

Daniele Sabaino

University of Pavia - Cremona

Lasso's motets: A case study in different layers of tonal type problematic nature*

1.1. The concept of mode in Renaissance polyphony has been widely criticised in the last thirty years.¹ However, many musicologists still believe that it cannot be completely dismissed,² because the process of ascribing a given composition to a specific mode (no matter how difficult it might prove to be) can have an epistemological/hermeneutical value in itself, and because, all things considered, the idea that Renaissance composers, when they were to compose a piece of music, were concerned with the modes only *a posteriori* – i.e. they did not have in their mind any criterion with which to organise the tonal space – seems still really hard to believe (not to say utterly unbelievable).

Discovering such organisation in actual pieces, however, can be (and really is) controversial. To cope with the issue, the principle of 'tonal type' as defined by Harold Powers is therefore of invaluable help, as it permits to work sensibly with the music without blurring at the very first step of the examination the distinction between the individual features of a composition and the modal categories of the theoretical tradition(s).³

* Contents and conclusions of this paper have been discussed at length with Marco Mangani as a part of a wider research project that we are carrying on within our Faculty. I am also grateful to my students Antonio Chemotti and Francesco Molmenti for their valuable help during many phases of the research.

¹ The debate stirred up immediately with Carl Dahlhaus' review of Bernhard Meier's *Die Tonarten der klassischen Vokalpolyphonie, nach den Quellen dargestellt* (Utrecht: Oosthoek, Scheltema & Holkema, 1974; English translation revised by the author: *The Modes of Classical Vocal Polyphony Described According to the Sources*, New York: Broude Brothers, 1988) published in *Die Musikforschung*, 29 (1976), pp. 300-303 and 354-356, and it has going on almost relentlessly ever since.

² See CRISTLE COLLINS JUDD, "Introduction: Analyzing Early Music", in: *Tonal Structures in Early Music*, ed. Cristle Collins Judd (New York and London: Garland, 1998), pp. 3-13.

³ See especially HAROLD S. POWERS, "Tonal Types and Modal Categories in Renaissance Polyphony", *Journal of the American Musicological Society*, 14 (1981), pp. 428-470; "Modal Representation in Polyphonic Offertories", *Early Music History*, 2 (1982), pp. 43-86; "Is Mode Real? Pietro Aron, the Octenary System, and Polyphony", *Basler Jahrbuch für historische Musikpraxis*, 16 (1992), pp. 9-52; "Modality as a

1.2. Still, any try at mapping the recurrent links between tonal types and represented modes seems to hint that each tonal type has its own problematic nature with respect to the modal system (or systems: the situation seems to undergo very few changes taking into account either the eight- or the twelve-mode system); or, to say it in another (and maybe more ‘Powersian’) way, that different tonal types ‘resist’ differently to modal ascription.

This fact – which can have some significant consequences in the field of modal studies as well as for the interpretation of Powers’ methodological legacy – appears to have gone practically unnoticed in the musicological literature. In order to verify its consistency (firstly noted while working on the paper read at the first Kraków *Early Music Congress* in 2003⁴), Marco Mangani and I have thoroughly scrutinised Palestrina’s *Offertoria totius anni* and *Motecta festorum totius anni*.⁵ The scrutiny has showed that:

(a) even in the modally ordered collection:

- some modal categories openly conflict with the corresponding modal outlines described by whomever theorist;
- certain modes are musically less clear-cut than others;

(b) in the non-modally ordered collection, the uneven characteristics of what that, according to the theorists, contribute to determine a mode (i.e. Tenor *ambitus*, cadential plan, and *exordium*) suggest that, with respect to that determination, (at least) three kinds of tonal types exist:

- unproblematic tonal types, or tonal types ‘of problematic nature of grade zero’ ($\flat\text{-g}_2\text{-G}$, $\flat\text{-g}_2\text{-F}$, $\sharp\text{-c}_1\text{-G}$, $\flat\text{-c}_1\text{-G}$, $\flat\text{-c}_1\text{-F}$): that is, the tonal types whose relationships with the represented modes are easy recognizable;
- less obvious tonal types, or tonal types ‘of problematic nature of grade one’ or ‘of moderate problematic nature’ ($\sharp\text{-g}_2\text{-D}$, $\flat\text{-c}_1\text{-D}$, $\sharp\text{-g}_2\text{-G}$): i.e., the tonal types whose associations with the represented modes are less firmly tied because of some ‘elements of disturbance’;
- ‘tricky’ tonal types, or tonal types ‘of problematic nature of grade two’ or ‘of severe problematic nature’ ($\sharp\text{-g}_2\text{-C}$, $\sharp\text{-g}_2\text{-A}$, $\sharp\text{-c}_1\text{-A}$, $\flat\text{-g}_2\text{-A}$): that is, the tonal types whose possible modal links are absolutely awkward, owing to the fact that they display – so to speak – as many elements ‘of modal disturbance’ as of ‘modal corroboration’.

1.3. What that analysis seems to put forward, thus, is that complete scepticism about the ‘reality’ of the modal categories is not fully justified. The famous Powersian question *Is mode real?*, in other words, cannot be considered any longer just a rhetorical question with implicit, negative answer. Instead, it should be regarded as a true epistemological question, and maybe reformulated as *In what way and to what extent is mode*

European Cultural Construct”, in: *Secondo Convegno Europeo di Analisi Musicale. Atti*, ed. Rossana Dalmondo and Mario Baroni (Trento: Università degli Studi di Trento, Dipartimento di storia della civiltà europea, 1992), pp. 207-219; “Anomalous Modalities”, in: *Orlando di Lasso in der Musikgeschichte*, ed. Bernhard Schmid (München: Bayerischen Akademie der Wissenschaften, 1996), pp. 221-242. See also FRANS WIERING, *The Language of the Modes. Studies in the History of Polyphonic Music* (New York: Routledge, 2001); “Internal and External Views of the Modes”, in: *Tonal Structures in Early Music*, pp. 87-107.

⁴ MARCO MANGANI – DANIELE SABAINO, “*Modo Novo*” or “*Modo Antichissimo*”? Some Remarks About La-Modes in Zarlino’s Theoretical Thought, in: *Early Music. Context and Ideas. International Conference in Musicology* (Kraków: Institute of Musicology, Jagellonian University, 2003), pp. 36-49.

⁵ MARCO MANGANI – DANIELE SABAINO, *Tonal Types and Modal Attribution in Late Renaissance Polyphony: New Observations*, expanded version of the paper read at the 18th Congress of the International Musicological Society (Zurich, 10-15 July 2007), forthcoming.

real? without any risk of turning into Meierian ultras and without any need to dismiss the very idea of tonal type. And this precisely because *tonal types are not all equal with respect to modal representation*.

1.4. Further research has then confirmed that such a problematic nature of tonal types is not exclusive of Palestrina's works, but can be considered constitutive of many (late) sixteenth-century compositions, and so a common feature of (late) Renaissance polyphony. In this paper I will thus examine some collections of Lasso's motets from this point of view, in order to exemplify on a relatively broader spectrum the different layers of tonal type problematic nature as well as to validate – albeit still provisionally – the assumption itself of considering the level of deviation of a piece from one or more of the elements that all the Renaissance theoretical tradition agrees on considering the main modal parameters (Tenor *ambitus*, cadential plan and *exordium*) as a useful tool for the analysis of the tonal space of (late) sixteenth-century music, and, ultimately, for a better definition of the very concept of mode.

The best way to go through such an examination – as it was the case with Palestrina – is of course to compare collections modally ordered by Lasso himself with other collections not-modally ordered neither by him nor by the publisher.⁶ Because of the limited space allowed to this paper, I will restrict myself to the following books of motets:

- (1) *Sacrae cantiones quinque vocum tum viva voce tum omnis generis instrumentis cantatu commodissime*, Nuremberg 1562 (RISM 1562a, LW 1562-4: hereafter L-1562): 25 motets in modal order;
- (2) *Moduli quinis vocibus nunquam hactenus editi*, Paris 1571 (RISM 1571a, LW 1571-4: hereafter L-1571): 19 motets in modal order;
- (3) *Patrocinium musices [...] Prima pars. Cantionum, quas mutetas vocant, opus novum. Prima pars*, Munich 1573 (RISM 1573a, LW 1573-9: hereafter L-1573): 21 motets ordered by number of voices (1-7, 4v; 8-14, 5v; 15-21, 6v);
- (4) *Sacrae cantiones quinque vocum quae tum viva voci, tum omnis generis instrumentis musicis commodissime applicari possunt*, Munich 1582 (RISM 1582d, LW 1582-6: hereafter L-1582); 20 motets ordered by system and cleffing.⁷

2.1. Tables 1 and 2 summarise the content of each collection as it appears in the respective *editio princeps*.

The modal order suggests a close relationship between tonal types and represented modes: apart from the relevant exception of L-1571/7 as well as from the question of the distinction between the third and the fourth mode – both of which I will discuss below –, only the sixth mode is represented by more than one tonal type (\natural - g_2 -C in L-1562, \flat - c_1 -F and \natural - c_1 -F in L-1571). Modes 1 and 2 appear always transposed *per bemolle*.

