Daniele V. Filippi

Polychoral rewritings and sonic creativity in Palestrina and Victoria

Introduction

The study of the phenomenon of rewriting, of the author's reinvention of his own existing, definite text, seems increasingly essential for an understanding of the compositional process. Nevertheless, until recently an epoch such as the sixteenth century did not appear to lend itself to this kind of investigation, owing to the relative paucity of known examples and the difficulty of identifying others, the frequent uncertainty with regard to the authorship of the alterations, the documentary lacunae that often make it difficult to establish the chronological relationship between versions, and so on.

However, since Jessie Ann Owens stirred the waters with her *Composers at Work*,[1] demonstrating that investigation of the compositional process is also possible in this period and that significant evidence is available, something has changed. The stimulus offered by studies such as Owens', together with the development of new sensibilities towards intertextual dynamics and, in general, of new approaches to Renaissance music, has eased the opening of a promising, if largely unexplored, field of investigation. While the study of the compositional process in this period will never enjoy an abundance of material comparable with that of later centuries, probing in this direction usefully induces confrontation of other great themes: for example, the tie between the compositional process itself and patronage; the responsiveness of the composers towards some 'environmental variables'; the relationship between a composer and his own work; the aesthetic status attributed by contemporaneous mentality to the work and its different versions; and, in a yet broader sense, the re-understanding and redefinition of the characteristic elements of a certain style developing in time.

As anyone who has attempted similar research knows, the work in this field is onerous, far from simple, and bristling with methodological traps.[2] But it is worth pursuing, and not only for the immediate outcomes, whose various spin-offs are always plentiful and surprising. In fact, once a fuller set of case studies is available, it will be finally possible to set aside circumspection, raise our

---

[1] Jessie Ann Owens, *Composers at Work. The Craft of Musical Composition 1450-1600*, New York-Oxford, Oxford University Press, 1997.

[2] As regards the philological *coté,* see Maria Caraci Vela, *La filologia musicale. Istituzioni, storia, strumenti critici*, vol. I, Lucca, Libreria Musicale Italiana, 2005, pp. 144-156.

sights and lay genuinely new foundations for a material (and spiritual) history of composing in the Cinquecento.

The examples analysed from this perspective in the following pages belong to the work of two authors to whom musicology commonly attributes a well-defined stylistic identity of 'monolithic' connotations: Giovanni Pierluigi da Palestrina (c. 1525-1594) and Tomás Luis de Victoria (c. 1548-1611). Their 'backstage' compositional practices, laid bare, can therefore surprise still more, precisely owing to the highly polished facade that obscures them.

In Victoria's output, the richness of the phenomena of rewriting, revision and retouching has been known for some time.[3] Nevertheless, although recognised as a characteristic trait of his compositional personality, this aspect still awaits full study and comparison with other authors.

In short, the most interesting instances in Victoria's work regard:

A. The *Lamentations* of Holy Week, preserved in a manuscript version in I-Rvat Cappella Sistina 186 and a printed version included in Victoria's *Officium Hebdomadae Sanctae* of 1585. Notwithstanding the uncertainty of its date, the version of CS 186 is unanimously recognised as prior to the printed version, on the base of stylistic considerations.[4] Victoria, beyond retouching details of declamation and melodic ornamentation, intervenes by suppressing or restructuring entire segments, modifying some choices of text expression, rewriting cadences and rationalising the harmonic connections, proposing alternative new sections, and altering some complex structural balances of the series as a whole. The number of the interventions is, therefore, conspicuous, although distributed irregularly. Even if not all the

---

[3] See in particular SAMUEL RUBIO, *Historia de las reediciones de los motetes de T.L. de Victoria y significado de las variantes introducidas en ellas*, «La ciudad de Dios», CLXII, 1950, pp. 313-351; THOMAS RIVE, *Victoria's Lamentationes Geremiae: a Comparison of Cappella Sistina MS 186 with the Corresponding Portions of Officium Hebdomadae Sanctae (Rome, 1585)*, «Anuario Musical», XX, 1965, pp. 179-208; IDEM, *An Examination of Victoria's Technique of Adaptation and Reworking in his Parody Masses, with Particular Attention to Harmonic and Cadential Procedure*, «Anuario Musical», XXIV, 1969, pp. 133-152; ROBERT STEVENSON, *La música en las catedrales españolas del Siglo de Oro*, Madrid, Alianza Editorial, 1993, *passim*; EUGENE CASJEN CRAMER, *Studies in the Music of Tomás Luis de Victoria*, Aldershot, Ashgate, 2001, *passim*; LUCY HRUZA, *The Marian Repertory by Tomás Luis de Victoria in Toledo, Biblioteca Capitular, Mus. B.30: A Case Study in Renaissance «Imitatio»*, Ph.D. diss., University of Calgary, 1997; EADEM, *A Manuscript Source for Magnificats by Victoria*, «Early Music», XXV/1, 1997, pp. 83-98; EADEM, *Multiple Settings of the «Salve Regina» Antiphon: Tomás Luis de Victoria's Contribution to the Renaissance Veneration of the Virgin Mary*, in *Encomium Musicae: Essays in Memory of Robert J. Snow*, edited by David Crawford and G. Grayson Wagstaff, Hillsdale (NY), Pendragon Press, 2002, pp. 409-433; and now DANIELE V. FILIPPI, *Tomás Luis de Victoria*, Palermo, L'Epos, 2008 (Constellatio musica, 16), pp. 76-85.

[4] See FILIPPI, *Victoria*, pp. 76-82 and the cited literature.

modifications are coherent, one recognises a directionality in the revisions, which, in the absence of more precise data regarding the performance destination and other circumstances, suggests reasons of a purely *stylistic* nature.

B. The compositions preserved in manuscript B.30 of the Biblioteca capitular of the Cathedral of Toledo: three masses (*Ave maris stella*, *De beata Maria* and *Gaudeamus*), three *Magnificats*, the psalm *Nisi Dominus* and the *Salve Regina* for eight voices. They are also included in the 1576 *Liber primus: qui missas, psalmos, Magnificat, ad Virginem Dei Matrem salutationes aliaque complectitur*. The two versions of each work differ in various ways. According to Lucy Hruza, the versions of B.30 emphasise «textural contrast» and sonic variety,[5] while the printed versions show more integrated and homogenous solutions and a more balanced voice-leading. Moreover, in B.30 there is more 'expressive' ornamentation, and less with a structural-cadential function, just as there are more authentic[6] and non-syncopated cadences (while in the *Liber primus* there are more perfect[7] and syncopated cadences). Hruza has therefore recognised in these and other specific traits of the manuscript versions the influence of a typically Spanish taste. If the dating of the manuscript to 1576-1577 is correct[8] – making the various versions thus very close in time – and if, even with some distinctions,[9] Hruza's proposition is provisionally accepted, the differences between the versions would be ascribable here not so much to the stylistic evolution of the composer as to the different needs of the destined recipients of the works: the Spanish ecclesiastical institution for which the manuscript was realized (possibly on behalf of Victoria himself),[10] and the Roman and international audiences who would have had the printed edition. It is difficult to establish

---

[5] For example, there are clearer contrasts between florid imitative counterpoint and *secco* writing. At an upper level, Victoria substitutes, in the *Missa Gaudeamus*, the short Hosanna I with a new setting for 6 voices in triple time, contrasting with the surrounding sections: cfr. HRUZA, *The Marian Repertory*, pp. 126-128.

[6] That is, with a leap of an ascending fourth or descending fifth (*clausula basizans*) in the low voice.

[7] With stepwise descending movement (*clausula tenorizans*) in the low voice.

[8] HRUZA, *The Marian Repertory*, p. 1; the manuscript is attributed with certainty to the papal copyist Johannes Parvus.

[9] Motivated by the vagueness of certain affirmations and by the author's difficulty in interpreting her own results in a coherent way, which gives rise to partial contradictions. The question needs to be reexamined.

[10] As is known, Victoria was always very active in the promotion of his own works, in particular by sending manuscript or printed copies to the chapels of important Spanish ecclesiastical institutions, to potential patrons, etc.

which version preceded the other (in an article of 1997, for example, Hruza arrives in a rather convincing way at the conclusion that the *Magnificats* of Toledo B.30 may be revisions of the printed versions, while in a paper of 2002 she proposes that the manuscript version of the *Salve Regina* might be considered earlier than that of the *Liber primus*...);[11] and it might be thought that at least in some cases they had been conceived and realised in parallel.[12] Thus, we see a different factor come into play: the passage *from one geographical and cultural milieu to another*, characterised by different tastes. Setting aside the necessity of further investigations, Toledo B.30 seems in other words to suggest that the questions aroused by the phenomenology of sixteenth-century rewritings and revisions cannot always find an answer in mere issues of chronology and personal style.

C. Motets republished by Victoria in successive collections. With some exceptions (including *Doctor bonus*, *Cum beatus Ignatius*, *Super flumina Babylonis*), these mainly demonstrate interventions of light retouching, tied to the *labor limae* characteristic of a composer whose output was limited, but highly controlled from the stylistic point of view and edited personally with much care. The matter of Victorian motets then allows us to refer to another delicate problem encountered in this type of investigation: the recognition of the possible contribution of different hands from those of the author (here in particular as regards the use of the accidentals in the editions of Milan, Dillingen and Venice, presumably altered without Victoria's direct intervention).[13]

D. The polychoral rewritings of the *Magnificat primi* and *sexti toni*, which I will analyse in detail in the third part of this article.

At present, the known cases of revisions in Palestrina's oeuvre are less numerous. However, the identification in the *Liber primus musarum* (Venice, Rampazzetto, 1563) of a different version of the motet *Nativitas tua* included that same year by Palestrina in his very successful *Motecta festorum* opens new horizons.[14] Considering Palestrina's vast compositional output and its complex

---

[11] See respectively Hruza, *A Manuscript Source for Magnificats by Victoria*, and *Multiple Settings of the «Salve Regina» Antiphon*.

[12] For other considerations in this regard, see also Filippi, *Victoria*, pp. 82-84.

[13] Regarding the revision of the motets, see Filippi, *Victoria*, pp. 84-85 and the cited literature.

[14] I have outlined this case in my papers «Palestrina's Nativitas tua Dei Genitrix Virgo. New Perspectives about the Compositional Process in the Renaissance» (South-Central Renaissance Conference «Exploring the Renaissance» 2004, Austin, Texas, aprile 2004) and «Transition as reinvention in works by Palestrina and other Roman composers» (18th International Congress of the International Musicological Society, Universität Zürich, luglio 2007); an ar-

transmission in manuscripts and anthologies, I suspect that other significant examples of revision and rewriting may be found, beyond the few already encountered but still not systematically investigated by scholars. In the central part of this article, I will thus analyse two examples of Palestrinian rewriting alongside, as already anticipated, two cases drawn from the works of Victoria. The typology of these rewritings, linked to the birth and development of the polychoral technique, is the same: as often is the case in the Roman milieu to which they belong, they are characterised by the *passage from mono- to polychorality* (a variant of which is the *change* – most frequently, the *expansion – of the polychoral scoring*).

The study of rewritings requires a close examination of the compositional fabric and a continual exegesis of the author's intentions. For these reasons, it leads almost invariably to the heart of other crucial problems. This occurs also in this case, which moreover regards a hitherto very neglected part of the repertory. In every step of the argument, therefore, specific reflections on the theme of rewriting and revision will be flanked by stylistic observations, in particular regarding sonic creativity and the relationship between polyphonic and polychoral writing in the work of Palestrina and Victoria.

PALESTRINA

The manuscript I-Rvat Cappella Giulia XIII 24,[15] which probably dates from the first half of the 1580s,[16] is a fundamental source for Roman polychorality. In particular, Noel O'Regan has rightly defined it as «the single most important source» as regards the polychoral production of Palestrina.[17]

The dating of the manuscript corresponds to a period in which Roman

---

ticle on the subject is in preparation.

