

Contrafacta

*Modes of Music Re-textualization
in the Late Sixteenth and Seventeenth Century*

edited by
Marina Toffetti and Gabriele Taschetti

Musica Iagellonica
Kraków 2020

On the cover

Front page: *Nova metamorfosi de diversi autori opera del R. P. F. Geronimo Cavaglieri* [...] *Libro terzo*, Milano: Melchiorre Tradate, erede di Agostino, 1610, Canto I, p. 2. Vercelli, Fondazione Museo del Tesoro del Duomo e Archivio Capitolare di Vercelli, Biblioteca Capitolare di Vercelli, MUSI.CAP.35.

Back page: Franz Tunder, *Hosianna dem Sohne David / Jubilate et exultate vivat Rex Carolus*, *Canto primo*. Uppsala, Universitetsbibliotek, Vmhs 36:6.

Layout

Andrzej Sitarz

Revision of the English texts and translation of the articles of Marina Toffetti, Chiara Comparin, Tomasz Jeż, Marco Giuliani, and Gabriele Taschetti

Michael Webb

Indexes and music examples

Gabriele Taschetti

This volume was made possible with the support of the Department of Cultural Heritage of the University of Padua and represents the outcome of the International Spring School “*Contrafacta*. Music with new texts for new contexts” held at the Conservatorio di Musica ‘Arrigo Pedrollo’ in Vicenza (25–29 March, 2019) under the scientific direction of Marina Toffetti.

© 2020 Copyright by the Authors and Musica Iagellonica Sp. z o.o.

ISBN 978-83-7099-239-2



Musica Iagellonica
ul. Westerplatte 10
31-033 Kraków, Poland
www.mi.pl



UNIVERSITÀ
DEGLI STUDI
DI PADOVA



Marina Toffetti

***Contrafacta* of Palestrina's works printed in Milan (1597–1605)**

1. The circulation of Palestrina's music in Milan

In a previous article on the reception of Giovanni Pierluigi da Palestrina's music in Milan between the 16th and 17th century, I examined the question as to which of the composer's single compositions and individual collections were disseminated in Milan, the channels through which they arrived, and how the local musical milieu had reacted to these stimuli.¹ A rich and varied picture emerged, which provides a clear idea of how Palestrina's output raised interest among local composers, music publishers, clerics and men of culture.

While only few of Palestrina's compositions appear to have been copied in Milan between the 16th and 17th century, several collections of his music were reprinted there thanks to the initiative of the publishers Tini and Lomazzo (Francesco ed eredi di Simone Tini; eredi di Francesco e Simone Tini; erede di Simon Tini e Filippo Lomazzo), who played a driving role in the local diffusion of his music and that of other notable composers from outside the musical

¹ See Marina TOFFETTI, "La ricezione palestriniana a Milano fra '500 e '600", in *Palestrina e l'Europa. Atti del III Convegno Internazionale di Studi (Palestrina, 6–9 ottobre 1994)*, eds. Giancarlo Rostirolla – Stefania Soldati – Elena Zomparelli, Palestrina: Fondazione Giovanni Pierluigi da Palestrina, 2006, pp. 855–935. Sections 2–4 of the present article are a revised and updated version of pp. 885–908 of the above-mentioned essay.

milieu of Milan.² In line with the tendencies of the local printers, who were in turn influenced by the counter-reformist climate of the Ambrosian archdiocese, preference was given, in choosing which of Palestrina's collections to reprint, to the collections of sacred music: above all to motets (of which there are four Milan reprints) and, in second place, to the masses (of which two reprints have survived, one being a compilation based on two different books); besides these, one book of litanies and one of madrigals were also reprinted, now lost.³ The only book to be reprinted twice is that of the motets on the Song of Songs, considered still today one of the greatest achievements in sacred polyphonic music of all times. The publishers Tini also imported to Milan an edition of the offertories by Palestrina printed elsewhere, thus contributing to its local circulation. In addition, a reworking for four voices of the *missa papae Marcelli*, which for various reasons would be taken as a paradigm of that clarity of writing recommended in the decrees of the Council of Trent, can be found both within a Milan reprint, and in a printed anthology now lacking the title-page (of which the date, place of publishing and name of the printer are thus unknown) preserved in the Archivio della Veneranda Fabbrica of the Duomo of Milan. Contrary to what happened in other centres, nearly all the reprints issued in Milan appeared before Palestrina's death: the first five were certainly published before 1594; the last two, now lost, before 1596.⁴ On the other hand, the later publication of the *Basso prencipale col soprano* of Palestrina's fourth book of four and five part masses (1610), published twenty years after the local reprint of the same collection, shows the wish to make practical and in some ways simplified editions of Palestrina's music available to organists and therefore confirms the continuing interest in his music also after his death. The examination of the Milan reprints and the collation with the respective presumed antigraphs also points to the close association between Milanese music publishing firms and those of Venice.

² See Marina TOFFETTI, "Tini", in *Dizionario degli Editori Musicali Italiani dalle origini alla metà del Settecento*, ed. Bianca Maria Antolini, Pisa: ETS, 2019 (Dizionari, 2), pp. 642–649; EAD., "Tini (Famiglia)", in *Dizionario Biografico degli Italiani*, Roma, Istituto per la Enciclopedia Italiana, vol. 95 (2019), pp. 700–704 (www.treccani.it).

³ A list can be found in the Appendix of Palestrina's individual collections reprinted in Milan, his single compositions (with or without substitute text) printed or reprinted in Milan in collective editions, and re-elaborations with *passeggiature* of some of his compositions.

⁴ See Oscar MISCHIATI, *Indici, cataloghi e avvisi degli editori e librai musicali italiani dal 1591 al 1798*, Firenze: Olschki, 1984, pp. 108–109.

Besides the reprinting of individual collections, a key role in the diffusion of Palestrina's works in Milan was played by the collective editions. The presence of well-known compositions by Palestrina within collective editions reprinted in Milan, although assembled elsewhere, allow us to appreciate the extraordinary importance of such publications as vehicles to disseminate the repertoire. It can in fact be observed that almost all of Palestrina's works featured in them would reappear, in versions variously reworked (with either *passeggiature* or substitute texts), in later music editions printed in Milan.⁵

The investigation on the dissemination and assimilation of Palestrina's music in Milan also revealed the importance of the *passeggiature* and *contrafacta* made by some well-known composers and local clerics. Such re-elaborations, as intertextual artifacts *par excellence*, not only point to a receptive and vital approach in the musical milieu in Milan, but also provide a clear indication of the fame that the selected works by Palestrina must have enjoyed there at the time.

2. *Contrafacta* of Palestrina's works in Milanese music prints

“Mi è anco parso di servirmi di composizioni note ad ognuno”.⁶

In the Milanese prints five compositions by Palestrina appear with substitute texts: two compositions were printed with a text by Orfeo Vecchi, two with a text by Geronimo Cavaglieri, and one composition has both a substitute text by Orfeo Vecchi and one by Geronimo Cavaglieri. The collections in which

⁵ For further details of the Milanese reprints of Palestrina's music, see TOFFETTI, *La ricezione palestriniana, passim*.

⁶ (It also occurred to me to make use of compositions well known to all). The quotation is taken from the *avvertimento* “Al virtuoso lettore” found in the second part of the *Regole Passaggi di musica* by Giovanni Battista Bovicelli, published in Venice “appresso Giacomo Vincenti ad instantia delli heredi di Francesco, e Simon Tini library in Milano” (by Giacomo Vincenzi, at the request of the heirs of Francesco and Simon Tini, booksellers in Milan) in 1594. Anastatic reprint: Giovanni Battista BOVICELLI, *Regole Passaggi di musica 1594*, ed. Nanie Bridgman, Kassel-Basel: Bärenreiter, 1957 (Documenta Musicologica. Erste Reihe: Druckschriften-Faksimiles, 12). Giovanni Battista BOVICELLI, *Regole Passaggi di musica* (Venezia, 1594), with an introduction by Giancarlo Rostirolla, Roma: Società Italiana del Flauto Dolce, 1986. English translation in *Historic Brass Society Journal*, 4, 1992, pp. 27–44. On Bovicelli's treatise, see Edward V. FOREMAN, *A comparison of selected Italian vocal tutors of the period circa 1500 to 1800*, DMA dissertation, Music, University of Illinois, 1969; Bruce DICKEY, “L'accento. In search of a forgotten ornament”, *Historic Brass Society Journal*, 3, 1991, pp. 98–121; John POTTER, “Reconstructing lost voices”, in *Companion to medieval and Renaissance music*, London: Dent-New York: Schirmer, 1992, pp. 311–316.

works by Palestrina appear with a substitute text are two books by Orfeo Vecchi — respectively the *Motetti di Orfeo Vecchi [...] e d'altri eccellentiss. Musici*, printed in 1597 and reprinted in 1599 and, with the addition of the score, in 1603,⁷ and the *Scielta de Madrigali a cinque [...] Accommodati in Motetti*, published in 1604⁸ — and two collections of *contrafacta* by Geronimo Cavaglieri — i.e. the first and second book *Della nova Metamorfosi*, published respectively in 1600 and 1605.

As already suggested in other studies, the first impression one gains from these collections is that Vecchi and Cavaglieri, who were probably in contact with one another, competed in adapting different Latin texts to the same madrigals⁹ — or at least influenced each other reciprocally in the choice of compositions, the texts of which were to be substituted. A similar case of emulation (or, at least, the tendency to use the same compositions) can also be detected in the treatises on diminution, including *passeggiature* of some compositions by Palestrina: the madrigal *Io son ferito abi lasso*, for example, appears both in Giovanni Battista Bovicelli's *Regole*, and in Francesco Rognoni's *Selva de varii passaggi*, published in Milan by Filippo Lomazzo in 1620.¹⁰

It is probable that the compilers of the collections of *contrafacta* and the authors of the diminished versions came to know Palestrina's works through local prints. Of the five compositions reissued in Milan with substitute texts, three had in fact been previously published in *Il quarto Libro delle Muse a cinque voci*, printed in Milan by Francesco and the heirs of Simon Tini in 1587, while the

⁷ In the organ score the two *contrafacta*, notated in *chiavette*, are transposed down a fifth.