We can therefore assume this relationship as substantial and proceed to verify the

⁶ PETER BERGQUIST, "Modal Ordering within Orlando di Lasso's Publications", in: *Orlando di Lasso Studies*, ed. Peter Bergquist, Cambridge, Cambridge University Press, 1999), pp. 203-226 has argued convincingly that the arrangement within Lasso's modally ordered collections comes from the author himself and reflect his intentions. See especially pp. 222-224.

⁷ Modern editions: ORLANDO DI LASSO, *The Complete Motets 2* (ed. James Erb), 8-9 (ed. Peter Bergquist), and 12 (ed. Rebecca Wagner Oettinger; Middleton: A-R Editions, 2002, 1999, 2000, and 2001 respectively). The «LW» number refers to *Orlando di Lasso. Seine Werke in zeitgenössischen Drucken 1555-1687*, ed. Horst Leuchtman and Bernhold Schmid (Kassel – Basel: Bärenreiter, 2001).

evenness of each group by examining the main modal parameters: Tenor *ambitus*, *exordia*, and cadential plans.

2.2. Before going into the details of such an analysis, however, let me sound some cautionary notes about the constitution and classification of cadences. For clarity's sake, in this paper I will first distinguish between *clausulae* and cadences, reserving the former term to those standard melodic movements occurring in a single voice that Meier has labelled *cantizans*, *altizans*, *tenorizans*, *basizans* according to the intervallic quality and direction of the movement,⁸ and the latter term to the contrapuntal combinations of at least two *clausulae* that mark the end of a musical segment in relation to the division of the literary text into significant units⁹ (the identification of a cadence, in other words, is here subject to more constraints than in Maier's book, as a combination of *clausulae* is considered a cadence only if, when and where it satisfies not only *musical*, but also *textual* specific conditions).¹⁰ For a better evaluation of the 'specific gravity' of each cadence in the context of an entire composition (and with respect to a particular mode or tonal type), I will then go beyond the simple opposition *cadenza realizzata* vs. *cadenza fuggita* (cadence brought to the end or full cadence vs. cadence not brought to the end or avoided cadence) that Meier derived from Zarlino, and – bearing in mind that the line which goes from completely *fuggite* to completely affirmed cadences is a continuous, and not a discrete one – I will categorise the different kinds of cadences that occur in each motet as follows:¹¹

(1) Partial cadences: two or more voices form a cadence, but the musical stream continues in one or more other voice(s). Each *clausula* of the cadence can be:

(I) *fuggita*

(i) by apocope of the last note (truncated partial cadence);

(ii) by alteration of the 'normal' /expected progression of a *clausula* (deviated partial cadence);

(iii) by a brief continuation of the melodic movement on the same text syllable (prolonged partial cadence);

(II) *realizzata*, i.e. brought to the end (partial cadence with full *clausulae*).

(2) Evaded cadences: all the active voices take part in the cadential process, but at least one of them avoids its 'normal' conclusion by:

(i) omitting the last note (truncated cadence);

⁸ See MEIER, *The Modes*, pp. 91-93.

⁹ See GIOSEFFO ZARLINO, *Le Istitutioni Harmoniche* (Venice: [Pietro da Fino? Francesco Franceschi?], 1558; facs. repr. New York: Broude Brothers, 1965], part. IV, ch. 53, p. 221: «La Cadenza adunque è un certo atto, che fanno le parti della cantilena cantando insieme, la qual dinota, o quiete generale dell'harmonia, o la perfezione del senso delle parole, sopra le quali la cantilena è composta [...] non è però da usarla, se non quando si ariva alla Clausula, ovvero al Periodo contenuto nella Prosa, o nel Verso; cioè in quella parte, che termina il Membro di essa, ovvero una delle sue parti. Onde la Cadenza è di tanto valore nella Musica, quanto il Punto nella Oratione; et si può veramente chiamare Punto della Cantilena».

¹⁰ The restraint follows and develops the idea of 'double segmentation' that Marco Mangani has proposed for the analysis of Renaissance *Canzonette* and *Villanelle*. See MARCO MANGANI, *Per un'analisi delle forme minori tra Cinque e Seicento*, PhD Diss., University of Bologna, 1997; "Proposta d'un metodo di segmentazione per l'analisi delle forme vocali minori tra Cinque e Seicento", *Quaderni di Analitica*, 1 (2001), pp. 99-135; *Segmenti polifonici e frasi musicali nel primo libro delle Villanelle di Luca Marenzio*, in: *Miscellanea Marenziana*, ed. Maria Teresa Rosa Barezzani and Antonio Delfino (Pisa: ETS, 2007), pp. 497-532.

¹¹ For Meier's categorization, see *The Modes*, pp. 90-101. The classification proposed here is only a summary sketch; it will be refined and provided with proper examples elsewhere.

- (ii) turning aside the last step of the *clausula* (deviated cadence);
 - (iii) briefly continuing the melodic movement on the same text syllable (prolonged cadence).
- (3) Interconnection cadences: all the active voices achieve their cadential goals, but on the last note of the cadence one (or more) other voice(s) start(s) with a new imitative phrase.
- (4) Full cadences: all the active voices are brought to a proper conclusion, after which only a new musical phrase (in case) begins.
- (5) Non-cadential endings: the active voices arrive at the conclusion of a musical phrase at the same time without using any standard *clausula*.

(Categories 1 to 3 are all of the *fuggita* type. Categories 1 to 4 comprise also the *in mi* form, i.e. the so-called Phrygian cadence; categories 1.I.i, 2.i, 3, and 4 also the plagal form.)¹²

And now, let us turn to the analysis of Tenor *ambitus*, *exordia* and cadential plans of L-1562 and 1571.

2.3. As regards the *ambitus* and the *exordium*, almost all the motets in modes 1, 2, 5, 6, 7 and 8 display exactly the characteristics that the majority of theorists consider appropriate for the respective modes¹³ (only L1571/15 has a larger *ambitus*, which indicates a partial *mixtio* of modes 7 and 8 expressive of the 'exchange' implicit in its Gospel text: indeed, the *mutatio* from mode 7 to mode 8 is particularly evident at the end of the

¹² Examples of cadences in the motets under investigation by categories (C/A/T/B = *clausula cantizans* / *altizans* / *tenorizans* / *basizans* [because of its secondary role in the cadential process, the *clausula altizans* will be normally taken into account only in the full cadences]; the numbers after the publication date refer to motet and bar(s) of the modern editions quoted above; truncated, deviated or prolonged *clausulae* are shown in brackets):