[15] Number 34 of the catalogue José M. Llorens, *Le opere musicali della Cappella Giulia. 1: Manoscritti e edizioni fino al '700*, Città del Vaticano, Biblioteca Apostolica Vaticana, 1971 (Studi e testi, 265), pp. 89-92.

[16] Cfr. for example Noel O'Regan, *Roman Polychoral Music: Origins and Distinctiveness*, in *La scuola policorale romana del Sei-Settecento. Atti del Convegno internazionale di studi in memoria di Laurence Feininger (Trento, Castello del Buonconsiglio, Biblioteca Clesiana, 4-5 ottobre 1996)*, a cura di Francesco Luisi, Danilo Curti e Marco Gozzi, Trento, Provincia autonoma di Trento. Servizio beni librari e archivistici, 1997, pp. 43-64: 45.

[17] Noel O'Regan, *Palestrina's Polychoral Works: A Forgotten Repertory*, in *Palestrina e l'Europa*. Atti del III convegno internazionale di studi (Palestrina, 6-9 ottobre 1994), a cura di Giancarlo Rostirolla, Stefania Soldati e Elena Zomparelli, Palestrina, Fondazione Giovanni Pierluigi da Palestrina, 2006, pp. 341-363: 350.

polychorality had reached its first full maturity.[18] If polychorality's nascent phase – after its incubation in the works of Costanzo Festa, Dominique Phinot, Orlando di Lasso – dated from the beginning of the 1570s with the *Secondo libro delle laudi* of Giovanni Animuccia (1570), it was Palestrina and Victoria who thoroughly developed the technique, in the first experiments of 1572[19] and then in the works included in the collections of 1575-1576.[20]

Among the thirty-six Palestrinian polychoral works contained in CG XIII 24,[21] two are revised versions of motets originally published for six voices: *O Domine Jesu Christe* and *O bone Jesu*.[22] I will now examine in detail each of these two motets, considering first the monochoral version, then the process of transformation undertaken by Palestrina, and finally the polychoral version itself (the musical Appendix contains all four compositions in full: see examples 1a-1b, and 2a-2b).

A. O Domine Jesu Christe

The *Liber primus ... mottettorum, quae partim quinis, partim senis, partim septenis vocibus concinantur*, issued in Rome in 1569 by the press of the «heirs of Valerio and Aloysio Dorico»[23] and dedicated to Cardinal Ippolito d'Este, contains motets for various ensembles and with differently characterised writing. Among the pieces for five voices, a broad majority are basically imitative and have a rather dense texture, although with the frequent changes of vocal orchestration and the shifting organisation of contrapuntal structures typical of Palestrina. A small group of compositions, including *O admirabile comercium* at the start of

---

[18] On polychorality in Rome see particularly: KLAUS FISCHER, *Le composizioni policorali di Palestrina*, in *Atti del Convegno di Studi Palestriniani (28 settembre - 2 ottobre 1975)*, a cura di Francesco Luisi, Palestrina, Fondazione Giovanni Pierluigi da Palestrina, 1977, 339-363; NOEL O'REGAN, *The Early Polychoral Music of Orlando di Lasso. New Light from Roman Sources*, «Acta musicologica», LVI/2, 1984, pp. 234-251; ANTHONY F. CARVER, *Cori spezzati. 1: The development of sacred polychoral music to the time of Schutz*, Cambridge, Cambridge University Press, 1988, pp. 107-125; O'REGAN, *Roman Polychoral Music*; PETER ACKERMANN, *Studien zur Gattungsgeschichte und Typologie der römischen Motette im Zeitalter Palestrinas*, Paderborn, Schöningh, 2002, pp. 177-200; O'REGAN, *Palestrina's Polychoral Works*; FILIPPI, *Victoria*, pp. 86-100.

[19] Respectively in Palestrina's *Motettorum liber secundus* and in Victoria's *Motecta*.

[20] Palestrina, *Motettorum liber tertius*, 1575; Victoria, *Liber primus*, 1576.

[21] See the listing in O'REGAN, *Palestrina's Polychoral Works*, pp. 360-361.

[22] Cfr. ACKERMANN, *Studien zur Gattungsgeschichte*, pp. 188-196.

[23] RISM P700. At least another four editions are known, all Venetian: Angelo Gardano, 1579 and 1590, heir of Girolamo Scotto, 1586 and 1600. Modern edition in GIOVANNI PIERLUIGI DA PALESTRINA, *Werke*, hrsg. von Franz Xavier Haberl etc., Leipzig, Breitkopf & Härtel, 1862-1903 (facsimile edition Gregg, Farnborough, 1968), vol. I, and in the *Opere complete*, a cura di Raffaele Casimiri etc., Roma, F.lli Scalera, 1939-1987, vol. V.

the collection, is instead built on a predominant base of animated homorhythm, with clearer formal caesuras and in general a more transparent texture. What in other motets – where hybrid cases between the two typologies artificially isolated here are not lacking –[24] are particular effects, aimed at text expression (the opposition of blocks of voices, the synchronous declamation of the text, etc.), here become common currency. For the motets in six voices, Palestrina seems to prefer this second type of writing. In motets such as *O magnum mysterium* or *Viri galilaei*, he thus fully exploits the variety of structural solutions offered by the CCATTB scoring (vocal subgroups of different colour and consistency, to be set in alternation to the *tutti*), avoiding an excessive thickening of the polyphonic fabric. Two canonical motets, *Solve, jubente Deo* and *Pulchra es o Maria*, are exceptions for obvious reasons. Nevertheless, it is noticeable how in the latter, though characterised by a double canon, the orchestration and texture are rather transparent and innervated by vertical sonorities. The two only pieces for seven voices, *Virgo prudentissima* (also with double canon) and *Tu es Petrus*, have an imitative framework.

O Domine Jesu Christe constitutes a particular case within the group of motets for six voices: not for the type of writing in itself, but for the significance of the choices made within a decidedly concise development (45 modern measures, corresponding to half or two thirds of a single *pars* of the other motets for six voices in the book). The special expressive intensity of the piece springs, as obvious, from the text, drawn from the so-called *Septem precationes Sancti Gregorii de Passione Domini*: prayers associated as much with devotion for the Crucifix, and in general with the Passion, as with Eucharistic worship, and used often as motet texts:[25]

O Domine Jesu Christe, adoro te in cruce vulneratum, felle et aceto potatum.

Te deprecor ut tua vulnera sint remedium animae meae, morsque tua sit vita mea.

As noted, the piece is characterised by animated homorhythm *à la Palestrina*, with frequent lightenings and contrasts of vocal orchestration. Beyond occasional desynchronization of the declamation and some hints of pseudo-imitation, genuine

---

[24] For example, see the motet *Ego sum panis vivus*, whose fundamentally imitative texture often clusters in homorhythmic blocks.

[25] According to religious legend, Pope Gregory was celebrating mass. During the consacration, Christ appeared to him, surrounded by the instruments of the Passion: a confirmation of His true presence in the Eucharistic species. The scene is frequently represented in Books of Hours, alongside the text of the *Precationes*, but also in frescoes and altar-pieces: for example, Jacopo Zucchi painted it for the church of SS. Trinità dei Pellegrini at Rome, in the Holy Year 1575.

imitation occurs only in the *finale* (in free form). From the formal perspective, we can observe the dimensional emphasis on the *exordium* and the *finale* (a situation far from uncommon in motets by Palestrina, reflecting the influence of traditional rhetoric);[26] the double exposition of the first three segments (always varied, with ascending or descending climaxes); the presence of a *Generalpause* just before halfway in the piece (b. 25), which highlights the crucial turning-point of the motet; the ensuing supplication («te deprecor…»), prepared by the pause and marked by the only deployment in the piece of a strictly homorhythmic *tutti*. The tonal plan is marked by an expressive use of the cadences, whose *finalis* and typology vary in response to the text.

Let us see now, step by step, how Palestrina expands the six voice version (in itself, complete, successful and admired),[27] transforming it into a motet for eight voices in two choirs.[28]

SEGMENT 1: *O Domine Jesu Christe*

version for six voices, 1569	polychoral version, CG XIII 24
a) first exposition, in 4 voices (CATT); homorhythm, then lightly animated	a) Choir I; faithful reproduction of 1569
b) second exposition, in 6 voices, with progressive entries (B+CA, CTT); very varied in respect to a); extended range both downwards and upwards; ascending climax	b) Palestrina develops the 1569 vocal blocks in two choral layers: Choir I is superimposed on Choir II; on *Christe* the writing is for eight voices the overall dimensions of this and the following three segments remain virtually identical

---

[26] See DANIELE V. FILIPPI, *Il primo libro dei mottetti a quattro voci di Giovanni Pierluigi da Palestrina. Edizione critica e studio storico-analitico*, tesi di laurea, Cremona, Scuola di Paleografia e Filologia Musicale dell'Università degli Studi di Pavia, a.a. 1998-1999, pp. 381-424 *passim*.

[27] Giuseppe Baini mentions *O Domine Jesu Christe* among the motets of this book that Palestrina would have composed for the pontifical chapel, and that would have already been in use before printed publication (GIUSEPPE BAINI, *Memorie storico-critiche della vita e delle opere di Giovanni Pierluigi da Palestrina*, Roma, 1828 [facsimile edition Hildesheim, Georg Olms, 1966], vol. I, p. 352).

[28] Modern edition in PALESTRINA, *Werke*, vol. VI.

SEGMENT 2: *adoro te*

version for six voices, 1569	polychoral version, CG XIII 24
a) first exposition, in 4 voices (CATT); animated homorhythm	a) Choir II; the hinge with the preceding segment is changed, but the material remains substantially unchanged
b) second exposition, in 4 voices (CATB), with variation and transposition downwards	b) Choir I; substantially unchanged

SEGMENT 3: *in cruce vulneratum*

version for six voices, 1569	polychoral version, CG XIII 24
a) first exposition, in 3 voices (CCT); strict homorhythm at first, then animated	a) CAT of Choir II; substantially unchanged
b) second exposition, in 3 voices (ATB), with variation and transposition downwards	b) ATB of Choir I; substantially unchanged

SEGMENT 4: *felle / et aceto potatum*

version for six voices, 1569	polychoral version, CG XIII 24
in 5 voices (CCATB); anticipated entry of the second soprano, then homorhythm in prevailingly long note values, with extensive cadence, followed by a *Generalpause*	also here it might be said that Palestrina develops the staggered entries of 1569 in superimposed choral layers: the soprano of Choir II enters first, dragging the rest of the group, on which however the entries of Choir I are immediately superimposed; the second part of the segment is written for 8 voices, with livelier animation in comparison to the 1569 version; the *Generalpause* is preserved.

SEGMENT 5: *te deprecor*

version for six voices, 1569

polychoral version, CG XIII 24

brief six-voice segment, strictly homorhythmic, which emphasises the passage to the supplication, already prepared by the preceding pause

eight-voice homorhythm, slightly more animated; the text is repeated twice, increasing the tonal emphasis on G (the final sonority of the entire piece) the dimensions are doubled in respect to 1569 (4 measures rather than 2), and this tendency toward expansion persists in the following segments

SEGMENT 6: *ut tua vulnera*

version for six voices, 1569

polychoral version, CG XIII 24

four-voice (ATTB); pseudo-imitation

a) Choir II**,** reworking 1569, with adjustments and inversion of the parts because of the different vocal ensemble;

b) Choir I, harmonic variation

c) Choir II, = a)
the 1569 segment is tripled (with noticeable dimensional expansion)

SEGMENT 7: *sint remedium animae meae*

version for six voices, 1569

polychoral version, CG XIII 24

four-voice (CCAT);
at first strictly homorhythmic;
sonic contrast with the preceding segment and rhythmic acceleration

the segment is doubled, and there is much less contrast with the preceding segment than in the 1569 version;
a) Choir II follows directly, in continuity with the preceding segment;

b) Choir I; variant that follows a similar harmonic journey, without transposition

SEGMENT 8: *morsque tua / sit vita mea*

version for six voices, 1569

polychoral version, CG XIII 24

actually, two distinct segments

Palestrina divides the segment differently, so that in the first two repetitions it is all one, while in the later repetitions the first part (*morsque tua*) falls and the choirs only repeat *sit vita mea*

morsque tua: six-voice, animated homorhythm	a) Choir II; the 1569 segment is compressed for four voices and strictly homorhythmic; the same choir continues with *sit vita mea*, again simplified in respect to 1569
sit vita mea: free, variously imitative writing, for four voices in different blocks (CCAT, CTTB), finally in six voices for the concluding cadence	b) Choir I; repeats almost exactly *morsque tua*, changing then the link with the following, and duplicating *sit vita mea*
	c) Choir II varies *sit vita mea*; Choir I responds with a new variation, on which Choir II is immediately superimposed, until the two choral layers fuse at the close in eight voices; the harmonic substance of 1569 is however largely preserved; the diverse motivic ideas of 1569 on *sit vita mea* are taken up and developed; the dimensional increase is notable (from 12 to 18 mm.)