⁸ In this case, Palestrina's madrigal *Io felice sarei* (with the substitute text *Domine in virtute tua*) is the first work of the collection.

⁹ On the madrigal models common to the *contrafacta* of Vecchi and Cavaglieri, see Antonio DELFINO, "Geronimo Cavaglieri e alcuni contrafacta di madrigali marenziani", in *Luca Marenzio musicista europeo. Atti della Giornata di Studi marenziani (Brescia, 6 marzo 1988)*, eds. Maria Teresa Rosa Barezzani — Mariella Sala, Brescia: Edizioni di Storia Bresciana, 1990, pp. 165–216: 178–179. For a comparison among the various substitute texts assigned to madrigals by Andrea Gabrieli in the collections of Geronimo Cavaglieri, Aquilino Coppini and Simone Molinaro, see Marina TOFFETTI, "Aspects of the reception of the music of Andrea Gabrieli in Milan", *Musica Iagellonica*, 8, 2017, *Special issue: The music of Andrea and Giovanni Gabrieli in Europe: dissemination, assimilation, adaptation* (guest editor: Marina Toffetti), pp. 5–29.

¹⁰ See Claudio SARTORI, *Bibliografia della musica strumentale italiana stampata in Italia fino al 1700*, Firenze: Olschki, 1952 (Biblioteca di Bibliografia Italiana, 23), 1605a 1620c–1620d. Francesco ROGNONI, *Selva de varii passaggi*, anastatic reprint with an introduction by Guglielmo Barblan, Bologna: Forni, 1970 (repr. 1983) (Bibliotheca Musica Bononiensis, II/153). On the treatise by Francesco Rognoni, see DICKEY, *L'accento*.

motet *Pulchra es*, reposed by Cavaglieri in 1605 with the text *Salve sancta facies*, had already appeared in the two Milan reprints of the fourth book of five-voice motets (1587 and 1593) (see table 1). In the same way, almost all of Palestrina's works that appear in versions subjected to *passeggiature* had already appeared in previous Milan editions (see table 2).¹¹ Both the *contrafacta* and the *passeggiature* of Palestrina's compositions provide a clear sign of the vitality with which some composers and local clerics received his production.

The use of sacred texts conveying edifying messages in place of secular texts must certainly have contributed to the circulation among a wide and varied public of works which were previously already known. Nevertheless, it is likely that the deepest significance of such re-workings could be appreciated by a quite limited and elite public, namely by those who had already heard the original compositions. One could in fact say that the full efficacy of these re-visitations, whether re-texted or diminished, could only be perceived by the (presumably few) listeners who were able to recognize the model and remember its characteristics while listening to the re-elaborated version.

It remains to be asked whether and to what extent the composers were aware of such a plurality of levels of reception. Certainly, they appear to have been conscious of the fact that the works subjected to re-elaboration were well known: this can be deduced, among other things, from the metaphor of the bee that gathers the honey from the most scented flowers (the compiler of an anthology that selects the finest compositions) used in the dedication of the *Motetti di Orfeo Vecchi [...] e d'altri eccellentiss. musici* (Milan, eredi di Francesco e Simon Tini, 1597), and again three years later in that of Geronimo Cavaglieri for his first book, *Della nova Metamorfosi* (Milan, Tradate, 1600). Their works therefore assume the form of deliberate acts of homage, whose significance can be fully grasped only by comparison with their respective models.

¹¹ Here we do not intend to analyze the many technical, compositional and performing issues involved in late-Renaissance *passeggiatura*; such re-workings, instead, are taken into account only for the purposes of obtaining a general overview of the modalities and channels of the circulation of Palestrina's works in Milan. On the main problems raised by the diminished repertoire (and in particular by the compositions of Francesco Rognoni) see Imogene HORSELEY, "The Solo Ricercar in Diminution Manuals: New Light on Early Wind and String Techniques", *Acta Musicologica*, 33, 1961, pp. 29–40; Howard M. BROWN, *Embellishing Sixteenth-century Music*, Oxford: Oxford University Press, 1976 (Early Music Series, 1); Enrico CARERI, "Le tecniche vocali del canto italiano d'arte tra il XVI e il XVII secolo", *Nuova Rivista Musicale Italiana*, 18, 1984/3, pp. 359–375.

Table 1

ORIGINAL COMPOSITION	FIRST EDITION	MILAN REPRINT	SUBSTITUTE TEXT	COLLECTIONS INCLUDING THE <i>CONTRAFECTUM</i>
<i>Io son ferito</i>	1561 ¹⁰	1587 ⁵	<i>Quanti mercenarii</i>	Vecchi 1597, 1599 ⁴ , 1603 ⁶
<i>Vestiva i colli / Così le chiome mie</i>	1566 ³	–	<i>Surge propra / Veni dilecte</i>	Vecchi 1597, 1599 ⁴ , 1603 ⁶
<i>Vestiva i colli / Così le chiome mie</i>	1566 ³	–	<i>Semper laudabo / Sana me Domine</i>	Cavaglieri 1600 ¹¹
<i>Saggio e santo</i>	1574 ⁴	1587 ⁵	<i>Replatur os meum</i>	Cavaglieri 1600 ¹¹
<i>Io felice sarei</i>	1574 ⁴	1587 ⁵	<i>Domine in virtute</i>	Vecchi 1604 ¹¹
<i>Pulchra es</i>	1583 ⁴	1587 1593	<i>Salve sancta facies</i>	Cavaglieri 1605 ⁶

Table 2

ORIGINAL COMPOSITION	FIRST EDITION	MILAN EDITIONS	<i>CONTRAFECTA</i> PUBLISHED IN MILAN	COLLECTIONS INCLUDING THE <i>CONTRAFECTUM</i>	TITLE OF THE <i>PASSEGGLATURA PASSEGGLATURA</i>	TREATISES INCLUDING <i>PASSEGGLATURA</i>
<i>Io son ferito</i>	1561 ¹⁰	1587 ⁵	<i>Quanti mercenarii</i>	Vecchi 1597, 1599 ⁴ , 1603 ⁶	<i>Io son ferito</i>	Bovicelli 1594 Rognoni 1620
<i>Io son ferito</i>	1561 ¹⁰	1587 ⁵	<i>Quanti mercenarii</i>	Vecchi 1597, 1599 ⁴ , 1603 ⁶	<i>Ave verum</i>	Bovicelli 1594
<i>Io son ferito</i>	1561 ¹⁰	1587 ⁵	<i>Quanti mercenarii</i>	Vecchi 1597, 1599 ⁴ , 1603 ⁶	<i>Quanti mercenarii</i>	Rognoni 1620
<i>Vestiva i colli / Così le chiome mie</i>	1566 ³	–	<i>Surge propra / Veni dilecte</i>	Vecchi 1597, 1599 ⁴ , 1603 ⁶	<i>Vestiva i colli</i>	Rognoni 1620 (2 versions)
<i>Vestiva i colli / Così le chiome mie</i>	1566 ³	–	<i>Semper laudabo / Sana me Domine</i>	Cavaglieri 1600 ¹¹	<i>Vestiva i colli</i>	Rognoni 1620 (2 versions)
<i>Pulchra es</i>	1583 ⁴	1587 1593	<i>Salve sancta facies</i>	Cavaglieri 1605 ⁶	<i>Pulchra es</i>	Rognoni 1620 (2 versions)

Also Giovanni Battista Bovicelli seems to have been aware of the fame of the compositions he reworked, and explains that he has included in the second part of his treatise “compositions known to all” not only as a homage to the greatest composers of his time, but also in a manner that one can “easily see the effect that his *passeggiature* have together with the other parts”, thus taking for granted not only that the works included were known to all, but also that the knowledge of them was indispensable to understand the significance and worth of his re-workings:

Mi è parso, dopò l’haver messo i sopra scritti Passaggi, quasi, come si dice, in astratto, che si possono addattare ad ogni sorte di canto, di mettere ancora alcuni motetti, e madrigali, e falsi bordoni passeggiati; acciò più chiaramente si veda l’effetto de i precedenti, e più speditamente possa ogn’uno, ben che novitio in questa professione, sapere il modo, col quale si devono usare. Mi è anco parso di servirmi di compositioni note ad ogn’uno; si per che possa sia chi si voglia, facilmente vedere l’effetto che fanno insieme con l’altre parti; si anco perche ogni debito volea, ch’io mi servissi delle compositioni di quelli autori, che in questa professione di musica sono tenuti, e meritamente in grande stima.¹²

(It occurred to me, after putting the above-written passaggi, almost, as they say, in abstract, which can be adapted to every sort of canto, to add some further motets, and madrigals, and falsibordoni passeggiati; so that the effect of the previous can be seen more clearly, and everyone, even though a novice in this profession, may readily know the way in which they can be used. It also occurred to me to make use of compositions known to all; both so that whosoever can easily see the effect they have together with the other parts; and also because I wished to pay tribute, in using their compositions, to the authors who in this profession of music are held, and justly, in great esteem).

Among the *contrafacta* included in the Milan collections there are two of Palestrina’s best known compositions, the madrigals *Io son ferito abi lasso* and *Vestiva i colli*. These works seem worthy of a more detailed account, covering the modalities of transmission and how the music and texts have been treated in the various surviving re-textualizations.

3. Orfeo Vecchi versus *Io son ferito abi lasso*

First published in *Il terzo libro delle Muse a cinque voci* (Venice, Antonio Gardano, 1561),¹³ the famous five-voice madrigal *Io son ferito abi lasso* was later included in the *Prima stella de madrigali a cinque voci* (Venice, Girolamo Scotto,

¹² BOVICELLI, *Regole*, p. 37: “Al virtuoso lettore. L’autore”.

¹³ RISM B/I 1561¹⁰.

1570)¹⁴ and again in an intabulated version for lute, in Vincenzo Galilei's *Fronimo* (Venice, erede di Girolamo Scotto, 1584).¹⁵

In Milan this same madrigal appeared for the first time in 1587, in *Il quarto Libro delle Muse a cinque voci*.¹⁶ In 1594 it can be found in Giovanni Battista Bovicelli's *Regole Passaggi di musica*, printed in Venice by Giacomo Vincenti "A instantia delli Heredi di Francesco, e Simon Tini, Librari in Milano", while their author was working as choirmaster at the Duomo in Milan, and dedicated to Giacomo Buoncompagno, "Generale de gli uomini d'arme nello Stato di Milano" (general of the men of arms in the State of Milan). After illustrating the main difficulties encountered in the art of *passaggiatura*, Bovicelli includes two versions (the first without diminutions, the second diminished following the criteria previously explained) of the upper voice of fourteen widely known compositions, with their relative text.¹⁷ Among these we find *Io son ferito abi lasso*, followed in turn by its contrafact *Ave verum corpus*.¹⁸ It seems likely that the choice to diminish this composition stems from the wish to rival in bravura Giovanni Bassano, who just three years before had included in his *Motetti, madrigali et canzoni [...] diminuiti per sonar con ogni sorte di Stromenti, et per cantar con semplice Voce* (Venice, Giacomo Vincenti, 1591)¹⁹ a diminished

¹⁴ RISM B/I 1570¹⁶.

¹⁵ RISM B/I 1584¹⁵. A transcription of the madrigal *Io son ferito* in the version given by Vincenzo Galilei appears in *Vierter Nachtrag zur Gesamtausgabe der Werke von Pierluigi da Palestrina. Ergänzungen, Diminutione, Lautentabulaturen, Textanfänge sämtlicher Kompositionen Palestrinas und Thematischer Katalog derselben. Ausgearbeitet von Franz Xaver Haberl*, Leipzig: Breitkopf & Härtel, s.d. (reprint: Farnborough: Gregg International Publishers, 1968), vol. 33 (henceforth: HABERL 33), pp. 74–75.

¹⁶ For the later reprints after that of Milan, see RISM B/I.

¹⁷ The featured composers are, in order, Giovanni Pierluigi da Palestrina, Cipriano de Rore, Thomás Louis de Victoria, Claudio Merulo, Giulio Cesare Gabussi, Ruggiero Giovannelli and Giovanni Battista Bovicelli himself, with two works for each composer.

¹⁸ A transcription of the madrigal *Io son ferito* (and of its *contrafactum*, *Ave verum corpus*) in the diminished versions by Giovanni Battista Bovicelli appears in HABERL 33, pp. 63–66. The transcription gives just one line of not diminished music (which corresponds, apart from slight divergences, to the one superimposed on the *contrafactum* *Ave verum corpus* in Bovicelli's treatise).

¹⁹ SARTORI, *Bibliografia*, 1591e. Besides the madrigal *Io son ferito abi lasso*, Giovanni Bassano's collection includes another ten compositions by Palestrina (of which *Benedicta sit sancta* appears in two different versions). On Bassano's collection, see Ernst T. FERAND, *Die Motetti, Madrigali, et Canzoni Francese...Diminuiti...des Giovanni Bassano (1591)*, in *Festschrift Helmut Osthoff zum 65. Geburtstag*, eds. Lothar Hoffmann-Erbrecht – Helmut Hücke, Tutzing: Schneider, 1961, pp. 75–101.

version, with text, of the same madrigal,²⁰ or at least that Bovicelli had gained the idea from Bassano's collection to rework the same composition, or else that Bassano had turned to the madrigal *Io son ferito* because it was widely known and as such could be easily recognized. The fact that Bovicelli knew the most recent publications on the criteria of *passaggiatura* is confirmed in the introduction to his treatise, where he states he is amazed by the great difference between his *passaggi* and the ones of those who wrote them before him.²¹

Still in Milan, ten years after the publication of the *quarto libro delle Muse*, the first book of five-voice motets by Orfeo Vecchi and other illustrious musicians (1597) was published, which, besides a version with a substitute text of the famous *Vestiva i colli*, includes a contrafact of *Io son ferito*.²² In 1591 Orfeo Vecchi was awarded the post of mansionarius at the prestigious collegiate church of Santa Maria della Scala in Milan:²³ his compositions must therefore have been destined for some of the most learned exponents of the city's clergy.

With regards the substitute text, it should be remembered that while Aquilino Coppini, professor of Rhetoric at the University of Pavia and an excellent Latin scholar, had himself written the texts of his highly refined

²⁰ A transcription of the madrigal *Io son ferito*, in the diminished version by Giovanni Bassano, appears in HABERL 33, p. 62.

²¹ For a comparative study of the various diminished versions of the best known Renaissance polyphonic compositions, see *Italienische Diminutionen die zwischen 1553 und 1638 mehrmals bearbeiteten Sätze*, herausgegeben von Richard Erig unter mitarbeit von Veronika Gutmann, Zürich: Amadeus, 1979.

²² A transcription of the two motets of Palestrina with substitute texts adapted by Orfeo Vecchi can be found in Laura MAURI, *Motetti di Orfeo Vecchi maestro di cappella di Santa Maria della Scala in Milano*, M.A. dissertation, Università di Pavia – Scuola di Paleografia e Filologia Musicale di Cremona, 1983, pp. 119–126 and 171–176 (critical notes on pp. 67–70 and 76–77). For the purposes of the transcription of the *cantus* part, the 1603 reprint has not been collated; the text inserted below the notes of the upper voice is reconstructed by the editor.

²³ See Marina TOFFETTI, "Nuovi documenti su Orfeo Vecchi. «Presbyter Orfeus Vecchius» (1551–1603), «filius quondam Reinaldi Mediolanensis»: un ignoto status personalis di Orfeo Vecchi, mansionario in Santa Maria della Scala a Milano", *Nuova Rivista Musicale Italiana*, 30, 1996/3–4, pp. 445–65. For more information on the environment of the royal collegiate church of Santa Maria della Scala and on the musicians linked to this institution, see also EAD., *Gli Ardemanio e la musica in Santa Maria della Scala di Milano nella prima metà del Seicento*, Lucca: LIM-Libreria Musicale Italiana, 2004 (Quaderni dell'Archivio per la storia della musica in Lombardia, 2), and Daniele TORELLI, *Benedetto Binago e il mottetto a Milano tra Cinque e Seicento*, Lucca: LIM-Libreria Musicale Italiana, 2004 (Quaderni dell'Archivio per la storia della musica in Lombardia, 3).

contrafacta of Monteverdi's madrigals,²⁴ Orfeo Vecchi chose to adapt some well-known passages from the Old or New Testament to the music of various celebrated composers. The very nature of this operation appears to have been completely different: it would be pointless to search in Vecchi's substitute texts for the careful adhesion to the music that can be discerned in the *contrafacta* of Coppini. This does not mean, though, that the operations involved in the use of pre-existing texts do not reveal, at various levels (from the choice of the new text, to the way of adapting it), the author's notable musical sensitivity and cultural depth. While in a madrigal the relation between text and music commonly sees the prevalence of the former, on which the form and substance of the music, albeit in the most diverse and creative ways, is shaped, in a *contrafactum* using a newly invented text this same relation is overturned, since in this case the new text depends *in toto* on the character and form of the music. Different still is the case of *contrafacta* that use pre-existing texts, where the choice of the new poetic text can respond to intentions quite different from the usual search for the topical adhesion between text and music. In his *contrafacta* Orfeo Vecchi, even though paying attention to the details of the adaptation of single words and of fragments of text beneath the notes, apparently tends to focus more on the relation created between the substitute text and the original one. The new poetic text is thus not used as a comment on the musical structure, but to some extent comments, through the music, on the original text.

An example of this way of working can be seen in the re-elaboration of the madrigal *Io son ferito*. The text adopted by Orfeo Vecchi, *Quanti mercenarii in domo Patris*, is taken from the parable of the prodigal son, found in the Gospel according to St Luke.²⁵ The original text is given below, with the corresponding lines of the substitute text.

²⁴ On Aquilino Coppini's *contrafacta*, see Margaret Ann RORKE, "Sacred contrafacta of Monteverdi and Cardinal Borromeo's Milan", *Music & Letters*, 65, 1984/2, pp. 168–175, and Uwe WOLF, "Prima Arianna, poi Maria. Rielaborazioni religiose di musica vocale profana degli inizi del XVII secolo", in *Intorno a Monteverdi*, eds. Maria Caraci Vela – Rodobaldo Tibaldi, Lucca: LIM, 1999, pp. 351–366.

²⁵ Luke 15, 17–19.

Io son ferito ahi lasso e chi mi diede
accusar pur vorrei, ma non ho prova
e senz'indizio al mal non si dà fede
né getta sangue la mia piaga nuova.
Io spasm'e moro, il colpo non si vede.
La mia nemica armata si ritrova.
Che fia **tornar a lei** crudel partito,
che sol m'abbia a sanar, chi m'ha ferito.

(I am wounded, alas, and she who gave it to me
I wish to accuse, but have no proof
and without evidence of evil, none will believe
nor does my new wound pour forth blood.
I shiver and die, the blow cannot be seen.
my armed enemy is refund.
What good would it do to **return to her**, cruel
happening,
as only she who wounded me, can heal me).

Quanti mercenarii in domo patris mei,
abundant panibus, ego autem hic fame pereō!
Surgam, et ibo ad patrem meum,
et dicam ei:
Pater, peccavi in coelum, et coram te;
iam non sum dignus vocari filius tuus:
fac me sicut unum
ex mercenariis tuis.

(How many hired servants of my father
have bread enough, and I perish with hunger!
I will arise and go to my father,
and will say unto him:
father, I have sinned against heaven and
before thee,
and am no more worthy to be called thy son:
make me as one
of your hired servants).

At first reading one can note, above all, the great distance between the two texts: in place of an octave devoted to one of the *tòpoi* of 16th century poetry (the outpouring of an unrequited lover), we now find a pericope taken from St Luke's Gospel, dealing with the famous parable of the prodigal son. Apart from the desperation of the characters that give vent to their feelings speaking in the first person, the only motive common to both situations is the theme of return (to the loved one in one case, to the father in the other). Both situations can be resolved only through the reunion with the loved person, who in the first case is responsible for the pain of the lover, and in the second suffers the consequences of his son's behaviour. The structure of the two texts is nevertheless very different: in the passage from the New Testament the theme of returning appears halfway through the first part ("Surgam, et ibo ad patrem meum"), while in the original madrigal it is mentioned only in the penultimate line ("tornar a lei").

A closer reading reveals a more subtle meaning, of a super-lexical and eminently conceptual nature, underlying the substitution of the text: while, in the madrigal, the unrequited lover invokes justice to see the person who wounded him (by making her fall in love) punished, in the text from the Gospels the repented sinner invokes *on himself* the just punishment that can purify him. While the madrigal expresses the desperation of the unhappy lover towards

the woman who caused his suffering, the motet expresses the desperation of the dissolute son, who after causing his father's grief, recognizes his error and appeals to his paternal mercy, asking for *his own* just punishment. The text of the motet is taken from the most famous of the three New Testament parables on mercy, which express with exemplary simplicity the deepest meaning of the new law of pardon: "Quick, bring here the best robe and put it on him, put a ring on his finger and shoes on his feet. Bring the fatted calf, kill it, let us eat and be merry, because this my son was dead and he is alive again, he was lost and has been found".²⁶ While the *contrafacta* of Aquilino Coppini reveal the hand of a competent Latin scholar, skilled and sensitive to the musical charm of Monteverdi's madrigals, in those of Vecchi the ecclesiastic seems to have prevailed over the musician.

Since the operation of reworking consists of the search, starting from a composition already known and loved by the public, for a new relationship between text and music, reinvented on the basis of a text different from the original, the outcome is of such intertextual complexity as to create presumably different levels of fruition, from the most aware to the most ingenuous. While any person could have enjoyed listening to the result of the re-texting of a pre-existing composition, even without any knowledge whatsoever of its model, of the old and new text and the nature of the operation (and this is probably the way these *contrafacta* were perceived by the majority of the faithful during liturgical, and paraliturgical services), it is equally indisputable that those who knew the original work, remembered its text and were able to recognize and understand the alternative text, would have been able to better comprehend and appreciate the new composition.

In fact, in order to adequately grasp the sense of the textual substitution, the listener would have to know Palestrina's madrigal (or at least, on hearing the music, should be able to associate it with the corresponding text and remember its theme),²⁷ as well as understand Latin or, at least, know it sufficiently as to be able to recognize the passage taken from the parable of the prodigal son, and know its conclusion, in which the potential moral of the text is expressed in full. It is likely that the *contrafacta*, sophisticated artistic products, were aimed

²⁶ Luke 15, 22–24.

²⁷ It is doubtful whether the simple listening to a madrigal would be sufficient to allow the poetic text to be fully understood and appreciated in all its nuances.

in primis at the refined and elite public of the most prominent exponents of the local clergy. These would certainly also include the dedicatee of Vecchi's collection in which the *contrafactum* *Quanti mercenarii* appears, Francesco Bernardino Porro, canon in Santa Maria della Scala in the same period in which Orfeo Vecchi held the position of mansionarius, doctor in civil as well as ecclesiastical law, apostolic protonotary and referendary, and for a certain time pastoral visitor in Milan.²⁸

If we consider the overall sense of the composition, it becomes evident that Orfeo Vecchi was fully aware of his choice, setting the madrigal to a text carrying specularly different values. This is not, however, the only level on which the author worked in adapting Palestrina's madrigal: a careful analysis of the two texts has revealed further correspondences at a rhetorical level, bringing about a similar division in the overall form. Both compositions include an antithesis – “e chi mi diede accusar pur vorrei / ma non ho prove” (and she who gave it to me I wish to accuse / but I have no proof), against “Quanti mercenarii in domo patris mei, / ego autem hic fame pereor!” (How many hired servants in my father's house, / while I perish with hunger) and a sort of lament halfway through the text – “io spasm'e moro” (I suffer and die) – in the first, “Pater, peccavi” (father, I have sinned) in the second. On the other hand, despite such analogies, there are also considerable rhetorical and structural differences between Palestrina's text and the one used by Orfeo Vecchi. The words “Surgam, et ibo ad patrem meum” (I will arise and go to my father), one of the most intense moments of the story of the prodigal son, have no correspondence in the text of the madrigal (and thus in Palestrina's music). The lack of a clear and effective motive in the composition with the alternative text is felt in particular on the word “Surgam”, which in an original composition would almost certainly have prompted some classic madrigal procedures (scales or rising intervals), or in any case a characteristic and clearly identifiable motive, deserving, as a true turning point in the parable (at least in terms of the interior path of the prodigal son), an effective expressive emphasis. This “Surgam” represents the moment of repentance and

²⁸ For further biographical details of Francesco Porro and Orfeo Vecchi, see TOFFETTI, *Nuovi documenti*.

results in his intention to return home, but there is nothing in the musical setting to help underline it (see example 1):²⁹



Example 1. “Surgam et ibo” from Orfeo Vecchi, *Quanti mercenarii* (contrafact of Giovanni Pierluigi da Palestrina, *Io son ferito abi lasso*), *cantus* part

On the contrary, even without knowing Palestrina’s madrigal, any listener, if able to understand the Latin text, would have been able to enjoy the moments where the textual substitution is most successful and recreates well balanced and efficacious motives. See, for example, one of the most effective moments in the retexting, where the son’s begging for paternal pardon (“Pater, peccavi”) in the new version is made to coincide with the lament of the unhappy lover (“io spasm’è moro”) in the original text (see example 2).³⁰

In the *contrafactum* the suffering of the person who is repenting coincides (and is thus compared in nature and intensity) with that of the unhappy lover, so that the sincerity of the repentance finds its natural outlet in the same inconsolable cry in which the suffering of the unrequited lover is vent. Just as happens in Aquilino Coppini’s *contrafacta* of Monteverdi, here too, with a typical Baroque procedure, the religious experience is humanized through the assimilation with one of the most common human experiences, in order to make it immediately accessible to the listener.

Equally successful is the substitution of the first words of the concluding couplet (“che fia tornar a lei”) with those of the exhortation of the repentant son (“fac me sicut unum”), which we give below (see example 3).³¹

²⁹ The example shows the relative passage in the *cantus* part, transcribed, with halved note values, from Orfeo Vecchi’s *Partitura del Primo libro delli Motetti à cinque voci* (Milan: Appresso l’herede di Simon Tini, e Filippo Lomazzo, compagni, 1603), in which the composition is transposed a fifth lower than the part-books of the previous editions (lacking the *cantus*). In the transcription the original tune has been restored.

³⁰ The example shows a transcription, in halved note values, of Palestrina’s madrigal; the text of Vecchi’s *contrafactum* is given below the original text.

³¹ As in the previous example, here too the text of Orfeo Vecchi’s *contrafactum* is given below the original text.

34

38

Example 2. “Pater peccavi” from Orfeo Vecchi, *Quanti mercenarii* (contrafact of Giovanni Pierluigi da Palestrina, *Io son ferito abi lasso*)

C

Che fia tor - nar a lei
Fac me sic - ut u - num

Example 3. “fac me sicut unum” from Orfeo Vecchi, *Quanti mercenarii* (contrafact of Giovanni Pierluigi da Palestrina, *Io son ferito abi lasso*), *cantus* part

Although for a cleric like Orfeo Vecchi the use of a text from the Gospels might appear obvious, it cannot, however, be ruled out that the choice of the new text may have been suggested to him by a member of the clergy who belonged to his *entourage*, possibly a canon of Santa Maria della Scala, or perhaps by Francesco Bernardino Porro himself, to whom the collection is dedicated.³² The task of adapting the text, which is part of the competences of a composer of vocal music and assumes a role of prime importance when replacing the text of a previous composition, was almost certainly carried out by Vecchi. On this matter, if one examines the correspondence between the textual and the musical phrases in the new composition (as well as the presence of repetitions of some portions of the text and their position), one can note a particular attention to respecting the accentuation of the Latin text, occasionally involving some slight changes to the original melodic line.

If we then compare the distribution of the text in Palestrina's madrigal and in Orfeo Vecchi's motet, certain differences can be found, resulting from the structural differences between the two texts: in correspondence to the fourth line of the madrigal ("né getta sangue la mia piaga nuova"), the Latin text, which simply reads "et dicam ei", is repeated because of the different number of syllables in the new text. The repetition therefore has no expressive purpose, but is simply the result of the need to adapt a text that is shorter than the original one. The same phenomenon can be found in the last two lines of the madrigal, which corresponds in the new text to a single phrase "fac me sicut unum ex mercenariis tuis", with the consequent repetition of some of its parts. Other interventions by Orfeo Vecchi on the physiognomy of the melodic profile simply respond to the needs of syllabification (the addition or elimination of a melodic fragment where there is a greater or smaller number of syllables to set) or of correct accentuation.

The same *contrafactum*, along with Vecchi's re-textualization of Palestrina's madrigal *Vestiva i colli* (with the substitute text *Surge propera*), was included in the reprint of Palestrina's fourth book of five-voice motets published in Antwerp by Pierre Phalèse in 1605.³³ The circumstances surrounding the com-

³² See TOFFETTI, *Nuovi documenti*.

³³ A transcription of the two *contrafacta* appears in HABERL 33, pp. 37–44. Haberl seems unaware that the re-elaborations are by Orfeo Vecchi; his transcriptions also contain some issues regarding the syllabification of the Latin texts, and differ slightly from Phalèse's reprint in the distribution of the text beneath the notes.

pilation of the reprint, which bears the title *Cantiones sacrae [...] ex cantico canticorum*, are not known to us. It seems quite likely that Phalèse (or in any case the compiler of the collection) had drawn the two *contrafacta* of Palestrina from Orfeo Vecchi's first book of five-voice motets,³⁴ which the same Phalèse would reprint (but without the two *contrafacta*) only three years later.³⁵ In this reprint of Palestrina's fourth book of motets, whose contents, with the exception of the two *contrafacta*, coincide exactly with that of previous editions of the collection, there is no explanation as to why the latter two compositions did not originally appear in Palestrina's collection, and that they are actually works by Palestrina re-elaborated by Orfeo Vecchi with substitute texts.³⁶ And yet the two *contrafacta* by Vecchi are clearly extraneous to Palestrina's collection: not only is *Quanti mercenarii* the only motet on a text from the Gospels, but in the collection printed by Phalèse the text *Surge prospera* is set twice; finally, Vecchi's *contrafactum* based on this text is the only motet of the whole collection divided into two parts.

