GIULIO DE' MEDICI'S MUSIC BOOKS*

For Nino Pirrotta

David S. Chambers’s provocative study of the cardinalate in the late fifteenth and early sixteenth centuries is rich in implications for music historians. A document of December 1509 suggests that at that time a cardinal’s household averaged 144 *familiares*, and the 1526 census revealed similar figures. Moreover, the corporate income of the College of Cardinals had been regulated since 1289 by a Bull of that year that decreed that a half of certain items of papal revenue was to be divided among cardinals resident in Rome, although the actual amounts that individual cardinals received fluctuated in response to changes in the size of the college. There were other sources of income: Roman residents were entitled to the revenue of their ‘title’ church, and those few who held office in the Roman bureaucracy commanded extraordinary salaries.¹ For cardinals with musical interests, the institutional and economic conditions necessary to sustain a musical establishment therefore existed, and despite the relative absence of information on such

---

¹ I welcome the opportunity to express my gratitude to Ms Sheryl Reiss, the author of a Princeton University doctoral dissertation on Cardinal Giulio de’ Medici as a patron of art, for generously and graciously sharing the results of her research with me and for reading a draft of this paper and suggesting a number of improvements; and to Professors Janet Cox-Rearick of Hunter College of the City University of New York and John Shearman of Harvard University and Dr Julian Kliemann of Villa I Tatti, The Harvard University Center for Italian Renaissance Studies in Florence, for answering questions about iconographic devices in Medici art. Some of the research for this paper and all of the writing of it were undertaken during the academic years 1988–9 and 1989–90, when I was first a Fulbright Scholar in Florence and then National Endowment for the Humanities and Robert Lehman Foundation Fellow at Villa I Tatti. I am grateful to the Commissione per gli Scambi Culturali fra l'Italia e gli Stati Uniti and to the Academic Advisory Committee of Villa I Tatti for affording me the opportunity to spend two such professionally profitable and personally satisfying years in Florence.

establishments, we may assume that there were singers and instrumentalists among the *familiares* of many cardinals’ households.

Among the cardinals of the time who would have been unusually well positioned to participate in Roman musical life was Giulio de’ Medici. As a member of the most famous of Florentine families, he had been witness to an extraordinary tradition of artistic patronage; and as a cardinal resident in Rome during the papacy of his first cousin, Leo x (Giovanni de’ Medici), he was witness to the patronage practices of one of the greatest patrons of music in European history.

Giulio was the illegitimate son of Giuliano, the younger brother of Lorenzo ‘il Magnifico’, and a woman named Fioretta. He was born on 26 May 1478 only weeks after his father had been assassinated in the Cathedral of Florence at the time of the so-called Pazzi Conspiracy; his uncle Lorenzo, who himself narrowly escaped

---

death at the hands of the Pazzi and their co-conspirators, undertook responsibility for his nephew. When Lorenzo’s sons were exiled from Florence in 1494 Giulio accompanied them into exile, and when they were restored in 1512 Giulio returned with them. From the very first days of the restoration Giulio played a central role in the city’s governance, in great part because of his relationship to his cousin Cardinal Giovanni, Lorenzo il Magnifico’s eldest surviving son and at that time the family’s senior member. Within weeks of Giovanni’s election to the papacy, he appointed Giulio Archbishop of Florence (9 May 1513); later that year (20 and 29 September) he legitimised him and named him cardinal. Other important appointments followed: on 1 September 1514 Giulio was made Legate to Bologna, and on 9 March 1517 he became Papal Vice-Chancellor and as such held the most important position in the Roman bureaucracy. It was also one of the most lucrative: Giulio’s accounts for 1521–2 contain the entry: ‘Cancelleria di Roma facendo el solito d[ucati] 6000’. Giulio had a room in the papal palace and thus enjoyed the special access to the pope of a Palatine Cardinal. After the death of his cousin Lorenzo II, Duke of Urbino, who had been the family’s principal representative in Florence in the years after 1513, Giulio assumed Lorenzo’s role, and, presumably in order to enhance his authority further still, Leo named him Legate to Tuscany, a position he himself had earlier held. After having installed Cardinal Silvio Passerini of Cortona as his agent in Florence, Giulio returned to Rome in October 1519, but his presence in Florence was demanded repeatedly because of the regime’s instability; he was there within a month of his departure in 1519, again in February 1520 and, later that year, from the end of July until the beginning of September; he left for Florence again in January 1521, returned to Rome at the end of April that year, and was again in Florence from late 1522 until the end of March 1523. Within a few months of his Roman entrata of April 1523, which John Shearman has rightly characterised as politically important, he was elected pope.

3 Chambers, p. 299 n. 52. On Chambers’ source, see also the important note by M. Bullard, Filippo Strozzi and the Medici (Cambridge, 1980), p. 140, n. 75; I am grateful to Sheryl Reiss for bringing this note to my attention.
4 Ibid., p. 292 and n. 15.
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What do we know of Giulio’s musical interests? It is not my objective to review the documentation pertaining to his musical patronage as Pope Clement vii, since it is abundant and difficult enough to assess comprehensively, scattered as it is among several publications. Giulio’s papal patronage, moreover, is not our principal concern here and is relevant only for what it may tell us generally about his personal musical interests. What does seem clear from even a brief review of the documentation from his time as pope is that the reference in the diaries of Marino Sanuto to the effect that ‘he doesn’t want jesters or musicians, he doesn’t go hunting, nor [does he have] other amusements, as the other popes did’ seems not to be substantiated by other evidence, some of it contained elsewhere in Sanuto’s own diaries: a reference for April 1528 specifies that during the pope’s absence from Rome after the Sack ‘His Holiness has taken singers and others with him and he is reassembling the court and hopes to have the rocca of Viterbo, where he wishes to go’, and an entry for 17 August 1533 reads: ‘after lunch the pope was in bed, and there was music by three lutenists’. Sanuto’s diaries also provide evidence of Clement’s own


7 ‘no vol bufoni, non musichi, non va a caza, ne altri piaceri, come feva li altri Pontefici’; I diarii di Marino Sanuto, 59 vols. (Venice, 1879–1903), xlii, col. 283. Unless otherwise noted, translations of sixteenth-century texts are my own.

8 ‘Soa Santità ha tolto cantori et altri, et rinova la corte et spera haver la roca di Viterbo dove vol andar’; ibid., lvi, col. 270.

9 ‘da poi pranzo [il] Pontefice ... era in leto ... et si havea una musica di tre lauti’; ibid., lviii, col. 610.
musicianship; a chronicler described the coronation ceremony for the Emperor Charles V in February 1530: ‘After the Secret was finished, the pope said the Preface, and very well, having a good voice and being a perfect musician.’ And Antonio Soriano, a Venetian envoy in Rome during Clement’s papacy, wrote similarly: and certainly one sees no one more favoured and holding and performing religious observances more devoutly than His Holiness; serving him greatly in this is music, an art quintessentially his, such that the pope — it is said — is among the good musicians at present in Italy’. (Colin Slim has interpreted a reference in the horoscope cast by Lucas Guarico for the harpsichordist and organist Vincenzo da Modena as evidence that Giulio may have received instruction on the organ, a reference that may thus provide further witness still to his musicianship.) Other sources testify to musical activities at Clement’s court; in a dispatch of 1525 Francesco Gonzaga described a dinner ‘at the pope’s property [the Villa Madama on the Monte Mario], where the most beautiful accommodation is under construction with some rooms already finished, as sumptuous and magnificent as can be, done during his time as cardinal. The dinner was most estimable and amply supplied with foods, and throughout there was musical entertainment of various kinds.’ In 1526 Gonzaga wrote:

The cavalier Franceschino [Cibo] took Her Ladyship [Isabella d’Este] into the room where Our Lord ordinarily eats, and having prepared there a beautiful meal of confections, fruits and other things, [the pope] then had come Francesco da Milano, most excellent player of the lute, as perhaps Your Excellency [Federico Gonzaga] knows, who with two companions played music with two lutes and a viol.

10 ‘Finito che fu le secrete il papa disse el prefatio et molto bene, per haver bona voce, et esser perfeto musico.’ Ibid., iii, col. 648.
11 ‘è certo niun altro si vede più graziata e devotamente celebrare ed eseguire alcune ecclesiastiche osservanze, di quello che fa Sua Santità; servendola in questo anche molto la musica, arte a lui molto propria; di sorte che è fama, il papa essere dellu buoni musicì che ora siano in Italia’; see E. Alberi, ed., Relazioni degli ambasciatori veneti al Senato, 2nd series, iii (Florence, 1846), p. 278.
14 ‘Il cavaglier Franceschino [Cibo] condusse Sua Signoria [Isabella d’Este] in la stantia
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Edward Lowinsky recounted other incidents related in Cellini’s autobiography and Cosimo Bartoli’s *Ragionamenti* that reflect on the place of music at Clement’s court. Moreover, there are a great many entries in the papal account books from Clement’s time that record payments to musicians and a great many letters, Bulls and documents of other kinds that served to confer various favours on papal musicians. The members of Clement’s musical establishment included, among many other singers, Bernardo Pisano, Charles d’Argentille, Costanzo Festa, Eustachio de Monte Regali Gallus, Ivo Barry, Jean Beausseron, Jean Conseil, Niccolò de’Pitti (whose correspondence with Clement includes an interesting letter of 1528 in which Pitti described his recent compositional activity) and Vincent Misonne, and, among the instrumentalists, Gian Maria Giudeo, Francesco da Milano and Lorenzo da Gaeta. Of Clement’s singers, Conseil seems to have played an unusually important role: in 1528, after the Sack, he was sent on a recruiting trip in order to identify prospective singers for the Cappella Sistina; we can chart his progress on the basis of a series of interesting letters between Giovanni Salviati, Papal Legate in France, and his father Jacopo, the pope’s secretary.

The available documentation for Giulio’s musical interests as cardinal is much less extensive and therefore easier to review and interpret. As a member of the Compagnia del Diamante, which was under the direction of his cousin Giuliano, Lorenzo il Magnifico’s youngest son, Giulio, may have helped to organise the 1513 carnival festivities, the first since his family’s restoration to Florence. Among the carnival activities arranged by the Compagnie del Diamante and del Broncone, which was under Lorenzo ii’s direc-

*dove Nostro Signore manza hora ordinamentemente, et havendo preparata li una bella colazione de confetti di zuchar, frutti et altre diverse cose, fece doppi venire Francesco de Milano, excellentissimo sonatore de liuto, come forsi deve sapere Vostra Excellentia [Federico Gonzaga], con due compagni che fecero musica con due liuti et uno violone.*

W. F. Prizer, ’Lutenists at the Court of Mantua in the Late Fifteenth and Early Sixteenth Centuries’, *Journal of the Late Society of America*, 13 (1980), pp. 5–35, especially p. 34. (The translation is Prizer’s.)

---


16 See the texts published in the studies cited above (note 6).


18 Haberl (see note 6), especially pp. 72–3 n. 3.
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tion, were performances of *canti carnascialeschi* whose texts and music have come down to us; their texts reveal that the Medici were aware that the occasion possessed considerable ‘propaganda’ potential that they exploited to their advantage: the various elements of the carnival’s activities, the *canti* among them, so effectively created the illusion of the return of a golden age that one chronicler wrote: ‘al popolo pareva che fussino tornati i tempi di Lorenzo Vecchio’. 20

That Giulio quickly established himself as Leo x’s trusted agent emerges as clearly from his correspondence concerning musical matters as from other correspondence, and, indeed, it is in that role that we first see unequivocal evidence in the documents of his musical interests as cardinal. Within a year of Leo’s election Giulio corresponded with Lorenzo ii concerning Lorenzo’s attempts on behalf of the Signoria of Florence to secure the services of instrumentalists, and he did not hesitate to challenge Lorenzo implicitly to maintain a certain qualitative standard in his practices as a patron of music: ‘I understand the Signoria’s desire to have *pifferi* and trombonists from Cesena . . .; and because I do not believe it to be an excellent thing, I judge that there what is called good music is that which costs little, and it appears to me that Your Magnificence does not delight in it as the pope does’. 21 In 1515 Giulio wrote to Lorenzo on behalf of the musician Alessandro Coppini, who wished to be elected Provincial of the Servite Order in the Province of Tuscany, and the fullness of his recommendation, as well as the specificity of its language, suggests that, in this instance, Giulio’s advocacy was in no sense perfunctory. 22 Giulio accompanied the pope to Florence in November 1515 on the occasion of Leo’s famous Florentine *entrata* and played a role in the musical performances that were so important a part of the activities

---

20 The 1513 carnival is discussed at length in my study *Music and Political Experience in Medici Florence, 1512–1537* (Princeton, forthcoming).


organised in Florence at the time. In 1518, Giulio wrote to Bernardo Dovizi da Bibbiena, Leo’s legate in France at the court of Francis I, that

His Holiness wishes that Your Most Reverend Eminence arrange with the master of the king’s chapel to have three putti cantori of the age and voice [type] that you may determine by way of the enclosed memorandum that Carpentras drafted for me. And should it be necessary to speak to His Majesty about it, perform the service how and when it seems best to you, in His Holiness’s name.

The ‘putti’ are the subject of a letter of Dovizi’s to Giulio: ‘the king’s mother has taken responsibility for finding and sending three putti musici to His Holiness, in accordance with Carpentras’s note’.

After Lorenzo II died and Giulio assumed responsibility for the Florentine government, there are further traces of his patronage; a document of April 1521 suggests that the tenure of two singers at the Annunziata depended upon ‘la volontà del nostro Reverendissimo Messieur Cardinale de’ Medici’, and in May that year Niccolò de’ Pitti, the Prior of the Papal Chapel, wrote to Giulio concerning Verdelot, the most important of the earliest madrigalists, who was in Florence at that time and in some way associated with Giulio. We might argue that the famous lutenist Gian Maria Giudeo, for many years an intimate of various members of the Medici family, was also associated with Giulio during the years between Leo’s death and Giulio’s election, given that Giulio and his agent, Angelo Marzi, wrote four letters in 1522 on Gian Maria’s

---

23 Cummings, Music and Political Experience.


25 ‘Madama ha preso l’assunto di trovare et di mandare a Nostro Signore i tre putti musici, seconda la nota di Carpentrasse’; G. L. Moncallero, Epistolario de Bernardo Dovizi da Bibbiena, 2 vols., Biblioteca dell’Archivium Romanicum 44, 81 (Florence, 1955, 1965), II, p. 127. I can offer no explanation as to why Giulio’s letter to Dovizi, which is given here first, is dated 4 September 1518, after Dovizi’s letter to Giulio, which is dated 18 July 1518, when the content of Giulio’s suggests that it must have preceded Dovizi’s; I have not seen the original documents, and it may be that one of the editors reported mistakenly on the date.


