Critical Commentary Accompanying the Transcription of *Inperiale sedendo*

General comments

**Lu** is the only manuscript to transmit *Inperiale sedendo* with a contratenor part. The contratenor is textless and inessential (not needed for the song to make sense contrapuntally), but poses few problems for transcription. The most obvious problem with regard to this part is that it cannot be performed at the same time as the tenor part, since the contratenor needs to turn from page 91r to 91v while the tenor is still singing music on 91r. I have transcribed the breve as a half note, so that

\[
.o. = 2/4 \quad .p. = 3/4 \quad .i. = 6/8 \quad .q. = 2/4
\]

Generally, the contratenor is composed against the tenor. This is especially obvious in the ritornello, where both voices often move together. The contratenor has two roles: it mirrors the tenor rhythmically when the tenor has ligatures, and it provides rhythmic interest by singing syncopated passages when there are none in the other voices. For example, the contratenor creates a hocket-like passage against the tenor (mm. 34-36), and it imitates the descending stepwise motive in the tenor, but half a breve later (mm. 64-66). From a heraldic perspective, the contratenor gets in the way, since it often obscures the heraldic text that is sung homophonically in the outer voices. Finally, the contratenor often joins the tenor in the untexted passages (for example, mm. 25-30 and 58-61).

Mensuration changes

The madrigal *Inperiale sedendo* as it appears in **Lu** contains many internal mensuration changes, but does not feature one at the ritornello. All six of these changes are marked in the cantus and four are marked in the tenor, but only two are marked in the contratenor. **Mod A** is the only other manuscript to give the same *divisio* markings as **Lu**; none of the other manuscripts that transmit this madrigal have .i. (6/8) from measures 87-90, or the .q. (2/4) from m. 131 to the end of the ritornello.
The contratenor part in Lu does not indicate the change in mensuration from .p. to .i. at m 87, resulting in an interesting situation. If the mensuration change is made only in the voices where it is marked (cantus and tenor), then the contratenor stays in .p. (3/4). In this situation it does not move rhythmically with the tenor and is awkward against the cantus. If the mensuration change is made in all voices, however, the contratenor ends up with a ligature that is partially in .i. (6/8) and partially in .p. (3/4) (mm. 90-91). Rhythmically, it does not matter for the end of the ligature, since it fills an entire measure, but it is an impossible situation for the performer, who must either sing in simple time against the compound time of the other voices, or change mensurations partway through a ligature. Since it is not possible to perform from this score anyway, it is a moot point. In the edition, I have chosen to change the mensuration to .i. in all voices.

Errors

Cantus

The cantus is missing a breve rest at mm. 26-29 (the rests add up to 3 breves, but should be 4). The notes at m. 80 are unclear (the time signature is .p., but it looks as though there are 4 semibreves in the bar. I have changed this to semibreve-minim-semibreve-minim, since it looks as though there was a stem on the final note of the bar at one point).

Contratenor

The first note of the song should perhaps be a long, as in the other voices, so that the music up to m. 30 will not be one breve too short. Measures 27-28 are very unclear. As in the cantus part, it looks as though there are 4 semibreves in a bar of .p., but it is clear from the counterpoint that this is meant to be two bars (which is what I have added). There is an error in one of the ligatures at the end of the ritornello, where the mensuration changes from .p. to .q. (a change not marked in the contratenor, but necessary in order for the parts to work together). One of the two ligatures made up of breves needs an extra breve, so I have added this to the end of the ligature at m. 134, where it works best contrapuntally. This is also the most natural place that a stem might have been accidentally omitted.
The text of *Inperiale sedendo* as it appears in *Lu* differs slightly from versions in other manuscripts (*Inperiale sedendo* is transmitted for voice in *Lu, Pit, PR, Mod A* and *Sq*). In *Lu*, the texts of the cantus and tenor differ in places. For example, the cantus incipit is *Inperiale sedendo* while that of the tenor is *Imperiale sedendo*. While the cantus gives *signor*, the tenor gives *segnor*. Additionally, while most manuscripts give *mai benegno* and *Pit* gives *più benegno*, *Lu* gives *via benegno* (perhaps a misreading of *mai*, or perhaps *mai* is a misreading of *via*). Considering the proximity to Padua of the *Lu* version, it seems more likely that *mai* is a corruption of *via*). As in other manuscripts, portions of the text are repeated.