

Title: Einstein's Musical Sources: Building a History of the Italian Madrigal from the Prints

Author(s): Philippe Canguilhem

Source: *Das italienische Madrigal : Alfred Einsteins »Versuch einer Geschichte der italienischen Profanmusik im 16. Jahrhundert« und die Folgen*, ed. by Sebastian Bolz, Moritz Kelber, Katelijne Schiltz; Dresden, musiconn.publish 2025, (= troja. Jahrbuch für Renaissancemusik 20), p. 255–266.

DOI: <https://doi.org/10.25371/troja.v20223942>

Creative Commons license: CC BY-SA



Vorliegende Publikation wird unter obengenannter CC-Lizenz durch musiconn.publish im Open Access bereitgestellt.

musiconn.publish dient der kostenfreien elektronischen Publikation, dem Nachweis und der langfristigen Archivierung von musikwissenschaftlicher Fachliteratur. Auch Arbeiten aus der Musikpädagogik und der Künstlerischen Forschung mit Musikbezug sind willkommen. Außerdem bietet musiconn.publish die Möglichkeit zur digitalen Publikation von wissenschaftlichen Noteneditionen.

musiconn.publish ist ein Service des Fachinformationsdienstes Musikwissenschaft (musiconn – für vernetzte Musikwissenschaft), der von der Deutschen Forschungsgemeinschaft gefördert und gemeinschaftlich von der Sächsischen Landesbibliothek – Staats- und Universitätsbibliothek Dresden und der Bayerischen Staatsbibliothek München betrieben wird.

Weitere Informationen zu musiconn.publish finden Sie hier: <https://musiconn.qucosa.de/>

Eine Übersicht zu allen Services von musiconn finden Sie hier: <https://www.musiconn.de/>

Das italienische Madrigal.
Alfred Einsteins »Versuch einer Geschichte
der italienischen Profanmusik im 16. Jahrhundert«
und die Folgen

Herausgegeben von
Sebastian Bolz, Moritz Kelber und Katelijne Schiltz

Die Tagung im Jahr 2022, auf die dieser Band zurückgeht, und diese Publikation erfuhren großzügige Unterstützung. Wir danken herzlich unseren Förderern:



Eine Veröffentlichung von musiconn.publish –
dem Open-Access-Repository für Musikwissenschaft

Sächsische Landesbibliothek –
Staats- und Universitätsbibliothek Dresden
Zellescher Weg 18
01069 Dresden



© 2025 Autor*innen

Die Inhalte dieses Werks werden unter der Creative-Commons-Lizenz
CC BY-SA 4.0 DE zur Verfügung gestellt. Hiervon ausgenommen ist das Bild-
material, das ggf. abweichenden, in den Bildlegenden spezifizierten Bestimmun-
gen unterliegt.



Layout: Sebastian Bolz und Moritz Kelber
Cover: Moritz Kelber

ISSN: 2513-1028

DOI: <https://doi.org/10.25371/troja.v2022>

Inhalt

Sebastian Bolz, Moritz Kelber, Katelijne Schiltz	
Vorwort	9
Abkürzungen	18
Sebastian Bolz	
Alfred Einsteins <i>Das italienische Madrigal</i> .	
Zur Entstehung eines musikwissenschaftlichen Buchs	19
Anna Magdalena Bredenbach	
Das Madrigal erzählen.	
Alfred Einsteins Gattungsgeschichte in narratologischer Perspektive	73
Katelijne Schiltz	
Alfred Einstein, <i>The Italian Madrigal</i> and Analogies of the Ages	101
Benjamin Ory	
Alfred Einstein's Scholarship, the Italian Madrigal, and <i>The Italian Madrigal</i>	123
Moritz Kelber	
Concepts of Nationality and Migration	
in Alfred Einstein's <i>The Italian Madrigal</i>	139
Laurie Stras	
Singing Madrigals:	
On the Aesthetics of Singing in Einstein's <i>The Italian Madrigal</i>	159
Christian Thomas Leitmeir	
Ein Riese auf Schultern von Zwergen?	
Einstein im Rekurs auf Forschungstradition	181
Iain Fenlon	
Alfred Einstein: The Early Italian Madrigal Revisited	211

Philippe Canguilhem Einstein's Musical Sources: Building a History of the Italian Madrigal from the Prints	255
Giovanni Zanovello Einsteins Frottola und ihr Erbe	267
Kate van Orden Verdelot and Arcadelt: Chanson, Madrigal, and National Style	279
Bernhold Schmid »Eine[r] der grössten Meister aller Zeiten«. Orlando di Lassos Madrigale in Einsteins Sicht	293
Paul Schleuse »Dolcemente facendola finire«: Orazio Vecchi and Einstein's Endings	311
Florian Mehlretter Das Madrigal als literarische Gattung. Der Beitrag der Romanistik nach Einstein	323
Cristina Urchueguía Trotzige Noblesse: Einstein und seine Musikverleger. Ein Melodram	343
Cristina Urchueguía Alfred Einstein als Herausgeber: Eine Bibliographie	383
Henrike C. Lange Berkeley als geistige Lebensform: Alfred Einstein's Arrival in the Bay Area	393