27 Sherr (see note 22), especially p. 409.
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behalf to various prospective benefactors; since Conseil is documented as a member of Giulio's household in Rome in 1517, 1520 and 1521, it may reasonably be suggested that among Giulio's intimates were three of the more famous musicians of the early sixteenth century. Testimony of a different sort to Giulio's artistic and musical interests is provided by Pietro Alcionio's Medices legatus de exilio of 1522, and although the reference must be interpreted in the context of the literary tradition the text exemplifies, it is not inconsistent with the documentary evidence for Giulio's artistic interests; he is depicted as engaged in a discussion with Lorenzo II:

Certainly, Lorenzo, I neglected no genre of ancient letters and I enjoyed them, because I felt letters to be the principal ornament of life; I also endeavoured to learn music and painting thoroughly, because they are of the greatest help in perfecting the body; they keep us engaged in a noble occupation, to the great pleasure of the soul, if we want to master them.\(^{29}\)

\(^{28}\) On Gian Maria, see A. M. Cummings, 'Gian Maria Giudeo, Sonatore del Liuto, and the Medici' Fontes Artis Musicæ 38 (1991); on Conseil as a member of Giulio's household, see the texts of documents dated 4 March 1517, 11 January 1520 and 9 April 1521 in Frey, Regesten (see note 6), pp. 180–1. Richard Sherr graciously informed me of the existence of another reference of 1517 (Rome, Archivio Segreto Vaticano, Registri delle suppliche, 1598, fol. 218\(^{v}\)) that similarly documents Conseil as a member of Giulio's famiglia; I am grateful to Professor Sherr for providing me with a copy of the document in question.

Two other references suggest that Cardinal Giulio may have taken an interest in the musical education of his protégés or associates; an account book in Rome, Archivio di Stato (Camerale I, Appendice 6), that lists expenses incurred by Giulio's page (fol. 26\(^{v}\), \(\text{mem}x\) A presso nota dipù spese fatte p[er] Stefano di m[esser] Mario Crece[n]tio paggio d[e]l R[everendissi]mo Car[dina]li d[e\'] medici incominciate addi 6 di novembre 1520\(^{v}\)) contains the following item: 'E am[aestr]o Ber[nard]o sonatore diliuto p[er] havere insegnato ad[e]c[t]o Stefano dua mesi.' And in his autobiography, Benvenuto Cellini recorded that Cardinal Giulio offered to assist the young artist and provide letters of recommendation for him should he choose to go to Bologna to study music with a renowned master named Antonio; in this instance, however, I should note that, according to Cellini, Giulio failed to fulfil the terms of his offer, which in any event was made not on Giulio's own initiative but in response to a suggestion from a certain Pierino, a pupil of Cellini's father; see The Life of Benvenuto Cellini, trans. J. A. Symonds (London, 1920), pp. 12–15.

\(^{29}\) 'IUL: Prorsus Laurentii: nullum enim genus antiquarum literarum omisi, quod non attingerem, quia suspicioer, praeclara vitae ornamenta esse literas, incanaque etiam sum maximo studio perdiscedi Musicam et Picturam quoniam haec ad perfectionem corporum notitiam adiumentum afferit maximum, illa, quod faciat, nos ostium honeste & cum magna animi voluptate tenere, si modo illud complecti velimuss.' For assistance with the translation, and for help on many other matters given with characteristic generosity, I am grateful to Dott. Gino Corti of Villa I Tatti. I am grateful for the reference to Alcionio, and for the transcription, to Sheryl Reiss, who also suggested that the narrative content of the scene depicted in Giulio's official seal may be indirect evidence of his musical interests: it is a Nativity scene in which musicians are present, and since
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There is evidence, too, that Giulio, as Leo’s close associate, was present on occasions in Rome when music was performed; documentation of his musical interests therefore consists not solely of references that pertain to Florentine musical developments, which Giulio was evidently asked to monitor on Leo’s behalf, but to specifically Roman musical life as well. On two occasions, correspondents reported on musical performances; in July 1513 the Mantuan representative wrote to Francesco Gonzaga: ‘Yesterday I went to His Holiness, whom I found at the Belvedere with the Archbishop of Florence. In the antechamber was the Most Reverend Cardinal of Ferrara and the Cardinal of Ancona. I visited His Holiness and then Gian Maria Giudeo made music with viols’, and in June 1516 Beltrando Costabili reported to Ippolito d’Este that ‘Adriano, Auns, Sauli, Cornaro and Medici ate there [the site of the future Villa Madama] with His Holiness, and Signor Antonio Maria and Frate Mariano and “il Proto”, with his music, was present’.

Giulio also possessed two books of polyphonic music which were evidently prepared for him during his time as cardinal, and one can argue accordingly that he is a figure of considerable musical-historical importance, since, to my knowledge, there is no other cardinal of the time with whom two such sources can be associated. It is to an examination of these manuscripts that I should now like to turn. Before doing so, however, I might comment briefly on a third manuscript, VatP 1982, sometimes said to have been Giulio’s on

30 ‘Heri andai dal Nostro Santità, qual ritrovaì a Belvedere . . . cum . . . l’Arcevescovo di Firenze. In l’anticamera era el Reverendissimo Cardinale de Ferrara et Monsignore Cardinale de Ancona v[i]site el Nostro Santità et poi la musica di violini che fece Zoanne Maria Judeo.’ Prizer (see note 14), especially p. 33. (The translation is Prizer’s.)

31 ‘Et mangioli [the site of the future Villa Madama] cum Sua San. Adriano, Auns, Sauli, Cornaro, et Medici, et el S. Ant. M. et Frate Mariano, et il Protho ge intraveneno cum la sua musica’; J. Shearman, ‘A Note on the Chronology of Villa Madama’, The Burlington Magazine, 129 (1987), pp. 179–81; for this reference I am grateful to Sheryl Reiss. The pope was not the only host who included Cardinal Giulio among his guests on occasions when music was performed; on 7 May 1518, Pompeo Colonna hosted a convivio on which Cornelius de Fine reported in his diary (Rome, Biblioteca Apostolica Vaticana, Ottob. Lat. 2137): ‘plebis autem innumerabilis multitudo, Sonorum, et omnis generis musicorum infinitus numeros: . . .’. For this reference, and for providing me with a copy of the relevant page from the diary, I am again grateful to Sheryl Reiss.

32 Manuscript sigla used in this article are those found in the Census-Catalogue of Manuscript Sources of Polyphonic Music 1400–1550, 5 vols., Renaissance Manuscript Studies 1 (Neuhausen-Stuttgart, 1979–88); on VatP 1982, see vol. rv, p. 25.
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the basis of its binding, which shows the Medici coat of arms, the familiar shield with a central ball positioned at the top centre and five others arranged in the shape of a V.\footnote{See I. Schunke, *Die Einbände der Palatina in der Vatikanischen Bibliothek*, 2 vols., Studi e Testi 216–18 (Vatican City, 1962), i, p. 176, Tafel cxxxiii, and n. p. 902.} In my view, however, there is no particular warrant for identifying this manuscript with Giulio, or indeed with any one specific member of the family, since there is nothing about the version of the coat of arms that appears on the binding that serves to distinguish it as one individual’s device. In this discussion, therefore, it will not be considered as one of Cardinal Giulio’s manuscripts; also excluded from consideration here are the Cappella Sistina sources dating from Giulio’s time as Pope Clement vii.\footnote{On the Cappella Sistina manuscripts, see now J. Dean, ‘The Scribes of the Sistine Chapel, 1501–1527’ (PhD dissertation, University of Chicago, 1984). Giulio was also Cardinal Protector of the French king, and in that role had a relationship to the church of San Luigi dei Francesi in Rome, as Sheryl Reiss reminded me. Although the relationship was largely ceremonial, I would observe, first of all, that the musical repertory of the church in the early sixteenth century bore some relationship to the Cappella Sistina repertory and, second, that the ‘Johannes Heritier’ listed among the members of Leo’s *famiglia* in 1514 may be identical with the well-known composer Jean Lhéritier, who was one of the early *maestri di cappella* at San Luigi. I would not necessarily argue that the early sixteenth-century music manuscripts from San Luigi should therefore be considered products of Giulio’s patronage; however, might not members of the musical establishment at the church have asked Cardinal Giulio to intercede on their behalf in order to secure Lhéritier’s appointment and to procure pieces from the Sistine Chapel repertory? On the choirmasters, see H.-W. Frey, ‘Die Kapellmeister an der französischen Nationalkirche San Luigi dei Francesi in Rom im 16. Jahrhundert. Teil I: 1514–1577, Teil II: 1577–1608’, *Archiv für Musikwissenschaft*, 22 (1965), pp. 272–93, especially 274–6, and 23 (1966), pp. 32–60; on the ‘Johannes Heritier’ in Leo’s household, see Frey, ‘Michelagniolo’ (note 6), p. 162 n. 63; on the musical repertory of the church, see L. L. Perkins, ‘Notes bibliographiques au sujet de l’ancien fond musical de l’Église de Saint Louis des Français à Rome’, *Fontes Artis Musicae*, 16 (1969), pp. 57–71, M. Staehelin, ‘Zum Schicksal des alten Musikalien-Fonds von San Luigi dei Francesi in Rom’, *Fontes Artis Musicae*, 17 (1970), pp. 120–7 (especially pp. 125–6 n. 23, on MS BerlS 40091), and (also on BerlS 40091) Staehelin, review of Lowinsky, *The Medici Codex* (see note 15), *Journal of the American Musicological Society*, 33 (1980), pp. 575–87, especially p. 578 and n. 6.}

**The Manuscript VATP 1980–1**

**Physical characteristics**

**MS 1980**

*Binding: MS VatP 1980 is the tenor partbook of what was presumably a four-volume set. It is bound in tooled brown leather, and the word ‘TENOR’ is stamped at the top centre of the front cover.*

*Evidence of ownership:* Towards the top of the spine is a blue printed sticker with the words ‘BIBL. AP. VATICANA Pal. lat. 1980’; towards the
bottom is a sticker with the pencil inscription ‘1980’. At the upper left corner of the paper guard sheet that is glued to the inside front cover is a blue sticker identical with that which appears on the spine. Three additional paper guard sheets, foliated i, ii and iii, precede the manuscript proper; with the sheet that is glued to the inside cover, they form two bifolium: a bifolium consisting of the inside front cover and fol. iii, and bifolium i/ii. On fol. i' is written ‘Pal. 1980’ in blue crayon; fol. iii' contains the index and a stamp ‘BIBLIOTHECA APOSTOLICA VATICANA’.

*Collation:* The manuscript proper consists of eighty-six sheets of gilt-edged paper in oblong quarto; the edges are stamped with designs. Each folio measures c. 212 mm long×132 mm high. Gathering i (folis. 1–6) consists of three double sheets; the remaining ten gatherings consist of four double sheets each. At the end is a bifolium, folios. [LXXXVII]–[LXXXVIII] (my foliation); folios. [LXXXVIII] is glued to the inside back cover.

*Paper types:* Although the paper is principally of one type, as the *Census-Catalogue* published by the American Institute of Musicology correctly reported, in addition to the anchor-in-circle watermark that the entry for VatP 1980–1 describes, bifolium 9/12 contains a different mark, two crossed arrows.36

**MS 1981**

*Evidence of ownership:* VatP 1981’s physical characteristics are almost identical with those of VatP 1980, except that its front cover is stamped ‘BASSVS’, the stickers on the spine read ‘1981’, and fol. I contains the inscription ‘Bassus’ in brown ink above the inscription ‘Pal. 1981’. The index on fol. iii' is essentially identical with that of VatP 1980, except for some minor differences in the spellings of the text incipits and the fact that the first two pieces contain the only composer attributions in the manuscript: ‘fevi[n]’ and ‘[La] rue’.

*Collation:* The manuscript consists of ninety-four paper sheets, of which

---

35 See the entry for VatP 1980–1 in *Census-Catalogue* (note 32); the paper type specified there, Briquet 491 (see C. M. Briquet, *Les filigranes*, ed. A. Stevenson, 4 vols. [Amsterdam, 1968]), is documented in Florence in 1519, but one version or another of this extremely common mark is found in many parts of Italy, and great care should therefore be exercised in assessing its significance; see V. Mośn, *Anchor Watermarks* (Amsterdam, 1973), passim.

36 See, for example, Briquet 6267–8 and 6280–2. Because the manuscript is in oblong quarto, the watermarks appear at the fold of the page and never appear in their entirety; rather, each appearance is of half of the mark. For these reasons, and because I was unable to arrange for photographs of the marks – and thus cannot offer documentation for any assertion I might make – I am reluctant to attempt to specify more precisely which of Briquet’s exemplars most closely resemble the marks in VatP 1980 (though I have excluded some exemplars). Further study may serve to identify the marks precisely. As Iain Fenlon reminds me, however, in any analysis of watermarks one has to be aware of the existence of and differences between ‘twin’ marks; see especially A. Stevenson, ‘Watermarks are Twins’, *Studies in Bibliography*, 4 (1951–2), pp. 57–91.
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fols. [86]–[94] are unfoliated. At the end is a bifolium, fols. [xcv’]–[xcvi] (my foliation); fol. [xcvi] is glued to the inside back cover. Gathering i (fols. 1–6) consists of three double sheets, gatherings ii (fols. 7–14), iii (fols. 15–22), iv (fols. 23–30), vi (fols. 35–42), vii (fols. 43–50), viii (fols. 51–8), ix (fols. 59–66), x (fols. 67–74), xi (fols. 79–[86]) and xii (fols. [87]–[94]) of four, and v (fols. 31–4) and xi (fols. 75–8) of two.

*Paper types:* Again, the paper is almost exclusively of the type reported in the *Census-Catalogue* with the exception of guard sheet ii, which at the centre shows a different mark, a cardinal’s (?) hat with tie-strings, upside down.

**Evidence of provenance and date.** I have reported on the physical characteristics of the manuscript in such detail because, apart from the illumination that appears at the bottom centre of fol. 1r, they are the only external evidence for its origin. Nothing about them is inconsistent with the evidence of the illumination: a gold shield, with five red balls arranged in a v-shape and a single blue ball at the top centre with three gold fleurs-de-lis, surmounted by a gold crucifix and a red cardinal’s hat and ornamented on either side by red tassels and green laurel (?) branches. Lowinsky observed more than twenty years ago that the illumination almost certainly serves to identify the manuscript’s intended recipient as Cardinal Giulio. Its repertory is too late for the manuscript to have been intended for Cardinal Giovanni, who in March 1513 became Pope Leo x, and too early for it to have been intended for Cardinal Ippolito, who became cardinal in January 1529. We now know more about the biographies of several of the composers whose

---

37 See note 35.

38 See, for example, Briquet, nos. 3369–70, 3373, 3384–5, 3387–94; but see also the reservation expressed in note 36. In any further study of VatP 1980–1, attempts should be made to procure beta radiographs of the watermarks so that careful comparisons with Briquet’s exemplars can be made and the relevance of the evidence of the paper types to a proper interpretation of the manuscript can be determined. Analyses of the readings of the works in the repertory should also be undertaken in order to determine VatP 1980–1’s ‘textual’ relationship to its concordant sources. Both kinds of analysis were beyond the scope of this paper, but I am fully aware of their relevance to a more complete assessment of the manuscript. From the information currently available concerning the evidence both of paper types and of ‘textual’ traditions represented in the manuscript, I would at least be prepared to say that neither type of evidence is inconsistent with the thesis advanced here concerning MS VatP 1980–1.

