Ad Magnificat, Antiphona.

7. a

A

D Jesum autem cum venīssent, * ut vi-dérunt
But after they were come to Jesus, when they saw that

e-um jam mórtu-um, non fregérunt e-jus crura: sed
he was already dead, they did not break his legs.

unus mí-li-tum lánce-a latus e-jus apéra-it, et con-
But one of the soldiers with a spear opened his side:

tí-nu-o ex-i-vit sanguis et a-qua. Eu o u a e
and immediately there came out blood and water.

2. Et exsultavit ... (Guerrero, 4v) — **Soprano** carries Mode vii PsTn

4. Quia fecit mihi magna ... (Morales, 4v) — **Tenor** carries Mode vii PsTn

6. Fecit potentiam ... (Guerrero, 4v) — **Tenor** carries Mode vii PsTn

8. Esurientes implevit bonis ... (Guerrero, 4v) — **Bass** carries Mode vii PsTn

10. Sicut locutus est ... (Palestrina, 4v) — **Soprano & Tenor** carry Mode vii PsTn

12. Et nunc, et semper ... (Guerrero, 5v) — **Alto** carries Mode vii PsTn
2. Et exsultavit spiritus meus in Deo salutari meo.

Magnificat anima mea Dominum. 2. Et exsultavit

animam meam Dominum. 2. Et exsultavit
TENOR

ALTO
(Contratenor)

BASS
(Bassus)
Qua facit mihi magna qui potens est, et sanctum nomen eius.
Those who sing Renaissance music have freedom with regard to Text Underlay for three reasons: (1) it is difficult to ascertain the composer’s intentions; (2) the part books are not always clear; (3) composers showed flexibility. Verse 6 (below) is an excellent example, and the editor has changed Text Underlay based on his study of the part books, which are conveniently printed on the opposite page. Dr. Owen Rees, Professor at Oxford, in 2017 published Reworking in the motets of Francisco Guerrero, a marvelous document, and two of his examples (1555v1570—1555v1589) are provided. Sometimes Text Underlay is puzzling; e.g. Missa Salve Regina by Victoria seems to demand different pronunciations of “Kyrie Eleison” in the same movement! Yet sometimes it could not be more simple; e.g. the Bass line for Verse 8.

Scholars are divided on whether the Text Underlay was done by the composer or the publisher. Jane Bernstein (Oxford University Press, 1998) says: “a reader would check one of the earliest sheets pulled from the press. [The printer]—or a professional proofreader knowledgeable in music—presumably did this task for many of the music editions, particularly the anthologies, but a composer or his representative was usually responsible for correcting commissioned publications of his own works.” She gives two examples where proofreading was undertaken by a surrogate because the composer himself could not be present. Richard Agee (University of Rochester Press, 1998) says: “while music historians might be drawn to the possibility of extensive composer collaboration with in-house editing in printing houses, it is most likely that the printers themselves—who would be forced to reset the type of any portions of the book found objectionable by the composer—would have wanted as little interference as necessary after they had received a fair copy of the music.” Although he cites possible involvement by the composer in the editing process in the cases of editions of Cypriano de Rore (d. 1565), Giosseffo Zarlino (d. 1590), and Orlando de Lassus (d. 1594), Agee nevertheless concludes that “as standard practice it would appear that composers rarely participated in the proofreading process.” But Tess Knighton (Bulletin of Spanish Studies, 2012) emphasizes the evidence from Spanish printing contracts which say “it was the composer who was responsible for proofreading and corrections.” When we consider the utter perfection of the Renaissance compositions, it is somewhat difficult to accept that composers such as Guerrero did not care whether their scores were reproduced accurately; it would be like suggesting that Michelangelo never bothered to pop his head into the Sistine Chapel to see how the ceiling came out.
Nacho Alvarez confirmed (3 April 2020) his source book was “copied from a modern Spanish book FULL of typos, errors, and mistakes.” Text underlay for Soprano seems poor: 

Fe-cit po-ten-ti-am in bra-chio su-o di-

一审, the second verse (Guerrero) placed PsTn in Soprano. The fourth verse (Morales) placed PsTn in Tenor. The sixth verse (Guerrero) also places PsTn in Tenor, allowing an “apples to apples” comparison between Father Morales and his pupil, Father Guerrero.

When you see “ij” or “//” it means some part of the text is repeated. The Alto line here demonstrates that it isn’t always easy to know which part to repeat; specifically, should the word “in” be repeated, or just the word “bracchio.”

The fourth note of the Bass line has a “ligature.” Why did composers continue using ligatures, even after some were no longer necessary from a notation standpoint? We can assume: (1) “tradition” played a role; (2) making sure the syllable was not broken; (3) reminding the singers of the plainsong origins.

Di-sper-sit su-per-bos [men-te cor-dis su-i.]
Towards the end, the Alto voice has a most remarkable ascending stepwise passage (more than an octave). This technique is reminiscent of something Felix Mendelssohn like to do; cf. Trio in D Minor (op. 49) Finale measure 251 and Scherzo measure 133.

This section demonstrates common difficulties with Musica Ficta, because certain notes have sharps added while others do not; cf. Soprano measure 88. With regard to Musica Ficta, a particularly difficult section begins in measure 74; editors struggle with this.

