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#### Abstract

The Florilegium Portense encompasses three anthology publications in Leipzig by Erhard Bodenschatz from 1603 to 162 . Born around 1576 , Bodenschatz was a composer and pastor who was active in Saxony and Thuringia. While serving as the cantor at the prominent Schulpforta near Naumburg, Saxony from 1600 to 1603 , he compiled an anthology of eighty-nine motets called the Florilegium Selectissimarum Cantionum, which was published by Abraham Lamberg in 1603. Nearly all of the works contained in the anthology were in Latin and most were for eight voices. An expanded and revised volume of 115 motets was published in 1618 and was the only publication to truly bear the name of Florilegium Portense. The anthology was designed for use at the school, primarily to provide music for daily functions such as singing at meals. Three years later, Bodenschatz published another volume of 150 motets, entitled Florilegii Musici Portensis. The last was intended more for liturgical use and consists mostly of music by Italian composers. Eighty-three of the pieces in this latter volume also occur in the Promptuarium Musicum, a contemporary four-volume collection edited by Abraham Schadaeus and Caspar Vincentius. The anthologies have become known primarily because of their use by Johann Sebastian Bach in Leipzig, but they were widely used in schools and churches throughout Germany.

Research on the Florilegium has slowly progressed, but much of the music remains unavailable in score. The primary purpose of this project is to present editions of fourteen motets from the 1618 volume: three by Andreas Berger, one by Bodenschatz, five by Albinus Fabricius, two each by Andrea Gabrieli and Jacob Handl (known as Gallus), and one motet by Vincentius. These were chosen because they represent some of the more prolific composers found in the anthology, its editor, and possible contributor of the continuo part. The motets by Gabrieli and one by Handl were chosen because they are eight-voice arrangements of works originally scored for ten or twelve voices. During the transcription and editing process, it was discovered that the motets in the anthology differ, often in significant ways, from the composers' original publications. The changes, although inconsistent, appear to be driven by a desire to make the music more accessible, most likely for the students at


Schulpforta. There are also many errors in the Florilegium. The text of this study will explore each of the motets that were transcribed and examine the differences between the composers' original publications and the versions in the Bodenschatz anthology.
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## Part I:

## Text

## Chapter 1: Introduction

Throughout the sixteenth century, the relatively new printing system of movable type enabled composers to distribute their music more easily and thereby develop a reputation. Prolific Italian printers such as Ottaviano Petrucci, Antonio Gardano, and Girolamo Scotto published collections of individual composers' works but also released anthologies of secular and sacred music. For those publishing firms, anthologies were a "shop window," a representation of the composers and pieces that they printed in a format that might be more practical than volumes of pieces by a single composer. ${ }^{1}$ In addition to providing a survey of the musical output of a given region, such collections also enabled lesser-known composers to have their works appear alongside the music of established masters, although as Jerome Roche points out, to have one's music included in a collection at all would indicate some degree of renown. ${ }^{2}$ The anthologies of madrigals and motets published during the lateRenaissance represented a curated selection of what the publishers considered to be the paragons of the genre.

These anthologies eventually spread outside of Italy; those brought to German-speaking regions (hereafter referred to as Germany for convenience, even though the country was not unified) provided access to music from the south and, along with composers like Hans Leo Hassler and Heinrich Schütz who actually traveled to Venice to study before returning Germany, contributed to the spread of the Italian style north of the Alps. The transmission of repertoire, however, was understandably delayed. While concertato sacred music became the focus of Italian composers early in the seventeenth century, that style did not take hold in Germany until later. Thus, it was the music of Giovanni Pierluigi da Palestrina, Claudio Monteverdi, and the polychoral style of composers like Andrea and Giovanni Gabrieli that formed the body of sacred repertoire in Germany in the first half of the century and occupied the most space in new anthologies printed there. The German music printing industry was unlike Italy in that it was comprised of smaller, scattered firms that did not have large catalogs of

1. Jerome Roche, "Anthologies and the Dissemination of Early Baroque Italian Sacred Music," Soundings 4 (1974): 10.
2. Roche, 6.
composers and pieces to draw from. ${ }^{3}$ It was often knowledgeable editors who compiled the works that were published in their anthologies, which would then be printed by others. One of the first important motet collections in Germany was the two-volume Sacrae Cantiones of 1585 and 1588, edited by Friedrich Lindner. The first volume contains forty-one works, many in multiple sections and most for five or six voices. Palestrina, Claudio Merulo, and Pandolfo Zallamella are the most represented composers. The second volume of fifty-six works, titled Continuatio Cantionum Sacrarum, represents the polychoral tradition, dominated by the two Gabrielis. Lindner's anthologies were followed by two collections of massive proportions. Published in four volumes from 1611 to 1617, the Promptuarium Musicum was compiled by Abraham Schadaeus and Caspar Vincentius and included 432 works in total. The Promptuarium was printed in Strasbourg, a major publishing center for southern Germany, which contains both Catholic and Protestant regions. ${ }^{4}$ In the Protestant city of Leipzig, another collection was printed in 1603, 1618, and 1621 that is the focus of this study: the Florilegium Portense, edited by Erhard Bodenschatz.

Most of the details about Erhard Bodenschatz come from the groundbreaking dissertation by Otto Riemer on the Florilegium Portense. ${ }^{5}$ In addition to context from Bodenschatz's publications, Riemer also examined municipal and ecclesiastical records to compile information about Bodenschatz's life and career. Riemer's work and a dissertation by Mark Chaney, ${ }^{6}$ which is the most comprehensive research thus far in English, give thorough attention to Bodenschatz, so only the most important details will be reproduced here. No record exists of Bodenschatz's birth, but scholars believe that he was born in Lichtenberg around $1576 .{ }^{7}$ He was a student at the Schulpforta, a renowned school near Naumberg, under the musical tutelage of Sethus Calvisius, who is known today primarily for his theoretical publications and his tenure as cantor at the Thomaskirche in Leipzig. ${ }^{8}$ Bodenschatz

[^0]also studied at the university in Leipzig. In 1600, Bodenschatz became the cantor at Schulpforta himself until he took the position of pastor at Rehausen in 1603. In 1608, he became pastor at Gross Osterhausen, where he served until his death in $1636 .{ }^{9}$

Bodenschatz benefited much from his study with Calvisius and not only as regards his understanding of music and composition. It appears that his publications as an editor and composer, when in the same genres as Calvisius (collections of hymns, a psalter, and bicinia), are modeled on the anthologies of the older musician. ${ }^{10}$ In fact, Bodenschatz's second publication as editor was a collection of hymns composed by his teacher. Published in 1606, the Florilegium selectissimorum hymnorum was known colloquially as the Kleine Florilegium, was very popular in the Lutheran church, and reissued as late as 1777, according to Riemer. ${ }^{11}$ More importantly for this study, it appears that most of the music for Bodenschatz's first publication of motets in 1603, the Florilegium Selectissimarum Cantionum, ${ }^{12}$ was compiled by Calvisius during his time as cantor at the Schulpforta, despite the fact that the title page only lists Bodenschatz as collector and editor. Calvisius's involvement is indicated in his Latin poem that was included in the 1603 collection, which Holger Eichhorn calls an "Ur-Florilegium" ${ }^{13}$ because it precedes the more famous, revised collection of 1618. Translated in Chaney's dissertation, ${ }^{14}$ the illustrative poem reveals that Calvisius desired to publish this collection of motets, but was not able to do so: "Publishing these songs pleased me but the envious fate was against me: The same luck did not come upon me like it does for you now." ${ }^{15}$ Scholars point out a tone of bitterness coming from the Calvisius ${ }^{16}$ in lines such as the above and the conclusion of the poem: "because you succeeded in finding better patrons who promote your intentions so that as a result your fame will probably rise
9. Otto Riemer and Clytus Gottwald, "Bodenschatz, Erhard," Grove Music Online, 2001, accessed April 9, 2021, https://www-oxfordmusiconline-com.proxy2.library.illinois.edu/grovemusic/view/10.1093/gmo/9781561592630.001. 0001/omo-9781561592630-e-0000003360.
10. Chaney, "Four Motets," 11-12, 15; Bodenschatz's compositions will be discussed in Chapter 4.
11. Riemer, "Bodenschatz und sein FP," 52; Halter, "A Study," 38.
12. Erhard Bodenschatz, ed., Florilegium Selectissimarum Cantionum: praestantissimorum aetatis nostrae autorum, 4. 5. 6. 7. \& 8. Vocum (Leipzig: Abraham Lamberg, 1603), http://digital.slub-dresden.de/id456199454.
13. Holger Eichhorn, "Ein Sammeldruck vom Beginn des Dreißigjährigen Krieges: Das Florilegium Portense," in Musik Zwischen Leipzig Und Dresden: Geschichte Der Kantoreigesellschaft Mügeln 1571-1996, ed. Michael Heinemann and Peter Wollny (Oschersleben: Ziethen, 1996), 65.
14. Chaney, "Four Motets," 193-94.
15. Chaney, 193.
16. See Riemer, "Bodenschatz und sein FP," 56-57; Eichhorn, "Ein Sammeldruck," 61; and Chaney, "Four Motets," 15-16.
up to the heavenly realms." ${ }^{17}$ It is likely because of this sour tone that when Bodenschatz published the 1618 revision, Calvisius's poem was removed along with five of his seven compositions from the earlier anthology, while the total number of motets increased by twenty-six. The most important impact of the poem, however, is the knowledge that the repertoire was compiled by Calvisius, meaning that any alterations to the eighty-nine works in the original Florilegium Selectissimarum Cantionum might have been made by him and merely copied by Bodenschatz. ${ }^{18}$ Despite the rise of the printing industry, repertoire was still often copied by hand and passed on in that manner. It could be that it was Calvisius's transcriptions of repertoire or hand-copied versions that he acquired from others that were used in producing the partbooks for the Florilegium rather than the composers' original published editions. Finally, the poem also reveals that it was Calvisius who instituted singing before and after meals: "and if they opened their throats to the meal or by food satisfied hunger yielded, gladly looking at the shining stream, the boys a pleasing song together sang." ${ }^{19}$ This is stated as one of the primary purposes of the collection on the title page of the 1618 volume (ante \& post cibum) in addition to general educational use (studiosae Juventutis usum). ${ }^{20}$

The Florilegium Selectissimarum Cantionum was published in 1603 while Bodenschatz was still cantor at the Schulpforta. As mentioned previously, it contains eighty-nine motets. ${ }^{21}$ Of these, ten had not been published previously: the seven motets by Calvisius, two by Bodenschatz, and one by Julius Eremita (number 14, "Deus adiutor fortis"). In 1618, Bodenschatz published a revised and expanded version of the 1603 volume as the Florilegium Portense. This is signified by a line on the title page: "second edition with additions and corrections". ${ }^{22}$ The name of the 1618 volume also reflects its educational purpose, translated as the "Flowers of Schulpforta," invoking the name of the

[^1]institution where Calvisius and Bodenschatz taught. ${ }^{23}$ Riemer points out that unlike contemporary publications like the Promptuarium Musicum, this revised volume did not contain a list of printing mistakes, but changes did occur to fix errors and make alterations. ${ }^{24}$ In the musical editions in this project, however, there were often discrepancies between the 1603 and 1618 versions in which the earlier volume more closely aligned with the composer's original publication. These can be observed in the editorial notes following the scores. It seems that while some errors were fixed in the revision, others arose. In addition to correcting errors, the new volume contained a continuo part for each motet, included in the Basis Generalis partbook. Riemer and Gottwald claim this is "supplied by the editor, ${ }^{25}$ and indeed, no other person besides Bodenschatz is mentioned on the title page of the Florilegium. Eichhorn, however, hypothesizes that the continuo parts for the 1618 and 1621 anthologies were edited by Caspar Vincentius, ${ }^{26}$ who was responsible for the continuo parts for the first three volumes and the entirety of the fourth volume of the Promptuarium Musicum. The Basis Generalis and Eichhorn's hypothesis are discussed further in Chapter 2.

Most of the motets in the Florilegium Portense were inherited from the Florilegium Selectissimarum Cantionum. Other than the removal of five of Calvisius's motets (numbered 85 through 89 by Bodenschatz), there were two other alterations to the body of music from the 1603 anthology. First, number 26, "Cor mundum" had been listed as anonymous in the earlier volume but is credited to Andreas Pevernage in the latter. Second, Christian Erbach's "Nesciens mater" (motet 51) was replaced by "Repleatur os meum" by Gabriele Fattorini. Other works by Erbach were retained. Calvisius' motets were replaced and additional works were included to bring the total number of works in the 1618 volume to 115 . Some of the composers of the additional motets were already represented in the 1603 volume, including Hieronymus Praetorius and Giovanni Gabrieli. Of the new composers, Andreas Berger, Melchior Vulpius, and Christoph Walliser claim three motets each, and Nikolaus Zangius is represented by two pieces. Fourteen composers have only one work added, the most notable being Melchior Franck, Adam Gumpelzhaimer, Michael Praetorius, Martin Roth, Caspar Vincentius, and

[^2]Ludovico Viadana. Eight of these new additions are also contained in the Promptuarium. ${ }^{27}$ Roth, who was cantor at Schulpforta from 1606 to 1608 , and Gumpelzhaimer are the most represented composers in the second volume of the Florilegium. In general, the composers represented in the 1618 volume are primarily south Germans, which is quite different from other anthologies, such as Lindner's and the Promptuarium, that focus on Italians. The most frequently included composers are Jacob Handl (known as Gallus) with nineteen works, Hieronymus Praetorius with ten, and Orlande de Lassus with nine motets. In addition to the composers mentioned above, Albinus Fabricius and Christian Erbach each have five works in the 1618 volume, and Hans Leo Hassler and Andrea and Giovanni Gabrieli each have three. There are seven anonymous motets in the Florilegium Portense, five of which also exist in the Florilegium Selectissimarum Cantionum. The fact that Bodenschatz included these attests to their quality and that the editor was concerned with the music contained in his collection, not only the names represented. ${ }^{28}$ All but five of the motets in the Florilegium have Latin texts. Those five exceptional works have German lyrics, including two settings of "Das alte Jahr vergangen ist. ${ }^{29}$ Notably, three of the five pieces by Calvisius that were expunged from the Florilegium were in German, including a setting of "Vom Himmel hoch" and the carol "Joseph lieber, Joseph mein." By far, the anthology is comprised mostly of motets for double choir. Eighty-three of the works in the 1618 volume are for eight-voices, four works are for seven parts, nineteen are written for six voices, and only eight motets are for five parts. There is just one piece included for four voices: Jacob Handl's "Ecce quomodo moritur justus," which became a regular feature of Good Friday vespers in Leipzig during Bach's time.

