

ARTICLES / SAGGI

FOR ANTONIO DA MONTALCINO AND APOSTOLO ZENO

NELIA CACACE SAXBY
(University of Cape Town)

Sommario

Come, quando e perché i testi entrano a far parte della storia letteraria? I quesiti vengono esaminati in rapporto al caso particolare del codice delle "Rime" di Antonio da Montalcino, in confronto con la sorte toccata al Cod. Grey 7.b.5 della South African Library, entrambi donati da Pier Jacopo Martelli ad Apostolo Zeno. La fortuna delle "Rime" viene spiegata attraverso le "Lettere" di Apostolo Zeno, le quali servono ad illustrare i modi e gli interessi dei collezionisti del Settecento.

L'indagine si sposta, nella seconda parte, sul contenuto metrico delle "Rime" del Senese, la cui originalità è stata esclusivamente legata alla elaborazione della terzina lirica. Ne emerge che, in quanto innovatore metrico, egli si allontana sia dai contemporanei sia dai modelli illustri in più luoghi di quanto si sia finora pensato.

The recent edition by Emanuela Braico¹, of the poems of Antonio da Montalcino contained in Ms. Marciano ital. ix 241 of Venice, is an important contribution to the literary history of the *secolo senza poesia*. In its turn, its provenance, from the collection of Apostolo

¹ In *Letteratura Italiana Antica*, V, 2004: 27-68.

Zeno, turns the spotlight on Zeno's untiring activity as a book collector and scholar of early vernacular literary texts. A full examination still has to be undertaken of catalogues penned by him as well as those compiled by his collaborators which contain manuscript descriptions, notes of purchase and letters from fellow collectors. So far as can be made out, even the full extent of his collection as it once was remains problematical².

Research in this area is hindered by Zeno's almost illegible handwriting, as well as by the fact that the material is not preserved in any chronological or thematic order. Documents as well as notes from his correspondents are frequently unsigned³. Given these circumstances, Zeno's published letters provide a more accessible and reliable base from which to reconstruct his researches on a particular topic and serve to pinpoint the fellow scholars whose interests coincided with his own. The correspondence generated by the manuscript containing the poems of Antonio da Montalcino may be said to be exemplary in this regard, especially when seen in the context of eighteenth century literary history and scholarship.

Apostolo Zeno's interest in Antonio da Montalcino appears to have been stimulated by his friendship with the nobleman, book

² Paolo Canciani, *Indice non compiuto dei MSS di Apostolo Zeno (Cl. XI, 284 = 6787)*, 1787: "[...]ma tale non pervenne a noi, perché altri codici furono distrutti da Zeno; altri ne ebbe il fratello Somasco, altri come si crede passarono alla Biblioteca dei padri Serviti di questa dominante, altri finalmente si hanno dovuti cedere a case patrizie". In his prefatory note to the *Indice* (1v), Fr. Domenico Pellegrini was to warn of Canciani's work: "Nella stessa breve prefazione che stese da sé, errò, supponendo che Apostolo Zeno avesse fatto doviziosa raccolta di MSS i quali poi a noi non sieno pervenuti".

³ A tantalizing and frustrating example of this may be found in the *Indici e spogli di MSS appartenenti a varie persone*, It. Cl. X. Cod. 349 = 7320, num. 55. It concerns the sixteenth century manuscript containing the *Novelle* of the Sienese, Gentile Sermini. From the note, it is clear that Zeno had asked a collaborator to examine the text for him before his purchase of it. Unfortunately, the note is neither dated nor signed.

collector and man of letters, Annibale degli Abati Olivieri of Pesaro⁴. In the autumn of 1736 Zeno had spent some time in Ravenna, drawn there by the collection held in the Library of Classe⁵. Presumably at Olivieri's request, Zeno had examined documents which were pertinent to Olivieri's interest in the cultural heritage of Pesaro. On his return to Venice, he wrote to Olivieri:

Nel tempo che io soggiornava ozioso e spensierato in Ravenna, il mio maggior piacere si era l'andare a visitare la bella libreria de' PP. di Classe, copiosa di ottimi libri sì a stampa che a penna. Fra questi ne ho osservati alcuni concernenti la vostra patria, e i letterati di essa.⁶