The polychoral version is therefore notably faithful to the 1569 version for six voices, both from motivic and harmonic points of view (although with some deviation on occasion of the principal expansions). It presents what might be called a 'natural' development of some ideas of the preceding version: the pseudo-imitations and opposed vocal groups of 1569 now become polychoral blocks or layers, segments replicated with different scoring evolve into genuine antiphonal repetitions, and so on. From the dimensional perspective, while in the first four segments the difference is almost imperceptible (from 25 to 27 measures), in the following ones there is an evident extension (from 20 to 35 – in total, from 45 to 62 measures). Moreover, it is in the second part of the motet that a more specifically idiomatic reinvention takes place: Palestrina's writing becomes more independent from the older version and more idiomatically polychoral (see, for example, segment 6, with the antiphony of blocks in harmonic variation).

As regards form, the framework of the musical rendition of the text remains substantially the same. The principal caesura of the motet falls in both cases between segments 4 and 5, underlined by the general pause and by the homorhythmic declamation of the words «te deprecor» – a rather emblematic case of the expressive and sonic expansion of a pre-existing idea obtained by means of the transition to the polychoral ensemble. However, subtle redistributions of formal emphasis can be observed: the *tutti* of the 6-voice and 8-voice versions are not perfectly coincident; the expansion of the second part means that in the new version the previously mentioned principal caesura is anticipated in the overall formal balance, etc. And there is nothing automatic in the transition from one version to the other. For

example, segment 3, although lending itself to a polychoral replication similar to those of later segments, remains unaltered. Perhaps, the fact that the most apparent interventions of restructuring are concentrated in the second part is determined by the presence of segments repeated by various vocal groups in the first part of the 1569 version.[29] The formal alteration of the *finale*, however, is important. There is at first more emphasis on the words «ut tua vulnera», while there is no longer separation between this segment and the successive «sint remedium animae meae» (in 1569 they were sung by different vocal groups). The syntagm «morsque tua», sung solemnly by the full ensemble in 1569, loses importance and becomes more integrated in the surrounding fabric, thus favouring perhaps an even more logical 'meditation' of the concluding segment (no longer: «morsque tua / sit vita mea», but «morsque tua sit vita mea, / sit vita mea»).

The two versions are in short very closely related. Yet one recognises the work of a skilful hand in the revision, capable of finding continuity with preceding material, but also of reinventing, where necessary, by marrying technical efficacy to logic in the expressive reading of the text.

Leaving aside for a moment the comparison between the two versions, and concentrating attention on the motet for two choirs, let us summarise its prominent characteristics from the perspective of polychoral technique. The fundamental principle is a mostly animated homorhythm that only occasionally, for precise expressive purposes, becomes strict or on the contrary leaves space for brief imitative entries. Although striking effects are absent, the polychoral idiom is well developed (antiphonal exchanges, the superimposition and fusion of choral layers, the careful management of sonic masses, the importance of harmonic blocks significantly contribute to the formal construction). With the obvious exception of the *exordium*, it is generally choir II that begins the new segment. On only one occasion (the crucial «te deprecor») is there a genuine homorhythmic *tutti* in eight voices, while elsewhere the full ensemble is attained through the superimposition of choral layers.[30] In substance, an *exordium* opened by the first choir arrives at the *tutti*, then we have two segments in antiphony, a segment in layered writing for eight voices, the *Generalpause*, the *tutti*, two other antiphonal segments (the first with tripartite geometry 2-1-2), the *finale* that passes from an antiphony of rather broad phrases to briefer exchanges (with the uncoupling of the sub-segment «sit vita mea»), and then to the final *tutti*.

---

[29] Nevertheless, notwithstanding the undoubted relationship between these phenomena (exchanges between contrasting groupings within a single vocal ensemble and exchanges between genuine antiphonal blocks of discrete choirs), one cannot forget the difference that exists between them, if only for the sake of spatialization.

[30] Naturally, always within a carefully chosen formal strategy; Palestrina arrives thus at the writing for eight voices: 1) at the end of the introductory segment; 2) immediately before the general pause, in preparation for *te deprecor*; 3) at the end of the motet.

B. O bone Jesu

The *Motettorum quae partim quinis, partim senis, partim octonis vocibus concinantur, liber tertius*, published at Venice «apud Haeredem Hieronymi Scoti» in 1575,[31] was dedicated to Alfonso II d'Este, brother of Cardinal Ippolito II d'Este – patron of Palestrina «foelicis recordationis» –[32] who had died three years previously. The principal nucleus of the book is constituted by motets in five voices (more numerous than the motets for six and eight voices combined), among which pieces such as *Cantantibus organis* and *Quid habes Hester* stand out for their expressive intensity. Various motets are in responsorial form, and almost all have a predominantly imitative structure. In some, such as the *Ave Maria*, a tendency for the voices to cluster in homorhythmic blocks appears, but without a true clarity, continuity and structural significance. One exception is the *Jubilate Deo*, in which the homorhythm is decidedly more diffuse, notwithstanding the imitative exordium and the continuous, changeable animation of the homorhythmic blocks themselves.

Four of the nine motets for six voices are canonic, and so obviously have an imitative layout (the *Accepit Jesus calicem* contains a canon «tres in unum»).[33] In the other motets for six voices, nevertheless, even in the alternation and variety of constructive solutions a greater propensity is apparent toward brief segmentation, the creation of homorhythmic blocks, the opposition of high and low voices, and so on. *Susanna ab improbis*, the first in the section for six voices, marks immediately a change in this sense in respect to the preceding motets for five voices. Similarly interesting is the brief *Haec dies* (whose homorhythmic incipit soon dissolves in imitative and free counterpoint, followed by another homorhythmic section in triple time – «exultemus et laetemur in ea» – and an imitative and melismatic «alleluia»).

We will discuss the motets for eight voices (milestones for Palestrinian and Roman polychorality) in this collection later: let us pause now on *O bone Jesu*.

The text derives from the ancient and widely-known prayer *Anima Christi* (XIV sec.), reproducing (with omissions, modifications and additions) the second part of its standard form:

> *O bone Jesu, exaudi me, et ne permittas me separari a te; ab hoste maligno defende me; in hora mortis meae voca me, et pone me juxta te, ut cum angelis et sanctis laudem te, Dominum salvatorem meum, in saecula saeculorum. Amen.*

In this version, all the most explicit references to the Eucharist and the Passion

---

[31] RISM P711. Reprints published *ibidem* in 1581 and 1589, at Milan by Francesco & eredi di Simon Tini in 1587, and again at Venice by Angelo Gardano in 1594. Modern edition in PALESTRINA, *Werke*, vol. III, and in *Opere complete*, vol. VIII.

[32] From the dedication that can be read in LINO BIANCHI, *Palestrina nella vita nelle opere nel suo tempo*, Palestrina, Fondazione Giovanni Pierluigi da Palestrina, 1995, p. 155.

[33] In the portrait currently conserved at the Papal chapel, Palestrina holds the music for this motet in his hands (see BIANCHI, *Palestrina*, p. 156).

(«Anima Christi, sanctifica me; corpus Christi, salva me; sanguis Christi, inebria me; aqua lateris Christi, lava me; Passio Christi, conforta me … intra tua vulnera absconde me») that habitually characterise the prayer are missing. The aspect of *praeparatio mortis* and of supplication in the sight of the extreme hour, united to the foretaste of Paradise, is thus accentuated. The text's character of sorrowful, passionate piety, in perfect syntony with the spirituality of the epoch, remains. The typological kinship with *O Domine Jesu Christe* is clear. Here again, the sequence of brief, intense textual segments (sometimes of only two or three words) lends itself to a setting in which homorhythm, conciseness, strong contrasts and lively harmonic tints convey the devotional content in a perfectly fitting way.

The motet, then, has a fundamental framework of animated homorhythm, in the context of which imitation rises to the role of *effetto*. The contrast between segments (concerning rhythmic pace, vocal orchestration, texture, etc.) and expositions within the segment (often two) is notable. A controlled harmonic variety colours an articulated formal structure, marked by some strong elements: the use of a *Generalpause*, the introduction of a final section in triple time, the recurring of motivic and chordal patterns.

O bone Jesu is exceptional in the 1575 collection for brevity (60 bb.), segmentation, and the preponderance of homorhythmic counterpoint. Nevertheless – beyond recalling preceding motets, such as *O Domine Jesu Christe* – it represents the ultimate achievement of a tendency that in Palestrina appears inherent in the six-voice medium: it is the same tendency we saw in the six-voice motets of this same collection, in contrast with the typical layout of the motets for five voices.

Let us examine here in detail how Palestrina reworks also the 1575 *O bone Jesu* (which Giuseppe Baini, a severe critic of this collection, numbers among the only three motets endowed with «some degree of beauty»)[34] in order to develop it into a polychoral motet.[35]

SEGMENT 1: *O bone Jesu*

version for 6 voices, 1575	polychoral version, CG XIII 24
a) first exposition, for four voices (CATB)	a) Choir I; faithful reprise of 1575

---

[34] BAINI, *Memorie storico-critiche*, vol. II, p. 15. The polychoral motets of the collection are also exempted from this criticism: Baini praises above all *Surge, illuminare* (unanimously considered as one of Palestrina's greatest masterpieces).

[35] Modern edition in PALESTRINA, *Werke*, vol. VI.

b) second exposition, for six voices, with exchange of voices and additions	b) Choir II; exact antiphonal repetition of a)
	c) expanded reworking, in which the two choral layers are superimposed the segment, divided in two *cola* in 1575, is now divided in three; in consequence the dimensions are enlarged

SEGMENT 2: *exaudi me*

version for 6 voices, 1575	polychoral version, CG XIII 24
a) first exposition, for four voices (CATT)	a) Choir I; the 1575 segment is reproduced, preserving the harmonic progression, with adaptations
b) second exposition, for six voices	b) Choir II; as above in the passage from a) to b), in respect to 1575, the intensification given by the higher range of the upper voice remains, but there is no enlargement of the vocal ensemble; the dimensions remain identical

SEGMENT 3: *et ne permittas me*

version for 6 voices, 1575	polychoral version, CG XIII 24
in four voices (CCAT)	a) Choir I; more homorhythmic than in 1575
	b) Choir II responds by transposing and varying the unitary segment of 1575 is now divided in two *cola*; in consequence the dimensions are enlarged, and the harmonic destination changes

SEGMENT 4: *separari a te*

version for 6 voices, 1575	polychoral version, CG XIII 24
in four voices (CATB)	Choir II continues without solution of continuity from the preceding segment, drawing faithfully on the 1575 version

SEGMENT 5: *ab hoste maligno*

version for 6 voices, 1575	polychoral version, CG XIII 24
in six voices	On Choir I, which draws closely on 1575 (though the homorhythm becomes stricter), is soon superimposed Choir II (perhaps as a development of the pseudo-imitative idea of 1575), in a layered writing for 8 voices (four + four)

