and breasts. Rather should they sing me three and four times, fearful of tritone; and, if they will not infringe the prescriptions of the rule [here] underlying, soon will they be accepted in the sodality of [true] singing, forever. Amen." Either through mistakes on the part of the scribe, or through our lack of insight, we have so far not gained access to the blessed truth of the rule; but it is worth further trying. Otherwise, how could we avoid, for instance, the "fearful" triple tritone of the *Amen?*

I

uncommon among his Italian contemporaries[4]. That Lorenzo's was a speculative mind will soon be confirmed by the discussion of the rhythmic and formal problems raised by his works. Literary refinement is indicated in his selection of texts by, among others, Giovanni Boccaccio, Niccolò Soldanieri and Franco Sacchetti. Because he did not set to music any other poems by Sacchetti after those dated around 1355, and because we have under his name several one-voice, but no polyphonic *ballate*, the editor has suggested[5] *ca.* 1370 as the terminal date of his activity; but it might well be that he despised the new fashion of the polyphonic *ballata*. Indeed, he combined an eagerness for experimentation in new ways in rhythm and form with a surprising harmonic conservatism, overstressing perfect consonances and parallel motion of the voices. This attitude, possibly the result of some stylistic inhibition, eventually was reflected in the different harmonic attitude toward madrigals and *ballate* assumed by later polyphonists such as Landini and Paolo Tenorista.

Even less is known of Donato[6], who has in common with Lorenzo a love for great melodic expansion. Together they represent the peak of virtuoso singing in the Italian madrigal, and therefore in the Italian Ars nova as a whole. Donato, however, is by far the more spontaneous composer, largely guided by his musical instinct. He, too, was a priest, and, according to the miniature heading his works in the Squarcialupi Codex and to the title Dominus (or Don) he is usually given, also a Benedictine monk. Divergencies in the form of his name ("de Florentia" and "da Cascia")[7] are as easily explained as in the case of Giovanni, since there is such a place called Cascia in the immediate vicinity of Florence. Two madrigal poems by Sacchetti, set to music by Donato (but the music is now lost), are later than the poems for which Lorenzo composed the music, although they still belong to the 'fifties. Soldanieri, too, was one of Donato's poets. The latter poetic selection includes humorous descriptions (nos. XXII, XXIII, XXXI, and, to some extent, XVIII), obscure political allusions (nos. XXVI and XXIX, the latter possibly referring to the visit of Emperor Carl IV to Italy in 1355), and two poems belonging to the literary genre of the *disperata*, one of them rather conventional in kind (no. XXIV, analogous, among others, to Lorenzo's *Povero zappator*), the other (no. XIX) determined by some precise event not necessarily autobiographic. Other reasons for placing Donato, along with Lorenzo, in a younger phase are (besides the melismatic floridity of their vocal style) the independence of text declamation in the different voices (also characteristic of Lorenzo), and the attitude toward the genres of the *caccia* and the *ballata*. The former Donato approached, as far as we know, only once for a moralistic text (no. XXXII), thus showing that his activity as a composer probably belongs to a later period than that of the short-lived fashion of the descriptive *caccia*. To the polyphonic *ballata*, which must have started around 1365, Donato made at least one contribution (no. XXXIII);[8] that he also set to music one piece in the analogous form of the *virelai* (no. XXXIV) is confirmation that the impulse for the polyphonic setting of the *ballata* must have come from the example of French polyphony.[9] The polyphonic *ballata* had always a more compact form than the madrigal, even more so at its beginnings; there is evidence that the polyphonists were undecided as to how to adjust the objective, figurative grand manner of the madrigal to a lyrical genre. They often resorted to a compromise, setting to music either dialogic *ballate* (for which precedent could be found in the *caccia* style) or comic ones; often enough they gave their settings the fast binary rhythm of a special type of danced *ballata*, the *trotto*.[10] These traits might explain the stylistic peculiarities of Donato's single *ballata*. As for Lorenzo, the suggested date for the end of Donato's activity is ca. 1370.