39 See the plate in Lowinsky (note 15), p. 64. The presence of Josquin’s chanson *Se congé prans* may be internal evidence for a Medici provenance; on its Medicean associations, see M. Briener, ‘The Manuscript Verona, Accademia Filarmonica, 8 218 and its Political Motets’, *Studi Musicali*, 16 (1987), pp. 3–12, especially pp. 6–10.
works are contained in the manuscript than we did when Lowinsky first advanced his thesis, and what more we know only serves to substantiate it. In particular, that Mouton’s and Richafort’s relationship to Leo x⁴⁰ (and Mouton’s to another Italian patron)⁴¹ is now clearer, and that Willaert was present in Italy earlier than had been supposed,⁴² obviates the need to account for the presence of their works in a Medici manuscript dating from between 1513 and 1523, since a Medici patron could easily have had access to their music in those years. In addition, the manuscript contains one piece by Andrea de Silva, who was in Leo’s service,⁴³ and one by Févin, who, as a member of the French court chapel, represented a musical tradition that Leo especially favoured; it is not difficult to imagine how a piece by Févin might have found its way into a Medici manuscript.⁴⁴ Finally, as a survey of concordances makes clear, VatP 1980–1 has a large number of works in common with other Medici sources, or sources that seem to bear some relationship to Medici patronage. Of the twenty-one works in the manuscript, five are also found in FlorL 666, the famous Medici Codex of 1518; as Lowinsky observed, four of the five occur as a group in VatP 1980–1 and their readings are very similar to those in FlorL 666. Four of the twenty-one are found in VatP 1982, a Medici manuscript whoever its specific intended recipient, and three (nos. 15, 16 and 21, which are also found in FlorL 666) occur in the print 1521⁶, which shows evidence of a relationship to Medici musical

⁴² L. Lockwood, ‘Adrian Willaert and Cardinal Ippolito I d’Este: New Light on Willaert’s Early Career in Italy, 1515–1521’, Early Music History, 5 (1985), pp. 85–112. In my forthcoming study Music and Political Experience in Medici Florence, I present the texts of three documents that demonstrate that Cardinal d’Este was present on the occasion of three different performances of music in Medici Rome, and I speculate that the documents may suggest a personal relationship between Leo and Ippolito that was based in part on a common interest in music and that may help to explain Ferrarese–papal musical connections.
⁴³ See Frey, ‘Regesten’ (note 6), 8, p. 61.
Giulio de' Medici's music books
circles. The survey of concordances also suggests that Lowinsky's thesis about the manuscript's date is correct: three of the five principal concordant sources date from Giulio's time as cardinal, not from Giovanni's or Ippolito's: BolC Q19 (5 concordances), FlorL 666 (5 concordances) and VatP 1982 (4 concordances).

In sum, the manuscript's physical characteristics, the heraldic device it contains, its repertory and its relationship to concordant sources all serve to substantiate an interpretation that argues for a Medici provenance in the decade between 1513 and 1523. Further discussion of MS VatP 1980–1 is deferred pending a consideration of Giulio's other music book.

THE MANUSCRIPT CORBC 95–6/PARISBN 1817

Manuscripts 95 and 96 of the Biblioteca Comunale in Cortona and manuscript Nouvelles acquisitions françaises 1817 of the Bibliothèque Nationale, Paris, are the altus, superius and tenor part-books of a four-volume set; the bassus book is missing, although it is rumoured to be housed in a library in Madrid. Since the publication of the article by Gustave Gröber which first established that the Cortona and Paris books belong to the same set, the manuscript has been identified, not as Giulio's, but as his cousin Giuliano's. I believe the evidence suggests that it was more likely to have been prepared for Giulio, and I shall now examine the evidence for its provenance and date in some detail.

Physical characteristics

MS 96

Binding: MS 96 (superius) is bound in tooled brown leather stamped with gold designs.

Evidence of ownership: On the spine is a worn label that bears the inscription '96 Memb'. In the upper left corner of the parchment sheet that is glued to the inside front cover is written '96'; beneath it is the word 'SOPRANO'

45 I argue thus largely on the basis of the print's repertory (see I. Fenlon and J. Haar, The Italian Madrigal in the Early Sixteenth Century [Cambridge, 1988], pp. 205–7), its provenance and date (Rome, 1520) and its relationship to concordant sources (it is most densely concordant with such sources as FlorBN ii. r. 232, FlorL 666 and 15213, among others).

46 See Lockwood (note 41), especially pp. 234–41.
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and to its right, in purple ink, is ‘Supremus’; the centre of the page ink: ‘CORTONA . ACCADEMIA ETRUSCA (FONDATA NEL 1727) . OBSCVRA DE RE LVICIDA PANGO’. There follows a single modern parchment guard sheet and a parchment bifolium that contains the index.

Collation: The manuscript proper consists of eighty-seven gilt-edged parchment sheets, each measuring c. 176 cm long×127 cm high, and collated as follows: gatherings I (fols. 1–10), II (fols. 11–20), III (fols. 21–30), IV (fols. 31–40), V (fols. 41–50), VII (fols. 60–9) and IX (fols. 78–87) are quinterns; gathering VI (fols. 51–9) is a quatern (fols. 52–9) to the back of which is glued a single sheet, fol. 51; and gathering VIII (fols. 70–7) is a quatern. The collation is therefore in quaterns, with the exception of two gatherings, and is thus typically Florentine.49 Following the manuscript proper are a single parchment guard sheet, which is stitched to the binding behind the last gathering, and a parchment sheet which is glued to the inside back cover and bears the library stamp.

MS 95

Evidence of ownership: MS 95 (altus) is similarly bound and bears a label on its spine which reads ‘95 [C]od. memb. 95’. The parchment sheet glued to its inside front cover is similarly inscribed and stamped: under the designation ‘95’ that appears in the upper left-hand corner the word ‘CONTRALTO’ is written in pencil and in the centre of the page is a parchment label with the word ‘alt[us]’. A single parchment guard sheet whose verso is inscribed ‘altus’ in its upper left-hand corner is followed by the parchment bifolium that contains the index.

Collation: The ninety folios that make up the manuscript proper are bound in nine regular quaterns and are followed by a single guard sheet and a guard sheet bearing the library stamp that is glued to the inside back cover.

MS 1817

Evidence of ownership: MS 1817 is bound in tooled brown leather; its spine bears a label that reads ‘FR. nouv. acq. 1817’. Towards the lower left-hand corner of the parchment sheet glued to its inside front cover is the word ‘Tenor’ written upside down in ink. In the centre of the page is a paper label with what appears to be representations of the obverse and reverse of a coin. One face shows the inscription ‘LVG DVN’, its two halves surrounding a depiction of a lion; the other shows the inscription ‘YEMENIZ’; between the two coin faces is written the numeral ‘658’ in pencil. MS 1817 had previously been in the collection of Nicholas

49 As has been observed (Fenlon and Haar [note 45], pp. 119–20), collation in quaterns is not unequivocal evidence of Florentine origin. Nonetheless, many Florentine manuscripts are so collated; see Atlas (note 47), i, p. 24 n. 4.
Yemeniz and is listed as entry number 658 in the Catalogue de la Bibliothèque de M. N. Yemeniz (Paris, 1867); it was bought by the Bibliothèque Nationale in 1866.\(^{50}\) To the right of the label bearing Yemeniz’s name is another, identical with the one on the spine. Glued to the stub of the guard sheet that is the inside front cover is a parchment sheet, blank except for its foliation (3). Stitched to the binding through the stub is the bifolium (fols. 1–2) that contains the index. In the upper right corner of fol. 1, below the foliation, is the inscription ‘Acq. nouv. fr. No. 1817’, and to the centre left of the page BIBLIOTHÈQUE IMPÉRIALE MSS.’ is stamped in red ink; in the lower left-hand corner is the inscription in ink ‘R. C. 6032’.

**Collation:** The manuscript proper consists of eighty-one parchment sheets (fols. 4–84): fols. 4–83 are regular quin terns (although fols. 56/61, 57/60 and 58/59 are not true bifolia: fols. 59, 60 and 61 are single sheets glued to the stubs of fols. 58, 57 and 56); fol. 84 is glued to the stub of the blank sheet glued to the inside back cover.

**Heraldic devices and ornamentation.** That the manuscript was prepared for a member of the Medici family there can be no doubt. It is the only source to contain three pieces by Heinrich Isaac with specifically Medicean associations: his two elegies for Lorenzo il Magnifico\(^ {51} \) and his instrumental work based on the Medici motto ‘Palle, palle’, which refers to the balls in the family shield. More important, the shield itself ornaments the pages of the manuscript that contain *Palle, palle*. On fol. 38\(^{r} \) of the superius and altus books, it is enclosed within the initial ‘P’ of the text incipit, and on fol. 41\(^{r} \) of the tenor occurs a considerably more elaborate version (see Figure 2): surmounting the familiar coat of arms itself is a gold crucifix and a cardinal’s hat, from either side of which hangs a cord with six tassels; to the right and left sides of the shield are green, leafless laurel (?) branches from which hang black discs with the inscription ‘GLO VI S’ in gold lettering. There is evidence throughout the manuscript of other attempts to distinguish it as a Medici manuscript: several works whose texts (or second or third parts) begin with the letter ‘L’ have illuminated initials that incorporate a design reminiscent of the feather that accompanies

---
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the diamond ring and motto ‘SEMPER’ in Lorenzo il Magnifico’s personal device.52

How is the device on fol. 41’ of the tenor book to be interpreted? Its imagery is richer than one might at first suppose. As Allan Atlas observed, Isaac modelled the melodic shape of the tenor part on the forms of the Medici coat of arms: the first five longae of the tenor are reminiscent of the arrangement of the five red balls, and the following three longae are reminiscent of the arrangement of the gold fleurs-de-lis that adorn the central blue ball.53 Moreover, the

52 A plate of the illuminated initial ‘P’ as it appears in the superius and altus books may be found in E. Levi, *La lírica italiana nel cinquecento e nel seicento fino all’Arcadia* (Florence, 1909), p. 258bis. For an instance of the feather design, see, for example, the ‘L’ of ‘Laurus impertu fulminus . . .’ that forms part of the text of Isaac’s *Quis dabit capiti* (fols. 48’–50’ [superius partbook]); for a representation of Lorenzo il Magnifico’s device, see J. Cox-Rearick, *Dynasty and Destiny in Medici Art* (Princeton, NJ, 1984), plate 1. In *A Gift of Madrigals and Motets*, 2 vols. (Chicago, 1972), i, p. 36, Colin Slim suggested that the illuminator of CorBC 95–6/ParisBNN 1817 may have been Giovanni Boccardi, on the basis of the illuminations’ similarities to those in Chicago, Newberry Library, Case MS.-VM 1578.M91, which he had earlier identified as Boccardi’s (pp. 29–36). I find Slim’s suggestion plausible. Compare, for example, the illuminated initial ‘P’ in Figure 2 with the initials ‘Q’ illustrated in the colour plate facing the title page of vol. i of Slim’s study.


Figure 2  Paris, Bibliothèque Nationale, MS Nouv. acq. fr. 1817, fol. 41’.
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letters ‘GLO VI S’ are themselves arranged so as to reflect the arrangement of the balls, as are the red tassels of the cardinal’s hat. Janet Cox-Rearick’s recent book on imagery in Medici art offers many examples of the kind of ‘triangular’ arrangement of images that are found in MS CorBC 95–6/ParisBNN 1817.\textsuperscript{54} The manuscript’s compiler and illuminator chose to illuminate the tenor book in this way, therefore, precisely because it is the tenor part that recalls the Medici imagery and thus would have afforded an illuminator the opportunity to include several images that refer simultaneously to one another.

Gustav Gröber cited an example of a medallion with the name ‘IVLIANVS. MEDICES. DVX. NEMORII’ on one face and the inscription ‘GLO VI S’ on the other as evidence that the motto was Giuliano’s.\textsuperscript{55} On the basis of Gröber’s citation, CorBC 95–6/Paris BNN 1817 has been considered ever since to have been compiled for Giuliano and to date from between 1514 (the date of the event, the death of Anne of Brittany, that occasioned the writing of no. 51, Mouton’s \textit{Quis dabit oculos}) and 1516, the date of Giuliano’s death. The anomaly of the motto’s appearance in conjunction with a cardinal’s hat has not been addressed. However, the medallion that Gröber cited is an eighteenth-century piece, the work of the medalist Antonio Selvi.\textsuperscript{56} It is also catalogued in George Francis Hill’s classic work on Italian medals of the Renaissance in a section entitled ‘Later Restitutions’, where it and others in the same series are described as ‘iconographically mischievous’.\textsuperscript{57} There are other sources chronologically proximate to Giuliano, however, that also attribute the GLOVIS motto to him. Paolo Giovio, for example, wrote in his \textit{Ragionamento . . . sopra i mutti e disegni d’arme e d’amore} that Giuliano,

\textsuperscript{54} For example, see Cox-Rearick (note 52), p. 82.
\textsuperscript{55} Gröber (see note 48), p. 372 n. 3.
\textsuperscript{58} ‘avendo presa per moglie la zia del Re di Francia, . . . et essendo fatto Confalonier della Chiesa, per mostrare che le Fortuna, la quale gli era stata contraria per tanti anni, si
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Giovio was sufficiently well positioned that we may accept his testimony as authoritative: he entered Leo’s service in 1513, received the Bishopric of Nocera dei Pagani from Clement, and died in 1552, while in the service of Cosimo I de’ Medici, Duke of Florence. And MS 2122 of the Biblioteca Riccardiana in Florence contains a famous letter of 1565 written by Vincenzo Borghini (a letter described by Francis Ames-Lewis as a paraphrase of Giovio) in which Borghini, the prior of the Ospedale degli Innocenti and one of Duke Cosimo’s trusted advisers, described ‘Imprese di Casa Medici’; his entry for Giuliano reads: ‘Il Duca Giuliano in uno GLO scudo triangolare a questo modo con VI sei lettere GLOVIS’.

Different kinds of evidence bear on a proper interpretation of such devices, however, as Ames-Lewis suggested, and the relevant sources are often inconsistent among themselves. Indeed, one occasionally has the sense that late or posthumous sources, whether they be ‘theoretical’ like Giovio’s treatise or Borghini’s letter, or ‘practical’ like Selvi’s medals, aim to associate a particular device uniquely with one patron, whether or not the device was uniquely his, in a sense to attempt to clarify an unclear situation or impose an order where, in fact, there was none. This is the view expressed by Albinia de la Mare, who has written that a difficulty in studying the manuscripts of Giovanni and Giuliano di Lorenzo il Magnifico is to distinguish which were made for which member of the family. In her view Medici devices and mottoes cannot yet be assigned with certainty, and perhaps it will never be possible to do so, since they were, to some extent, interchangeable. Despite the fact that Giovio and Borghini unequivocally associate the GLOVIS

cominciava a rivolgere in favor suo, fece fare un’anima senza corpo in uno scudo triangolare, cioè una parola di sei lettere, che diceva GLOVIS, e leggendola a lo rovescio, SI VOLG'; see the edition of the relevant portion of Giovio’s treatise in A. Zenatti, ‘Andrea Antico da Montona: nuovi appunti’, Archivio Storico per Trieste, l’Istria e il Trentino, 3 (1884), especially p. 260.