SEGMENT 6: *defende me*

version for 6 voices, 1575	polychoral version, CG XIII 24
in six voices, but with opposition of blocks of three or four voices, up to the cadence for full ensemble	close antiphonal exchange: Choir I/Choir II/tutti; the 1575 idea is thus developed according to a feature typical of polychoral syntax; motivic material and harmony are fundamentally preserved; so too is the *Generalpause* that separates this segment from the following

SEGMENT 7: *in hora mortis meae / voca me*

version for 6 voices, 1575	polychoral version, CG XIII 24
in four voices (CCAT), in a single segment	a) Choir I, which sings the words *in hora mortis meae* only*,* is a kind of varied transposition of 1575
	b) Choir II responds with the same harmonic scheme of 1575, by adding also the words *voca me* the duplication in the first half of the segment obviously determines a dimensional enlargement

SEGMENT 8: *et pone me juxta te*

version for 6 voices, 1575	polychoral version, CG XIII 24
a) in four voices (CTTB)	a) Choir I substantially reproduces the 1575 version
b) in six voices (three + three)	b) Choir II does not follow 1575, but repeats the block of Choir I inverting the parts; as in segment 2, in the passage from a) to b), the intensification given by the higher range of the upper voice remains, but there is no enlargement of the vocal ensemble; harmonic destination changes

SEGMENT 9: *ut cum angelis et sanctis tuis*

version for 6 voices, 1575	polychoral version, CG XIII 24
in four voices (CCAT)	a) after a chromatic passage from the triad of G to that of E, Choir I replicates the progression of 1575 in varied transposition
	b) Choir II responds with the same harmonic scheme of 1575, by inverting the parts here again, a dimensional enlargement corresponds to the reduplication of the segment

SEGMENT 10: *laudem te, Dominum*

version for 6 voices, 1575	polychoral version, CG XIII 24
three to four voices (pseudo-imitation with staggered entries)	a) Choir I reworks the idea of the staggered entries and maintains the harmony of 1575
	b) Choir II draws on the continuation of 1575, by varying and compressing the homorhythm the 1575 segment is reproduced by subdividing it between the two choirs, but the dimensions are similar

SEGMENT 11: *salvatorem meum*

version for 6 voices, 1575	polychoral version, CG XIII 24
segment strictly tied to the preceding; imitative writing, substantially for four voices (first CCAT, then CATB);	a) Choir I b) Choir II in respect to 1575 there is a clearer break with the preceding segment, given the change of choir; the imitative idea of 1575 is preserved, and developed methodically (with entries from the highest to the lowest voices) in each of the two blocks; notwithstanding the internal differences, the cadential goal is the same; the dimensional enlargement is marginal

SEGMENT 12: *in saecula saeculorum. Amen.*

version for 6 voices, 1575	polychoral version, CG XIII 24
in triple time;	in triple time;
writing for four/five/six voices	a) Choir I
	b) Choir II
	c) Choir I + Choir II, in two superimposed choral layers
	d) in eight voices
	a), b) and c) in fact follow 1575, with the same harmonic journey and even more regular homorhythm; the cadence of c) is more ornamented than in 1575;
	d) is a form of variation of c), with homorhythmic alignment of the eight voices, inversion of parts, new cadential ornaments: it thus assumes the function of a sumptuous additional coda, which determines an increment of the dimensions of the *finale*

As in the case of *O Domine Jesu Christe*, one can therefore conclude that the polychoral version is a faithful development of the six-voice version. It tends to maintain all the fundamental ideas of the earlier version, including its harmonic-cadential journey (although with some digressions and modifications of various kinds: more perfect rather than authentic cadences, more major triads as cadential goals, and the notable introduction of the chromaticism g-g# with a direct passage from the major triad of G to that of E in segment 9). The polychoral rearrangement nevertheless appears more 'systematic': the homorhythm is less animated and more uniform, imitations are used with parsimony (and opportunely reorganised in structure), the two choirs follow one another and alternate in rather regular blocks. The dimensions increase (from 60 to 77 mm.), in particular as a result of the addition of the 'coda' and the polychoral reduplication of originally monadic segments.

The framework of the musical rendition of the text remains the same (for example, the homorhythmic *exordium*, the *Generalpause*, the imitative idea on «salvatorem», the *finale* in triple time, etc., are retained), but a more remarkable formal reorganisation takes place. This tends to exploit in an ordered and methodical way the idiomatic opportunities of the polychoral medium, by channelling within a marked regularity the typical *varietas* of six-voice motets

(with the continual skilful contrasts of vocal orchestration etc.). The *tutti* of the two versions do not coincide perfectly, a sign of light differences in the overall formal equilibrium. A segment with an increase from four to six voices in the 1575 version may correspond in the polychoral version to a balanced antiphony between the two choirs. And where the scoring of two consecutive segments contrasts in 1575, this distinction is at least in part lost when they come to be antiphonally reduplicated by two choirs in the new version. It is interesting to note how Palestrina retrieves variety and interest by means of the aforementioned interventions on other elements (seasoning and varying the harmonic progression, changing the dimensional relationships, etc.)

As for *O Domine Jesu Christe*, let us again set aside for a moment the comparison between the two versions, and recapitulate the notable traits of the new motet from the specific point of view of the polychoral idiom. Rather short homorhythmic blocks predominate, whose simple antiphonal alternation (Choir II responds to Choir I through variation and transposition) constitutes the fundamental brick of the formal construction – although obviously other solutions are used. There are no cases of particularly close antiphony (with the exception of segment 6, «defende me»), nor macroscopic sonic contrasts. The use of *tutti*, either true writing for 8 voices or the superimposition of two layers of four + four, marks formally significant areas: the closure of the exordium, the episode that precedes the *Generalpause*, and the *finale*. With regard to the formal plan, the play of tension given by the different intervals of superimposition between the choirs and by the varying horizontal dimensional relationship between segments (among which the *exordium* and *finale* have the principal weight) is notable. Thus, ideas sprung from the text and (as we already know) from the preceding version are brought in a new formal dialectic ingrained in the polychoral idiom.[36] The overall scheme of the motet provides an *exordium* opened by Choir I that arrives then via superimposition of layers to the *tutti*; a series of antiphonal segments, whose superimposition becomes closer at a certain point, up to the *tutti* that precedes the *Generalpause*; a new series of regular antiphonal exchanges; and the *finale* in triple time that summarises the three modalities of polychoral interaction (exchange, superimposition, eight-voice polyphonic writing).

C. Final observations: polychorality
    The six polychoral motets included by Palestrina in the 1575 book of motets

---

[36] See what takes place in segments 2-6. Segments 2 and 3 institute a rather regular antiphonal alternation, while segment 4 (intoned by only Choir II as an immediate continuation of the preceding) interrupts this rhythm by preparing the following 'crisis': in segment 5 («ab hoste maligno») the response between the two choirs is strict and amply superimposed, and in segment 6 («defende me») Palestrina passes from the close exchange to the homorhythmic *tutti*; after the cadence, a general pause follows, creating the primary formal caesura of the motet.

constitute a fundamental stage of Roman polychorality.[37] Notwithstanding an underlying recognisable stylistic uniformity, they demonstrate a notable variety, which – as Anthony Carver and Noel O'Regan have rightly observed –[38] also derives from the different nature of the set texts. *Ave Regina coelorum* in fact belongs to the specific typology of Marian antiphons, while *Veni, sancte Spiritus* and *Lauda Sion* partially set the homonymous sequences. In this period, the settings of these texts (although broadly ascribable to the category of the motets) always recall characteristic traditions (in the recourse to *cantus prius facti*, in the musical rendering of textual structures, etc.); and it is thus opportune to recognise that they belong to specific subgenres. The Christmas *Hodie Christus natus est* is in its turn a particular case, for the presence of the ritornello «noe, noe». *Jubilate Deo* belongs to the category of the «festal psalm-motets»;[39] while *Surge, illuminare*, whose text from *Isaiah* 60, 1-2 is the incipit of the *lectio secunda* of the first nocturn in the matins of Epiphany, can be considered as a 'normal' motet.

The characteristics of these works may differ in a relevant way. *Ave Regina coelorum*, for example, opens with prolonged monochoral episodes, of imitative structure and alternated without overlap; only later Palestrina introduces genuine antiphonal exchanges between homorhythmic blocks, and then the *tutti*. *Hodie Christus natus est* instead exploits the possibilities of the polychoral idiom in a more plastic manner, with the richness of contrasts (between melismatic and syllabic writing, between strict homorhythm and imitative entries, between different rhythmic paces, and so on), the recurrence of the cited textual ritornello «noe, noe», and the *finale* in triple time. In motets such as *Surge, illuminare* and *Jubilate Deo*, the polychoral technique gives shape to yet different balances – the *incipit*, for example, is monochoral and imitative in the first motet, fundamentally homorhythmic (but melismatic) and antiphonal in the second. But all in all, the repertory of possibilities is common: the alternation of long exchanges and closer interactions, careful strategic-formal management of the orchestration (single choir, antiphony, two layers, *tutti*), metrical and rhythmic contrasts, the range of solutions that extends from strict homorhythm to free counterpoint and from regular and imperative declamation to the melismatic *jubilus*. Palestrina manages the assemblage of these ingredients with extraordinary skill, creating motets of magnificent workmanship.

---

[37] And not only, given that, as Noel O'Regan recalls, five of these six pieces «were the first *cori spezzati* pieces (i.e. with harmonically independent choirs) to be published by any composer» (see O'REGAN, *Palestrina's Polychoral Works*, p. 341 and the relevant note).

[38] See CARVER, *Cori spezzati*, p. 109-110 and, among O'Regan's various publications, at least *Palestrina's Polychoral Works*, p. 343.

[39] O'REGAN, *Palestrina's Polychoral Works*, p. 346.

Manuscript CG XIII 24 is slightly later than *Motettorum … liber tertius*, and in polychorality's early development, the years (even if few) count. Nonetheless, it seems logical to compare the two polychoral revisions that we have analysed with the small and variegated corpus of 1575. From the comparison, it clearly emerges that the procedures adopted are the same – that is, the outline of the same polychoral style is recognisable. The dimensions are rather contained; in *O bone Jesu* the homorhythm is perhaps more constantly observed; and of course the text of both motets is more frequently and constantly segmented (there are more – and shorter – segments). But overall the two works, notwithstanding their different polychoral structure, are fully coherent with the gamma of possibilities of the 1575 compositions.

The distinctive traits of the two revised motets moreover derive, *mutatis mutandis*, from their monochoral antecedents, both ascribable to the subgenre of devotional motets. Both the monochoral versions share the same characteristics: conciseness, homorhythmic-declamatory layout, and frequently segmented, intense Christocentric texts that Palestrina interprets with supreme mastery by exploiting the possibilities of the six-voice (CCATTB) ensemble. If some traits of the original motets led in an entirely natural way to the transformation, others end by conferring a certain irreducible peculiarity to the polychoral versions of *O bone Jesu* and *O Domine Jesu Christe* (but as we have seen, the Palestrinian polychoral typologies *are* varied!). In short, there is nothing obvious and mechanical about the process of reworking. Other six-voice motets in the 1575 collection, for example, would have been as suited as *O bone Jesu* to a polychoral reworking. And the presence itself of the six-voice version in the 1575 book, alongside perfectly developed polychoral motets, clearly indicates that the monochoral *O bone Jesu* is not a 'draft' or a 'polychoral motet *manqué*', but the extreme realisation of some traits of the Palestrinian six-voice compositional style already evident in other works (preference for homorhythmic textures, opposition of groups of voices, sectionalisation, emergent role of vertical aggregations, etc.). These tendencies in Palestrina's writing *prepare* the polychoral developments.[40]

On one hand, in the above reworkings we see the continuity between these premonitory signs and genuine polychoral writing; on the other, the co-existence of fully polychoral works and the six-voice *O bone Jesu* in the *Motettorum … liber* of 1575 also shows the existence of a definite boundary, guarding us against too organicistic interpretations.[41] Polychorality did not arise automatically from

---

[40] See O'Regan, *Palestrina's Polychoral Works*, p. 342: «The double-choir pieces published in 1575 were the culmination of a trend found in Palestrina's music from the 1560s onwards, particularly in works for six voices, towards a more homophonic texture with contrasting blocks of voices».

