

The Three Requiem Masses by Palestrina: New Light on Some Doubtful Attributions*

RICCARDO PINTUS

One of the events that most influenced Giovanni Pierluigi da Palestrina's late years was his marriage in 1581 to a wealthy widow of a Roman fur merchant, Virginia Dormoli. This second marriage guaranteed the composer enough economic stability to be able to devote himself assiduously to the publication of his works. To this end, he took over Giovanni Coattino's printing workshop on 27 August 1593.¹ In the years following his death, this printing endeavour was continued with great commitment by his son Iginio. For instance, in the 1594-1601 period he published eight books of masses comprising some forty-four settings, some of which had probably been composed many years earlier. Notwithstanding this impressive output, not all of Palestrina's work was published by him and his son, and some works remained only in manuscript sources. Many of these compositions were added to the corpus in the following centuries, thanks to the work of scholars. This attitude on the part of the academic community has lasted right up to the present, and Palestrina's repertoire seems to be under constant revision. One of the more fascinating cases is the *Missa Nativitas tua Dei genitrix virgo*, recently brought to light by Bernhard Janz.² Needless to say, new discoveries are not always supported by strong evidence, and sometimes the lack of proof gives way to controversial attribution.

Palestrina's repertoire of music intended for the commemoration of the dead is by no means exempt from such revision and controversy. In this list, the presence of three Requiem masses—one for five voices and two for four voices—stands out, along with twelve motets and responsories on text related to the liturgy for the dead.³ The Requiem for five voices is the only one that with certainty can be ascribed to Palestrina, as it was included by the author in the fourth edition of his first book of masses in 1591 and then reprinted in the fifth edition in 1596.⁴ In contrast, the two further Requiems attributed to Palestrina are preserved only in manuscript; one is in BarcOC 10bis, and

* A condensed version of this paper was presented at the Medieval and Renaissance Music Conference, Edinburgh, 1-4 July 2020. I am profoundly grateful to all the colleagues and scholars that read a draft of this article and shared with me their impressions; in particular to David Burn, Antonio Chemotti, Giacomo Pirani, and Rodobaldo Tibaldi. I am also indebted to Dario Tabbia, whom I consider partly accountable for some of the findings that will follow, and Sarah Jane Down.

¹ See Patrizio Barbieri, 'Music Printers and Booksellers in Rome (1583-1600) with New Documents on Coattino, Diani, Donangeli, Tornieri, and Franzini', in *Recercare* 16 (2004), 69-112 at 87-89.

² Bernhard Janz, 'Riflessioni sull'attribuzione della Missa "Nativitas tua Dei genitrix virgo" nel codice 70 del fondo Cappella Sistina', in *Palestrina e l'Europa: Atti del III Convegno Internazionale di Studi (Palestrina, 6-9 ottobre 1994)*, ed. Giancarlo Rostirolla, Stefania Soldati, and Elena Zomparelli (Palestrina, 2006), 789-808.

³ This repertoire encompasses three settings of *Libera me, Domine* (two for four voices and one for five voices), three responsories from the office of the dead, and five motets that use a text from the office of the dead.

⁴ *Missarum cum quatuor, quinque ac sex vocibus liber primus*, fourth edition (Rome: Alessandro Gardano, 1591) [RISM P658] and fifth edition (Venice: Angelo Gardano, 1596) [RISM P659].

the other in I-FEc Cl. II 476.⁵ At present, the only existing study on the Requiem for five voices is the brief *Zum Offertorium in Palestrinas Missa pro defunctis* by Manfred Hermann Schmid, and it deals only with the offertory.⁶ The Requiems of uncertain origin, on the other hand, have gained more attention from scholars: the first one was analyzed by Robert J. Snow and the latter by Jean Duchamp.⁷ Duchamp trusted the ascription in the Ferrara codex with such certainty that he edited and published the mass with Palestrina's name on the front cover.⁸

The dubious masses have thus been subjected to greater scrutiny, while significant study is still lacking for the certain one. This scenario perhaps reflects scholars' predilection for issues regarding dubious attributions, rather than studies of a historical or analytical nature. This probably happens because being able to confirm or deny the authorship of a work exerts a fascination on scholars, and readers—a fascination that is undeniably difficult to resist. However, it must be remembered that matters concerning authorship are a slippery slope, and they always require the utmost caution, in order to avoid the mistakes that the philologist easily falls into when 'looking for the scoop'.⁹ As the reader will notice, I cannot conceal the fact that attribution issues exert some appeal upon myself as well, and that a large part of the present article in fact concerns the dubious Requiems. On the other hand, I believe this brief essay might also offer a fruitful opportunity to investigate some features of the five-voice Requiem, for whose peculiarities an explanation will be suggested.

The three Requiem masses have very diverse structures (see Table 1), musical styles, and transmission histories. When I first approached this repertoire, I felt doubtful that Palestrina had composed three Requiem masses with such different characteristics. The two for four voices, at first glance, seem to lack the typical features of Palestrina's writing, which is usually founded upon rather strictly imitative counterpoint. Moreover, they are transmitted only by peripheral sources, which is definitely uncommon for Palestrina's core repertoire. However, a closer look reveals that it is the five-voice Requiem which has the most unusual structure: it includes only one Proper section, the offertory, and as far as I am aware it is the only Requiem in the entire repertoire that lacks an introit.¹⁰ Consequently, given that even the authentic Requiem shows some very

⁵ The codex is not listed in the Census-Catalogue. Below is a key to abbreviations of sources cited more than once:

AlqBC 1	Alqu�zar, Biblioteca de la Colegiata, Ms. 1
BarcOC 10bis	Barcelona, Centre de Documentaci� de l'Orfe� Catal�, Ms. 10bis
I-FEc Cl. II 476	Ferrara, Biblioteca Comunale Ariostea, Ms. Cl. II 476
TurBN I.27	Turin, Biblioteca Nazionale Univeristaria, Ms. Ris. Mus. I. 27

⁶ Manfred Hermann Schmid, 'Zum Offertorium in Palestrinas *Missa pro defunctis*', in *Compositionswissenschaft: Festschrift Reinhold und Roswitha Schl tterer zum 70. Geburtstag*, ed. Sabine Kurth and Bernd Edelmann (Augsburg, 1999), 85-93. Along with this one, two additional essays must be mentioned: Jean-Marc Sanchez, 'Lassus et Palestrina: *Missa pro defunctis*   5 voix', in *Ostinato rigore* 4 (1994), 139-62 and the analysis by Christian Thomas Leitmeir included in David J. Burn (ed.), *The Book of Requiems* (Leuven, forthcoming), vol. 1.

⁷ Robert J. Snow, 'An Unknown *Missa pro defunctis* by Palestrina', in *De musica hispana et aliis: miscel nea en honor al Prof. Dr Jos  L pez-Calo, S.J., en su 65  cumplea os*, ed. Emilio Casares Rodricio and Carlos Villanueva Abelairas (Santiago de Compostela, 1990), 387-428. Jean Duchamp, 'Un manuscrit musical pour la liturgie des morts et ses *Requiem* inconnus de Palestrina et "Jachet"', in *Revue de Musicologie* 96 (2010), 271-319.

⁸ Giovanni Pierluigi da Palestrina, *Missa pro defunctis   quatre voix d'hommes d'apr s le manuscrit de Ferrare, Ariostea Cl. II 476*, ed. Jean Duchamp (Lyon, 2011).

⁹ This comes as a word of advice from Claudio Annibaldi, 'Quando il filologo musicale cerca lo "scoop": considerazioni preventive sull'ultimo volume delle "Opere Complete" di Girolamo Frescobaldi', in *Il Saggiatore Musicale* 19 (2012), 237-64.

¹⁰ Antonio Chemotti is of the same opinion; see Antonio Chemotti, *Polyphonic Music pro mortuis in Italy (1550-1650)* (Lucca, 2020), 40.