Der vorliegende Band ergänzt und kommentiert
die deutschsprachige Erstausgabe des titelgebenden Werks:

Alfred Einstein, *Das italienische Madrigal.*
Versuch einer Geschichte der italienischen Profanmusik
im 16. Jahrhundert, hrsg. von Sebastian Bolz, München 2025
(Münchner Veröffentlichungen zur Musikgeschichte, 83)

Die Edition von Einsteins Text ist digital verfügbar:

DOI: 10.5282/ubm/epub.128701 (PDF)

DOI: 10.5282/ubm/data.691 (TEI, MEI)

Philippe Canguilhem

Einstein's Musical Sources: Building a History of the Italian Madrigal from the Prints

There can be no question that Einstein's *Italian Madrigal* remains a key work of reference for anyone studying the development of secular music in sixteenth-century Italy. Re-reading his magnum opus, we are struck by the soundness of his scholarship, the topicality of many of his assertions, and the book's broad range of perspectives, not to mention its lively literary style, which is no longer found in the somewhat dry and sanitized musicological prose in which we convey our ideas today.

Despite all these qualities, a number of Einstein's conclusions have been revised over the decades since its publication in 1949. One of the most important modifications, and one which is universally accepted today, concerns the early chronology of the genre. While Einstein concluded that the Italian madrigal emerged around 1530, James Haar has since demonstrated why we should move its origins back a decade, and his work on early sources in collaboration with Iain Fenlon, published in 1988, has enabled a profound reconsideration of Einstein's perspective. In addition to this chronological revision, another major consequence of Haar and Fenlon's work has been the abandoning of Einstein's theory about the continuity from frottola to madrigal. In fact, it is no longer possible to claim that the frottola turned into the madrigal like a chrysalis into a butterfly.¹ This was revealed by a careful reading of the manuscript sources, which indicate that as early as 1520, Florentines were setting a new type of poetry to music in a way that was closer to the French chanson or the Latin motet than the earlier frottola, which belongs to a separate and independent cultural, poetic, and musical tradition.²

1 See also Giovanni Zanovello's contribution to the present volume.

2 Iain Fenlon and James Haar, *The Italian Madrigal in the Early Sixteenth Century. Sources and Interpretation*, Cambridge 1988.

Did Einstein overlook this phenomenon, and if so, why? Which sources did he use to write his history? Did he simply ignore the existence of these early madrigal manuscripts? And what can we say about the way he used his sources to build his narrative? These are the questions I would like to focus on in the following, mainly concentrating on the decades between 1520 and 1550 as it is during this early period that the issue of sources is particularly relevant. In the second half of the sixteenth century, with few exceptions, the Italian madrigal essentially spread through prints, and benefited less from the by then much weaker manuscript circulation than it had in former decades, even though this topic surely deserves to be studied more thoroughly than it has been so far.

Einstein's sources

For musicologists studying the early modern period, one of the most spectacular gifts of the digital era is the availability of the sources and the ease with which we can access them. But if we wanted to rewrite Einstein's history today, this would not be the major benefit gained from the eighty years that have passed since his work was first published. Rather, we would be relieved to have at hand a considerable number of modern editions, ranging from the academic publications of musicologists to the personal undertakings of amateurs. To give an idea of the wealth available, as of June 26th, 2023, the Choral Public Domain Library contains 6601 available scores labeled »madrigal«.³ In the 1920s Einstein had no choice other than to go directly to the sources.

It is well known that Einstein was able to conceptualize his impressive history thanks to his transcription of hundreds of pieces in score that are still preserved at the Smith College Library in 89 volumes. A fraction of these transcriptions appeared as the third volume of his book, but this selection was evidently merely the tip of the iceberg, and, as he confessed in the foreword of the book, »in nearly forty years not many weeks went by in which I did not score at least a few works from the old part-books«.⁴ Where did Einstein go to find the partbooks he needed?⁵ Again, his foreword gives us a short list of the main libraries he visited in order to consult the music: after the Bavarian State Library, he singles out London, Italy and the US as the places and countries where he had found the sources necessary to achieve his task.⁶

3 <https://www.cpdll.org/wiki/index.php/Category:Madrigals>.

4 *TIM*, p. v.