In 1621, Bodenschatz published another collection of motets, the Florilegii Musici Portensis. ${ }^{30}$ On the surface, the 1621 collection is much like its predecessor, though larger in scale. The later volume has 150 motets, forty-five more than the 1618 anthology. There are fourteen motets in German, which

[^3]is a slightly larger percentage than in the earlier volume but still considerably less than the motets in Latin. ${ }^{31}$ The voicing of the works is similar: five motets for five voices, twenty in six parts, nine works for seven voices, and 115 for eight parts. As the four-voice piece by Handl was an outlier in the Florilegium Portense, the 1621 anthology contains an extraordinary voicing in the opposite direction: the ten-part "Factum est, dum iret" by Vulpius. There are two notable differences between the 1618 and 1621 anthologies, however. The first lies in the purpose of the publication. By 1621, Bodenschatz was no longer teaching at the Schulpforta but serving as pastor at Gross Osterhausen. His occupation there would be focused more on worship and less on teaching music. Whereas the Florilegium Portense mentions singing the motets around meal times and for general educational use, the title page of the Florilegii Musici Portensis describes its pieces as appropriate for use on feast days and general Sundays throughout the church year. ${ }^{32}$ The 1618 anthology includes a liturgical index, but Chaney notes that the later volume goes further by placing the motets in a stricter liturgical order. ${ }^{33}$ In the 1621 publication, headings for seasons and particular feast days do appear in the body of the anthology starting at the seventy-third motet, but the first sixty-four pieces seem to simply be in alphabetical order, although the first two are referenced as appropriate for Advent in the liturgical index. Out of the ninety-eight individual citations in the liturgical index of the Florilegii Musici Portensis, only eleven motets are among the first sixty-four pieces, reinforcing the separation between sections of the volume. To further assert Bodenschatz's perspective as a priest, Chaney points out that there are 150 motets in the collection, which is the same as the number of Psalms, and that the final motet is a setting of Psalm 150. ${ }^{34}$

The second way in which the Florilegii Musici Portensis differs from its predecessor is by the composers who are represented. As stated previously, the composers with the most works in this volume are Martin Roth (fifteen motets) and Adam Gumpelzhaimer (thirteen). Interestingly, the motets by Gumpelzhaimer were not credited to him but listed as "ignoratus," "anonymous," or "in-

[^4]certus." With his 1980 article, however, Werner Braun revealed that all thirteen of those pieces were from Gumpelzhaimer's first book of motets, Sacrorum Concentuum, published in 1601. ${ }^{35}$ Braun hypothesizes that since Bodenschatz included one motet from Gumpelzhaimer's collection in the 1618 Florilegium, "Benedicta sit Sancta Trinitas," the editor may have copied a stack of motets from the Sacrorum Concentuum but only labeled the first piece with the composer's name. ${ }^{36}$ According to this theory, when Bodenschatz decided to compile the 1621 anthology, the rest of Gumpelzhaimer's pieces had become separated from the labeled motet, which had been used to make the partbooks for the 1618 collection. This points to another interesting aspect of the Florilegii Musici Portensis: that Bodenschatz had access to many of the works included in the 1621 volume before the first anthology was published in 1618. For example, Martin Roth died in 1610, and it seems likely that he transmitted his works to Bodenschatz personally since the two had a connection through their work at the Schulpforta. In fact, referring to the previously mentioned division of motets by alphabetical and liturgical order, most of Roth's (thirteen of fifteen) and Gumpelzhaimer's (ten of thirteen) appear in the first portion of the anthology. Similarly, many of the composers of the first sixty-four works also appear in the Florilegium Portense: Calvisius, Franck, Hassler, Vulpius, Walliser, and Friedrich Weissensee, for example. Calvisius's two pieces surround a motet in German by Bodenschatz himself entitled "Ich danke dir," and Chaney argues that this placement pays homage to the editor's teacher. ${ }^{37}$ The inclusion of this older repertoire in a section separate from the liturgically-ordered motets demonstrates an overflow of pieces that Bodenschatz was not able to include in the first volume. Furthermore, while most of the composers of the first section of the Florilegii Musici Portensis are German, the rest of the anthology is populated by Italians. The Italian composers with the most motets are Leone Leoni and Benedetto Pallavicino (each with five works); Ludovico Balbi, Curtio Valcampi (four pieces); and many composers with three motets, including Vincentius Bertholusius (Vincenzo Bertolusi), Francesco Bianciardi, Giovanni Gabrieli, Asprilio Pacelli, Antonio Savetta, and Giovanni Battista Stefanini. Many of these represent a newer generation than composers such as Handl and

[^5]Lassus that comprise the first anthology. ${ }^{38}$ Other German composers are also included in this section: Vincentius (four pieces), Christoph Demantius and Nicolaus Zangius (three motets each), and one work by Bodenschatz himself. The ordering and content of the second part of the Florilegii Musici Portensis also demonstrates the influence of the Promptuarium Musicum. Although Bodenschatz had already added eight motets from the Promptuarium to the 1618 Florilegium Portense, he duplicated eighty-three works from the Strasbourg collection in the Florilegii Musici Portensis. Sixty-six of these appear in the liturgical section of the anthology, and they tend be grouped together with other motets from the same volume of the Promptuarium. ${ }^{39}$ Twenty-two motets are from the first volume of the Promptuarium (1611), twenty-three from the second (1612), twenty-six from third (1613), and twelve pieces come from the final 1617 volume, which was edited by Vincentius alone. These differences in purpose and content indicate a significant departure from the first volume of the Florilegium.

The reason Bodenschatz's anthologies have received so much interest is that their use was quite widespread, especially throughout northern Germany. Riemer and Gottwald write that "the 1618 and 1621 editions were for long used, and frequently rebound, by schools at Bremen, Dresden, Grimma, Halle, Leipzig (where Bach used them at the Thomasschule), Lüneburg, Pirna and elsewhere." ${ }^{40}$ Indeed, much of the fame of the Florilegium occurred because Johann Sebastian Bach ordered copies for St. Thomas in $1729 .{ }^{41}$ Some scholars have stated that Bach ordered additional copies during his tenure in Leipzig and, thus, exaggerated the importance of the collection and led some to believe that it was printed multiple times. It seems, however that these historians misinterpreted the Leipzig records, which mention only the partial title of Florilegium in a 1737 entry. ${ }^{42}$ Eichhorn states that these scholars confused the motet anthology with the 1606 Florilegium selectissimorum hymnorum, which was reprinted in several editions throughout the eighteenth century. ${ }^{43}$

The use of the Florilegium Portense in Leipzig is also demonstrated by the Leipziger Kirchen-

[^6]Andachten of $1694 .{ }^{44}$ This document is a prayer book intended to be used by churches, but also contains an index of hymns for each Sunday and all the major feasts of the church year. In addition, there are suggestions of motets from the 1618 and 1621 volumes of the Florilegium for each day. There are also suggestions from Melchior Vulpius's Cantionum Sacrarum (published in three volumes: two volumes in 1602 and 1603 in Jena and the third in Erfurt in 1610). The Leipziger KirchenAndachten, in addition to confirming the use of the anthology, provides us with an idea of what motets might have been sung on particular days in Leipzig, complimenting the liturgical indices contained in the collections themselves. The motets can therefore be connected with other repertoire, such as Bach's cantatas.

As Riemer and Gottwald state, the Florilegium was also found in other locations outside of Leipzig, and this is confirmed in catalogs of choral libraries. An inventory of music from St. Michael's school in Lüneburg, where Bach sang as a youth, includes an entry for a "Florilegium Bodenschatz." ${ }^{45}$ Buxtehude also encountered the collection during his education at St. Mary's church in Helsingør, and both volumes of the anthology were in his library at St. Mary's in Lübeck. ${ }^{46}$ On a visit to the library in Hamburg, the head of the special collections in art, music, and theater, Dr. Jürgen Neubacher, was kind to share that the copies of the anthologies now found in that library once belonged to Thomas Selle, cantor at the Latin school and director of church music in Hamburg in the mid-seventeenth century and a prolific composer. ${ }^{47}$ It is likely, therefore, that the Florilegium was in use at the Johanneum in Hamburg. RISM indicates that extant copies can be found in many other libraries across Europe, including in Austria, Belgium, France, Poland, and Sweden. Copies outside of continental Europe are held in London, Oxford, New York, and Washington D.C. ${ }^{48}$

[^7]Many writings on Lutheran liturgical music mention the Bodenschatz collection as an important resource in the repertoire. Friedrich Blume's extensive discussion of Protestant church music places the collection in the context of Italian influence on German music of the time and the lasting effect it had on composers such as Hassler and Schein. ${ }^{49}$ Other resources such as Günther Stiller's work on Leipzig liturgy is more specific about how the motets were used as introits and their importance based on the copies ordered by Bach and the citations in church rubrics. ${ }^{50}$ Another contextual resource, Lorenzo Bianconi's survey of sacred music in the Lutheran church, cites the Latin motets within the Bodenschatz anthology and others as examples of commonality with the Catholic church, the music of which he examines in the previous chapter. ${ }^{51}$ He notes that their popularity is due in part to the teaching of rhetoric and languages (Latin) in schools and describes their endurance in the repertoire as a "tenacious resistance to the rapid changes of modern taste." ${ }^{52}$

Christian Leitmeir's chapter on cross-confessional music echoes the work of Bianconi in that it seeks to eliminate the delineation that some historians have made between the music of Lutheran and Catholic churches. ${ }^{53}$ He states that "in the sixteenth century most Christians, regardless of their confessional background, considered themselves as heirs to the same musical legacy and tended to appreciate the same works by the same composers." ${ }^{54}$ Musical styles were similar and sacred polyphony was favored in both the Catholic and Lutheran churches, but texts might be altered to fit theological ideas. Marian texts or texts for Corpus Christi, for example, would be avoided or changed in Lutheran settings. ${ }^{55}$ Language was not an issue, and Leitmeir points out that Luther valued the use of Latin in worship for churches with schools attached, reflecting Bianconi's comments about the importance of

[^8]the language in education. ${ }^{56}$ In general, Lutherans tended to adopt more music from Catholic composers than vice versa although some German hymns were used in Catholic settings, especially if they were from before the Reformation. ${ }^{57}$ Leitmeir discusses the Psalmodia by Lucas Lossius, a collection of Vesper hymns by Jacobus Kerle, and the motet anthologies of Friedrich Lindner as examples of importing Italianate music in Latin into the Lutheran church. These are useful in demonstrating how common the practice was and in establishing a precedent for anthologies like the Florilegium, especially in the case of Lindner's collections. Leitmeir asserts that aesthetically pleasing "prestigious and fashionable" music was desired over music of a Lutheran origin, ${ }^{58}$ justifying the inclusion of so many Italian Catholic composers in Bodenschatz's collections.

David Crook's article examines the use of motets in worship to comment on the readings of the day, especially the Gospel. ${ }^{59}$ He examines liturgical indices from several collections as well as performance records to find motets which were suggested or programmed for Sundays when the musical text was not already designated as part of the service for that day. These occasions indicate a link between themes or meaning in the motet text and the readings or focus of the occasion. Crook first examines Johannes Rühling's Tabulaturbuch auff Orgeln (1583), which is organized by the church year and has each piece assigned to an occasion, creating a model for anthologies to come. Crook examines the lesser feasts in particular, where the choices of motets are less obvious and where Rühling's recommendations seem to be chosen specifically for how their text reinforces the scripture. Crook gives more examples, eventually discussing Andreas Pevernage's Cantiones Sacrae. This collection exemplifies Leitmeir's points about the sharing of repertoire in that it was originally published for Catholic audiences in 1578 but then revised in 1602 with some problematic texts removed, showing "unmistakable signs of repackaging for a Lutheran audience." ${ }^{60}$ The revision also contains a liturgical index. One motet by Pevernage, "Cor mundum crea in me," is found in the Florilegium, and in both collections, the piece labeled for use at Pentecost. The revision of Pevernage's collection to
56. Leitmeir, "Beyond the Denominational Paradigm," 156.
57. Leitmeir, 157.
58. Leitmeir, 174.
59. David Crook, "The Exegetical Motet," Journal of the American Musicological Society 68, no. 2 (2015): 255-316. 60. Crook, 289.
be accessible to Lutherans is mirrored in Bodenschatz's anthologies: taking many pieces of music that were written for Catholic parishes and publishing them in a Protestant area with an index for use in Lutheran schools and churches. Finally, Crook warns that as we label the origin of texts in modern editions, we risk limiting their use and fail to reflect the historical reality that the motets were a musical sermon: theological commentary that could be appropriate far more than once or twice in a lectionary cycle. ${ }^{61}$

In order to understand the Bodenschatz anthology within the context of other contemporary collections, Jerome Roche's article gives a comprehensive overview of the variety of sacred music that was disseminated throughout Italy and Germany. ${ }^{62}$ The first half of the study reflects a highly regionalized publishing scene, where anthologies printed in Venice, Milan, and Rome demonstrate different appreciations of composers and styles. Roche eventually discusses anthology publication in Germany, mentioning Bodenschatz's Florilegium Portense and its counterpart from Strasbourg, Abraham Schadaeus's Promptuarium Musicum, both of which included a large of amount of Italian music. Roche's survey demonstrates that the Germans were slow to adopt the concerted motet style. Thus, the polychoral motet that dominates the Florilegium was falling out of fashion in Italy by the time Bodenschatz's anthologies were printed. Later German collections by Johann Donfrid in the 1620s and especially those by Ambrosius Profe in the 1640s represented the adoption of the concerted style, including some contrafacta of some of Monteverdi's later madrigals.

Stephen Rose's article focuses on the printing and publishing scene of Leipzig. ${ }^{63}$ He covers the genres of printed music (partbooks, hymnals, treatises, and pamphlets for specific occasions) and the major publishers. Included in this discussion is Abraham Lamberg, the printer of the Florilegium and an alumnus of the Pforta school. ${ }^{64}$ Rose states that Lamberg developed a printing font around 1607, which explains differences in notation of semifusae between the 1603 and 1618 volumes. ${ }^{65}$ Most importantly, Rose states that most printers in Leipzig did not specialize in music exclusively,
62. Roche, "Anthologies."
63. Rose, "Music Printing in Leipzig."
64. The title page of the 1621 volume lists Lamberg and Andreas Mamitzsch. Rose states "Mamitzsch was responsible for the physical act of printing, but Lamberg supplied the type and may also have set it" (Rose, 336).
65. Rose, 335; this issue is discussed in Chapter 2, beginning on page 22.
nor did they have extensive training in knowledge in music. There were even complaints of errors in printings of normal texts. This could be a contributing factor to the number of errors in the Florilegium anthologies. One other point of interest is the discussion on print runs, in which Rose suggests the average run for a partbook collection might be around 1,000 copies.

Turning to literature specifically on the Florilegium, the first work that must be considered is Otto Riemer's groundbreaking dissertation on Bodenschatz and the collections. ${ }^{66}$ The document begins by detailing the life of Bodenschatz, researched through prefatory material of his works and Riemer's gathering of city, school, and church records. Riemer then discusses each of Bodenschatz's publications as a composer, giving musical examples. He turns to the Florilegium specifically, discussing the front matter, the composers, and the pieces themselves. Reimer states that although the use of motets in services varied by locale, they could be performed at the Introit, after the Epistle, after the words of institution, or during distribution of communion. ${ }^{67}$ There is an interesting analysis of text painting in which Riemer shows several examples from the music. The author addresses the ambiguity of the $i j$ markings and the difficulty this presents in setting the underlay accurately, advocating for following the rules of syllabification set forth in 1903 by Jakob Quadflieg. ${ }^{68}$ There is some discussion of chiavette and performance practice, but it is now outdated and not very helpful as Eichhorn and Chaney have said. ${ }^{69}$

Clifford Halter's thesis is a generalized translation of Riemer's work, with the addition of background material on the motet and sacred music in Germany during the seventeenth century. ${ }^{70}$ Halter omits most of the material on performance practice and chiavette issues. As Chaney points out, ${ }^{71}$ Halter claims in his introduction that an unnamed professor at the University of Michigan was working on transcriptions of repertoire from the Florilegium, but none have surfaced. ${ }^{72}$

Holger Eichhorn's essay attempts to correct misunderstandings about Bach's purchases of the

[^9]Florilegium and focuses on the purpose of the anthology: to collect music that would be accessible to singers. Eichhorn relays an informed perspective, relating the anthology to those by Lindner and Schadaeus. Eichhorn is the first scholar to posit the idea of Vincentius editing the continuo part, but this is adopted by Chaney as "almost certain" despite it being a sort of loose hypothesis. ${ }^{73}$ Eichhorn does address the many errors as "a sign of considerable provinciality," ${ }^{, 74}$ but he is careful to say that the collection was successful and achieved its purpose of providing a body of repertoire that school and church choirs could perform. As previously mentioned, Eichhorn's index of the anthologies is quite thorough, the most helpful information perhaps being the original publication date and location of each motet.

Mark Chaney's study is the most comprehensive summary of scholarship on the Florilegium in English. ${ }^{75}$ The goals of the study are to place the collection in historical context and assert its significance. In addition, Chaney transcribes and analyzes four motets that were previously unpublished: Bodenschatz's "Quam pulchra es," Curtio Valcampi’s "Senex puerum," "Lieblich und schön sein" by Roth, and "Jubilate Deo" by Gumpelzhaimer. Chaney does cite the original publications of Valcampi and Gumpelzhaimer, but they are not referenced in the editorial notes, so it's unclear whether they were consulted as sources or if Chaney's editions only come from the two volumes of the Florilegium. ${ }^{76}$ The background information presented in the dissertation, which mostly comes from the research into Bodenschatz by Otto Riemer, is very useful in understanding Bodenschatz's status as a musician and the importance of the publication itself within the context of other sacred music partbook collections.

A more recent publication on repertoire from the Florilegium is Frederick Jodry's 2014 study of the motets by Martin Roth. ${ }^{77}$ In this article, he offers excerpts of only four works, but his editions of all sixteen motets from the two volumes have now been published. ${ }^{78}$ Jodry first gives a summary of the anthology and its use in Leipzig. There is not much novel information in this overview, but
73. Chaney, "Four Motets," 23.
74. "Ein Anzeichen erheblicher Provinzialität" (Eichhorn, "Ein Sammeldruck," 68).
75. Chaney, "Four Motets."
76. Chaney, 50-52.
77. L. Frederick Jodry, "Bach and the Renaissance Motet: Martin Roth and the Florilegium Portense," The Choral Journal 55, no. 4 (2014): 47-57.
78. Martin Roth, Complete Motets from "Florilegium Portense," ed. L. Frederick Jodry V (Middleton, WI: A-R Editions, Inc., 2021).

Jodry does identify some other contextual sources not used by Chaney. Most useful is the writer's analysis of the pieces that he has transcribed. Interestingly, about half use a SSAT-ATTB scoring, creating a dichotomy of high and low textures rather than two equal SATB choirs. The most novel motet, according to the author, is "Non est bonum," a quodlibet of two chorale tunes in German accompanied by the six other parts in Latin. Jodry's scores represent the only published works by Roth and are an enormously important contribution in the scholarship on the Florilegium.

Finally, there is a recent interest in performing music from the Florilegium, as exemplified by a recording by Vocal Concert Dresden, led by Peter Kopp. ${ }^{79}$ The album presents six motets from the 1618 Florilegium Portense and seven from the 1621 volume. There is also one motet by Calvisius that was in the 1603 Florilegium Selectissimarum Cantionum but removed in the 1618 edition. ${ }^{80}$ In addition, there are three hymns by Calvisius from the 1606 Florilegium selectissimorum hymnorum. Most notably, the motets include Bodenschatz's "Quam pulchra es," perhaps using Chaney's edition. There are eight works for eight voices, three pieces for six parts, two for five voices, and Handl's four-part "Ecce quomodo moritur justus." The album is a study in the performance practice options available in this repertoire. The ensemble is comprised of twenty singers, cornetto, viola, trombone, dulcian, violone, theorbo, and organ. The instruments play colla parte with the chorus on the eightvoice works, but the works for fewer voices use more unique configurations. On Calvisius's parody motet, two of the six parts are played by the trombone and viola with no singers audible on those lines. The five-voice motet by Stefanini is performed with only a tenor singer and the rest of the parts covered by instruments. Pieces that are more polyphonic seem to have less doubling, more conservative theorbo playing, and sometimes no cornetto. The exquisite piece by Handl is performed a cappella. The motet by Arcangelo Borsaro, "Sit nomen Domini benedictum," is in refrain form, in which the entire chorus sings the repeated passage while the inner sections are performed by soloists. The pieces seem to be performed at Chorton pitch, as the tonal center of the recordings is a semitone above that in the score at modern pitch. Four pieces, however, are a minor third lower than modern 79. Vocal Concert Dresden, Florilegium Portense: Motten \& Hymnen (Auswahl), cond. Peter Kopp, Carus 83.492, 2018, Compact Disc.
80. This motet, "Praeter rerum seriem," is a parody on the setting of the same text by Josquin.
pitch, indicating a transposition of a fourth to adjust for chiavette. The hymns are introduced by organ or theorbo, and two of the three are sung by soloists on the inner verses. There is no apparent ornamentation by the singers, but the cornetto ornaments cadences quite often and has a pseudodescant on one of the hymns, "Te lucis ante terminum." The performances are quite fine, and this album is a welcome and much needed representation of the collection. Finally, the liner notes by bass Christopher Koop reveal more information about the use of the Florilegium at St. Thomas in Leipzig: that it continued to be use under cantor Johann Friedrich Doles but was discarded around 1790 by his successor Johann Adam Hiller. Koop also states that there were discussions around 1800 to produce a new edition of the Florilegium, but these never came to fruition. ${ }^{81}$

The primary purpose of this project is to make available the repertoire from Bodenschatz's anthologies that is not currently published in modern score. After a thorough search, roughly thirty motets from the first anthology were identified as unavailable in score at all. Another ten motets only exist in periodic collections that are not easily accessible to many performing groups. These unavailable works include the pieces with no certain authorship, motets which are the single representation of a composer within the collection, and groups of pieces by composers such as Albinus Fabricius, Andreas Berger, and Melchior Vulpius. In his article, Martin Staehelin hypothesizes that the reason there has been no edition of the Florilegium is simply because of its massive size and the effort and expense necessary to make such an edition. ${ }^{82}$ Indeed, much work is required to examine the concordance between the Florilegium and composers' original editions, and the number of motets in the anthology is immense. In his conclusion, Chaney suggests editing the works of Roth, Bodenschatz, Gumpelzhaimer, and Valcampi. ${ }^{83}$ Jodry has since produced editions of Roth's motets, and although Gumpelzhaimer's works remain unpublished, a more diverse selection of composers was desired for this project. Additionally, works from the first volume were chosen since they represented mostly composers from Bodenschatz's home country and less borrowing from the Promptuarium. Thus, the
82. Staehelin, "Eigentümlichkeiten von und Editionsprobleme," 44.
83. Chaney, "Four Motets," 103.
five motets by Fabricius and three by Berger were chosen as contiguous groups. The pieces by Fabricius also provide an example of writing for six voices, which is less common in the anthology than pieces for double choir. Additionally, one motet by Bodenschatz himself was selected. Also, because of his possible involvement in the Basis Generalis part, the piece by Vincentius from the 1618 volume was transcribed. The last group of pieces were included in this project because they were found to demonstrate remarkable editorial changes from the original. Two motets by Andrea Gabrieli and one by Jacob Handl were originally scored by the composers for more than eight voices (two in twelve parts and one in ten) but were arranged in the anthology for just eight parts. Finally, the version of Handl's "Veni Sancte Spiritus" in the Florilegium has significant rhythmic alteration as compared to the composer's original publication. Thus, although these last four pieces have been published in their original form, they do not exist as found in Bodenschatz's anthology and are also useful cases for studying his editorial choices (or Calvisius's, since the scores could have been edited by the elder cantor).

It is not only the arrangements of motets originally for ten or twelve voices which demonstrate significant departures from the original published versions. First, many errors were found in the Florilegium while editing the scores for this project. This has been cited in the literature ${ }^{84}$ but had not been examined and described in such detail as the editorial notes which accompany the editions in this project. Unfortunately, there are so many steps in the publication process where these mistakes could have been introduced that is difficult to attribute them to any particular stage or responsible party. Not all of the discrepancies appear to be errors, however. There are changes which seem to be intentional, deemed to be so due to repetition or duplication among other parts, or because they require other changes to be made, such as altered voicing or harmony. These editorial departures from the original often occur in the categories of ornamentation, rhythmic simplification, and minimization of harmonic shifts. Unfortunately, these changes are applied inconsistently: ornamentation is removed in order to simplify the rhythm in one passage but added in another, for example. Despite the inconsistencies, the intentional departures from the composers' original publications in the

[^10]Florilegium Portense versions demonstrate the editorial goals of Bodenschatz and Calvisius. Not only was their aim to collect a body of repertoire for their students but to edit those works to make them more accessible and to guarantee the success of their singers. More broadly, the way in which they treat problematic issues perhaps sheds light on the skill of the young singers of the day and the instructional goals of their teachers. The editorial decisions in the Florilegium have not been discussed in the literature thus far and will be thoroughly examined as the main focus of this text.

Following this introduction, a brief chapter will present the sources used in this project, an examination of the notation of the Florilegium, and a discussion of some of the issues in creating the attached editions. The principal concern of this document, however, is examining the differences between the composers' original publications and the versions in the Florilegium Portense. The editorial changes will be presented for each motet, grouped into chapters by voicing. First, the six-voice works of Fabricius, which were largely unchanged in the Florilegium, are discussed. The following chapter examines the works of Bodenschatz, Vincentius, Berger, and Handl's "Veni Sancte Spiritus." Finally, the arrangements of motets that were originally composed for ten or twelve voices will be studied. In each chapter, the life and works of the lesser-known composers, i.e. excepting Gabrieli and Handl, will be discussed. Hopefully, this document and especially the attached editions will enrich our understanding of the music in the Florilegium Portense, equip us with new motets by unexplored composers to study and perform, and inspire even more interest and research into this famous anthology.

## Chapter 2: Notation of the Florilegium Portense

For this project, three extant sets of the 1618 Florilegium Portense were consulted to create the editions. Digitized scans from the United States Library of Congress (LOC) and from the Sächsische Landesbibliothek - Staats- und Universitätsbibliothek (SLUB) in Dresden were used in conjunction with a facsimile of the copies held at Staats- und Universitätsbibliothek in Hamburg, produced by Dr. Bernd Christoph Becker. ${ }^{1}$ All parts are present in the Library of Congress, but the Altus I book is missing several of the printed pages, which have been substituted with handwritten versions. The set in SLUB Dresden is missing the Bassus I partbook. There is no Basis Generalis partbook in Hamburg, so, in his facsimile, Dr. Becker reproduced the copy from the Bayerische Staatsbibliothek in Munich. The three copies of the 1618 volume were compared with scans of the original publication by each composer (detailed in the forthcoming chapters) as well as the 1603 Florilegium Selectissimarum Cantionum (FSC) if the motet was present in that earlier volume. The primary source for the FSC was the scans from the SLUB, with the exception of the Septima partbook, for which a facsimile by Cornetto-Verlag from the Stadtbibliothek Västerås in Sweden was used. ${ }^{2}$

Mark Chaney's dissertation on the Florilegium lists the nine partbooks and describes the prefatory material of the 1618 and 1621 volumes, but does not detail the introductory pages of the Florilegium Selectissimarum Cantionum. ${ }^{3}$ Like the later volumes, the earliest Florilegium inserted the prefatory material in all of the partbooks. Many collections from the time only place such pages in the Tenor book. The title page for the 1603 version is very similar to the 1618 volume, and the anagram by Justinius Bertuchius, rector at Schulpforta from 1601 to 1626, at the very beginning of each partbook is the same except that it is listed as an epigram in the earlier publication. ${ }^{4}$ Bodenschatz's preface to the Florilegium Selectissimarum Cantionum appears nearly verbatim as the Florilegium Portense, although

[^11]two additional paragraphs are added in the latter publication. The 1603 volume then contains a series of poems, written by M. Hieronymus Kromayer, M. Johannes Mülmannus, Calvisius, and Zacharias Schilterus. ${ }^{5}$ An alphabetical index of titles follows, but there is no liturgical index as in the later volumes.

While Chaney does describe the prefatory material of the 1618 and 1621 volumes of the Florilegium, he fails to adequately detail the notation of the sources. He merely comments that the "printed edition of the original is easy to read." ${ }^{6}$ Indeed the pitches are clear, but there are many problems that one encounters when creating an edition from the Florilegium. This chapter will explore the notation of the partbooks and the challenges that stem from the way in which the volumes were edited and published.

The music in the Florilegium is notated using white mensural notation with longa, breve, semibreve, minim, semiminim, fusa, and semifusa note values. In this project, these have not been reduced, so that the semibreve is indicated as a whole note and the rest of the values are represented accordingly. Longa notes typically appear only as the final note of a motet, but longa rests appear quite frequently. The first notational problem arises with the semifusa. In the Florilegium Selectissimarum Cantionum, the semifusa is difficult to distinguish from the fusa, differentiated only by an extra curl through the tail of the note. This is visible in the second line of the Discantus I part of Fabricius "Exaudiat te Dominus" (Figure 2.1a): the second through fourth notes of the line are fusae, but the seventh and eighth notes are semifusae. As stated in the previous chapter, Rose writes that Lamberg, the printer of the Florilegium, standardized his font around 1607. ${ }^{7}$ This date could explain why the semifusae in the Florilegium Selectissimarum Cantionum are different from those in the Florilegium Portense. Although the semifusae are easily distinguishable from the fusae in the 1618 volume by having two flags (see the second and third notes of the second line in Figure 2.1b), either the editor or the printer frequently mistook semifusae for fusae. In the pieces transcribed for this project, this
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## (a) Florilegium Selectissimarum Cantionum

Sächsische Landesbibliothek — Staats- und Universitätsbibliothek Dresden; Mus.Pi.33,2; p. 54; 12051253N


Figure 2.1: Appearance of semifusae in Fabricius "Exaudiat te Dominus," Discantus I
error occurs three times in "Sis praesens Deus" by Fabricius and once in his "Exaudiat te Dominus" (Figure 2.2). In these four cases, the pair of notes are represented as semifusae in the composer's

(a) Cantiones Sacrae, Altus

Herzog August Bibliothek, 2.13.19 Musica, p. 109, 49443581X

(b) Florilegium Portense, Altus I Library of Congress, Music Division, M1490.B7, p. 208, 2010456596

Figure 2.2: Employment of semifusae in Fabricius "Exaudiat te Dominus"

Cantiones Sacrae and in the Florilegium Selectissimarum Cantionum but appear as fusae in the Florilegium Portense. The same substitution occurs four times in Berger's "Cantate Domino" and once in his "Laudate Dominum," but in each of these cases, the prior note was shortened: an adjustment that indicates conscious musical decisions. ${ }^{8}$ The inconsistency of semifusae is one of the most egregious errors in the Florilegium and would have created a great deal of confusion in rehearsal if a choir was reading from the partbooks and had no other source to draw on.

In the Florilegium, accidentals are marked either with a flat sign or a character resembling an "x," which indicates a raising of pitch (the " $x$ " accidental, therefore is the equivalent of a modern sharp sign or a natural sign, depending on the context). Frequently at cadential figures in the Florilegium, only one accidental is printed where two appear in the original (Figure 2.3). As in the figure, usually it is the latter accidental that is printed in the Bodenschatz anthology. In these cases, the musical context certainly implies that both notes should be raised, but the performer would need to be looking ahead, and novice choristers may not have had the knowledge required to make such an adjustment on their own.

The Florilegium contains other features of mensural notation that are consistent with other publi-
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(a) Cantiones Sacrae, Quinta

Herzog August Bibliothek, 2.13.19 Musica, p. 224, 49443581X

(b) Florilegium Portense, Discantus II Library of Congress, Music Division, M1490.B7, p. 956, 2010456596

Figure 2.3: Cadential accidentals in Fabricius "Gaudent in caelis"
cations of the time. First, ligatures are used to indicate consecutive notes on the same syllable. Unlike earlier notational systems, which had a large variety of ligature shapes to indicate different rhythmic values, these are almost always realized as two semibreves in the Bodenschatz volumes since the stem at the left side of the figure points upward. In this project, ligatures are indicated in the score by closed horizontal brackets above the notes. Some ligatures have the second note colored black, employing a special type of coloration called minor color (Figure 2.4). In these ligatures, the first note is still

(a) Florilegium Portense

(b) mm. 47-48

Library of Congress, Music Division, M1490.B7, p. 1255, 2010456596

Figure 2.4: Minor color in Vincentius "Apparuerunt Apostolis," Octava
a semibreve, but the second note is shortened by the length of the note that follows. In most cases, the second note of the ligature becomes the equivalent of a dotted minim as it is followed by a semiminim. Such notation is not really necessary given the prevalent use of the dot in the partbooks but the ligature does help confirm the syllabification. ${ }^{9}$ In addition to identifying the ligature in the score

[^14] Press, 2010), 128-29.
with a closed horizontal bracket, an open bracket is used in this project to indicate the coloration.
The other type of coloration used in the Florilegium denotes imperfections within a triple-meter passage. In triple meter at the rhythmic level of these pieces, the breve is perfected such that two consecutive breves are realized as dotted breves or consisting of three semibreves each. If the composer wanted the breves to not be perfected, this would have to be indicated as an exception to the default. Such exceptions often occur at the end of a phrase and result in a Lombardic rhythm, with a semibreve preceding the imperfect breve in a short-long rhythm (Figure 2.5). In this figure, the


Figure 2.5: Coloration in Fabricius "Non vos relinquam," Tenor
fact that there are only two semibreves in between breves already indicates that one will not be perfected, but the coloration confirms that the penultimate breve is imperfect (two semibreves in length) while the breve that follows is perfect (three semibreves long). Again, the issue of perfection and coloration would not be necessary if dots were used consistently, but perhaps dots were not employed as a default in order to save paper, to retain the earlier practice, or maybe even to preserve a certain rhythmic feeling to the music. In his article on coloration, Michael Robertson points out that since the blackened notes would not be interpreted in different rhythm, it must imply a change in accent. ${ }^{10}$

Another significant problem with the Florilegium is text underlay: it is often difficult to determine which syllable is attached to which note. Printing choices by the publisher, Lamberg, contribute to this. The Bodenschatz anthologies were published in portrait format, while some of the original sources were printed in landscape, like Fabricius's Cantiones Sacrae or Handl's Opus Musicum. In the landscape publications, the wider paper size allows for the notation to have wider horizontal spacing in
10. Michael Robertson, "Edited Out: Note-blackening and Mensural Notation in 17th-century Dance Music from Leipzig," Early Music 42, no. 2 (May 2014): 212.
order to line up with the syllables more precisely. The notation of the Florilegium is fairly compressed horizontally, and syllables often extend past the notes that they correspond with. This is especially problematic in melismatic passages. Furthermore, some placement of syllables in the anthology is haphazard or, at best, illogical. Often a melisma appears to be on the last syllable of the word when it would make more musical sense for more notes to occur on the stressed syllable. An example is the word "omnis" in the Altus II part of Berger's "Laudate Dominum" (Figure 2.6). On the first statement


Figure 2.6: Melisma in Berger "Laudate Dominum" (Florilegium Portense), Altus II Library of Congress, Music Division, M1490.B7, p. 1131, 2010456596
of the word in this passage, the first syllable is four times as long as the second: one breve followed by one minim. The repetition of "omnis" as it appears in the Florilegium, however, places the melisma on the second syllable, resulting in an emphasis on the unstressed part of the word. Such syllabification is either a poor editing decision or intended to be modified by the performer, which again may not be realistic if one considers the use of this anthology by young choristers.