[41] All these evaluations are, in effect, subjected to various cautions. As occurs frequently in these repertories, largely insoluble problems relating to precise chronology, to the circum-

such tendencies, although these laid important technical and musical foundations. And when, for disparate reasons, it came to being and had its own peculiar developments (formal idioms, the harmonic independence of the two choirs with all its consequences described effectively by O'Regan,[42] etc.), Palestrina made free, unforeseeable use of its various compositional possibilities – obviously, according also to the circumstances, the performance context, and so on.

D. Final observations: rewriting

According to the overall logic of this study, the discourse on the 'two + two' Palestrinian motets must close with a brief consideration regarding not polychoral technique, but rather the rewriting in itself and for itself, and the methodological indications that emerge from this experience of analysis.

First of all, an observation on the delicate problem of authenticity. In both cases, we have comparatively strong documentary support. O'Regan states that the inclusion of the two reworkings in CG XIII 24, an authoritative and fundamental manuscript in the tradition of Palestrina's polychoral music, «would seem to indicate that the expansion to eight voices was carried out by Palestrina himself, or under his supervision». Thus O'Regan, an authority about Palestrina's oeuvre and the principal expert in Roman polychorality, considers them «authentic works».[43] As I have tried to demonstrate, the results of the compared analyses confirm this conviction. But beyond the single case, one cannot help underlining that stylistic many-sidedness (one thinks again about the polychoral motets of 1575 – few, and rather diverse!), paradoxically combined to the relative impersonality of the language, the vicious circles of attributions, and the problems of dating, always risk setting insidious traps.

Returning to the specific, what status do the two versions of each motet have? Given, on one hand, the publication of the six-voice versions in Palestrina's personal motet collections and the presence of the eight-voice versions in a manuscript such as CG XIII 24, and on the other the stylistic perfection of each version according to the standards of its own compositional *medium*, it seems to me that their autonomy must surely be recognised. Notwithstanding the relatively few changes made by the composer and the unequivocal relationship between the versions, the shift in the technical category (through the adoption of the particular system of polychoral writing) implies that we are dealing with different and fully autonomous works.

---

stances of the composition, and to the identification of the original destination of every single piece, tend to trigger a web of interdependent conjectures, whose foundation risks becoming less and less verifiable.

[42] O'REGAN, *Palestrina's Polychoral Works*, p. 344.

[43] O'REGAN, *Palestrina's Polychoral Works*, p. 352.

As we have seen, Palestrina's behaviour in this type of reworking is highly interesting, and his approach wholly other than mechanical: sensitive to the structure of the pre-existing version but decisive in exploiting the possibilities of the new *medium*, and entirely faithful to the existing expressive project, although with the redefinition of some details. The decisive importance of the physiognomy of the pre-existing version is evident. Nevertheless, the comparison between the two processes of reworking highlights that unpredictable freedom of the composer mentioned in the preceding paragraph. In certain aspects, in fact, the six-voice *O Domine Jesu Christe* is already 'schematic', with more defined binary segmental repetitions and homorhythmic blocks, while *O bone Jesu*, formally less regular, seems perhaps less predisposed to a polychoral expansion. The difference may seem subtle, but in both cases Palestrina realises the less obvious reworking, giving to *O bone Jesu* a more regular formal schematism and a more rigid structure in homorhythmic blocks.

One of the most fascinating elements of the study of reworkings is the variable balance between conservation and change. What does Palestrina preserve in the transition from one version to the other? Almost everything, in effect: there are no clamorous structural modifications, but adjustments in the articulation between segments, reorganisations dictated by the change of performance *medium*, etc. The main formal and expressive traits are maintained. Nonetheless, the autonomy of the new versions appears undeniable. On what grounds, therefore, does the composer intervene? Certainly modifying the nature of the counterpoint, usually accentuating its homorhythmic character; to which is obviously added a series of minor changes from the melodic and rhythmic point of view, etc. Then there are sporadic but important changes on the harmonic level (an aspect until now largely ignored, unfortunately, in the study of Palestrina). And if, as noted above, the fundamental ideas that generate the form according to the text are preserved, this is not the case with respect to the principles of formal development. Thus, for example, the opposition of the antiphonal blocks tends to alter the overall dimensions (always broadened) and proportions, while in consequence the geometry of the inner articulations also changes, to say nothing of the more marked sectionalisation and greater plasticity of contrasts.

VICTORIA

In the collection *Missae, Magnificat, motecta, psalmi et alia quam plurima, quae partim octonis, alia nonis, alia duodenis vocibus concinuntur*, published in Madrid «Ex typographia regia, apud Ioannem Flandrum» in 1600 and dedicated to Philip III of Spain, Victoria assembles his own most mature polychoral works

for eight, nine and twelve voices.[44] It is perhaps the part of his output that has been most neglected by scholars and modern performers, because it is stylistically distant from the most renowned compositions of his Roman period. The sonic moods are very different from those, for example, of the austere and meditative *Officium Hebdomadae Sanctae* – which became Victoria's 'trade-mark' –, and in short too much unlike a certain idealised and arbitrarily simplified image of the Spanish master. Despite such meagre attention, which continues to mar historical and critical judgement of the composer, works such as the *Missa Pro victoria* for nine voices emerge as very rich in interest, both for their compositional structure and for their sonic and aesthetic impact.[45]

Two compositions of the 1600 collection present a distinct and original stylistic synthesis that depends on their particular origin. The eight-voice *Magnificat primi toni* and the twelve-voice *Magnificat sexti toni* are in fact polychoral rewritings of *Magnificats* published earlier for four voices, respectively in 1576 and 1581.[46] In the following pages, I intend to study the nature of this double reinvention, exploring, as in the case of Palestrina, both the process of reworking and its peculiar stylistic outcomes.[47]

A. Magnificat primi toni

In the collections of 1576 and 1581, Victoria set both the odd-numbered verses of the canticle of the Blessed Virgin (beginning from «Anima mea»), and the even-numbered verses (from «Et exultavit»), in two independent series. This disposition, open to *alternatim* as much as to an entirely polyphonic performance, complied with the customs and needs of different chapels on various liturgical occasions. Save where differently indicated, in the analyses that follow I will consider the *Magnificat primi toni* as a unitary and complete work, the sum of the two series of even- and odd-numbered verses.

---

[44] Notwithstanding the title, the collection (Rɪsᴍ V1435) in fact comprises also compositions for four voices (see the catalogue in Fɪʟɪᴘᴘɪ, *Victoria*, pp. 202-203). Moreover, various pieces for four and eight voices published here had already appeared in preceding collections between 1572 and 1592: Victoria's habit of reproducing his own compositions even without any retouching in successive editions is known. The 1600 polychoral compositions are also supplied with an organ part, which generally follows the first choir with occasional reductions or additions.

[45] On the *Pro victoria* see Fɪʟɪᴘᴘɪ, *Victoria*, pp. 129-138.

[46] In the same collection of 1581, the *Primi toni* was also reproduced. The modern edition both of the monochoral and the polychoral versions is found in Tʜᴏᴍᴀᴇ Lᴜᴅᴏᴠɪᴄɪ Vɪᴄᴛᴏʀɪᴀ Aʙᴜʟᴇɴsɪs, *Opera omnia*, ornata a Philippo Pedrell, Leipzig, Breitkopf & Härtel, 1902-1913 (fac-simile edition Ridgeway, NJ, Gregg Press, 1965), vol. III.

[47] The interest of these compositions has already been registered by Cᴀʀᴠᴇʀ, *Cori spezzati*, p. 121.

As apparent from Table 1, the basic scoring for four voices repeatedly changes complexion in the odd-numbered verses (from CATB to CCAT and ATTB), while in the even-numbered verses it increases to five in «Sicut locutus…» and to six, by the insertion of a double canon, in the «Sicut erat…» of the Doxology. The interaction of the two procedures gives an appreciable variety to the unified sequence. Victoria's writing oscillates rather fluidly between imitative counterpoint and homorhythmic declamation, even if a slightly greater propensity towards the latter is perceivable in the odd-numbered verses and an opposite tendency in the even-numbered. Nevertheless, there are no episodes of true homorhythmic synchronisation of all voices, and therefore a non-strict imitative counterpoint prevails: for the most part syllabic, now more dense, now more rarefied, occasionally innervated by homorhythmic pairs or threes. Varied but devoid of clear contrasts, it is articulated in brief episodes, within the overall brachylogy typical of Victoria. Among the different elements that contribute to the 'variety in unity' are metre (with the passage to the ternary measure in correspondence to the «Gloria...») and motif, with the reference to the first *Magnificat* tone often in strong evidence (see for example the «Quia respexit…», with the insistence of the *cantus* on the reciting tone of d, or the «Sicut locutus…», with the intonation in long notes).

The process of reinvention that Victoria undertakes in transforming this *Magnificat* into a polychoral composition allows on some occasions for the integral maintenance of a verse, and on others for its complete rewriting. Between these two extremes, there are no cases of a true reworking of materials, although occasional motivic reminiscences in the new version can be recognised; these depend moreover on the first tone, which functions as a generative matrix of motives in both versions. Table 1 summarises in a schematic way the composer's approach.

The first thing to note, naturally, is that the composition is now unitary in effect, while *alternatim* performance is in all probability excluded: this is confirmed, beyond structural and stylistic considerations, by the Doxology written in a single span.

The two choirs of the new version differ: the first has a higher scoring (CCAT), while the second has the usual CATB layout. This choice, presumably adopted in order to obtain greater brilliance in the polychoral verses and, in general, further possibilities of contrast, influences the percentage of rewriting in some cases. For example, while verse 1 is unchanged from the pre-existing version, verse 2 (which in 1576 was written for CATB but now is entrusted to Choir I, CCAT) has been substantially rewritten. The new verse does not differ much either in dimensions or in other typological-structural aspects. In the light of what will emerge from the comparisons, I believe one can deduce that here the change of ambitus and relationships between the voices – and not other needs of a formal

or expressive order – may have pushed Victoria to reinvent the verse afresh. The motivic reminiscences of the preceding version are in effect weak.

In the third verse, where for the first time Victoria avails himself of both choirs, a different approach emerges. Here, the rewriting aims at the exploitation of the idiomatic resources of polychorality. In short, the new version is differentiated radically from the preceding one in structural terms, through the use of the choirs at first alternated and then superimposed in a layered writing (four + four voices), predominant homorhythm, and notable synthesis (18 bars, rather than 31). And yet connections can be discerned with the 1576 version, once again mediated by the reference to the tone (for example, compare the line of the cantus and its retarded entry in 1600, bb. 1-6, with the corresponding bb. 3-8 of 1576: see examples 3a and 3b in the Appendix).

The fourth and fifth verses are retained without modifications from the 1576 version, courtesy also to the fact that the «Et misericordia…», intoned now by Choir I, already had a CCAT scoring. However, Victoria arranges a shorter new alternative for this verse, in three voices CCA, with canon in unison between the two higher parts.

In the sixth verse, «Fecit potentiam…», Victoria returns to full scoring. Again, he rewrites the verse completely, in order to exploit the possibilities of the polychoral medium, to which he generously recourses (homorhythm in ternary measure, rhythmically very lively antiphonal blocks, superimposition of layers, etc.). The intervention on the succeeding verse is yet more apparent, even with the retention of the four-voice scoring (but with the transition from ATTB to CATB). Victoria entirely abandons the imitative writing and in general the sonic atmospheres of 1576, and realizes *ex novo* a very short verse (passing from 24 to only 9 measures), almost perfectly homorhythmic, in ternary measure, divided in two by a general pause (see examples 4a and 4b in the Appendix). The melodic reminiscence of the initial subject probably depends also here on the tone.

The verse that follows, «Esurientes…», is polychoral and completely rewritten, with notable dimensional contraction (from 25 to 11 bars), while the «Suscepit…» is retained without changes. The five-voice «Sicut locutus…» of 1576, in which the tone was initially in strong and solemn evidence in the top voice, with long note values, was rewritten with a reduction in scoring (to four-voice CCAT) and dimensions (from 28 to 16 bars), at first in ternary measure, and in short without any relationship with the preceding version.