61 Ibid.

device exclusively with Giuliano, there are numerous examples of its use by Lorenzo il Magnifico and his son Giovanni, and, I believe, at least one instance of its use by Cardinal Giulio. The seeming anomaly of the appearance of what was putatively Giuliano’s device in conjunction with a cardinal’s hat may therefore be no anomaly at all, since it may well be that the device was as much Giulio’s as Lorenzo il Magnifico’s, Giovanni’s and Giuliano’s.

Among the principal practical sources, closer in date to Giovanni’s, Giuliano’s and Giulio’s own time, that bear on the question are the following:

GIOVANNI: (1) MS Ashburnham 1075 of the Biblioteca Medicea-Laurenziana, Florence, a beautifully written and illuminated parchment manuscript, replete with Medici devices, which contains an Officium mortuorum and the Septem psalmi penitenti; on fols. 51v–52r, it contains the inscription ‘Demandato S. D. N. D. Leonis Divina Provid. Papae. x. Genesius de la Barrera Hispanus Ortu Carmona Hispalen. Dioc Famulatus. S. Suae Prof:essor Scripsit. Rome Pontific. Prelibati D. N. Ann. viii.’ to which a second hand has added ‘1520’; because the manuscript thus dates from after Giuliano’s death (1516), the GLOVIS device

\[
\text{GLO}
\]

that appears on fol. 30v, arranged thus,

\[
\text{V}
\]

IS

presumably cannot refer to him; (2) Antico’s Liber quindicim missarum of 1516 which, on the first page of each mass, contains a representation of a lion holding a globe on which the device is inscribed; Catherine Weeks Chapman remarked on the use of the device in conjunction with the image of a lion, symbolic of Leo;\(^6\) (3) MS Landau Finaly 183 of the Biblioteca Nazionale Centrale, Florence, ‘Scritti e Canzoni in lode di Papa Leone x’ by Guglielmo de’ Nobili; that the GLOVIS motto occurs there (fol. 2v) in conjunction with Leo’s personal device, the
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yoke, again demonstrates, and more convincingly still, that the device was not exclusively Giuliano’s; (4) the Sala del Papa in the Church of S. Maria Novella in Florence, which was decorated by Ridolfo Ghirlandaio and Jacopo Pontormo on the occasion of Leo’s visit to Florence in 1515 and contains the device in a number of places;64 (5) Giuliano da San Gallo’s sketch (Florence, Galleria degli Uffizi, Gabinetto dei Disegni, UA 7949) for the renovation of the Medici palace in Rome (now the seat of the Italian Senate), which contains the following inscription on the reverse: ‘1513 adi p[rimo] djluglio / disegnj delpalazo delpapa lione j[n]navona djroma Palazo demedjci j[n]navona Di Giuliano da S. Gallo GLO / VI / S’; (6) Jacopo Pontormo’s lunette in the Salone in the Medici villa at Poggio a Caiano, whose execution was begun before Leo’s death and which contains the device; (7) finally, and perhaps most important, the floor of what is now called (after Vasari) the Stanza della Segnatura in the Vatican apartments, which contains the motto.65

GIULIANO: MS Palat. 206 of the Biblioteca Nazionale Centrale, Florence, which contains three sonnets whose texts are preceded by the motto; they are anonymous in MS Palat. 206 but in concordant sources are attributed to Giuliano: Non è viltà, né da viltà procede (fol. 152v) is also found in Biblioteca Medicea-


65 I am grateful to Sheryl Reiss for reminding me that Pontormo’s lunette at Poggio contains the device and for signalling its particular importance in this context. More so than in some of the other instances of its use cited thus far, in this case it may refer to the family more generally, rather than to Leo specifically. A plate of the lunette at Poggio may be found in Cox-Rearick (see note 52), colour plate 2. A representation of the floor of the Stanza della Segnatura may be found in J. Shearman, ‘The Vatican Stanze: Functions and Decoration’, Proceedings of the British Academy, 57 (1971), pp. 369–424 and plates xxvii–xxxi, especially plate xxxi. For still other ‘Leonine’ uses of GLOVIS, see the manuscript Vatican City, Biblioteca Apostolica Vaticana, Cappella Sistina, x, fol. lxxi (for this reference I am grateful to Sheryl Reiss) and X. B. de Montault, ‘Inventaire de la Chapelle papale’, Bulletin Monumental, 5th series, 45/7 (1879), p. 267: ‘Un messal grande, dove è una messa ad longum dei SS. Pietro e Paolo, coperto di broccato in filo rosso, con 4 scudi d’argento indorato, dove son rilievi et intagli, cioè quattro teste de leone con 4 diamanti con lettere Suave glovis con 4 fribbe d’argento indorate’.
Laurenziana, MS Pluteus xli.25, in a section of the manuscript (fols. 254r–273v) labelled ‘Del Magnifico Juliano suo [i.e. Lorenzo il Magnifico’s] figliuolo’, and in Bologna, Biblioteca dell’Università, MS 2618, fol. 83r, where it is ascribed to ‘Juliani Medices’; Perché hai Seraphin, morte, offeso tanto? (fol. 153v) also occurs in MS Palat. 210 of the Biblioteca Nazionale Centrale, the principal source of Giuliano’s poetry; and Se i vostr’ochi ove e mia son sempre involti (fol. 154r) is also found in Biblioteca Nazionale Centrale, MS II.1.60, fols. 42r–44r, under the rubric ‘Sonetti del S.r Mag.co Juliano Medici’, and in MS Pluteus xli.25 of the Laurenziana, in the section of the manuscript that contains Non è viltà, né da viltà procede.66

GIULIO: (1) MS Vat. Lat. 5803 of the Biblioteca Apostolica Vaticana, which is dedicated to Cardinal Giulio and contains the motto on fol. 1v; but since it also contains Leo’s devices, its evidence is not entirely unequivocal;67 (2) Oxford, Bodleian Library, MS Don. F. 408, a printed book (the Third Decade of Livy) with manuscript additions; the opening of each section is illuminated with miniatures and fol. 1r is extensively illuminated (see Figure 3): at the top centre is the GLOVIS device, arranged in the now familiar triangular shape, and at the bottom centre is the Medici shield surmounted by a cardinal’s hat; at the right centre is a laurel branch whose left side only shows new growth; the print’s colophon, ‘Florentiae per haeredes Philippi Iuntae Anno . . . M. D. xxii.’, serves to demonstrate that in this instance the GLOVIS device can refer neither to Giuliano, who died in 1516, nor to Leo, who died in 1521.

Can it refer to anyone other than Cardinal Giulio? The authors of a catalogue of manuscripts in the Bodleian Library, J. J. G. Alexander and Otto Pächt, describe the device as Cardinal Ippolito

66 See Giuliano de’ Medici, Poesie, ed. G. Fatini (Florence, 1939), pp. cvi n. 1, cviii, cxiv and cxvii.

67 I am grateful to Sheryl Reiss for bringing this example to my attention and sending me a photograph of the relevant folio. I am also grateful to her for informing me of another instance of the device’s use: P. M. Giles and F. Wormald, A Descriptive Catalogue of the Additional Illuminated Manuscripts in the Fitzwilliam Museum, 2 vols. (Cambridge, 1982), i, pp. 118–19, make reference to a manuscript, Marlay Cutting It 33 b, a vertical border from a liturgical manuscript (possibly a missal) executed for Clement vii, that contains a tablet at the top inscribed ‘CLEM. VII. PON. MA’, a yoke with the inscription ‘Suave’ and a tablet at the bottom with the inscription ‘GLO VI S’. The device is thus used in a Giulian context, but since it appears in conjunction with Leonine devices (the yoke and the motto ‘Suave’) it may be that in this instance it should be interpreted as generically Medicean rather than specifically Giulian.
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Figure 3  Oxford, Bodleian Library, MS Don F. 408, fol. 1'.
de' Medici’s,\(^{68}\) and, indeed, the book, though printed in 1522, might not have been illuminated until 1529, when Ippolito, who was Giuliano’s illegitimate son, was named cardinal. It is possible, however, that Alexander and Pächt may have identified the devices as Ippolito’s because they assumed that GLOVIS had been uniquely his father’s, and, indeed, inside the front cover of the Bodleian book is a loose sheet of paper with the note: ‘Illumination. (Livius, Liber Primus Florence, 1522). The first page and the initials magnificently decorated for Ippolito de’ Medici (afterwards cardinal). See the Medici arms and GLO symbols and the famous device VI which was adopted by S Giuliano de Medici, the father of Ippolito’.

The argument that the device is Cardinal Ippolito’s is not extravagant; the appearance of a motto traditionally associated with Giuliano in conjunction with a cardinal’s hat leads one inevitably to posit that such a combination suggests his son. There is, however, independent testimony concerning the book’s owner: on the verso of the second of the guard sheets that precede the book proper, faded almost to illegibility, is the inscription ‘Clement viii’ in the upper left-hand corner. While the devices on fol. 1\(^{r}\), therefore, may be Ippolito’s, the fact that the motto that plays so important a role in the illumination’s interpretation was not exclusively his father’s, coupled with the date of the print and the inscription on guard sheet [\(\nu^{r}\)], suggests that Cardinal Giulio is just as likely to have been the owner; the significance of the Bodleian print for an interpretation of CorBC95–6/ParisBNN 1817 is obvious: if the devices in the Bodleian book can have been Giulio’s, those in ParisBNN 1817 can have been as well. For these reasons, therefore, I disagree with Nino Pirrotta’s thesis that CorBC 95–6/ParisBNN 1817 may have been Ippolito’s.\(^{69}\) Pirrotta’s thesis, too, may have been based on the assumption that the GLOVIS device was orig-

---

\(^{68}\) O. Pächt and J. J. G. Alexander, *Illuminated Manuscripts in the Bodleian Library*, 3 vols. (Oxford, 1966–), n. p. 109. Iain Fenlon suggested that Boccardi may have illuminated the Bodleian print. The style of the illuminations is not dissimilar to that of CorBC 95–6/ParisBNN 1817, and given that Colin Slim attributed the illuminations in CorBC 95–6/ParisBNN 1817 to Boccardi (see note 52 above), Dr Fenlon’s suggested identification, arrived at independently, is plausible. I am grateful to him for making it.

originally Giuliano's; moreover, the survey of concordances makes clear that many of CorBC 95–6/ParisBNN 1817's most closely related sources date from Giulio's time as cardinal (or before), not from Ippolito's: FlorBN Magl. 164–7 (17 concordances, c. 1520),\textsuperscript{70} FlorBN ii.1.232 (16 concordances, c. 1516–21),\textsuperscript{71} BolC Q17 and the Medici manuscript VatG xiii.27 (10 concordances each, late fifteenth century),\textsuperscript{72} FlorC 2442 and RISM 1504\textsuperscript{3} (7 concordances each, FlorC 2442 from after 1507/8),\textsuperscript{73} FlorBN Magl. 107bis and FlorBN Magl. 178 (6 concordances each, FlorBN Magl. 107bis from before 1513, FlorBN Magl. 178 from 1492–4).\textsuperscript{74}

The fact that the device was used interchangeably is consistent with an interpretation of its significance. Cox-Rearick's book makes very clear that, in Medici art, themes of dynastic continuity, rebirth, regeneration and return were central.\textsuperscript{75} Concerned as the Medici were with the fragility of their regime, given the many challenges to its very survival, they favoured imagery that celebrated its continuity and evoked the past. And by 1520 the regime was seriously imperilled: Giuliano had died prematurely in 1516, Lorenzo in 1519; the surviving members of the family who were old enough to participate effectively in the governance of Florence (Pope Leo and Cardinal Giulio) were both clerics and, therefore, officially unable to father children (though Giulio was widely rumoured to have been the father of Alessandro de' Medici, later the first Duke of Florence). It is not surprising that the family's works of art are thus replete with images of laurel branches (which, depending on the particular historical circumstances of the moment, either do or do not show new growth) and of wheels (Fortune's wheel, whose turns served to change the conditions affecting the regime) and contain references to spring and the


\textsuperscript{71} Cummings, 'A Florentine Sacred Repertory' (see note 51), \textit{passim}.

\textsuperscript{72} Atlas (see note 47), \textit{passim} (on VatG xiii.27); and (on BolC Q17) C. Wright, 'Antoine Brumel and Patronage at Paris', \textit{Music in Medieval and Early Modern Europe}, ed. I. Fenlon (Cambridge, 1981), pp. 37–60, especially p. 52 n. 38.

\textsuperscript{73} On the date and provenance of FlorC 2442, see, most recently, L. Bernstein, 'Notes on the Origin of the Parisian Chanson', \textit{The Journal of Musicology}, 1 (1982), pp. 275–326, especially pp. 286–7, n. 28.

\textsuperscript{74} On FlorBN Magl. 107bis, Rifkin (see note 70), especially p. 312 n. 25; on FlorBN Magl. 178, Atlas (see note 47), i, p. 247.

\textsuperscript{75} Cox-Rearick (see note 52), \textit{passim}. 
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return of a golden age. In this context, Giovio’s explanation of the GLOVIS device (‘[Giuliano] had a motto invented, without an image . . . , that said GLOVIS, reading in reverse SI VOLG’; . . . in order to show that fortune, which had been against him for many years, was beginning to turn to his favour’) evokes a constellation of related themes.76

On fols. 60r, 62r and 64r of the superius, altus and tenor books appears another illumination that may be similarly interpreted (see Figure 4): enclosed within the initial letter ‘P’ of Isaac’s Prophetarum maxime is a white dog tied to a tree, which is encircled by a banner bearing the inscription ‘COST ANE’ (in the case of the superius and altus books) or ‘COST ANTE’ (in the case of the tenor book).

76 ‘fece fare un’anima senza corpo . . . , che diceva GLOVIS, e leggendola a lo rovescio, SI VOLG; . . . per mostrare che la Fortuna, la quale gli era stata contraria per tanti anni, si cominciava a rivolgere in favor suo’. On the changes in the status of the regime around 1520, see J. R. Hale, Florence and the Medici: The Pattern of Control (London, 1977), pp. 95–108. On Fortune’s wheel as a Medicean (and specifically Giulian) device, see also R. Eisler, ‘The Frontispiece to Sigismondo Fanti’s Triompho di Fortuna’, Journal of the Warburg and Courtauld Institutes, 10 (1947), pp. 155–9, especially pp. 156–7 and plate 41b. For this reference, I am grateful to Iain Fenlon.
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‘COSTANTE’ has been interpreted as an Italian translation of Lorenzo il Magnifico’s motto ‘SEMPER’, but I believe it has a different meaning. The fact that the illumination ornaments Isaac’s piece is telling, since *Prophetarum maxime* is a piece for the feast of San Giovanni, the patron saint of Florence. Isaac’s piece combines a text from the liturgy for the day with an apparently freely composed, non-liturgical text, and no text in the manuscript refers more evocatively to Florence than Isaac’s.