- truncated partial cadences: C-(T), L-1571/12,87; C-(B), L-1562/6,27-28; (T)-B, L-1573/11,6-7; (T)-B, L-1562/22,19; C-(T)-B, L-1562/22,114; (C)-T-(B), L-1573/1,87-88; C-(T)-(B), L-1571/3,76-77;
- deviated partial cadences: (C)-T, L-1573/1,46; C-(T), L-1562/22,28; (C)-b, L-1573/2,23-24; C-(B), L-1573/8,8; (C)-(B), L-1573/2,41-42; T-(B), L-1573/11,63-64; (T)-B, L-1562/21,32; (T)-(B), L-1582/4,6-7; (C)-T-B, L-1571/3,104-105;
- prolonged partial cadences: (C)-T, L-1562/7,37-38, L-1571/6,64 (Phrygian); C-(T), L-1571/9,134-135 (Phrygian); (C)-B, L-1573/9,8; C-(B), L-1571/7,7-8; C-(T)-B, L-1571/12,67-68; (C)-T-(B), L-1562/1,24;
- mixed forms (truncated-deviated, truncated-prolonged or deviated-prolonged partial cadences): C-T-(B), L-1582/2,28; (C)-(T), L-1573/11,206; C-(T)-(B), L-1562/1,36; (C)-T-(B), L-1571/16,115; (C)-(T)-(B), L-1562/20,13; (C)-(B), L-1571/12,61; (C)-T-B, L-1571/5,17;
- partial cadences with full *clausulae*: C-T, L-1562/21,18; L-1571/18,15-16 ('*repercussa*'); L-1562/15,57 (two cadences concatenated), L-1573/1,26-27 (Phrygian); C-B, L-1562/1,33-34; T-B, L-1571/1,30; C-T-B, L-1562/22,5-6;
- truncated cadences: C-(T), L-1571/8,4; C-(T)-B, L-1562/9,111-112; C-T-(B), L-1571/16,25; C-(T)-(B), L-1571/3,10;
- deviated cadences: (C)-T-B, L-1573/7,24-25; C-T-(B), L-1573/1,23-24; (C)-T-(B), L-1573/11,124-125 (deviated and truncated); C-(T)-(B), L-1573/1,32; (C)-(T)-(B), L-1573/13,80-81;
- prolonged cadences: (C)-T, L-1573/8,166-167; (C)-T-B, L-1562/22,126-127; C-(T)-B, L-1582/3,63-64;
- interconnection cadences: L-1562/7,10; L-1571/3,68; L-1562/2,39 (Phrygian);
- full cadences: C-T, L-1571/17,38; L-1571/3,24-25 (Phrygian); C-A-T, L-1562/10,37-38 (*simplex*); L-1562/1,22 (*formalis*); L-1562/11,21 (Phrygian); C-T-B, L-1562/3,28 (*simplex*); L-1573/2,167-168 (*formalis*); L-1562/3,39-40 (partially *repercussa*); L-1562/10,31-32 (Phrygian); plagal: L-1562/5,25-26;
- non-cadential endings: L-1562/22,95; L-1571/19,35-36 (conclusion of *prima pars* !)

(The list itself shows how inconsistent is the idea expressed by MEIER, *The Modes*, p. 99, that «Lasso tends to refrain from using 'fuggir la cadenza'».)

¹³ On the *exordium* as modal parameter, see MEIER, *The Modes*, pp. 171-233. For a detailed account of the *ambitus* of each L-1562 motet, see *ibid.*, pp. 69-83.

prima pars, at the words «aut quam dabit homo *commutationem pro anima sua?*»¹⁴. The motets in the mode(s) represented by the tonal type $\natural\text{-c}_1\text{-E}$, on the contrary, present a different situation. The Tenor *ambitus* is authentic in all of them. The respective *exordia*, however (according to Meier's 'practical rule' that states that «If the upper voice raises quickly – and possibly without any 'interruption' – from the final to the sixth above it, or if it begins in the range near this sixth above the final, we may conclude that the work is in Mode 3. But if the soprano hovers closely around the final, or remains for a long time in the ambitus of the fourth *mi-la*, then Mode 4 may be assumed»¹⁵), denote mode 3 for L-1562/11 and 14 as well as for L-1571/10 and 11; points (with some qualms) towards mode 4 for L-1562/12, but is inconclusive for L-1562/13 and 1571/9.¹⁶ This confirms once more Meier's well-known statement that modes 3 and 4 (may) differ slightly from each other.¹⁷

The tonal types $\flat\text{-c}_1\text{-F}$ and $\natural\text{-c}_1\text{-F}$ that in L-1571 represent the sixth mode in immediate succession, finally, are another proof that Lasso's modal horizon was the eight-, and not the twelve-mode system.

2.4. The proper correspondence between the cadential plan and the implied mode of a motet is another matter. To draw some meaningful conclusions, we must first establish a cadential hierarchy, and then compare the result with the relevant assertions of the theorists.¹⁸

The classification of cadences sketched before can be considered a hierarchy in itself; therefore, it may well satisfy the first need without addition or extension (of course, non-cadential endings will lay outside the system, and a cadential event that can be listed under more than one heading – for example, because it comprises a truncated *clausula* as well as a deviated one –, would be better set on the higher level possible, i.e. where it has more 'weight'). On the theoretical side, we may then regard Gallus Dressler as a good point of comparison: not only for chronological as well as for geographical reasons, but also for his threefold taxonomy of cadences according to their modal rank and for his faithfulness to the eight-mode tradition.¹⁹ His distinction of cadences in *principales*, *minus principales* and *peregrinae* can be summed up as follows:²⁰

¹⁴ On L-1562/24 and 1571/18 *exordia*, see MEIER, *The Modes*, p. 193; on L-1562/7 and 1571/5 *ibid.*, p. 224.

¹⁵ MEIER, *The Modes*, p. 230. According to POWERS, *Anomalous Modalities*, p. 230, the only modally ordered collections where Lasso clearly distinguishes modes 3 and 4 are 1577 *Novae aliquot [...] ad duas voces cantiones* (RISM 1577c, LW 1577-3), and 1584 *Psalmi Davidis poenitentiales* (RISM 1584d, LW 1584-6).

¹⁶ On the *exordium* of L-1571/13, see MEIER, *The Modes*, p. 231; on L-1571/14, *ibid.*, p. 230.

¹⁷ MEIER, *The Modes*, pp. 47-88.

¹⁸ Cf. HERMANN FINCK, *Practica musica* (Wittenberg: Rhaw, 1556; facs. repr. Bologna: Forni, 1969), f. Rrijr: «Specta initium Fugae, et perpende ad quem tonum referri possit: perge deinceps ordine considerare etiam reliquas clausulas et fugas in eo cantu, ac vide an etiam prioribus, quantum ad tonum, respondeant, an vero ad alium, et ad quem tonum proprie congruant: idque fac per totam cantilenam. Nam ad quem Tonum maior fugarum et clausularum pars referri potest, illi tanquam principali ascribenda est tota cantilena».

¹⁹ That the eight-mode system should have been Lasso's modal reference is confirmed not only by the modally-ordered collection published under his control, but also by the famous letter that Leonhard Lechner sent to Samuel Mageirus on 8 August 1593. See GEORG REICHERT, "Martin Crusius und die Musik in Tübingen um 1590", *Archiv für Musikwissenschaft*, 10 (1953), pp. 185-212: 210-212.

²⁰ See GALLUS DRESSLER, *Praecepta musicae poeticae*, ed. Olivier Trachier et Simonne Chevalier (Paris – Tours: Minerve, 2001), cap. IX (Dressler lists untransposed modes 1 and 3 to 8, and transposed mode 2 only; the remaining ones are given here for the sake of completeness, even though modes 7 and 8 transposed *per bemolle* are seldom or never used in practice).

A) Modes 'suo naturali loco'

Mode	<i>C. principales</i>	<i>C. minus principales</i>	<i>C. peregrinae</i>
1	D, A	F, E	G, B, C
2	D, F, A	E	G, B, C
3	E, B, C	G, A	F, D
4	E, A	G, C	F, B, D
5	F, C	A-mi	G, B(b), D, E
6	F, A-mi, C	–	G, B(b), D, E
7	G, D	C	A, B, E, F
8	G, C, D	–	A, B, E, F

B) Transposed Modes

Mode	per	<i>C.principales</i>	<i>C. minus principales</i>	<i>C. peregrinae</i>
1	b	G, D	A, B _b	C, E, F
2	b	G, B _b , D	A-mi	C, E, F
3	b	A, E, F	C, D	B _b , G
4	b	A, D	C, F	B _b , E, G
5	♯	C, G	E	D, F, A, B
6	♯	C, E, G	–	D, F, A, B
7	b	C, G	F	D, E, A, B _b
8	b	C, G, F	–	D, E, A, B _b

Put side by side, the cadential analysis of L-1562 and L-1571 and Dressler's modal relevance of each cadence degree reveal that:

- (a) In any mode, both *minus principales* and *peregrinae* articulations are used with some freedom at the level of partial cadences²¹ (according to Finck, «Praecipuae autem huius varietatis causae sunt, affectum in textu observatio, et iuxta hunc fugarum ac clausularum conveniens variatio [...] Et quia in uno eodemque textu, diversae materiae tractantur, variae etiam fugae et clausulae excogitandae sunt, quae affectus in textu contentos proprijs quasi coloribus depingant atque expriment»²²).
- (b) At a higher level of the cadential hierarchy, *cadentiae minus principales* are still relatively common. In the motets in ♯-c₁-E, in particular, A is by far the most recurrent cadence degree – it always prevails over C, independently from the ambitus (as Meier has already noted²³), and normally also over the final E –, but G, too, seems to be a cadence degree (at least) as frequent as the final itself. Moreover, in mode 7 (tonal type ♯-g₂-G), cadences on C play often a significant role (in L-1562/22 C even replaces completely D as second-rank cadence degree and as conclusion sonority of the *prima pars*).
- (c) Finally, at the level of full cadences (and non-cadential endings), *principales* cadences obviously dominate, but a certain amount of *peregrinae* also appear. Most of these *peregrinae* are of course textually motivated,²⁴ but a part of them – and not

²¹ See, as a typical example, L-1562/8, where *peregrinae* partial cadences appear at bars 20 (full partial *cantizans-tenorizans* on C), 26-27 (partial deviated *cantizans-[tenorizans]* on F), and 46-47 (*cantizans-tenorizans*↑-*basizans*).