Table 1. Structures of the three Requiems

Requiem for 5 voices	Barcelona Requiem	Ferrara Requiem
—	Introit	Introit
Kyrie	Kyrie	Kyrie
—	Gradual	—
—	—	Sequence
Offertory	Offertory	Offertory
Sanctus	Sanctus	Sanctus
Agnus Dei	Agnus Dei	Agnus Dei
—	Communion	Communion

unique traits, Palestrina's authorship for the other ones, unlikely as it may seem, cannot be inferentially considered false on stylistic grounds, and all the characteristics of these masses must be fully explored before being able to declare them spurious or authentic.

The Barcelona Requiem

In his 1990 essay, Robert Snow recognizes that many compositions circulating under Palestrina's name in peripheral sources only, are difficult to attribute. Nevertheless, he considers the Requiem from Barcelona to be possibly authentic. Some sections of this mass (introit, Kyrie, and offertory) are also found in AlqBC 1. This codex originates from Alquézar, a small village in eastern Spain close to the Pyrenees, and was probably compiled for the local church of Santa Maria Mayor.¹¹

BarcOC 10bis is a miscellaneous and late manuscript, datable to the turn of the seventeenth and eighteenth centuries.¹² In its version the mass includes the introit, Kyrie, gradual, offertory, Sanctus, Agnus Dei, and communion. AlqBC 1, on the other hand, is a very heterogeneous codex of the mid-seventeenth century, at least fifty years older than the Catalan one. In this manuscript, the mass carries no ascription and has a slightly different structure: it lacks the gradual and communion, while a tract is included, along with a Sanctus and an Agnus Dei that are different from the Barcelona ones (see Table 2).¹³

Snow points out that the Barcelona version of the mass is the result of several composers' work: while the three sections also preserved in AlqBC 1 show traits that are common to each other, and can therefore be attributed to the same composer, he considers the others to be from another pen. In an attempt to establish a geographical area of origin, he then identifies a series of characteristics pointing to an Italian provenance for the introit, Kyrie, and offertory, whereas some of the remaining sections clearly show Spanish features and a later compositional style. The gradual makes a

¹¹ For a description of the manuscript and its contents see Snow, 'An Unknown Missa', 388 n. 4.

¹² For a description of the manuscript and its contents see Snow, 'An Unknown Missa', 388 n. 3.

¹³ To distinguish the two settings of the Sanctus and Agnus Dei from one another I will use the letter 'a' to refer to the ones from Alquézar and 'b' for the ones from Barcelona.

Table 2. Structure of the Requiem in the two sources

AlqBC 1	BarcOC 1obis
Introit	Introit
Kyrie	Kyrie
—	Gradual
Tract	—
Offertory	Offertory
Sanctus α	Sanctus β
Agnus Dei α	Agnus Dei β
—	Communion

particularly advanced use of *musica ficta* and presents the long version of the chant intonation ‘Requiem aeternam’, as was common amongst Spanish composers. The Sanctus and Agnus Dei, on the other hand, are quite short and written in a quasi-chordal style, which suggest that ‘these two items probably were composed by a Catalonian chapelmaster active during the middle third of the seventeenth century or slightly later.’¹⁴ In contrast, the Barcelona introit features the short intonation ‘Requiem’, which was more common in Italy than Spain; likewise, the offertory has the short intonation ‘Domine Jesu Christe’ in the Italian manner, unlike the Iberian custom which extends the chant up to the words ‘Rex gloriae.’¹⁵ In addition, the opening of the Kyrie resembles the first measure of the introit. Given all these elements, Snow infers that the introit, Kyrie, and offertory must have been written by the same author, who must have been Italian. As for the communion, he underlines how the difference between the polyphonic complexity of the antiphon ‘Lux aeterna’ and the quasi-chordal texture of the verse ‘Requiem aeternam’ shows a considerable regard for the psalm tone sung by the tenor. Such regard definitely suggests an Italian author, although there are not sufficient elements to link the communion to the other three sections, nor to establish whether it was composed by Palestrina.

According to Snow, the Alquézar version presents some peculiarities that clearly indicate the intervention of a Spanish chapelmaster in adapting the mass to the mid-seventeenth century Iberian customs. The Sanctus is copied until the end of the first ‘Osanna’—thus omitting the ‘Benedictus’ and the second ‘Osanna’—in order to leave room for a *villancico* to be sung at the elevation. Similarly, the offertory lacks the entire verse ‘Hostias et preces’, which was usually present in Italian masses and less commonly in Spanish ones. However, in Snow’s opinion this must have originally existed, given that the incipit of the *repetenda* ‘Quam olim Abrahae’ is fashioned ‘in a manner typical of the beginning of a section that is so to be repeated after the singing of another textual unit.’¹⁶ In this version, the introit is adapted to the Iberian customs as well, through the replacement of the short chant intonation with the longer one and the adjustment of the first polyphonic episode to the words ‘dona eis’. From an examination of the polyphonic

¹⁴ Snow, ‘An Unknown Missa’, 396.

¹⁵ See Owen Rees, *The Requiem of Tomás Luis de Victoria (1603)* (Cambridge, 2019), 170–72.

¹⁶ Snow, ‘An Unknown Missa’, 415; see also Illustration 9, 413.

texture and movement of the parts, he is convinced that the Barcelona reading is the correct one, whereas Alquézar exhibits a further adaptation to Spanish habits.¹⁷ In contrast, the offertory preserves its original short intonation, due to the impossibility of finding a ‘satisfactory way to replace the words “Rex gloriae”, obviously the original text, with “libera animas omnium fidelium defunctorum”’.¹⁸

In addition to the reasoning directly derived from the analysis of the sources, Snow proposes a comparison between the opening of the offertory of this Requiem and that of the five-voice one. He argues that the reworking of the melodic material from the five-voice Requiem into the other is so manifest that it may be evaluated as a real case of ‘parody’. Assembling all the elements presented so far, he affirms that ‘a comparison... of those items whose general style suggests that they could be by Palestrina with their counterparts in a five-part *missa* known to be by him leaves little doubt that at least the introit, Kyrie, and offertory of the mass under consideration are his as well’.¹⁹

The reader who has decided to put faith in Snow’s arguments presented so far will be disappointed to discover that this Requiem is not in fact by Palestrina: the version from AlqBC 1 is the *Missa pro defunctis* for four voices by Giulio Belli (c. 1560–after 1620), an Italian composer who was born in Longiano (near Forlì) and worked mainly in the eastern Po Valley Area, as *magister capellae* at Imola, Venice, Ferrara, Osimo, Ravenna, and Padua. During his career, he published more than twenty masses and several books of motets, psalms, antiphons, and litanies, as well as four books of madrigals. The original printed version of this four-voice Requiem was published in 1599 and also includes the sequence, along with a different communion from that of the Barcelona codex.²⁰ On the other hand, the print does not contain the tract, which can thus be considered definitely spurious. A connection between the two Spanish sources can be proved through a collation of the readings. In addition to a large number of extremely simplifying variants introduced in Barcelona, the presence of a common variant between the two sources should be noted (see Example 1);²¹ this may have been generated during the copying of AlqBC 1 and transmitted in BarcOC 10bis, or perhaps it already existed in a common antigraph.²² Since Snow was not aware of the correlation with the original printed version, he obviously was not able to demonstrate the kinship between the Spanish manuscripts.

Snow’s insights are perhaps oriented toward finding an Italian pen behind this mass, so as to be able to confirm the attribution to Palestrina. However, these insights can still be considered valid, and have directed me towards the Italian repertoire to seek a possible correspondence, which I indeed found in Belli’s mass. In the light of my

¹⁷ See Snow, ‘An Unknown Missa’, Illustration 7, 402–6.

¹⁸ Snow, ‘An Unknown Missa’, 406.

¹⁹ Snow, ‘An Unknown Missa’, 424.

²⁰ *Missarum quatuor vocibus liber primus* (Venice: Gardano, 1599) [RISM B1758].