Rosso da Collegrano is indeed a shadowy figure, known only from the madrigal no. XXXV. Nor has the editor been able to trace Collegrano as a place either in Tuscany or elsewhere. The poetic frame is distorted in the *ritornello* of the madrigal by an expansive need for the inclusion of a large number of feminine names to whom homage is paid. Source, style, and names suggest a Tuscan rather than a northern composer; use of the *octonaria* and *duodenaria* measures keeps the work chronologically near Lorenzo's and Donato's time.

As in Volume II, a certain number of anonymous pieces that seem to have some relationship to the main contents of Volume III have been added. Suggestion for the inclusion of the incomplete *Et in terra* (no. XXXVI)

---

[4] The same concern in later composers might be a reflection of Lorenzo's attitude.

[5] In *Die Musik in Geschichte und Gegenwart*, Kassel, VIII, 331—332.

[6] Eager as we are for documentary evidence, we cannot include that indicated by S. Clercx, *Johannes Ciconia*, Bruxelles 1960, I, 24, n. 4. The documents of 1344 there mentioned both clearly refer not to our composer but to a Dominicus Donati, or de Donatis, of Florence.

[7] See *Die Musik in Geschichte und Gegenwart*, III, 660–61.

[8] It seems hard to dismiss the attribution given by the Squarcialupi Codex, as suggested by K. von Fischer, *Studien zur Italienischen Musik des Trecento und früher Quattrocento*, Bern 1956, 69, n. 342.

[9] The attribution comes from the fragment Rome, Bibl. Vaticana, Urbinate lat. 1419 (RU₁) and is made plausible by the presence of the same piece, without composer's name, in Lo. It still remains to be explained how the *virelai* happened to be included in the exotic manuscript Prag, Universitätsbibliothek XI E 9 (Pr).

[10] See N. Pirrotta, "Ballate e soni secondo un grammatico del Trecento", to be published in *Studi in memoria di Ettore Li Gotti*.

and the *Sanctus* (no. XXXVII) came from an unpublished dissertation by B. J. Layton.[11]   The attribution of the former piece to Lorenzo, proposed by Layton, has a good amount of probability; the *Sanctus* seems also in a Florentine style.   It must be pointed out that the two pieces are found in the fragment Rome, Vatican Library, Urb. lat. 1419 (RU₁), which also contains Lorenzo's authentic *Sanctus* (no. I) and Gherardello's *Et in terra* (Vol. I, no. XXI); from the same source, strongly ressembling Lo in its visual aspects, come Donato's *virelai* already mentioned, and the short anonymous madrigal no. XXXVIII, which has some donatesque flavor.   The remaining six pieces (nos. XXXIX–XLIV), all two-voice *ballate,* are further illustrations of the earliest phase in the history of the polyphonic *ballata.*   They all come from the manuscript Lo.   One of them, however, is found in three other sources as well, including a northern one; this is *Io sono un pellegrin* (no. XLII), once attributed to Giovanni on the basis of mistaken evidence,[12] but evidently too late for what we know of the period of his activity.   The fact remains, however, that after Giovanni no works by Florentine composers were known in Northern Italy with the exception of a few by Landini, who seems to have traveled there sometime before 1368;[13] *Io sono un pellegrin* might well be an early *ballata* by Landini, discarded by the compilers of the Squarcialupi Codex because of its autobiographical implications, not fitting the gravity of the later Landini.

THE TRANSCRIPTIONS

The principles followed in the transcription of the music in the present volume have been indicated in the Foreword to Volume I.   Still, it may be useful to recall how the characteristic types of division in the old Italian notation are rendered: basically reducing the *semibreves* of the original notation into modern quarter or dotted quarter notes, making a distinction, however, between slower *duodenaria* and *octonaria* (= $\frac{3}{4}$ and $\frac{2}{4}$). and faster *senaria perfecta* and *quaternaria* (= $\frac{3}{4}$ and $\frac{2}{4}$).   A greater reduction in values is applied only when the editor has felt that the composer's notation in *duodenaria* or *octonaria* was manipulated at some later time, producing versions in which the original *semibreves* are made into *quaternaria* measures; in such cases every *brevis* of the resulting *quaternaria* is rendered as $\frac{1}{4}$, so that regrouping of such measures ($3 \times \frac{1}{4}$ or $2 \times \frac{1}{4}$) restores the original rhythm.   Grouping of measures is also used to bring into evidence a larger sense of rhythm, which has no expression in the notation of the fourteenth century, but is quite often felt in the music.