Nel rivoltar che poi feci il Catalogo compilato dal P. Ab[ate] Canneti, dei Codici da lui acquistati per la medesima Biblioteca, ritrovai che 34 egli ne aveva comperati in Pesaro nel Giugno dell'anno 1711 e ne fece memoria in tal guisa: *Codices MSS Pisarenses empti ac translati in Classensem Bibliothecam anno*

⁴ Some three years later, in 1739, Olivieri's passion, if not obsession, with the Sforza rulers of Pesaro, their literary correspondents and the ruling families of that city, resulted in an exchange of letters and information with the Librarians of the Classe Library. Fruit of this collaboration was the transcription of Almerici's poems which is held by the Biblioteca Oliveriana of Pesaro. A detailed account is given by Nelia Cacace Saxby, "Alcune lettere Olivieri-Fiacchi. Su e per Raniero degli Almerici e I codici delle sue *Rime*", in *Studia Oliveriana*, N. S., vol. XX, 2000: 91-106. The reader is referred to this article for the bibliography.

⁵ On the Library and the Librarians of Classe, see Donato Domini, *La biblioteca classense*, in *Le grandi biblioteche dell'Emilia Romagna e del Montefeltro*, Casalecchio di Reno, Grafis, 1991, 2 voll., vol. 1: 207-25; 212.

⁶ Apostolo Zeno, *Lettere*, seconda ed., Venezia, Sansoni, 1785; vol. V: 241. *Lettera* 945. *Al medesimo. A Pesaro. Venezia 7 Novembre. 1736.*

1711. *Mense Junio*. A voi facilmente sarà noto donde egli avesse modo di trarli.⁷

Il XIV codice che è cartaceo in 4 del secolo XV è un grosso canzoniere di Raniero da Pesaro, il quale (come appare dal *Canzoniere medesimo*) visse verso la metà del XV secolo.⁸ Vi si trovano proposte e risposte passate in sonetti tra lui e i mentovati principi Sforzeschi, Costanzo ed Alessandro suoi signori, come pure tra lui e Alessandro Pogliarii da Rieti, e un Maestro Antonio da Fano. Uno è il sonetto di Costanzo Sforza, uno pure di Alessandro Sforza, del quale Alessandro trovo pure un sonetto indiritto ad un certo Antonio da Montalcino, Poeta vivente nel medesimo tempo, di cui v'ha tra' miei codici un bel Canzoniere scritto in carta pergamena in 4.⁹

Zeno's remark on the exchange of sonnets between Alessandro Sforza and Antonio da Montalcino must have bewildered Olivieri. The scholar would have known of the contents of the Almerici manuscript if not at first hand, indirectly from Giovan Mario's Crescimbeni's *Istoria della vulgar poesia* (1714). In the edition published by Antonio de' Rossi in Rome, under the numbers 73, 74, 75, 76, Crescimbeni had recorded not only what he knew of Raniero degli Almerici, and the Lords of Pesaro, Alessandro and Costanzo,

⁷ Lettera 945: 243.

⁸ Raniero Almerici da Pesaro (e altri), *Rime (Ravenna, Biblioteca Classense, Cod. 240)*, a cura di Nelia Cacace Saxby, Bologna, Commissione per i Testi di Lingua, 2003: xxiv-xlv.

⁹ Lettera 946. *Al medesimo. A Pesaro. Venezia 22 Novembre 1736*: 244.

but also what he had been able to find on Maestro Antonio di Maestro Giovanni da Fano, whose poetic exchange with Almerici figured in the manuscript. Crescimbeni had made no mention of Sforza's correspondence with the mysterious Antonio of Montalcino¹⁰. On Almerici, Crescimbeni had himself obtained information from Fr. Canneti, a fact which Olivieri was to mention in a later publication (1785), his *Memorie di Alessandro Sforza, signore di Pesaro*¹¹.

In a subsequent letter (947) to Olivieri, written in Venice on 30 November 1736, Zeno, having discoursed generally on the holdings of the library of Classe and more particularly on the Almerici manuscript continued:...