²² FINCK, *Practica musica*, f. Rriv.

²³ MEIER, *The Modes*, pp. 166-168.

²⁴ See for instance L-1562/14,25-26: F cadence at the words «terrores tui»; L-1562/25,66-67: A Phrygian cadence at «dolor meus» (see MEIER, *The Modes*, p. 240); L-1571/9,90: B, non-cadential ending on

a negligible number – is not. Among the not-textually motivated, some *peregrinae* seem to be a rhetorical/structural device, used to underline a vocative²⁵ or to obtain an effect of suspension, as a sort of musical colon;²⁶ some can even be understood as other than *peregrinae*, depending on how the *clausulae* that form the cadence are interpreted:²⁷ but for some others we must admit that there is no convincing or satisfactory explanation.²⁸

2.5. On a different level, this is also true for the motet *Si bona suscepimus*, L-1571/7. In the *Moduli quinis vocibus*, this extraordinary piece of work is inserted among the motets in (transposed) mode 2, but its tonal type is $\flat\text{-c}_1\text{-A}$, which from a purely theoretical point of view should represent transposed mode 3. Therefore, or Lasso mistook the order of the collection, or the motet is modally problematic at the highest degree. That the former is probably not the case is possibly demonstrated by the reprint of the motet ‘with the composer’s consent’ in the *Fasciculus aliquot sacrarum cantionum* (Nuremberg: Gerlach 1582; RISM 1582c, LW 1582-8), where the ambiguous placement persists (the motet is inserted between the groups representative of the second and the third mode, and so it can be the last of mode 2 or the first of mode 3), but where the general ordering of the collection seems also to confirm Lasso’s intention to think of *Si bona suscepimus* as a representative of mode 2.²⁹ Therefore, the motet is modally problematic at the highest degree.³⁰ But to what extent?

James Haar, who has analysed the composition in great details, supposes that its basic nature is Phrygian: «a D opening (G in transposition) followed by movements to, and final emphasis on, the E mode (A, transposed)».³¹ Peter Bergquist concedes that «An alternate explanation could be that the piece is in mode 2, but ends out of the mode».³² The cadential plan, in fact, show a clear modal *commixtio*, the reason of which lies without doubt in the biblical text, taken from the book of Job as mediated

«insaniam»; see also L-1571/13,62: G interconnection cadence (with B \flat) at «vexatur et algoribus»; L-1571/17,31-32 and 36-27: prolonged D Phrygian cadence at «exaudi orationem» (see MEIER, *The Modes*, p. 274: «class of words signifying prayer»). In the dedicatory motet L-1571/1, the strong deviation (B \flat)→E \flat (both cadence degree foreign to the first transposed mode) looks ironic, as it points up the words «dulces efficiunt animi cum probitate modos».

²⁵ L-1571/6,9-10: F plagal cadence on «Lamuel»; L-1571/8,19: D Phrygian cadence on «(Deus...) patiens».

²⁶ See e.g. L-1562/23,43: E plagal cadence on «et videbitis»; 1571/8,19: E \flat cadence on «quem quaeritis». The same effect, in L-1571/4,49-50, has the truncated-evaded-interconnected F cadence – *cantizans-tenorizans*↑-(*basizans*) – on «et dixit illi».

²⁷ In 1571/17,72-73, the cadence is *peregrina* if interpreted as D-plagal, but *minus principalis* if interpreted as A-Phrygian with the bass standing a fifth below the Phrygian *bicinium* and the pitch F raised to F \sharp to reinforce the sonority. Similarly, in 1571/17,27-28, the A sonority can be interpreted as the conclusion of a plagal cadence, but also as the result of the deviation of a G cadence with the *clausulae cantizans* and *tenorizans* deviated, and the *clausula basizans* truncated.

²⁸ See for example L-1562/19,19-20 (cadence on D); L-1571/6,37 (on F, with truncated *basizans*); L-1571/13,65 (on B \flat , with *tenorizans*↑); 1571/16,86-87 (Phrygian on A) and 88-89 (Phrygian on E in consequence of the previous one); L-1571/19,70 (interconnection on F).

²⁹ PETER BERGQUIST, *Introduction*, in: ORLANDO DI LASSO, *The Complete Motets*, 8, p. xv.

³⁰ It is noteworthy – and maybe revealing – that Meier’s book (which quotes more than three hundreds Lasso’s composition) does not contain a single reference to *Si bona suscepimus* in all its length.

³¹ JAMES HAAR, *Orlande de Lassus: “Si bona suscepimus”*, in: *Models of Musical Analysis. Music before 1600*, ed. Mark Everist (Oxford: Blackwell, 1992), pp. 154-174: 160.

³² BERGQUIST, *Introduction*, p. xiv.

by the Divine Office.³³ As Haar has suggested, «*Si bona suscepimus* is a misleading opening; the scriptural passage as a whole is about acceptance of misfortune, not about rejoicing in the good things of life. The textual ambiguity is underscored by musical ambiguity».³⁴ In setting the text to music, in other words, Lasso acts once in a while more as an exegete than as a painter. Consequently, it is precisely on this grounds that I believe that the piece and its meaning are better understood if we suppose that *Si bona suscepimus* is rooted in mode 2, and that only after that *this* mode has been established it is mixed with mode 4 – the mode in which the motet arrives at its conclusion. That is to say: you are perfectly able to recognise the *bona* (the correct mode): but, when *Dominus* (the composer) takes them away (*abstulit quod dedit*, takes away the mode), you have to accept the new situation and stay content with it (with the new mode); you know that, someday, you will go back to your primeval situation *nudus*, with nothing but your very nature (the 'real' mode): yet in the meanwhile you have to accept the new situation and stay indefinitely content with it (with the conclusion in the 'other' mode). This exegetical reading, in my opinion, is perfectly expressed by the arrangements of the cadence degrees: in the first section («*Si mala suscepimus de manu Domini, mala autem quare non sustineamus?*»), Lasso sets up G as main modal reference (the opening *bicinium* ends with an interconnected prolonged cadence *cantizans-tenorizans* on G followed by two other partial prolonged cadences on the same note); introduces the idea of *mala* with a B \flat *minus principalis* truncated cadence, and marks the end of the section with a D interconnection cadence (b. 34). In the second section («*Dominus dedit, Dominus abstulit. Sicut Domino placuit, ita factum est. Sit nomen Domini benedictum*»), he moves immediately to F (three truncated/partial truncated cadences in bb. 35-45), and then to A, where he stays until the end of the section (b. 61: A-Phrygian partial cadence). In the third section («*Nudus egressus sum de utero matris meae, et nudus revertar illuc*»), he firstly restores F, then arrives at the 'basic' G on the second «*nudus*» (bb. 79-80), and finally reverts to D on «*revertar illuc*» (interconnection cadence at bb. 83-84). Lastly, he repeats thoroughly the second section until the A-Phrygian cadence, which this time he supports with the fifth below (b. 112), and then ends the piece at once with another A – plagal – cadence.

Clearly, such an exegetical reading makes sense only if we credit Lasso with a correct ordering of the *Moduli* and suppose that the motet begins as Hypodorian, not as Hypophrygian; otherwise, if the 'true' mode were the final Hypophrygian, and the 'false' one the Hypodorian set at the beginning, we would have no *bona* in our possession and we could not properly leave them (neither – Lasso wrote indeed for a catholic Court – gain merit with doing so).

Whatever the right interpretation, anyway, the particular configuration of this motet leaves no doubt as to the problematic nature of the tonal type $\flat\text{-c}_1\text{-A}$.

2.6. At the end of this survey, therefore, we can conclude that in L-1562 and L-1571 the majority of tonal types offers little resistance to modal interpretation, especially if we take into account the textual/rhetorical motivation for some 'surface' irregularities. However, some tonal types – and notably $\sharp\text{-g}_2\text{-C}$, $\sharp\text{-c}_1\text{-E}$, $\sharp\text{-g}_2\text{-G}$, and $\flat\text{-c}_1\text{-A}$ – present

³³ The text is a responsory used in the Matins of the first two Sundays of September: see *Breviarium Romanum. Editio princeps (1568)*, facs. repr., ed. Manlio Sodi and Achille Maria Triacca (Città del Vaticano: Libreria Editrice Vaticana, 1999), n° 3658.