Although the system applies to the transcription of all the works to be included in *CMM* 8, it has been designed with the problems raised by the older phase of the Italian Ars nova particularly in mind.   The editor knew, however, that the very notion of newer, rhythmically refashioned versions of older works implied the existence of a critical point, or phase, of transition from older to newer systems of mensural notation; he also knew where the break was due to become most evident – in the works of Landini and Niccolò del Preposito.[14] The music in the present volume, however, appears to contain the first announcements of the transition, namely in the works by Lorenzo.

Different versions of the same piece generally occur in different sources; but the collection of Lorenzo's works in the Squarcialupi Codex intentionally opens, one would say, with two different versions of *Ita se n' era a star* (no. VI).   The madrigal is conceived in a basic frame of *duodenaria* (with occasional passages of *novenaria*) in its first section, of *octonaria* in the *ritornello;* but either version in the manuscript displays an attempt to refashion it, though in opposite directions.   Wolf[15] has transcribed the second version, which follows the path above described of making the *semibreves* into *breves* of *quaternaria,* leaving unchanged, as usual, the *novenaria* (except for some short passages in which *semibreves* in perfect prolation are turned into *breves* of the unusual *ternaria divisio).*   The first version has been taken as basis of the transcription in the present volume (adding a few excerpts of the other, where they slightly diverge); it replaces the *duodenaria* and *octonaria,* respectively, by *senaria perfecta* and *quaternaria,* making the minims into semiminims, and adopting a series of quite unusual figures to indicate change of prolation or further fractioning of the values.   The second solution must have been found to be impractical, though a few other instances of it exist in the sources; thus, the first prevailed, better fitting the slowing down of tempo and the increased virtuosity of Lorenzo's works, which was one of the

[11] *Italian Music for the Ordinary of the Mass 1300–1450* (Harvard University, 1960) 364–366.

[12] K. von Fischer, *op. cit.* 56, n. 266, discusses the attribution, but does not agree with the editor's new attribution to Landini.

[13] *Die Musik in Geschichte und Gegenwart,* VIII, 165.

[14] L. Schrade seems to have missed this point in his edition of *The Works of F. Landini,* Monaco, 1956, starting as he does *mediis in rebus.*

[15] *Der Squarcialupi-Codex,* Lippstadt 1955, 77 f. Wolf had already given a facsimile of the two versions and transcription of the second one in *Geschichte der Mensural-Notation,* Leipzig 1904, II, nos. XII. a and b, III, no. 49. A discussion of the first version is also included there, vol. I, 316–320.

reasons for changing in the first place.   If Lorenzo, as seems likely, was the first to envisage the problem and its possible solutions, his propensity for some of the French ways in polyphonic music might have been a factor in the decision; the practice that finally prevailed corresponds, in fact (in so far as the *quaternaria* measures regularly combine in groups of two or three), to the fourteenth-century concept of *modus*.   The idea of a fullfledged *modus* seems to be present, indeed, in Lorenzo's *caccia* (no. XII), which also derives from contemporary French *chaces* the unusual feature of a third voice participating in the canon.[16] Lorenzo is no slavish imitator, however. The opening melisma is quite Italian in style; Italian also is the formal structure with strophic repetition of the first section and final contrasting *ritornello;* quite personal, then, is the kind of impressionistic effect obtained through the use of the canon – not a pictorial effect of "aerial perspective" (as attempted in Piero's *cacce),* but a geometrically calculated crescendo and diminuendo of rhythmic intensity, arrived at through multiple repetitions in each voice, first narrowing, then widening the distance between imitative entries.   After the turmoil of the *stanze,* a poetic contrast and an overwhelming sense of returned peace is created in the one-voice *ritornello* by the broad lyrical melody of its beginning and end, in spite of the echoing sounds of the central part.   K. von Fischer[17] has proposed a canonic interpretation also for the *ritornello*.   The following intabulation may help to show the eventual results of a two-voice or three voice canon:

The editor thinks that, if Lorenzo conceived the idea of a canonic *ritornello,* he must have abandoned it in favor of a monophonic version; he was, after all, an extremely gifted melodist, besides being a polyphonist with inclinations toward intellectualistic experiments.   This is largely proved by his five extant one-voice *ballate,* which suggest another reason for Lorenzo's important role in the establishment of the new rhythmic thinking and notational procedures discussed above.   The expressive type of *ballata* was traditionally set either in *senaria perfecta* or, more often, *duodenaria;* but rhythmic flexibility introduced in the performance of *ballate* by solo singers may have induced Lorenzo to replace notation in *duodenaria* by one using faster *quaternaria* measures, as an easier means to achieve the alternation of (slow) binary and (slow) ternary rhythm (see nos. XIII–XV).   The new system of notation abolishes *duodenaria* and *octonaria* (thus allowing the suppression of *punctus divisionis*) and retains in use only Vitry's *quatre prolations,* in which the minims have a common constant value, plus a faster type of *quaternaria* that relates to the perfect *semibrevis* in terms of *proportio sesquitertia* (four minims instead of three);[18] it therefore probably marks the beginnings of proportional thinking among Italian composers.   An example of the two different types of *quaternaria* can be found in another of Lorenzo's most ambitious works, his three-voice madrigal *Dolgom' a voi* (no. V), where application of the same tempo to the first section and to the *ritornello* would prove either too fast for the first or too slow for the second.   Lorenzo might, however, have been at first in doubt as to which one was the better of the two solutions he had envisaged; two madrigals possibly showing rather early stylistic features, *Sovra la riva* (no. X, composed ca. 1355) and *Vidi nell' ombra* (no. XI), have practically the same rhythm but different notation for it (respectively, in *quaternaria* and *octonaria,* the semiminims of the first corresponding to the minims of the

---

[16] An edition of the few known *chaces* would be most desirable.

[17] *Op. cit.,* 35, n. 146. I realize too late that von Fischer suggests a canon starting not after eight, but after twelve *longae,* quite an unusual distance for imitative entries. The result, however, presents more or less the same kind of harmonic shortcomings as in the eight-measure solution.

[18] Later practice came to distinguish this type of *quaternaria* with the mensural signo.

second). In *Sovra la riva* (meas. 24 and 44) one also finds examples of deliberate playing against the bar line (or whatever corresponded to it in the medieval mind); others can be found in the madrigals nos. III, V, and VIII.[19] To conclude with the stylistic peculiarities of Lorenzo's music, mention must be made at least of the isorhythmic tenor of *Povero zappator* (no. IX),[20] of the repetitions of a „key motive" leading each time to a different continuation in *Ita se n' era* (no. VI, meas. 53, 62, and 69), and of the repetitions of similar melodic lines, though at different pitch levels, at the end of every line of text in the first section of *Dolgom' a voi* (no. V).

The rather extensive but by no means exhaustive discussion of the rhythm of Lorenzo's works has been here necessary not only to illustrate the transition from the earlier to the later system of notation, but also because Lorenzo's attitude toward rhythm is largely shared by all the Florentine composers and by some of their Northern Italian colleagues. They not only had a feeling for what in the present edition has been defined as "larger rhythm", but eventually played with it.[21] Even more often they played with the internal organization of the established measures. Introduction of $\frac{6}{8}$ grouping into $\frac{3}{4}$ measures, or viceversa (speaking in modern terms), is quite frequent with them; eventually, *duodenaria* ($= \frac{3}{4}°$) may be transformed for a short while even into a $\frac{12}{16}$ (see Donato's madrigal no. XXIV). These rhythmic inversions are introduced in melismatic passages and also to bring variety to the declamation of the texts (in the latter case the sources are usually extremely accurate in their placement of the syllables under the right notes). In performance they should be rendered in the smoothest possible way, avoiding stiff syncopation.