5 See also the contribution by Moritz Kelber and Christian Thomas Leitmeir to the present volume.

6 *TIM*, p. vii: »From the long list of libraries and individuals to whom my thanks are due, I can single out only a very few. For many years, until 1927, the Bavarian State Library in Munich

But despite these 40 years of hard work scoring music at the libraries best stocked with sixteenth-century partbooks, Einstein had to imagine his history based on only a partial picture of the overall repertory. And we can be sure that either some sources' lack of availability or his decision to avoid transcribing some pieces played a role in his narrative and at times could breed frustration. The first factor explains why Einstein's history of the early madrigal neglects Francesco de Layolle and Mattio Rampollini. All three prints of these composers are present at Wolfenbüttel, but for some reason, Einstein did not consult them. As he admitted regarding Rampollini: »I unfortunately neglected to transcribe the only extant copy of this print, which is now in the Wolfenbüttel Library«. ⁷

Even though deeply dependent on the sources available to him, Einstein nevertheless acknowledged that in some cases, he did not transcribe everything at his disposal. When trying to appraise Verdelor's compositions for five or six voices, he wrote that he was not able to give a comprehensive picture of this repertoire as he had »scored only a few« of them. And he concluded: »Only when his entire work has been scored shall we be able fully to estimate the importance, originality, and versatility of Verdelot.« Strange as it may seem, this task still remains unfinished today. ⁸

Issues of availability aside, discussing the sources was apparently not a major concern for Einstein. He does not explore the specificity of manuscript versus print transmission, nor the question of anthologies versus single-author prints, in terms of their significance for the history of the genre. This is not to say that he was not aware that the situation was far from simple or straightforward; however, he only considered these arguments in passing. I would like to take a brief closer look at his knowledge and use of the manuscript sources for the early madrigal, as they in large part determined the historical revisions that have subsequently been made.

was most liberal in placing its treasures at my disposal and in borrowing materials for me from other German libraries. It gives me special pleasure to recall the many hours spent working at the British Museum and the Royal College of Music in London, at the library of the Liceo Musicale in Bologna, in Florence at the library of the Istituto Musicale, the Biblioteca Centrale, and the library of Horace de Landau, at the Marciana in Venice, at the Biblioteca S. Cecilia in Rome, and at the Library of Congress in Washington.«

7 Ibid., p. 135. A second copy, unknown both to Einstein and to Samuel Pogue at the time of the publication of his catalogue *Jacques Moderne, Lyons Music Printer of the Sixteenth Century*, Geneva 1969, is in Turin (I-Tn, Ris. Mus. IV 23/1).

8 TIM, p. 257. A critical edition of Verdelor's five-voice madrigals is still lacking. For the six-voice madrigals, see Alexandra Amati Camperi, *Madrigali a sei voci. Edizione critica*, Pisa 2004.

Abbreviation	Manuscript sigla
Bologna Q.21	I-Bc (Bologna, Museo Internazionale e Biblioteca della Musica), Ms. Q.21
Bologna R.142	I-Bc (Bologna, Museo Internazionale e Biblioteca della Musica), Ms. R.142
Basevi 2440	I-Fc (Florence, Conservatorio di Musica Luigi Cherubini), Ms. Basevi 2440
Magliabecchiano 164–167	I-Fn (Florence, Biblioteca Nazionale Centrale), Ms. Magl. XIX 164–167
Magliabecchiano 142	I-Fn (Florence, Biblioteca Nazionale Centrale), Ms. Magl. XIX 142 [= Banco Rari 230]
Magliabecchiano 130	I-Fn (Florence, Biblioteca Nazionale Centrale), Ms. Magl. XIX 130
Marciana 1795–1798	I-Vnm (Venice, Biblioteca Nazionale Marciana), Ms. it. IV, 1795–1798

Tab. 1: Madrigal manuscripts cited in Einstein's *TTM*, vol. 1

Einstein did not deliberately ignore the manuscripts containing early madrigals (Table 1). He had access to some of them over the course of his lengthy preparatory work, and could have seen them firsthand in Bologna, Venice, or Florence. In this last case, we know that he lived for some time in the hills around Florence, at Mezzomonte, and went to see the manuscripts at some point during the 1930s.⁹ Among the four Florentine manuscripts mentioned in his book, two are particularly relevant for Einstein: Basevi 2440 and Magliabecchiano 164–167.

The case of Basevi 2440 is interesting, as Einstein considers it to be representative of the music composed in Florence during the lifetime of Lorenzo the Magnificent (1449–1492), and thus concludes that it was copied towards the end of the fifteenth century. This assumption was not deduced from his own dedicated study of the manuscript, but instead simply follows Riccardo Gandolfi's article about this source, which is now generally dated to between 1515 and 1520, making it a key witness to the development of the early madrigal. Gandolfi's dating motivates Einstein to claim that the five pieces attributed to Bernardo Pisano in the manuscript »can hardly have been written after 1490«, and that the madrigal by Costanzo Festa, *Madonna io mi consumo*, is »a later interpolation anonymously entered«.¹⁰ Finally, this manuscript, rather than helping Einstein build up his

⁹ See also Benjamin Ory's contribution to the present volume.