As already mentioned, the doxological conclusion is now composed in unitary fashion: the transition from ternary to binary measure serves as the principal element of articulation between the two halves. The «Gloria…» was already ternary in 1576, but here it is homorhythmic and wholly reinvented, in the ever rapider alternation of the vocal groups. «Sicut erat…», which in the first version was for six voices CAATTB, was also completely rewritten. Nevertheless, it is

interesting to note how a phrase with long note values of 1576 – which, anticipated by the top voice, appears in the second altus and second tenor (transposed) for a total of four times – is found again in the tenor of the second choir in the sumptuous eight-voiced conclusion of 1600, in regular breve note values (see examples 5a and 5b in the Appendix). Here again, the common dependence on the first tone is clear: the notes of the phrase correspond in fact to one of its typical concluding formulas. It is not by chance, I think, that both versions share the elegant and extremely appropriate idea of highlighting this phrase at the conclusion of the *Magnificat*. Rather, it indicates that – even in the absence of extensive reworking of the existing material – in the course of this reinvention Victoria was considering in some measure the compositional model of 1576 even when writing a verse anew. In short, it is a further example of the processes of creative development and reorganisation of preceding ideas whose case history in the work of Victoria is exceptionally rich.[48]

In conclusion to this comparison, we note that the new version is significantly more concise (225 bars[49] against 303 in the 1576 version, with a drop of more than 25%) and that the material retained unchanged from 1576 – verses 1, 4, 5 and 9 – constitutes more than 40 % (94 bars).

Having begun from an imitative four-voice *Magnificat*, stylistically congruent with so many other examples of his writing in the 1570s and 1580s, what kind of composition, what new form does Victoria arrive at through this reinvention? In other words, how can we describe specifically the 1600 version of the *Magnificat primi toni*?

This polychoral work as a whole is varied and complex (see Table 2). Whether one looks at the technical framework or the sonic outcome, many things are happening. Different episodes follow each other: sections maintained intact from the preceding version, whose writing interprets the text of the canticle with all the proven resources of the polyphonic *ruminatio*; passages impregnated with the polychoral idiom, now with syncopated rhythms, now with antiphonal exchanges combined with harmonic progressions; very terse homorhythmic segments; and so on, in a collection of writing manners that also contemplates the use of the full scoring for eight voices, in a less idiomatically polychoral fashion, or the use of the canon in a spare *tricinium*. It is an articulated musical meditation, characterised

---

[48] It is necessary to add that, to complicate things, the 1600 Doxology is all but identical to that of the 1581 *Dixit Dominus (primi toni)* for eight voices (CARVER, *Cori spezzati*, p. 120). The web is therefore still more complex, but this is not surprising, given the abundance of inter-textual relationships within Victoria's output (the pioneer of the study of these phenomena is Eugene C. Cramer: see CRAMER, *Studies in the Music of T.L. de Victoria*, in particular, chapters 3 and 5; for a recent critical appraisal of the problem, see FILIPPI, *Victoria*, pp. 72-75).

[49] Or even 211, if one considers the alternative version of verse 5 for three voices.

by strong and insistent contrasts: dimensional and structural (for example, compare verse 5, of 37 imitative bars, to verse 7, with only 9 homorhythmic bars), metrical and rhythmical (with the frequent alternation of the measures, and the calibrated differentiation of note values), and naturally of vocal orchestration. Under this last aspect, and with obvious consequence on the overall form, an almost regular ternary progression is apparent, based on the pattern Choir II-Choir I-*tutti.* The succession of such contrasting sections places this composition in an unprecedented formal logic, entirely different both from the *alternatim* principle, and from the constantly polyphonic concept of the *Magnificats* with fixed scoring, often characterised by substantial faithfulness to the tone. (The first tone finds its space, however: not only in some passages already mentioned above, but also for example in the «Et exultavit…», a completely rewritten verse, in which the tone stands out still more conspicuously than in the 1576 version).

The polychoral writing adopted by Victoria does not display its idiomatic possibilities in extreme fashion, as can be ascertained in the *finale*: after the ternary, homorhythmic and antiphonal «Gloria…», the «Sicut erat…» resumes a more animated contrapuntal writing, and the overall architecture of the conclusion thus has, surprisingly, more an imprint of polyphonic density than of polychoral sonic masses. Nevertheless, the use of contrasts between sections with different scoring is skilful, and the passage to the polychoral *tutti* is deliberately invested with a peculiar expressive value: see episodes such as «omnes generationes», «[esurientes] implevit bonis», or the start of the doxology.

The penchant for contrasts and the lively sonic creativity that emerge as characteristic of the mature Victoria (at least beginning from the 1583 twelve-voice *Laetatus sum* in three choirs),[50] produce here a particular alchemy thanks to the synthesis between polyphony and polychorality propitiated by the revision. There would be less imitative writing mingled with the polychoral idiom, if it did not derive from the recovery of a pre-existing text. We might even say: Victoria «would not have written a *Magnificat* thus» at this chronological point, if he had begun entirely afresh. But another of his distinctive features – the habit of reworking his own compositions, of returning to works already perfectly complete in themselves – leads him towards this very fertile association of contrasting sonorities, writing methods, and vocal styles.

B. Magnificat sexti toni

Also for the *Sexti toni* Victoria composed and published in 1581 a double series of odd- and even-numbered verses. The basic scoring is different – CATB for the odd-numbered verses, ATTB for the even-numbered –, but the principle according to which it is reduced for the central verse of the canticle (in three

---

[50] See FILIPPI, *Victoria*, pp. 97-98.

voices, respectively ATB and TTB) and broadened in the Doxology (with added canonical voice, CATTB and AATTB; see Table 3) is analogous. In spite of the different scoring, the two series are similar and coherent. The sixth tone plays a key role, appearing now in one voice and now in another, sometimes also in long note values, and generates a good part of the *soggetti* (which therefore recall each other more or less faithfully). To the motivic unity determined by the centrality of the tone is added the *unitas in varietate* of the contrapuntal procedures and formal structures. The writing is constantly based on imitation, with rather modest homorhythmic inclinations that generally involve not more than two voices. Text expression is limited. Abstract sumptuousity of the polyphonic fabric prevails, and some typical procedures – vocal leaps, figurations, harmonic inflections – raise the emotional temperature in Victoria's characteristic manner. There are differences: for example, regarding dimensions (especially among the odd-numbered verses, which go from the 9 bars of the first verse to the 32 of the following, while among the even-numbered verses there is more homogeneity), and scoring, as already mentioned. Nevertheless, it is clear that the compositional project as whole privileges uniformity in respect to contrast.

The polychoral reinvention that Victoria achieves for the 1600 collection is still more spectacular than that relative to the *Magnificat primi toni*, given the expansion of the ensemble to twelve voices in three choirs, the second of which with two cantus (CATB-CCAT-CATB; see again Table 3). With respect to the *Primi toni*, an interesting gamut of intermediate approaches is evident between the integral preservation of a verse and its complete rewriting. As we will see, here one can speak properly of a reworking of pre-existing materials, well beyond the motivic contiguity deriving from the sixth tone.

In this case also, the unity of the composition is beyond dispute. Its calibrated formal architecture, with the changes of orchestration that do not follow the binary alternation of odd- and even-numbered verses, does not allow performance in *alternatim*.

Verse 1 was substantially preserved from the 1581 version. Victoria made minimal modifications to the declamation of the text (on the word «Dominum», in the *tenor* and *cantus*) and cut a bar, thus simplifying and shortening the final cadence. The following verse at first presents slight retouchings of various kinds, but then above all a structural revision owing to the change of scoring from ATTB to CCAT. Victoria transposed melodic fragments or entire phrases an octave above in order to exploit the ambitus of the new vocal ensemble, and in the second hemistich also effected an exchange of parts between upper voice and tenor,[51] with opportune adjustments; again, the final cadence was abbreviated by

---

[51] I use here these terms in structural sense, for the sake of clarity; whereas preserving the real names of the parts, I should say that the line of the second *tenor* of 1581 passes to the first

a measure, contracting its ornamental development.

In verse 3 Victoria introduces polychorality for the first time, using all three choirs (see examples 6a and 6b in the Appendix). Choir 3 begins, resuming the initial imitative segment of 1581 by compressing it («Quia respexit»). The entry of the cantus is anticipated with respect to the preceding version, and its phrase is rhythmically contracted, so that a cadence occurs already in the fourth bar. At this point the argument passes to the second and then to the first choir, whose homorhythmic blocks fragment the text («humilitatem / ancillae suae»). Therefore, in the turn of a few measures, the three choirs are superimposed in layers («ecce enim ex hoc»). A new episode of exchange between the three groups, with an interesting AAB structure (with A *ouvert* and B, melodically symmetrical, *clos*) follows on «beatam me dicent». An impressive superimposition on «omnes generationes» leads to the *finale*, in which the layers are fused in twelve-voice writing. Only in the first segment does Victoria preserve a recognisable relationship with the preceding version, but the phenomenon is of the greatest importance. In the rest of the verse, the composer thinks in a purely polychoral way, making use of its idiomatic possibilities: the short, homorhythmic blocks, and the rapidity of the exchange contrasting to the powerful superimposition of choral layers. Vertical harmony, sonic spatialisation, and the contrasts of the masses dominate at the cost of motivic significance: in this dissolution of the motifs, the reference to the sixth tone*,* so evident in the 1581 version, is lost for the most part. Whereas scoring and sonic masses are expanded, the verse is reduced exactly by 25% (32 to 24 bb.).

Overall, the 1600 version is significantly more concise than the preceding one (186 bars as opposed to 275 in 1581, with a reduction of around a third). The verses kept intact from the 1581 version constitute 30% (57 bars).[52]

In verse 4 («Quia fecit…») Victoria passes for the first time to ternary measure: this happens again in another three passages, a sign of a clear interest in diversification and contrasts. And the contrast here is observed on more than just the metrical level: see the return to the monochoral ensemble, the initial imitative writing, the extreme brevity (10 bb., divided into 6+4 by the general pause), the expressive mood – rather, one would say *in*expressive –, the character almost of 'liturgical Gebrauchsmusik' (see example 7 in the Appendix). Even here, there remains a trace of the preceding version. We can recognise the imitative *soggetto* of 1581 transposed up an octave and subdivided between the two cantus of 1600 («Quia fecit mihi ma[gna]»: the first four notes to the second cantus,

---

cantus of 1600, and that of the *altus* to the second *altus*.

[52] I include among these last, beyond 7 and 9, also verse 1: in the light also of what has been said regarding the revision of verse 2, however, the case history is more nuanced in respect to that of the *Primi toni.*

the following three to the first). But for the rest, the reinvention is complete, and that demonstrates the deliberateness of the compositional choice in introducing so strong a contrast. Victoria could have preserved the 1581 verse (as he would do later for verses 7 and 9), adapting it and contenting himself with the sonic difference given by the move from twelve to four voices and from animated and layered homorhythm to imitative counterpoint. Instead, he rewrites, juxtaposing against the preceding verse (the epitome of polychoral magnificence) a far more modest one than that of 1581. In short, he 'adds' to verse 3, and 'takes away' from verse 4.

Victoria almost completely rewrites the following «Et misericordia…», more synthetically than in 1581, passing from 34 to 15 bars (a reduction of 55%). This constitutes the only notable structural difference from the preceding version, considering that the scoring is the same (three voices ATB, which in 1600 belong to Choir III). The writing in imitative-free counterpoint is analogous. The *soggetto* and the initial imitative structure are, moreover, similar;[53] significantly, the idea of resuming the sixth tone in long note values on «timentibus eum» remains, although migrating from the *tenor* to the *bassus*. Another approach therefore intervenes in the process of reworking: here Victoria, on the one hand, preserves some fundamental parameters (the scoring, the type of contrapuntal texture) and draws on two important structural ideas that mark the beginning and end of the verse, while, on the other hand, he changes the musical substance and noticeably alters the overall proportions.