Characteristic rhythmic inversions are not missing in the music by Donato. Actually they can be found in almost every one of his madrigals, though they regularly occur within single measures, never at the level of larger rhythm. Some of Lorenzo's notational problems can be found reflected in Donato's works. Thus, the same kind of rhythm (*octonaria* for the first section, *duodenaria* for the *ritornello*) is found in two different works: in the original notation in *Sovran uccello* (no. XXIX), but refashioned in diminished notation in *I' fu' già usignolo* (no. XXIII). More surprisingly, an identical rhythmic flow is rendered in *I' fu' già bianc' uccel* (no. XXII) with a normal *quaternaria*; this probably happens because the following *ritornello* is in a faster ternary rhythm (correctly notated in *senaria perfecta*) than the ritornello in *duodenaria* of no. XXIX. In general, however, Donato has a marked preference for the smooth rhythmic flow of the *senaria imperfecta*, usually combining the measures in groups of two; the result in the transcription is a broad $\frac{12}{8}$ (nos. XXI, XXIV, XXV, XXVI, XXVIII). Speaking of him as a natural composer does not mean that he is a less refined composer than Lorenzo. Actually his music gives a sense of clarity and perfection, even though it involves dissonances and other harmonic procedures handled with uncommon skill. With regard to formal features, the *caccia* setting of *Faccia chi de'* (no. XXXII) is unusual in so far as the three voices are all texted, although only the two upper voices are in canon; the same applies to the *ritornello*. It must be recalled that the text is not a descriptive one, but a regular madrigal. Finally, Donato's polyphonic *ballata* (no. XXXIII) does not have the customary repetition of the music of the first section (*ripresa*) for the last part of the strophe (*volta*). A good reason for having set the *volta* to new music may have been that the first line of the dialogic poem breaks in three repartees, duly stressed in the music, while the corresponding line of the *volta* is all given to a single character.

A dialogue of a different kind marks, among the nine anonymous pieces, the setting of the *Et in terra* (no. XXXVI); this is the alternation in short monodic phrases of the voices on *Laudamus te. Benedicimus te. Adoramus te. Glorificamus tibi.* Also soloistic are three measures of the upper voice, significantly, at *Tu solus Dominus*, and the beginning of a *caccia*-like imitation proposed by the lower voice at *Cum sancto Spiritu*. Here upper and lower voice are meant in a purely graphic sense, the two voices, like those of Lorenzo's *Sanctus*, being more or less equal in range. Among the six *ballate* concluding the volume, *Io sono un pellegrin* (no. XLII) resembles Donato's *Senti tu, donna* in rhythm but not in poetic meaning, being a kind of a juggler's self-description. Conversely, *Donna, tu pur invecchi* (no. XLI), which is, like Donato's *ballata*, a dialogue

[19] This is quite evident in no. III (meas. 15–18, where it occurs in a passage of *novenaria* rhythm) and VIII (meas. 22–23), while in the two other examples it occurs in "restored" rhythms. In the *ritornello* of no. XI the editor feels that meas. 59 should be extended to include the first half of meas. 60; continuation in displaced binary rhythm from this point to the end would have the double advantage of placing the "down beats" on the best consonances, and of reestablishing at the end the feminine cadence that has already characterized every previous line. Such rebarring, however, would contradict the notated *octonaria*.

[20] In the first section the rhythmic *color* of the tenor is repeated for each one of the three lines of text; each *color*, however, also has an internal isorhythm, every third measure (of the transcription) repeating in diminution the melody and rhythm of the preceding two measures, a complex structure indicating that, for once at least, the tenor must have been composed before the upper voice. The second statement of the text in the *ritornello* is also a diminution of the first one, this time in both voices.

[21] This will become more evident with some of the later Florentines. Later composers from Northern Italy were more concerned with variety of rhythm on a small scale, and less perceptive of larger rhythmic and formal effects. They were also painfully unaware, at times, of the rhythmic requirements of their texts.

between lovers (though not a love dialogue), is in a different rhythm, a fast *senaria perfecta* measure, also shared by *Bench' i' serva con fè* (no. XL); in this latter the lover's complaint is made more ironical than pathetic by the accented final syllables of all its lines of text.[22] *Non posso far bucato* (no. XLIII), also belonging to the type of comic complaints, deliberately follows a French model, or perhaps the composer's idea of a French model, adopting *senaria imperfecta* rhythm, untexted tenor, and double endings for the two *piedi (verto* and *chiuso)*. *Bench' amar crudel donna* (no. XXXIX) and *Non senti', donna* (no. XLIV), being typical expressive love *ballate,* are likely to be younger than the rest; the first of them, however, is still in *duodenaria* and in a very simple melodic style; the second, notated in ternary *modus* of diminished *quaternaria*, has some pretension in the initial syncopation (whereas it would be possible to replace the two first measures by three binary ones), but is quite madrigalesque in the rhythmic imitation created by the non-simultaneous declamation of the second line of text.

THE TEXTS

As for the music (see, vol. I, p. III), a single source has usually been selected as the basis of the edition of each text, and is indicated at the beginning of every poem.   Lack of such an indication for some of the texts by Boccaccio, Sacchetti and Soldanieri means that the editor has accepted versions given in previous literary editions of the poems of these authors.   Even with them, however, it has often been felt that it was desirable to give the texts as they were set by the composers, or at least as they appear in the musical sources.   This is also the reason for having preserved such features of the texts as, for instance, the doubling of the initial consonants in a number of words.

As in the previous volumes, every case in which the setting of the texts does not follow the most usual practice for each poetic form or genre has been clarified through notes in the section of the introduction where the poetic texts are given.

[22] The second strophe, containing the lady's answer is in such poor shape in the Ms. that it is impossible to be sure about its metrical features.

LIST OF COMPOSITIONS

LAURENTIUS MASII DE FLORENTIA

1. Sanctus *(RU₁, P)*
2. Come in sul fonte fu preso Narciso *(FL), madrigale*
3. Dà, dà, a chi avaregia pur per sè *(FL), madrigale*
4. Di riv' a riva mi guidav' Amore *(FP, FL), madrigale*
5. Dolgom' a voi, maestri del mie canto *(FL), madrigale, 3 v.*
6. Ita se n' era a star nel paradiso *(Lo, FL), madrigale*
7. I' credo ch' i' dormiva, o a me parve *(Lo, FL), madrigale*
8. Nel chiaro fiume dilettoso e bello *(FP, P, FL), madrigale*
9. Povero zappator, in chiusa valle *(Lo, FL), madrigale*
10. Sovra la riva d' un corrente fiume *(FP, P, FL), madrigale*
11. Vidi nell' ombra d' una bella luce *(FP, Lo, P, FL), madrigale*
12. A poste messe, veltri e gran mastini *(FP, FL), caccia, 3 v.*
13. Donne, e' fu credenza d' una donna *(FL), ballata, 1 v.*
14. Non perch' i' speri, donna, oma' in te *(FL), ballata, 1 v.*
15. Non so qual' i' mi voglia *(FL), ballata, 1 v.*
16. Non vedi tu, Amor, che me, tuo servo *(FL), ballata, 1 v.*
17. Sento d' Amor la fiamma e 'l gran podere *(FL), ballata, 1 v.*

DONATUS DE FLORENTIA

18. Come da lupo pecorella presa *(FL), madrigale*
19. Come 'l potestu far, dolce signore *(FP), madrigale*

20. Dal cielo scese per iscala d' oro *(FL)*, *madrigale*
21. D' or pomo incominciò nell' aer fino *(FL)*, *madrigale*
22. I' fu' già bianc' uccel con piuma d' oro *(Lo. FL)*, *madrigale*
23. I' fu' già usignol in tempo verde *(P, FL)*, *madrigale*
24. I' ho perduto l' alber e 'l timone *(FL)*, *madrigale*
25. L'aspido sordo e 'l tirello scorzone *(Lo, FL)*, *madrigale*
26. Lucida pecorella son, campata *(FP, P, FL)*, *madrigale*
27. Seguendo 'l canto d' un uccel selvaggio *(FP, P, FL)*, *madrigale*
28. S' i', monacordo, gentile stormento *(FL)*, *madrigale*
29. Sovran uccello se' fra tutti gli altri *(FP, FL)*, *madrigale*
30. Un bel girfalco scese alle mie grida *(P, FL)*, *madrigale*
31. Un cane, un' oca e una vecchia pazza *(FP, FL)*, *madrigale*
32. Faccia chi de', se 'l po', chè passa l' ora *(P, FL)*, *caccia, 3 v.*
33. Senti tu d' amor, donna? No. Perchè? *(FL)*, *ballata*
34. Je port amiablement *(Lo, RU1, Pr)*, *virelai(?)*