¹⁰ *TTM*, pp. 129 f. and 246. This assertion is repeated on p. 259. As for the article quoted by Einstein, see Riccardo Gandolfi, »Intorno al codice membranaceo N. 2440, esistente nella Biblioteca del R. Istituto Musicale di Firenze«, *Rivista musicale italiana* 18 (1911), pp. 537–548.

narrative, only succeeds in raising more questions, as illustrated by his hesitancy about evaluating Francesco de Layolle's production. As it appears, the problems created by Basevi 2440 might explain Einstein's lack of interest in the madrigal production of Layolle, who only features in his book as a shadowy figure.¹¹

The other manuscript, Magliabecchiano 164–167 at the Florentine national library, is referred to in various places as a document that »gives us a cross-section of the transitional period about 1520«. ¹² The consistency of this dating in relation to the repertoire it contains allowed Einstein to use the source to construct a comprehensive snapshot of Bernardo Pisano's works, as only the alto and basso partbook of his printed *Musica de Messer Bernardo Pisano* were known to have survived. Turning to this manuscript source made it possible for him to transcribe the complete polyphonic versions of Pisano's *canzoni* and assign them a place within his history of the early madrigal's stylistic development.¹³

The limited use of manuscript sources in *The Italian Madrigal* can be surprising, given that Einstein was accustomed to working with such material. During the same period, he was updating Köchel's thematic catalogue of Mozart's works, for which »he himself examined all available autographs as the basis for a new chronology«. ¹⁴ Moreover, manuscripts other than the few items listed above were known to Einstein, but he does not mention them. The most egregious of these are the three manuscripts held at the library of the Brussels Conservatory, whose complete description with known concordances had been published in an article by Charles Van den Borren in 1934, which Einstein even cites in the first volume.¹⁵

Why, then, did he not make more extensive use of the manuscripts? Most likely, the answer has to do with their state of preservation, which is often partial: it is striking that nearly all the sources listed in Table 1, namely Bologna Q.21, Magliabecchiano 130 and 164–167, and Marciana 1795–1798, have been preserved in their entirety, with all their original partbooks. From this we can infer that Einstein used the manuscripts exactly as he used printed music, to transcribe

11 *TTM*, p. 279: »It is difficult to suppose that the Francesco Layolle, whose three-part ballata *Questa mostrarsi lieto* is found as No. 12 in the codex Basevi 2440 at the Istituto Musicale in Florence and who thus belongs to the circle of Lorenzo de' Medici and cannot have been born later than 1460, should be the same Francesco de Layolle whose two madrigal books were printed by Jacques Moderne of Lyons in 1540 and later«.

12 *Ibid.*, p. 343. Elsewhere in the book Einstein states that the manuscript dates to either »about 1522« (p. 126), »prior to 1525« (p. 135) or »about 1525« (p. 201).

13 *Ibid.*, pp. 129–134 and 201 f. The same can be said of Sebastiano Festa's output (pp. 141–143).

14 Alec Hyatt King, »Einstein, Alfred«, in: *Grove Music Online* (2001).

15 *TTM*, p. 284. Charles Van den Borren, »Inventaire des manuscrits de musique polyphonique qui se trouvent en Belgique«, *Acta musicologica* 6 (1934), pp. 26–29 and 65–70. The three sources, all of Florentine origin, bear the shelf marks 27.731, 27.511, and 24.135.

new madrigals and make the repertoire available for study and analysis. As most of the manuscripts containing madrigals copied in the 1520s and 1530s lack at least one, and often multiple voices, they were useless for transcription.

In this respect, however, there was at least one case where he needed to reconstruct the parts of an incomplete polyphonic piece because it was so instrumental to sustaining his historical vision. This was Giacomo Fogliano's *Io vorrei dio d'amore*, for which he had only the bass partbook of the 1537 edition at hand. But, as a specialist of the Renaissance viola da gamba repertoire since the time of his doctoral dissertation,¹⁶ he was aware of the existence of a version in viol tablature hidden among Silvestro Ganassi's *Regola Rubertina*. Thanks to the tablature, he was able to edit a three-part vocal version of Fogliano's madrigal in his musical supplement, commenting that »the vocal original for three voices with its facile imitations can easily be restored«.¹⁷ It is not difficult to see what Einstein's motivation was here: Fogliano represents a rare (and even unique?) case of a frottolist who became a madrigalist. Transcribing one of his works provided a crucial illustration of Einstein's evolutionary scenario from frottola to madrigal.