Unfortunately, there are many inconsistencies between the text underlay of the Florilegium and the original sources. In the above example from Berger's "Laudate Dominum" (Figure 2.6), the second iteration of "omnis" is indicated in the original publication an $i i$ marking, so the composer's intention is not explicitly clear. In such cases when the composer's uses an $i i$ or $i j$ to indicate a repetition of the prior word or phrase, the Florilegium often substitutes different words. Even text that is explicit in the original (i.e. not repetition indicated by $i i$ or $i j$ ) is sometimes changed in Bodenschatz's anthology. These inaccuracies led this editor to generally prefer the original when discrepancies in text underlay arose, unless it was clear that an intentional change was made in the Florilegium through repetition or duplication in multiple voices. Honey Meconi writes that while the underlay of earlier music was often
ambiguous in the manuscript and decisions were left up to the performer, composers of this period were becoming more intentional about the placement of syllables with the notes. ${ }^{11}$ It is unfortunate that so often the Florilegium does not accurately convey the underlay that is present in the composers' original publications.

The Basis Generalis part of the 1618 and 1621 volumes of the Florilegium is a basso seguente, an outline of the lowest voice parts rather than a part composed independently, although there are rare moments of ornamentation in the continuo line. ${ }^{12}$ Most of the pieces in the collection were originally published without any keyboard support, but the part was added to the collections in order to facilitate contemporary performance and publication practice. The Basis Generalis contains barlines whereas the vocal parts do not. Chaney claims that the "barring does not occur at regular intervals...[but] corresponds to major cadences or other structural events." ${ }^{13}$ This seems to be true of the 1621 Florilegii Musici Portensis, but not of the 1618 volume. In the continuo part of the earlier Florilegium Portense, barlines consistently correspond to the regular meter, except for triple sections where they appear half as often as they should: that is, after six semibreves rather than three. The Basis Generalis also uses very specific clef signs for higher voices, which create the effect of a condensed score, identifying each part with their respective clef (Figure 2.7). These clefs have been simplified to treble clef for ease of reading and because the score format negates the need for indication of voices in the continuo part.

The most unique feature of the Basis Generalis is that it contains text. Eichhorn hypothesizes that Caspar Vincentius is responsible for the Basis Generalis part in the Florilegium, citing the presence of text and Vincentius's vast output of continuo parts, which include a collection of Lassus's motets and the four volumes of the Promptuarium Musicum. ${ }^{14}$ It is unclear why the inclusion of text in the Florilegium continuo leads Eichhorn to suggest Vincentius as editor since the continuo parts of the Promptuarium do not have text. However, the irregular barring of the continuo in the 1621 Florilegii
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Figure 2.7: Clefs in Berger "Gaudent in caelis" (Florilegium Portense), Basis Generalis Library of Congress, Music Division, M1490.B7, p. 1472, 2010456596

Musici Portensis does reflect a similar practice by Vincentius in the Promptuarium, which can be seen in the comparison of the continuo parts of his "Apparuerunt Apostolis" in Chapter 4, beginning on page 94. The difference in barring between the 1618 and 1621 volumes of the Florilegium could reflect two different continuo editors, which might also explain why only one of Vincentius's motets appears in the first volume of the Florilegium, but four appear in the second: Eichhorn suggests that their inclusion may have been payment for his services as the editor of the continuo part since they were lesser known and might not have been included otherwise. ${ }^{15}$ Unfortunately, Bodenschatz does not mention any editor other than himself, so we cannot be certain who laid out the parts.

The text underlay of the Basis Generalis is not included in the attached editions as it generally follows the lowest voice exactly, but there are some interesting exceptions. In measures 33 and 34 of Fabricius's "Deus canticum novum," a breve from the Bassus I part (tied across the barline in the modern edition) is divided into two semibreves in the Basis Generalis so that the underlay can transition to the text of the upcoming phrase in the Altus I (Figure 2.8). If one were to look at only the notes of the continuo part, one might think the two semibreves are a mistake and that they should be tied. Indeed, it might make more sense for a keyboard player to sustain the G throughout the two notes, but the placement of the lyric syllable seems intentional enough that two distinct notes were left

[^16]

Figure 2.8: Continuo underlay in Fabricius "Deus canticum novum," mm. 32-35
in the attached edition. In Fabricius's "Gaudent in caelis," a longa in the Bassus I part is divided into a breve surrounded by two semibreves (compare the fourth note of second line in Figure 2.9a to the last note of the first line and first two notes of the second line in Figure 2.9b). This is likely because the printer had no way to tie the notes in the continuo part across a line break, but it is possible that the editor wanted more articulation in the continuo part.

The placement of accidentals in the Basis Generalis of the Florilegium is slightly problematic. Sometimes the accidental appears on the same staff line or space as the note to which it refers, or the modifier may appear slightly above the note. Unfortunately, the use of these two placements is inconsistent and seems to have no bearing on whether the accidental applies to the bass note or the chord realized above it. One must use the context of the mode and other parts to determine how to apply the accidental. The continuo part of Bodenschatz's own motet, "Audi Hymnum," is a good example (Figure 2.10). The piece is in G Dorian, but the first note (G) has a flat sign on the same space. Clearly a piece from this period would not start on a lowered tonic, so the flat sign must inflect the chord above the G -in this case a reminder to employ the $\mathrm{B} b$ already in the key signature. The E near the beginning of the second line, however, also has a flat sign on the same space, but in this case it affects the note itself, doubling the $\mathrm{E} b$ in the Tenor I (m. 5). Conversely, the two Ds in the first two lines both have sharps just above the note, which are to indicate D -major chords, but the D at the beginning of the third line has the accidental in the same space. That sharp is also referring to the

(a) Florilegium Portense, Bassus I (third note of second line should be semibreve)

Library of Congress, Music Division, M1490.B7, p. 622, 2010456596

(b) Florilegium Portense, Basis Generalis

Library of Congress, Music Division, M1490.B7, p. 1473, 2010456596
Figure 2.9: Continuo underlay in Fabricius "Gaudent in caelis"


Figure 2.10: Continuo accidentals in Bodenschatz "Audi Hymnum" (Florilegium Portense) Library of Congress, Music Division, M1490.B7, p. 1309, 2010456596
third of the chord and not to bass the note even though its placement is different from the previous two sharps. The following sign on the space with three G semiminims is also indicating for the third of the chord to be raised-in this case the equivalent of a modern natural sign in accordance with the B Я in the Discantus II (m. 9). Finally, in the middle of the third line, we see that the accidental before the D minim is actually on the line below. Again, because of our context of G Dorian, the symbol is indicating not to raise the D but the third of the chord above. In summary, it seems the three different placements of the accidentals in the Basis Generalis (below, adjacent, or above) was more dependent on which punches of movable type Lamberg had available for that page than how the accidental was to be employed. This is in contrast to the more careful system of accidentals seen in the Promptuarium Musicum, discussed in Chapter 4, beginning on page 94.

Furthermore, there are a few instances where it seems that the accidental in the continuo is surprisingly intended to inflect the sixth of the chord rather than the third. In measure 14 of Fabricius's "Gaudent in caelis," there is a sharp adjacent to the A in the Basis Generalis (see the seventh note of the second line in Figure 2.9b above). There is also an indication for a 5-6 motion above that note. Normally, the accidental would refer to the third, but if one examines the vocal texture above the bass line, three parts clearly have C4s, and the Bassus II part has a F\# (Figure 2.11). Neither a raised A or C would be logical harmonically, and to raise the C would contradict so many vocal parts that it would be an unreasonable choice. Thus, it seems that the sharp in the continuo is indeed intended to raise the F , which makes sense in the cadential motion towards G major. The same problem occurs in measure 90 of the same motet, involving the same harmonic progression with a 7-6 motion. Apparently, the slashed 6 notation had not been developed in this period or was not available to Lamberg such that there were three possibilities of inflection for accidentals in the Basis Generalis: to inflect the bass note, the third of the chord, or the sixth. This ambiguity potentially creates much confusion for the player reading from the continuo part alone and, therefore, would require them to study the vocal parts to better understand the context of the music.

The most significant problem with the Florilegium is the large number of errors in the partbooks. There are many discrepancies between the Bodenschatz anthology and the original sources that do not


Figure 2.11: Continuo accidentals in Fabricius "Gaudent in caelis," mm. 12-14
appear to be intentional. As stated in the introduction, Eichhorn calls these a "sign of considerable provinciality." ${ }^{16}$ A particularly egregious example is in the Tenor I part of Gabrieli's "Exsultate, justi," where the equivalent of two longa rests (semibreve, longa, breve, semibreve) is missing from the Florilegium (compare the rests between "Cantate ei" and "canticum novum" in Figure 2.12). A tenor reading the Bodenschatz version for the first time would be quite far ahead of the rest of the ensemble through no fault of their own. Another interesting error is a simultaneous printing of a minim note and minim rest in the Tenor part of Berger's "Laudate Dominum" (Figure 2.13). Here, the rest is correct, and the note is in error (see m. 93 of the transcription). In some of the extant copies, one can see where the singers made corrections to the partbooks by hand as they encountered errors. The last note of the Discantus II part of Berger's "Laudate Dominum" is printed as an E even though the piece is in F. This is an obvious error, which the singer corrected by drawing another notehead on the $f^{" 17}$ line and also writing the letter above (Figure 2.14a). In Figure 2.14b, one can observe the
16. Eichhorn, "Ein Sammeldruck," 68.
17. Throughout this document, specific pitches are given in the Helmholtz system, in which middle C is $c^{\prime}$.

(a) Concerti di Andrea et di Gio. Gabrieli, Tenor, line 4 Österreichische Nationalbibliothek Musiksammlung, SA.79.C.8/1, p. 19v, AC08816699

(b) Florilegium Portense, Tenor I, lines 3 and 4

Library of Congress, Music Division, M1490.B7, p. 372, 2010456596
Figure 2.12: Rest omission in Gabrieli "Exsultate, justi"


Figure 2.13: Printing error in Berger "Laudate Dominum" (Florilegium Portense), Tenor I Library of Congress, Music Division, M1490.B7, p. 490, 2010456596
most common method in which the singers corrected erroneous pitches by hand: drawing two lines from both sides of the notehead to the correct line or space. If a set of partbooks were used for many years, such manual corrections would greatly benefit future rehearsals and performances of the same works.

Although some scholars believed that there were many printings of the Florilegium Portense because Bach ordered new copies in 1729, there is no indication of edition numbers or printing dates

(a) Berger "Laudate Dominum"

Library of Congress, Music Division, M1490.B7, p. 988, 2010456596

(b) Berger "Cantate Domino"

Library of Congress, Music Division, M1490.B7, p. 985, 2010456596

Figure 2.14: Hand-corrections in Florilegium Portense, Discantus II
other than the original publication information on the extant copies used for this project. ${ }^{18}$ However, upon closer examination, discrepancies appear between the copies, indicating that the publisher periodically made changes to the print source without identifying the revisions. This presents an unfortunate scenario as there is then no definitive version of the volume or way of knowing which revision one has without sifting through the music. A thorough comparison of the three sets of partbooks was not done, but several discrepancies were noted during the transcription process (Table 2.1). By

| Composer | Motet | Part | Page | Line | Note | LOC | Hamburg | SLUB | FSC | Original |
| :--- | :--- | :--- | :--- | :--- | :--- | :--- | :--- | :--- | :--- | :--- |
| Fabricius | Gaudent in caelis | D1 | 1 of 2 | 5 | 11 | semiminim | semiminim | minim | minim | minim |
| Bodenschatz | Audi Hymnum | B1 | 1 of 2 | 3 | 9 | semiminim | minim | N/A | minim | N/A |
| Bodenschatz | Audi Hymnum | D2 | 1 of 2 | 5 | 5 | semiminim | minim | semiminim | minim | N/A |
| Berger | Cantate Domino | D1 | 2 of 2 | 4 | 13 | semiminim | semiminim | minim | N/A | minim |
| Berger | Laudate Dominum | A1 | 2 of 3 | 8 | 25 | semiminim | semiminim | minim | N/A | minim |

Table 2.1: Discrepancies between three copies of the Florilegium Portense, the Florilegium Selectissimarum Cantionum (FSC), and the original composers' publications
comparing each of the three copies with the Florilegium Selectissimarum Cantionum and the original publications, we see that each copy of the Florilegium Portense seems to be a different printing. In each of these five discrepancies found, the LOC copy is in error, but the Hamburg and SLUB copies have mixed results. The set at Hamburg has the correct rhythmic values for "Audi Hymnum" only, while the SLUB copies has just one error (again, the Bassus I part is missing from the set at SLUB).

[^17]Based on the number of discrepancies, one might assume that the copy at the LOC is oldest, followed by the copy of Hamburg, and that the SLUB set has had the most errors corrected. If that is the case, it is interesting that the error in the Discantus II part might have been reintroduced after it was fixed in the prior printing. Such a publication timeline is supposition of course, but the differences between extant copies highlight yet another challenge in performing and editing the music from the Florilegium. It is conceivable that a choir in the seventeenth century may have acquired the partbooks second-hand and received copies from multiple printings, thus encountering various errors among different singers or parts. Essentially, a cantor would need to have a score prepared for each motet in order to address these discrepancies and general errors in the partbooks when they arose. ${ }^{19}$ In modern times, editors working from different copies of the anthology may differ in their editions if they developed different solutions to the rhythmic problems created by the above errors. Thus, editions made of the music in the Florilegium must consider several sources: the Florilegium Selectissimarum Cantionum, multiple copies of the Florilegium Portense, and the composers' original publications if they are available. That is the aim of this project.

[^18]
## Chapter 3: Motets for six voices

Of the 115 motets in the Florilegium Portense, only nineteen are for six voices. Five of those were composed by Albinus Fabricius. Fabricius, along with Christian Erbach, is the fourth-most prolific composer in the collection behind Jacob Handl, Hieronymous Praetorius, and Lassus. Very little is known about this composer, who apparently was not a musician by trade. He was born in Saxony at an unknown date but lived most of his life in the Austrian state of Styria. There he held administrative posts connected to the Benedictine monastery of St. Lambrecht and as a commissioner for the Counter-Reformation for the district. He died in $1635 .{ }^{1}$

Only two of Fabricius's works have been published in modern score. His setting of Job 19:2526, "Ich weiß, daß mein Erlöser lebet," was first published by Carus in $1962 .{ }^{2}$ The postscript of the edition claims that the source is music for the burial of a Magdalena Pezel of Görlitz in 1585 and references Manuscript Mus. Gri. 9 at the Sächsische Landesbibliothek of Dresden. That manuscript, however, does not mention a Magdalena Pezel. The title page of the Tenor part only mentions the male cousin of a Georgius Beutherus named Ambrosius, who died on the June 11, 1585 at the age of twenty-eight. ${ }^{3}$ The funeral motet is possibly the only extant piece in German by Fabricius. It is for five voices with two parts in the tenor range and in A minor. (The Carus edition transposes the piece up to C minor.) The piece is in an imitative, polyphonic style with the five parts entering individually with either the opening motive or its counterpart (Figure 3.1). The composer made frequent uses of voice pairings in this piece. There is also a brief moment of homophony on the text "und werd in meinem Fleisch Gott sehen," first with the top four voices and then with the bottom four.

The other work by Fabricius that is available in score is a Magnificat for six voices, published

[^19]

Figure 3.1: Opening of Fabricius "Ich weiß, daß mein Erlöser lebet," mm. 1-5
in 1981 as part of the Denkmäler der Tonkunst in Österreich series. ${ }^{4}$ The manuscript is found in a choirbook from 1607 now in possession of the Universitätsbibliothek Graz as Manuscript $22 .{ }^{5}$ In that volume, there are ten pairs of Masses and Magnificats that were dedicated by chapel singer Georg Kugelmann to several individuals including the Bishop of Seckau. Fabricius's Magnificat appears after the Missa super Deus in adiutorium (LV 1150) of Lassus and is for six voices with two altus and two tenor parts. In the choirbook, the Cantus and two tenor parts appear on the verso page, and the two altus parts and Bassus appear on the recto. These parts are not labeled but can be identified by their clefs. The piece is composed in alternatim, with polyphony beginning at the second verse: "Et exsultavit spiritus meus . . .". The Magnificat is in C major and mostly in duple meter, ${ }^{6}$ with one brief triple section at "et sanctum nomen eius." It is generally imitative but does contain some homophony at several sections. The composer also experimented with texture: the "Fecit potentiam" begins with only the four lowest voices, while the following "Esurientes" section is entirely for the four upper voices. There are also antiphonal dialogues between smaller groups of parts, usually grouped by range. The figure at "et sanctum nomen eius" is traded between the four highest voices and then

[^20]the four lower ones, while a similar effect occurs in trios at "dispersit superbos."
Fabricius's Magnificat is a parody of Marenzio's madrigal, "Nel più fiorito Aprile." First published in his first book of six-voice madrigals in 1581, Marenzio's model is for the same vocal configuration as Fabricius's canticle, also in C major, and in duple meter except for a short triple section ("Cantano in vario suon"). Fabricius quoted the first the phrase of the madrigal exactly (Figure 3.2). While

(a) Marenzio "Nel più fiorito Aprile," mm. 1-2

(b) Fabricius "Magnificat 'Nel più fiorito Aprile," mm. 1-2

Figure 3.2: Quotation of opening of Marenzio madrigal in Fabricius "Magnificat 'Nel più fiorito Aprile"

Marenzio treated the next phrase of the madrigal with a canon at the unison, Fabricius began the imitation of this fragment with one voice at the fifth (Figure 3.3). Fabricius chose to repeat the

(a) Marenzio "Nel più fiorito Aprile," mm. 3-5

(b) Fabricius "Magnificat 'Nel più fiorito Aprile,"" mm. 2-4

Figure 3.3: Canonic quotation of Marenzio madrigal in Fabricius "Magnificat ' Nel più fiorito Aprile"
opening material and text (the beginning of which can be seen in the Bassus part of measure 4 in

Figure 3.3b), while Marenzio did not. Indeed, the scale of the madrigalian model is much smaller than the Magnificat due to the length of the text. The melody that opens both pieces in the highest voice is recalled later in the Magnificat, most clearly on the "quia fecit mihi magna" text. The next passage from Marenzio that appears in Fabricius's parody comes from directly after the triple section of the madrigal. Several pitches of the original Basso line are quoted directly in the Bassus line of the Magnificat (Figure 3.4), and the general contour and some pitch content from the other parts appears as well. Two shorter fragments from the madrigal were used frequently throughout the

(a) Marenzio "Nel più fiorito Aprile," mm. 14-16

(b) Fabricius "Magnificat 'Nel più fiorito Aprile," mm. 32-34

Figure 3.4: Quotation of Marenzio madrigal in Fabricius "Magnificat 'Nel più fiorito Aprile""
piece by Fabricius. The first is a descending triad motive on the words "a gara" that appears in the Magnificat on the texts "in brachio suo" and "[dimisit] in anes." The second is an ascending, dotted figure (Figure 3.5a) that appears in the canticle on "et divites," "et in saecula" (Figure 3.5b), and at other points. Finally, the entire texture of the closing of Marenzio's madrigal is represented in the

(a) Marenzio "Nel più fiorito Aprile," m. 25

(b) Fabricius "Magnificat 'Nel più fiorito Aprile,"" m. 102

Figure 3.5: Ascending dotted motive from Marenzio madrigal in Fabricius "Magnificat 'Nel più fiorito Aprile""
ending of the canticle by Fabricius. The last ten measures of the model are quoted with only slight rhythmic variations for text underlay.

Fabricius's principal publication is the Cantiones Sacrae of $1595 .{ }^{7}$ The volume was published in landscape partbooks, roughly 19.5 centimeters wide and 16 centimeters tall. According to the

[^21]prefatory material in the Tenor partbook, the work was dedicated to Vincentio Lehnero at Saint Paul's Abbey in Lavanttal, which is in southern Austria about one hundred kilometers southeast of Graz. The collection contains twenty-five Latin motets, all for six voices (Table 3.1). No part of this volume has

| I. | Gaudent in Coelis* | XIIII. | Sis praesens Deus* |
| :--- | :--- | :--- | :--- |
| II. | O Sacrum convivium | XV. | Ad te levavi |
| III. | Quare tristis es anima | XVI. | Convertisti planctum |
| IIII. | Non vos relinquam* | XVII. | Vulnerasti cor meum |
| V. | Hodie rex coelorum | XVIII. | Exultet omnium |
| VI. | Ave Regina | XIX. | Ascendit Deus |
| VII. | Salve festa dies | XX. | Alma redemptoris |
| VIII. | Chritus resurgens | XXI. | Sancta Maria |
| IX. | Aurea lux roseo | XXII. | Levavi oculos meos |
| X. | Tu solus qui facis | XXIII. | Benedictus Deus |
| XI. | Scio quod redemptor | XXIIII. | Deus canticum novum* |
| XII. | Cantate Domino | XXV. | Exaudiat te Dominus* |
| XIII. | Hodie Christus natus |  |  |

Table 3.1: Index of Fabricius Cantiones Sacrae (* indicates reproduction in Florilegium Portense)
been published in modern score. The printing is clear and legible, and the landscape format enables the text to be spaced so that the alignment of the lyrics is much clearer than in the Florilegium. The only description of the publication in English is from Walter Blankenburg's article on the composer, noting that the pieces "contain not only traditional polyphonic writing but also more up-to-date homophonic and declamatory passages." ${ }^{8}$ The only extant set of all six partbooks is held by the Herzog August Bibliothek in Wolfenbüttel. The Bischöfliche Zentralbibliothek in Regensburg, however, possesses a set of six handwritten partbooks that contain six pieces by Fabricius. ${ }^{9}$ The most prominent composers of the volume are Lassus and Alessandro Striggio. ${ }^{10}$ The motets in these partbooks only have a Latin incipit, not the full text. Three of the pieces by Fabricius are also found in the Cantiones Sacrae: "Vulnerasti cor meum" (number 107, with a missing Tenor part), "Quare tristis es anima mea" (110), and "Gaudent in coelis" (111). Since the Regensburg partbooks are dated 1579, these may have been

[^22]earlier drafts of the motets published in the 1595 volume. Indeed, a cursory comparison reveals slight differences between the handwritten versions and the later publication. "Exaudiat te Dominus," motet 108 in the Regensburg manuscript, shares a text with motet 25 in the Cantiones Sacrae, but the setting is different. Two unique pieces not from the Cantiones Sacrae are found in these partbooks: "Christus in his terris" (109) and "Christe salus mundis" (112), the latter of which is only for five voices.

The five compositions by Fabricius in the Florilegium Portense all come from his Cantiones Sacrae. Riemer states that in addition to these five, only one more piece by Fabricius is found in contemporary anthologies (although he does not specify which), meaning that the composer did not find much attention outside of the Florilegium. Based on the context around the mention of Fabricius, it seems that Riemer is suggesting that the inclusion of these motets was not due to the composer's reputation or artistic content but because of their practical use. ${ }^{11}$ The first of Fabricius's compositions in the Florilegium is "Deus canticum novum," which is the seventeenth motet in Bodenschatz's collection. The text from the Vulgate is Psalm 143:9 and 91:5. ${ }^{12}$ The Leipziger Kirchen-Andachten lists the piece for Cantate Sunday, which was then the fourth Sunday after Easter. ${ }^{13}$ Fabricius's setting was probably influenced by the five voice piece on the same text by Lassus, first published in 1565 in the Perornatae sacrae cantiones, later included in the second volume of the Selectissimae cantiones in 1568, ${ }^{14}$ and appears as the seventeenth work of the second volume in Lechner's revision of 1579, Selectissimae cantiones Altera pars. ${ }^{15}$ Both Lassus's and Fabricius's settings are in G Dorian and duple meter throughout, and both are polyphonic, imitative, and use occasional voice pairings. The most striking similarity between the two works is the opening, where each composer introduced the voices one-byone until the fourth entrance (Figure 3.6). Fabricius repeated the first gesture and ornamented the

[^23]
(a) Lassus "Deus canticum novum," mm. 1-7

(b) Fabricius "Deus canticum novum," mm. 1-6

Figure 3.6: Opening of Lassus and Fabricius "Deus canticum novum"
cadence with a suspension, while Lassus proceeded to the next line of text. In the "canticum novum" phrase (mm. 5-8) that follows the opening, Fabricius's writing is more homophonic. Throughout the piece, Fabricius used scalar melismas on most of the words that Lassus does: "cantabo," "psallam" (Figure 3.7), and "exsultabo." Fabricius's figures on "in factura tua" and "et in operibus manuum tu-


Figure 3.7: Similar melismas in "Deus canticum novum"
arum" (mm. 40-60), however, differ from Lassus's (mm. 54-68) in that they use longer note values and are more syllabic. Lassus's motet is divided into a prima pars and secunda pars with the former ending in a half cadence (m. 41). Fabricius's composition has no such break, and the text of the first verse ends with a cadence on G major, followed by a G minor chord as the piece continues (mm. 3132). Both pieces, however, begin the second verse with long semibreves on "quia." Fabricius, as he did in the opening of the motet, repeated and elaborated this gesture where Lassus did not. Finally, Fabricius's motive on "in psalterio decachordo" (mm. 14-20) is shorter and more rhythmic than the rest of the piece, where as Lassus set this line of text with longer note values (mm. 18-27).

There are no major differences between the Florilegium Portense version of "Deus canticum novum" and the version published in the Cantiones Sacrae, but two minor changes from the anthology have been retained for this project. The first is a change in text underlay in measure 19 (Figure 3.8). The lyrics for the Bassus part in the original publication have a melisma on the third syllable of "decachordo," which aligns with the two upper parts that sing this phrase. The version in the Bodenschatz collection, however, has a melisma on the first syllable of the word, which causes the rest of the word to better align with the other two lower parts. Either of these versions are plausible, but the latter


Figure 3.8: Melisma change in Fabricius "Deus canticum novum," mm. 18-20
First line of text in Bassus part from Cantiones Sacrae, second line from Florilegium Portense and

## Florilegium Selectissimarum Cantionum

melisma has been preferred because it also appears in the Florilegium Selectissimarum Cantionum and the Basis Generalis part of the Florilegium Portense. Although the third syllable of the word is stressed more than the first, one might also argue that it is more logical to have the bass voice function with the other lower parts rather than higher ones.

The other change in the Florilegium Portense that has been retained improves the voice leading of the Tenor II part in measure 29 (Figure 3.9). The original publication has a skip between the $c$ ' and the


Figure 3.9: Voice leading in Fabricius "Deus canticum novum," mm. 29-30
$a$, while the version in the anthology fills in the leap with a $b b$. This uninterrupted scale is consistent with the other voices in this section, and the leap may have been an error in the 1595 version.

Two changes in the Florilegium Portense version of "Deus canticum novum" have not been retained in this project. The first is a change in rhythm in the Tenor I part (Figure 3.10). In the antholo-

(a) Cantiones Sacrae

(b) Florilegium Portense and Florilegium Selectissimarum Cantionum

Figure 3.10: Rhythmic change in Fabricius "Deus canticum novum," mm. 35-37
gies, the rhythm of "me, Domine" has been simplified. The same note values do occur in other parts on this text, but most of those figures contain a leap of a minor third or fourth between the two words. Two other voices have a similar leading tone figure to the Tenor I part: the Discantus I in measure 35 (shown in Figure 3.10) and the Discantus II in measure 39. The dotted rhythm is retained in the Florilegium in both of those parts, so the 1595 version of the Tenor I was used for these editions.

Finally, in the penultimate bar of the motet, there is a difference in rhythm of the Altus (Figure 3.11). The original rhythm aligns with the Discantus I, while the alteration in the Florilegium is in


Figure 3.11: Rhythmic change in Fabricius "Deus canticum novum," mm. 72-74
sync with the Tenor I. Either pairing results in the two identical syllables being sung on the same note, but this effect is intensified in the Florilegium since it occurs as the penultimate rhythmic movement of the piece. The altered rhythm in the anthology is more complex than the original and moves the stressed syllable off the strong beat, so the Altus line from the Cantiones Sacrae has been retained in
this instance.

The next motet by Fabricius in the Florilegium Portense is "Exaudiat te Dominus," the twentysecond motet in that anthology and the twenty-fifth and final piece in the Cantiones Sacrae. "Exaudiat" is shorter than "Deus canticum novum:" fifty-four measures instead of seventy-four. Like "Deus canticum," "Exaudiat te Dominus" is in a minor mode, although based on A rather than G, and in duple meter throughout. The motet sets Psalm 19:1-6a, and according to the Leipziger KirchenAndachten, could be used on Exaudi Sunday (after Ascension) ${ }^{16}$ or for the election of city council members ("In Electione Novi Senatus"). ${ }^{17}$ "Exaudiat te Dominus" is the only motet listed for the latter occasion in that particular document, so it may have been used often.

The piece opens with the four highest voices in homophonic rhythm. The Tenor II enters in the next phrase, but the Bassus is not employed until the eighth measure. The motet is largely homophonic but does have a few short sections of imitative polyphony. The first occurs just after the first Bassus entrance where several sections have scales cascading downward in close proximity on the words "de sancto" (mm. 9-12). The "laetabimur" section contains four distinct duets (one couple is repeated) that overlap with each other (mm. 29-32). These voice pairings are followed by the longest section of polyphony in the piece ( $\mathrm{mm} .35-42$ ). In the latter passage, the rising scale on "salutari tuo" is balanced by the descending figure on "in nomine Dei" (Figure 3.12). This section is followed by more homophony. The rhythmic figure of the last line of text, "petitiones tuas," is repeated four times before a brief minim rest, and an augmentation of that motive ends the piece. In addition to the opening, Fabricius varied the texture in several of the homophonic sections: twice he composed a phrase for the four lowest voices followed by one for the four highest voices; once he omitted top and bottom voices; as well as other textural contrasts. He usually followed such reduced textures with tutti repetitions of the text. A moment of aural surprise is found in measures 19 and 20. As the piece modulates from a tonal center of A to F , the circle-of-fifths sequence is interrupted by a retrogression

[^24]17. Würdig, 305.


Figure 3.12: Contrasting motives in Fabricius "Exaudiat te Dominus," mm. 36-39
from G to F (Figure 3.13). The abrupt change in harmony brings attention to the word for "sacrifices"


Figure 3.13: Harmonic progression in Fabricius "Exaudiat te Dominus," mm. 18-21
after several repetitions of the first two words in "memor sit omnis sacrifici tui."
There are fewer discrepancies between the Florilegium Portense version of "Exaudiat te Dominus" and the Fabricius's original than in "Deus canticum novum." Interestingly, most of the errors and deliberate changes in the anthologies occur in the Altus part, and two have been retained. The first involves the underlay of a melisma in the Altus part of measure 27. In this instance the Florilegium Portense does not demonstrate a clear melisma, but the melisma in the Florilegium Selectissimarum Cantionum is different from that in the Cantiones Sacrae (Figure 3.14). The other three voices singing at this moment reach the final syllable of "tuum" on the penultimate note in the measure as in the case of the Florilegium Selectissimarum Cantionum version, so that underlay has been retained. It is


Figure 3.14: Difference in underlay in Fabricius "Exaudiat te Dominus," m. 27
possible that because the first syllable of the word is stressed an educated performer singing from the Cantiones Sacrae would have known to sing the melisma on the first syllable rather than the second, but such a reading is not explicitly clear in the notation.

Conversely, the text underlay from the anthologies has not been retained in measure 11 of the Altus part. In this instance, the Cantiones Sacrae has a melisma of three notes on the final syllable of "sancto," while both of the Bodenschatz volumes extend the melisma and place the final syllable of the word on the last note of the phrase (Figure 3.15). The Tenor II and Bassus voices that present

(a) Cantiones Sacrae

(b) Florilegium Selectissimarum Cantionum and Florilegium Portense

Figure 3.15: Difference in underlay in Fabricius "Exaudiat te Dominus," mm. 10-11
this phrase along with the Altus and Tenor I land on the final syllable of "sancto" at the beginning of measure 11, so the Cantiones Sacrae version of this line aligns better with those two parts.

Finally, the two Bodenschatz anthologies remove the raised third from the Altus part in the cadence at measure 38 (see Figure 3.12 above). This seems to be an attempt to avoid adjacent parallel harmonies between the D-major and D-minor chords. Although Fabricius mitigated this change in harmony (and the large leap in the Tenor II and Bassus) with a rest, similar changes can be seen in some of the arrangements from the Florilegium discussed in Chapter 5. It seems that it was desirable to Calvisius or Bodenschatz to avoid confusion between the major and minor chords, so the cadence remains minor in the attached edition in keeping with the version from the anthologies.

The third motet by Fabricius in the Florilegium Portense is "Sis praesens Deus." The fourteenth motet in the Cantiones Sacrae, this piece is the shortest by Fabricius to be included in the anthology, consisting of only thirty-eight measures. It is also the only Fabricius motet in the Florilegium in a major tonality, the key of F major. Like the previous two pieces, it is in duple meter throughout and for six voices with two sopranos and two tenors. The source of the text is unknown, but the first two lines are found near the end of a poem by Georg Fabricius. ${ }^{18}$ Georg, born in 1516, was a poet and teacher in Germany, and several of his texts were set to music by contemporary composers. ${ }^{19}$ It is possible that the composer Albinus was related to or knew the elder poet and wrote the text for this motet based on the borrowed lines. The Leipziger Kirchen-Andachten cites the piece as appropriate for the start of lessons. ${ }^{20}$ The motet is quite simple and almost entirely homophonic. The first imitative section consists of three voices following each other at a distance of one note with a fourth voice joining later (Figure 3.16). The disjunct, ascending figure is presented on G by the Discantus I, while


Figure 3.16: Imitation in Fabricius "Sis preasens Deus," mm. 8-11
the Tenor II and Discantus II have the motive based on C. As seen in other pieces by Fabricius, this phrase with the upper four voices is followed by one set in the lowest four, which then leads into a tutti section. The phrase after the tutti contains some imitative duets in pairs, with the Altus and Tenor II leading the two sopranos (Figure 3.17). The descending lines correspond to the text, which describes

[^25]

Figure 3.17: Duets in Fabricius "Sis preasens Deus," mm. 16-18
an angel being sent from above. The final phrase, "damnatas cogat turpiter ire vias," is presented four times, each in different combinations of four voices (Figure 3.18). Interestingly, a single part


Figure 3.18: Closing motive of Fabricius "Sis preasens Deus," mm. 30-33
enters one semiminim before the others in each iteration. The first occurrence (mm. 29-31) is led by the Tenor II and the Discantus II, Altus, and Bassus follow. The second iteration (mm. 31-33) uses Discantus II, Altus, and Tenor I, which are preceded by the Discantus I. The Tenor II again begins
the third group (mm. 33-35), which is similar to the first except that the Discantus I replaces the Discantus II. Finally, the phrase is sung by all voices. The rhythm Fabricius used on the first three words of the phrase gives a triple feeling to the middle of the figure. The voice that enters early in each iteration has a longer note value on the second syllable of "cogat" in order to align with the other parts for the rest of the phrase. Although four parts enter before the Discantus I and Bassus on the tutti repetition, only the Tenor I has an identical rhythm to the voices that lead the other iterations. The Discantus II, Altus, and Tenor II instead have a longer first note here.

There are more discrepancies in the versions of "Sis praesens Deus" than occurred in "Exaudiat te Dominus" despite its shorter length. Two changes in the Bodenschatz anthology are similar to the syllabification of melisma seen in the previous piece (see Figure 3.14 above on page 50). Both occur on words with two syllables in the Altus part, where the Florilegium Portense and Florilegium Selectissimarum Cantionum clearly indicate melismas on the first syllable, but the Cantiones Sacrae does not (Figure 3.19). Again, it is possible that the melisma on the first syllable is implied in Fabricius's


Figure 3.19: Differences in underlay in Fabricius "Sis praesens Deus"
publication, but the notation in the Bodenschatz anthologies represents a more sensible text underlay. There are two changes in rhythm in the later editions that improve upon the versions in the Cantiones Sacrae. First, the minim in the Tenor I part at the beginning of measure 13 in the composer's original causes the text underlay not to line up with other parts, but the Florilegium Selectissimarum Cantionum solves this problem by using two semiminims instead (Figure 3.20). The Florilegium Portense also employs the same change but mistakenly has fusas instead of semifusas later in the measure as


Figure 3.20: Rhythmic changes in Fabricius "Sis praesens Deus," mm. 12-13
mentioned in Chapter 2. The other rhythmic alteration occurs at the very end of the piece. In the Cantiones Sacrae and Florilegium Selectissimarum Cantionum, the Tenor II reaches its final note before the other five parts. While this sometimes occurs in other pieces, like Fabricius's "Gaudent in caelis," the placement is odd in that the stressed syllable of the final word ("vias") is very short and the unaccented second syllable lands in the middle of the metrical grouping (Figure 3.21). The Flo-

(a) Cantiones Sacrae and Florilegium Selectissimarum Cantionum

(b) Florilegium Portense

Figure 3.21: Rhythmic change in Fabricius "Sis praesens Deus," mm. 37-38
rilegium Portense amends this by adding a semibreve before the final note. This change necessitates a melisma on the last syllable of the prior word ("ire"), although this difference in underlay is not clear in the partbook. Once this change is realized, the Tenor II aligns with most of the other parts (except the Altus which sings the final word early to set up a cadential suspension).

Two changes to the Altus part in "Sis praesens Deus" have not been retained in this project. In both of these instances, the Cantiones Sacrae and Florilegium Selectissimarum Cantionum have the same content, but the editor altered the line or made an error in the later Florilegium Portense. In measure 22, the Altus part in the Florilegium Portense has a C\# on the first note, but that accidental does not exist in the earlier Bodenschatz anthology or Fabricius's original (Figure 3.22). While the raised note makes sense from a linear perspective in that the C is a neighbor tone between the surrounding Ds and there are cadential $\mathrm{C} \# \mathrm{~s}$ approaching, such an accidental creates a strongly accented


Figure 3.22: Harmonic issue in Fabricius "Sis preasens Deus" (Cantiones Sacrae and Florilegium Selectissimarum Cantionum), mm. 21-22
tritone with the Tenor I pitch. Thus, no accidental has been added in the attached edition. Finally, in measure 35, the Altus part has a slightly different rhythm at the end of the measure (Figure 3.23). The version with adjacent minims in the original and Florilegium Selectissimarum Cantionum is better

(a) Cantiones Sacrae and Florilegium Selectissimarum Cantionum

(b) Florilegium Portense

Figure 3.23: Rhythmic changes in Fabricius "Sis praesens Deus," m. 35
aligned with the phrase in the Tenor II and Discantus II (not shown). The dotted rhythm in the Florilegium Portense matches the Bassus, but this version was not used since the simpler rhythm occurs in two sources and aligns with more vocal parts.

The fourth motet by Fabricius in the Florilegium Portense is his "Non vos relinquam," which is also the fourth motet in the Cantiones Sacrae. The piece has the same voicing as the pieces discussed above, and is a similar length to "Exaudiat te Dominus:" fifty-three measures compared to fifty-four in "Exaudiat." The motet is in D minor, but it is the only one by Fabricius in the anthology to have a section in triple meter. The text from John 14:18 and 16:22b contains Jesus's words consoling his disciples regarding his pending ascension. That text is marked in the Liber Usualis as a communion antiphon for the Ember Friday after Pentecost, ${ }^{21}$ but the piece is designated in the liturgical index of the Florilegium Portense for use on the third Sunday of Advent, the Passion, ${ }^{22}$ and Ascension. The motet is listed in the Leipziger Kirchen-Andachten as appropriate for Cantate Sunday along with "Deus canticum novum." ${ }^{23}$ This variety of liturgical recommendations echoes Crook's warning against limiting the use of a text by using a single label on the score. ${ }^{24}$ Whereas the motets discussed thus far in this chapter contain a significant amount of homophony, "Non vos relinquam" is largely polyphonic (Figure 3.24). This may be due to the shorter text, which likely inspired more repetition of fewer


Figure 3.24: Polyphonic texture in Fabricius "Non vos relinquam," mm. 1-5
motives. Indeed, the opening motive is imitated through measure 24, making up nearly half of the entire piece. The text that follows, "sed veniam," is presented in each part only once or twice and begins in most voices with an ascending scale spanning a third (Figure 3.25). This motive is presented in three duets: first the two innermost parts (Altus and Tenor I), then outer voices Discantus II and Bassus, and finally the Discantus I and Tenor II. The parts in each of these pairs are a third apart.
21. The Liber Usualis: With Introduction and Rubrics in English (Tournai: Desclée, 1962), 899-900.
22. Modern church musicians should be aware of the "alleluia" section when considering this piece for Lent.
23. Würdig, Leipziger Kirchen-Andachten, 278.
24. Crook, "The Exegetical Motet," 296.


Figure 3.25: Second motive in Fabricius "Non vos relinquam," mm. 24-29

After the three short duets, the motive is modified as other parts repeat those two words and then move on to the rest of the textual phrase. The final section of polyphony consists of interweaving scales, first sung by the upper three parts and followed by the lowest four. The concluding section is in triple meter and homophonic. This closing "alleluia" section consists of two eight-measure phrases, each ending with several parts in Lombardic rhythm.

There are a few minor differences in text underlay between the Cantiones Sacrae and Florilegium Portense versions of "Non vos relinquam," but most of these can be attributed to lack of clarity in the partbooks or obvious errors. The only alteration of consequence is a harmonic change early in the piece. At the beginning of measure 6, the Discantus I has an F\# in the Florilegium Portense that does not appear in the Cantiones Sacrae or Florilegium Selectissimarum Cantionum (Figure 3.26). It is possible that this is in error, but the D-major chord has been retained because of the confirmation in the Basis Generalis. The subsequent Fs are not raised in any source.


Figure 3.26: Harmonic change in Fabricius "Non vos relinquam" (Florilegium Portense), mm. 5-7

The last piece by Fabricius to be included in the Florilegium Portense is his setting of "Gaudent in caelis," which is the seventy-ninth motet in the Bodenschatz anthology but the first piece in the composer's Cantiones Sacrae. The text is listed in the Liber Usualis as an antiphon at Vespers for the Common of Two or More Martyrs, ${ }^{25}$ but it is designated in the Florilegium index and the Leipziger Kirchen-Andachten as being suited for Michaelmas. ${ }^{26}$ "Gaudent in caelis" has a number of unique traits among the motets by Fabricius in the anthology. Whereas the other pieces were scored for six voices with two discantus and two tenor parts, "Gaudent" uses two discantus and two bass parts. The overall configuration of voices remains largely the same but having two parts in the lowest range creates a slightly different texture. These two bassus voices function interchangeably in this piece. The motet is in G Mixolydian: the first motet by Fabricius in the Florilegium to be in a mode other than Ionian or Aeolian. "Gaudent" is also the longest piece by the composer in the anthology, numbering ninety-eight measures, twenty-four more than the next longest motet, "Deus canticum novum."
25. Liber Usualis, 1160.
26. Würdig, Leipziger Kirchen-Andachten, 299.

This final motet by Fabricius in the collection is also the most polyphonic. The piece begins with a rising scale that circles back on itself (Figure 3.27). The motive that begins in the Discantus I


Figure 3.27: Opening of Fabricius "Gaudent in caelis," mm. 1-5
moves to the Altus, then the Tenor, Bassus I, Discantus II, and finally the Bassus II. The end of this section is interesting in that it alternates twice between D major and G major before a pedal point on G that leads to the next figure based on C (Figure 3.28). Another interesting progression


Figure 3.28: Harmonic progression in Fabricius "Gaudent in caelis," mm. 9-13
occurs a few measures later as demonstrated by the continuo line in Figure 3.29. Here, The Bb major and G minor chords in measure 20 are particularly striking within the motion to tonicize D in the next measure. The motive that follows with the text "qui Christi vestigia" uses longer note values,


Figure 3.29: Harmonic progression in Fabricius "Gaudent in caelis," mm. 18-21
particularly on the name of Christ. There are also three sets of duets that occur near the end of the imitation of that motive (Figure 3.30). Beginning in measure 28, the two discantus parts sing


Figure 3.30: Duets in Fabricius "Gaudent in caelis," mm. 28-32
together and are quickly followed by the Altus and Tenor. The two bassus parts enter together in the following measure, but their lines soon diverge from each other more than the other pairs. A similar duet occurs in measures 37 and 38 in the section of falling scales on "sunt secuti." In the passage that follows (mm. 40-47), Fabricius creates a dichotomy of high and low textures as seen in other of his motets. First, the upper four voices present the four-measure phrase, overlapping with the subsequent entrance of the lower four parts by one measure. The Altus and Tenor take part in both iterations. In contrast to the prevailing polyphony, the most homophonic writing occurs at four iterations of the words "sanguinem suum" in measures 49 and 50, 52 and 53, 54 and 55, and

57 and 58. The word "fuderunt" (shed) which precedes the homorhythmic, dotted figure is usually painted with a descending scale in semiminims, perhaps illustrating the shedding of blood during the crucifixion. The last occurrence of that word, though, is reiterated by four voices together in minims before the final dotted "sanguinem" (Figure 3.31). The final section that follows occurs twice. The


Figure 3.31: Homophony in Fabricius "Gaudent in caelis," mm. 54-58
first iteration begins with the Discantus I in measure 57 (see in Figure 3.31) and continues through measure 77. Fabricius made several modifications to the repetition, however. First, the composer did not repeat the first entrance of the Discantus I nor measures 58 and 59. The music that begins the repetition is modeled after the middle of measure 60, but the text in some parts is different because he did not repeat the first few original measures. Most of the parts repeat their own material, including the beginning of the two bassus lines, but Fabricius moved some material from the Bassus II to the Bassus I and writes some new music for the former (Figure 3.32). After this, the two lowest voices continue repeating the material that the opposite part had in the earlier passage. In the passage from measures 67 through 77, each part repeats their material several times, first alternating between $G$ and D major and then shifting between A major and D . This material is abbreviated at the repetition

(a) mm. 62-68

(b) mm. 80-85

Figure 3.32: Bassus exchange in Fabricius "Gaudent in caelis"
so that it is only seven measures, from 84 to 91 . Finally, Fabricius also made smaller changes to the second iteration of this passage, such as the ornamentation of the Discantus II part in mesaures 81 and 82 (Figure 3.33). The coda that follows the repetition of material contains several undulating

(a) mm. 63-66

(b) mm. 80-83

Figure 3.33: Ornamentation in Fabricius "Gaudent in caelis"
scales and the piece closes with plagal cadences underneath a pedal point in the Discantus I.
There are many more discrepancies between the three versions of "Gaudent in caelis" than the other motets by Fabricius. Nearly all of these have to do with text underlay and most of these are minor differences regarding the ending of melismas. These might be attributed to the lack of clarity in the underlay of the Florilegium Portense, except that they often occur in the Florilegium Selectissimarum Cantionum as well. The Tenor part in particular has many differences between versions in the first


Figure 3.34: Tenor part in Fabricius "Gaudent in caelis," mm. 1-37
Differences in text denoted with boldface, underlining, and red, differences in rhythm denoted in red and in rectangular boxes
half of the piece (Figure 3.34). Some of these discrepancies are of little significance, such as the first two differences in text underlay. The variations that follow, however, would have put the Tenor part at odds with the other voices if the Bodenschatz versions were retained in the score. Additionally, the alterations in the text underlay necessitated changes in rhythm in measures 28, 29, and 36. For these reasons, only the content from the Cantiones Sacrae has been used for this voice part at all of these points. There are several more examples of significant differences in underlay outside of the Tenor part. In measure 34 and 35, the Bodenschatz anthologies place the melisma in the Discantus I and Bassus I on the first syllable of "secuti," while the Cantiones Sacrae has the melisma on the second syllable (Figure 3.35). Subsequent entries of this motive in all voices always have the melisma on

(a) Cantiones Sacrae

(b) Florilegium Portense and Florilegium Selectissimarum Cantionum

Figure 3.35: Melisma discrepancies in "Gaudent in caelis," mm. 34-35
the second syllable, so Fabricius's original version was retained in this project. A similar issue occurs in the Bassus I in measures 64 and 65, where the Cantiones Sacrae has a rising scale on the first syllable of "Christo," but the Florilegium Selectissimarum Cantionum and Florilegium Portense extend the final syllable of the prior word "ideo." In this case, Fabricius's original is confirmed by the unique text underlay of the Basis Generalis. Emphasizing the name of Christ is also more logical than the unstressed ending of "ideo." The Basis Generalis solves another discrepancy in the Bassus I part in measures 83 and 84, which follows an issue in the Discantus II (Figure 3.36). Note that the reading of the Bassus I in the Cantiones Sacrae aligns with the ending of the phrase in the Discantus II, and Fabricius's original version of the Discantus II places the second syllable of "Christo" with the Bassus I. Additionally, it is more logical and more in concordance with other parts for the Discantus II to change syllables as it resolves the leading tone. The last textual discrepancy of note is in the Altus part near the end of the piece (Figure 3.37). The Bodenschatz anthologies remove the melisma in

(a) Cantiones Sacrae

(b) Florilegium Portense and Florilegium Selectissimarum Cantionum

Figure 3.36: Melisma discrepancies in "Gaudent in caelis," mm. 81-84

(a) Cantiones Sacrae

(b) Florilegium Portense and Florilegium Selectissimarum Cantionum

Figure 3.37: Textual discrepancy in "Gaudent in caelis," mm. 90-95
measures 91 and 92 , which creates room for more text that is implied by the $i j$ marking. This creates a melisma on the unstressed first syllable of "aeternum." (A melisma on "in" from the $d$ ' to the $g$ might also be possible, but it is no less awkward.) In contrast, the composer's original publication only repeats the second half of the phrase of text, and its melisma properly emphasizes the stressed syllable of "regnabunt" in the earlier measures.