ROSSO DA COLLEGRANO

35. Tremando più che foglia sanza gielo *(Lo)*, *madrigale*

NINE ANONYMOUS PIECES

36. Et in terra *(RU1)* *(fragment)*
37. Sanctus *(RU1)*
38. La bella giovinetta sospirando *(RU1)*, *madrigale*
39. Bench' amar crudel donn' amaro sia *(Lo)*, *ballata*
40. Bench' io serva con fè *(Lo)*, *ballata*
41. Donna, tu pur invecchi *(Lo)*, *ballata*
42. Io son un pellegrin che vo cercando *(FP, PR, Lo, P)*, *ballata*
43. Non posso far bucato che non piova *(Lo)*, *ballata*
44. Non senti', donna, più piacer già mai *(Lo)*, *ballata*

All compositions bearing no indication of the number of voices are for two voices.

LIST OF SOURCES

FL Firenze, Bibl. Laurenziana, Palatino 87 (Squarcialupi)

FP Firenze, Bibl. Nazionale Centrale, Panciatichiano 26

Lo London, British Museum, add. mss. 29987

P Paris, Bibl. Nationale, fonds ital. 568

PR Paris, Bibl. Nationale, nouv. acq. frç. 6771 (Reina)

Pr Prag, Universitätsbibliothek, XI E 9

RU1 Roma, Bibl. Apostolica Vaticana, Urbinate lat. 1419

TEXTS

Texts composed by Laurentius de Florentia

2. Madrigal by Giovanni Boccaccio

Come in sul fonte fu preso Narciso
Di sè da sè, così costei, specchiando
Sè, sè ha presa dolcemente amando.

E tanto vaga sè stessa vagheggia
Che, ingelosita della sua figura,
Ha di chiunque la mira paura,

Temendo sè a sè non esser tolta.
Quello ch' ella di me pensi, colui
Sel pensi che in sè conosce altrui.

FL   Se non m' inganno, me ne par di fore
Qual fu tra Febo e Danne odio ed amore.

*The music for the first line of ritornello must be
repeated for the second one.*

3. Madrigal by Niccolò Soldanieri

FL   Dà, dà, a chi avaregia pur per sè,
Se 'l tempo gli si volge a scherço d' orsa,
Chè non si trova amico fuor di borsa.

Tu, o tu che ài stato, ascolta me:
Quegli à il destro, a fare a sè amico,
Ch' à il piè nell' acqua, il becco nel panico.

(De') pensa, pensa che tardi si rincocca,
Chi scende, a risalir. Zara a cui tocca!

4. Madrigal

FP   Di riv' a riva mi guidav' Amore
Cercand' un mi' sparver. A piè d' un monte
Trova' bagnar più donn' a una fonte.

Eravi, di biltà nomata, Elèna,
Lo cu' piacer mi facea gir pensoso
E poi mi fe' di le' veder gioioso.

Poi china' gli ochi per l' onesto andare,
E temoroso mi scostai da l' acque,
Ch' era ciascuna come prima nacque.

Cantando diriva' per un bel piano
E trova' lo sparvero a man a mano.

*The music for the first line of ritornello must be
repeated for the second one.*

5. Madrigal

FL   Dolgomi a voi, maestri del mie canto,
Di que' che guastan tutte nostre note.
Ond' i' con man mi batt' ambo le gote.

. . . .
. . . .
. . . .

Se vogliono 'nparare,
A llor dite: Pian piano,
Chè ut, re, mi, fa, sol, la
Comincia dalla mano.

6. Madrigal

FL   Ita se n' er' a star nel paradiso
Cogliendo fior, Proserpina; cantava
Quando per l' amor so' Pluto cercava.

Così m' apparve, ond' io m' innamorava,
La donna che parò le mani al viso
Per far che mai da llei foss' i' diviso.

Benchè meglio di me fece Plutone
Che la rapì; ma i' stetti 'n prigione.

7. Madrigal

FL   I' credo ch' i' dormiva, o a mme parve,
Quando la dea d' amor vidi venire
Nell' atto che pietà fa duol sentire.

VIII

VI

Ita se n'era a star (Madrigale)