³⁴ HAAR, *Orlande de Lassus*, p. 160.

some relevant or severe discrepancies between their behaviours and the modes they should theoretically represent.

The next step, thus, is to verify if the same (or an analogous) situation is to be found within the polyphonic collections that are not modally ordered.

3.1. Table 3 and 4 list the motets of L-1573 and L-1582 as they appear in each print; table 5 rearranges the content of both collections in order of tonal types. The types used in L-1573 and L-1582 are all those contained in L-1562 and L-1571 but \flat - c_1 -A and with the addition \natural - c_1 -D, \natural - g_2 -A and \flat - g_2 -A. Let us comment briefly on their possible modal interpretations.³⁵

3.2. In L-1582/17 the type \natural - g_2 -C represents transposed mode 6 even more ‘regularly’ than it does in the modally-ordered L-1562:³⁶ the Tenor ambitus and the *exordium* match perfectly the theoretical description of the mode; the B \flat non-cadential ending in bb. 8-9 and the G cadential context in b. 28 simply depict, on the surface, the textual idea of *mors*.

3.3. Instead, L-1573/20 is a problematic motet. Its tonal type \natural - c_1 -D, in connection with the authentic Tenor *ambitus*, should represent pure mode 1:³⁷ however, although the *exordium* confirms the attribution, no full D cadences are found anywhere but the last three bars, and no textual reasons seem to be able to explain the *mixtio* with mode 2 on the word «quem amavi» (bb. 37-44: see the lowest D in b. 44): indeed, the relative *quem* refers to Jesus Christ, for the love of whom the devote singer/listener disdains «regnum mundi et omne ornatum saeculi».

3.4. The four motets in \natural - c_1 -E of L-1573 and L-1582 employ the A cadence as frequently as the seven of L-1562 and L-1571. Yet, the Tenor range of all of them, the melodic contour of their *exordia* and the lesser frequency of G cadences permit to read them as examples of mode 3 without too much difficulty. In fact, these later motets, however scattered in two collections, from a modal point of view seem to be a more homogeneous group than their modally-explicit L-1562 and L-1571 counterparts.³⁸

3.5. Vocal range and *exordium* of the six motets in \flat - c_1 -F and of the single one in \natural - c_1 -F are consistent with their interpretation as representative of mode 6 as in the modally ordered collection. Still, all Lasso’ rhetoric paraphernalia are here fully at work also at the cadential level, so that it is not always easy to discern between the idiosyncratic

³⁵ Interestingly enough, these two collections show (with only a couple of exception) a drastic fall of the number of *minus principales* cadences in the lower ranks of the cadential hierarchy (whilst *peregrinae* are still widespread). Because of this reason – and because the analysis of the modally ordered collections has demonstrated that «Tametsi enim ad unum solummodo tonum referri quaelibet muteta debet: tamen semper aliquas clausulas admixtas habet, quae etiam ad alios tonos accommodari possunt» (FINCK, *Practica musica*, f. Rrjir) –, in the notes that follow I will omit any account of partial cadences, and give details, in case, only of the relevant evaded and full *peregrinae*.

³⁶ It is absolutely noteworthy that all the L-1562 and 1582 \natural - g_2 -C motets «express joyful elation at the Resurrection and conclude with long chains of *Alleluias*»: POWERS, *Anomalous Modalities*, pp. 234-235.

³⁷ It does so, for example, in 1577 didactic duos, in the Penitential Psalms, and in the *Lagrima di San Pietro*. See POWERS, *Anomalous Modalities*, pp. 232-233.

³⁸ MEIER, *The Modes*, p. 319 remarks on a textually motivated *mixtio* with mode 6 in 1582/12.

characterisation of an individual composition and the problematic behaviour of a particular tonal type (even though the fact that 'strange' cadences are almost regularly deviated or truncated and therefore – so to speak – not completely integrated in the structural *bicinium* seems to favour the basic 'easiness' of the tonal type).³⁹

In addition, sometimes Lasso's compositional habits make the impression that the sonority *at* which he arrives is more worthwhile than the way *how* he arrives at it. See, for example, the two immediate instances of C in L-1582/4,34-38, the first of which is reached by a partial cadence *cantizans-tenorizans* in the Tenor and the Bass (with a *cantizans*-like suspended movement in the Discantus), and the second – without apparent hints in the text – by a deviated five-voice cadence *cantizans-(tenorizans)-(basizans)* (G→)C. See also the end of L-1573/3, where the final F sonority is reached by the way of a deviated cadence that 'blends' the forms of the perfect and the plagal cadence.

3.6. On the contrary (and few madrigalisms apart in L-1582/8), the tonal type $\flat\text{-}g_2\text{-}F$ can always and easily be understood as representing mode 5.

3.7. In the modally ordered collections, the tonal type $\natural\text{-}c_1\text{-}G$ represents mode 8.⁴⁰ The five motets in that type of L-1573 and L-1582 do the same, generally without problems (L-1573/18 is even quoted by Meier as an example of the class of works that expresses the semantic field of 'beauty' «by ostentatious preservation of the modal rule»⁴¹). However, L-1573/13 contains some unusual features for an eight-mode composition; it has no C cadences, but does have two stout F cadence: the first with deviated *tenorizans* at bb. 13-24, perhaps intended to match the general meaning of «qui tulerat populo dona plurima Dei»; the second at b. 54-55 (not *formalis* but full at five voices) with hardly any textual motivation (it crops up at the beginning of the *secunda pars* and divides the words «Plebs igitur» from the rest of the text).

3.8. The tonal type $\natural\text{-}g_2\text{-}G$ counts two motets in L-1573 and two in L-1582, each of which presents some problems as to modal representation. L-1573/11 is the less far from the theoretical description of mode 7: it contains 'only' two *peregrinae* cadences – a quite obvious *simplex* $B\flat$ at «peccatores» (b. 30-31)⁴² and a more subtle A plagal at the end of the sentence «dirigatur oratio mea» (b. 60) – as well as a modal *commixtio* with transposed mode 1 at the end of the first part (obtained with the pervasive use of $B\flat$).⁴³ L-1582/19 has not a single proper cadence on D all through the piece. L-1573/21 exhibits: a very atypical *exordium*⁴⁴ – the first cadence, at bb. 4-5, is on $B\flat$ («Agimus tibi gratias») –; a plagal Tenor *ambitus* (while the Discantus has an authentic one, although it does not reach the high G); only one cadence on D (b. 20, in comparison with two cadences on A, one *formalis*, b. 25-26, and one plagal, bb. 28-29), and – last but not least – a conclusion without any sort of *cadenza perfetta* (the final G is attained by the im-

³⁹ For instance: does the $B\flat$ cadence in L-1582/3,28-29 signify that, if you put your trust in money (= earthly) treasures, you will not get to be a blessed man? Or does the strong G cadence in L-1582/6,28-29 (with deviated *tenorizans* and sustentation of $B\flat$ to $B\flat$) insinuate that the eyes «defecerunt in salutare tuum, et in eloquium justitiae tuae» so much that you are no longer able to discern the right path?

⁴⁰ The three 1562 motets in $\natural\text{-}c_1\text{-}G$ are the first published by Lasso in this tonal type: see POWERS, *Anomalous Modalities*, p. 231.

⁴¹ MEIER, *The Modes*, pp. 368-369.

⁴² See MEIER, *The Modes*, p. 251.

⁴³ MEIER, *The Modes*, p. 317.

⁴⁴ MEIER, *The Modes*, p. 365.

mediate progression of the sonorities F, C and G).⁴⁵ L-1582/20 sets to music the famous hymn *Ut queant laxis* in an entirely homorhythmic style, and outlines the solmization syllables by having them sung by the Tenor alone, while the other voices enter on the second syllable of the pertinent words.

Given this evidence of modal discontinuity (and remembering what we noted above about the same tonal type in the modally ordered collections), it is perhaps revealing that Lasso favoured the hard hexachord over the natural and the *mollis* for this humorous solmization motet: it could well be the sign that he, too, perceived the authentic G mode as generally more amenable and with less constraints than the correlative C (not to say F) modes.