In «Fecit potentiam…» (see example 8 in the Appendix) Victoria passes from three voices TTB in 1581 to eight in 1600 (Choirs I and II), and again a strong dimensional abbreviation (from 21 to 12 bars) corresponds to the expansion of the scoring. There are apparently no relationships between the two versions; and the verse of 1600, which begins in ternary measure, is based idiomatically on homorhythmic blocks, declamation and sonic effects.

Verse 7 is instead reused without modification from 1581 and entrusted to Choir III. Clearly, the solemn imitative exordium in long note values on «Deposuit…», commenced by the low voices, assumes now a different meaning through the contrast with what precedes it, and gains decisively in expressive effectiveness (see again example 8). Revising the preceding verses, Victoria has prepared the ground for this one, thus re-employing to the best what he had composed twenty years earlier. Here, the sixth tone is paraphrased in long note values by the *cantus*: its sonic prominence, unique in the 1600 version, characterises yet more this verse.

The eighth verse is opened by Choir I, which on the word «Esurientes»

---

[53] The entry order TAB is preserved, and the intervals are similar: in 1600, however, the *bassus* enters already with the new segment «a progenie».

modifies the imitative structure of 1581, by transposing and compressing it, and by adding a counter-subject in the lower voices. But this calm beginning is only the masterly preparation for the entrance of the other two choirs on «implevit bonis», the second appearance in the work of the full scoring in twelve voices (see examples 9a and 9b in the Appendix). In these few measures, one admires all the freshness and cleverness of Victoria's reworking: skill in the reinterpretation of his own composition, control of the polychoral idiom, and sonic creativity converge in an expressive outcome of clear, supreme efficacy. The verse proceeds then in a fashion wholly independent from the preceding version, by developing polychoral interaction in a play of horizontal and vertical oppositions between *concitato* declamation («et divites dimisit…») and rhythmic stasis («… inanes»). Again, the pluridimensional explosion of the sonic material is matched by a radical synthesis, which reduces by half the length of the verse (from 26 to 13 bars).

Not by chance, the verse where the reinvention produces the most impressive effects in the controlled logic of contrasts that governs this work is found between the only two sections kept identical from the preceding version. Like the seventh verse, the ninth, «Suscepit Israel…», also remains intact.

In contrast, Victoria completely rewrites the following «Sicut locutus…». The weak relationship between the two versions is obviously mediated by the sixth tone, which in 1581 is in *tenor* 2 in long note values, while in 1600 it is paraphrased by *cantus* 1. The new verse is more concise (12 rather than 18 bars), mostly homorhythmic and in ternary measure. Comparing its start with that of «Fecit potentiam…» and the «Gloria…», one can almost speak of a 'ternary ritornello', testifying once again to the complexity of the strategies of unification and diversification adopted by Victoria in this vast sonic architecture. The 1600 final Doxology, composed in a single span, does not have recognisable relationships with that of the five-voice version. In fact, as Anthony Carver has noted, Victoria draws on another composition of his, the already cited three-choir *Laetatus sum* of 1583.[54] He changes principally the *incipit*, by substituting the six initial measures of 1583 with the current bars 1-3, perhaps in order to pursue the idea of the unifying ritornello. If in this last section of the *Magnificat* there is therefore no direct relationship between the 1581 and the polychoral versions, one nevertheless recognises another case of internal intertextuality in Victoria's oeuvre:[55] the umpteenth sign of an attitude of reuse of compositional materials

---

[54] See CARVER, *Cori spezzati*, p. 120. Carver himself recognises moreover a kind of fixed scheme for Victoria's polychoral Doxologies: the «Gloria…» is set in ternary measure, with antiphonal exchanges that do not necessarily result in a *tutti*, while the «Sicut erat…» is in binary measure and its antiphonal exchanges lead to a conclusive *tutti*.

[55] I add that there is also a clear relationship between the segment «quaesivi bona tibi» of the *Laetatus sum* and the «beatam me dicent» of the *Magnificat sexti toni*.

even at a distance of many years – an attitude particularly disconcerting when it regards works of extraordinary quality and novelty. Truly, Victoria appears to us here as someone «who brings out of his treasure things new and old».

This synthesis of old and new, which takes form through the reworking, is, as in the case of the *Magnificat primi toni*, highly remarkable. Having removed the fundamental contrast between monody and polyphony regulated by the *alternatim*, new and more varied formal possibilities open up for the composer. As can be seen in Table 4, the overall effect is extremely interesting: the alternation of monochoral episodes (in four or three voices, and differentiated by texture, scoring etc.) and polychoral episodes (in eight or even twelve voices) responds to rhetorical-structural as much as expressive needs. As in the *Primi toni*, an imperfect 'ternary pattern' (two monochoral verses followed by one polychoral) prevails, in which the sonic peaks in eight/twelve voices are fittingly prepared, distanced, and contrasted.

Victoria pursues here a genuine aesthetic of contrast: see, for example, the passage from verse 3, which closes on the first great sonic apex of the composition («omnes generationes»), to verse 4, intoned by Choir II (high voices CCAT), imitative, ternary, very concise (it is the only verse completely deprived of repetitions!). Or even again from verse 5 in only three voices, in imitative and free counterpoint, to 6, opened by the homorhythm in ternary measure of Choir I (the first and, apart from the «Gloria…», only homorhythmic opening) and thereafter typically polychoral, with antiphonal exchanges and an imposing *tutti* in two choirs; and then still to 7, a verse of a completely different sonic and constructive design. As has already been said, Victoria preserves integrally this last verse from the monochoral version, but juxtaposing now this *more antiquo* imitation to the gleaming polychoral segment that precedes it, he pursues and obtains an even more powerful effect. In the different context in which they are inscribed, the sections preserved unchanged from the 1581 version acquire, therefore, a new significance. See also verse 9 – now the longest of the entire work – to which the insistent imitations and the extended coda on the word «misericordiae» confer the character of a meditative pause preparatory to the scintillating *finale* in three choirs. The unchanged verses (1, 7, 9) are all odd-numbered. This depends also on the fact that the even-numbered verses of 1581 were scored for ATTB: in 1600, Choir II instead was CCAT. Evidently, in the new formal and expressive logic of the piece, Victoria wanted a choir of brighter sonority that contrasted both at the level of verse and in polychoral exchanges. In short, it is probable that some local aspects of the rewriting are subordinate to wide-ranging strategic choices.

The new expressive approach developed by Victoria in the years that separate the two versions, orientated to a unprecedented search for effects even within a carefully calculated equilibrium, manifests itself in an emblematic way in the

rewritten verse «Fecit potentiam…». In 1581, the delicate expressive touches did not condition the flow of the counterpoint, and the most notable element was the insistence on the sixth tone in the second part. In the 1600 version, instead, Victoria exploits the possibilities of the polychoral scoring in order to obtain a stream of clear-cut sonic images (see again example 8 in the Appendix). He sets the «Fecit potentiam» for Choir I in ternary measure, then characterises «in brachio suo» with an harmonic inflection (with Eb that propitiates the cadence on Bb), and subsequently triggers an antiphonal exchange on the martial declamation of «dispersit superbos», finally arriving at the *tutti* in the grand cadence of «mente cordis sui».

In the *Magnificat sexti toni* of 1600, this new compositional attitude was accompanied by a clear devaluation of the tone, which generally was instead very evident in the 1581 version. Newly written episodes in which the tone is briefly recalled are not lacking, but sufficient space in the new context is found with difficulty. This also marks a difference with the corresponding *Magnificat primi toni*, in which, as has been said, fidelity to the tone is largely observed. From this point of view, the *Sexti toni* of 1600 pushes further on the field of sonic creativity.

In my view, the effectiveness of Victoria's reinvention of the *Magnificat sexti toni* is exceptional, as much from the formal as from the expressive perspective. The strength and vivacity of the admirably controlled contrasts, and the indisputable originality of the interaction between polyphony and polychorality contribute to great aesthetic value. In typical Victorian fashion, the musical quality is matched by a richness of spiritual suggestions. The listening experience is thus similar to the contemplation of certain great frescoes of the period – in the continual interplay between the details and the overall form, sheer beauty, more than ever *unitas in varietate* and *varietas in unitate*, guides us on a journey of marvel, delight and intense inner motions.

C. Final observations

Looking at the two *Magnificats* from the perspective of the study of rewriting procedures, some specific and methodological suggestions clearly emerge. Among the former is a further confirmation of Victoria's known propensity for conciseness: when he rewrites, he tends to abbreviate. Here this trait is verified not so much in the polychorally revised episodes (in which an homorhythmic compression and a horizontal contraction corresponding to the vertical expansion can be considered as idiomatic), but especially in the new «Et misericordia» of the *Magnificat sexti toni*, which changes neither its scoring nor its structural typology.[56]

---

[56] In evaluating this 'quantitative' data it is necessary to take into account the specificity of a

The authorship of the interventions is certain, and the clarity of the chronological data, together with the macroscopic change of scoring and form, eliminates any doubt about the directionality of the modifications and the autonomy of the two distinct versions. In contrast to other cases, therefore, it is possible to evaluate the single choices of the composer with regard to a compositional project in itself clear.

Typologically, we have recognised in the *Magnificats* areas of complete rewriting, areas maintained unchanged from one version to another and, above all in the *Sexti toni*, episodes reworked to various degrees. Among the last, particular interest is aroused by passages such as the «Esurientes implevit bonis» of the *Magnificat sexti toni*, in which Victoria begins from the idea of the preceding version and then develops it in an entirely new fashion, according to the possibilities of the polychoral *medium*. This reworkings allow us, in short, to appreciate once again the continuity of Victoria's work of *inventio*, in all its nuances. It would be intriguing to analyse and compare analogous revisions by different composers: but only new and more indepth studies on the polychoral repertory will enable other cases beyond the few already noted to emerge.

Instead, what do these compositions teach us about Victoria's approach to polychorality and his sonic creativity? The study of the two works demonstrates the full command with which the Spanish composer moved between purely polyphonic and polychoral concepts. The singular stylistic synthesis deliberately realised by Victoria by fitting heterogeneous materials in a new sonic project is striking: an inextricable weaving of conservation and innovation, difficult to place in the little known history of the *Magnificat* as a genre, and even more in the categories and taxonomies of historiographic evolutionism. It is a synthesis that only a composer educated to the highest levels of contrapuntal mastery in the Rome of the 1560s and 1570s could conceive: a figure who had personally contributed to the definition of the polychoral idiom, the first to have published music for three choirs, and who delighted in returning many times to his compositions, to revise and reinvent, establishing a surprising intertextual network in his own limited musical output. In short, only Tomás Luis de Victoria.

Conclusions

There is a close connection between processes of rewriting and stylistic

---

unitary and entirely polyvocal performance, no longer in *alternatim*, and the particular needs of the liturgical context. However, the difference with the polychoral rewriting of Palestrina's two motets, in which the tendency was unequivocally towards enlargement, is noticeable.

issues. Thus, in analyses of the kind we have realised on Palestrina and Victoria, a considerable number of suggestions emerge on different fronts.

As regards Palestrina, we have cautiously recognised in the reinventions of *O bone Jesu* and *O Domine Jesu Christe* a kind of missing link in the development of his polychoral style, witnessing almost at first-hand the passage from the homorhythmic blocks of one of his particular interpretations of six-voice writing to the proper orchestration for two choirs.

The study of Victoria's two rewritten *Magnificats* has allowed us to understand the importance of an unprecedented experiment of syntheses between polyphony and polychorality, whose expressive consequences are striking. Beyond the specific interest of this incursion in a little known territory of his oeuvre, the case of the *Magnificats* raises questions regarding in retrospect not only Victoria's but also Palestrina's polychorality, and in general that of all Roman composers: what relationship was there between *polyphony* and *polychorality* in their works? And what role was played by an interest in sonic *contrasts*?