Lodo quanto so e posso il bel pensiero che vi è venuto in mente di pubblicare le Rime di quegli antichi poeti italiani esistenti nel vostro pregevolissimo codice da me attentamente osservato presso di voi; e molto più che vogliate illustrarle con opportune annotazioni, e dare inoltre un maggior lume alla raccolta con la giunta delle inedite de' vostri Poeti pesaresi antichi, o che sono vivuti entro il felice XVI secolo. Qui sotto avrete la proposta di Mess. Antonio da Montalcino, e insieme la

¹⁰ Nor for that matter had Francesco Saverio Quadrio, *Della Storia e della Ragione di ogni Poesia*, 4 voll., Milano, Francesco Agnelli, 1739-49; vol. 2, 1741: 203; or the later Filippo Vecchietti, *Biblioteca picena, ossia Notizie istoriche delle Opere e degli Scrittori Piceni*; tomo primo, Lett. A., Osimo, Domenicantonio Quercetti, 1790: 182-183.

¹¹ The book was published by Gavelli of Pesaro. In *Lettera 949, (250), Al Sig. Annibale degli Abati Olivieri. A Pesaro. Venezia 8 dicembre 1736*, Zeno writes: "Vi trasmetterò l'opera del Crescimbeni qui ristampata con alcune note fatteci dal Sig. Seghezzi, aiutato in molti luoghi dal fu P. Mio fratello e da me". Evidently Zeno felt that this edition contained new material of interest to Olivieri.

risposta di Mess. Alessandro Sforza. Il titolo del Codice da cui son tratti questi due Sonetti è questo: *Versi: Ritimi e Morali facti per Antonio da Montalcino*. Il Codice è in 4, in carta pecorina, scritto verso il 1480, con gentile carattere, e le prime lettere dei componimenti son dorate e miniate. Nel 1700 mi fu donato in Bologna dal chiarissimo poeta PierJacopo Martelli.¹²

On receipt of the poems from Zeno's manuscript, Olivieri must have been confused as to which sonnet acted as the *proposta* and which the *risposta*, given the title of *Signore illustre* accorded to the poet. Zeno clarified the matter in the letter of 8 December¹³:

Dei sonetti a voi mandate la proposta è certamente del Montalcino, e la risposta a nome di Madonna M. [i.e. Mattea Samperoli] è certamente di Alessandro Sforza¹⁴. Il primo senza alcun titolo è mescolato fra gli altri del Montalcino, e lontano quattro facciate intere dall'altro, che porta al di sopra in caratteri rossi il nome dello Sforza. Non vi dia fastidio che quivi il Montalcino sia trattato col titolo di "*Signor Illustre*" poiché è facile cosa che e' fosse di sangue nobile, e potea inoltre meritare quel titolo per la sua rara virtù. In un mio

¹² *Lettera 947*: 248. Martelli's gift to Zeno is mentioned by Braico in her description of the manuscript (29).

¹³ *Lettera 949. Al Sig. Annibale degli Abati Olivieri. A Pesaro* (250-51).

¹⁴ For the "tresca" between Mattea, Pacifica Samperoli and Sforza, see Olivieri, *Memorie*, (49).

bellissimo Codice in carta pecorina scritto l'anno 1461 in quarto, contenente le poesie latine distinte in 4 libri di Monsignor Francesco Patrizi il Vecchio, Vescovo di Gaeta, leggo nel I libro un lungo componimento in versi esametri *Cantus Fatui* (cioè *Fauni*) *de Origine Musices ad A. Illicinum*; il quale penso appunto che altri non fosse, che il suddetto Antonio da Montalcino.

Scholarly interest in Antonio da Montalcino then, seems to have been inextricably connected with interest in the poet-lords of Pesaro and the culture at their court. The Almerici text and that of Antonio da Montalcino were related by the fact that both contained evidence of the poetic craftsmanship of the Lords of Pesaro.

The manuscript containing Almerici's poems became generally accessible to scholarship once it had entered a public library. From there, it entered into the world of literary history. This was not the case of the manuscript containing the poems of Antonio da Montalcino which remained in private ownership and was known about only to a small group of scholars.

Limited access also affected the destiny of another manuscript, now Grey 7.b.5 of the South African Library of Cape Town. This too, containing the poems attributed to Giovanni de' Mantelli of Canobio, known as Tartaglia, coeval with the manuscript of Antonio da Montalcino's poems, was donated by Pier Jacopo Martelli to Apostolo Zeno. The donation is recorded in the note, written by Martelli, which is placed inside the front cover of the Grey manuscript:

Ecco i due libri antichi che io ho. L'uno non è di autor Bolognese ma l'altro è di uno di Casa Canobi, fra le

nobili di questa città. Valetene, se sono il caso vostro. Oggi dopo pranzo verrà a ritrovarvi e a godervi il vostro devoto amico; Pier Iacopo Martelli. At the bottom of the note, Zeno had added: Ad Antonio Canobi scriveva il Filelfo una Epistola del lib. 7, il dic[embre]. del 1450, dove difende Aristotele dall'accusa di Pier Candido Decembrio ch'ivi [there follows an indecipherable word] l'immortalità dell'anima.¹⁵

Martelli's undated note was evidently added to the manuscript containing Tartaglia's poems when this was discarded¹⁶. The attribution of previous ownership of the two manuscripts to Pier Jacopo Martelli and his part in passing them on to Zeno raises the questions of whether the two books were given to Zeno at the same time and whether there was some relationship between their contents which would have served to clarify Zeno's research on early lyric poets in that period.

At the present state of researches, there is no concrete evidence that the two manuscripts were donated on the same occasion. Zeno received the Montalcino manuscript in 1700, whereas it has been supposed that the Bolognese manuscript was received in 1710. It could be, however, that Zeno's visit to Bologna in 1710 was not his

¹⁵ Giovanni de' Mantelli di Canobio detto Tartaglia (ed altri), *Versi d'Amore*, a cura di Nelia Saxby, Bologna, Commissione per i Testi di Lingua, 1985: xiv-xv.

¹⁶ *Ampio catalogo-inventario autografo dell'abate Marco Forcellini (1748-49)*, containing the *Indice degli autoi e delle opere contenute nei MSS di Apostolo Zeno*, Cod. It. 285 = 7165, ff. 495r-496v. The manuscript is inventoried as Cod. CDVIII (ex CCXVIII). Alongside the description of the MS there is added the undated annotation, *Scartato*.

first¹⁷, and that the “*due libri*” were, indeed, part of the same gift. Besides the diligent mention of the manuscript in the various Zeno catalogues, there is no material pertaining to its contents which might attest to some scholarly interest in it on Zeno’s part. That the Grey manuscript was subsequently dispatched to a salesroom seems to be indicative of the lack of interest in its contents by its owner. A more palpable reason could be that, although voluminous, the manuscript lacks intrinsic value as a collector’s item. The Montalcino manuscript, on the other hand, written on parchment, in an elegant humanist hand and illuminated as well, would certainly have been considered more valuable.

Braico’s work has the merit of placing at the disposal of scholars an edition, prepared with scientific scruple, of a *corpus* of work that has been available to scholars in partial form in a nineteenth century publication¹⁸. The evanescent figure of “Messer Antonio of Montalcino” has, with its contextualization, been distinguished from that of his namesakes¹⁹, while his literary and topographical itinerary has been clarified and the chronological boundaries of his activity confirmed. These last, thanks to Antonio Lanza’s edition of

¹⁷ Francesco Negri, *La Vita di Apostolo Zeno*, Venezia, Alvisopoli, 1816: 128.

¹⁸ Francesco Flamini had published the *Ballate e terzine di Antonio da Montalcino rimatore del secolo XV*, in *Miscellanea nuziale Rossi-Teiss*, Trento [Bergamo], Istituto Italiano di Arti Grafiche, 1897: 389-400. The manuscript comprised, according to Flamini (390): “60 sonetti, 4 canzoni, 1 sestina, 5 ballate, 3 terzine”.

¹⁹ Following on from earlier sources, the names of Antonio da Montalcino, Antonio da Fano, Antonio Costanzi da Fano were brought forward to identify the “messer Antonio” who had exchanged sonnets with Raniero degli Almerici by Paolo Lorenzetti, “Rainero degli Almerici, rimatore pesarese della seconda metà del Quattrocento”, *La Romagna*, nov-dic. 1913, anno x, serie v.: 437-455; 438. The literary fortune of Antonio of Fano seems to have depended, thanks also to Apostolo Zeno with that of Raniero degli Almerici.

the poems of Comedio Venuti of Cortona have made it possible to reassess the figure of Antonio da Montalcino as a poet of transition between Northern Italian courts and the Tuscan lyric poetry of the age of Lorenzo dei Medici²⁰.