3.9. The other G tonal types, $\flat\text{-c}_1\text{-G}$ and $\flat\text{-g}_2\text{-G}$, act towards modal representation more or less as the type $\flat\text{-c}_1\text{-F}$ does: *exordia* and Tenor *ambitus* almost invariably match the theorists' descriptions of / prescriptions for – respectively – the second and the first transposed modes, and rhetoric strategies explain at the macro-level (most of) the full *peregrinae* cadences and at the micro-level the (rare) madrigalisms.⁴⁶ Once again, however, the high frequency of Phrygian cadences on D – not far from the total amount of 'normal' ones on the same degree – seems to demonstrate that the ultimate cadential sonority is (becoming) more important than the cadential process that leads to it.⁴⁷

In this class of motets, only L-1573/1 *Pater noster* stands apart: this time, however, not because of the problematic nature of the tonal type, but for the specificity of the *cantus firmus* on which it is based. Indeed, this is more a ornate reciting tone (still used in the current Roman Missal) than a modally-shaped chant. It moves around B, and bends to A and G as contrasting, cadential and final tones (actually, it has no proper final, because, after «sed libera nos a malo», the priest's prayer continues, again on the pitch B). Lasso employs the *cantus firmus* transposed a tone lower; therefore, he has to combine a G final with frequent F cadences. This provides the motet with a predominantly Lydian flavour and, consequently, makes the very last cadence on G sounding somewhat more 'appended' than truly necessitated – a feature, clearly, not unique to this motet but shared with almost all the *Pater noster* composed on the same *cantus firmus*.⁴⁸

3.10. Five motets – three in L-1573 and two in L-1582 – use the tonal type $\natural\text{-g}_2\text{-A}$.⁴⁹ They have no counterpart in L-1562 and L-1571: thus, to speculate about their possible modal nature, we have to rely especially on their inner characteristics, the comparison with other compositions in the same tonal type and the data of the eight-mode theoretical tradition.

⁴⁵ On the intertextual relationships between this motet and Rore's setting of the same text, see PETER BERGQUIST, *Introduction*, in: ORLANDO DI LASSO, *The Complete Motets*, 9, p. XXI.

⁴⁶ See, for example, the F cadence on the vocative «Domine» in L-1573/10,22-23, or the patent madrigalism with an E, deviated cadence on «in profundo» in L-1573/4,22-24.

⁴⁷ See for instance the two D Phrygian cadences that open 1573/9 (bb. 4 and 10-11).

⁴⁸ See e.g. Lasso's six voice setting in *Cantica sacra sex et octo vocibus* (Munich: Berg, 1581; *The Complete Motets* 15, ed. David Crook, Madison: A-R Editions, 1999, pp. 3-11, LW 830). The contrast F/G final 'appended' is even more pronounced and almost exasperated in MARC'ANTONIO INGEGNERI, *Sacrarum cantionum cum quatuor vocibus Liber primus* (Venice: A. Gardano, 1586; modern edition ed. by the present writer forthcoming in the series *MARC'ANTONIO INGEGNERI Opera Omnia*, Lucca: Libreria Musicale Italiana).

⁴⁹ PETER BERGQUIST, "The Modality of Lasso's Compositions in 'A minor' ", in: *Orlando di Lasso in der Musikgeschichte*, pp. 7-18. No-one of these motets is taken into account by Meier.

In the works of the theorists of this line, the *finalis* A is usually explained as either a *confinalis* or a *differentia* of the *finalis* D.⁵⁰ Modern musicologists have also accounted it for a transposition of the second mode an octave higher.⁵¹

Palestrina, in the *Offertoria totius anni*, employs the tonal type \natural -g₂-A to represent mode 1 – but the choice is challenging, as the motets, with respect to a *finalis* D, take up the plagal, not the authentic *ambitus*.⁵²

More generally, in the polyphonic practice of the Renaissance compositions ending on A seem to fulfil manifold purposes: they add some Phrygian spice to basically Dorian works; on the contrary, they temper with Dorian tinge a basically Phrygian piece; they permit to unify a structural *re-mi* ambivalence, and finally they can express a 'Glareanian' (or 'Zarlinian') true independent mode⁵³ (at the beginning of the sixteenth-century, this multifaceted range of qualities will be even further extended⁵⁴).

In L-1573 and 1582, the motets set to music different kinds of text (expression of praise and hope, invocation to and confidence in the Lord), and show the following individual musical traits besides a common Tenor *ambitus* moving roughly in the octave A-a:

- L-1573/6: *exordium re-fa-mi*; full cadences only on A; *perfette* and Phrygian full D cadences; A and E partial cadences; a non-cadential ending on F; conclusion with *cadenza perfetta* on A lacking the third of the sonority.
- L-1573/14: *exordium la-sol-la-fa-re-la*; first full cadence on F (b. 41-2); other full cadences on D and A; only two real Phrygian hints (one E-plagal and one A-Phrygian cadence).
- L-1573/19: *exordium* with the initial motto A-E and subsequent filling up of the fifth *re-la*;⁵⁵ many partial A and E-Phrygian cadences, but no full ones on A; proper full D and F cadences occurring very late (bb. 66 and 72);
- L-1582/16: *exordium* alternating the fifth *re-la* and the fourths *re-sol* and *mi-la*; full A *perfetta* cadence as early as b. 6; an F plagal cadence (bb. 11-12); other (evaded/interconnected) cadences on C, D, E (Phrygian).
- L-1582/18: scalar *exordium re-la*; no full A cadences; main cadences: F deviated to D (of great impact as first sectional articulation, bb. 14-15); full E Phrygian (bb. 18-

⁵⁰ Johannes Cochlaeus's *Tetrachordum musices* (Nuremberg: Stuchsenn, 1511), for example, explains transposition of chant and polyphonic music in terms of *confinalis*; see W. T. Atcherson, "Theory Accommodates Practice: 'Confinalis' Theory in Renaissance Music Treatises", *Journal of the American Musicological Society*, 23 (1970), pp. 326-330. Pietro Aron's *Trattato della natura et cognitione di tutti gli tuoni di canto figurato non da altrui più scritti* (Venice: Bernardino Vitali, 1525; facs. repr. Bologna: Forni, 1970) ch. 4 does not make use of the term but refers explicitly to *A-la-mi-re* as a termination in modes 1 and 2; see CRISTLE COLLINS JUDD, *Reading Renaissance Music Theory. Hearing with the Eyes* (Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 2000), pp. 60-68; POWERS, *Is Mode Real?*, pp. 24-26 and 32-35.

⁵¹ HAROLD S. POWERS, "The Modality of *Vestiva i colli*", in: *Studies in Renaissance and Baroque Music in Honor of Arthur Mendel*, ed. Robert L. Marshall (Kassel – Hackensack (NJ): Bärenreiter – Boonin, 1974), pp. 31-46.

⁵² MANGANI – SABAINO, *Tonal Types*, § 2.1.

⁵³ MANGANI – SABAINO, "Modo Novo", passim. See also BERGQUIST, *The Modality*, pp. 9-10.

⁵⁴ MARCO MANGANI – DANIELE SABAINO, "L'organizzazione dello spazio sonoro nell'Orfeo' di Monteverdi: modelli e strutture", *Philomusica online* (<http://philomusica.unipv.it>), 6 (2006-2007).

⁵⁵ PETER BERGQUIST, *Introduction*, in: ORLANDO DI LASSO, *The Complete Motets*, 9, p. xxi, says that «Lasso announces the tonality of the motet clearly at the outset with the insistence on A and E in both parts of the initial subject», perhaps meaning that the first two note are to be read *mi-mi*. This is of course possible, but, considering the continuation of the subject after the rest as well as the Bass entering in b. 10, I believe that *re-la* would perhaps be a better reading.

19); full D at the end of the *prima pars*; B \flat with deviated *tenorizans* sealing the line «et cupis in stygios praecipitare lacus» (b. 48-49);⁵⁶ A plagal as final (preceded by a partial full *cantizans-tenorizans* on D, not on the same A as customary).

Thus, a comprehensive evaluation of these motets allows us to conclude that they all are basically Dorian-oriented, but also that this basic Dorian orientation has a different specific gravity in each of them.⁵⁷ Deciding which mode they possibly represent, however, is a completely different matter: if we look simply at the Tenor *ambitus*, the five pieces would all be thought as representative of the second mode transposed an octave higher; however, if we take into account also their *exordia* and cadential plans, 1573/14 and 19 and L-1582/18 could pretend with almost equal rights to be attributed to the first mode, while L-1582/18 would be forever a borderline, debatable case.