The differences in the three versions of "Gaudent in caelis" are not constrained to issues of textthere are a few differences in accidentals and harmony. The first occurs in measure 22, where the editions in the Bodenschatz anthologies add a $\mathrm{B} b$ for the Discantus I that is simultaneous with the $\mathrm{B} b$
in the Bassus I (Figure 3.38). The lowered pitch makes sense in the linear context of the Discantus I as


Figure 3.38: Accidental in Fabricius "Gaudent in caelis" (Florilegium Portense and Florilegium Selectissimarum Cantionum), mm. 21-23
well, an example of the solmization guideline "una nota super la semper est canendum fa." Conversely, the editor or copyist of the anthologies missed two accidentals later in the piece. In measures 65 and 66, the Cantiones Sacrae has Fłs in the Discantus I and Altus (Figure 3.39), but they are not included in the Florilegium Selectissimarum Cantionum or Florilegium Portense. The Bassus II sings the raised


Figure 3.39: Accidental in Fabricius "Gaudent in caelis" (Cantiones Sacrae), mm. 64-69
note in between the two, and the section that follows has many D-major chords. In fact, the Altus part in all versions requires a great deal of musica ficta in the measures that follow so that it does not contrast with the $\mathrm{F} \sharp \mathrm{s}$ in the two bassus parts. The same modification is needed in the next phrase
(mm. 73-76) when the cadential chords are A major: the Altus must have C\#s applied in order to agree with the lower parts. These editorial additions are necessary in the repetition of this material as well (mm. 82-84 and mm. 88-89).

The five motets by Fabricius present a glimpse into the pieces for fewer than eight voices in the Florilegium. His compositions comprise nearly a sixth of those thirty-two works and more than onefourth of the nineteen pieces for six voices. Blankenburg's rather general statement that Fabricius's motets contain polyphony and homophony is indeed correct. As one might expect, the composer uses more homophony for longer texts and more imitative polyphony for shorter texts. The homophonic pieces tend to be shorter in length. Fabricius's counterpoint is quite smooth, frequently employing scalar passages. His text setting is logical, with natural word stresses. Several of the motets feature textural contrasts, reducing the six parts to the four highest or four lowest voices but sometimes using trios. These divided textures are often followed by repetitions of the text sung by the whole ensemble.

It is unfortunate Fabricius's music has not been published or examined in detail; it is of high quality and could be accessible to many ensembles, if they can divide into the appropriate vocal configuration. With regards to discrepancies between publications, the versions in the Florilegium Selectissimarum Cantionum and Florilegium Portense are mostly true to the composer's intention, with the exception of the many problems in "Gaudent in caelis." Of course, as in much of the anthologies, simple errors abound and to sing solely from the Bodenschatz compilations would be inadvisable unless corrections were made. Thus, the attached editions, produced with careful analysis and decisions, make these five motets by Fabricius available to study and perform.

## Chapter 4: Motets for eight voices

Motets for eight voices comprise the majority of the Florilegium Portense with eighty-three works. The popularity of the relatively new genre of polychoral music is likely the cause, and the motets transcribed for this project illustrate that compositional practice, although there is much variation in style among the examples. These pieces were chosen because they were not available in modern score except for Handl's "Veni Sancte Spiritus." That motet was originally transcribed only for performance purposes, but comparison of the Florilegium and original versions revealed significant differences. The three pieces by Berger were selected because he is the only musician other than Fabricius to have more than one motet in the Florilegium that is not available in a modern score. Vincentius's "Apparuerunt Apostolis"was chosen because of his possible involvement in editing the continuo part. Similarly, Bodenschatz's role as editor is the reason that his "Audi Hymnum" was included in the project.

While Bodenschatz's efforts as an editor and collector have been discussed, he was also prolific as a composer and arranger. Of his compositions, Riemer says "his masterly Magnificat and especially his 90 bicinia are nevertheless of considerable artistic merit and effectively combine an early Baroque inclination towards word-painting with supple vocal lines." ${ }^{1}$ His collection of Magnificats for four voices was published in 1599. ${ }^{2}$ The four partbooks contain twelve settings of the Magnificat in German, one for each of the modes and hypomodes. None of the pieces have been published in score, and the only known complete extant set of partbooks is held by the Bischöfliche Zentralbibliothek Regensburg. The Tenor book contains a preface by Bodenschatz and material by others before and after the music. Specifically addressing this collection of canticles, Riemer describes Bodenschatz's writing in the Magnficats as being very lively and harmonically clear. ${ }^{3}$ He also points to the composer's voice leading, methods of imitation, and use of all twelve modes as signs of modernity. ${ }^{4}$ The canticles are written in alternatim, with the first line of text set in polyphony. Each work ends

[^26]with a "Deo dicamus gratias" section, which was traditionally sung by the congregation. ${ }^{5}$ It is unclear why Bodenschatz set it polyphonically. The opening of the first piece (in Ionian) demonstrates Bodenschatz's simple polyphonic style (Figure 4.1). Although the voices enter independently, much of


Figure 4.1: Opening of Bodenschatz "Magnificat Primum," mm. 1-9
the first verse features parts moving in tandem. The Cantus, Altus, and Bassus present the second phrase together, for example, and the first iteration of "Gottes, meines Heilands" has the Cantus and Tenor in homorhythm. Each phrase cadences clearly before the next line of text begins. The closing "Deo dicamus" section is more melismatic than the rest of the canticle (Figure 4.2).

In 1607, Bodenschatz published his Psalterium Davidis. ${ }^{6}$ There is little music here as most of the content is the text of the Psalms in Latin. These are pointed with accents to be chanted with

[^27]

Figure 4.2: Closing of Bodenschatz "Magnificat Primum," mm. 63-70
eight tones composed by Bodenschatz, each for four voices (Figure 4.3). With each Psalm text, Bodenschatz recommends a tone based on the mood of the text. ${ }^{7}$ After the Psalm texts, there is a section of canticles which are intended to be chanted on the tones, followed by arrangements of a few hymns. This collection does not display Bodenschatz's skill as a composer but does demonstrate him responding to a practical liturgical need. ${ }^{8}$

A year after the psalter and two years after publishing a collection of four-voice hymns by Calvisius (the Florilegium selectissimorum hymnorum), Bodenschatz published his own hymnal for four voices, the Harmoniae Angelicae. ${ }^{9}$ The volume contains 152 pieces organized by the liturgical calendar. Most of the hymns are in German: only nine are in Latin. The Harmoniae Angelicae represents
7. Riemer suggests that Psalms about God as protector are set to the sixth tone and Psalms asking for mercy are sung to the third, but Halter conflates these and states that Psalms that treat "the subject of God as a Protector were sung to the 3rd Tone" (Riemer, "Bodenschatz und sein FP," 22; Halter, "A Study," 30-31).
8. Halter, "A Study," 31-32
9. Erhard Bodenschatz, Harmoniae Angelicae (Leipzig: Abraham Lamberg, 1608), http://diglib.hab.de/drucke/1164-102-theol/start.htm.


Figure 4.3: Bodenschatz "VIII. Tonus" from Psalterium Davidis

Bodenschatz's most enduring compositional legacy, as several of its hymns were reprinted in later collections by Michael Schaln and Gottfried Vopelius. ${ }^{10}$ The collection includes Bodenschatz's most famous composition and the only one in wide circulation today: his arrangement of "Joseph lieber, Joseph mein." This piece for Christmas is a vernacular rendition of the Latin carol, "Resonet in laudibus." The German version shares the same melody and is macaronic, borrowing parts of the Latin refrain. Bodenschatz's setting is simple and homophonic (Figure 4.4), which is appropriate


Figure 4.4: Opening of Bodenschatz "Joseph lieber, Joseph mein," mm. 1-8
to the carol and the purpose of the collection at large. As in other settings of this text, the meter alternates between triple and duple. Bodenschatz decorated the refrain by using scalar melismas on

[^28]the inner Altus and Tenor on "Eia" and in the Cantus and Tenor on "Sause." The carol ends with an extended melisma in duple that outlines plagal harmonies.

Bodenschatz's final publication of his own works was the Bicinia of 1615. ${ }^{11}$ This volume contains ninety duets based on the liturgical year. Riemer suggests that these might have been sung near the Gospel reading since many Gospel texts are set in the duets, but they were more likely performed during communion. Riemer's justification for such use is that collections of communion songs from the period emphasize fewer voices and two-part singing specifically. ${ }^{12}$ Riemer characterizes these pieces as more mature and intimate as compared to the fiery and youthful Magnificats. ${ }^{13}$ One of these duets, "Die Passionis Christi" was published in an anthology of contrapuntal compositions in 1945. ${ }^{14}$ The piece is in G Dorian, and the two voices trade lamenting melismas, most poignantly on the word "sanguis" (blood) (Figure 4.5). Riemer cites this passage as an example of text painting and use of sequences. ${ }^{15}$ Both lines are fairly active, although the lower part is slightly less so.


Figure 4.5: Opening of Bodenschatz "Die Passionis Christi" (25) from Bicinia, mm. 1-9

Bodenschatz placed two of his own works into the Florilegium Selectissimarum Cantionum and Florilegium Portense. "Quam pulchra es," the fifty-ninth motet, was transcribed and edited by Chaney
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12. Riemer, "Bodenschatz und sein FP," 27; Halter, "A Study," 34.
13. Riemer, "Bodenschatz und sein $F P$," 24; Halter, "A Study," 32.
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in his dissertation. ${ }^{16}$ The motet uses selected verses from Song of Solomon, mostly from Chapter 4. The text was presumably assembled by the composer. The piece is one of only eight five-voice pieces in the anthology, and that number of parts inspires a more polyphonic texture than the eight-voice pieces. Chaney gives a thorough analysis of the motet. ${ }^{17}$ Perhaps the most notable aspect of the piece is that the first two lines of text are each treated in two different styles. The first phrase (mm. 1-10) begins in imitation of a motive that starts with a distinctive pair of leaps, tonic-dominant-tonic or dominant-tonic-subdominant. These skips are followed by shorter notes that circle around the upper note of the opening figure. The section that follows sets the same text in a homophonic, dance-like triple meter (mm. 11-25). It is odd that the composer would set the same text in such dramatically different ways, perhaps illustrating the wide range of emotions one feels when they are infatuated with another person. The next passage continues the homophonic writing, although in duple meter (mm. 25-33), but then the text is repeated in close imitation with smaller note values (mm. 33-39). There is a notable pattern of descending fourths connected by ascending thirds, presented in a two-part canon on the text "non est in te" (mm. 39-45). This is followed by another section of homophony with a triple feel (mm. 50-55), and the piece closes with a return to imitation. The contrast of each of the sections do indeed give a "dramatic" feeling, as described by Chaney. ${ }^{18}$ As mentioned in Chapter 1, this motet is recorded by the Vocal Concert Dresden on their album of music from the Florilegium. ${ }^{19}$

The other motet by Bodenschatz in the Florilegium is his "Audi Hymnum." The text is an adaptation of I Kings 8:28-29. The motet is listed in the liturgical index of the Florilegium Portense as being appropriate for New Years and the Feast of Peter and Paul, and the Leipziger Kirchen-Andachten cites "Audi Hymnum" as an option for the dedication of a church. ${ }^{20}$ The piece is in G Dorian and in duple meter. Bodenschatz's motet is divided into high and low choirs: the first is comprised of two discantus parts, one altus, and one tenor, while the second group is made up of an altus, tenor, and two bassus parts. There is homophonic writing as one would expect for a polychoral work, but the tutti
16. Chaney, "Four Motets," 107-17.
17. Chaney, 53-65.
18. Chaney, 62.
19. Vocal Concert Dresden, "Quam pulchra es amica mea," track 15 on Florilegium Portense: Motten \& Hymnen (Auswahl), cond. Peter Kopp, Carus 83.492, 2018, Compact Disc.
20. Würdig, Leipziger Kirchen-Andachten, 305.
moments often contain a great deal of polyphony. The opening of the piece is a good example of such counterpoint (Figure 4.6). The composer also experiments with other groupings of the voices.


Figure 4.6: Opening of Bodenschatz "Audi Hymnum," mm. 1-4

The Altus I joins the upper choir in two passages (mm. 24-26 and 32-36) to create a five-voice texture, and the phrase that follows the latter has the Discantus II and Altus II joining the lower four voices (mm. 36-40). (See Figure 4.7 for portions of the latter two passages.) All of these sections are repeated later in the piece. Indeed, the repetition of a significant portion of music creates a tripartite structure. The first section is comprised of the polyphony that opens the work, followed by
polychoral dialogues and another florid tutti section on "orat coram te" (mm. 16-24). The second


Figure 4.7: Polyphony in Bodenschatz "Audi Hymnum," mm. 34-38
large section of the piece begins with more dialogue, and the rhythm on "ut sint oculi" has a triple feeling (mm. 24-28). In the middle of this section on the word "intentae," the composer created
interesting textures using a pattern that alternates between descending thirds and ascending seconds but the voices begin at different intervals in the sequence (Figure 4.7). This is followed by falling scales on "aures tuae," perhaps illustrating the divine paying more attention to the speakers' prayers. The homophonic phrase that follows is interesting rhythmically (Figure 4.8). Since the phrase is five


Figure 4.8: Rhythmic interest in Bodenschatz "Audi Hymnum," mm. 40-45
minims long, it is falls in the meter differently as it is repeated. In addition, the third repetition is shortened by a minim so that the beginning of the fourth iteration is syncopated. There are also slight variations in the beginnings and endings of each repetition in some parts, such as the break in the Discantus I phrase at measure 44 . The section closes with more antiphonal exchanges, and the end of this section features rare embellishment in the Basis Generalis (Figure 4.9). In measure 51, the


Figure 4.9: Continuo embellishment in Bodenschatz "Audi Hymnum," mm. 50-52
continuo line adds a passing note with dotted rhythm to the Bassus II line, and that figure is followed by an octave leap to cover the $G$ in the Bassus I. While this is a simple figuration, the Basis Generalis in this anthology usually functions as a conservative basso sequente without such embellishments. The third section of the piece that begins at measure 53 is a repetition of the second. The material is repeated exactly except for a few omissions and errors. No voices exchange parts or have any other intentional variations. In measure 80, some very brief cadential material concludes the piece. Bodenschatz ornamented nearly every cadence with either a suspension or neighbor tones. His heavy use
of polyphony and florid lines in "Audi," along with the variation and rhythmic interest in the other motives make this piece more interesting than the other, more conservative polychoral motets.

The only known sources for "Audi Hymnum" are the Florilegium Selectissimarum Cantionum and Florilegium Portense. It is surprising that there are errors and inconsistencies in these sources since the work is by Bodenschatz, but some of these may be due to copying or printing errors. There do appear to be some intentional changes, though, deemed purposeful because the discrepancies exist in both repetitions of the material. The first is the break in measure 44 of the Discantus I part mentioned above (see Figure 4.8). The Florilegium Portense contains the rest and semiminim on the first syllable of "istam," but the Florilegium Selectissimarum Cantionum uses a c" minim instead. The earlier version increases the tension against the $\mathrm{B} b$ suspension in the Discantus II, but the later revision erases that tension. The Florilegium Portense version was retained because the change occurs again at the repetition in measure 72 in the latter publication. Conversely, another change that occurs in both the second and third section was not retained. In measure 39, the Florilegium Portense has a dotted rhythm within the Bassus II scale, but it does not occur in the Florilegium Selectissimarum Cantionum or the Basis Generalis (Figure 4.10). Additionally, the Tenor I has a similar motive in measures 34


Figure 4.10: Rhythmic discrepancy in Bodenschatz "Audi Hymnum" (Florilegium Portense), mm. 38-40
and 35 , but has straight semiminims. The Bassus I from the later anthology is revised the same way in the repetition, but the conflict with the continuo and the context of the Tenor I were sufficient reason to use the Florilegium Selectissimarum Cantionum version rather than the Florilegium Portense. Two issues arise in the ending of the piece (Figure 4.11). First, the rhythm of the Altus II aligns oddly with the other parts, including reaching the final note ahead of the ensemble. Both sources concur, and since the pitches match the harmony, the passage was left as printed. Secondly, the text underlay


Figure 4.11: Ending of Bodenschatz "Audi Hymnum," mm. 80-82 Text underlay in Tenor II: first line, Florilegium Selectissimarum Cantionum; second line, Florilegium Portense
of the Tenor II was altered in the Florilegium Portense. This can be seen Figure 4.11: the first line of text is from the Florilegium Selectissimarum Cantionum, while the lower line is the later revision. The melisma on the first syllable of "nocte," however, is better aligned with the other voices, especially the Discantus I and follows the word stresses more naturally. For those reasons, the earlier version was retained.