²¹ The dotted boxes used in this and in the following examples highlight the issues to which I am referring.

²² This variant reading links the two sources to each other, but it is not easy to establish whether BarcOC 10bis was copied from AlqBC 1 or whether both are apographs of a lost source. While the introduction of a large number of simplifying variants in BarcOC 10bis locates the source at a much lower point of the tradition, the correct distribution of the text at the beginning of the introit seems to bring it back to a higher position. Following Snow’s reasoning, one may suppose that both were copied from an antigraph containing the correct reading for the text and the error at bb. 5–7, and that the variant in the distribution of the text was introduced during the copying of AlqBC 1 as an adaptation to Spanish customs. However, it cannot be excluded that this variant was already present in the antigraph, and that a mindful scribe brought it back to its original form during the copying of Barcelona—although this scenario seems quite unlikely.

Example 1. Giulio Belli, *Missa pro defunctis* for four voices, introit bb. 5-8 (comparison of sources)

a. RISM B1758

5

nam do na e is

ter nam do na e is Do

nam do na e is

nam do na e is

b. AlqBC 1 – BarcOC 1obis

5

nam do na e is

na e is Do

nam do na e is

nam do na e is

findings, Snow's reasoning loses strength; nevertheless, the case for identifying which aspects of his deduction are still effective and therefore acceptable, and which should be discarded, becomes even more profitable. In Belli's version, the Sanctus actually includes the 'Benedictus' and a second 'Osanna' that were not copied in AlqBC 1, whereas in the print the offertory was already lacking the verse. Therefore, Snow's intuition is only partially valid. He cannot be blamed for this, since the practice of performing the entire verse 'Hostias et preces' in plainchant was actually very widespread in Spain; however, some examples survive in central-northern Italian repertoire as well.²³

²³ I mainly refer to the eastern Po Valley area. Amongst the Requiem masses composed by authors from this region, I can mention the four-voice setting by Paolo Isnardi (*Missae quatuor vocum*, Venice: Gardano, 1573) [RISM I116], the five-voice setting by Giacomo Moro (*Officium et Missa defunctorum octonis vocibus*, Venice: Amadino, 1599) [RISM M3731] and those for eight voices by Giulio Belli (*Missarum Sacrarumque Cantionum octo vocibus*, Venice: Amadino, 1595) [RISM B1749], Lorenzo Vecchi (*Missarum octonis vocibus liber primus*, Venice: Gardano, 1605) [RISM V1002], and Orazio Vecchi (*Missarum senis et octonis vocibus liber primus*, Venice: Gardano, 1607) [RISM V1008, 16071]. In Novara we also find the Requiem for six voices by Michele Varotto (*Missarum liber primus cum sex vocibus*, Venice: Scotto, 1563) [RISM V987].

Snow argues that the melody paraphrased in Sanctus β , which is similar to that of Sanctus α , is different from the common Italian one that was also used by Palestrina in his five-part Requiem. It thus followed that this version of the melody should be sought in the Spanish repertoire. In fact, Belli uses the same melody as Palestrina. It is paraphrased in such a way as to blend better into the contrapuntal fabric, but it is actually the same and, probably, is also the same upon which the much later Sanctus β is fashioned. In my opinion, through this reasoning Snow aims to exclude the possibility of associating the Sanctus α and Agnus Dei α with the introit, Kyrie, and offertory, in order to discredit the textual reliability of AlqBC 1 and consequently restore the authority of BarcOC 10bis. If neither of the two sources transmits a Sanctus and an Agnus Dei that can be considered by an Italian author—and hence, possibly, by Palestrina—then it is feasible to consider the Barcelona reading valid (or at least as valid as the Alquézar one): a Requiem mass with an introit, Kyrie, offertory, and communion composed by Palestrina, to which a later Spanish author added a gradual, Sanctus, and Agnus Dei.²⁴

The ascertained authorship of Belli does not rule out the possibility that the offertory from the five-voice Requiem by Palestrina may have been used by Belli as a model, as Snow suggests. However, it is my belief that the model can be tracked down not in Palestrina's repertoire, but in Belli's own setting for five voices published in 1586 (five years before Palestrina's).²⁵ The similarities are, in my opinion, much more compelling. The four-voice offertory can be considered as a real reworking of the five-voice one, concerning not only the opening but the entire section, through a decrease of the setting from five to four voices (see Examples 2-4). Moreover, the resemblances between Belli's two masses go even further, as can be seen by comparing the openings of the Kyries (see Example 5) and communions (see Example 6).

This does not preclude the possibility that Belli considered Palestrina a model to follow, and that in his music there may sometimes be references to or re-workings of compositions by Palestrina. With this in mind, Snow's reasoning—according to which the presence of parody of a composition by Palestrina must mean that the author of the Requiem for four voices is the same as that for five—seems even weaker. It is undeniable that Palestrina often preferred to draw models for parody masses from his own production rather than others', but this does not mean that others could not draw from his. The further deduction offered by Snow, whereby the opening of the offertory is 'so atypical that it can be explained only by assuming that the composer derived it from the opening of the five-part setting', is also far from convincing.²⁶ Even without being aware of Belli's authorship, a comparison with the other sections demonstrates that the homorhythmic parallel thirds, which Snow finds so unusual, actually characterize the opening of the introit and Kyrie as well. It is in fact a stylistic feature typical of Belli, which can also be found in other compositions, such as the *Missa pro defunctis* for five voices itself.

²⁴ Snow contradicts himself when he suggests that the Sanctus α may be fashioned upon a *cantus firmus* that was widely disseminated in Spain, since he himself stated that the shortened version of Alquézar must have represented an attempt by a Spanish choirmaster to adapt a composition that clearly corresponded to the habits of another region.

²⁵ *Missarum cum quinque vocibus liber primus* (Venice: Gardano, 1586) [RISM B1745].

²⁶ See Snow, 'An Unknown Missa', 426.

Example 2. Giulio Belli, two Requiem settings, comparison of offertories ('Rex gloriae')

a. Four-voice setting, bb. 1-6

Rex glo - ri - ae, Rex glo - ri - ae, Rex glo - ri - ae, Rex glo - ri - ae

b. Five-voice setting, bb. 1-6

Rex glo - ri - ae, li - be-ra a - ni - Rex glo - ri - ae, Rex glo - ri - ae li - Rex glo - ri - ae, Rex glo - ri - ae, Rex glo - ri - ae li - be-ra Rex glo - ri - ae li - be-ra

Example 3. Giulio Belli, two Requiem settings, comparison of offertories ('de profundo lacu')

a. Four-voice setting, bb. 17-21

ni et de pro - fun - do la - cu. Li - fer - ni et de pro - fun - do la - cu. Li - be - fer - ni et de pro - fun - do la - cu. Li - fer - ni et de pro - fun - do la - cu. Li -

b. Five-voice setting, bb. 15-19

15

fer - ni et de pro - fun - do la - cu. Li - be - ra

poe - nis in - fer - ni Li - be - ra

fer - ni et de pro - fun - do la - cu. Li -

- - ni et de pro - fun - do la - cu. Li -

fer - ni et de pro - fun - do la - cu. Li -

Example 4. Giulio Belli, two Requiem settings, comparison of offertories ('quam olim Abrahæ')

a. Four-voice setting, bb. 46-50

46

- - - tam quam o - lim A - bra - hae pro -

- - - tam quam o - lim A - bra - hae, quam o - lim A - bra - hae pro - mi -

- - - tam quam o - lim A - bra - hae, quam o - lim A - bra - hae pro - mi - si -

quam o - lim A - bra - hae pro - mi - si - sti

b. Five-voice setting, bb. 43-46

43

- - - tam quam o - lim A - bra - hae, quam o - lim A - bra - hae

sanc - tam quam o - lim A - bra - hae pro - mi - si - -

- - - tam quam o - lim A - bra - hae

quam o - lim A - bra - hae pro -

sanc - tam quam o - lim A - bra - hae

Example 5. Giulio Belli, two Requiem settings, comparison of Kyries (opening)

a. Four-voice setting, bb. 1-6

Ky - ri - e e - le - i - son, Ky - ri - e e - le - i - son, Ky - ri - e e - le - i - son, Ky - ri - e e - le - i - son, Ky - ri - e e - le - i - son, Ky - ri - e e - le - i - son

b. Five-voice setting, bb. 1-5

Ky - ri - e e - le - i - son, Ky - ri - e e - le - i - son, Ky - ri - e e - le - i - son, Ky - ri - e e - le - i - son, Ky - ri - e e - le - i - son

Example 6. Giulio Belli, two Requiem settings, comparison of communions (opening)

a. Four-voice setting, bb. 1-7

Lu - ce - at e - is Do - mi - ne, lu - ce - at e - is Do - mi - ne cum, Lu - ce - at e - is Do - mi - ne cum sanc - tis tu - is, Lu - ce - at e - is Do - mi - ne

b. Five-voice setting, bb. 1-7

The Ferrara Requiem

The codex I-FEc Cl. II 476 is made up of four oblong partbooks and contains three Requiem masses—one ascribed to Palestrina, one to ‘Jachet’, and one anonymous—and a number of compositions for the Office of the Dead which carry no ascriptions.²⁷ Duchamp cites a number of factors that in his view help to establish the origin of the codex. First of all, he notes that according to the Briquet catalogue the watermark of the paper places the drafting of the codex between 1556 and 1589 in the central-eastern Po Valley area, roughly between Ferrara and Mantua.²⁸ Duchamp also speculates that the Requiem mass had been commissioned by the Accademia della Morte in Ferrara, following a lead already suggested by Adriano Cavicchi.²⁹ Finally, he suggests that further research on the litanies of the saints that are copied after the anonymous mass could indicate a possible connection with an institution that counted amongst its protectors at least one of the mentioned saints.

The Ferrara setting is a *voci pari*, which in Duchamp’s view immediately links the Requiem to one of Palestrina’s Mantuan masses with the same characteristics.³⁰ In

²⁷ For a detailed description of the manuscript see Duchamp, ‘Un manuscrit musical’, 272-73. For the complete list of works see Duchamp, ‘Un manuscrit musical’, 314-18.

²⁸ Charles-Moïse Briquet, *Les Filigranes. Dictionnaire historique des marques du papier dès leur apparition vers 1282 jusqu’en 1600* (Paris, 1907).

²⁹ Adriano Cavicchi was the first to draw attention to this mass, suggesting right away that Palestrina’s ascription could be ‘probable’; see Adriano Cavicchi, ‘Una sconosciuta messa funebre di probabile attribuzione palestriniana’, in *Atti del Convegno di Studi Palestriniani (28 settembre - 2 ottobre 1975)*, ed. Francesco Luisi (Palestrina, 1977), 411-14 at 413; and Duchamp, ‘Un manuscrit musical’, 308-11.

³⁰ The initial cleffing is C4, C4, C4, F4; it changes afterwards, as seen in Table 4. Duchamp is clearly referring to the only Mantuan mass for four voices by Palestrina. Since these Mantuan masses were discovered, it has been common opinion that the four-voice setting was the first to be composed by Palestrina for Guglielmo Gonzaga, before the duke made an express request to the composer to increase the ensemble to five voices (see Knud Jeppesen, ‘The Recently Discovered Mantova Masses of Palestrina. A Provisional Communication’, in *Acta Musicologica* 22 (1950), 36-47 at 43); more recently, this hypothesis has been challenged: see Ottavio Beretta, *Le messe dei Gonzaga - Musiche nella Cappella di Santa Barbara in Mantova Vol. IV: Messe di Giovanni Pierluigi da Palestrina, introduzione ed edizione critica* (Lucca, 2015), xxix, n. 2 and Paola Besutti, ‘Quante erano le messe mantovane?’, in *Palestrina e l’Europa*, 707-41 at 739-40. In

addition, Duchamp suggests that the spelling of the composer's name as 'Palestina',³¹ links this mass to other contexts, including an inscription made by the librarian of Santa Barbara in Mantua in a copy of the second book of masses by Palestrina.³²

Finally, he focuses on the sequence, highlighting the characteristic *alternatim* scheme. The regular succession of monodic and polyphonic stanzas breaks only at the very end, when the verse 'Oro supplex' and the following 'Lachrimosa' are both set in polyphony. Duchamp has no doubt about it:

Palestrina a choisi de rompre la stricte alternance entre polyphonie et monodie en présentant la strophe paire *Lachrimosa* de façon polyphonique. Sans doute cette particularité est-elle révélatrice de l'intention d'un artiste à la fois sensible à la beauté du texte de cette strophe et tout de même soucieux de terminer l'alternance par l'emphase polyphonique.³³

Palestrina has chosen to break the strict alternation between polyphony and monody by presenting the even stanza 'Lachrimosa' in a polyphonic way. No doubt this peculiarity is indicative of the intention of an artist who is both sensitive to the beauty of the text of this stanza and at the same time anxious to end the alternation with the polyphonic emphasis.

While recognizing that the sequence is the only section in which *alternatim* is present, and although the alternation is not strictly respected, Duchamp clearly supports the hypothesis of a link with the Mantuan masses and the ducal court of Guglielmo Gonzaga. However, it must be remembered that in the other sections the plainchant is limited to the intonations of the introit (antiphon and verse), offertory (response and verse), Sanctus, Agnus Dei, and communion (antiphon and verse). On the grounds of these stylistic arguments, Duchamp seems absolutely persuaded that the ascription to Palestrina must be reliable:

La clarté de l'écriture, la justesse rythmique de la prosodie et les silences ménagés au fil des cadences dénotent une attention toute particulière apportée au texte, ainsi que le réclamaient les pères du concile de Trente. En plus du court Requiem à cinq voix que le compositeur romain a ajouté à la réédition de son premier livre de messes in 1591, cette messe représente donc un ensemble polyphonique complet pour la liturgie des morts qui doit être ajouté à son catalogue... dans cette œuvre importante, le style de Palestrina ne semble pas pouvoir être mis en cause.³⁴

his discussion, Duchamp refers to Iain Fenlon, *Music and Patronage in Sixteenth-Century Mantua*, (Cambridge, 1980), vol. 1, 88–90, in which the assumption that this mass was the first one is significantly supported.

³¹ Each one of the partbooks bears the ascription: cantus, fol. 12^r, 'Palestina'; altus, fol. 12^r, 'Palestina'; tenor, fol. 13^r, 'Palestina a voce pari'; bassus, fol. 13^r, 'Palestina'.

³² *Missarum cum quattuor* (sic) *quinque, ac sex vocibus* (Venice: Gardano, 1598) [RISM P661]. The words 'Missæ del Palestina liber 2^o' are handwritten on each of the three remaining partbooks on which the copy is based. Duchamp argues for 'la main du bibliothécaire de l'église Santa Barbara de Mantoue' ('the hand of the librarian of the church of Santa Barbara in Mantua'), without specifying where he got this information or in what period the inscription may have been made. Furthermore, he refers to the copy by the shelf mark 'fondo "Santa Barbara", C 103 a, b, c' (see Duchamp, 'Un manuscrit musical', 291). As far as I am aware, the 'Santa Barbara' collection includes two copies of the second book of Palestrina's masses: one of the *princeps* (Rome: Dorico, 1567) [RISM P660] and one of the second edition. Given that the former is a folio choirbook, Duchamp is undoubtedly referring to the latter; but this copy, that lacks the cantus and bassus partbooks, corresponds in Guglielmo Barblan's catalogue to the record No. 230 and to the former shelf mark S.B. 191. It is definitely the same copy to which Duchamp refers, since this too consists of only three partbooks, but it is not clear where he got the shelf mark he reports (see Conservatorio di musica 'Giuseppe Verdi', Milano, *Catalogo della Biblioteca diretta da Guglielmo Barblan, Fondi Speciali 1: Musiche della Cappella di S. Barbara in Mantova* [Firenze, 1972], 282).