Coming back to the manuscripts and concluding this brief overview, we can ask what would have happened if Einstein had focused more extensively on the manuscripts to build his early history of the genre. He probably would have revised his concept of the »artistic pause«, which is motivated by the gap separating the end of Petrucci and Antico's printing press in 1520, and the start of Verdelot's collected madrigals in the mid-1530s.¹⁸ This bizarre concept attests the centrality of print in his historical vision, supported by the fact that the new generation of madrigalists (Verdelot, Festa, and Arcadelt) coincides chronologically with a new generation of printers (the Scottos and Gardano). But, as Fenlon and Haar wrote in 1988, »as far as the madrigal is concerned, the new music written in the years after the »calamità d'Italia« occasionally found its way into print, but mostly it circulated in manuscript«.¹⁹ And the study of such sources, far from reflecting the »confusion and disorder that prevail in Italian secular music about 1530«, instead

16 Alfred Einstein, *Zur deutschen Literatur für Viola da Gamba im 16. und 17. Jahrhundert*, Leipzig 1905.

17 Einstein's transcription appears in *TIM*, pp. 54 f. (no. 29). Fogliano's original madrigal is to be found in RISM 1537⁷, the bass part of which survives in Bologna, Museo Internazionale e Biblioteca della Musica.

18 *TIM*, p. 139. A justification of the »artistic pause« is found at p. 148: »this mixture is an indication of the confusion and disorder that prevail in Italian secular music about 1530 and of a lack of direction on the part of the publishers and printers, who are no longer sure of the demands of their own public.«

19 Fenlon and Haar, *The Italian Madrigal*, p. 58.

shows the circulation and production of madrigals that ended up in organized *canzonieri* mostly copied in Florence.²⁰

In search of authorship

Having elucidated why Einstein did not work more extensively on manuscripts, I would like to trace how he used his sources. In fact, he used partbooks not only to transcribe them and access new music, but also to document the poetic taste of the composers and to single out theatrical or political features, in which case he only copied the texts of the madrigals and did not go to the trouble of scoring the music. In one case at least, we know that he did not go to see all the partbooks. In order to emphasize Costanzo Festa's ties with Florence, Einstein gives the poem of his *Sacra pianta da quel arbor discesa*, written to celebrate Duke Alessandro de' Medici, either for his accession to the duchy in 1532 or for his wedding in 1536. A careful comparison of his rendering and the original source reveals that he did not score the piece, as his text is not complete: indeed, the sixth line is missing, probably because he copied the madrigal from the alto part, which is the only one to omit this line. Ironically, the words overlooked by Einstein would have reinforced the piece's Medici links.²¹

Elsewhere, Einstein also uses the musical sources either as an aid to dating individual pieces, or taking a philological approach as a way to appreciate the evolution of a composer's musical language. The first case is illustrated by his remark about Willaert's place in the early chronology of the madrigal:

»A madrigal on the doge Andrea Gritti, the tenor part of which is found in MS R. 142 of the Liceo musicale in Bologna, would be a positively dated composition of Willaert's if we could assume that it is an expression of gratitude for his appointment in Venice (1527). The MS is the work of several hands between 1515 and 1530: in addition to pieces of church music

20 We could add that by focusing almost exclusively on prints, Einstein provided a model followed by members of the next generation. To take only one example, Albert Seay did not take the manuscript tradition into account in his modern editions of the Arcadelt and Festa madrigals: Jacobi Arcadelt, *Opera omnia*, vol. 2 to 7, ed. Albert Seay, n. p. (American Institute of Musicology 1969–1970); Costanzo Festa, *Opera omnia*, vol. 7 and 8, ed. Albert Seay, n. p. (American Institute of Musicology 1977–1978). To date, then, we are still lacking critical editions that consider all the known sources of the three first »masters'« contributions to the genre of the madrigal.

21 TIM, p. 157 f.: »Onde di laude accesa / [Immortal gloria al Medico honorarebbe] / Cert'indarno sarebbe«. The comparison also shows how he seriously modernized the original text, with numerous spelling corrections (»fiorenza« vs »firenza«; »quel« vs »quell'«; »vede apresso« vs »ved'apresso«; »bellezze« vs »bellezza«). Contrary to his dating of 1537, the madrigal appears in RISM 1538²¹ no. 10.

by Josquin, Mouton, Festa, Jachet, Paulus de Ferrara, Claudin, it also contains secular compositions by Tromboncino [...] Marchetto, Verdelot.»²²

The second case leads him to compare different editions in order to understand the stylistic updates made by Francesco Corteccia: »He revised compositions of his which had been printed before, and a comparison of the different versions is frequently most instructive, for example, his *Un dì lieto giamai* (printed in 1543²³), in which he replaces every »Landini cadence-formula« with a normal cadential figure«. ²⁴ As far as source studies are concerned, we can finally add that notation helps Einstein distinguish between different printers' characteristic traits in the absence of a printer's mark on the extant copy of the *Motetti e canzone* in the Pierpont Morgan Library.²⁴