Notice the lyrical way Father Guerrero sets the words speaking of God sending the rich away empty: Esuriéntes implévit bónis: et divites dimisit inánes.—“He has filled the hungry with good things, but sent the rich away empty-handed.” Father Guerrero makes up for the incomplete chord in measure 88 by elongating the C-Sharp as much as possible.
The second verse (Father Guerrero) placed the PsTn in Soprano. The fourth verse (Father Morales) placed the PsTn in Tenor. The sixth verse (Father Guerrero) also placed PsTn in Tenor, allowing “apples to apples” comparison. The eighth verse (Father Guerrero) has the PsTn in the Bass voice, transposed down a fourth. Notice how Father Guerrero—or his publisher—places a large X on the Ti notes. That’s because a natural tendency (pardon the pun!) would be to flatten Ti into Te, because of Musica Ficta rules. Therefore, the singer is reminded here NOT to do that. The same thing occurs in the Alto.
The following verse—Verse #10—comes from Palestrina’s collection of Magnificat Settings publ. in Rome (1591 AD). There is nothing wrong with what Father Guerrero wrote for Verse #10, but now you can compare what other composers did. The plainsong melody is more or less used in canon at the unison (Soprano and Tenor).

[Music notation for the plainsong melody and its counter-melody is shown with annotations explaining the libreto and the use of the plainsong in the composition.]
A N ORGANIST, singer, and famed composer, PALESTRINA (d. 1594) uses the Mode 7 “Psalms Tone” as the basis for this movement, but does so differently than Father Morales or Father Guerrero. Carefully study the excerpts and see whether you agree that they come from the plainsong—then notice them as you sing them! For the record, the 1570s was difficult for Palestrina: he lost his brother, two of his sons, and his first wife in three separate outbreaks of the plague: 1572, 1575, and 1580, respectively.
FATHER Guerrero follows a very common practice in this final movement—he adds an extra voice. (Jeff Ostrowski has called this voice “Quintus” and recommends that altos and tenors join together, for a variety of reasons.)

Father Sebastián de Vivanco (ordained a priest in 1581) was the first peninsular composer to make a regular habit of printing two alternate Gloria settings at his Magnificat endings: the first Gloria not increasing the number of voices nor displaying the composer’s contrapuntal prowess; the second Gloria increasing voices and spurted with contrapuntal geyers. (This observation comes from Robert Murrell Stevenson.) A printed rubric always appears at the end of the simpler Gloria and usually reads as follows: “Verte folium et alteram videbis” (Turn the leaf and you will see another [Gloria])—such a wonderful and practical idea!

Mode 7 PsTn is in the Alto voice:

\[
\begin{align*}
\text{S} & \quad \text{Sic ut érat in princi} \\
\text{A} & \quad \text{Sic ut érat in} \\
\text{Q} & \quad \text{Sic ut érat in} \\
\text{T} & \quad \text{Sic ut érat, sic ut érat, in} \\
\text{B} & \quad \text{Sic ut érat}
\end{align*}
\]
Some will disagree, but it seems Guerrero has introduced a “free counter-melody” (free meaning “not taken from the plainsong”) based on ascending and descending fifths and octave leaps; but only in the Bass, Tenor, and Quintus voices.

**ALTO (Superius II)**

Francisci Guerrero.

**QUINTUS (Contratenor)**

**BASS (Bassus)**

**TENOR**
et nunc, et semper, semper, et

nunc, et semper, et

et nunc, et semper, et in saecula saeculorum, amen, saeculorum, amen,

in saecula saeculorum, amen, saeculorum, amen,
When composers set the Magnificat—“Our Lady’s own hymn”—they write sixteen (16) versions: even and odd for each mode. For Sacred Music Symposium 2020, we sang the “even” setting by Guerrero, which uses plainsong for the odd verses. It seemed appropriate to include a few examples from Guerrero’s Mode 7 “odd” setting. Notice the stunning capital letters. Notice, also, the PsTn placed in the Soprano voice, as well as how the word “Magnificat” is sung in the treble range. Finally, notice the ascending “free counter-melody.”

We will not be surprised Verse 7 has the PsTn in the Tenor voice:
SOPRANO • “Quia Fecit” (Father Morales, 1542)

ALTO • “Quia Fecit” (Father Morales, 1542)

TENOR • “Quia Fecit” (Father Morales, 1542)

BASS • “Quia Fecit” (Father Morales, 1542)
WE HAVE now sung the Guerrero/Morales/Palestrina technique: placing the PsTn in different voices, using the PsTn in augmentation, adding variety to the different movements through by means of various methods, and so on. To demonstrate how commonplace that technique was, we include below an excerpt by Orlando de Lassus (d. 1594). In many ways, Lassus was quite a different type of composer—in particular, his preference for chordal (horizontal) textures. Yet, he still uses the same techniques we’ve emphasized, e.g. placing the PsTn in different voices.

Notice how in Verse 10 (below), Lassus places the PsTn in the Tenor voice. Notice, also, how the PsTn is treated in a “cursive” manner, rather than an “accentual” manner. It will be remembered that Gregorian composers used cursive cadences, accentual cadences, and (sometimes) a mixture of both for psalmody. A cadence which takes the Tonic Accent into consideration—repeating notes if necessary—is “accentual.” A cadence which operates without respect to the Tonic Accent is “cursive” (a.k.a. “fixed”).

Lassus wrote something like 200+ Magnificat settings, and these are ripe for further investigation!
nostros, ad patres nostros, ad patres nostros,
nostros, ad patres, nostros, ad patres nostros,
nostros, ad patres, nostros, ad patres nostros,

Abraham, et semiinis in saecula, et
Abraham, et semiinis in saecula, et

Abraham, et semiinis in saecula, et

Abraham, et semiinis in saecula, et

Abraham, et semiinis in saecula, et
WE SHOULD NOT be surprised that Father Victoria uses the same techniques as his fellow Spanish composers (Morales+Guerrero), or his teacher (Palestrina). His setting of the Mode 7 Magnificat places the PsTn in various voices, but not the Bass voice (as we saw Guerrero do in Verse 8 above). Placing the PsTn in the Bass voice seems to be *relatively* uncommon. Here is an example of Victoria placing the PsTn in the Tenor I voice: