Zarlino's Definition of Fugue and Imitation

Author(s): James Haar

Zarlino's Definition of Fugue and Imitation

By JAMES HAAR

IN THE THIRD BOOK of his *Istitutioni harmoniche* (1558) Zarlino devotes separate chapters to the terms *fughe* and *imitationi*, making in his careful way a distinction ignored or only hinted at by earlier theorists: fugal passages have exact intervallic correspondence between participating voices, whereas imitations may ignore the sequence of tones and semi-tones in the leading voice. Students of the history of fugue, including Müller-Blattau, Ghislanzoni, Mann, and Horsley,[1] have taken note of Zarlino's terminology and have thought it—not always for precisely the same reasons—important. Alfred Mann discusses it as follows:

> We find in Zarlino's comprehensive treatment of fugue the foundation of a new terminology. He is the first to distinguish between fugue (*fuga, consequenza, reditta*) and imitation (*imitatione*). Entrances at the perfect intervals of unison, fourth, fifth, and octave are now the only ones recognized as constituting a fugue; entrances at all other intervals are called imitation. . . . In his fundamental distinction between fugue and imitation, however, Zarlino appears as a systematic rather than progressive theorist, for there is no indication in his text that it is a tendency toward tonal orientation which prompts him to single out entrances at the unison, fourth, fifth, and octave as the only true fugal entrances.[2]

For Müller-Blattau, Zarlino's distinction is of great importance because it separates fugue from the "kontrapunktischen Manier" of imitation. This is not because one is more thorough-going than the other, for as we shall see both fugue and imitation can for Zarlino be either canonically exact (*legata*) or free to break off wherever the composer wishes (*sciolta*); it is rather the theorist's supposed insistence on tonally important intervals like the fourth and fifth—those most nearly allowing exact intervallic correspondence—that has interested students of the fugue.

Here there is a difficulty, noticed by Mann: Zarlino seems in these definitions to be unconcerned with "tonal orientation"; he "ignores the tonal answer, which, by his classification, is no different from any other imitation and has no place in fugues."[3] It is true that Zarlino, unlike

---

[1] J. M. Müller-Blattau, *Grundzüge einer Geschichte der Fuge* (Kassel, 1931), p. 51; A. Ghislanzoni, "La genesi storica della Fuga," *Rivista musicale italiana*, LII (1951), 1; A. Mann, *The Study of Fugue* (New Brunswick, 1958), p. 19; I. Horsley, *Fugue. History and Practice* (Glencoe, 1966), pp. 11, 54.

[2] Mann, *The Study of Fugue*, pp. 19, 23.

[3] Mann, *op. cit.*, p. 23.

his contemporary Vicentino,[4] does not speak of tonal—or better, modal
—answers. But of course he knew their importance, and how to use
them; the duos written to illustrate the twelve modes in Book IV of the
Istitutioni have several clear examples of modal answers,[5] and in Zarlino's
terms would be defined as mixtures of fugue and imitation. At the end
of the 17th century Angelo Berardi still speaks of *fuga reale* as that in
which all intervals correspond exactly. G. M. Bononcini, on the other
hand, after defining *fuga propria* or *regolare* as that in which exact
correspondence of tones and semitones is observed, makes an exception
for tonal adjustment; in a *fuga regolare* one may answer a fifth with a
fourth.[6]

It is characteristic of 17th- and even 18th-century theorists that
they should preserve Zarlino's terminology while altering its meaning.
A whole group of writers in the late 16th and early 17th centuries had
repeated or paraphrased the definitions of fugue and imitation given in
the *Istitutioni:* Artusi, Tigrini, Pontio, Cerreto, Cerone, and Zacconi all
wrote on the subject.[7] Some of what they have to say is useful in clarify-
ing Zarlino's meaning, as will presently be seen; others, by emphasizing
that *fuga* is concerned with answers at perfect intervals, *imitatione* with
those beginning at imperfect and dissonant intervals, may have helped
form the views of modern scholars, which I believe to be rather super-
ficial and in part mistaken. On the whole, theorists up to the middle of
the 17th century at least *meant* to preserve Zarlino's thought. In writers
like Bononcini, however, one sees deliberate change in the meaning of
these terms; and by the 18th century only the words remain. Thus
Rameau, at once admirer and critic of Zarlino, dismisses imitation as
free fugato, whereas in fugue one must proceed with "plus de circon-
spection," following a whole set of rules familiar to us all as defining
the tonal fugue.[8]

---

[4] See N. Vicentino, *L'Antica Musica ridotta alla moderna prattica* (Rome, 1555).
Facs., ed. E. Lowinsky (Basel, 1959), IV, xxxii, fols. 88ᵛ-89.

[5] Examples illustrating modes 1, 5, and 10 (renumbered 3, 7, and 12 in the 1573
ed. of the *Istitutioni*) show use of modal answers. Edward Lowinsky calls attention
to these duos in *Tonality and Atonality in Sixteenth-Century Music* (Berkeley, 1961),
pp. 31-32.

[6] See Ghislanzoni, "La genesi storica," pp. 3-5; Mann, *op. cit.*, pp. 43-45.

[7] Each of these theorists will be considered separately below.

[8] J.-P. Rameau, *Traité de l'harmonie* (Paris, 1722), III, 44, p. 332. Fux, on the
other hand, repeats Zarlino's definitions with surprising faithfulness, allowing for his
altered concept of mode. See J. J. Fux, *Gradus ad Parnassum* (Venice, 1725;
facs. ed., New York, 1966), p. 140, *De imitatione:* "Imitatio fit, quando pars sequens
antecedentem sequitur post aliquam pausam servatis iisdem intervallis, quibus antece-
dens incessit, nullô Modi, Toni, Semitonique habitâ ratione; id quod fieri potest in
Unisone, Secondâ, Tertiâ, Quartâ, Quintâ, Sextâ, Septimâ, & Octavâ. . . ."; p. 143,
De Fugis in genere: "Quapropter alio definitio, quâ Fuga ab imitatione distinguatur,
statuenda est. Dico ergo: Fuga est quarundam Notarum in parte praecedenti posi-
tarum ab sequente repetitio, habitâ modi, ac plerumque toni, semitoniique ratione."

Rameau was of course not trying to explicate Zarlino but was using old terminology adapted to new purposes. Twentieth-century historians of fugue have been more careful than Rameau, but after all they do not have his excuse; and in looking for prophesy of the future in Zarlino's remarks on fugal procedure they have really failed to see the application of his definitions to the music of his own time. A closer reading of the text is clearly called for. The following passages are given as they occur in the 1573 edition of the *Istitutioni*, slightly altered and expanded from the first edition of 1558.