First and foremost, however, Einstein uses sources to make attributions. In many places, comparisons of manuscript and printed versions of the same piece allow him to confirm or reject a given attribution, with results additionally obtained through the comparison of notational features.²⁵ Leafing through the pages of Einstein's first volume, his obsession with assigning individual pieces to individual composers is striking: »Three unquestionably genuine madrigals by Costanzo Festa« appear in Arcadelt's first book of three-voice madrigals;²⁶ »In subsequent editions it [Arcadelt's *S'infinita bellezza*] has become d'incerto autore, i.e., anonymous. But it is so exactly like the chanson just described that it is impossible to imagine anyone else as the composer«. ²⁷

Here we come to a central point. In this last example, rather than relying on source comparison to ascribe the madrigal to Arcadelt, Einstein compares it stylistically to one of his chansons. In fact, most of Einstein's attributions are based

22 *TIM*, p. 325. See also what he says on p. 258: »The motets for three parts printed by Gardano in 1543, to judge from the uniformity of their style (and as is proved by MS sources), were presumably all of them composed prior to 1521.«

23 *Ibid.*, p. 278.

24 *Ibid.*, p. 135.

25 Attribution by concordances (*ibid.*, p. 297): »[Giacomo Fogliano's] *Piango el mio fidel servire*, printed by Petrucci as anonymous, is ascribed to him in MS XIX, 142, No. 2 of the Biblioteca Nazionale at Florence [= BR 230]. A third, likewise anonymous in Petrucci, *Pur al fin convien scoprire*, bears his name in MS XIX, 141, No. 3 [*recte* 142, that is BR 230]«. Attribution by notational features (*TIM*, p. 259): »The first number, an obscene *mascherata* in the style of Giovanni Domenico da Nola, *Madonna, io son un medico*, cannot be Festa's, if only because of its notation: it is the only one in four-four time and is presumably the work of some Neapolitan composer«.

26 *TIM*, p. 264.

27 *Ibid.*, p. 267.

exclusively on stylistic observations.²⁸ Transcribing large numbers of madrigals allowed him to make strong assumptions in this regard, in exactly the same way as, in the same period, the art historian Bernard Berenson treated anonymous Italian paintings. I would like to suggest that, to a certain extent, Einstein's book exemplifies the method of connoisseurship that was first theorized by Giovanni Morelli in 1874 and was adopted by Einstein's contemporary Bernard Berenson. According to Morelli's theory,

»Artists repeat certain characteristic or typical forms or shapes (what he terms *Grundformen*) and [...] these are most apparent in areas of a picture where the forces of school, tradition or convention are least likely to influence an artist: for example, in the depiction of a hand, a drapery motif, or the structure of an ear. In such areas the painter develops conventions for their rendering, formulae that he repeats throughout his career. What the critic must do is determine these conventions for individual painters by studying authenticated works. He will thereby acquire a basis for comparison and a means of relating unauthenticated works to specific painters. By re-identifying the *Grundformen*, known from secure works, in other pictures, he has a method for attributions.«²⁹

Connoisseurship is no more than a comparative method inherited from sciences such as anatomy or botany, a method that developed over the course of the nineteenth century. Besides Berenson, this approach was adopted by the art historian Max Friedländer (1867–1958) at the turn of the twentieth century. But unlike Morelli, both Berenson and Friedländer relied more on their personal intuition. In Friedländer's opinion, the authorship of an artwork can be determined less by individual details than by a »total impression« based on intuition.³⁰

28 Another paradigmatic example appears on pp. 258 f., where Einstein evaluates Costanzo Festa's stylistic features based on a recent modern edition of ten of his madrigals: »Four out of the ten compositions published are not by Festa but must be ascribed to Jehan Gero (the three-voiced pieces *Altro non è l' mi' amor*, *Quel dolce foco*, *Tanta beltade*, and *Ab che vuoi più cruciarmi*); the four-voiced *Qual paura ho* is ascribed to Arcadelt in 1559, though the fact that the same music is used for the two quatrains of Petrarch's sonnet, still wholly in the manner of the frottola, points rather to Festa (though perhaps to Sebastian Festa, not to Costanzo).«

29 Hayden B. J. Maginnis, »The Role of Perceptual Learning in Connoisseurship: Morelli, Berenson, and Beyond«, *Art History* 13 (1990), pp. 104–117: p. 105. This method »focuses on the individual artist and the single work of art, and that at a moment when many art historians, under the influence of the social sciences, have come to think of groups and movements as the proper material of modern scholarship« (p. 104). Giovanni Morelli (1816–1891) was from a different generation to Berenson (1865–1959) and Einstein (1880–1952).

30 Max J. Friedländer, *On Art and Connoisseurship*, London 1942. He should not be confused with the musicologist of the same name.

Reading Einstein's assertions through this lens, I have come to the conclusion that he, too, combined these two practices in order to make attributions for individual madrigals. Let me take two examples here. The first is Einstein's assessment of Willaert's style: »It is clear that Willaert stems as a madrigal composer from Verdelot. But in his first madrigals he already differs from his model in his freer and bolder feeling for harmony and his freer and less constrained voice-leading, to say nothing of the decisive factor, which is the complete fusion of voice-leading and harmony«. ³¹ This is a good example of Einstein's »total impression«, even though he then turns to details to home in on Willaert's stylistic individuality: »A fascinating contrast to this feeling for harmony is the retention of the Landini cadence formula and the play of the cross-relations«. ³²

Cadences, rhythm and voice-leading are among the various *Grundformen* used in Einstein's *Italian Madrigal* to help him in his attribution process. The second example demonstrates how Einstein's stylistically based arguments mix general features with details. He discusses the five-voice *Qual anima ignorante* ascribed to Willaert in Cipriano's *Secondo libro a cinque*, which he thought was the work of Costanzo Festa: »It is a sonnet so schematic in its treatment of the quatrains and so uneven in its voice-leading that one is really forced to attribute it to the older master: The soprano floats in pure and measured declamation above the animated lower voices, which are presumably instrumental; and only in the two tercets does the composition become more homogeneous«. ³³

Assessing individual stylistic features using the tools of connoisseurship definitely made up a significant part of Einstein's musicological work. During the revision process of the Köchel catalogue, the New Grove recounts, he »relied mainly on judgment of style when dating Mozart's undated compositions instead of undertaking the systematic palaeographical study essential to establishing as exact a chronology as possible«. ³⁴

It could be fruitful to elaborate upon the other close relationships between Einstein's views and methodologies and the art-historical writing of Einstein's time on the Italian Renaissance. Such an inquiry would probably confirm that

31 *TIM*, p. 326.

32 *Ibid.*, p. 327.

33 *Ibid.*, p. 329. Sometimes there are no objective reasons justifying a given ascription, as is the case for Giacomo Fogliano: in 1537, »he is already represented in the company of Arcadelt and Festa with one composition: *Io vorrei Dio d'amor*, and it is quite possible that one or other of the anonymous compositions is really his work – this is fairly certain of *Iniustissimo amor*; while certainly not by him but by Costanzo Festa are: *Ogni loco m'attrista*, *Sopra una verde riva*, *Se mai vedeti amanti*, and *Che se può più veder*« (p. 297). In this case, it is not easy to determine whether Einstein relied on his intuition and knowledge of both composers' styles or checked for later attributed concordances.

34 Hyatt King, »Einstein, Alfred«.

he was highly dependent on art history, not only for his metaphorical vocabulary («musical painting» for madrigalism, Willaert is «colorful», etc.), but also when building concepts such as the existence of a Florentine and a Venetian school, the second of which, based on Willaert and his circle, was more concerned with «color» and «painting». To be sure, this concept of two different yet parallel traditions, inherited from art history, was adopted by a number of scholars in subsequent decades and is still found in recent musicological discourse.³⁵

As this remark and my former point about connoisseurship imply, Einstein was thus deeply dependent on the methodological and epistemological habits of his times, which seems perfectly logical and unsurprising. But as far as the question of authorship is concerned, he was fully aware of the limits of the application of modern musical methods to much older repertoires. In a beautiful and in some ways visionary passage on this topic, he comes to admit that

»Verdelot, Festa, and Arcadelt are three musical personalities who did not strive for ›personality‹; hence the uniformity of their production, hence the erroneous and confused ascriptions in the prints and the anonymity in the MSS. Their art is deeply rooted in the society of their time and for this very reason it is an art. This explains certain of the tendencies of Italian secular art in the Cinquecento: its conventional character, its uniformity, and its extraordinary productivity, tendencies directly opposed to those prevailing in the nineteenth and twentieth centuries«. ³⁶

The paradox is that this awareness did not prevent him from conceiving his history of the genre as author-centered. In a way, the outline of his third and fifth chapters are in keeping with those in *Music in the Romantic Era*, published two years earlier in 1947, where the organizational logic of his historical narrative is based on a succession of composers, a pattern he repeats for every genre. Having come to this conclusion, we understand better why working on manuscripts was not a priority for him: not only do they preserve the madrigals in incomplete fashion, but they rarely bear ascriptions, and hence are of little use in this respect.

35 *TIM*, pp. 275 f. The idea of a «Venetian school» founded by Willaert (p. 326: «What strikes the eye and the ear more than anything else is his strong and more sensitive feeling for color, for harmonic values») and carried on by his pupils, notably Cipriano de Rore, was taken over by numerous musicologists. To give just one example, in his article «Madrigal» in *Grove Music Online* (II,3), James Haar claims that Rore's madrigals «are certainly ›Venetian‹ rather than ›Florentine‹ in character».

36 *TIM*, p. 275 f.; Einstein then goes on to explain how the «canon» was constructed in the nineteenth century (although he does not use the term, of course). In the sixteenth century, the situation was quite different: «No one attaches any importance to creating works of ›eternal‹ value, and few masters and few printers take any care of their intellectual or commercial property» (p. 276).

As we all know, the issue of authorship became crucial in the second half of the sixteenth century, when the printing press had become vital for the dissemination of the genre. This can be deduced from the famous anecdote about Duke Guglielmo Gonzaga's madrigals, published anonymously for the sake of social conventions that prevented an aristocrat of his status from acting like his own domestic musicians. When asking three years later why so few copies of Guglielmo's book of madrigals had been sold, the chapel master Giaches de Wert was given the following answer by Angelo Gardano: »If his name had appeared on the print, then a larger number of them would have been sold than was the case. [...] To tell your lordship the facts, I don't believe that all the prints that have left my shop equal the number sixty«.³⁷

But in the early days of the madrigal, in the 1520s and 1530s, the situation was different. I would like to suggest in closing that the first madrigals circulated within quite closed communities, where cultural models and artistic idioms were highly codified. In micro-societies such as the Florentine elite of the 1520s and 1530s, those whom we call »authors« would be better described as spokespersons of the community, who were qualified to give form to its by-products and to disseminate them within this inner circle.

Why is it so hard to distinguish between two madrigals written by Festa and Arcadelt? It might be that neither our ears nor Einstein's are sophisticated enough to hear the differences between them, which might have been perfectly clear to certain erudite listeners of the period. But it might also be that for those members of the community who had their works copied without any ascription, this concern was irrelevant until the time came to print them and release them from the closed world for which they had been conceived. Einstein was right, then: the development of print entirely changed this balance and radically transformed the dynamics of the genre.

37 »Molto magnifico signor mio: Ho dalla sua inteso quanto ella mi scrive in materia delle compositioni di S.A. al che rispondo et dico, che senza alcun dubbio, se sula stampa di esse opere vi fosse stato il suo nome, se ne saria dato via assai magior quantità di quello che si è fatto; [...] per dirlo à V.S. non credo, che tra tutte quelle che sono uscite dalla mia bottega arrivano al numero di 60«. Richard Sherr, »The Publications of Guglielmo Gonzaga«, *Journal of the American Musicological Society* 31 (1978), pp. 118–123.

Abkürzungen

<i>DIM</i>	Alfred Einstein, <i>Das italienische Madrigal. Versuch einer Geschichte der italienischen Profanmusik des 16. Jahrhunderts</i> , hrsg. von Sebastian Bolz, München 2025 (Münchener Veröffentlichungen zur Musikgeschichte, 83), DOI: 10.5282/ubm/epub.128701
<i>DDT</i>	<i>Denkmäler deutscher Tonkunst</i> , hrsg. von Rochus von Liliencron u. a., Leipzig 1892–1931
<i>DTB</i>	<i>Denkmäler der Tonkunst in Bayern</i> , hrsg. von Adolf Sandberger, Leipzig 1900–1920, Augsburg 1924–1938 (Denkmäler deutscher Tonkunst, Zweite Folge); Neue Folge (N. F.), Wiesbaden 1962 ff.
<i>DTÖ</i>	<i>Denkmäler der Tonkunst in Österreich</i> , hrsg. von Guido Adler u. a., Wien 1894 ff.
<i>Grove Music Online</i>	<i>Grove Music Online</i> , hrsg. von Laura Macy, fortgesetzt von Deane L. Root, Oxford 2001 ff.
<i>LexM</i>	<i>Lexikon verfolgter Musiker und Musikerinnen der NS-Zeit</i> , hrsg. von Claudia Maurer Zenck u. a., Hamburg 2005 ff., https://www.lexm.uni-hamburg.de/
<i>MGG Online</i>	<i>Die Musik in Geschichte und Gegenwart Online</i> , hrsg. von Laurenz Lütteken, Kassel u. a. 2016 ff.
<i>PäM</i>	<i>Publikationen älterer Musik</i> , hrsg. von Theodor Kroyer, Leipzig 1926–1940
<i>TIM</i>	Alfred Einstein, <i>The Italian Madrigal</i> , übers. von Alexander H. Krappe, Roger Sessions und Oliver Strunk, Princeton 1949

Zitate aus *Das italienische Madrigal* / *The Italian Madrigal* erfolgen in der Regel in der Sprache und Ausgabe des jeweiligen Aufsatzes. Im Sinne dieses Bandes, dem es um eine Re-Lektüre unter den Bedingungen von Original und Übersetzung geht, werden entsprechende Stellen bei Bedarf in den Fußnoten in der jeweils anderen Sprache wiedergegeben.

Sämtliche im Band enthaltenen Links wurden zuletzt überprüft am 14.03.2025.