Having already appeared, in a version with passaggi, in Giovanni Basano's collection *Mottetti madrigali er canzoni francese [...] diminuiti* (Venice, 1591), and also, as we have seen (see table 2), in Giovanni Battista Bovicelli's *Regole Passaggi di musica* (Venice, Giacomo Vincenti at the request of the heirs of Francesco and Simon Tini, 1594), the madrigal *Io son ferito* was then included, along with *Vestiva i colli* and *Pulchra es*, also in Francesco Rognoni's *Selva* (1620).³⁷ Rognoni proposes two different versions of this composition: the first with echoes named "modo di passeggiar con arte e maestria", without a text and thus conceived for an exclusively instrumental performance; the second with the text used in Orfeo Vecchi's collection of motets, published in 1597 (*Quanti mercenarii*).³⁸ The title of the composition, dedicated to Donna

³⁴ See Jerome ROCHE, "The praise of it endureth for ever': the posthumous publication of Palestrina's music", *Early Music*, 22, 1994/4, pp. 631–640: 637.

³⁵ Pierre Phalèse's edition, contrary to what is written on the title-page (*Cantiones sacrae quinque vocum nunc primum in lucem editae*), is actually a reprint of the first and second book of five-voice motets by Orfeo Vecchi; not only the *contrafacta* of Palestrina have been excluded from the book, but also that of Giovanni Maria Nanino, *Amor deh dimmi come* (substitute text: *Assumpta est Maria*).

³⁶ RISM A/I P 724 simply describes the reprint as an 'extended' edition.

³⁷ On the diminished versions of this madrigal, see *Italienische Diminutionen*.

³⁸ A transcription of Francesco Rognoni's composition, together with a tabulature of Palestrina's original, can be found in Robert L. KENDRICK, *Genres, generations and gender: Nuns' music in early modern Milan, c. 1550–1706*, Ann Arbor: UMI University Press, 1993, pp. 1034–1042.

Ginepra Crivelli, a nun in the convent of Santa Margherita, is “Io son ferito ahi lasso. Madrigale del Palestina (sic) ridotto in Mottetto passeggiato per il soprano”. In the context of musical activity in convents in 17th century Milan, which were well known for their outstanding figures active in the field of both performance and composition,³⁹ Rognoni’s dedication helps to confirm that the singing skills of the nuns must have been exceptional, to the extent that composers destined some of their more technically challenging re-workings to these nuns.⁴⁰

4. Two approaches compared: Orfeo Vecchi, Geronimo Cavaglieri and the madrigal *Vestiva i colli*

Palestrina’s fame as a composer of madrigals was linked above all to the circulation of a group of works in a style quite close to that of his motets.⁴¹ One of the most outstanding of these is the madrigal *Vestiva i colli*.⁴² First published in *Il Desiderio. Secondo libro de’ Madrigali* (Venice, Girolamo Scotto, 1566),⁴³ the highly famous five-voice madrigal was extremely successful both in its original polyphonic form (in which it appears in various printed anthologies),⁴⁴ and

³⁹ See Robert KENDRICK, *Celestial Sirens: Nuns and their Music in Early Modern Milan*, Oxford: Oxford University Press, 1996.

⁴⁰ On the same matter, see also Robert KENDRICK, “The Traditions of Milanese Convent Music and the Sacred Dialogues of Chiara Margarita Cozzolani”, in *The Crannied Wall. Women, Religion, and the Arts in Early Modern Europe*, ed. Craig A. Monson, Ann Arbor: The University of Michigan Press, [1992], pp. 211–233.

⁴¹ See Michael HEINEMANN, *Giovanni Pierluigi da Palestrina und seine Zeit*, Laaber: Laaber Verlag, 1994, p. 184.

⁴² The composition was at the centre of a musicological debate due to the peculiarity of its modal setting. On this matter, see Harold S. POWERS, “The Modality of *Vestiva i colli*”, in *Studies in Renaissance and Baroque music in honor of Arthur Mendel*, edited by Robert L. Marshall and Arthur Mendel, Kassel: Bärenreiter, 1974, pp. 31–46 (Italian translation in *Il madrigale tra Cinque e Seicento*, ed. Paolo Fabbri, Bologna: Il Mulino, 1988, pp. 189–206); Wolfgang FREIS, “Tonal types and modal categories: *Vestiva i colli* revisited”, *Music research forum*, 3, 1988/1, pp. 35–66.

⁴³ RISM B/I 1566³.

⁴⁴ Before the Milan *contrafacta* the madrigal appears in the *Musica divina di XIX autori illustri*, Antwerp: Pierre Phalèse and Jean Bellère, 1583 (RISM B/I 1582¹⁵); in the anthology *Spoglia amorosa*, Venezia: eredi di Girolamo Scotto, 1584 (RISM B/I 1584⁷); in *Gemma musicalis*, Nürnberg: Catharina Gerlach, 1588 (RISM B/I 1588²¹); in *Musica transalpina*, London: Thomas East, 1588 (RISM B/I 1588²⁹) and in *Spoglia amorosa*, Venezia: Angelo Gardano, 1592 (RISM B/I 1592¹⁵). For the reprints following those that include the Milan *contrafacta*, see RISM B/I.

in tabulatures for lute⁴⁵ and for organ,⁴⁶ both printed and manuscript, in diminished versions⁴⁷ or with an alternative text.

Among the works of Palestrina repropoed in Milan with alternative texts, *Vestiva i colli* is the only one not to have appeared previously in a local reprint (see table 1). Although it cannot be excluded that the composition (which was, in fact, very popular) had circulated in manuscript form, one can hypothesize that the composers in Milan who wrote the *contrafacta* had come to know of the madrigal through one of the numerous anthologies in which it appeared – most likely one of those published in Venice: *Il Desiderio*, or one of the two entitled *Spoglia amorosa*. A further indication of how successful Palestrina's madrigal was within the confines of the Duchy of Milan is the presence of a transcription for lute *different* from the one found in Vincenzo Galilei's *Il Fronimo*, inside an important manuscript tabulature for lute originating from Como (not far from Milan) and dating from the first years of the 17th century.⁴⁸

In Milan, the madrigal *Vestiva i colli* appeared with a new text both in Orfeo Vecchi's collection of motets of 1597, and in Cavaglieri's first book *Della nova metamorfosi*, and also appears in two different diminished versions in Francesco Rognoni's *Selva de varii passaggi* (1620). The fact that both *contrafacta* were based on the same musical-poetic model allows us to highlight more directly the analogies and divergences in the *modus operandi* of the two clerics-adapters.

⁴⁵ See Vincenzo Galilei's *Fronimo*, Venezia: Girolamo Scotto, 1568, and Giovanni Antonio Terzi's *Intavolatura di liuto*, Venezia: Ricciardo Amadino, 1593 (RISM B/I 1593¹¹), which includes a diminished version. On the transcriptions for lute of *Vestiva i colli*, see Paolo Possiedi, "Intavolature di musiche vocali: note per l'esecutore", *Il Fronimo*, 33, 1980/8, pp. 5–14.

⁴⁶ See Johannes FISCHER – Jerzy GOŁOS, *Utwory z tabulatury organowej, 1595* [Works from organ tablatures, 1595], Łódź: Ludowy Instytut Muzyczny, 1990.

⁴⁷ See the diminished version "Da cantar in compagnia, & anco con il liuto solo" (i.e. to be sung in company and also with solo lute) included in Girolamo DALLA CASA, *Il vero modo di diminuir con tutte le sorti di stromenti*, Venezia: appresso Angelo Gardano, 1584. Anastatic reprint: Bologna: Forni, 1980 (Bibliotheca Musica Bononiensis, Sez. II, n. 23); and the diminished version with a literary text included in Giovanni Bassano's collection of *Motetti, Madrigali et Canzoni*, Venezia: Giacomo Vincenti, 1591. See also Aurelio Virgiliano's *Il Dolcimelo*, ms. datable to around 1600 (modern edition: Aurelio VIRGILIANO, *Dolcimelo. Libro 2. Selections. Thirteen ricercate from Il dolcimelo for solo treble instruments*, London: London Pro Musica, 1980). For an examination of the characteristics of the main diminished re-elaborations of this madrigal (including those successive to the Milan collections), see *Italienische Diminutionen*.

⁴⁸ Como, Biblioteca comunale, ms. 1. 1. 20. See Victor COELHO, *The Manuscript Sources of Seventeenth-Century Italian Lute Music*, New-York & London: Garland, 1995, pp. 68–72.

In Orfeo Vecchi's composition the texts used are *Surge propera* for the first part and *Veni dilecte* for the second (shown below alongside the corresponding lines of Palestrina's madrigal):

**Vestiva i colli e le campagne intorno
la primavera di novelli onori,**
e spirava soavi Arabi odori,
cinta d'erbe e di fior il crine adorno;
quando Licori all'apparir del giorno,
cogliendo di sua man purpurei fiori,
mi disse: in guiderdon di tanti onori
a te li colgo ed ecco io te n'adorno.

Così le chiome mie soavemente,
parlando io cinse e in sì dolci legami
mi strinse il cor ch'altro piacer non sente
onde non fia giammai che più non l'ami,
degl'occhi miei né fia che la mia mente
altri sospiri o desiando io chiami.

**(Clothed the hills and the countryside around
did Spring with fresh glories,**
and breathed sweet Arabian fragrances,
**girded with grasses and with flowers her
tresses adorned;**
when Licori at the appearance of day,
gathering in his hand purple flowers,
said to me: In recompense of so much ardor
for you I gather them, and behold I you with
them adorn.

Thus my hair, sweetly speaking
he girded, and in such gentle hands
he enfolded my heart, that other pleasure it
feels not,
thus shall it never be that no more I love him,
he of my eyes, nor shall it be that my mind
for others sigh, or longingly call).

Surge, propera, amica mea,
columba mea, et veni.

Iam enim hiems transiit;
imber abiit, et recessit.

Surge, propera, amica mea,
speciosa mea, et veni.

Flores apparuerunt in terra nostra.
Tempus putationis advenit.

Veni, dilecte mi,
egrediamur in agrum, commoremur in villis.
Mane surgamus ad vineas;
**videamus si floruit vinea,
si flores fructus parturiunt,
si floruerunt mala punica.**

(Arise, my love, my dove, my fair one,
and come away;
for now the winter is past, the rain is over
and gone.
The flowers appear on the earth; the time
of pruning has come.

Come, my beloved, let us go forth into the
fields, and lodge in the villages;
let us go out early to the vineyards, **and see
if the vines have budded,
if their blossoms have opened, if the
pomegranates are in bloom).**

The substitute text adopted by Vecchi is a centonization of two pieces taken from the Song of Songs: the first part from verses 2, 10–12 (with the insertion of the lines “surge, propera, amica mea, speciosa mea, et veni”), the second from verses 7, 11–13. Both texts had already been set to music by Palestrina in his

fourth book of five-voice motets, resulting in two of the most admirable and intense pieces of Renaissance vocal polyphony.⁴⁹ Orfeo Vecchi must certainly have known the collection, which was reprinted twice also in Milan, several years before the publication of his first book of five-voice motets (the reprints came out respectively in 1587 and 1593, and they were issued, moreover, by the same family of publishers to whom Vecchi had entrusted the publication of his own book of motets). Why, then, did he choose precisely these two texts?

On the one hand, their presence in Palestrina's book of motets, far from dissuading composers, both in Milan and elsewhere, from using them, must instead have probably contributed to their diffusion. More generally, the Song of Songs always met with great success among Renaissance and early Baroque composers: a success, however, mainly due, besides the indisputable charm of their texts, to the sensuality of the images, and to the precarious balance between allegorical and literal interpretations of their contents. For the same reason, the Song of Songs is also frequently used in several *contrafacta* of Geronimo Cavaglieri, who found it natural, in his intention to render their madrigal models wholly sacred, to combine the intense accents of the madrigals with the richness and multiple meanings inherent in the verses of the Song of Songs.⁵⁰ Orfeo Vecchi's approach, in this regard, was quite different. His use of the Song of Songs to re-clothe the notes of one of Palestrina's most famous madrigals does not respond in this case to the need to find a sacred equivalent to the sensuality of the secular model (it has been noted that this madrigal, on the contrary, contains stylistic features quite similar to those of the motets of the same composer). Instead, starting from a composition that, despite having a text that is clearly secular, sounds rather neutral, Vecchi intends to make it wholly sacred through the use of a text that, although certainly rich in sensual

⁴⁹ The text used for the first part of Orfeo Vecchi's *contrafactum* had been set to music by Palestrina in the motet n. 15 (*Surge prospera*), which also includes the lines "Vox turturis audita est in terra nostra; ficus protulit grossos suos; vineae florentes dederunt odorem suum"; the text adopted by Vecchi for the second part was used by Palestrina in the motet n. 29 (*Veni, dilecte mi*), which concludes with the line "ibi dabo tibi ubera mea".

⁵⁰ See DELFINO, "Geronimo Cavaglieri", pp. 165–216: p. 198: "Ed è forse in ragione di queste affinità fra il contenuto del Cantico ambiguamente inteso e la suadente sonorità della polifonia profana, che il Cavaglieri trova naturale avvicinare i madrigali più famosi (Marenzio soprattutto) con i versetti biblici di Salomone" (And it is perhaps due to these affinities between the ambiguous content of the Song and the persuasive sonority of secular polyphony, that Cavaglieri finds it natural to combine the most famous madrigals (especially Marenzio) with the biblical verses of Solomon).

motives (some of which are also present in the madrigal), carries a deeply spiritual message. Moreover, Vecchi does not appear concerned about the fact that his model was in fact a madrigal by Palestrina, who had already set to music the same two passages from the Song of Songs.

As happens in the *contrafactum* on *Io son ferito*, in this case too the original and the biblical text have much in common: both describe a love scene set within a naturalistic frame; in both we hear the voice of the lover and also that of the loved one (the madrigal opens with a description of the happy memories of the lover, then passing the word to the object of his love, Licori, and finally returning to recount and confide in first person in the second part of the text; in the motet we first hear the words of the groom, who begs his companion to join him, while the second part is entirely devoted to a similar exhortation on the part of the bride). As in *Quanti mercenarii*, here too the two texts share various motives: the spring setting, depicted in the first quatrain and evoked in the biblical text in the description of the end of winter (“iam enim hiems transiit, imber abiit et recessit”); the image of dawn, linked by the poet to the appearance of Licori, and evoked in the exhortation of the bride in the second part of the motet (“mane surgamus ad vineas”); and also the motive of flowers, appearing twice in the madrigal (“cinta d’erbe e di fior il crine adorno” and “cogliendo di sua man purpurei fiori”), and twice in the motet (“flores apparuerunt in terra nostra” and “videamus, si flores fructus parturiunt”), which is entirely centred, in its second part, on the theme of blossoming (“videamus si floruit vinea” and “si floruerunt mala punica”). As in *Quanti mercenarii*, however, the same contents make their appearance in different points of the two texts, so that, in the motet, they coincide with motives different from those used in the madrigal. In summary, the two texts share numerous images, but display few precise points of coincidence.

What does Orfeo Vecchi convey to his listener, through this operation, in which the clergyman seems once again to have prevailed over the composer and his purely artistic reasons? On the one hand, that he appreciated Palestrina’s composition, contributing to its circulation as a mark of homage; on the other, that the experience of love depicted in the madrigal could be substantially assimilated with the one described in the Bible. On the other hand, the exclusion of the final line of the bride in the Song (“ibi dabo tibi ubera mea”), the line most openly linked to the exaltation of sensual love, could also be an indication that Vecchi tended to read the Song of Songs in a rather allegorical key, thus

showing that he adhered to the interpretation preferred since ancient times by many exegetes, which sees the relation between the two spouses described in the Song as an allegory of the love of God for Israel or, more recently, the marriage of Christ with the Church, or else the mystical union of the soul with God — whereas, as we know, in the motet *Veni, dilecte mi* Palestrina had set the whole text to music, respecting its overall sense: “Let us go early to the vineyards to see if the vines have budded, if their blossoms have opened, if the pomegranates are in bloom: *there I will give you my love!*”. Heedless of the example of Palestrina, to whom he is nevertheless paying homage, Orfeo Vecchi believes it more fitting not only to set the madrigal to a biblical text, but also to purge the text of its explicitly carnal references. Orfeo Vecchi's operation proves therefore significant not only for the history of the dissemination of Palestrina's music, but also for that of biblical exegesis in the modern era.

The same overall impression can be drawn from the examination of the third *contrafactum* of Palestrina attributed to Orfeo Vecchi, published posthumously in 1604 in his *Scielta de madrigali [...] accommodati in motetti*. In this case, for the madrigal *Io felice sarei*, Vecchi chooses a biblical text taken from Psalm 20 (21), as follows:

Io felice sarei,

se gli occhi, onde io sempre ardo,
potessi rimirar quanto vorrei.
O begl'occhi d'amore,
onde uscir vidi il dardo
che fieramente mi trafiss' il core.
La ferita è mortale
né perciò 'l mio destin'acerb'è rio
acqueta in me 'l desio
di mirar voi, cagion d'ogni mio male.

(Happy I would be

if I could behold the eyes, for which I ever burn,
as much as I desire.
Oh beautiful loving eyes,
whence I saw depart the arrow
that ruthlessly transfixed my heart.
The wound is mortal
and yet my bitter and adverse fate
does not calm my desire
to admire you, cause of all my anguish).

Domine in virtute tua

laetabitur rex

et super salutare tuum
exultabit vehementer
desiderium cordis eius
tribuisti ei
et voluntate labiorum eius
non fraudasti eum.

(The king shall joy in thy strength,

and in thy salvation
how greatly **shall he rejoice!**
Thou hast given him
his heart's desire
and hast not withholden
the request of his lips).

Nothing in the text of the Psalm corresponds to the image of the eyes of the loved one, which actually appears twice in the madrigal, thus representing, along with that of the wound (equally absent in the *contrafactum*), one of its central motives. Even the corresponding semantic elements (happiness, the heart, desire) occur not only fleetingly, but above all in very different contexts: the lover would be happy (“Io felice sarei”), if he could admire the eyes of his beloved (but cannot do so: thus he is unhappy), while the king rejoices in the power of God (“in virtute tua laetabitur rex”); the lover’s heart is pierced (“il dardo che fieramente mi trafisse il core”), that of the king is gratified; the desire expressed by the unhappy lover finds no satisfaction (“né perciò ‘l mio destin’acerb’è rio acqueta in me ‘l desio”), that expressed by the king has been fulfilled (“desiderium cordis eius tribuisti eius”). In this case too the substitute text carries a clear moral message: earthly love is the cause of eternal unhappiness, the love of God will be fully gratified. This message can, once again, be fully grasped only by comparing the overall meaning of the two texts, placed in reciprocal relation through the same musical guise.

Coming back to *Vestiva i colli*, it remains to examine the treatment it underwent in Geronimo Cavaglieri’s *contrafactum*, published in his first book *Della nova Metamorfosi* just three years after the publication of Orfeo Vecchi’s book of motets. The texts used by the Bartholomite monk are *Semper laudabo* for the first part and *Sana me Domine* for the second.

Vestiva i colli e le campagne intorno
la primavera di novelli onori,
e spirava soavi Arabi odori,
cinta d’erbe e di fior il crine adorno;
quando Licori all’apparir del giorno,
cogliendo di sua man purpurei fiori,
mi disse: in guiderdon di tanti onori
a te li colgo ed ecco io te n’adorno.

Così le chiome mie soavemente,
parlando io cinse e in sì dolci legami
mi strinse il cor ch’altro piacer non sente
onde non fia giammai che più non l’ami,
degli occhi miei né fia che la mia mente
altri sospiri o desiando io chiami.

Semper laudabo Salvatorem meum
in sono tubae
et benedicam eum semper
in toto corde meo
quia fecit nobiscum
misericordiam suam
Sana me, Domine, et salvum me fac,
et benedicam Salvatorem meum.

Sana me, Domine
et salvus ero,
quia peccavi nimis
in vita mea,
sana me, Domine
et benedicam Salvatorem meum.

(Clothed the hills and the countryside around
did Spring with fresh glories,
and breathed sweet Arabian fragrances,
girded with grasses and with flowers her tresses adorned;
when Licori at the appearance of day,
gathering in his hand purple flowers,
said to me: In recompense of so much ardor
for you I gather them, and behold I you with them
adorn.

(I shall forever praise my Saviour
with the sound of the trumpet
and bless him always
with all my heart
because he hath shown
his mercy unto us
Heal me, o Lord,
and save me
and I shall bless my Saviour.

Thus my hair, sweetly speaking
he girded, and in such gentle hands
he enfolded my heart, that other pleasure it feels not,
thus shall it never be that no more I love him,
he of my eyes, nor shall it be that my mind
for others sigh, or longingly call).

Heal me o Lord,
and I shall be saved,
that I have greatly sinned,
in my life
*heal me o Lord,
and I shall bless my Saviour).*

Both texts are freely drawn from the book of Psalms, with frequent repetitions of whole lines and fragments. In the exposition of the various fragments of text the voices proceed autonomously, giving rise to polytextual situations that the transcription of the text given above, deliberately synthetic, cannot express. The result is a song of praise with a prevalently neutral tone, lacking in references, general or precise, to the motives expressed in Palestrina's madrigal. Far from the approach adopted by Orfeo Vecchi, Cavaglieri shows here an attitude similar to that already seen in his *contrafacta* of Marenzio,⁵¹ characterized by little attention to the relation between text and music, by the use of frequent repetitions within the texts, denoting scarce literary ambitions, and the search for an even tone and an overall balance. Cavaglieri seems to pursue no other purpose than to pay homage to Palestrina, contributing to the dissemination of his music in a phase of the history of music in which Palestrina's style was considered outdated.

The same approach can also be found in the second *contrafactum* of Palestrina included in Cavaglieri's first book *Della nova Metamorfosi*, the madrigal *Saggio e santo pastor*, retexted with *Repleatur os meum* in the first part and *Exurge gloria mea* in the second:

⁵¹ See DELFINO, "Geronimo Cavaglieri".

Saggio e santo Pastor, che al gregge pio
con l'opre accorte e con li preghi onesti
mostr' hai quaggiù, quanto su ne' celesti
chiostri il tuo ben oprar sia grato a Dio.
Ecco, oggi pur, che fuor del cieco oblio
traendo il popol tuo, sgombri da mesti
petti il soverchio affanno, indi li vesti
di vera luce e di sovran desio.

Onde seguendo l'onorata impresa
dal lido spera ancor di Costantino
passar, ov' il Giordan correndo giace.
A sì nobil desir la mente accesa
solo gli hai tu, che dal Fattor divino
impetrar puoi per noi tranquilla pace.

(Wise and holy Shepherd, who to the pious flock
with judicious works and with honest prayers
hath shown on earth, how in the heavenly
cloisters your worthy deeds are pleasing to God.
Lo, this very day, guiding your people
out of the dark oblivion, you release from their sad
breasts the oppressive sorrow, and clothe them
in true light and sublime desire.

And so pursuing the noble task
from the shores of Constantine they hope
again to pass, where the Jordan lies flowing.
To such a noble desire only you
have inflamed their minds,
you who from the divine Maker
can beg for us restful peace).

Nor is there any divergence from this *modus operandi* in Girolamo Cavaglieri's third *contrafactum* of Palestrina, which appears in the second book *Della nova Metamorfosi* (1605). Unlike those examined so far, in this *contrafactum* Cavaglieri's new text replaces a previous *sacred* text (that of the motet *Pulchra es amica*,⁵² taken once again from the already mentioned fourth book of five-voice motets).

Repleatur os meum laude tua
alleluia
ut possim cantare
alleluia
in te Domine speravi
non confundat in aeternum
alleluia
inclina ad me aurem tuam Deus, alleluia.

Exurge gloria mea
exurge psalterium et cithara
exurgam di luculo
cantabo, gaudebunt labia mea
dum cantavero tibi
alleluia.

(Let my mouth be filled with thy praise
hallelujah,
that I may sing
hallelujah,
In Thee, O Lord, have I put my trust
let me never be put to confusion
hallelujah,
incline thine ear unto me, and save me,
hallelujah.

Arise o my glory
arise psaltery and harp
I will arise early
I shall sing, my lips shall rejoice
when I sing to you).

⁵² The text of Palestrina's motet is taken from the Song of Songs (6, 3–4).

Pulchra es, amica mea, suavis
et decora sicut Jerusalem;
terribilis ut castrorum acies ordinata.
Averte oculos tuos a me,
quia ipsi me avolare fecerunt.

(Beautiful you are, my love
sweet and charming as Jerusalem;
and terrible like an army ready for combat.
Remove your eyes from me
because they overcome me).

Salve, sancta facies redemptoris
impressa in sudario nivei candoris;
duc nos ad gloriam regni superioris
ad videndum faciem Christi Salvatoris.

(Hail, o face of the redeemer
impressed on a shroud as white as snow;
lead us to the glory of the highest heavens
to see the face of Christ our saviour).

Although we cannot rule out that this re-textualization expressed a simple act of homage to Palestrina, the explicit reference to the veil of Veronica that appears in the substitute text makes it seem more plausible that it was motivated by the need to allow Palestrina's motet to be sung in particular liturgical or devotional circumstances.

In the score of these *contrafacta*, as was customary, the text is only given under the bass part, as a guide for the organist, making it unfortunately impossible to study the placing of the text beneath the notes in the various voices. The score of this collection by Cavaglieri, like the part-books (which are lost), was dedicated to Cesare Negri. Doctor in Theology and apostolic protonotary, Giulio Cesare de Nigris (as he is mainly named in the archive documentation) was famous above all for his ability to accumulate ecclesiastic benefits of different kinds and provenance: we know that in 1596 he received contemporaneously an income for the chaplaincy of Santa Marcellina in San Pietro in Rome, one for the chaplaincy of San Bartolomeo in Pisa, for the priesthood of San Fedele in Caranago and of San Taddeo in Montevicchia in the Pieve of Missaglia, as well as a pension on the daily distribution for the canonry of Giovanni Casati in the collegiate church of San Babila in Milan, and two further pensions on the parish portion of San Babila and on the income of the provost of San Lorenzo, again in Milan.⁵³ From the same year of 1596, in addition to these numerous benefits, he also received that deriving from a canonry at the collegiate church of Santa Maria della Scala, which he held until his death (1611), certainly bringing him into contact not only with Orfeo

⁵³ See Giuseppe DE LUCA, "Traiettorie" ecclesiastiche e strategie socio-economiche nella Milano di fine Cinquecento. Il capitolo di S. Maria della Scala dal 1570 al 1600", *Nuova Rivista Storica*, 77, 1993/3, pp. 505–569: 519–520.

Vecchi, but also with Francesco Bernardino Porro, to whom Vecchi's first book of five-voice motets is dedicated. In the light of all this, the milieu of Santa Maria della Scala must therefore have assumed a position of prime importance in both the patronage, and in the production and use of both Orfeo Vecchi's and Geronimo Cavaglieri's *contrafacta*.

Conclusions

The examination of the relation between text and music in the *contrafacta* of Palestrina produced in Milan, and above all regarding the relation between the original text and the alternative text, has highlighted some peculiarities in the approach used by the various composers in their adaptations. In Orfeo Vecchi's *contrafacta* the sacred text adopted includes motives and images also present in the original text, but often with a diametrically opposed meaning. The substitute texts therefore seem to be more linked to the original texts than to the music of Palestrina. Such sophisticated cultural operations were probably destined to members of the clergy linked, like Vecchi and like the dedicatee of one of his collections of motets that includes *contrafacta* of Palestrina, to the refined milieu of the collegiate church of Santa Maria della Scala. In the compositions of Geronimo Cavaglieri, instead, the new texts are not strictly related either to the original texts, or to the music; in this case, then, one would say the textual substitution was motivated simply by the desire to pay homage to Palestrina by contributing to the circulation of some of his compositions that became famous in the local ecclesiastical milieu.

Over and above the differences in the criteria used for choosing and adapting the substitute texts, the *contrafacta* of Palestrina published in Milan testify to a widespread attitude that is respectful of tradition, but at the same time lively and creative in its adaptation to the tastes and needs of local culture.

Summary

From 1587 several of Palestrina's collections were reprinted in Milan thanks to the initiative of the publishers Tini, later in association with Filippo Lomazzo. In line with the tendencies of the local press, influenced by the counter-reformist climate of the Ambrosian archdiocese, preference was given, when choosing which of Palestrina's collections to reprint, firstly to those of motets and secondly to his masses, as well as one book of litanies and one of madrigals, now lost. A key role in the dissemination of

Palestrina's works in Milan was also played by the collective editions, to the extent that almost all of Palestrina's works included would reappear, in variously re-elaborated versions (with passaggi or alternative texts), in subsequent Milanese editions.

The reworkings with passaggi and the *contrafacta* made by some well-known composers and local clerics highlight the vital and receptive approach to Palestrina's music in Milan, at the same time giving a clear indication of the fame that the selected works of the composer must have reached.

In the decade following Palestrina's death, five compositions by Palestrina would be published in Milan with substitute texts, either by Orfeo Vecchi or by Geronimo Cavaglieri: the motet *Pulchra es amica mea*, taken from the famous fourth book of five-voice motets on the Song of Songs, and the madrigals *Io sono ferito abi lasso*, *Vestiva i colli* (of which two *contrafacta* have survived, with two different texts adapted respectively by Vecchi and by Cavaglieri), *Saggio e Santo pastor* and *Io felice sarei*. Not by chance, four of these five compositions by Palestrina had been reprinted shortly before in Milan, while the madrigal *Vestiva i colli*, with its second part *Così le chiome mie*, had circulated thanks to various successful collective editions printed elsewhere.

Unlike Aquilino Coppini, who in his *contrafacta* created new lyrics each time, allowing himself to be guided by the emotions provoked by listening to the madrigals with their original text, and giving rise to organisms in which the relation between text and music was no less meaningful than it had been in the original composition, the procedure adopted by Vecchi and Cavaglieri, who moreover most likely came into mutual contact, competing with each other in the retexting of the same madrigals, was quite different. Both, in fact, adapted pericopes or centonizations from the Bible to the music. The article undertakes a detailed examination of the *modus operandi* of Orfeo Vecchi as an adapter, focusing in particular on his approach to the madrigal *Io sono ferito*, repropounded with the text of the parable of the prodigal son taken from the Gospel of St Luke (*Quanti mercenarii*). Although the result of this operation lacks the precise adhesion to the music found in Coppini's *contrafacta*, it nevertheless reveals the musical sensitivity and cultural depth of their author, placing the stress on the relation established between the substitute text and the original one.

Finally, Vecchi's approach is compared with that of Cavaglieri, whose *contrafacta* are less interesting in terms of the relation between the original and the substitute text, and between the new text and the musical texture of the model, while not lacking, however, in aspects of the adaptation of the text and of its single words beneath the notes that reveal a certain care and mastery of the craft.

Keywords: *Contrafacta*, Milan, textual adaptation, Giovanni Pierluigi da Palestrina, Orfeo Vecchi, Girolamo Cavaglieri.

Appendix
Music collections and compositions by Palestrina
published in Milan or by Milanese publishers (1587–1620)

- 1587 Giovanni Pierluigi da Palestrina, *Motecta festorum totius anni, cum communi sanctorum. A Io. Petro Aloysio Praenestino quaternis vocibus aedita. Liber primus. Mediolani, apud Franciscum, & haeredes Simonis Tini.*
- 1587 Giovanni Pierluigi da Palestrina, *Liber II. Motectorum quatuor vocum. Nuper recognitus. Mediolani, Apud Franciscum, & haeredes Simonis Tini.*
- 1587 Giovanni Pierluigi da Palestrina, *Liber IIII Motectorum quinque vocum. Nuper recognitus. Mediolani, Apud Franciscum, & haeredes Simonis Tini.*
- 1587 *Benigni Spiriti. Il quarto Libro delle Muse a cinque voci, composto da diversi eccellentiss. musici. Novamente coretto, & ristampato. In Milano, appresso Francesco, & gli eredi di Simon Tini. [In Milano, per Michel Tini. 1587].*

- Compositions by Palestrina:
1. *Io felice sarei*
 2. *Io son ferito abi lasso*
 3. *Le selv'havea*
 4. *Saggio e santo pastor*
 5. *Se di pianti e di stridi*

- 1588 *Liber primus musarum cum quatuor vocibus, seu sacrae cantiones, quae vulgo motecta appellantur, ab Orlando Lasso, Cipriano Rore, & alijs ecclesiasticis authoribus compositae, et ab Antonio Barre collectae, & in lucem editae, addito nuper dialogo cum octo vocibus Orphei Vecchi. Mediolani, apud Franciscum et haeredes Simonis Tini. [apud Michaelem Tinum].*

- Compositions by Palestrina:
1. *O quam suavis*
 2. *Nativitas tua*

- 1590 Giovanni Pierluigi da Palestrina, *Missarum cum quatuor vocibus. Liber Primus. Mediolani. Apud Franciscum et haeredes Simonis Tini.*
- 1590 Giovanni Pierluigi da Palestrina, *Missarum cum quatuor, et quinque vocibus. Liber quartus. Mediolani, Apud Franciscum, et haeredes Simonis Tini.*

[c.1590] Choral book *in folio*, without title-page and with no table of contents, date, place of printing and name of printer. The folios are numbered only *recto*.

Compositions by Palestrina: 1. *Missa Papae Marcelli* [anonymous re-elaboration for four voices]

[preserved at the Archivio della Veneranda Fabbrica del Duomo di Milano (Librone 23)]

1592 *Missae Dominicales quinis Vocibus diversorum Auctorum, a F. Julio Pellinio Carmel. Mant. Collectae. Mediolani. Ex Typografia Michaelis Tini. Ad signum Famae.*

Compositions by Palestrina: 1. *Missa Dominicalis*

1593 Giovanni Pierluigi da Palestrina, *Motectorum quinque vocum liber quartus ex Canticis Salomonis. Denuo summa opera diligentiaque excussus. Mediolani, Apud haeredes Francisci, et Simonis Tini.*

1594 Giovanni Battista Bovicelli, *Regole, passaggi di musica madrigali e motetti passeggiati. Venezia, Giacomo Vincenti, a instantia delli heredi di Francesco, e Simon Tini, librari in Milano.*

Compositions by Palestrina: 1. *Io son ferito*
(2nd version with substitute text:
Ave verum corpus)

ante 1596 Giovanni Pierluigi da Palestrina, Letanie a 4. lib. primo.

[printed by the Tini publishers; lost]

ante 1596 Giovanni Pierluigi da Palestrina, Madrigali a 4. Palestina a 4. lib. primo.

[printed by the Tini publishers; lost]

ante 1596 Giovanni Pierluigi da Palestrina, Offertoria totius anni, Palestina 1. e 2. parte a 5.

[available in Milan in the bookstore of the Tini publishers]

- 1604 [Orfeo Vecchi] *Scielta de Madrigali a cinque voci de diversi eccel. musici, accommodati in motetti da Orfeo Vecchi con la partitura d'essi motetti. Nuovamente data in luce. In Milano, Per l'herede di Simon Tini, e Filippo Lomazzo.*
- Compositions of Palestrina: 1. *Io felice sarei* (substitute text: *Domine in virtute tua*)
- 1605 [Geronimo] *Della nova metamorfosi de diversi autori, opera del R. P. F. Geronimo Cavaglieri dell'ordine di S. Basilio dell'Armeni, libro secondo à cinque voci. In Milano, Appresso Agostino Tradate.*
- Compositions by Palestrina: 1. *Pulchra es amica* (substitute text: *Salve sancta facies*)
- 1605 Giovanni Pierluigi da Palestrina, *Cantiones sacrae [...]* ex canticis canticorum. Antwerpen, Pierre Phalèse.
- [reprint of Palestrina's fourth book of five-voice motets; it includes the two *contrafacta* from Orfeo Vecchi's first book of five-voice motets, attributed to Palestrina]
- 1608 Orphei Vecchii [...] *Cantiones sacrae [...]* quinque vocum nunc primum in lucem editae. Antwerpen, Pierre Phalèse.
- [reprint of Orfeo Vecchi's first and second book of five-voice motets; it does not include the *contrafacta*]
- 1610 [Giovanni Pierluigi da Palestrina] *Basso prencipale co 'l soprano del quarto libro delle messe a quattro, e cinque voci dell'eccellentiss. Gio. Pietro Aluigi Palestina* (sic). *Nuovamente fatto d'Alessandro Nuvoloni organista. In Milano, Presso l'herede di Simon Tini, & Filippo Lomazzo.*
- 1620 Francesco Rognoni Taegio, *Selva de varii passaggi secondo l'uso moderno, per cantare, & suonare con ogni sorte de stromenti [...]* di Francesco Rognoni Taegio. Milano, Filippo Lomazzo.
- Compositions by Palestrina: 1. *Io son ferito*
(2nd version with a substitute text: *Quanti mercenarii*)
2. *Vestiva i colli* (2 versions)
3. *Pulchra es* (2 versions)

Contents

Foreword (Marina Toffetti)	5
----------------------------	---

INTRODUCTORY ESSAY

Marina Toffetti <i>Contrafacere</i> . Re-textualizing polyphonic music from the late sixteenth to the seventeenth century	9
--	---

PART ONE: RE-THINKING AND RE-CREATING MUSIC

Alessandra Petrina The court of James VI of Scotland (1566–1625) and its reception of Italian musical modes	43
Michael Chizzali Text and context of the Thuringian <i>contrafactum</i> . New insights into Melchior Backhaus's <i>Primus liber</i> (1587)	61
Marina Toffetti <i>Contrafacta</i> of Palestrina's works printed in Milan (1597–1605)	83
Chiara Comparin From Venice to Nuremberg and Leipzig. <i>Il trionfo di Dori</i> (1592) and its German re-textualizations	117
Tomasz Jeż <i>Contrafacta</i> of Italian madrigals in Polish musical sources	151

PART TWO: RE-USING AND ADAPTING MUSIC

Katarzyna Spurgiasz <i>Salve Iesu Christe, Rex misericordiae</i> . Lutheran adaptations of pre-Reformation repertoire from St Elisabeth's Church in Wrocław	173
Lars Berglund <i>Arde Fillis / Isti sunt</i> : a <i>contrafactum</i> by Gustav Düben, based on a madrigal by Stefano Landi, and previously attributed to Giacomo Carissimi	187
Maria Schildt Re-using pre-existing music with new texts. Repertoire for court and church in seventeenth-century Sweden	209
Lars Berglund Mourning a dead Queen. The music at the funeral of Ulrika Eleonora the Elder in Stockholm (1693)	247

ADDENDUM: PRINTED COLLECTIONS INCLUDING *CONTRAFACTA*

Marco Giuliani	
Printed collections including <i>contrafacta</i> (1576–1621)	267
List of collections	270
Tables I–XXXII	275
Gabriele Taschetti	
Printed collections including <i>contrafacta</i> (1646–1649)	325
List of collections	326
Tables XXXIII–XXXV	327
Index of the composers mentioned in the tables	333
<i>List of abbreviations</i>	337
<i>List of illustrations</i>	338
<i>Index of names</i>	339
<i>Index of places</i>	353