Delle Fughe, o Consequenze

. . . Et tal modo di far cantare le parti in cotal maniera da i Prattici diversamente è stato nominato; percioche alcuni considerando, che le parti cantando insieme al modo detto, l'una segue l'altra alla guisa di uno, il quale fuggendo sia seguitato da un'altro; l'hanno chiamato Fuga; alcuni Risposta; percioche tra loro cantando par che l'una parte all'altra quella istessa modulatione rispondi con proposito; alcuni l'hanno addimandato Reditta; essendo che l'una parte viene à ridire & à referire quello, che l'altra hà detto, o cantato prima: alcuni altri l'hanno chiamato Consequenza; poi che da quell'ordine di Modulatione, che primieramente è detto dall'uno de Cantori in una parte, consequentemente si può da un'altro replicare. Ma alcuni altri l'hanno detto Imitatione: percioche quello che segue il primo, quanto puote cerca di imitarlo; si ne gli Intervalli & ne i Tempi, come anco nelli Movimenti; & si sforza di ridire tutto quello, che hà detto il primo. Et se bene tutte queste tendono ad un fine; le ridurremo a tre capi soli: cioè alla Fuga, alla Imitatione & alla Consequenza; & diremo prima, Fuga esser la Replica, o Reditta di una particella, overo di tutta la modulatione fatta da una parte grave, overo acuta della cantilena; da un'altra parte, overo dalle altre parti del concento, procedendo l'una dopo l'altra per alquanto spacio di tempo, per gli istessi intervalli nello istesso suono, o voce; overamente per una Diapason, over Diapente, o pure per

On Fugues, or Consequences

And such a way of writing the voice parts has been called different things by musicians. For some, considering that when the parts sing together in this way one follows the other, in the manner of the first fleeing, pursued by the second, have named it Fugue. Others style it Response, because in performance it seems that one part aptly answers another with the same melody. Some have named it Repetition, since one part repeats and refers to what the other has said or sung. Yet others have named it Consequence because in this kind of melody what is first sung by a performer on one part may consequently be repeated by another. But still others have termed it Imitation, because he who follows the first part tries to imitate it as best he can, both in intervals and time values, and in [melodic] movements; he is thus constrained to repeat everything the first performer has sung.

Since all these aim at the same end, we shall reduce them to three headings: Fugue, Imitation, and Consequence. Let us say first that Fugue is the copy or repetition by one or more parts of the voice-complex of a section or of a whole melody sung [first] by one part, high or low, of the composition. The parts may proceed one after the other at any distance of time, using the same intervals, singing at the unison, the octave, the fifth, or the fourth below or above. Next, we shall call Imitation that copy or repetition which is like what

una Diatessaron più grave, o più acuta. Dipoi Imitatione nominaremo quella Replica, o Reditta, la quale hò già dichiarato nella Fuga; quella però, che non procede per gli istessi Intervalli; ma per quelli, che sono in tutto differenti dalli primi; essendo solamente li movimenti che fanno le parti cantando & le figure ancora simili. Ma la Consequenza diciamo essere una certa Replica, o Reditta di modulatione, la quale nasce da un'ordine & collocatione di molte Figure cantabili, fatta dal Compositore in una parte della Cantilena; dalla quale ne segue un'altra, o più dopo un certo spacio di tempo.[9]

I have already described for the Fugue, except that it does not proceed by the same but by quite different intervals, the rhythmic and melodic figures of the two parts being nonetheless similar. We call Consequence a certain copy or repetition of a melody, rising from an ordering of many vocal figures, written by the composer in a single voice—from which one or more other voices follow it at a prescribed length of time.

Of the three terms Zarlino would like to see in general use, we may dismiss *Consequenza*, which is simply a strict fugue or imitation written as a single part—what "Musici poco intelligenti" usually call *Canon*. Both fugue and imitation may be either *legata*—strictly carried out through a whole section of a piece—or *sciolta*, broken off whenever the composer finds it convenient to do so.[10] Either may proceed in parallel motion or in contrary motion (*per Arsin et Thesin*). After giving examples of *fuga sciolta* (at the octave) and *fuga legata* (one at the octave, in similar motion, another at the third in contrary motion, an interval giving exact intervallic correspondence), Zarlino goes on to speak in detail of imitation.

Delle Imitationi, & quel che elle siano

Non di poco utile è la Imitatione alli Compositori: imperoche oltra l'ornamento, che apporta alla cantilena, è cosa di ingegno & molto lodevole; & è di due sorti, si come è la Fuga: cioè Legata & Sciolta. E da i Prattici etiandio chiamata Fuga; ma in vero tra la Fuga & la Imitatione è questa differenza: che la Fuga legata o Sciolta, che ella si sia, si ritrova tra molte parti della cantilena, lequali,

On Imitations, and what they are

Imitation is a very useful thing to composers. For besides the ornament it provides music, it is ingenious and praiseworthy in itself. It is of two kinds, just like Fugue: that is, strict and free. Practical musicians indeed call it fugue; but there is this real difference between fugue and imitation. Fugue, whether strict or free, occurs in many voice-parts of a piece, and these contain, as I have shown, the

---

[9] *Istitutioni harmoniche del Rev. Messere Gioseffo Zarlino* (Venice, 1573), III, 54, p. 257. In the 1558 ed. this is ch. 51. For a translation of the 1558 text see G. Marco and C. V. Palisca, trans., *Gioseffo Zarlino. The Art of Counterpoint* (New Haven, 1968), pp. 126-27.

[10] The use of *fuga* to mean a point of imitation that may be broken off at any time may be found as early as Ramos. See *Musica Practica Bartolomei Rami de Pareia*, ed. J. Wolf (Leipzig, 1901), II, 1, i, p. 68: ". . . quod voces, quae sequentur in tenore, non discordent cum illis, quia, cum fuga incipit discordare, in similitudine fiat immediate dissimilitudo, ita ut non faciat contra regulas, supra dictas."

o per movimenti simili, o per con-
trarij, contengono quelli istessi inter-
valli, che contiene la lor Guida, come
hò mostrato: ma la Imitatione sciolta,
o legata, come si vuole; quantunque
si ritrovi tra molte parti (come
mostraremo) & procedi all' istesso
modo; nondimeno non camina per
quelli istessi intervalli nelle parti con-
sequenti, che si ritrovano nella Guida.
La onde; si come la Fuga si può fare
all'Unisono, alla Quarta, alla Quinta,
alla Ottava, overo ad altri intervalli;
*cosi la Imitatione si può accommodare
ad ogni intervallo dall'Unisono &
dalli nominati in fuori.* [my italics]
Per ilche, si potrà porre alla Seconda,
alla Terza, alla Sesta, alla Settima &
ad altri intervalli simili. Diremo
adunque che la Imitatione è quella, la
quale si trova tra due, o più parti;
delle quali il Consequente imitando
li movimenti della Guida, procede
solamente per quelli istessi gradi, senza
havere altra consideratione de gli in-
tervalli. Et la cognitione tanto delle
legate, quanto delle sciolte si potrà
havere facilmente, quando si haverà
conosciuto quello, che voglia dire
Fuga legata & Fuga sciolta.[11]

same intervals as does the Guide—
whether in similar or contrary motion.
On the other hand imitation, free or
strict as you wish, though it too
occurs in many parts (as will be
shown), and proceeds as does fugue,
nonetheless does not show in its course
the identical intervals in the conse-
quent voices as are formed in the
Guide. Now, as one can write Fugue
at the unison, the fourth, the fifth,
the octave, or other intervals, *so one
can manage Imitation at every inter-
val from the unison and the above-
named intervals on.* Thus one will
be able to make use of the second, the
third, the sixth, the seventh, and other
like intervals. Let us then say that
Imitation, found between two or
more voices, is that procedure in
which the Consequent, while imitating
the movements of the Guide, pro-
ceeds merely by the same steps, with-
out regard for the precise intervals.
If one understands the meaning of
strict and free Fugue he will easily
recognize strict and free imitation.

The examples for this chapter include one showing *imitationi sciolte*,
a duo with a half-dozen points of imitation at various intervals and in
a mixture of similar and contrary motion; one illustrating *imitatione
legata*, a strict canon at the third, hence inexact intervallically; another
canon at the octave but in contrary motion, thus again inexact in cor-
respondence of tones and semitones; and a canon at the fifth below,
strictly carried out and intervallically exact except for two not very
prominent occurrences of G-F-E in the guide, answered inexactly, hence
imitatively, by C-B-A in the consequent.[12] This last example is called
by Zarlino a "misto di Fuga & Imitatione." Two things should be noted
here: first, an example of canon at a perfect interval, the fifth, is in-
cluded in the chapter on imitation; and second, Zarlino does not suggest
that a B♭ be supplied everywhere in the lower voice to make the imita-
tion exact, or fugal.

First, then, the distinction between fugue and imitation is not based

---

[11] *Istitutioni*, III, 55, pp. 262-63 (ch. 52 in the 1558 ed.); cf. Marco and Palisca,
The Art of Counterpoint, p. 135.
[12] See Marco and Palisca, *op. cit.*, pp. 136-41, for transcriptions of these examples.

on use of perfect as opposed to imperfect intervals, as is usually said. Use of intervals like the third will almost certainly result in imitation, not fugue; but imitation is possible at the perfect intervals as well (see the italicized text in the passage quoted above). This observation is trivial as regards the example cited above, but it could be of greater importance in other situations; one can easily imagine subjects that stress intervals impossible to imitate exactly at the fourth and fifth without chromatic alteration. There is no need to imagine them, in fact; such subjects occur quite often in music of pervadingly imitative texture, from the time of Josquin through the 16th century. If it is true, as Imogene Horsley says, that "in practice composers with their usual skill in circumventing difficulties, often omit the note or notes that would make the answer at the fifth inexact,"[13] still there are plenty of examples of composers including, sometimes even emphasizing, such notes. Each instance of this sort must doubtless be judged individually; in the terms of this discussion one could decide in favor of fugue by means of *musica ficta* applied to make canons or points of imitation intervallically symmetrical, or one could leave the music alone, settling for Zarlino's concept of imitation. Later I shall give some examples in which decisions of this kind must be made. At this point it should be emphasized that for Zarlino imitation is by no means a second-class form of fugue; indeed he goes out of his way to describe it as "molto lodevole."

No theorist before Zarlino seems to have elaborated upon this distinction between fugue and imitation. Nor do his exact contemporaries introduce it; Bermudo, for instance, gives a definition of *fuga* accompanied by a three-voice example of what Zarlino would have called fugue at the octave below and imitation at the third above.[14] And although I think Zarlino's discussion is amply illustrated in the music of his teacher Adrian Willaert and so possibly the result of Willaert's precepts, a fellow-pupil, Nicola Vicentino, makes no explicit mention of fugue vs. imitation in his *Antica Musica ridotta alla moderna prattica* of 1555. Vicentino stresses the modal importance of fugal entries at the fourth and fifth, advising alteration of the answer to fit within the modal octave. About "fuguing" at other intervals he says little except that caution is necessary, since in writing a fugue at, say, the second, one is in danger of going outside the mode;[15] this could be taken to

---

[13] I. Horsley, "Fugue and Mode in 16th-Century Vocal Polyphony," *Aspects of Medieval and Renaissance Music. A Birthday Offering to Gustave Reese*, ed. J. LaRue (New York, 1966), pp. 414-15.

[14] J. Bermudo, *Declaración de Instrumentos musicales* (Ossuna, 1555). Facs., ed. M. S. Kastner (Kassel, 1957), fol. cxxxvij: "Es la fuga una sucessiva distribucion de una mesma clausula en principio, o en qualquiera o tro lugar de la cantilena: o es repeticion de clausula."

[15] *L'Antica Musica*, IV, xxxii, fols. 88ᵛ-89.

mean that in such cases Vicentino recommends imitation rather than exact fugue, but he does not say so explicitly.

It is among Zarlino's disciples in the theorists of succeeding generations that further mention of fugue and imitation is made. But before we turn to them, one earlier theorist, not heretofore cited in this context, should be called in to testify. Pietro Aron gives the two terms as synonymous in his earliest treatise, the *De institutione harmonica* of 1516:

Imitatio in Cantilenis sive fugatio de parte in partem fieri solet. Est autem ideo dicta imitatio/sive fugatio: quia subsequens: vel antecedens: praecedentis voces partis/vel subsequentis easdem nomine/sed locis diversas repetit: & vel quasi imitando pronunciat/vel quasi subsequendo fugare videtur.[16]

Imitation or fugue between parts is customarily practiced in musical compositions. It is called imitation or fugue because the consequent (or antecedent) voice repeats the very notes of the preceding part or else repeats notes identical in name though different in location. Thus it sings as it were in imitating; or seems, in following, as it were to give chase.

Here Aron is defining exact fugal imitation at the octave or another perfect interval, with the imitating voice following (or anticipating) the main statement. All that is important here is the use of *imitatio*, a word not used in earlier works defining *fuga*, such as the *Diffinitorium* of Tinctoris.

In a later work, the *Lucidario* of 1545, Aron, who appears to have spent some time in Venice in his middle years,[17] approaches Zarlino's view much more closely.

Di alcuni progressi da molti falsamente chiamati fuga, oppenione

A view of certain progressions wrongly called fugue by many

Gia dannoi molte volte fu havuto consideratione alla poca avertenza, & vana oppenione di alcuni, i quali si credono creare nelle loro compositioni quello, che dal musico è chiamato Fuga, la imaginatione de quali non sara in tutto quella, ch'alla fuga si conviene, imperoche essi considerano tal effetto solamente convenirsi alla fuga, conciosa che esso sia appartenente etiando al canon. Il quale appresso de Greci val quanto regola, come seguitando intenderai.

Se da te sara considerato, come procedano le note, o sillabe del sopra posto essempio, vederai, che di necessita bisognera, che il Tenore pausi i

In our circle there has often been discussion of the carelessness and mistaken opinion of those who think they are writing in their music what the musician terms Fugue. Their view is in fact not at all in accordance with what pertains to fugue, since the effect [they strive for] is thought by them to belong solely to fugue, whereas it may also be found in canon (which among the Greeks means rule, as you shall later see).

If you will consider how the notes or syllables proceed in the above example [see Ex. 1], you will see that the tenor, having waited the space of two breves in the canto,

---

[16] P. Aron, *Libri tres de institutione harmonica* (Bologna, 1516), III, lii.

[17] See D. P. Walker, "Aron," *Die Musik in Geschichte und Gegenwart*, I (Kassel, 1949-51), col. 665.

dui tempi del Canto, & procedendo tal principio non sara l'effetto somigliante al Canto, perche esso procede da re, mi, fa, sol, il qual processo è la prima Diatessaron, & il Tenore da ut, re mi, fa, il quale è processo della terza Diatessaron, la onde per essere da molti tal via ignorata, diranno, che sia fuga per Diapason, percioche il principio del Tenore rende ottava al canto. Et cosi in tutte le altre imitationi danno il titolo alla fuga non convenevole al cominciamento di colui che lo segue, onde nascono inconvenienti manifestissimi.[18]

does not have the same effect in its beginning as does the canto, since the latter proceeds in the first species of fourth—*re mi fa sol*—while the tenor sings the third species of fourth—*ut re mi fa*. This is ignored by many people to such an extent that they call [Ex. 1] a fugue at the octave since the beginning of the tenor sounds an octave with the canto. And so in all other examples of imitation they give the unsuitable name of fugue to the beginning of that part which follows—whence arise the most obvious difficulties.

Ex. 1 is the falsely-named fugue to which Aron refers. Zarlino would call this an illustration of *imitatione sciolta;* the fact that the interval is a perfect one, the fifth, makes no difference. In a *resolutione* of the false opinion he has has just countered, Aron cautions the reader that fugues may be written at the unison, the fourth, the fifth, or the octave, but may be so called only if the hexachord syllables are the same—that is, if the imitation is intervallically exact. If not, he advises calling them "Canon per Diatessaron, ò per Diapente, ò come ti piacera, & non fuga."

Example 1

Aron, *Lucidario,* II, x

It is tempting to think that by "dannoi" (see the beginning of the passage given above) Aron meant a circle of enlightened musicians, with himself and the young Zarlino included, around Willaert in Venice. At any rate his view of fugue and imitation seems quite similar, if not so systematically presented, to that of Zarlino[19]—except that the latter deplored the barbarism of calling strict fugue or imitation by the name of canon, which ought to mean only the rule directing its performance.

[18] P. Aron, *Lucidario in musica* (Venice, 1545), II, x. This passage is briefly discussed by P. Bergquist, "Mode and Polyphony around 1500," *The Music Forum,* I (1967), 119.

[19] Cf. Aron's description of fugue in his *Compendiolo di molti dubbi . . .* (Milan, s.d. [1550?]), ch. 70: "Fuga over consequenza, non è altro che una somiglianza di intervalli, Musici, gli quali è mestiere che siano simili di forma & di nome. Et tal fuggire si fa in quattro modi cioè per unisono, per Diatessaron, per Diapente & per Diapason, & per le loro composte, o replicate."

Aron, like Zarlino, makes no distinction in quality between fugue and imitation; he simply wants them kept separate. Why should this distinction have been important to the two theorists—and possibly to all of Willaert's circle in Venice? I shall try to give an answer at a later point in this study.

Among the theorists who echo Zarlino's definitions of fugue and imitation, only the Spaniard Cerone seems to have noticed Aron's discussion as well. In Book XIV of his monumental *Melopeo* the passage quoted above from the *Lucidario* appears, along with Aron's example; Cerone's only comment is that "the moderns call this Fugue even though it does not proceed by means of the same numbers and intervals."[20] Next Zarlino's distinction between fugue and imitation is paraphrased by the Spanish theorist. An example of *fuga sciolta* at the fourth is given, along with the caution that one should keep the subject inside the hexachord if the intervals are to be reproduced exactly by the second voice. Imitation is said to make use of intervals such as the second, third, sixth, and seventh, but also, exceptionally, the fourth and fifth.[21]

A chapter on imitation, again close to Zarlino's text, follows. Then comes a chapter on the two types of imitation, *libre* and *con obligacion*.[22] Cerone's examples, given here as Ex. 2, are revealing: both are at the perfect interval of the fifth, and nowhere is it suggested that accidentals be introduced to make the imitation fugally exact—even though a brush with a melodic diminished fifth and a harmonic cross-relation may be seen in Ex. 2b.

Since melodies that exceed the range of a hexachord are hard to reproduce exactly, Cerone says that composers "casi siempre" write "mixed" canons showing a combination of fugue and imitation. A canon given as illustration (Ex. 3) is marked by the theorist with a cross to show where imitation stops and fugue begins. At this point Cerone advises the beginner that he may simply call things like this *canon*; the distinctions are made to be of use to professionals, and to "demonstrate the precious artifices of music."[23]

The subject evidently intrigued Cerone, for he has still more to offer. Chapter xiii has a tabular example showing a subject beginning with descending thirds (D-B-G); against this are given fugues starting on G-E-C above and below, imitations starting (at a later point) on A-F-D above and below.

Finally Cerone provides an example of a three-voice canon, described as "Imitation for three voices, which can be sung at the fifth and the

---

[20] P. Cerone, *El Melopeo y Maestro* (Naples, 1613), XIV, ii, p. 763.
[21] *El Melopeo*, XIV, iv, pp. 765-66.
[22] *Op. cit.*, XIV, x, pp. 770-71.
[23] *Op. cit.*, XIV, xi, p. 772.

Example 2

Cerone, *El Melopeo*, XIV, x

(a) *libre*

(b) *obligada*

Example 3

Cerone, *El Melopeo*, XIV, xi

Consiguente en imitacion   *en Fuga*

Guia en imitacion   *en Fuga*

ninth below" (Ex. 4.).[24] Though a slightly improbable piece of music, this example seems to me particularly important in its resolutely diatonic character; where fugally exact repetition occurs, as between the two lower voices, it is on an equal footing with the inexact imitation both show in relation to the leading voice.

None of the other writers following Zarlino on this point devoted as much space to it as did Cerone, admittedly a loquacious theorist in general. Artusi makes a brief reference to Zarlino's distinction, emphasizing the occurrence of imitation at intervals other than the perfect ones.[25] Tigrini stays very close to Zarlino's text, and thus says that imitation may occur at any interval, perfect or otherwise.[26]

A somewhat more individual treatment of the subject may be found in the *Dialogo* of Pietro Pontio. In distinguishing between fugue and imitation Pontio seems to add little beyond a certain grammatical ambiguity:

L'imitazione sarà questa, che imitarà un Motetto, Madrigale, ò Canzone con gli istessi movimenti; mà non servarà il valore delle figure del Motetto, ò Madrigale, od altra cosa, che si sia; nè tampoco alle volte gli stessi Tuoni, & Semituoni: Questo modo adunque si dirà imitatione; e questa è la differenza, che si trova tra la fuga, & l'imitazione.[27]

Imitation is that which imitates a motet, madrigal, or canzone with the same melodic movements. But it does not preserve the figures of the motet, or madrigal, or what have you; nor does it always so much as keep the same [relationship of] tones and semitones. This procedure is then called imitation; and such is the difference between imitation and fugue.

By *figure* Pontio means note values; at an earlier point in his treatise he defines an *Inventione*, by which he means a point of imitation, as *reale* if it preserves *figure, nomi & intervalli* (note values, solmization degrees, and general intervals), *non reale* if any of these are imitated inexactly.[28] Examples of these various situations are given, including one *inventione* (Ex. 5) that is *reale* (fugal) in the first tone, *non reale* (imitative) in the fourth tone. Pontio's definition is something of an improvement upon Zarlino's, for there are countless points of imitation in 16th-century music that are inexact in rhythm as well as in pitch, with the latter being often a matter of different intervals, not just of different hexachordal structure.

In saying that "imitation is that which imitates a motet, madrigal, or canzone" Pontio is surely referring to a point of imitation, for he is distinguishing it from fugue; but his awkward language can be ex-

---

[24] *Op. cit.*, XIV, xviii, p. 777.
[25] G. M. Artusi, *L'Arte del Contrapunto ridotto in tavole* (Venice, 1586), p. 31.
[26] O. Tigrini, *Il Compendio della musica* (Venice, 1588); facs. ed. (New York, 1966), IV, ii-v, esp. p. 107.
[27] *Dialogo del R. M. Don Pietro Pontio* (Parma, 1595), p. 106.
[28] *Dialogo*, pp. 46-50.

Example 4

Cerone, *El Melopeo*, XIV, xviii

plained, I think, with the realization that the term *imitatione* meant more than one thing to him. By way of bringing up the subject of *inventione* Pontio remarks that a composer who wrote a piece too closely resembling that of another man would be judged ignorant and of little worth unless this were done "per qualche imitatione di Messe, over Ricercarij"—"through a certain imitative procedure in Masses or Ricercari"; if the composer were so minded he could choose the same points of [fugal] imitation, and even the same harmony.[29]

[29] *Op. cit.*, p. 45.

Example 5

Pontio, *Dialogo*, pp. 46-47

(a) 1st tone

(b) 4th tone

Like Pontio I am running out of terms and am beginning to stumble over the meanings of "imitation"; but it seems clear that what Pontio means by the term in the passage just cited is the procedure we usually call "parody." This has been convincingly demonstrated, for the case in hand and for 16th-century practice in general, by Lewis Lockwood.[30] In the passage distinguishing imitation from fugue Pontio may then be trying to say two things at once, trying without notable success to combine Zarlino's terminology with another, broader meaning of the term *imitatione*. In an earlier work Pontio again uses the word in the general sense; he disapproves of cross-relations, but says they are tolerable when done "per imitatione," as in a passage he himself wrote in his *Missa Ancidetemi*, where he wished to take up the material used in the [Arcadelt] madrigal.[31]

Pontio, a lesser Zarlino, had his followers, among them Scipione Cerreto, whose remarks on "fughe à imitatione" paraphrase Pontio's distinction between fugue and imitation; Cerreto adds that one should

[30] "On 'Parody' as Term and Concept in 16th-century Music," *Aspects of Medieval and Renaissance Music*, pp. 560-75. On p. 570 Professor Lockwood quotes the two passages from Pontio's *Dialogo* given above (see fns. 27 and 29), and says of them "the point of interest in both is again the use of *imitatione* as a term referring to two interrelated compositions, in contradistinction to *fuga*, the familiar alternative 16th-century term for contrapuntal 'imitation,' as later understood." In view of Pontio's use of terminology borrowed from Zarlino, I believe the meaning of the passages in question should be taken as I have tried to do above; for Pontio *imitatione* has both a specific and a general definition.

[31] *Ragionamento di Musica del Reverendo M. Don Pietro Pontio* (Parma, 1588), pp. 68-69. The passage quoted by Pontio from his Mass is derived from Arcadelt's *Ancidetemi pur*, mm. 15-16 and 28-29 in the edition of A. Seay, *Jacobi Arcadelt. Opera Omnia*, II (American Institute of Musicology, 1970), p. 10.

take care to "osservare il Tuono" in writing imitations—meaning that tonal answers are frequently necessary.[32]

In the writings of the last theorist we shall consider here, Lodovico Zacconi, one sees Zarlino's distinctions fading, his terminology being edged toward a usage we find recognizably familiar. At one point in his *Prattica in musica* Zacconi repeats Zarlino's definitions of *fuga legata* and *fuga sciolta*, adding that imitation, in contrast, means that the answering voice does not have to repeat the *figure* of the guide but can merely imitate the melody in a general way—following "l'integrità della modulatione."[33] But elsewhere he advances terminology of his own: *fuga naturale* is used for Zarlino's *fuga*, the later 17th century's *fuga reale*; *fuga accidentale* is defined as inexact imitation, but the example shows that Zacconi is thinking of tonal answers.[34] And in mentioning *fuga legata* and *fuga sciolta* as defined by Tigrini, Zacconi says that practicing musicians now call the first canon, the second imitation.[35] In several places the "via delle imitationi" is spoken of as a general contrapuntal procedure: after mastering note-against-note counterpoint, compared to *libri volgari*, the student should try to learn the "Latin of music" by trying *fughe* based on a borrowed melody, and finally by beginning to compose freely in two parts that imitate each other, this method called *fantasia*.[36] Finally, Zacconi extends the meaning of *imitatione* to include sequential repetitions within a single voice.[37]

*   *   *

If Pietro Aron had, at least in his early work, used *imitatio* as a casually chosen synonym for fugue, Zarlino used *imitatione* with deliberate intent. The musical distinction between fugue and imitation, at first sight a rather pedantic one, seems to me of real importance on several counts, not least the application of *musica ficta* in imitative contrapuntal passages. In a moment we shall turn to this problem. But first Zarlino's choice of the term *imitatione* deserves some notice. That the principle of *imitazione della natura* was of central importance to

---

[32] S. Cerreto, *Della Prattica musicale Vocale et Strumentale* (Naples, 1601), III, xv, p. 212. Cerreto's admonishment about observing the mode, already seen in Vicentino's chapters on fugue, appears in many 17th-century theorists. Christoph Bernhard in his *Tractatus compositionis augmentatus* (*ca.* 1650) calls the tonal answer, for which he gives examples from the works of Palestrina, *consociato modorum*. See J. Müller-Blattau, ed., *Die Kompositionslehre Heinrich Schützens in der Fassung seines Schülers Christoph Bernhard* (Leipzig, 1926), ch. 53, p. 98.

[33] L. Zacconi, *Prattica in musica. Seconda parte* (Venice, 1622), IV, xv, p. 265.

[34] *Prattica*, II, lxv, pp. 113-14. Zacconi's terms, it should be noted, have no connection with diatonic or chromatic practice.

[35] *Prattica*, III, xxxv, pp. 166-67.

[36] *Op. cit.*, II, xxviii, p. 79; III, lv, p. 220. Use of the term *fantasia* in this sense may be seen in Zarlino also; *cf. Istitutioni*, III, 26, p. 200 (1573 ed.).

[37] *Prattica*, III, xlvi, p. 129; *cf.* Pontio, *Ragionamento*, pp. 90-91.

16th-century musicians hardly needs stressing here;[38] but does the word itself when used for contrapuntal procedures have any connection with this principle?

The frequent use by 16th-century composers and publishers of the phrase *Missa ad imitationem* . . . for parody Masses is surely relevant here;[39] as Pontio's words show, the procedure we call by the name of parody, a process in which one composer copies features of another man's work almost as if it were an object in Nature, was thought of as closely akin to the technique of contrapuntal imitation in general.

Zarlino's normal word in speaking of modal ethos or of setting words to music is *accommodare*; one "suits" the music to the expressive character of the text by choice of the proper mode and by using just declamatory procedures. Writing of the "accommodation" of music to words, Zarlino describes the power of the text to convey "o per via della narratione, o della imitatione" various sentiments; it is the musician's duty to select melodies and harmonies "simile alla natura" of these sentiments.[40] Thus the composer's melodic subject or invention can be in its way an imitation of nature. At an earlier point in the *Istitutioni* Zarlino reminds composers that melodies used in fugal entries should be properly separated in time and should begin slowly, for

. . . veramente in ciò & in ogn'altra cosa dobbiamo imitar la Natura, il cui procedere si vede esser molto regolato; conciosia che se noi haveremo riguardo alli Movimenti naturali, ritrovaremo, che sono ne i loro principij alquanto più tardi, di quello, che non sono nel mezo & nel fine; come si può vedere in una Pietra, che sia lasciata cadere dall'alto al basso; della quale il Movimento è più veloce, senza dubio, nel fine, che non è nel principio. Imitaremo adunque la Natura & procederemo in tal maniera, che li Movimenti, che faranno le parti delli Contrapunti non siano molto veloci nel principio; ilche osservaremo etiandio nel mezo & nel fine di ciascuna parte, quando dopo le Pause incomincieranno à cantare. . . .[41]

Truly in this and in all things we should imitate Nature, whose workings are most orderly. Thus if we observe motion in Nature, we shall see that it is somewhat slower at its start than in midcourse or at the end —as can be seen in a stone, the motion of which when dropped is surely faster at the end than at the beginning. Let us therefore imitate Nature by proceeding in such a way that the movement of contrapuntal voices is not very fast at the outset. We should also observe this in the middle and end of any voice part, whenever that part begins to sing after some rests.

[38] On this subject see A. Carapetyan, "The Concept of *Imitazione della natura* in the 16th Century," *Journal of Renaissance and Baroque Music* [= *Musica Disciplina*], I (1948), 47-67; L. Schrade, "Von der 'Maniera' der Komposition in der Musik des 16. Jahrhunderts," *Zeitschrift für Musikwissenschaft*, XVI (1934), 3-20; 98-117; 152-70.

[39] See Lockwood, "On 'Parody,'" p. 563. In a chapter called "Von der Imitation," Christoph Bernhard gives lists of the composers who "mehr wert sind [ge]imitiret zu werden." See Müller-Blattau, *Die Kompositionslehre*, ch. 43, p. 90.

[40] *Istitutioni*, IV, 32, p. 319 (1573 ed.).

[41] *Op. cit.*, III, 45, p. 238.

From the passage above it seems a short step to the notion that fugal entries "imitate the nature" of the subject they follow. Why then did Zarlino not simply call all fugal procedure imitation? He seems rather discontent with the term *fuga*; for exact canons he prefers *consequenza*, and he suggests in place of *fuga* words like *replica* and *reditta*. *Fuga*, a term without rhetorical meaning or classical associations, may even have struck Zarlino's circle in Venice as something of a barbarism. It was nonetheless in common use, and Zarlino as practical musician doubtless knew it would remain so. But he could at least define it precisely by calling it an exact repetition of something else, hence different from an imitation. Musicians could then choose either to restate a subject in another voice, or to imitate its character more or less closely. The fact that imitation is far more common than fugue in the music of the middle and later 16th century should not lead even the most enthusiastic humanist among us to think of this music as therefore more imitative of nature; but Zarlino's choice of language may nevertheless have a strong current of humanistic thinking behind it.

*   *   *

Modern scholars when writing about 16th-century antecedents of the tonal fugue have tended to prefer Vicentino's discussion of *fuga* to that of Zarlino; Vicentino sets up no rigid categories, appears to speak directly and in chatty fashion about practical matters, and stresses the connection of fugue to tonal thinking more than Zarlino does. In fact the two theorists do not contradict each other but rather give useful complementary information.[42] Zarlino, like most theorists before him and many after his time, does have a certain fondness for setting up categories. But on the whole, and certainly in this instance, his distinctions make eminent good sense. If one looks for examples of *fuga* and *imitatione* in the polyphonic music Zarlino presumably knew best, that of his master Adrian Willaert, they are not at all hard to find. Even the theorist's seemingly pedantic stress on fugue and imitation in contrary motion turns out to be very practical; if lengthy canons *per arsin*

---

[42] At one point Vicentino seems to approach Zarlino's concept of imitation as it chiefly concerns us here. In a chapter on composing canons (*L'Antica Musica*, IV, xxxiii, fols. 89ᵛ-90) he says: "Et si de avvertire che quando il Tenore farà il Canon con il Contr'alto in quinta, che s'il Tenore sarà per b. molle, il Contr'alto verrà per ♮ incitato; & si fugerà di far quarto, per non fare che in quello venghi il tritono" ("one should take note that when the tenor is in canon with the alto at the 5th, if the tenor is on a [B] flat, the alto will be on an [E] natural; and one should avoid the interval of the fourth, lest the tritone should occur in the second voice"). This passage begins with a recommendation that the non-canonic voices begin "con l'imitatione del Canon."

In one detail Vicentino's terminology does differ slightly from that of Zarlino. By *arsin et thesin* in imitative counterpoint Zarlino means contrary melodic motion (*Ist.*, III, 55, p. 260). Vicentino uses this term to mean imitation in syncopated rhythm (*L'Ant. Mus.*, IV, xxxii, fol. 88ᵛ); then in the next chapter (fol. 90) he employs the term with the meaning Zarlino gives it.

et thesin do not abound, there are innumerable examples of points of imitation, strict or free, in melodic inversion.

By way of testing Zarlino's ideas I looked through two collections of Willaert's motets, those in the *Musica nova* of 1559 and the second book of four-voice motets, published in 1539 and reprinted in 1545.[43] Examples of *fuga sciolta*, exactly carried out points of imitation at the unison, fourth, fifth, and octave, are so numerous that there is no point in discussing single instances; but a few examples of Zarlino's other categories might be instructive.

Fuga legata, the strict canon at a perfect interval allowing for exact intervallic correspondence, is plentifully represented in the motets of the *Musica nova*. Willaert chooses for the most part the interval of the fifth above or below; the fugal exactness of the canon is indicated in several motets by the use of partial signatures. In *Sustinuimus pacem— Peccavimus* (no. 9), for instance, a motet with the inscription "Canon. Fuga quatuor temporum in diapente remissum," the upper voice has a signature of one sharp. Any written ♮ in this voice is carefully answered by a written ♭ in the lower voice, and nowhere is use of *musica ficta* likely in one voice but difficult to apply in the other.[44] This motet is typical of the canonic pieces in the *Musica nova*; intervallic exactness was obviously one of Willaert's aims. A slightly more evident bow toward imitation may be seen in one or two of the motets in *Musica nova*,[45] but troublesome spots are rare, and would be rarer still except for the editor's somewhat inconsistent use of *musica ficta*, evidently placed without very much regard for preservation of fugal exactness.[46]

Imitatione legata, canon without perfect equivalence of intervals, seems uncommon in Willaert, but there are instances. One is the "Canon duorum temporum fuga in subdiapente" in the four-voice *Ave regina coelorum*.[47] Here the canon is a Phrygian melody on E, answered on

[43] See *Adriani Willaert. Opera Omnia*, ed. H. Zenck and W. Gerstenberg (American Institute of Musicology, 1950-), vols. II, V.

[44] The F's in the upper part are flatted at almost all important points, and the resulting B♭'s in the canonic voice do not disrupt the modal *concentus*. Thus the question of whether an exact canon such as this involves modal transposition—a problem to be considered in a general way later in this study—seems academic; Willaert takes care to keep his canonic voices within the general mode of the motet.

[45] See *Veni Sancte Spiritus* (no. 11), bars 46-51, 52-57, for instance. Possibly Zarlino would allow at moments like this a small admixture of imitation (*cf.* his example of mixed fugue and imitation on p. 264 of the *Istitutioni*) in what otherwise meets his definition of fugue.

[46] For examples of this see *Salve sancta parens* (no. 15), bars 31ff.; *Aspice Domine* (no. 17), bars 84 and 87.

[47] *Opera*, II, 35. The canon is praised as a skillful one in G. Reese, *Music in the Renaissance* (New York, 1954), p. 372. A curious example of a four-part canon with entries at successive fifths (G-D-A-E), may be seen in Verdelot's *Dignare me laudare te*, printed in A. Smijers, ed., *Treize livres de Motets parus chez Pierre Attaingnant en 1534 et 1535*, III (Paris, 1936), 39. The very diatonic character of this piece makes it a particularly good instance of *imitatione legata*. I am grateful to Mr. Benjamin Peck of New York University for calling this piece to my attention.

A below; the obvious problem is how the F's in the upper voice, approached in a variety of ways, are to be answered in the lower: B♮ or B♭? The editor has inserted a few flats here and there, and a few more could conceivably be added; but there is no way to make the imitation exact enough for it to be called fugue (despite its superscription). Ex. 6 shows the opening of the piece, followed by passages in which fugal exactness is not feasible (as marked by asterisks). Notes over which I have placed a "♭?" are places in which *musica ficta* could be introduced in an effort to make the imitation more nearly exact. I do not, however, think these flats necessary or even especially desirable.

This piece is a clear example of imitation; and Zarlino nowhere says that one should try to get imitation as close to fugue as possible. One consequence of his distinction between the two is that there is no need to try to keep the solmization of canonic melodies exactly alike; a defective fugal canon simply becomes a perfectly acceptable imitative one.

More complicated, since the examples are so much more numerous, is the phenomenon of *imitatione sciolta*. The opening of Willaert's four-voice *Beatus Joannes—Ipse est*,[48] given in Ex. 7, is a good illustration. How long should the written E♭'s in alto and bass obtain? In all probability for just one note, in the alto at any rate; thus what looks like a strictly fugal opening becomes an example of *imitatione sciolta*.

Imitations of this kind may be found at many points within these pieces, not just in opening figures. Use of intervals such as the third, guaranteeing imitation rather than fugue, is more common within pieces

Example 6

Willaert, *Ave regina coelorum* (*Opera*, II, 35)

Canon duorum temporum fuga in subdiapente

* The rests as given in this part are clearly in error. The facsimile from a MS source for this piece, reproduced on p. ii of the volume from which this example is drawn, gives them correctly.

48 *Opera*, II, 71. The *secunda pars* of this motet begins with a motive imitated at the third below, then at the fifth above (both of these inexact intervallically), and finally at the octave in exact *fuga sciolta*.

Example 7

Willaert, *Beatus Joannes — Ipse est* (*Opera*, II, 71)

Example 8
Willaert, *Usquequo Domine — Illumina* (*Opera*, II, 26), mm, 23-29

than at their openings,[49] but the perfect intervals remain the most fre-
quently used ones. The kind of small problem attention to Zarlino's
distinction can pose is illustrated in Ex. 8, a passage from the middle
of the first part of Willaert's *Usquequo Domine—Illumina*. In this ex-
ample of three-part imitation the alto could possibly be "fugally" in-
flected by flatting the E's in its version of the figure, but the result
would be curious in sound; it seems better to consider this another
example of *imitatione sciolta*.

Sometimes the composer decides everything himself. In Ex. 9 Wil-
laert provides an example of mixed imitation and fugue (between
superius and alto) so clear that Zarlino could have used it for an exam-

[49] Vicentino, *op. cit.*, IV, xiiii, fols. 78ᵛ-79, advises sticking to the perfect intervals
at the opening points of imitation in a piece, saving the other intervals, which he
here terms "cattive prese di voci," for later points, where *inganni* such as syncopated
entries may also be used to good effect.

ple. But more often the decision is left to the performer or to the modern editor. Zarlino's definitions do not provide certain solutions, but they may be of real help if we can simply decide whether the case at hand is one of fugal or of imitative procedure.

*   *   *

Writing about music of the turn of the 16th century, Putnam Aldrich describes problematic imitative entries in this way:

> If the imitation is to be strict the modal octave, or at least the portion of it used in the subject, will be transposed a fifth or a fourth. An accidental inserted in the part by the composer will insure that such a transposition was intended. In the absence of any accidental it is sometimes difficult to determine whether or not strict imitation (and therefore transposition) was intended to be arrived at through musica ficta.[50]

Edward Lowinsky, describing a group of ricercari by Willaert, takes a different tack:

> Each time the question is whether a motive introduced by Willaert in an unambiguous solmization should preserve its character in transposition one or two fifths lower through the addition of accidentals necessary to observe the original solmization. Each time the editors agreed that this must have been Willaert's intent.[51]

These statements introduce two topics not expressly treated by Zarlino in connection with fugue and imitation. Vicentino warns against fugal entries that go outside the mode, but limits himself to favoring entries at perfect intervals and to recommending adjustment of fifths to fourths so as to keep answering voices within the octave. On the matter of modal transposition in imitative entries he, like, Zarlino, is silent.[52] As for solmization patterns, they are of course implicit in any talk of the relationship of tones and semitones in a melody; in defining imitation Zarlino is in effect saying that hexachord relationships need not always be kept intact in successive entries. What he does not say is what Professor Lowinsky asks, whether one should employ fugue in order to keep exact a very distinctive thematic outline.

Solmization patterns, when transposed literally from one voice to another distant any interval other than the octave, can result in modal

---

[50] P. Aldrich, "An Approach to the Analysis of Renaissance Music," *The Music Review*, 30 (1969), p. 10.

[51] E. Lowinsky, Foreword to *Musica Nova*, ed. H. Colin Slim. Monuments of Renaissance Music, I (Chicago, 1964), p. xi.

[52] On this point see Horsley, "Fugue and Mode," p. 416. Glareanus does speak of canons at the interval of the second above and below, pieces in which the two voices sing in separate, normally unrelated modes. His examples, canonic duos from Josquin's *Missa Mater Patris* and *Missa Malheur me bat*, show mixtures of Ionian and Dorian, and of Phrygian and Dorian. See *Dodekachordon*, III, xxiv (Vol. II, p. 276, and examples 105-110 in the translation of C. A. Miller [American Institute of Musicology, 1965]).

Example 9
Willaert, *Congratulamini — Beatam* (*Opera*, II, 18), mm. 31-39

ambiguity or even modulation. This causes problems in contrapuntally imitative music from the middle of the 15th century on.[53] Of course a composer might have wanted to work out a highly chromatic series of modulatory phrases by means of exactly transposed entrances at the interval of a fourth or fifth; Professor Lowinsky has discussed some intriguing instances of this and similar procedures in the music of Josquin and his successors.[54] If not deliberately made chromatic for

[53] Somewhat similar problems are caused by sequential ostinato patterns within a single voice in the music of Obrecht, Isaac, and their contemporaries. See M. van Crevel, "Verwante Sequensmodulaties bij Obrecht, Josquin en Coclico," *Tijdschrift der Vereeniging voor Nederlandse Muziekgeschiedenis*, XVI/2 (1941), 107-24.

[54] See especially his "The Goddess Fortuna in Music," *The Musical Quarterly*, XXIX (1943), 45-77, and "Matthaeus Greiter's *Fortuna*: An Experiment in Chromaticism and in Musical Iconography," *ibid.*, XLII (1956), 500-19; XLIII (1957), 68-85.

experimental or expressive purposes, however, Renaissance polyphony remains within the limits of a diatonic modal system. Just what these limits are, and how modal theory may be said to govern polyphonic practice over a wide span of time, are subjects beyond the scope of this study. But if we are to believe the theorists at all, the individual voices of a polyphonic piece all subscribe to either the plagal or authentic compass of a single mode—exceptionally, perhaps, to pairs of closely related modes. Solmization patterns are mentioned in this regard only as they characterize the species of fourth and fifth which go to make up the various modal octaves.