3.11. Finally, the only \flat -g₂-A motet in the four collections, composed on a famous and widespread *cantus firmus*,⁵⁸ displays a relative weight of the G sonority (due to the partial cadences on that degree) that contrasts sharply with the normally-supposed modal interpretation of a piece with B \flat signature ending on A as a transposed-Phrygian composition. However, the weakening of the Phrygian base of the work results also from the scarcest occurrence of Phrygian cadences: the three on A (the first at bb. 38-39, the second at the end of the *prima pars*, bb. 54-55, and the third at the end of the piece, bb. 101-102) are all encapsulated in a D sonority; and the only other place where the *cantus firmus* would support a similar cadence (b. 82) is completely ‘neutralised’ by the contrapuntal progression. The Tenor *ambitus* F-f, on the contrary, matches perfectly the theorists’ descriptions of transposed mode 4.⁵⁹

3.12. From the above account as well as from the previous examination of the modally ordered collections we can therefore arrange the tonal types of these four books of motets in the following progressive order as to their problematic nature:

- (1) unproblematic tonal types: \flat -g₂-F; \flat -c₁-F; \flat -g₂-G; \natural -c₁-G;
- (2) tonal types of problematic nature of grade one: \natural -g₂-C; \flat -c₁-G; \natural -g₂-E; \natural -g₂-D;
- (3) tonal types of problematic nature of grade two: \natural -g₂-G; \natural -g₂-A; \flat -g₂-A; \flat -c₁-A.

4.1. If we compare the arrangement just outlined with the result of the analysis of Palestrina’s *Offertoria* and *Motecta totius anni*,⁶⁰ we realise immediately that the order of problematic nature of the tonal types is virtually the same in both composers – especially revealing, from this point of view, is the type \natural -g₂-G, whose problematic nature

⁵⁶ In the antepenultimate sonority of this line Lasso ventures up to E \flat , a pitch that goes beyond his normative *cantus durus* tonal compass: DAVID CROOK, “Tonal Compass in the Motets of Orlando di Lasso”, in: *Hearing the Motet. Essays on the Motet of the Middle Ages and Renaissance*, ed. Dolores Pesce (New York: Oxford University Press, 1997), pp. 286-306.

⁵⁷ This confirms Bergquist’s remark that «most Lasso’s pieces in A fall somewhere on a continuum from a clear and unequivocal A at one extreme through increasing emphasis on D, and finally to the other extreme, where D is stronger than A» (*The Modality*, p. 9).

⁵⁸ On the history of *In media vita* text and melody, see WALTHER LIPPARDT, “Mitter wir im Leben sind”, *Jahrbuch für Liturgik und Hymnologie*, 8 (1963), pp. 99-118. However, BERGQUIST, *Introduction*, pp. XIX-XX notes that the *cantus firmus* of Lasso’s motet «does not correspond completely to any known version of the melody».

⁵⁹ MEIER, *The Modes*, p. 165.

⁶⁰ See above, § 1.2.

was unpredictable in Palestrina's as well as in Lasso's music. Clearly, there are some distinctions – the most evident is the different position of the type $\natural\text{-}g_2\text{-}C\text{-}$, but these distinctions, in my opinion, are due more to the different number of motets considered and to the diverse compositional habits of the two composer than to a truly dissimilar behaviour of same tonal types.⁶¹ In Palestrina, for instance, the hiatus between 'unproblematic', 'problematic' and 'very problematic' tonal types is more pronounced; instead, in Lasso the dividing lines between the three categories seem to be less definite and more depending on the individual characterisation of each motet, and on his well-known mastery of rhetorical strategies and devices. With the usual disclaimer about the perils of such generalisations, then, we might well think of Lasso as a visual artist who normally depicts the immediate meaning of a literary text (with or without madrigalism), and think instead of Palestrina as a scriptural exegete who digs deep into the inner meaning of a text, sometimes even beyond its own literalness (which results in the impression of being less interested in its expression).

4.2 Whichever the reasons behind Lasso's compositional choices, however, it seems evident that he 'stretches' the tonal types in at least four ways:

- (1) by broadening the spectrum of their typical cadence degrees, though differently for each type and more resolutely as to the partial than to the evaded and full cadences;
- (2) by inserting some melodic, contrapuntal and cadential gestures related more to the rhetorical than to the modal order;
- (3) by reaching a 'regular' modal cadential goal 'irregularly' (or even 'non-cadentially'), and finally
- (4) by lessening the difference between the authentic and the plagal version of the modes ending on the same *finalis* that a particular tonal type is supposed to represent.⁶²

4.3. Eventually, all the evidence collected so far lead us to some more general conclusions:

- (A) The investigation of eighty-five Lasso's motets confirms – I daresay beyond reasonable doubt – that the very idea of 'tonal type' is not so plain and unproblematic as it may seem: as the types do not behave univocally with respect to modal representation, they should not be considered any longer as they were 'all the same'.
- (B) The broadening of the cadential spectrum in consequence of rhetorical suggestions has the effect of gradually transforming the modal system(s) from a structural framework into a hermeneutical tool. However, this transformation does not support the idea that Renaissance composers had (to use Frans Wiering's terminology) only an external, and not (also) an internal idea of the modes; on the contrary, it contradicts it – clearly, you can 'break the rules' on purpose only if you agree that *there are* rules and that they should be (and are) normally in operation. (For today's musicology, this can therefore mean that discarding Renaissance modal theory as mostly foreign to the everyday polyphonic practice of the time, and contenting itself with a completely *etic* consideration of the same theory is not the best way to either enhance or make easier any understanding of that music.)

⁶¹ «Quilibet enim symphonista suum quoddam et peculiare habet iudicium, ac pro arbitrio hic isto, alius alio modo in effingendis clausulis et fugis utitur»: FINCK, *Practica musica*, f. Rrjir.

⁶² This is especially true – as it was in Palestrina – for the $\natural\text{-}D$ and $\natural\text{-}G$ modes.

- (C) In Renaissance terms, thus, the persistence of the eight-mode system can be regarded as ‘progressive’ with respect to the twelve-mode system. In fact, while the former ‘stretches’ more and more the modes ‘from the inside’, the latter, by giving equal rights to all the possible *finales*, stretches mainly the idea that each mode has its own typical features, and so simply perpetuates the old order in a wider and ‘easier’ way. More than renew an old system, the twelve-mode system attempts to preserve a modal orthodoxy⁶³ – it cannot be by chance, incidentally, that it was firstly conceived by a humanist and that it has always and cunningly been related to the ancient theoretical tradition.
- (D) With this respect – we can finally conclude – Lasso’s ultimate choice of contenting himself with the eight-mode system is probably only another, welcome evidence of how sensible and extraordinary an artist he was.

Table 1: L-1562 (print = modal order)

Implied Mode	N°	Tonal type	Motet	LW
First	1	\flat -g ₂ -G	<i>Confitemini Domino</i>	108
	2	\flat -g ₂ -G	<i>Omnia quae fecisti nobis</i>	109
	3	\flat -g ₂ -G	<i>Jerusalem, plantabis vineam</i>	110
	4	\flat -g ₂ -G	<i>Videntes stellam Magi</i>	111
Second	5	\flat -c ₁ -G	<i>Deus, qui sedes super thronum</i>	112
	6	\flat -c ₁ -G	<i>Heu quantus dolor</i>	113
	7	\flat -c ₁ -G	<i>Veni in hortum meum</i>	114
	8	\flat -c ₁ -G	<i>Angelus ad pastores ait</i>	115
	9	\flat -c ₁ -G	<i>Exaudi, Domine, vocem meam</i>	116
	10	\flat -c ₁ -G	<i>Taedet animam meam</i>	117
Third (and Fourth)	11	\natural -c ₁ -E	<i>O Domine salvum me fac</i>	118
	12	\natural -c ₁ -E	<i>Adversum me loquebantur</i>	119
	13	\natural -c ₁ -E	<i>Quam benignus es</i>	120
	14	\natural -c ₁ -E	<i>In me transierunt irae tuae</i>	121
Fifth	15	\flat -g ₂ -F	<i>Nisi Dominus aedificaverit domum</i>	122
	16	\flat -g ₂ -F	<i>Non vos me elegistis</i>	123
	17	\flat -g ₂ -F	<i>Legem pone mihi, Domine</i>	124
	18	\flat -g ₂ -F	<i>Illustra faciem tuam</i>	125
Sixth	19	\natural -g ₂ -C	<i>Surrexit pastor bonus</i>	126
	20	\natural -g ₂ -C	<i>Surgens Jesus</i>	127
Seventh	21	\natural -g ₂ -G	<i>Confundantur superbi</i>	128
	22	\natural -g ₂ -G	<i>Clare sanctorum senatus</i>	129
	23	\natural -g ₂ -G	<i>Sicut mater consolatur filios</i>	130
Eight	24	\natural -c ₁ -G	<i>Benedicam Dominum in omni tempore</i>	131
	25	\natural -c ₁ -G	<i>Caligaverunt oculi mei</i>	132

⁶³ See MANGANI – SABAINO, “*Modo Novo*”, pp. 37-38.