³³ Duchamp, 'Un manuscrit musical', 293. Translations of this and the following citations by the author.

³⁴ Duchamp, 'Un manuscrit musical', 295.

The clarity of the writing, the rhythmic accuracy of the prosody, and the silences arranged over the cadences denote a special attention paid to the text, as demanded by the fathers of the Council of Trent. In addition to the brief five-voice Requiem that the Roman composer added to the reissue of his first book of masses in 1591, this mass hence represents a complete polyphonic setting for the liturgy of the dead which must be added to its catalogue... in this important piece of work, it does not seem that the style of Palestrina may be called into question.

Setting aside the usual clichés of the musicological tradition regarding the requests of the Council fathers,³⁵ the evidence shows that this Requiem, like the Barcelona setting, is not actually by Palestrina either—or at least, it is not entirely by Palestrina. The sequence is, in fact, also found in the codex TurBN I.27 (the ‘Staffarda Codex’), within the *Missa pro defunctis* by Engarandus Juvenis.³⁶ I was not able to track down a correspondence for the remaining sections elsewhere, and the ascription to Palestrina cannot therefore be excluded *a priori*. After all, the practice of combining sections extrapolated from different masses while copying a new manuscript was fairly common, especially up to the fifteenth century when only a manuscript tradition existed. However, as I will demonstrate, the remaining sections of this Requiem have some characteristics that make the attribution highly unlikely.

Comparing the two versions of the sequence (see Table 3),³⁷ some of the features pointed out by Duchamp become clearer. The original structure does not include the two consecutive polyphonic stanzas in the finale, but follows strictly in *alternatim* only up to the ‘Juste judex’ stanza. At this point there are six plainchant stanzas, followed by the polyphonic setting of ‘Lachrimosa’. Amongst the features that Duchamp fails to mention is the fact that in the Ferrara codex the three stanzas ‘Qui Mariam’, ‘Inter oves’, and ‘Oro supplex’ are a reworking of the three stanzas ‘Quid sum miser’, ‘Liber scriptus’, and ‘Juste judex’, respectively. It seems likely that the scribe of Ferrara tried to fill the void of the original version by replacing the monodic stanzas with some of the previous polyphonic ones, easily adapting a poetic text like the *Dies irae* which has exactly the same rhyme scheme and metre.

Since Duchamp was not aware of the link between the two sources, he was unable to reconstruct the structure of the sequence. However, he also missed other aspects that clearly reveal the sequence as a foreign body within the mass and indeed within Palestrina’s corpus as a whole. First of all, the sequence is clearly a late fifteenth century cycle, with a compositional style that is strikingly archaic. The imitative contrapuntal

³⁵ For a complete bibliography on this topic see Daniele Sabaino, ‘Ancora su ricezione ed ermeneutica delle prescrizioni ‘musicali’ del Concilio di Trento: nuove considerazioni a partire dall’esperienza della Diocesi di Cremona’, in *Cara Scientia mia, musica: studi per Maria Caraci Vela*, ed. Angela Romagnoli et al., *Diverse voci... 14*, 2 vols., (Pisa, 2018), vol. 2, 601-26 at 610-11, nn. 38 and 39.

³⁶ The manuscript can be dated between the late fifteenth and early sixteenth centuries; originally found in the library of the abbey of Santa Maria di Staffarda (CN), at present it is part of the ‘Riserva Musicale’ collection of the Biblioteca Nazionale Universitaria in Turin. The codex contains compositions of a mixed nature, sacred and secular. Some of these are *unica*, such as a Magnificat, a *Missa pro defunctis* and a *Salve Regina* ascribed to ‘Enguerandus’ or ‘Engarandus Juvenis’, an obscure composer of whom no trace can be found anywhere. Paolo Robotti devoted his master’s degree thesis to the codex, drawing an article from it a few years later (see Paolo Robotti, ‘Le composizioni musicali del manoscritto Ris.Mus. I, 27 della Biblioteca Nazionale di Torino: Aspetti della polifonia sacra, con particolare riferimento alla Messa “Pro Defunctis”’ [Master’s diss., Università degli Studi di Torino, 1979]; and Paolo Robotti, ‘Il Manoscritto Ris. Mus. I, 27’, in *Medioevo musicale nel Marchesato di Saluzzo*, ed. Carla Bianco [Torino, 1996], 31-46).

³⁷ The stanzas in round brackets are in plainchant, those in square brackets indicate the original polyphonic stanza adapted by the scribe.

Table 3. Structure of Engarandus's sequence in the two sources

TurBN I.27	I-FEc MS Cl. II 476
'Dies irae' (‘Quantus tremor’)	'Dies irae' (‘Quantus tremor’)
'Tuba mirum' (‘Mors stupebit’)	'Tuba mirum' (‘Mors stupebit’)
'Liber scriptus' (‘Judex ergo’)	'Liber scriptus' (‘Judex ergo’)
'Quid sum miser' (‘Rex tremendae’)	'Quid sum miser' (‘Rex tremendae’)
'Recordare' (‘Quaerens me’)	'Recordare' (‘Quaerens me’)
'Juste judex' (‘Ingemisco’)	'Juste judex' (‘Ingemisco’)
(‘Qui Mariam’)	'Qui Mariam' [‘Quid sum miser’]
(‘Preces meae’)	(‘Preces meae’)
(‘Inter oves’)	'Inter oves' [‘Liber scriptus’]
(‘Confutatis’)	(‘Confutatis’)
(‘Oro supplex’)	'Oro supplex' [‘Juste judex’]
'Lachrimosa' (‘Judicandus’)	'Lachrimosa' (‘Judicandus’)
'Pie Jesu' – ‘Amen’	'Pie Jesu' – ‘Amen’

fabric is quite loose, the voices echo each other only for very short passages and often they are even left out of the imitative process. In addition to that, the sequence and every internal subdivision end with an open fifth or octave, which is definitely an old-fashioned feature for compositions of Palestrina's age.

Even more relevant is the problem of the overall ranges of the voices (see Table 4). If one sets aside the case of the offertory, in which all the voices undergo an upward shift—which probably calls for a downward transposition in performance³⁸—the sequence turns out to be outside the parameters used in the other sections. It greatly exceeds the range of an *a voci pari* ensemble, with a cantus part that covers a range of almost two octaves (*c'–bb''*); this could not be compensated through a downward transposition, given that in the sequence the bassus is already at the lower limits of its range (*G*).

Finally, the most obvious anomaly must be pointed out, which is that the entire 'Liber scriptus' stanza and, in the Ferrara version, its 'Inter oves' reworking as well, is fashioned in two-part counterpoint (cantus and altus). There is no similar case in Palestrina's whole output, whereas this practice was still widespread amongst the

³⁸ The transposition criteria between the fifteenth and the seventeenth centuries differed depending on the period and region. For a complete overview of the practice see Patrizio Barbieri, "Chiavette" and Modal Transposition in Italian Practice (1500–1837), in *Recercare* 3 (1991), 5–79 at 35–57.

Table 4. Voice ranges of the Requiem in I-FEcCl. II 476

	Introit	Kyrie	Sequence	Offertory	Sanctus	Agnus Dei	Communion
C							
A							
T							
B							

previous generations of composers. If the features hitherto highlighted may be questionable, I believe the latter leaves little room for interpretation; even with no awareness of the connection with the Staffarda codex, it is unreasonable to consider this sequence an authentic work by Palestrina.

Looking at the Ferrara codex from this perspective, a number of questions arise. It is clear that the sequence is the only foreign element of this mass, and that the remaining sections were probably composed by the same author. So why would this composer—or a scribe—turn to a composer as old and obscure as Engarandus Juvenis to dig out a sequence that clashes so remarkably with the rest of the Requiem? Did he not have other options? I cannot believe that he chose it because it was a particularly favoured setting, given that it is found only in TurBN I.27. And then again, how could he have had access to a cycle with such a limited circulation? These questions remain unanswered, at least for the moment.