The comparison on this terrain between Palestrina and Victoria is complicated by a web of problems of genre and dating. If, in fact, for Victoria we have the difficulty of precisely dating the single compositions of a published collection such as that of 1600 (issued several years after the preceding publications), Palestrina's polychoral repertoire is transmitted in large part in manuscripts or in posthumous publications and pivots on a central *corpus* dating from the 1570s and 1580s. There is therefore the risk that the comparison is distorted by such a chronological mismatch. For this reason, I believe it appropriate to stay within a pragmatic evaluation, without jumping to hasty conclusions about the artistic personality of the two composers: to counterbalance a 'conservative Palestrina' with an 'innovative Victoria' would be grossly misleading.

For both Palestrina and Victoria, the adoption of polychoral writing certainly implies a more marked orientation to *Klanglichkeit* and a greater percentage of homorhythm, but only in some cases – generally in compositions of rather short span – does the homorhythmic counterpoint have the upper-hand over free-imitative counterpoint. Elsewhere, free-imitative textures are instead integrated with homorhythmic writing, with variety of equilibriums and solutions.

In Palestrina's polychoral compositions, the grounding in imitative counterpoint is mostly highly perceptible (both for the presence of entire imitative segments and in general for the contrapuntally animated texture). The integration of different writing styles creates a striking *varietas* but not deliberately accentuated local contrasts. In the compositions for twelve voices, for example, there is never a weighty opposition between a single choir and the *tutti* in three choirs.[57]

---

[57] A particular case is that of the *Salve Regina* preserved in the manuscripts CG XIII 24 and I-Rn 77-88: three distinct monochoral sections (one for each choir) in mostly free-imitative

Even when, in the masses, there are internal monochoral sections, it seems that Palestrina tends to attenuate rather than accentuate the contrast (as in the *Kyrie* of the *Missa Hodie Christus natus est*, in which the *Christe* in four voices has an homorhythmic incipit, while the following *Kyrie* II in eight voices has an imitative beginning). Carver defines a motet such as *Spiritus sanctus replevit* in eight voices as «[Palestrina's] closest rapprochement to the Gabrielian manner».[58] In fact, the idiomatic elements of a mature polychoral style are here (from the homorhythmic declamation in short note values to the changes of metre). But the concept remains strongly marked by the polyphonic-imitative thought, as one sees in crucial places such as the *incipit*, with its two well-spaced duets, and the alleluiatic *finale*. And although the vocal orchestration may be skilfully moulded to the service of expressivity, there is no marked taste for the opposition of sonic masses. On an almost infallible control of the formal architecture, obtained with the proper means of polyphonic writing (that is, working on motivic material, the geometry of counterpoint, harmonic and cadential syntax, and vocal projections of the text), Palestrina grafts the new possibilities of the polychoral idiom, without any need of more exaggerated sonic oppositions.

In Victoria, the contrasts are more extreme. An aesthetic orientation that had already emerged in the 1583 *Laetatus sum* (and which cannot therefore be defined as late and extraneous to his Roman period) certainly finds its greatest expression in the masses and the *Magnificats* published at Madrid in 1600.[59] The factors that principally contribute to the establishing of these contrasts are the changes of scoring, and the polar opposition between free-imitative and homorhythmic counterpoint.

Even in the same collection, however, Victoria follows different paths, rooted in the models he uses: the parody of (1) polychoral works already imprinted with the aesthetic of the contrast (*Missa Laetatus sum*) or (2) not (*Missa Ave Regina coelorum*), or instead of (3) non-polychoral but strongly characterised works such as the chanson *La bataille* (*Missa Pro victoria*), and, on the other hand, the revision of (4) pre-existing monochoral versions (in the case of the two *Magnificats* that we have analysed), leading to different outcomes.

In the *Missa Ave Regina coelorum*, for example, the polychoral style is 'advanced'

---

counterpoint are followed by one for two choirs, with homorhythmic antiphonal or superimposed blocks, while the concluding section is for three choirs, with blocks initialy quite long and animated, then shorter and homorhythmic, and an imposing *tutti finale*. In short, it is an unusual sonic-formal project, *sui generis* in the Palestrinian output for its particular formal 'ordered imbalance' and the conspicuous use of the constrast of scoring in a *formbildend* sense. But here too, in the progressiveness of the transition from one sonic extreme to the other, Palestrina's usual aversion for excessive local contrasts can be recognised.

[58] CARVER, *Cori spezzati*, p. 114.

[59] In shorter pieces like the sequence *Victimae paschali laudes* or the motet *O Ildephonse* one could hardly expect to find so many contrasts and so many different technical solutions.

(for example, through declamation in short, syncopated note values that recalls the coeval sequences *Victimae paschali laudes* and *Lauda Sion*), but there is not a formal quest based on *contrast*: one would rather speak more blandly of '*varietas*'. Victoria, nevertheless, does not renounce the insertion of entire episodes in imitative writing (for example, the *Christe* in five voices, in part the *Crucifixus* in four, and especially the *Sanctus* and the *Benedictus*, separated by the contrasting *Hosanna* I).

In the masses *Pro victoria* and *Laetatus sum*, a sonic creativity emerges with the same clarity as in the case of the two *Magnificats*, expressed both through the combination of episodes in imitative polyphony and polychoral episodes, and more generally through the greater valorisation of the contrasts. See, for example, the *Credo* of the *Pro victoria* (with episodes strongly characterised by the polychoral idiom combined with elements of the 'battle' style, as against contrapuntally animated segments entrusted to a single choir, internal sections for reduced scoring, etc.), or those passages of the *Laetatus sum* in which episodes for three treble voices are juxtaposed to grand polychoral masses.

Here and in the *Magnificats,* the same sensibility is manifested, the same sonic creativity. But it is clear that in the masses the imitative episodes remain rather isolated 'artifices of contrast'. In the *Pro victoria*, for example, they do not in general build a lasting polyphonic organisation and are conditioned by the predominant homorhythmic background, by the brevity of the segments, and so on. The peculiarity of the genesis of the two *Magnificats*, instead, creates a polar antagonism, almost an *alternatim* of a new kind, between the polychoral idiom for full ensemble and contrapuntal writing for reduced ensemble, making them unique. These works anticipate formal developments that were to come in the following decades.[60]

<p style="text-align:center">* * *</p>

---

[60] In order to depict more fully the polychoral style of the 1600 collection, it would be necessary also to examine a much more obscure figure: the Flemish Philippe Rogier (c. 1561-1596), active at the Madrid court since 1572. What remains of his polychoral output for eight and twelve voices (see CARVER, *Cori spezzati*, pp. 125-128) seems extremely interesting for its pursuit of striking contrasts, and the variety and vivacity of the formal and expressive ideas. The date of Rogier's death poses an irrefutable *terminus ante quem* for the compositional chronology, but the manuscript tradition of his music is highly problematic (both for conflicting attributions and for the difficulty of identifying later interventions), as pointed out by Alfonso de Vicente in *Los comienzos de la música policoral en el área de la Corona de Castilla. Algunas hipótesis y muchas preguntas* (unpublished version of a paper presented at the seminary «La tradizione policorale in Italia, nella penisola Iberica e nel Nuovo Mondo», Venice, Fondazione Levi, October 2005; I wish to thank professor de Vicente, who not only sent me a copy of his essay, but also took the pain to read a preliminary version of the present article, and made important observations). Thus, the questions regarding the relationship between Victoria's compositions and the works dubiously attributed to Rogier will have to remain unanswered for the moment.

The double case of polychoral reworking analysed in these pages has presented different and only in part comparable problems, because of the diverse gamut and phenomenology of the changes (more extensive in Victoria, more contained in Palestrina), and of the greater autonomy of the new sonic projects undertaken by Victoria in respect to the more linear polychoral expansion carried out by Palestrina. Nevertheless, this comparative study (as always happens in analytical investigations of the kind) has collected valuable information and suggestions. Even merely knowing that composers such as Palestrina and Victoria[61] undertook reworkings of this kind, and knowing *how* they did it constitutes a valuable acquisition. We understand better their methods of work, the strategies and parameters of their interventions on previously composed music, and in short their relationship with the works themselves. And in cases of problematic attributions of other reworkings, the knowledge that these possibilities existed in their mental horizons might be decisive.

The catalogue of known cases of reworking by sixteenth-century composers appears in constant expansion, and throws new light on the compositional process of the late Renaissance – which obviously includes other well-known typologies of reuse and reinvention, such as borrowing, *imitatio*, parody, etc. –, revealing once again its extreme dynamism. The composers revised their own works (even if fully complete and already published) in different ways and on different occasions, and stimulated by different factors.

The incidence of these phenomena is probably much greater than we are accustomed to thinking. Outside specific or indepth studies, rewritings and revisions can easily be mistaken for secondary and insignificant documents of the tradition of an already known piece. Different versions can be found in anthologies (such as Palestrina's *Nativitas tua*, of which above), in reissues (for example the lauda *Poi che 'l cuor mi stringe et serra* by Animuccia),[62] in manuscripts (as in the case of the two Palestrinian motets analysed here, but also of Victoria's works in Toledo B.30, or the polychoral reworkings of Annibale

---

[61] If we are certain that Victoria made the changes himself, in the case of the two Palestrinian motets, as already noted, the attribution of the revision to the hand of Palestrina is perfectly plausible.

[62] Published in the first (1563) and second book (1570) of his *laudi*: see LOTHAR SCHMIDT, *Die römische Lauda und die Verchristlichung von Musik im 16. Jahrhundert*, Kassel, Bärenreiter, 2003 (Schweizer Beiträge zur Musikforschung, 2), pp. 83-85. Another very interesting example, again in the Roman area although dating to the early seventeenth century, is given by Giovanni Francesco Anerio's *Motecta*, published in 1609 and then revised in 1620. See GRAHAM P. DIXON, *Progressive Tendencies in the Roman Motet During the Early Seventeenth Century*, «Acta Musicologica», LIII, 1981, pp. 105-119: 115; but the revisions extend much further than suggested by Dixon, as I hope to be able to show in a forthcoming study.

Zoilo[63] and Luca Marenzio[64]). And even when different versions are available in modern editions, as in the complete works of composers such as Palestrina and Victoria, the particularity and the importance of the relationship between them may not immediately arouse scholarly attention. It is very probable, moreover, that a still greater number of reworkings tied to specific circumstances might have been irredeemably lost.

The composers of the Renaissance, even those that we persist in believing 'classically' free from «second thoughts»,[65] were often retracing their steps. And where the footprints are superimposed, the work of tracking them along the paths of musical creation is made yet more difficult and fascinating.

---

[63] I allude to the two distinct versions of the *Regina coeli*, for 12 and 20 voices, in the manuscript I-Rn Mus. 77-88: see LUCIA NAVARRINI, *Un precursore di Ruggero Giovannelli: Annibale Zoilo (1537?-1592)*, in *Ruggero Giovannelli «musico eccellentissimo e forse il primo del suo tempo». Atti del convegno internazionale di studi (Palestrina e Velletri, 12-14 giugno 1992)*, a cura di Carmela Bongiovanni e Giancarlo Rostirolla, Palestrina, Fondazione Giovanni Pierluigi da Palestrina, 1998, pp. 487-508, and ACKERMANN, *Studien zur Gattungsgeschichte*, pp. 197-200.

[64] See MARINA TOFFETTI, *Note a margine del processo compositivo marenziano. I salmi «Jubilate Deo» e «Laudate Dominum» nella duplice versione a otto e dodici voci* and FRANCESCO ROCCO ROSSI, *Marenzio, la Polonia e un'intavolatura per organo: le due versioni del mottetto «Jubilate Deo … Servite»*, both in *Miscellanea marenziana*, a cura di Maria Teresa Rosa Barezzani e Antonio Delfino, Pisa, Edizioni ETS, 2007 (Diverse voci…, 9), respectively at pp. 71-148 and 149-192.

[65] JOHN MILSOM, *Tallis's first and second thoughts*, «Journal of the Royal Musical Association», CXIII/2, 1988, pp. 203-222.