Table 2: L-1571 (print = modal order)

Implied Mode	N°	Tonal type	Motet	LW
First	1	\flat -g ₂ -G	<i>Multarum hic resonat</i>	419
	2	\flat -g ₂ -G	<i>Emendemus in melius</i>	420
	3	\flat -g ₂ -G	<i>Verba mea auribus percipe</i>	421
	4	\flat -g ₂ -G	<i>Pater Abraham, miserere mei</i>	422
Second	5	\flat -c ₁ -G	<i>Venite ad me, omnes qui laboratis</i>	423
	6	\flat -c ₁ -G	<i>Noli regibus, o Lamuel</i>	424
	7	\flat -c ₁ -A	<i>Si bona suscepimus</i>	425
	8	\flat -c ₁ -G	<i>Angelus Domini locutus est</i>	426
Third (and Fourth)	9	\natural -c ₁ -E	<i>Stabunt iusti in magna constantia</i>	427
	10	\natural -c ₁ -E	<i>Quid tamen, o quid agis</i>	428
	11	\natural -c ₁ -E	<i>Veni, dilecte mi</i>	429
Fifth	12	\flat -g ₂ -F	<i>Deus iudex iustus</i>	430
	13	\flat -g ₂ -F	<i>Exsultet caelum, mare</i>	431
Sixth	14	\flat -c ₁ -F	<i>Si quid vota valeant</i>	432
	15	\natural -c ₁ -F	<i>Quid prodest homini</i>	433
Seventh	16	\natural -g ₂ -G	<i>Descendit sicut pluvia</i>	434
	17	\natural -g ₂ -G	<i>Dominator, Domine</i>	435
Eight	18	\natural c ₁ -G	<i>Inter natos mulierum</i>	436
	19	\natural c ₁ -G	<i>Nuntium vobis fero</i>	437

Table 3: L-1573 (print order)

N°	Tonal type	Motet	Voices	LW
1	\flat -c ₁ -G	<i>Pater noster, qui es in caelis</i>	4	500
2	\flat -g ₂ -G	<i>Salve Regina misericordiae</i>	4	501
3	\flat -c ₁ -F	<i>Gaudent in caelis</i>	4	502
4	\flat -c ₁ -G	<i>Nos qui sumus in hoc mundo</i>	4	503
5	\natural -c ₁ -E	<i>Pulvis et umbra sumus</i>	4	504
6	\natural -g ₂ -A	<i>Lauda anima mea Dominum</i>	4	505
7	\natural -c ₁ -G	<i>Pauper sum ego</i>	4	506
8	\flat -c ₁ -F	<i>Exsurgat Deus</i>	5	507
9	\flat -c ₁ -G	<i>Misericordias Domini</i>	5	508
10	\flat -g ₂ -G	<i>Oculi omnium in te sperant</i>	5	509
11	\natural -g ₂ -G	<i>Domine clamavi ad te</i>	5	510
12	\natural -c ₁ -E	<i>Quis mihi det lacrimis</i>	5	511
13	\natural -c ₁ -G	<i>Martini festum celebremus</i>	5	512
14	\natural -g ₂ -A	<i>Exaudi Domine preces populorum</i>	5	513
15	\flat -g ₂ -A	<i>Media vita in morte sumus</i>	6	514
16	\flat -g ₂ -F	<i>Ante me non est formatus Deus</i>	6	515
17	\natural -c ₁ -F	<i>Confitemini Domino filii Israel</i>	6	516
18	\natural -c ₁ -G	<i>O gloriosa Domina... quae nec primam</i>	6	517
19	\natural -g ₂ -A	<i>In Deo salutare meum</i>	6	518
20	\natural -c ₁ -D	<i>Regnum mundi</i>	6	519
21	\natural -g ₂ -G	<i>Agimus tibi gratias</i>	6	520

Table 4: L-1582 (print order)

N°	Tonal type	Motet	LW
1	b-c ₁ -G	<i>Auris bona est</i>	696
2	b-c ₁ -G	<i>Peccata mea, Domine</i>	697
3	b-c ₁ -F	<i>Beatus vir, qui inventus est</i>	698
4	b-c ₁ -F	<i>Ego sum panis vivus</i>	699
5	b-c ₁ -F	<i>Impulsus eversus sum</i>	700
6	b-c ₁ -F	<i>Feci iudicium et justitiam</i>	701
7	b-g ₂ -F	<i>O sacrum convivium</i>	702
8	b-g ₂ -F	<i>Justorum animae</i>	703
9	b-g ₂ -G	<i>Cantantibus organis</i>	704
10	b-g ₂ -G	<i>Popule meus, quid feci tibi</i>	705
11	b-g ₂ -G	<i>Qui sunt hi sermones</i>	706
12	♯-c ₁ -E	<i>Anima mea liquefacta est</i>	707
13	♯-c ₁ -G	<i>O salutaris hostia</i>	708
14	♯-c ₁ -G	<i>Benedixisti, Domine, terram tuam</i>	709
15	♯-c ₁ -E	<i>Deus tu conversus</i>	710
16	♯-g ₂ -A	<i>Respexit Elias</i>	711
17	♯-g ₂ -C	<i>Christus resurgens ex mortuis</i>	712
18	♯-g ₂ -A	<i>Evehor invidia pressus</i>	713
19	♯-g ₂ -G	<i>Ego sum pauper et dolens</i>	714
20	♯-g ₂ -G	<i>Ut queant laxis</i>	715

Table 5: L-1573 and 1582 ordered by tonal type

Tonal type	N°	Motet	Voices
\natural -g ₂ -C	1582/17	<i>Christus resurgens ex mortuis</i>	5
\natural -c ₁ -D	1573/20	<i>Regnum mundi</i>	6
\natural -c ₁ -E	1573/5	<i>Pulvis et umbra sumus</i>	4
	1573/12	<i>Quis mihi det lacrimis</i>	5
	1582/12	<i>Anima mea liquefacta est</i>	5
	1582/15	<i>Deus tu conversus</i>	5
\natural -c ₁ -F	1573/17	<i>Confitemini Domino filii Israel</i>	6
\flat -c ₁ -F	1573/3	<i>Gaudent in caelis</i>	4
	1573/8	<i>Exsurgat Deus</i>	5
	1582/3	<i>Beatus vir, qui inventus est</i>	5
	1582/4	<i>Ego sum panis vivus</i>	5
	1582/5	<i>Impulsus eversus sum</i>	5
	1582/6	<i>Feci iudicium et justitiam</i>	5
\flat -g ₂ -F	1573/16	<i>Ante me non est formatus Deus</i>	6
	1582/7	<i>O sacrum convivium</i>	5
	1582/8	<i>Iustorum animae</i>	5
\natural -c ₁ -G	1573/7	<i>Pauper sum ego</i>	4
	1573/13	<i>Martini festum celebremus</i>	5
	1573/18	<i>O gloriosa Domina... quae nec primam</i>	6
	1582/13	<i>O salutaris hostia</i>	5
	1582/14	<i>Benedixisti, Domine, terram tuam</i>	5
\natural -g ₂ -G	1573/11	<i>Domine clamavi ad te</i>	5
	1573/21	<i>Agimus tibi gratias</i>	6
	1582/19	<i>Ego sum pauper et dolens</i>	5
	1582/20	<i>Ut queant laxis</i>	5
\flat -c ₁ -G	1573/1	<i>Pater noster, qui es in caelis</i>	4
	1573/4	<i>Nos qui sumus in hoc mundo</i>	4
	1573/9	<i>Misericordias Domini</i>	5
	1582/1	<i>Auris bona est</i>	5
	1582/2	<i>Peccata mea, Domine</i>	5
\flat -g ₂ -G	1573/2	<i>Salve Regina misericordiae</i>	4
	1573/10	<i>Oculi omnium in te sperant</i>	5
	1582/9	<i>Cantantibus organis</i>	5
	1582/10	<i>Popule meus, quid feci tibi</i>	5
	1582/11	<i>Qui sunt hi sermones</i>	5
\natural -g ₂ -A	1573/6	<i>Lauda anima mea Dominum</i>	4
	1573/14	<i>Exaudi Domine preces populorum</i>	5
	1573/19	<i>In Deo salutare meum</i>	6
	1582/16	<i>Respexit Elias</i>	5
	1582/18	<i>Evehor invidia pressus</i>	5
\flat -g ₂ -A	1573/15	<i>Media vita in morte sumus</i>	6