The dog may also have been one of the family’s symbols. Alessandro Segni’s 1685 treatise on Medici emblems exists in at least three drafts; the earliest (MS 1185f of the Biblioteca Riccardiana, fol. 3r) states that one of the devices of Averardo detto Bicci, Cosimo il Vecchio’s grandfather, combined the family shield and the image of a dog. MS Ashb. 660 of the Biblioteca Laurenziana, which contains another draft of Segni’s treatise, similarly describes Averardo’s device. Averardo’s commemorative medallion of c. 1720 bears no device but does bear the motto ‘FIDE CONSTANTI’. We thus have explicit testimony that both elements of the illumination, the dog and the motto, may have been included in Averardo’s impressa. Having questioned the validity of evidence that dates from the eighteenth century in the case of the GLOVIS device, however, I can hardly argue that the testimony of a seventeenth-century treatise and an eighteenth-century medallion is necessarily more valid in this instance, tempting though it may be to do so: given the Medici family’s concern for the continuity of their regime in the early sixteenth century, they could not have substantiated claims about their family’s importance to the history of Florence more effectively than by invoking the memory of their fourteenth-century ancestor, Averardo detto Bicci, and by illuminating the initial of a piece in honour of Florence’s patron saint with Averardo’s devices.

It is not necessary to rely on seventeenth- and eighteenth-century evidence to offer an interpretation of the illumination, however. The image of a dog has, since classical times, served as a symbol of

---

77 Gröber (see note 48), p. 372.
79 On MS 660, see Cox-Rearrick (note 52), p. 108. On Selvi’s medallion, see Ames-Lewis (note 60), especially p. 126, and Hill (note 57), p. 284.
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fidelity, and in the case of MS CorBC 95–6/ParisBNN 1817 the addition of the motto 'COSTANTE' clarifies the meaning of the reference, whether or not it was intended to allude specifically to Averardo de' Medici: the Medici had served their native city faithfully.

Based on the foregoing, therefore, I offer the following observations about MS CorBC 95–6/ParisBNN 1817: (1) that it was copied, not for Giuliano, but for Cardinal Giulio; (2) that its illuminations evoke traditional Medici themes that reflect the family's concerns about the survival of their regime; (3) that, further, the manuscript may date from the time (1519–23) when Giulio was de facto head of the Florentine government, and that the GLOVIS device and the leafless branches of the laurel tree (Lorenzo II's personal emblem, which he had assumed in order to make reference to his grandfather II Magnifico and which afforded allusion to his own name) signify the regime's continuity, notwithstanding Lorenzo II's death: the leafless laurel, in my interpretation, would represent the dead Lorenzo, and the GLOVIS device would signify the turn of Fortune's wheel that resulted in the regency of Giulio, represented by the cardinal's hat; the fact that Pontormo's lunette at Poggio a Caiano was executed at about the same time and contains the GLOVIS device is suggestive, given that it, too, has been interpreted as reflecting concern about the regime's continuity: it depicts the god Vertumnus, whose aid is invoked in Ariosto's poem of 1519, Ne la stagion, written at the time of Lorenzo II's final illness; and, finally, (4) that the imagery of the Bodleian book, similar as it is to that of CorBC 95–6/ParisBNN 1817, is further testimony that themes of renewal were current around 1520 in works of art associated specifically with Cardinal Giulio.

Finally, I would like to discuss Liliana Pannella's thesis that CorBC 95–6/ParisBNN 1817 was written in stages, that the section that contains Palle, palle dates from before 1513 and that the car-

---

80 J. Gelli, Divise motivi impressi di famiglie e personaggi italiani (Milan, 1916), pp. 238, 450. On the dog as a Medici device, see also Cox-Rearick (note 52), pp. 108 and 142. On the ascription of the attribute of constancy to Leo X in an ephemeral work of art executed on the occasion of his visit to Florence in 1515, see Shearman (note 64), esp. pp. 141 and 145; in my view, however, the use of the inscription 'COSTANTE' in the Cortona–Paris manuscript is likelier to sustain the more general interpretation offered here than a specific interpretation.
dinal’s hat thus refers to Cardinal Giovanni before his election to the papacy.\textsuperscript{81} Pannella’s thesis is based in part on an assessment of the character of the manuscript’s repertory. In her view, it is unlikely that the two Isaac laments for Lorenzo il Magnifico would have been copied into a manuscript dating from after 1514; moreover, she cited a change in handwriting after no. 42, the Isaac elegy \textit{Quis dabit capiti meo aquam}, as evidence that the manuscript was written in stages, and that the two Isaac laments and the GLOVIS device appear in an earlier section. As is suggested by the material presented above, however, the appearance of the Isaac pieces in a manuscript of the second decade of the sixteenth century or later is not necessarily an anachronism, concerned as the Medici were with the theme of the return of a golden age. Cox-Rearick has remarked on the retrospective, neo-Laurentian character of restoration art,\textsuperscript{82} on its highly selfconscious evocation of an idealised past, and in the context of the political sentiment of the time, the copying of the Isaac pieces does not need to be justified. Moreover, the change in handwriting that Pannella cites is to be explained differently, in my view. The changes in text hand correspond to changes in the \textit{language} of the text. They signal, not disparate stages in the manuscript’s history, therefore, but different scribes’ varying levels of conversance with the languages of the texts they were responsible for entering. The text hands are difficult enough to distinguish, and even now, having spent many hours examining the manuscript, I am not convinced that I have completely succeeded in doing so. However, as evidence for my assertion, I would point out that, when the language of the text changes, there are often textless or partially texted pieces, as if the scribe responsible for the previous section was insufficiently conversant with the language of the texts in the new section of the manuscript to enter them. For example, nos. 19 and 20 are on Italian texts, nos. 21–7 on French texts; in manuscripts 95 and 96, no. 21 is untexted beyond the incipit. Similarly, after the three Latin works nos. 29–31, nos. 32–4, which are on French texts, are untexted beyond the incipits in MS 95. The change in handwriting after no. 42 that Pannella noted, therefore, may be explainable by

\textsuperscript{81} L. Pannella, ‘Le composizioni profane di una raccolta fiorentina del cinquecento’, \textit{Rivista Italiana di Musicologia}, 3 (1968), pp. 3–47, especially pp. 6–7 n. 3.

\textsuperscript{82} Cox-Rearick (see note 52), pp. 220–3, for example.
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virtue of the fact that there is a change in language: no. 42 is on a Latin text, no. 43 on a French text. Moreover, there is at least one instance of the occurrence of the text hand in the putatively 'later' section of the manuscript in the 'earlier' section: the hand of nos. 44–53 contributed to no. 34. The hands alternate throughout the manuscript, therefore, and, in my view, one cannot conclude from them that the section that contains the illumination dates from earlier than 1514.

How did the superius and altus books come to be housed in Cortona? Giulio’s principal representative in Florence during the time he spent in Rome in the years between 1519 and 1523 and after his election to the papacy was Silvio Passerini, Cardinal of Cortona, who had been one of his family’s most loyal agents. In 1527, after the Sack of Rome, Passerini and Alessandro and Ippolito de’ Medici, the two principal members of the family then in Florence, were exiled from the city, and it may be that the manuscript was taken to Cortona at that time. As for the presence of the tenor book in Paris, I can offer no explanation at this time; might we seek one in the many associations between the Medici and the French royal family?

THE REPERTORIES OF CORBC 95–6/PARISBNN 1817 AND VATP 1980–1 AND IMPLICATIONS FOR DATING

If manuscripts CorBC 95–6/ParisBNN 1817 and VatP 1980–1 were indeed prepared for the same patron, it might be argued that their repertories are anomalous in that they are so different. They have a single piece in common, Mouton’s Gaude Barbara beata, and Stanley Boorman has suggested that the readings that the two manuscripts contain differ to the extent that we cannot posit a common model.83 Further, CorBC 95–6/ParisBNN 1817 is rich in works by composers with Florentine associations (Agricola, 1 work, and Isaac, 9 works)84 or whose works are transmitted largely in Florentine sources (Ninot, 4 works); VatP 1980–1’s repertory, on the

84 For biographical information, see the relevant entries in The New Grove Dictionary (note 44).
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counter, comprises works ascribed to composers known to have been active in Leonine Rome or at the French Royal Chapel, whose musical traditions Leo x favoured: Brumel, De Silva, Févin, Lhéritier, Moulu, Mouton, Richafort and Willaert;85 (the nature of the contents of CorBC 95–6/ParisBNN 1817 would be misrepresented, however, if one failed to take note of the fact that it, too, contains works by Mouton, as well as the two surviving motets by Michele Pesenti; Pesenti was in Leo’s service in 1520 and 1521,86 and the presence of his music in CorBC 95–6/ParisBNN 1817 may be further evidence for a dating in the years between 1519 and 1523, since it may be his relationship to a Medici patron that accounts for the inclusion of his music in a Medici manuscript). Finally, the contexts formed by each manuscript’s concordant sources are entirely different: as we have seen, CorBC 95–6/ParisBNN 1817 shares its repertory most extensively with Florentine manuscripts from the late fifteenth and early sixteenth centuries; VatP 1980–1, on the other hand, shares its repertory most extensively with the two Medici manuscripts FlorL 666 and VatP 1982, with the north Italian manuscript BolC Q19, and with the manuscripts SGallS 463 and 464.

The repertories may reflect different phases of Cardinal Giulio’s career. The ‘Roman’ phase (1513–19) is reflected in the repertory of VatP 1980–1, the ‘Florentine’ phase (1519–23) in the repertory of CorBC 95–6/ParisBNN 1817. One should bear sharply in mind, however, that political and diplomatic connections between centres of patronage were never closer in early modern Italy than they were between Florence and Rome between 1513 and 1534. There is archival evidence of exchanges of music between the two cities87 and there were ample opportunities for other such exchanges that are not attested by documentary references. Moreover, the various phases of Giulio’s career cannot be distinguished so neatly, as a review of his biography makes clear. Nonetheless, the two repertories are interesting in their differences. Giovanna Lazzi of

85 Ibid., and Sherr’s study cited in note 40. On Lhéritier among the members of Leo’s famiglia, see note 34, above.

86 Frey, ‘Regesten’ (see note 6), 9, pp. 140 and n. 94, 141 and 142 n. 7.

the Sala di Manoscritti of the Biblioteca Nazionale Centrale in Florence suggested that the elaborate character of CorBC 95–6/ParisBNN 1817 may signify that a particular event prompted its copying, and it may be that its compiler consciously sought to assemble a repertory with so essentially Florentine a character, perhaps to celebrate Giulio’s arrival in Florence and the beginning of his ‘regency’; indeed, Giulio himself may have preferred a repertory that was different from that contained in others of his music books. On the other hand, it may be that one can exaggerate the extent to which works in the Roman repertory were available to Florentine scribes, even during the time of the Medici papacies; perhaps the simplest hypothesis of all is that the compiler exercised aesthetic preference, that he may have chosen not to include works by Roman composers even if they were available to him.

THE MUSIC-HISTORICAL IMPORTANCE OF CORBC 95–6/PARISBNN 1817: SOME OBSERVATIONS

If CorBC 95–6/ParisBNN 1817 was indeed Giulio’s, it may be one of the more important documents we have for the evolution of the Italian madrigal. Pirrotta advanced a thesis concerning the historical context in which the new genre evolved:

Although only a little light can be cast on the initial stage and the course of development of the new genre, it may be taken as certain that most contributions to it originated in the cities of Florence and Rome, which were in close alliance under the Medici popes. . . . The transition to the madrigal-type . . . was probably effected in the entourage of Cardinal Giulio de’ Medici during his stay in Florence (1519–23) and in the early years of his pontificate as Clement vii.88

Walter Rubsamens and James Haar advanced theses concerning the stylistic antecedents of the madrigal. Rubsamens89 cited such genres as (1) the so-called ‘new’ chanson, exemplified by works like Ninot’s
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*Et levez vous hau, Guillemette* and Compère’s *Alons fere nos barbes*, in which ‘the music is textually bound and singable throughout the parts’, ‘sections of isometric (frottolistic?)’ homophony alternate with those in imitative polyphony, and portions in ternary meter enliven the basically duple rhythmic pattern’, and ‘[t]hemes are light and folklike, often in repeated notes of equal value’; (2) polyphonically elaborated Italian popular melodies like Isaac’s quodlibet *Donna di dentro* and Compère’s *Che fa la ramancina* in which the popular melodies are used ‘in an entirely vocal context, thus laying the groundwork both for the future villotta and the equivalence of textually conceived voice parts in the madrigal’; and (3) the works of Michele Pesenti, whom Rubsamen described as ‘[o]ne of the first Italian composers of the Cinquecento to write . . . works in textually conceived, imitative polyphony’ and who ‘participated . . . in the serious literary trend leading to the madrigal by setting to music two odes of Horace’. Haar suggested, following an idea of . . . Rubsamen’s, that [the madrigal’s] roots are in the French chanson – not that of Claudin or Janequin but an earlier one, represented by the simpler pieces, sometimes dubbed ‘modern’ in style, in Petrucci’s *Odhecaton, Canti B*, and *Canti C*. In other words this style of syllabically declaimed, completely vocal chordal polyphony with a gently imitative coloration is an Italian adaptation, as the so-called ‘Parisian’ chanson was a French adaptation, of an earlier prototype.90

CorBC 95–6/ParisBNN 1817 serves to connect the theses as to the context in which the madrigal evolved and its stylistic antecedents, since (in my view) it was prepared for Cardinal Giulio and a substantial proportion of the works it contains may be classified in the categories established by Rubsamen and Haar (its repertory

---

90 J. Haar, ‘The Early Madrigal’, *Music in Medieval and Early Modern Europe*, ed. I. Fenlon (Cambridge, 1981), pp. 163–92, especially pp. 189–90. Iain Fenlon has argued similarly: he observed (‘Context and Chronology of the Early Florentine Madrigal’, *La letteratura, la rappresentazione, la musica al tempo e nei luoghi di Giorgione*, ed. M. Muraro [Rome, 1987], pp. 281–93, especially p. 284) that the French chanson was disseminated in Italy between 1460 and 1525 in four distinct manuscript traditions, the last of which was specifically Florentine and consists of sources written during the second and third decades of the sixteenth century: FlorBC 2442, FlorBN Magl. 107bis, FlorBN Magl. 117, FlorBN Magl. 121, FlorBN Magl. 164–7. This complex of sources forms CorBC 95–6/ParisBNN 1817’s immediate context, and, as Fenlon remarked further, the French chanson was one of the elements in the Florentine musical culture in which the madrigal emerged.

In their recent book (see note 45), Fenlon and Haar have challenged Pirrotta’s thesis about the importance of Medici patronage to the emergence of the madrigal. I myself am not prepared to abandon Pirrotta’s thesis; indeed, for reasons that I hope to detail elsewhere, I believe it continues to be valid.
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may thus be described as a kind of conspectus of madrigalian precursors). It contains the four works by Compère, Isaac and Ninot cited above and the anonymous quodlibet *Fortuna desperata/Vidi la foro setta/Vo m’avete svergogne*; the two quodlibets document an interest in polyphonic settings of Italian texts and belong, in Pirrotta’s words, ‘on a sensibly higher cultural level, since the task of combining simultaneously various already extant tunes required considerable skill in counterpoint’. It also contains the two surviving motets by Pesenti, one of which Rubsamen rightly described as ‘every bit as polyphonic and vocally conceived throughout the parts as are ... [Che farala che dirala and So ben che le non sa, two of Pesenti’s frottole]’. Indeed, Pesenti’s role in the evolution of the madrigal has not yet been adequately assessed, but it must, in my view, have been an important one. He was, as Pirrotta remarked, an ‘elegant ... contrapuntist’, and he seems to have been the originator of the contrapuntal villotta in which all lines make use of popular melodic material, as Pirrotta also argued. The contrapuntal villotta bears a relationship to the contemporary French chanson, in that such works as the anonymous *Tambur tambur*, Josquin’s *Entre je suis*, Févin’s *Pardonnez moy* and Mouton’s *Veley velela*, all of which are contained in *CorBC 95–6/ParisBNN 1817*, are polyphonic arrangements of pre-existent popular melodies.

Haar wrote that ‘[s]ome of the pieces cited by Rubsamen, ... appear in the Florentine chanson manuscript Basevi 2442 and in the mixed source Magl. xix. 164–7; thus although the music was no longer new in the 1520s it was in currency in Florence at just the time Verdelot started his career there’. Such pieces may have been even more readily available to Verdelot than Haar suggested; as Giulio’s associate in 1521, Verdelot would presumably have had access to such works as those in the repertory of Giulio’s music.

---

92 See Chanson and Madrigal (note 89), p. 87.
93 See N. Pirrotta, ‘Novelty and Renewal in Italy: 1300–1600’, Studien zur Tradition der Musik: Kurt von Fischer zum 60. Geburtstag (Munich, 1973), pp. 49–65, especially pp. 59–60 and n. 19: ‘Composers ... used popular tunes ... as material for contrapuntal elaboration in the special type [of frottola] called villotta (somewhat parallel to some French chansons). ... Villotta and French chansons are often associated in prints and manuscripts of the period preceding the ascent of the madrigal; they probably met the demand for polyphonic pieces to be sung a libro by dilettanti, a habit which may have contributed to the all-vocal development of the madrigal.’ On the chanson *Tambur tambur*, see B. J. Blackburn, ‘Two Carnival Songs Unmasked: A Commentary on MS Florence Magl. xix. 121’, Musica Disciplina, 35 (1981), pp. 121–78, especially pp. 135–6.
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book, CorBC 95–6/Paris BNN 1817, a repertory that constitutes such crucial testimony to the Medici family’s tastes in secular music during the years that witnessed the evolution of the Italian madrigal.
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APPENDIX

Inventories of MSS CorBC 95–6/ParisBNN 1817 and VatP 1980–1

Note: Sigla for concordant manuscripts are those used in the Census-Catalogue of Manuscript Sources of Polyphonic Music 1400–1550, 5 vols., Renaissance Manuscript Studies 1 (Neuhausen-Stuttgart, 1979–88). Sigla for concordant prints are those used by the Répertoire International des Sources Musicales [RISM]; bibliographic information concerning anthologies is given in RISM B/iv/1, Recueils imprimés, xviie–xviiie siècles, ed. F. Lesure (Munich and Duisburg, 1960); bibliographic information concerning prints devoted to individual composers [Josquin: 1502 J 666, 1514 J 667, 1514 J 673, 1516 J 668, 1516 J 674, 1526 J 669, 1526 J 675, 1549 J 681, 1555 J 678, and (1559) J 676; Mouton: 1555 M 4017; and Willaert: 1539 W 1108 and 1545 reprint of 1539 W 1106] is given in the relevant volumes of RISM A/1, Einzeldrucke vor 1800 (Kassel, 1971–86). The siglum 1560 Bibliographie des éditions d’Adrian Le Roy . . . , no. 68, refers to the print catalogued on pp. 91–4 of F. Lesure and G. Thibault, Bibliographie des éditions d’Adrian Le Roy et Robert Ballard (Paris, 1955); the print is not listed in RISM B/iv/1.

MS CorBC 95–6/ParisBNN 1817

The text incipit and foliation are given as they appear in the superius partbook. For each concordant source, inclusive foliation and composer ascription are provided, where known.

[1] fols. 1r–2r, [anonymous], Ie nay dueil que de vous ne viegne
   BolC Q17, fols. 69v–71r, A Agricola
   BrusBR 228, fols. 20r–22v, anonymous
   FlorBN Magl. 178, fols. 0r–2r, Alexander
   FlorBN BR 229, fols. 183v–185r, Alexander agricola
   FlorR 2794, fols. 28v–30r, Agricola
   LonBLR 20 A.xvi, fols. 24r–26v, anonymous
   RegB C120, pp. 308–11, Agricola
   RomeC 2856, fols. 162r–164r, Agricola
   SegC s. s., fols. cxivr–cxivr, Alexander agricola
   VatG xvi.27, fols. 38r–40r, Agricola
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VerBC 757, fols. 34v–36r, anonymous
1501, fols. 42v–44r, Agricola

[2] fols. 2r–2v, [anonymous], Base moy
BrusBR iv.90/TourBV 94, fols. 22v–23v, anonymous
1502s, fol. 38r, Josquin
1520s, fols. 17v–18v, anonymous
[c. 1535]14, no. 33, anonymous

[3] fols. 2v–3v, [anonymous], Une playsant figlette
FlorBN Magl. 164–7, no. 69, anonymous
FlorC 2442, fols. 56v–58r, Loyset Compere
1504s, fols. 9v–10r

[4] fols. 3v–4v, [anonymous], Youli mariner passe moy sena
FlorBN Magl. 164–7, no. 49, anonymous

[5] fols. 4v–5v, [anonymous], Veci la danse barbari

[6] fols. 5v–6v, [anonymous], Lordault lordault
BasU F.x.1–4, no 119, Josquin
BolC Q17, fols. 60v–61r, Nino petit
ParisBNF 1597, fols. 56v–57v, anonymous
RegB C120, pp. 266–7, Compere
1502s, fols. 8v–9r, Compere

[7] fols. 6v–7v, [anonymous], Vostre bargeronette
BolC 17, fols. 65v–66r, Loyset Compere
FlorBN Magl. 178, fols. 73v–74r, Loyset Compere
VatG xiii.27, fols. 41v–42v, anonymous
1501, fols. 46v–47v, Compere

[8] fols. 7v–8v, [anonymous], Et leve vo[us] o guigliermette
FlorC 2442, fols. 12v–13v, Ninot le petit
1504s, fols. 81v–83r, anonymous

[9] fols. 8v–9v, [anonymous], Ie suis amie du forrier or alez
FlorBN Magl. 107bis, fols. 12v–13v, anonymous
FlorBN Magl. 164–7, no. 64, anonymous
VatG xiii.27, fols. 104v–105r, Loyset Compere
1502s, fols. 14v–15r, anonymous
[c. 1535]14, no. 21, anonymous

[10] fols. 9v–9v, [anonymous], Gentil galans de france
FlorBN Magl. 164–7, no. 63, anonymous
1504s, fols. 14v–15r, anonymous

101
Anthony M. Cummings

CopKB 1848, pp. 2 and 15, anonymous
FlorBN Magl. 107bis, fols. 16r–17r, anonymous
FlorBN Magl. 164–7, no. 65, anonymous
SGallS 463, no. 178, Compere
1501, fols. 28r–29r, Compere

[12] fols. 11r–11v, [anonymous], Tambien mison pe[n]sada mari semi
bate
BoIC Q17, fols. 73v–74r, anonymous
FlorBN Magl. 107bis, fols. 8r–9r, anonymous
FlorR 2356, fol. 14v, anonymous
ParisBNF 1597, fols. LIV–LVr, anonymous
RomeC 2856, fols. 145v–146r, anonymous

[13] fols. 11v–12v, [anonymous], Tambur ta[m]bur tambor

[14] fols. 12v–13v, [anonymous], Voles oir une chanson
FlorBN Magl. 164–7, no. 66, anonymous
VatG xiii.27, fols. 90v–91r, Loyset Compere [text is a contrafactum,
‘De les mon getes’]

[15] fols. 13v–14r, [anonymous], Si ie vo [sic: altus reads ‘fet’] un chop
apres,
BoIC Q17, fol. 78v, anonymous [text is a contrafactum, ‘Tan bien’]
1501, fols. 36v–37r, Japart [text is a contrafactum, ‘Tan bien’]

[16] fols. 14r–15r, [anonymous], Si ie vo[us] avoye pointe

[17] fols. 15r–16r, [anonymous], Ciascun me crie marietoy marie
15043, fols. 34v–36v, anonymous

[18] fols. 16v–17v, [anonymous], Fille vo[us] aves mal garde le pan
davant
BoIC Q17, fols. 64v–65v, Ysac
BoIC Q18, fols. 58v–59v, anonymous
CopKB 1848, pp. 400, 405, 424–5, anonymous
FlorBN Magl. 121, fols. 31r–33r, anonymous
FlorBN Magl. 178, fols. 70v–72r, Enriquis Ysac
FlorC 2442, fols. 78v–79v, yzac
SGallS 463, no. 137, anonymous [text is a contrafactum, ‘Ave
sanctissima Maria’]
VatG xiii.27, fols. 62v–64r, Ysach
VienNB Mus. 18810, no. 50, Henricus Ysaac

[19] fols. 17v–18r, [anonymous], Fortuna disperata/Vidi la forosetta
[altus]/Vo m’avete svergogne [tenor]
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FlorBN BR 337, fols. 33r–34r, anonymous
FlorBN Magl. 164–7, no. 39, anonymous

[20] fols. 18r–19r, [anonymous], Donna di dentro dalla tua chasa/Da[m]ene un poco [altus]/Fortuna d’un gran tempo [tenor]
FlorBN BR 229, fols. 154r–156r, Henricus Yzac

[21] fols. 19v–20r, [anonymous], Entre ye suis en gra[n] pensar
AugS 142a, fols. 42r–43r, anonymous
BasU F.x.1–4, no. 51, Josquin
BrusBR 228, fols. 28r–29r, anonymous
FlorBN Magl. 164–7, no. 46, anonymous
FlorC 2439, fols. 24v–25r, Josquin
MunU 328–31, fols. 22r, 58v, 3v, 13v, anonymous
VienNB Mus. 18810, fols. 4v, 4r, 2v, 3r,Josquin de pres
153511, no. 37, Josquin [text is a contrafactum, ‘In meinem sinn’]
[c. 1535]13, no. 87

[22] fols. 20r–21r, [anonymous], Forsellement

[23] fols. 21r–21v, [anonymous], Il estoit ung bon home
FlorBN Magl. 164–7, no. 68, anonymous
ParisBNF 1597, fols. 60r–61r, anonymous

[24] fols. 22r–22v, [anonymous], Amor demoi

[25] fols. 22r–23r, [anonymous], T[ ]
FlorBN Magl. 164–7, no. 47, anonymous
Ulms 237, fols. 22v–22r, anonymous

[26] fols. 23r–24r, [anonymous], Maire de die

[27] fols. 24r–24v, [anonymous], Laultre ior ie cievalcioie
FlorBN Magl. 164–7, no. 35, anonymous
15055, fol. 47r

[28] fol. 25r, [anonymous], Che fa laramanzina
BolC Q17, fols. 62r–63r, Compere
FlorBN Magl. 164–7, no. 35, anonymous
15055, fol. 47r

[29] fols. 25r–26r, [anonymous], Substinuimus pacem
FlorBN Magl. 164–7, no. 35, anonymous
SGallS 461, pp. 46–7, h. ysacc
VatV 11953, fols. 5r–6r, H. Yzac
WittenL 1048
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FlorBN II.t.232, fols. 117v–118l, Iosquin [index]
FlorBN Magl. 164–7, no. 81, anonymous
VerBC 758, fols. 44v–46v, anonymous
1504\(^1\), fol. 15r [superius partbook], anonymous

[31] fols. 27v–29r, [anonymous], Alma rede[m]ptoris mater/Ave regina celorum [altus]
FlorBN II.t.232, fols. 109v–111l, IOSQVIN
FlorBN Magl. 164–7, no. 76, anonymous
MiLD 3, fols. 178v–180r, Jusquin [altus]
UlmS 237, fols. 6r–7r [superius partbook], anonymous
VatS 15, fols. 188v–190r, anonymous
1505\(^2\), fol. 2v [superius partbook], Josquin [superius partbook]

[32] fols. 29v–30r, [anonymous], Elogeron n[o]us seans
BoIC Q17, fols. 61v–62r, Yzac
FlorBN BR 229, fols. 1r–2r, Henricus Yzac
FlorBN Magl. 107bis, fols. 13v–14r, anonymous
FlorBN Magl. 178, fols. 41v–42r, Yzac
SGallS 463, no. 179, anonymous
VatG xiii.27, fols. 32v–33r, Ysach
1501, fols. 45v–46r, anonymous

[33] fols. 30v–30r, [anonymous], Une [musque de Biscaye]
BoIC Q17, fols. 75v–76r, Josquin
BoIC Q18, fols. 74v–75r, anonymous
FlorBN BR 229, fols. 149v–150r, Josquin
FlorBN Magl. 178, fols. 16v–17r, Josquin
RomeC 2856, fol. 85v, Josquin de pres
SevC 5-1-43/ParisBNN 4379, fols. 113v–114r, anonymous
VatG xiii.27, fols. 27r–28r, Josquin
1504\(^3\), fol. 129r, Josquin

[34] fols. 30v–31r, [anonymous], Vray dieu q[ue] pene messe
BoIC Q17, fols. 71v–72r, anonymous
FlorBN Magl. 178, fols. 38v–39r, anonymous
FlorC 2442, fols. 85v–86r, Gaspart
VatG xiii.27, fols. 87v–88r, anonymous [text is a contrafactum, ‘Quam diu che pen messe’]
1504\(^3\), fol. 130r, Compere

[35] fols. 31v–34r, [anonymous], Si oblitus fuero
CambraiBM 125–8, fols. 37v–38r [superius partbook], anonymous
DresSL 1/D/505, pp. 458–61, JA. Obrecht
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FlorBN 11.I.232, fols. 70v–74r, Ninot [index]
MunBS 3154, fols. 357v–358r, anonymous
SienBC K.1.2, fols. 192v–196r, anonymous
VatS 42, fols. 150v–154r, Jo. le petit
15041, fols. 11v–12r [superius partbook], anonymous

[36] fols. 35v–37v, [anonymous], In illo tempore
FlorBN 11.I.232, fols. 67v–70r, Ninot [index]
VatS 42, fols. 74v–78r, Jo. le petit

[37] fols. 38v–39r, [anonymous], Palle, palle
BasU F.x.21 [text is a contrafactum, ‘La bella’]
FlorBN Magl. 107bis, fol. 43v, anonymous
FlorBN Magl. 117, fols. 82v–83r, yzac
KönSU 1740 [text is a contrafactum, ‘Alleluia, Hodie Christus natus est’]
Kraków, Klasztor OO. Dominikanów [piece bears the designation ‘Capellae Leonis Papae’]
LonBLE 3051/WashLC M6, fols. 1xxi2–1xxxii3r, anonymous
VatG XIII.27, fols. 0v–2r, H. Isach

[38] fols. 39v–42v, [anonymous], Liber generationis
DresSL i/D/505, pp. 416–21, anonymous
FlorBN 11.I.232, fols. 51v–57r, IOSQVIN
FlorBN Magl. 107bis, fols. 24v–30r, anonymous
LonRC 1070, pp. 192–203, anonymous
MunBS 10, fols. 127v–145r, Josquin de Press
ToleF 23, fols. ivv–7r, Josquin despres
UppsU 76c, fols. 64v–67r, Josquin des Pres
VatS 42, fols. 41v–47r, anonymous
15041, fols. 3v–3r [superius partbook], Josquin
15381, no. 37, Josquin [tenor partbook index]
15471, pp. 376–87, Iodoco
1555 J 678, fol. 3v
15592, no. 8, IOSQVIN DE PRES

[39] fols. 42v–44v, [anonymous], Tulerunt dominum
MunU 322–5, fols. 9v–10v, Josquinus Auctor
SGallS 463, no. 111, Josquinus Pratensis
15031, fols. 30v–33r, anonymous
15192, no. 9, Pre Michael de Ver[ona]
15261 = reprint of 15192
1527 = reprint of 15192, 15263
15471, pp. 314–19, Isaac
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FlorBN n.1.232, fols. 31r–35r, YZACH
FlorBN Magl. 164–7, no. 71, anonymous
PadBC A17, fols. 98r–101r, anonymous
VatV 11953, fols. 1r–4r, hen yzack
15204, fols. 219r–227r, h. yzac [superius partbook]

[50] fols. 63r–65r, [anonymous], Misericordias domini
FlorBN n.1.232, fols. 166r–170r, Iosquin [index]
15193, no. 8, Iosquin [superius partbook]
15264 = reprint of 15193
15371, no. 54, Iosquin [tenor partbook index]
15592, no. 6, IOSQVIN DE PRES

[51] fols. 66r–68r, [anonymous], Quis dabit oculis
FlorBN n.1.232, fols. 185r–187r, Io m[ou]ton [index]
RegB C120, pp. 126–31, anonymous
VatC 234, fols. 136r–139r, anonymous
15192, no. 8, Jo. mouton [superius partbook]
15263 = reprint of 15192
1527 = reprint of 15192, 15263
1555 M 4017, fols. 4r–5r [superius partbook]
15593, no. 12

[52] fols. 68r–69r, [anonymous], Factum est silentium
FlorBN n.1.232, fols. 48r–51r, IO. MOVTON
ModD 9, fols. 50r–53r, Jo. mouton
PadBC A17, fols. 129r–131r, anonymous
VatS 46, fols. 100r–103r, anonymous
VienNB Mus. 15941, fols. 59r–61r [altus partbook], mouton [tenor partbook index]
15191, no. 18, Io. mouton [superius partbook index]
15213, fols. 7r–8r [superius partbook], Io. Mouton [superius partbook index]
15262 = reprint of 15191

[53] fols. 70r–72r, [anonymous], Gaude barbara beata
CambraiBM 125–8, fols. 1r–2r [superius partbook], anonymous
CivMA 59, fols. 60r–62r, anonymous
FlorBN n.1.232, fols. 163r–166r, Io: Mouto [index]
LonRC 1070, pp. 144–5, anonymous
MadM 6832, pp. 6–9, Joannes Monton
VatP 1980–1, fols. 65r–66r [tenor partbook], anonymous
15144 fols. 2r–2e [superius partbook], Io. mouton [superius partbook index]
15261 = reprint of 15144
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[54] fols. 73r–v, [anonymous], Missus est gabriel angelus
AugsS 142a, fols. 36v–38r, Josquin[us]
BoIC R142, fols. 9r–9v, Josquin[us]
BrusBR 9126, fols. 177r–178r, Josquin
FlorBN II.i.232, fols. 94v–95r, IOSQVIN
FlorBN Magl. 164–7, no. 79, anonymous
LonBLR 8.G. vii, fols. 23v–25r, anonymous
ToleBC 10, fols. 31v–34r, Jusquin
UlmS 237, fols. 12r–12v [superius partbook], anonymous
UppsU 76c, fols. 67v–68r, Josquin des Pres
VatS 63, fols. 47v–48r, anonymous
1504¹, fol. 7v [superius partbook], Josquinini [superius partbook index]

[55] fols. 73r–74v, [anonymous], [M]anus tue fecerunt me & plasmaverunt
CasAC D(F), fols. 41v–42r, anonymous
VerBC 760, fols. 48v–49r, Al Danglon
[1521]⁶, fols. ixr–xv, Dom Michel

Concordant sources

AugsS 142a: 21, 54
BasU F.x.1–4: 6, 21
BasU F.x.21: 37
BoIC Q17: 1, 6, 7, 12, 15, 18, 28, 32, 33, 34
BoIC Q18: 18, 33
BoIC Q19: 48
BoIC Q20: 40
BoIC R142: 48, 54
BrusBR 228: 1, 21
BrusBR 9126: 54
BrusBR iv.90/TourBV 94: 2
CambraiBM 125–8: 35, 53
CasAC D(F): 55
CivMA 59: 53
CopKB 1848: 11, 18
DresSL 1/D/505: 35, 38
FlorBN II.i.232: 29, 30, 31, 35, 36, 38, 40, 41, 42, 48, 49, 50, 51, 52, 53, 54
FlorBN Magl. 107bis: 9, 11, 12, 32, 37, 38
FlorBN Magl. 117: 37
FlorBN Magl. 121: 18
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FlorBN Magl. 164–7: 3, 4, 9, 10, 11, 14, 19, 21, 23, 25, 27, 28, 30, 31, 47, 49, 54
FlorBN Magl. 178: 1, 7, 18, 32, 33, 34
FlorBN BR 229: 1, 20, 32, 33
FlorBN BR 337: 19
FlorC 2439: 21
FlorC 2442: 3, 8, 18, 34, 43, 44, 45
FlorR 2356: 12
FlorR 2794: 1
KasL 24: 40
KönsSU 1740: 37
Kraków, Klasztor OO. Dominikanów: 37
LonBLE 3051/WashLC M6: 37
LonBLR 8.G.vii: 54
LonBLR 20 A.xvi: 1
LonRC 1070: 38, 53
MadM 6832: 53
MilD 3: 31
ModD 9: 52
MunBS 10: 38
MunBS 3154: 35
MunU 322–5: 39
MunU 328–31: 21
PadBC A17: 49, 52
ParisBNF 1597: 6, 12, 23
RegB C120: 1, 6, 51
RomeC 2856: 1, 12, 33
SegC s. s.: 1
SevBC 1: 48
SevC 5–i–43/ParisBNN 4379: 33
SienBC k.i.2: 35
SGallS 461: 29
SGallS 463: 11, 18, 32, 39, 41
ToleBC 10: 54
ToleF 23: 38
UlmS 237: 25, 31, 48, 54
UppsU 76C: 38, 54
VatC 234: 51
VatG xiii.27: 1, 7, 9, 14, 18, 32, 33, 34, 37, 42
VatP 1980–1: 53
VatS 15: 31
VatS 42: 35, 36, 38
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VatS 46: 52
VatS 63: 54
VatV 11953: 29, 49
VarBC 757: 1
VarBC 758: 30, 48
VarBC 760: 48, 55
VienNB Mus. 15941: 52
VienNB Mus. 18810: 18, 21
WittenL 1048: 29
1501: 1, 7, 11, 15, 32
1502 J 666: 48
1502\(^2\): 2, 6, 9
1503\(^1\): 39, 42
1504\(^1\): 30, 35, 38, 54
1504\(^3\): 3, 8, 10, 17, 27, 33, 34
1505\(^2\): 31
1505\(^3\): 28
1514 J 667: 48
1514\(^4\): 53
1516 J 668: 48
1519\(^1\): 52
1519\(^2\): 39, 51
1519\(^3\): 50
1520\(^3\): 2
1520\(^4\): 49
1521\(^3\): 52
[1521]\(^6\): 55
1526 J 669: 48
1526\(^1\): 53
1526\(^2\): 52
1526\(^3\): 39, 51
1526\(^4\): 50
1527: 39, 51
1535\(^1\): 21
[c. 1535]\(^{13}\): 21
[c. 1535]\(^{14}\): 2, 9, 44
1537\(^1\): 50
1538\(^3\): 38
1539\(^9\): 47
1547\(^1\): 38, 39, 41
1555 J 678: 38, 47
1555 M 4017: 51
1559\(^2\): 38, 50, 51
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Concordant sources ordered by number of concordances

17: FlorBN Magl. 164–7
16: FlorBN ii.1.232
10: BolC Q17, VatG xiii.27
7: FlorC 2442, 15043
6: FlorBN Magl. 107bis, FlorBN 178
5: SGallS 463, 1501
4: FlorBN BR 229, UlmS 237, 15041

Index of compositions

Alma redemptoris mater/Ave regina celorum, Josquin, 31
Alon fere nous barbes, Compere, 11
Amor demoi, anonymous, 24
Base moy, Josquin, 2
Che fa laramanzina, Compere, 28
Ciascun me crie marietoy marie, anonymous, 17
Donna di dentro dalla tua chasa/Damene un poco/Fortuna d’un gran tempo, Isaac, 20
Ecce tu pulchra es, Josquin, 48
Elogeron nous seans, Isaac, 32
Entre ye suis en gran penser, Josquin, 21
Et leve vous o guigliermette, Ninot, 8
Factum est silentium, Mouton, 52
Fille vous aves mal garde le pan devant, Isaac, 18
Forsellement, anonymous, 22
Fortuna disperata/Vidi la forosetta/Vo m’avete svergogne, anonymous, 19
Gaude barbara beata, Mouton, 53
Gentil galans de france, anonymous, 10
Ie me leve laultre nuyt, Ninot, 43
Ie nay dueil que de vous ne viegne, Agricola, 1
Ie suis amie du forrier or alez, Compere, 9
Il estoit ung bon home, anonymous, 23
In illo tempore, Ninot, 36
Laultre ior ic cievalcioie, anonymous, 27
Liber generationis, Josquin, 38
Lordault lordault, Compere, Josquin, Ninot, 6
Maire de die, anonymous, 26
Manus tue fecerunt me et plasmaverunt, Danlon, Pesenti, 55
Misericordias domini, Josquin, 50
Missus est gabriel angelus, Josquin, 54
O bone et dulcis domine yhesu, Josquin, 30
Anthony M. Cummings

Palle, palle, Isaac, 37
Paratum cor meum, Josquin, 47
Pardonnes moy se je foloye, Fevin, 44
Prophetarum maxime, Isaac, 49
Quis dabit capiti meo aquam, Isaac, 42
Quis dabit oculis, Mouton, 51
Quis dabit pacem, Isaac, 40
Se jay perdu mon amy, anonymous, 46
Si ie fet un chop apres, Japart, 15
Si ie vous avoye pointe, anonymous, 16
Si oblitus fuero, Ninot, Obrecht, 35
Substinuimus pacem, Isaac, 29
T[ ], anonymous, 25
Tambien mison pensada mari semi bates, anonymous, 12
Tambur tambur tambor, anonymous, 13
Tota pulchra es, Isaac, 41
Tulerunt dominum, Isaac, Josquin, Pesenti, 39
Une musque de Biscaye, Josquin, 33
Une playsant figlette, Compere, 3
Veci la danse barbari, anonymous, 5
Vele ci vele la, Mouton, 45
Voles oir une chanson, Compere, 14
Vostre bargeronette, Compere, 7
Vray dieu que pene messe, Compere, Weerbeke, 34
Youli mariner passe moy sena, anonymous, 4
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Agricola: Ie nay dueil que de vous ne viegne, 1
Compere: Alon fere nous barbes, 11; Che fa laramanzina, 28; Ie suis amie
du forrier or alez, 9; Une playsant figlette, 3; Voles oir une chanson, 14;
Vostre bargeronette, 7
Compere, Josquin, Ninot: Lordault lordault, 6
Compere, Weerbeke: Vray dieu que pene messe, 34
Danglon, Pesenti: Manus tue fecerunt me et plasmaverunt, 55
Fevin: Pardonnes moy se je foloye, 44
Isaac: Donna di dentro dalla tua chasa/Damene un poco/Fortuna d’un
gran tempo, 20; Elogeron nous seans, 32; Fille vous aves mal garde le
pan davant, 18; Palle palle, 37; Prophetarum maxime, 49; Quis dabit
capiti meo aquam, 42; Quis dabit pacem, 40; Substinuimus pacem, 29;
Tota pulchra es, 41
Isaac, Josquin, Pesenti: Tulerunt dominum, 39
Japart: Si ie fet un chop apres, 15
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Josquin: Alma redemptoris mater/Ave regina celorum, 31; Base moy, 2;
Ecce tu pulchra es, 48; Entre ye suis en gran penser, 21; Liber generationis, 38;
Misericordias domini, 50; Missus est gabriel angelus, 54; O
bone et dulcis domine yhesu, 30; Paratum cor meum, 47; Une musique
de Biscaye, 33
Mouton: Factum est silentium, 52; Gaude barbara beata, 53; Quis dabit
oculis, 51; Vele ci vele la, 45
Ninot: Et leve vous o guigliermette, 8; Ie me levei laultre nuyt, 43; In illo
tempore, 36
Ninot, Obrecht: Si oblitus fuero, 35
anonymous: Amor demoi, 24; Ciascun me crie marietoy marie, 17; Forsel-
lement, 22; Fortuna disperata/Vidi la forosetta/Vo m'avete svergogne,
19; Gentil galans de france, 10; Il estoit ung bone home, 23; Laultre ior
ie cievalcioie, 27; Maire de die, 26; Se jay perdu mon amy, 46; Si ie vous
avoye pointe, 16; T[ ], 25; Tambien mison pensada mari semi bates,
12; Tambur tambur tambor, 13; Veci la danse barbari, 5; Youli
mariner passe moy sena, 4

MS VatP 1980–1
Composer ascriptions for the first and second pieces are given as they
appear in the index to MS VatP 1981 (no ascriptions are given in the
manuscript other than those reproduced here); text incipits are given as
they appear in the index to MS VatP 1980; genre designations as they
appear in the index to MS VatP 1980 are given in square brackets before
the text incipit; foliation is given as in the tenor partbook.