The status of Antonio da Montalcino as a lyric poet in a period of transition may more clearly be assessed by the manner in which he handles the canonic metrical schemes in vogue during the second half of the fifteenth century²¹. Of the forms sanctioned by the model of Petrarch's *Canzoniere*, Antonio adopts the sonnet, the *ballata*, the *canzone* and the *sestina*. With Gianotto Calogrosso and Alessandro Sforza, Antonio da Montalcino is considered an innovator for his use of the *terzina lirica*, a hybrid form, whose origin has been attributed to Leon Battista Alberti. The form combines elements of the madrigal, the *sestina* and the *ballata*. Antonio was in poetic correspondence with Calogrosso, making him one of the first to use the scheme for a social purpose generally relegated to the sonnet. The four *terzine* which constitute the correspondence with Calogrosso refer to the relationship between Sante Bentivoglio and Nicolosa Sanuti. Between 1453 and 1459, Calogrosso had compiled his earlier work into a *prosimetron*,

²⁰ In *Lirici toscani del Quattrocento*, 2 voll., Roma, Bulzoni, 1973-75, vol. II: 712-13, 744. See also, Stefano Carrai, *La lirica toscana nell'età di Lorenzo*, in Marco Santagata – S. Carrai, *La lirica di corte nell'Italia del Quattrocento*, Milano, Franco Angeli, 1993: 117-124.

²¹ Santagata, *La lirica di corte...* (66-86), gives an analysis of the forms and the metrical schemes used by the poets of the Romagna-Montefeltro area, taking account also, of lyric poetry produced in Tuscany in the fourteenth and fifteenth centuries. The information given in the text takes account of and supplements Santagata's researches on Antonio da Montalcino. The metrical table for the forms of the sonnet is to be found at note 88 (70).

Nicolosa Bella, which told the story of the lovers²². The correspondence with Gianotto Calogrosso, according to Carrai, took place about 1452, a decade or so after Alberti's metrical innovations from which the *terzina lirica* originated²³. Whether Alberti's texts reached the North Italian courts before he did, in the 1460s, is still open to question.

Unlike Calogrosso's compositions, Alessandro Sforza's *terzina*, *S'io chiedo amando giorno e nocte pace*, is not part of a poetic correspondence and stands alone in his collection²⁴. Gorni has pointed out that the *senhal* is a feature of the form. In the case of Sforza, the *senhal* is *Pace* (for *Pacifica*), in that of Calogrosso, as Carrai has shown, the *senhal* is *Sante* (*Bentivoglio*). In Antonio's *terzina*, *Quando quella ligiadra mia Madonna* (Braico ed. 2), if he does in fact, adhere to the convention, it is probably *Luce* (=Lucia) which occurs just before the internal rhyme, significantly, *madonna* in the final line.

Antonio's elaboration of the meter of the sonnet, specifically with regard to the tercets, is not without some interesting variations

²² The details for the *terzina* in Antonio's poems are given by Emanuela Braico, "Antonio da Montalcino, *Le Rime*" (28). The *prosimetron* was published in 1959, in Bologna, by the Commissione per i Testi di Lingua.

²³ Stefano Carrai, "Un esperimento metrico quattrocentesco (la *terzina lirica*) e una poesia dell'Alberti", *Interpres*, vol. V, 1983-84. The poetic exchange and the question of its dating are to be found on pages 36-40. In Braico's edition the *terzine* of the correspondence are: 44 a, b; 56 a, b. Gorni gives 1441, as the date of composition of a prototype of the *terzina*, *Le chiome ch'io adorai nel sancto LAURO*; in Leon Battista Alberti, *Rime e Versioni poetiche*, a cura di Guglielmo Gorni, Milano-Napoli, Ricciardi, 1975. See especially the notes to VI: 19-20.

²⁴ "Appunti metrici e testuali sulle rime di Alessandro Sforza", *Giornale storico della letteratura italiana*, vol.152, 1975: 222-233; 229 for the *terzina*. Luciana Cocito has edited the so-called *Canzoniere* of Alessandro Sforza (Milano, Marzorati, 1973). *Terzina* 224, is on page 165. The *senhal* of *Pace* for *Pacifica* Samperoli is recurrent in Sforza's poems.

from the norm as established by Petrarch and, in Northern Italian lyric poetry, by Giusto dei Conti. As may be seen from Santagata's table, Antonio da Montalcino, like his contemporaries, exhibits a distinct preference for the more common of Petrarch's schemes for the *terzine*. Secondly, he too, like his contemporaries in the Romagna-Montefeltro area, adopts the scheme CDE CED, in no less than five instances (Braico ed. 35, 54, 67, 70, 71). The scheme originated with Giusto dei Conti, is unknown in Petrarch's poetry and ignored by nearly all the Tuscan lyric poets²⁵. Its usage is a distinctive characteristic of the poets of Northern Italian courts and constitutes the boundary between them and their Tuscan contemporaries.