A look at the remaining sections reveals a Requiem that differs from the five-voice setting in many respects. In the first place, it has a different structure: the Requiem for five voices comprises three Ordinary sections (Kyrie, Sanctus, and Agnus Dei) to which only one Proper section is combined (offertory). The Ferrara Requiem, on the other hand, also includes the introit and communion. Moreover, in the four-voice mass all the sections (with the exception of the Kyrie) open with a plainchant intonation, including internal subdivisions (i.e., the second and third verses of the Agnus Dei and for the first line of the verses of the introit, offertory, and communion).³⁹ In the other setting, in contrast, plainchant is never employed.

Since the Kyrie never uses the intonation, the masses have three common sections upon which a comparison can be made: the offertory, Sanctus, and Agnus Dei. While there is roughly an equal number of masses over the whole repertoire with and without intonations in the Sanctus and Agnus Dei, the statistics are different for the offertory. Plainchant is nearly always used at the beginning of the response, in the short form ‘Domine Jesu Christe’ (Italy) or in the longer one through the addition of ‘rex gloriae’

³⁹ The Kyrie is the only section that never opens with the plainchant intonation. It is likely that during the performance each internal section (‘Kyrie’/‘Christe’/ ‘Kyrie’) was repeated three times, alternating chant and polyphony, in order to obtain a ninefold reiteration (see Rees, *The Requiem*, 167-70).

(Spain). On the other hand, the verse ‘Hostias et preces’ usually opens with plainchant, with polyphony reserved for the latter section ‘Tu suscipe’ and the *repetenda* ‘Quam olim Abrahae’. Less commonly, the entire verse is sung either in plainchant or polyphony. The Requiem for five voices by Palestrina excludes the intonation for both the response and the verse, and shapes the whole offertory in polyphony. The Ferrara version, on the contrary, begins with the ‘Domine Jesu Christe’ in plainchant, and leaves the first part of the verse ‘Hostias et preces tibi Domine laudis offerimus’ to be sung monodically as well. The latter is therefore shown to be absolutely in line with the most common customs, as opposed to the five-voice setting, which represents an utterly exceptional case: one more aspect on which the two Requiems radically diverge.⁴⁰

There are some other differences between the two masses worth pointing out—differences that at first blush may not seem significant, but which do affect the overall shape of the works. The *a voci pari* setting, for example, is quite unusual in Palestrina’s music. In his whole corpus the only composition with a similar ensemble is the Mantuan mass for four voices mentioned by Duchamp. The motets for four voices *Domine, secundum actum meum* and *Ne recorderis peccata mea, Domine* do also feature this scoring, but they are part of a group of unique compositions.⁴¹ And from a stylistic point of view, many of the most typical features of Palestrina’s writing, as found in the five-voice Requiem as well, are missing. In the Ferrara mass, the imitative counterpoint based on the paraphrased plainchant gives way to a much denser polyphonic texture, in which the voices often move all together and rarely imitate each other.

All the differences identified so far concern compositional issues. If one were inclined to accept the ascription in the manuscript, one might speculate that Palestrina composed the Requiem for a special context. Duchamp suggests the Gonzaga court in Mantua or the Accademia della Morte in Ferrara, and it cannot be excluded that the dissimilarities depend precisely on the diversity of practices widespread outside Rome. However, there is another difference between the two masses, which concerns the text of the offertory: instead of the fragment ‘ne cadant in obscurum’, which was used in the Roman version of the rite, one reads in all four partbooks ‘ne cadant in obscura tenebrarum loca’. This formula, especially common in France and in some regions of the Iberian peninsula,⁴² represents a far more important difference from the previous ones, because

⁴⁰ As far as I am aware, the only Italian Requiems in which the offertory opens directly in polyphony are the four-voice Requiem by Paolo Isnardi [RISM I116], the eight-voice setting by Giulio Belli [RISM B1749], the five-voice setting by Costanzo Porta (*Missarum liber primus*: Venice: Gardano, 1578) [RISM P5180], and the *Missa defunctorum tribus vocibus* by Gianmatteo Asola (*s.l., s.n., s.d.*) [RISM A2609]. In the first two cases the verse is left entirely to the chant, whereas for the others it is all in polyphony; therefore, the latter are the only offertories to have exactly the same structure as Palestrina’s.

⁴¹ The eight motets for four voices from the ‘*Collectio Altemps Minor*’ (see *Le Opere Complete di Giovanni Pierluigi da Palestrina*, vol. 35, ed. Lino Bianchi and Giancarlo Rostirolla [Rome, 2013], XXIII) share some peculiarities, such as the *a voci pari* ensemble: *Ascendes Christus in altum, Domine, secundum actum meum, Ne recorderis peccata mea, Domine*, and *Ecce, nunc benedictus Dominum* (cleffing C3, C3, C3, C4); *Deus, qui animae famuli tui* (C4, C4, C4, C4); *Innocentes pro Christo* and *Princeps gloriosissime* (C1, C1, C1, C3); and *Gaude Barbara, beata* (G2, G2, C1, C2).

⁴² For an examination of the textual variants of the Requiem mass see Jack Eby, ‘A Requiem Mass for Louis XV’, in *Early Music* 29 (2001), 218–32. Although the article concerns a much later repertoire, a thorough account of the pre- and post-Tridentine French tradition can be found in it. Amongst Spanish Requiems that use the alternative version of the text, the setting by Cristóbal de Morales from the *Missarum liber secundus* (Rome: Dorico, 1544) [RISM M3582] deserves mention. The Requiem by Francisco Guerrero is an even more significant case: it had been initially published in France in the *Missarum liber primus* (Paris: du Chemin, 1566) [RISM G4870] with the variant ‘obscura tenebrarum loca’ in the sequence. In its later version found in the *Missarum liber secundus* (Rome: Basa, 1582) [RISM G4872], it was adapted for Italian habits by removing not only the textual variant but the entire corresponding musical passage.

it is of a liturgical rather than a compositional nature. Even assuming that the mass was composed for one of the contexts proposed by Duchamp, it should be remembered that the Accademia della Morte used the Roman rite, while the Mantuan rite at Santa Barbara followed the Roman liturgy, and did not include these kinds of variations.

Believing that a composer like Palestrina could twist his habits in the ways described above—not only compositional but also liturgical—is a truly arduous challenge. As noted, Duchamp starts by attempting to link the mass unnaturally to the Mantuan context by referring to the ‘Palestina’ variant and the *alternatim* of the sequence, even though the former was actually a very widespread variant, found in dozens of codices from the most diverse regions,⁴³ and the latter was the only known practice for the *Dies irae* sequence.⁴⁴ Then, he tries to identify the provenance of the codex through Briquet’s method, which is notoriously unreliable, given the widespread use of watermarks such as those found in this manuscript.⁴⁵ Moreover, the names of the saints that, he suggests, merit investigation are unfortunately amongst the most common ones.⁴⁶ In any case, even if it were possible to demonstrate the northern Italian origin of the codex, in no way would this confirm its ascription to Palestrina.

In light of these factors, I am decidedly inclined to consider this *Missa pro defunctis* a spurious composition. However, some issues remain unresolved, such as the kind of connection that exists between two manuscripts as dissimilar as the Ferrara and the Staffarda codices. In the latter, there is an ownership note on fol. 40r: ‘Ex libris Fratris Brixiani Tapparelli Religiosi Stapharde’. Paolo Robotti discarded the hypothesis that the term ‘Brixianus’ indicates the city of Brescia (Brixia) as a place of birth, claiming it might rather be a first name. Consequently, he identified the former owner of the manuscript as Bersano Tapparelli—a descendant of the Savigliano branch of the noble Tapparelli family—whose activity as a monk is recorded at Staffarda abbey during the latter half of the sixteenth century.⁴⁷ I am quite in favour of Robotti’s suggestion, given that no trace of a Tapparelli family can be found in the Brescia region. Unfortunately, no further assumptions can be made about the origin of the manuscript. Robotti points out some concordances with other codices of the same period, only useful to clarify the authorship of the compositions that have no ascription in the manuscript. Sadly, none of these is found in I-FEc Cl. II 476.⁴⁸

⁴³ For instance the codex BarcOC 1obis, previously mentioned, illustrates a case in which one reads the ascription ‘Misa a 4. de Difuntos de Palestina’. Franz Haberl was already fully aware of the large number of variants with which the composer’s name appears; in 1884 he published a list in *Giovanni Pierluigi da Palestrina’s Werke*, ed. Franz Xaver Haberl, vol. 28 (Leipzig, 1884), i, n. 2.

⁴⁴ Some completely polyphonic settings of the *Dies irae* are found in late sixteenth century Requiems for eight voices. The first case of which I am aware comes from the settings by Giulio Belli (RISM B1749), although in that mass the ensemble is split into two four-voice choirs, which alternately sing the even and odd stanzas; only the final *Pie Jesu* is actually composed for eight voices.

⁴⁵ The symbols identified by Duchamp are the anchor, the double-headed eagle, and the sun with alternating rays (see Duchamp, ‘Un manuscrit musical’, 274–76).

⁴⁶ St. Michael Archangel, St. Peter, St. Lawrence, St. Augustine, and St. Mary Magdalene (see Duchamp, ‘Un manuscrit musical’, 289).

⁴⁷ In his essay, Paolo Robotti says that among the names found in the documents that come from the Staffarda abbey, ‘Bersano Tapparelli’ is the only one that resembles ‘Brixianus’. I believe that ‘Bersano’ was the real Italian name, which was changed to ‘Brixianus’ in an attempt to translate into Latin. See Robotti, ‘Il Manoscritto’, 33–35’.

⁴⁸ The *Missa pro defunctis* by Engarandus is in fact the only funeral composition present in the codex. For a description of its contents see Frank d’Accone (ed.), *Turin, Biblioteca Nazionale Universitaria, MS Ris. Mus. I, 27 (olim qm III. 59)*, Renaissance Music in Facsimile 18 (New York–London, 1986), ix–x.

I would suggest that establishing a direct kinship between the two codices does not seem possible—at least not without making some fairly easily refutable hypotheses. I do not exclude that it is possible that new documents will emerge that could provide more answers. At present, I can only point out that it seems unlikely that TurBN I.27, or a *descriptus* of it, was used as an antigraph by the scribe of I-FEcl. II 476, given that the two sources come from different branches of the tradition. This can be inferred through the only decidedly erroneous reading in TurBN I.27, which is instead correct in I-FEcl. II 476 (see Example 7). In TurBN I.27, the absence of the dot after the *g* semibreve in the altus (b. 86) creates a minim shift, which is compensated by the scribe through an elongation of a further *c'* from minim to semibreve (b. 91).⁴⁹ This leads to a series of inconsistencies, such as the three parallel fourths (*d-g*, *e-a*, *f-b*) between bassus and altus (b. 87) and the parallel fifths (*a-e'*, *b-f'*) between altus and cantus (bb. 89-90), or even harsher dissonances such as the unprepared and unresolved second (*d'-e'*) between altus and cantus (b. 90).⁵⁰ The large number of errors present in I-FEcl. II 476 (especially rhythmic ones) would make it almost impossible for singers to perform the Requiem from the four partbooks.⁵¹ For this reason, I find it difficult to believe that the correct reading in I-FEcl. II 476 (altus, bb. 86-91) depends on an intervention by the scribe, who might have been led by his critical attitude to fix the mistake. This difference only proves that the two sources belong to different branches of a separate tradition, every other vestige of which appears to have been lost.

Conclusions: The Five-Voice Requiem

These two cases clearly demonstrate how establishing the authorship of a composition can be a challenging task, and how easy it can be to fall into error if driven by the desire to make an attribution. I have sought to demonstrate beyond any doubt that the masses are spurious compositions, based on my fortunate discovery of a correspondence in Belli's print and in the Staffarda codex. But would it have been just as simple if I had not been so fortunate? The limitations of stylistic attribution are even more evident in the genre of the Requiem, in which authors employ a more archaic style, resulting sometimes even in compositional clichés. For instance, the chant model is usually treated with much respect, whether it is paraphrased or used as *cantus firmus*. Moreover, in the sections that involve the use of the psalm tone—such as the verse of the introit and communion—

⁴⁹ In I-FEcl. II 476 the dot is placed after the second semibreve of the ligature (*f*) instead of the first (*g*), and this generates an erroneous dissonance on the *thesis* (down-beat) of the second *tactus* of b. 86. Evidently, not even the Ferrara reading is perfectly correct, but this is irrelevant in my opinion, as it rather depends on the *usus scribendi* of the copyist. For each ligature *cum opposita proprietate* in which the first semibreve is dotted, he tends to move the point after the ligature; the effect of rhythmic syncope is thus cancelled and contrapuntal errors are often generated. In his edition, when such cases occur, Duchamp corrects the passage *ope ingenii*, pointing out that 'le point est placé après la note suivante dans la source' ('the dot is placed after the following note') (see Giovanni Pierluigi da Palestrina, *Missa pro defunctis à quatre voix d'hommes*, 14, 18, 19, and 22).

⁵⁰ The passage seems beyond repair regardless of any *facta* intervention. On the one hand, if the *b* flattened, the succession of parallel fifths becomes unacceptable; on the other, without the flat, there is an equally inadmissible root-positioned diminished fifth on the *thesis* of the first *tactus* of b. 90.

⁵¹ Even Duchamp points this out, declaring that 'plusieurs erreurs grossières du copiste en rendent l'exécution difficile' ('several major errors by the scribe make the execution difficult') (Duchamp, 'Un manuscrit musical', 295).

Example 7. Engarandus, *Missa pro defunctis*, sequence bb. 86-91 (comparison of sources)

a. TurBN I.27

86
 — pa - tro - num ro - ga - tu - rus?
 num ro - ga - tu - rus?
 — ro - ga - tu - rus? Dum vix
 tro - num ro - ga - tu - rus?

b. I-FEc Cl. II 476

86
 — pa - tro - num ro - ga - tu - rus?
 num ro - ga - tu - rus? Dum vix
 — ro - ga - tu - rus? Dum vix
 tro - num ro - ga - tu - rus?

most authors tend to enhance its presence by assigning the plainchant line to the tenor, using long notes and accompanying it with a quasi-chordal style in the other voices.

Some of these recurring features may be found in Palestrina's authentic five-part Requiem as well. In the entire mass, he shows great respect for the plainchant melody: the paraphrase is always gentle, often limited to a few embellishments in the cadences, so that the model is constantly recognizable and not lost in the contrapuntal fabric. Significant passages are found, for instance, in the Sanctus, with the plainchant melody preserved in the tenor part; this is especially so in the 'Pleni sunt' section (see Example 8), where it is sung mostly in breves or semibreves. In this case, the composer's desire to keep the intonation formula of the plainchant model intact by using it as a *cantus firmus* is manifest. Along with these features, which prove the composer's intent to echo a more archaic style, other characteristics reveal Palestrina's more familiar attitude towards imitative counterpoint. In the first section of the Kyrie (see Example 9), he constructs a sort of contrapuntal backbone through three integral repetitions of the plainchant melody paraphrased in the *finalis* tone; first in the cantus, then in the quintus, and finally in the tenor. Surrounding this supporting structure, he then combines two fragments—one paraphrasing the plainchant (A) and the other as a sort of countersubject

(B). In the *Agnus Dei*, the author's combinative impulse goes even further (see Example 10): in the first section, the plainchant fragment corresponding to the words 'qui tollis peccata mundi' appears twice (bb. 14-24), first in the altus on the *repercussio* tone, then in the cantus on the *finalis*. The remaining parts follow the plainchant in a quasi-chordal style, and the three internal lines (A, B, and C) of the first episode (bb. 14-17) are recombined in the second (bb. 17-21): fragment A moves from the tenor to the altus, fragment C from the bassus to the tenor, whereas the fragment B remains in the quintus part but a fourth higher. Then, a third repetition of the episode follows (bb. 21-24), but this time the plainchant is absent and only two of the internal lines are repeated (A and C). In my opinion, this passage is extremely fascinating, because Palestrina seems to use a technique which was typical of his parody masses: starting from a polyphonic model—in this case found in the preceding passage—whereby only some of the lines are used, with the remaining ones newly composed. In this case, what results is a sort of cast, a music negative of a plainchant model that is no longer present.

I believe that these few peculiarities of the five-part Requiem that I tried to point out can confirm authorship, thanks to the information that comes directly from the sources. If not supported by strong evidence from the sources, the attribution on stylistic grounds might lead scholars to highly controversial results; on the other hand, in cases when several factors point to the same solution, making hypotheses on stylistic bases seem less unwise, sometimes even unavoidable. In the matter of the two spurious Requiems, I reckon the attribution proposed by Snow, though erroneous, to be much more acceptable than Duchamp's. Belli's compositional style can be mistaken for Palestrina's, and it is difficult to oppose the ascription if one has no other evidence to prove the contrary. In the case of the Ferrara mass, on the other hand, the inconsistencies are so significant that Duchamp should at least have been slightly more sceptical before publishing the mass with a confirmation of Palestrina's authorship.

As for the authentic five-part Requiem, it is reasonable to imagine that had it not been printed by the author, and had it therefore had only manuscript tradition, ironically even its authorship could have been questioned, given the oddity of its structure. More recently, Christian Leitmeir has also investigated the possible significance of this particular organization.⁵² In his analysis, the issue is whether an introit was originally included in this mass, or whether Palestrina intentionally chose not to set it. I believe there are at least a couple of reasons for believing that the latter was the case. First of all, as Leitmeir points out, the sources that transmit the mass were both produced under the composer's supervision and thus they must be considered reliable proofs of his intentions. However, one more unusual feature is the absence of the paraphrased *cantus firmus* in the entire response of the offertory, as already stressed by Schmid.⁵³ In his two complete sets of offertories,⁵⁴ Palestrina uses the same compositional approach even more radically, since none of these compositions is based on the corresponding *cantus firmus*. Therefore, they may be considered actual motets in the shape of a responsory and based upon the text of the offertories. Rodobaldo Tibaldi speculated that this

⁵² Christian Thomas Leitmeir, 'Giovanni Pierluigi da Palestrina (1525/26-94): *Missa pro defunctis* for Five Voices', in Burn (ed.), *The Book of Requiems*; I am thankful to David Burn for granting me access to this unpublished material.

⁵³ Schmid, 'Zum Offertorium', 85.

⁵⁴ *Offertoria totius anni, secundum Sanctae Romanae Ecclesiae consuetudinem, quinque vocibus concinenda* (Rome: Coattino, 1593): *pars prima* [RISM P746]; *pars secunda* [RISM P749].

13

qui tol - lis

qui tol - lis pec - ca - ta mun - di, qui tol - lis

qui tol - lis pec - ca - ta mun - di, qui tol - lis

qui tol - lis pec - ca - ta mun - di, qui tol - lis

di, qui tol - lis pec - ca - ta mun - di,

approach depends on Palestrina's desire to create a repertoire of elevation motets fashioned upon the texts of the offertories, to cover the whole liturgical year: a complete set of motets independent from the *cantus firmus*, so as to be freely composed, but based on the liturgical text of the corresponding feast, in order to obtain the highest liturgical relevance.⁵⁵ In my opinion, the offertory of the *Missa pro defunctis* performs a similar function: it is a motet in the shape of a responsory based upon the text of the offertory of the Requiem mass. The responsorial structure is carefully observed, in order for the text to fully express its meaning; as a result, the music underlines the presence of the *repetenda*, but refuses the *cantus firmus* for the entire response. Thus, Palestrina obtains a more freely composed counterpoint, while maintaining the text and the structure of the offertory.

At the Cappella Giulia, the weekday performance of polyphonic Requiem masses that included three Ordinary sections and the offertory is testified by the *diario cerimoniale* of Andrea Amici (canon of St. Peter in the years 1602-20), as reported by Noel O'Regan in his article on music in St. Peter's cathedral:

[la messa] è stata cantata all'altare de *santi* Processo e Martiniano con obbligo in musica, cioè s'è cantato il Kyrie, l'offertorio, il Sanctus et l'Agnus Dei, et in fine il responsorio Libera me Domine.⁵⁶

[the mass] was sung in polyphony at the altar of the Saints Processus and Martinian, i.e., the Kyrie, the offertory, the Sanctus, and the Agnus dei were sung, and eventually the responsory *Libera me, Domine*.

The episode in question is dated 17 April 1617 and concerns the anniversary of the death of Cardinal Anton Maria Salviati. Amici specifies the sections of the mass that were sung 'con obbligo in musica' (i.e., in polyphony), and these correspond to the sections of Palestrina's mass, with the addition of the responsory *Libera me, Domine*. So, it could

⁵⁵ See *Edizione Nazionale delle Opere di Giovanni Pierluigi da Palestrina (1525-1594)*, vol. 6, ed. Rodobaldo Tibaldi (Rome, 2018), xii.

⁵⁶ Noel O'Regan, 'Music in the Liturgy of San Pietro in Vaticano During the Reign of Paul V (1605-1621): A Preliminary Survey of the Liturgical Diary (Part 1) of Andrea Amici', in *Recercare* 11 (2019), 119-51 at 135.

be easily suggested that the Requiem sung for the cardinal was precisely Palestrina's cycle, given also that a manuscript version of the mass, with the addition of a five-part *Libera me, Domine* by Palestrina himself, is found in the codex Città del Vaticano, Biblioteca Apostolica Vaticana, Ms. Capp. Giulia XV.15. Since we possess no further elements, it is impossible to be perfectly confident about it, but I believe this uncertainty leaves room for an even more fascinating doubt. By inverting the perspective, one could presume that the mass mentioned by Amici does not have this peculiar structure because it is necessarily the mass by Palestrina, but rather that Palestrina fashioned his mass this way because Kyrie, offertory, Sanctus, and Agnus Dei were the only sections that were actually sung in polyphony at the Cappella Giulia during the *pro defunctis* rite.

Such a reversal of approach radically changes the sense of the reasoning. Since the Gloria and Credo are not part of the *pro defunctis* rite, what remains of the Ordinary sections is the Kyrie, Sanctus, and Agnus Dei. In the same way, the Gloria and Credo were almost never sung during weekday masses, in order to contain the duration of a celebration that was less solemn than the Sunday mass. The only further moment that provided the use of polyphony was the offertory, for which a motet was usually chosen. Therefore, it may be inferred that at the Cappella Giulia the Requiem mass was intended as a *Missa ferialis*, with the addition of an offertory to be sung as a motet for the elevation: in light of this structure, one can easily imagine that Palestrina composed a Requiem mass that perfectly matched the customs of the musical institution for which he worked for the best part of his life. If one supports such an interpretation, the reasons behind this unique structure become clearer. More thorough examination of the documents from the Cappella Giulia archives may provide further information supporting this theory.

Abstract

Three Requiem masses, one for five voices and two for four voices, have been attributed to Giovanni Pierluigi da Palestrina with different degrees of certainty. A thorough analysis of sources, as well as stylistic and liturgical features, reveals that an alternative attribution can be inferred for two of them. The five-voice Requiem is the only one that can be attributed to Palestrina with certainty. However, the oddity of its structure leaves room for some speculation about the role of *pro defunctis* masses at the Cappella Giulia in the late Renaissance.