If, then, the solmization of a subject changes when transposed to another interval, an entry at this second interval may not be an exact answer to the subject but instead an imitation of that subject, copying the intervallic makeup of its guide as closely as is possible within the portion of the modal octave corresponding to its range. The music of Josquin contains many examples illustrating such modally-governed imitation. The openings of three Masses—*Allez regretz*, *Ave maris stella*, and *Pange lingua*—are instances (Ex. 10). In Ex. 10a the symmetrical spacing of answers at the fourth below and above the subject would at first suggest identical solmization on *ut* . . . , the starred note then a *fa*. But an E♭ in the alto at the end of bar 6 would take that voice outside the mode, for no good reason; it seems much more sensible to consider the alto answer as being on *fa* . . . , hence ending on a *mi* at the starred note.[55] The bass entry in Ex. 10b, its B♭ strikingly different in sound from the E in the subject's corresponding spot, cannot here or in other movements of the Mass be raised a semitone. Nor should the E's in the other three voices be lowered; context in the final entry, as well as in other sections of the work (*cf.* Agnus Dei III, bar 64), makes this alteration impossible.[56] Thus the bass part remains in G-Dorian like the others, using a different segment of the octave and sung to a hexachord pattern beginning on *re*, against the *ut* . . . (or *re*, followed by a mutation) of the subject.

In Ex. 10c a flat could be added to the third note of the bass and alto entries (this is actually done in the Credo, where a persistent *mi-fa* undulation marks the subject). But such an alteration causes problems two bars later, and results in modal transposition in the answering voices, which otherwise fit well within a segment of the normal Phrygian octave. A subject opening on *mi* answered by an imitation on *re* (*cf.* Ex. 5b above) seems, at least in the terms of this study,

---

[55] Raising the corresponding B♭ in the tenor and F in the bass would produce a stylistically improbable result, more like an Elizabethan dance-song than like Josquin. And comparison with the opening of Agnus I in this Mass, where the context prohibits an F♯, shows that the notes in question should be sung as written.

[56] See also the major sixth degree in the plainchant hymn on which the Mass is based (*Liber Usualis*, p. 1259).

Example 10

(a) Josquin, *Missa Allez regretz* (*Werken*, *Missen*, IV, xx), *Kyrie*

Josquin's intention. A special problem arises in the *Qui tollis* of the Gloria in this Mass, where successive entries of the subject on B, E, A, and D give B-C-B, E-F-E, A-Bb(written in)-A, D-*E*-D. Professor Lowinsky argues that the E in the final entry should be flatted to preserve thematic symmetry.[57] This is indeed possible, but if Bb can be regarded as a normal occurrence in untransposed Phrygian (lying as it does above the basic *mi-la* tetrachord inside the mode's species of fifth), Eb involves a real transposition, and a double one at that, of the

[57] "The Goddess Fortuna," pp. 60-61. It should be noted that Professor Lowinsky is in general opposed to the notion, at least as it applies to music of the 15th century, that one voice part should be regarded as occupying a transposed form of the basic mode. See his "Conflicting Signatures in Early Polyphonic Music," *The Musical Quarterly*, XXXI (1945), 227-60, and "Conflicting Views on Conflicting Signatures," this JOURNAL, VII (1954), 181-204.

Example 10

(b) Josquin, *Missa Ave maris stella* (*Werken, Missen*, II, vi), *Kyrie*

mode. Zarlino's concept of imitation here again supports a diatonic rendering of this final entry.[58]

Further examples from music of the early and middle 16th century could be added,[59] but I think those already given suffice to demon-

[58] Professor Lowinsky's statement ("The Goddess Fortuna," p. 61) that a D-E♮-D entry in the bass involves a "shift from Phrygian to Dorian, breaking up the tonal unity of this marvellously organized section of the Mass" does not strike me as convincing; the bass entry revolves about E and F, ending on an E-A fifth. To flat the first E's is, I think, to confuse the modal clarity of this entry and of the whole *concentus*. The *phrasis* of Glareanus' modal theory, by which mode is established in a single voice, has to do with the range and intervallic quality of a whole phrase, and is thus not determined by an opening point of imitation.

[59] Entries on successive fifths, involving inexact imitation, may be seen in the *tertia pars* of Josquin's *O admirabile commercium* and in Festa's *Deduc me domine;* see E. Lowinsky, ed., *The Medici Codex of 1518*. Monuments of Renaissance Music, IV (Chicago, 1968), pp. 38, 56. A particularly troublesome instance of this kind may be seen in Francesco de Layolle's *Occhi miei lassi*, bars 55ff.; see F. D'Accone, ed., *Music of the Florentine Renaissance*, IV (American Institute of Musicology, 1969), p. 60. Here a subject beginning on F is imitated by three voices beginning on E, A, and D respectively; no amount of *musica ficta* can make these points of imitation fugally exact.

Example 10

(c) Josquin, *Missa Pange lingua* (*Das Chorwerk*, I, ed. F. Blume), *Kyrie*

strate my point (the interested reader is encouraged to hunt up examples of his own). Naturally counter-examples could also be found without difficulty; there are pieces in which hexachordal symmetry seems intended, often playfully so, even in strongly diatonic pieces.[60] Here *musica ficta* resulting in fugally exact entries could be applied even at the cost of temporary dislocation of the mode.

<center>*   *   *</center>

In summary I think it can be said that Zarlino's definition of fugue and imitation, at first reading a distinction of interest only to other theorists, was made for very practical reasons. As two equally valid aspects of contrapuntal technique, imitation and fugue serve to unify

[60] See, for example, Compère's *Chanter ne puis* in H. Hewitt, ed., *Ottaviano Petrucci. Canti B*. Monuments of Renaissance Music, II (Chicago, 1967), 220. Here a double series of entries on successive fifths seems (though the editor apparently did not think so) to call for *la-re* solmization throughout the first series, *sol-ut* throughout the second.

compositions and to further the concept of *imitazione della natura*—all the while remaining subservient to an unstated but strongly implied idea of diatonic modal unity. The emerging *seconda prattica* of the later 16th century gave rise to music that the essentially conservative Zarlino could not have, would not have wished to account for. Yet in a sense his theory was not behind the times. If, as Alfred Mann says, Zarlino's theory "ignores the tonal answer, which, by his classification, is no different from any other imitation," this is because his concept of *fuga* and *imitatione* is a broader and more thoughtful theory of tonal fugue than that of his contemporaries. Taking note of these distinctions will not give us final answers for application of *musica ficta* to imitative entries; it may indeed only support timid diatonicists and give pause to hardy chromaticists among us. Perhaps, though, it is not final answers about *musica ficta* that we want, only more refined criteria for making individual decisions.[61] This it seems is what Zarlino is offering us.

New York University

---

[61] On this see the very sensible remarks of Lewis Lockwood in "A Sample Problem of Musica Ficta: Willaert's *Pater Noster*," *Studies in Music History. Essays for Oliver Strunk*, ed. H. Powers (Princeton, 1968), p. 169.