Antonio's structure in the sonnet, *Fra mille donne, dove Amor mi scorse* (Braico ed. 46), marks an exceptional deviation from the norm. The tercets have the unusual scheme of: CDECDF²⁶, nor can this be imputed to some textual corruption which can be healed by some facile textual emendation. The use of the scheme may therefore be considered deliberate. Unrelated by rhyme scheme, the *terzine* are, however, related by the internal rhyme *dolcezza:vaghezza*, which occurs in the concluding *endecasillabo a minore* in fifth position of each *terzina* (ll. 11, 14). The same internal rhyme, *dolcezza*, in the same *a minore* position, connects the *quartine* to the *terzine* (l. 8). So far as may be ascertained, Antonio may be regarded as an innovator for this variant of the rhyme scheme in the tercets as well as for the use of internal rhyme

²⁵ Santagata, *La lirica di corte...* (77).

²⁶ According to Santagata's table, a similar case is to be found only in the poems of the anonymous Costabili *La lirica di corte...* (75, note 100).

as an alternative linking device between the sonnet's metrical divisions.

Among his contemporaries, Antonio da Montalcino is exceptional in the Pesaro-Urbino area for the inclusion of no less than five *ballate* (Braico ed. 15, 26, 38, 39, 40) in his poems²⁷. Not one of these is modelled on the rhyme schemes of any of the four *ballate* composed by Giusto dei Conti, nor of the seven included in Petrarch's *Canzoniere*. All the *ballate*, as are the majority of those in Petrarch's *Canzoniere* and all but one of Giusto's, are monostrophic. Consisting of 12 lines, the *ballate* are identical in structure, comprising a three-line refrain; a single stanza of two *piedi* of the scheme AbC AbC plus, in four out of five cases, a *sirma* (C) which connects the body of the stanza with the rhyme scheme of the refrain. In so far as the structure of the refrain is concerned, Antonio da Montalcino keeps to two of the fundamental schemes canonized by Petrarch's usage: XYY (together with its variant XyY), and Xy(y)X²⁸. The first of Petrarch's schemes characterizes *ballate* 15, 38²⁹, while its variant, XyY appears in *ballata* 26. In all three instances the final rhyme of the refrain is repeated in the concluding line. This is in keeping with the convention governing the structure of the meter as codified by Antonio da Tempo³⁰.

²⁷ Santagata, *La lirica di corte...* (68).

²⁸ Guglielmo Gorni, *Metrica e analisi letteraria*, Bologna, Il Mulino, 1993: 219-249; 240.

²⁹ The closest example for the scheme of the two ballate is provided by Rosello Roselli's *Poi che crudel fortuna e rio destino*, in *Lirici Toscani...*; vol. II: 433, LVIII.

³⁰ Pietro G. Beltrami, *La metrica italiana*, Bologna, Il Mulino, 1991: 250-253.

The *blanda anarchia* and “structural disformity” which, according to Gorni, is typical of a group of Florentine poets, comprising Niccolò Tinucci and Rosello Roselli³¹, may now be extended to include the examples of Antonio da Montalcino’s remaining *ballate*, 39, and 40. In these two instances, as in those of the Florentine poets, there is no correspondence between the final rhyme of the refrain and that of the *ballata*. In the first case, 39, the refrain, XyY is elaborated, at the conclusion of the poem, in the scheme (with internal rhyme): Cx(x)X.

Ballata 40 exasperates the canonic structure to an even greater degree, having as its scheme: Xy(y)X. AbCAbCXy(y)X; where it may be perceived that the *sirma* is done away with and replaced by the entire refrain. It is noteworthy that the refrain itself derives from Petrarch, whereas the form as a whole signals a distinct break with the traditional models and tends rather, to echo Alberti’s tendency, derived from the example of Giusto dei Conti, to experiment with the dissemination of the rhymes of the refrain in the stanza.