[1] fols. 1v–6v, fevi[n], Dite moy maues pense [mass]
BolC Q19, fol. 141v, fauim
VatP 1982, fols. 57v–64r, anonymous
VatS 16, fols. 102v–117r, Ant. de Fevin

CambraiBM 4, fols. 58r–69r, anonymous
JenaU 4, fols. 90v–101r, Petrus de la Rue
JenaU 8, fols. 6v–25r, Petrus de la Rue
MunBS C, fols. 71v–99r, Petrus de [la] rue
NurGN 83795, fol. 41v, anonymous
's HerAB 72B, fols. 20v–39r, P. Rue
VatG xi.2, fols. 225r–242r, anonymous
VatS 154, fols. 30v–49r, anonymous
WolfA A, fols. 28v–54r
'549F, nos. 59–62 [Pleni, Benedictus, and In nomine only]
Anthony M. Cummings

[3] fols. 14v–21r, [anonymous], Missa descendii
   BolC Q19, fols. 157r–164r, anonymous [Gloria and Credo only]
   BudOS 20, fols. 78r–83r, H. J. [Agnus missing]
   BudOS 24, fols. 30r–32r, 33r–34r, Henr: Jsac [Kyrie, Gloria and
   Credo only]
   ModD 4, fols. 76r–87r, brumel
   StuttL 45, fols. 69r–92r, Antonius Bruml [Agnus Dei iii incomplete]
   VatP 1982, fols. 17r–28r, Brumel [Benedictus missing]

[4] fols. 21v–27r, [anonymous], Missa pange lingua
   BrusBR iv.922, fols. 28v–41r, Josquin
   BudOS 8
   JenaU 21, fols. 1v–18v, anonymous
   LeipU 49, fols. 4r–12r, Josquinus
   MilA 46, fols. 61v–72r, Josquin
   MunBS 260, nos 20, Josquin; 21, anonymous; 22, anonymous
   [Pleni, Benedictus and Agnus Dei ii only]
   MunBS 510, fols. 42v–63r, anonymous
   RegB C100, Josquin
   RosU 49, no. 2, Josquin
   ToleBC 16, fols. 20v–38r, Jusquin
   VatG xii.2, fols. 186v–200r, anonymous
   VatP 1982, fols. 140v–151r, Josquin
   VatS 16, fols. 36v–46r, Josquin
   VatSM 26, fols. 214v–229r, anonymous
   VienNB 4809, fols. 1v–22r, Josquin
   VienNB Mus. 18832, nos. 2, 3, 6 [Pleni, Agnus Dei ii and Benedic-
   tus only]
   1539\(^2\), no. vii, Josquin
   1545\(^6\), nos. i, ii, Josquin; iii, anonymous [Pleni and Agnus Dei ii only]
   1547\(^1\), p. 321, Iusquini Pratensis [Pleni only]
   [1559] J 676, no. ii, Josquin

[5] fols. 27v–33r, [anonymous], Missa [sine nomine]

[6] fols. 34v–41r, [anonymous], Missa Ave Maria
   CambraiBM 18, fols. 168v–183r, anonymous
   CasAC M(D), fols. 70v–80v, la Rue
   CoimU 2, fols. 104v–121r
   JenaU 12, fols. 18v–32r, anonymous
   MechS s.s., fols. 49v–62r, anonymous
   MontsM 773, fols. 30v–43r, anonymous
   SubA 248, fols. 56v–75v
   VatP 1982, fols. 46v–57r, P. dela rue
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VatS 45, fols. 16v–30r, Pe. de la Rue
VienNB 15496, fols. 36v–50r
15161, fol. 19v
1522, no. 2

[7] fols. 41v–47r, [anonymous], Missa anima mea

[8] fols. 48v–52r, [anonymous], Missa faisant regres
JenaU 3, fols. 1v–14v, Josquin de Pres
MunBS 510, fols. 24v–41r, anonymous
ToleBC 9
VatS 23, fols. 118v–128r, Josquin des Pres
VienNB 4809, fols. 90v–108r, anonymous
VienNB Mus. 15495, fols. 33v–47r, Josquin des Pres
1514 J 673, fol. 4v, Josquin [title page]
15161, fols. 104v–114r, Josquin
1516 J 674 = reprint of 1514 J 673
1526 J 675 = reprint of 1514 J 673, 1516 J 674
undated reprint of 1514 J 673, 1516 J 674, 1526 J 675

fols. 52v–62v, blank

[9] fols. 63v–64r, [anonymous], [Motetti] Salvator Mundi
CasAC D(F), fols. 37v–39r, anonymous
SGallS 463, no. 124, Joannes Mouton
SGallS 464, fol. 12v, anonymous
VallaC 5, fols. LVIIv–LIXv, Jo. Mouton
VatG xii.4, fols. 20v–24v, Leriter
15202, fols. 5v–6v, anonymous
[c. 1521]7, fols. 7v–8v, anonymous

[10] fols. 64v–65r, [anonymous], [Motetti] Miseremini
LeidGA 1441, fols. lxviiv–lxixv, anonymous
MunBS 16, fols. 60v–66v, Johannes Mouton
SGallS 463, no. 136, Joannes Mouton
SGallS 464, fol. 12v, anonymous
VatP 1976–9, fols. 62v–64r, anonymous
VienNB Mus. 15941, fols. 36v–37r, Richafort [index]
15191, no. 4, Richafort
15202, fols. 2v–3v, Josquin
15262 = reprint of 15191
15343, fols. 15v–15v, anonymous
15471, pp. 322–5, Joannes Mouton

CambraiBM 125–8, fols. 1v–2r [superius partbook], anonymous
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CivMA 59, fols. 60v–62v, anonymous
CorBC 95–6/ParisBNN 1817, fols. 70v–72v, anonymous
FlorBN n.1.232, fols. 163v–166r, Io: Mouto [index]
LonRC 1070, pp. 144–5, anonymous
MadM 6832, pp. 6–9, Joannes Monton
15141, fols. 2r–2v [superius partbook], Io. mouton [superius partbook index]
15261 = reprint of 15141

[12] fols. 67v–68v, [anonymous], [Motetti] In Convertendo
BergBC 1209, fol. 36bisv, anonymous
BolC Q19, fols. 84v, Lupus
BolC Q20, no. 18, Lupus
StuttL 42, fol. 133v, anonymous
TrevBC 7, fols. 84v, Lupus
153210, p. 23, Lupus
15351, no. 5, Lupus
15390, no. 26, Lupus
153912, p. 43, Lupus
15454, p. 41, Lupus
15646, p. 42, Lupus

[13] fols. 68v–70r, [anonymous], [Motetti] Lauda Jerusalem
FlorL 666, fols. 10v–14r, Mr. Jam
GothaF A98, fol. 120v, anonymous
KasL 24, no. 52, Josquin
15371, no. 49, Jo. Heugel

[14] fols. 70v–71v, [anonymous], [Motetti] Saluto te
FlorL 666, fols. 22v–26v, Adriano
LonRC 2037, fol. 31v, Adrianus Willaert
1539 W 1108, no. 21, Adrianus Willaert
1545 reprint of 1539 W 1106, no. 23, Adrianus Willaert

[15] fol. 72v, [anonymous], [Motetti] In illo Tempore[c]
BolC Q19, fol. 44v, Andreas de silua
FlorL 666, fols. 84v–85v, Andreas de silua's HerAB 72C, fol. 67v, anonymous
15201, no. 11, A. de silua
15216, no. 4, Andrea de silua

[16] fol. 72v, [anonymous], [Motetti] In omni tribulatione
FlorL 666, fols. 79v–80v, Mouton
VerBC 760, fol. 6v, anonymous
15215, no. 14, Moulu
15216, no. 3, Molu
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[17] fol. 73r, [anonymous], [Canzon[i]] Ne uos challie
SGallS 463, no. 191, Richafort
SGallS 464, fol. 8v, Richafort
VienNB Mus. 18746, fols. 28v–29r, anonymous
1544', fol. 7r, Jo. Richafort

[18] fol. 73v, [anonymous], [Canzon[i]] In Cessament
BerIPS 40013, fols. 169v–170r, anonymous [text is a contrafactum, ‘Sic Deus’]
GothaF A98, fols. 36v–37r, anonymous [text is a contrafactum ‘Sic Deus’]
MunBS 1508, no. 71, anonymous
NurGN 83795, fol. 166r, anonymous [text is a contrafactum ‘Sic Deus’]
SGallS 463, no. 197, Petrus de la Rue
VienNB Mus. 18746, fol. 16r, anonymous
WeimB B, fols. 96v–97r, anonymous [text is a contrafactum ‘Sic Deus’]
[c. 1521]', fol. 18v, anonymous
1549 J 681, fol. xiii', Josquin des prez [title page]
1552', anonymous
1560 Bibliographie des éditions d’Adrian Le Roy . . ., no. 68, fol. 28r.
Delarue
1572', fol. 52r, De La Rue

[19] fol. 74r, [anonymous], [Canzon[i]] Petitte Camusete
BolC R142, fol. 32v, Josquin
CopKB 1873
1545', fol. xi, Josquin des Pres [title page]
1549 J 681, fol. xvi', Josquin des prez [title page]
1560 Bibliographie des éditions d’Adrian Le Roy . . ., no. 68, fol. 32v, Josquin

[20] fol. 74v, [anonymous], [Canzon[i]] Se conge prans
BolC A71
LeipU 49, fols. 188v–189r, Josquin [text is a contrafactum, ‘Miserator et misericors Dominus’]
SGallS 463, no. 211, Josquin
SGallS 464, fols. 8v–9r
1545', fol. viii, Josquin des Pres [title page]
1549 J 681, fol. vii', Josquin des prez [title page]
1560 Bibliographie des éditions d’Adrian Le Roy . . ., no. 68, fol. 31r, Josquin
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[21] fol. 75r, [anonymous], [Motetti] Salua nos
BolC Q19, fol. 22v, Jo. moton
BolC R142, fol. 57r, Josquin
FlorL 666, fols. 87v–88r, Mouton
ModD 9, fol. 83v, Mouton
's HerAB 72C, fol. 46v, Joannes Mouton
StuttL 3, fol. 185v, Joannes Mouton
VatS 38, fol. 151v, Jo. Mouton
15215, no. 1, Jo. Mouton
15407, no. 3, Joannes Mouton
154210, no. 13, Willaert
15584, no. 16, Mouton
fols. 75r–86v, blank

Concordant sources
BergBC 1209: 12
BerlPS 40013: 18
BolC A71: 20
BolC Q19: 1, 3, 12, 15, 21
BolC Q20: 12
BolC R142: 19, 21
BrusBR iv.922: 4
BudOS 8: 4
BudOS 20: 3
BudOS 24: 3
CambraiBM 4: 2
CambraiBM 18: 6
CambraiBM 125–8: 11
CasAC D(F): 9
CasAC (D): 6
CivMA 59: 11
CoimU 2: 6
CopKB 1873: 19
CorBC 95–6/ParisBNN 1817: 11
FlorBN ii.1.232: 11
FlorL 666: 13, 14, 15, 16, 21
GothaF A98: 13, 18
JenaU 3: 8
JenaU 4: 2
JenaU 8: 2
JenaU 12: 6
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JenaU 21: 4
KasL 24: 13
LeidGA 1441: 10
LeipU 49: 4, 20
LonRC 1070: 11
LonRC 2037: 14
MadM 6832: 11
MechS s.s.: 6
MilA 46: 4
ModD 4: 3
ModD 9: 21
MontsM 773: 6
MunBS 16: 10
MunBS 510: 4, 8
MunBS 1508: 18
MunBS C: 2
NurGN 83795: 2, 18
RegB C100: 4
RosU 49: 4
’s HerAB 72B: 2
’s HerAB 72C: 15, 21
SGallS 463: 9, 10, 17, 18, 20
SGallS 464: 9, 10, 17, 20
StuttL 3: 21
StuttL 42: 12
StuttL 45: 3
SubA 248: 6
ToleBC 9: 8
ToleBC 16: 4
TrevBC: 12
VallaC 5: 9
VatG xii.2: 2, 4
VatG xiv.4: 9
VatP 1976–9: 10
Vat P 1982: 1, 3, 4, 6
VatS 16: 1, 4
VatS 23: 8
VatS 38: 21
VatS 45: 6
VatS 154: 2
VatSM 26: 4
VerBC 760: 16
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VienNB 4809: 4, 8
VienNB Mus. 15495: 8
VienNB Mus. 15496: 6
VienNB Mus. 15941: 10
VienNB Mus. 18746: 17, 18
VienNB Mus. 18832: 4
WeimB B: 18
WolfA A: 2
15141: 11
1514 J 673: 8
15161: 6, 8
1516 J 674: 8
1519: 10
15201: 15
15202: 9, 10
15211: 16
15216: 15, 16, 21
[c. 1521]7: 9, 18
1522: 6
15261: 11
15262: 10
1526 J 675: 8
153210: 12
15343: 10
15351: 12
15371: 13
15392: 4
15399: 12
153912: 12
1539 W 1108: 14
15407: 17, 21
154210: 21
154413: 17
15454: 12
15456: 4
1545 reprint of 1539 W 1106: 14
154513: 19, 20
15471: 4, 10
154916: 2
1549 J 681: 18, 19, 20
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(1559) J 676: 4
1560 Bibliographie des éditions d’Adrian Le Roy . . . , no. 68: 18, 19, 20
1564: 12
1572: 18
undated reprint of 1514 J 673, 1516 J 674, 1516 J 675: 8

Concordant sources ordered by number of concordances
5: BolC Q19, FlorL 666, SGallS 463
4: SGallS 464, VatP 1982
68
2: BolC R142, GothaF A98, LeipU 49, MunBS 510, NurGN 83795,
’s HerAB 72C, VatG xii.2, VatS 16, Vien NB Mus. 18746, 1516, 1520, [c. 1521], 1540, 1545, 1547

Index of compositions
Gaude barbara, Mouton, 11
In Cessament, Josquin, La Rue, 18
In Convertendo, Lupus, 12
In illo Tempor[e], de Silva, 15
In omni tribulatione, Moulu, Mouton, 16
Lauda Jerusalem, Heugel, Josquin, Mr. Jam, 13
Miseremini, Josquin, Mouton, Richafort, 10
Missa anima mea, anonymous, 7
Missa Ave Maria, La Rue, 6
Missa descendi, Brumel, Isaac, 3
Dite moy maves pense [mass], Fevin, 1
Missa faisant regres, Josquin, 8
Missa incesament, La Rue, 2
Missa pange lingua, Josquin, 4
Missa [sine nomine], anonymous, 5
Ne uos challie, Richafort, Werrecore, 17
Petitte Camusete, Josquin, 19
Saluto te, Willaert, 14
Salua nos, Josquin, Mouton, Willaert, 21
Salvator Mundi, Lhérétier, Mouton, 9
Se congé prans, Josquin, 19

Composer index
Brumel, Isaac: Missa descendi, 3
De Silva: In illo Tempor[e], 15
Fevin: Dite moy maves pense [mass], 1
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Heugel, Josquin, Mr. Jam: Lauda Jerusalem, 13
Josquin: Missa faisant regres, 8; Missa pange lingua, 4; Petite Camusete, 19; Se conge prans, 20
Josquin, La Rue: In Cessament, 18
Josquin, Mouton, Richafort: Miseremini, 10
Josquin, Mouton, Willaert: Salua nos, 21
La Rue: Missa Ave Maria, 6; Missa incesament, 2
Lhéritier, Mouton: Salvator Mundi, 9
Lupus: In Convertendo, 12
Moulu, Mouton: In omni tribulatione, 16
Mouton: Gaude barbara, 11
Richafort, Werrecore: Ne uos challie, 17
Willaert: Saluto te, 14
anonymous: Missa anima mea, 7; Missa [sine nomine], 5