In comparison with Antonio da Montalcino’s handling of the shorter meters, his five *canzoni* attest to the “forte omogeneità” (Santagata) which characterizes the *canzone* scheme in the work of the poets of the Urbino-Montefeltro area³². *Canzoni* 9, 72, are variants of a similar scheme. The first has the scheme: ABbCABbCCDdEeFF x 5 *stanze* plus the *congedo* which replicates exactly the *sirma*. *Canzone* 72 also exhibits the four line *piedi*,

³¹ *Metrica e analisi...* (248).

³² Santagata, *La Lirica di corte...* pp.82-86. Of fundamental importance on the subject are Guglielmo Gorni’s “Ragioni metriche della canzone, tra filologia e storia”, in *Studi di Filologia e di letteratura offerti a Carlo Dionisotti*, Milano, Napoli-Ricciardi, 1973: 15-24; subsequently in *Metrica e analisi letteraria*, Bologna, Il Mulino, 1993: 207-218; his “Appunti metrici e testuali sulle Rime di Alessandro Sforza”: 22-233; 227-228.

recurrent in Petrarch, but lacks the rhyming couplets in the *sirma* which are typical in the structure of the *canzone* in the area. It is of six *stanze* and has the scheme: ABbCBAAaCCDEeDFF. The *congedo* has an unrelated rhyme in place of the *sirma* and is structured in rhyming couplets: DEeFfGG. The precedent for the scheme of *canzone* 9, but with an extra rhyming couplet in the *stanze* is Simone Serdini's *canzone* LXIX, *Vinto da la pietà del nostro male*. Amongst its imitators are to be counted Alessandro Sforza and Gianotto Calogrosso. The origin of the scheme for *canzone* 72 is Petrarch's great *canzone* 264, which enjoyed a vast fortune in the Quattrocento and was imitated by Giusto dei Conti, Rosello Roselli and Alessandro Sforza, in his *canzone* 229³³.

Structural parallelism also characterizes *canzone* 16, whose scheme is: ABCABCCDEEDdFggF x 8 *stanze*, with an unusual *congedo* which comprises a majority of *settenari*: abbcDdCcEE; and the subsequent *canzone* 43, x 9 *stanze*: ABCABCcDEEDdFF. In this case, the *congedo* is reduced to the final three lines of the stanza: dFF. The *piedi*, structured in tercets, is also common to Calogrosso's *canzone* LXXXV and Angelo Galli's *canzone* 336³⁴. Both *canzoni* illustrate, in the *sirma*, an amalgam of three out of the five structures that are common to the 28 *canzoni* examined by Santagata³⁵.

³³ For the scheme of *canzone* 9, Gorni, "Ragioni metriche...(16-19); "Appunti metrici... (227-8).

³⁴ Santagata, *La lirica di corte...* (85).

³⁵ Santagata, *La lirica di corte...* p. 82, gives the following schemes: cDdEeFF (3); CDdEEeFF (9); cDdEE (2); CDeDFF (3); CDEEDdFfGG (5); CDdEdFfGG (2). The *Trecento* and early *Quattrocento* adaptations of the metrical schemes are listed by Andrea Pelosi, in his "Repertorio metrico della canzone italiana del Trecento", in *Metrica*, vol. V: 5-162; 24-50. There is no exact correspondence between the examples given by Pelosi and the schemes used by Antonio da Montalcino.

Whereas as at first glance it may seem that Antonio da Montalcino fits into the conventional metrical panorama of the Romagna-Montefeltro area, on closer examination it would appear that, especially with regard to the short meters, his innovations are not limited to the elaboration of the *terzina lirica*. The lessons derived from the models of Giusto dei Conti and of Alberti influence the structure of two of his *ballate* but would also seem to point to the influence of a qualified group of Florentine poets. The anomalous sonnet form with which he experiments could, in its turn, point to a contact with the anonymous poet of the Costabili family. So far as his *canzoni* are concerned, it is worth remarking that the element that most surprises is to be found in those *congedi* which metrically bear no relationship to the body of the *stanza*. The *stanza* schemes themselves are hybrids of structures in vogue, and present an eclectic mixture of elements drawn from Petrarch's and Giusto's models as well as those of earlier Tuscan lyric poets who influenced Northern Italian lyric poetry. As a poet whose activity spans most of the second half of the fifteenth century, Antonio da Montalcino's work combines, in its structures, both the traditional, conventional factors as laid down by illustrious predecessors and the innovations which eventually open the way for the poetic experimentations of the age of Lorenzo.