There are a few other minor issues in this piece. The cadence at measure 9 is ambiguous: one might expect the $f$ " in the Discantus I to be raised, especially in light of the $\mathrm{F} \sharp$ in the Altus II on the next note, but the first chord remains minor (Figure 4.12). The Basis Generalis also has no indication to raise the third of the chord. Thus, an accidental was added as musica ficta to the Discantus I. Another problem occurs at the end of measure 35, where the composer merged the two discantus voices into three unison notes (Figure 4.13). A better choice might have been to change the $g$ ' minim in one of the parts to a semiminim and ascend back to the $a^{\prime}$ in alignment with the Altus I. That movement would mirror the motion of the Tenor II in the similar cadence that follows in measure 40, but the lines were left as printed in the attached edition. Finally, editorial accidentals were added to make the second and third sections match. These changes occurred in both directions: additions were made to the second section to match upcoming material, and changes were required in the third section to match the prior music. Most of these situations are intuitive as cadential figures (Discantus I, m. 33) or to match other simultaneous pitches (Discantus II, m. 54), but the Tenor If $f \sharp$ in measure 56 is not necessarily implied by the context and was used to match the same content in measure 28. The raised pitch also matches the imitation of the same figure that follows in the two bassus parts.


Figure 4.12: Cadence in Bodenschatz "Audi Hymnum," mm. 5-9


Figure 4.13: Part writing in Bodenschatz "Audi Hymnum," mm. 34-36

Jacob Handl's "Veni Sancte Spiritus" is the seventieth motet in the Florilegium. Handl's biography and works have been covered significantly elsewhere, so they will not be addressed here, with the exception of some contextual information on the original publication. The motet originally appeared as the fifty-seventh motet in the second volume of the composer's Opus Musicum. ${ }^{21}$ This collection of four volumes contains 374 motets for the entire liturgical year. Handl published the first volume in 1586, parts two and three in 1587 , and the final volume in 1590 . Each book is divided by liturgical day, and the motets for each occasion are then organized by voicing. The second part resumes where the first left off: Passion Sunday, which includes a setting of the Lamentations of Jeremiah for eight voices. The next section of motets is for Easter and Ascension, followed by Pentecost. In total, the second volume of the Opus Musicum contains seventy works (counting the Lamentations as individual pieces). This is thirteen more than the third volume but significantly fewer than the first ( 103 pieces) and fourth (144). The second volume contains eighteen works for four voices, fourteen pieces for five, eleven for six parts, and twenty-five motets for eight voices. The Easter and Ascension section also includes a motet for twelve voices, one for sixteen, and two echo choruses, double-choir pieces in which the second choir repeats the last few syllables of each phrase of the first choir, creating the illusion of an echo. The first echo motet, "Quo mihi crude dolor" (number 33), is a dialogue between Mary Magdalene and Christ, and the second, "Quid ploras mulier?" (number 55), depicts angels addressing Mary Magdalene at the empty tomb.

[^29]"Veni Sancte Spiritus" is the second of three Pentecost motets for eight voices in the Opus Musicum. ${ }^{22}$ As expected, the Florilegium Portense liturgical index and the Leipziger Kirchen-Andachten also cite "Veni Sancte Spiritus" as appropriate for Pentecost. ${ }^{23}$ The motet is in D Dorian. The two choirs are equal in voicing: one each of discantus, altus, tenor, and bass. Antiphonal exchanges between the choirs are clearly delineated throughout the piece. In fact, there are no tutti phrases anywhere in the work. Handl's writing in this motet is more melismatic than in his "Cantate Domino", which is discussed in the following chapter, and there is also some imitation, demonstrated in the second half of the first phrase (Figure 4.14). The style that follows the opening is largely the same,


Figure 4.14: Opening of Handl "Veni Sancte Spiritus," mm. 1-7
although there is an interesting circular melisma on "animae" in the Tenor I (Figure 4.15a), falling scales in thirds on "beatissima" in the Tenor I and Bassus I (Figure 4.15b), an undulating scale in the Bassus II (Figure 4.15c), as well as one that flows the opposite direction in the Bassus I (Figure 4.15d). The final phrase in the first section is homorhythmic, although the text stresses are displaced within the meter in an interesting way (Figure 4.16). Thus far, the motet has been in duple meter, but the section that follows is in a lilting triple. In this triple-meter passage, the choirs sing in an overlapping, antiphonal dialogue with shorter phrases than in the rest of the piece (about four measures long). The section concludes with a plagal cadence from G minor to D . Then, the music in triple meter is repeated verbatim with different text. The piece is interesting harmonically in that major and minor

[^30]23. Würdig, Leipziger Kirchen-Andachten, 282.

(a) mm. 23-24

(c) mm. 46-47

(b) mm. 37-38

(d) mm. 60-61

Figure 4.15: Melismatic writing in Handl "Veni Sancte Spiritus"


Figure 4.16: Word stress in Handl "Veni Sancte Spiritus," mm. 62-68
chords based on the same root often appear in close proximity to one another. The first example of this is in the first phrase of the piece, seen in Figure 4.14 above. The transition in measure 7 between the G-minor and G-major chords is quite jarring. In measure 39, the composer uses a G\# neighbor tone between two As in the Discantus I, but it is odd because the harmony is not leading to A but to an F chord (Figure 4.17). Later in the piece, the composer moves from an F-major chord to D major (m. 59), a harmonic shift that is uncharacteristic of the style.

One of the harmonic changes discussed above is created by a deliberate change in the Bodenschatz anthologies. The shift from G minor to G major in measure 7 (see Figure 4.14 above) does not occur in the original Handl publication. In the Opus Musicum, the bassus voice has a Bq at the beginning of the


Figure 4.17: Dissonance in Handl "Veni Sancte Spiritus," mm. 39-40
measure, which makes the whole progression smoother. While Handl's original may be preferable, the alteration in the anthologies has been retained in this project since it seems to be an intentional change due to the agreement of the Bassus I and Basis Generalis partbooks. Conversely, one change in the anthologies has not been retained. In measure 82 (and the repetition at measure 111), the Florilegium Selectissimarum Cantionum and Florilegium Portense do not contain the C\#s found in the original Discantus I part, perhaps because of the C two notes earlier. The strong cadential nature of the A triad, however, necessitates the $\mathrm{C} \sharp \mathrm{s}$, so the alteration in the anthologies was reversed (Figure 4.18). As in the repetition of material in "Audi Hymnum," there are passages in the repeated section of "Veni Sancte Spiritus" in the Florilegium where accidentals in the first iteration are missing in the second. Where these are missing in the Bodenschatz anthologies, they are present in the Opus Musicum (Discantus II m. 108 note 2 and m .112 note 1 ).

A few other minor changes are worth noting. Curiously, the choirs in the Bodenschatz anthologies are reversed from the content in the Opus Musicum. In Handl's original, the second choir begins the piece, but Choir I has the first entrance in the Florilegium Selectissimarum Cantionum and Florilegium Portense. There is also a difference in text in the phrase just before the triple section. In the Opus


Figure 4.18: Cadential harmony in Handl "Veni Sancte Spiritus," mm. 80-83

Musicum, Choir I sings "fove quod est languidum, riga quod est aridum, sana quod est saucium," but the corresponding voices in the Bodenschatz collections have "flecte quod est rigidum, fove quod est frigidum, rege quod est devium." The latter agrees with the Liber Usualis, so that version has been retained. In the prior phrase, however, both musical settings have "Lava quod est sordidum, riga quod est aridum, rege quod est devium," while the Liber Usualis reads "Lava quod est sordidum, riga quod est aridum, sana quod est saucium." It seems some of the text was shifted in error, so this phrase was made to match the line from the Liber Usualis in the attached edition.

The most significant difference between the two versions of "Veni Sancte Spiritus" is in the triplemeter section (Figure 4.19). Beginning with Choir II in measure 88, Handl's original ends each phrase with only a minim and shifts from regular semibreves to a syncopated rhythm in the upper three parts. Choir I follows with the same rhythm in the next measure. The bassus parts of both choirs have D-minor arpeggios in regular semibreves. The editor of the version in the Bodenschatz anthologies apparently thought that this rhythm was too complex for his students and decided to lengthen the ending of the phrase, using a more regular rhythm instead of Handl's syncopation. The pitch content of the outer parts is essentially the same, but the inner parts are altered. In the Opus Musicum, the two tenor parts differ in pitch content, but the Tenor I and Tenor II in the anthology are essentially in canon with each other until the ending cadence. The Altus I is very similar to the original Septima


Figure 4.19: Rhythmic simplification in Handl "Veni Sancte Spiritus"

(b) Florilegium Portense and Florilegium Selectissimarum Cantionum, mm. 87-96

Figure 4.19, continued: Rhythmic simplification in Handl "Veni Sancte Spiritus"
part without the octave leaps, but the Altus II part of the arrangement is altered so that it bridges each statement of Choir II. It also provides the important third in several A-major chords. All of these changes occur again in the Florilegium at the repetition of this material in measures 116 through 125, and the elongation of these two passages adds a total of four measures to the piece in the anthologies. The rhythmic simplification that occurs in "Veni Sancte Spiritus" is the most significant change to any of the motets studied in this project, excluding the arrangements discussed in the next chapter. Curiously, the Bassus I part in the Florilegium Selectissimarum Cantionum matches the original Opus Musicum version in both instances, so it therefore does not line up with the other parts in the 1603 anthology. The fact that one partbook mirrors the original suggests that this change was made at the time the Florilegium Selectissimarum Cantionum was compiled. If Bodenschatz was using some manuscript by Calvisius that already contained the simplified rhythm, it would be unlikely that one part would not match. It seems that the editor either forgot to alter the Bassus I partbook or the decision to change the rhythm was made after the part was copied.

Finally, one should note that the ending of the first triple section (m. 94 in the Opus Musicum, m. 96 in the Florilegium) is inconsistent as to length within both sources. In the original, all of Choir I extends through the measure, but Bodenschatz wrote a minim rest for one of those parts (the Discantus II). The outer parts of Choir II in the Opus Musicum do not have the minim rest that the inner parts have. Bodenschatz added the rest to the Discantus I in the Florilegium edition but not the Bassus I. Therefore, both editions in this project have unified the note lengths of each choir so that the group that sings the next phrase has a minim rest and the other choir does not.

The possible contribution of the Basis Generalis by Caspar Vincentius has already been discussed. Born in northern France around 1580, Vincentius began his musical life as a chorister. He first sang at Saint Omer Cathedral, then the court chapel of Archduke Ernst in Brussels, and finally the imperial chapel in Vienna. It is there that he met and studied with Philippe de Monte. He continued his musical career in 1602 as an organist in Speyer, where he met Abraham Schadaeus and began their
collaboration on the Promptuarium musicum. He ultimately served at Würzburg Cathedral from 1618 until his death in 1624. ${ }^{24}$

The works list in Grove Music Online for Vincentius includes a Canticum graulatorium, published in Speyer in 1611, but this collection does not seem to be available today. Also lost are a Missa super ‘Cecilia gaude’ for eight voices and a motet on Psalm 127 in German for eight voices, "Wo der Herr nicht das Haus bauet." No doubt thanks to his involvement with the continuo part and because he assembled the entirety of the fourth volume of the Promptuarium musicum, twenty-five of Vincentius's compositions were included across the four volumes of the collection, published from 1611 to 1617 (Table 4.1). Although all four volumes of the Promptuarium were available in 1618 when the Florilegium Portense was published, only one motet by Vincentius was included. Perhaps the four motets by him that were published in the Florilegii Musicii Portensis became more popular over time and were then included in the 1621 anthology for that reason. None of Vincentius's works have been formally published in score, but a few amateur editions are available and can provide a general sense of the composer's style. The pieces for five to seven voices resemble Fabricius's in style but with less use of homophony. There are a few moments of homophony or voice pairings in "Ecce dies veniunt" and "Domine Deus meus," but for the most part, these are truly polyphonic works. The eight-voice motets are certainly in the polychoral style but contain lots of melismatic writing. They often begin with imitative entrances rather than starting with a homophonic texture. Two of the pieces are notable for their recurring refrains in triple meter. "Gloria tibi Domine" begins with a refrain that is then repeated four times throughout the piece, twice in an abbreviated length. In "Tua est potentia," Vincentius uses the triple section twice in the middle of the motet.

For this project, the work in the first volume of the Florilegium, "Apparuerunt Apostolis," was edited. Since "Apparuerunt" was first published in the second volume of the Promptuarium Musicum in 1612, it was not included in the Florilegium Selectissimarum Cantionum of 1603. The motet sets verse 3 and part of 11 from the second chapter of Acts. The description of Jesus's disciples speaking in

| PM | FP | Text incipit | Voices |
| :--- | :--- | :--- | :--- |
| PM I-5 |  | Ecce dies veniunt/In diebus illis | 7 |
| PM I-19 | FP II-79 | Claritas Domini circumfulsit | 8 |
| PM I-28 | FP II-83 | Gloria tibi Domine | 8 |
| PM I-46 |  | Domine Deus meus/Et cum defecerit | 6 |
| PM I-82 |  | Tua est potentia | 8 |
| PM I-83 |  | Super salutem | 8 |
| PM II-1 |  | Alleluia. Agnus redemit oves | 5 |
| PM II-17 |  | Salve sacra dies | 8 |
| PM II-50 | FP I-95 | Apparuerunt Apostolis | 8 |
| PM II-59 |  | Pange lingua gloriosi | 6 |
| PM II-100 |  | Adesto dolori meo | 8 |
| PM III-13 |  | Summae Trinitati simplici Deo | 8 |
| PM III-20 | FP II-127 | Et tu puer Propheta | 8 |
| PM III-71 |  | Tollite jugum meum | 6 |
| PM III-109 | FP II-59 | Veni in hortum meum | 6 |
| PM IV-3 |  | Panis angelicus fit panis | 8 |
| PM IV-66 |  | Domine Deus meus [different from PM I-46] | 6 |
| PM IV-73 |  | Verbum iniquum et dolorosum | 7 |
| PM IV-105 |  | Nisi Dominus custodierit | 8 |
| PM IV-117 |  | Quam pulchra es et quam decora | 8 |
| PM IV-125 |  | Regina coeli laetare | 8 |
| PM IV-126 |  | O praecelsi bellatores | 8 |
| PM IV-127 |  | Christophori nomen casu ne | 8 |
| PM IV-128 |  | Sancte Christophore/O Martyr Christophore | 8 |
| PM IV-129 |  | Ave ignati pervium | 8 |

Table 4.1: Compositions by Vincentius in all volumes of the Promptuarium musicum (PM) and Florilegium Portense (FP)
tongues after being anointed by the Holy Spirit is listed as appropriate for Pentecost in liturgical index of the Florilegium Portense and the Leipziger Kirchen-Andachten. ${ }^{25}$ The second half of the text is found in the Liber Usualis as an antiphon for Pentecost Vespers. ${ }^{26}$ The piece is in G Mixolydian. The texture is divided into a high and low choir similar to "Audi Hymnum," with the Bassus II functioning as the lowest voice of the first choir. The choirs are clearly delineated, with no voice joining the opposite choir except in tutti passages. Such moments of tutti texture are rare. Of the eight-voice motets in this study, "Apparuerunt" is perhaps the most polyphonic and melismatic throughout. The piece opens with an imitative figure that circles the fifth scale degree before falling to the tonic (Figure 4.20). The

[^31]

Figure 4.20: Opening of Vincentius "Apparuerunt Apostolis," mm. 1-4
voices of Choir I then sing a series of independent rising scales on "dispertitae linguae" before the first antiphonal exchange on "tamquam ignis." In that phrase, two of the parts in each group have faster scales in duet (Figure 4.21). Overlapping with the last iteration of "tamquam ignis" in Choir I, Choir II begins a repetition of the opening motive. In this reprise, the voices of the first choir follow in imitation of the circling figure just after all the voices in Choir II have entered rather than at the end of their phrase. There is a shorter dialogue on "tamquam ignis" that ends in an enlongated tutti statement (mm. 19-23) before leading to a similar antiphonal exchange of "alleulia" (see Figure 4.24 below). The second half of the verse from Acts 2:3 at measure 30 resumes imitative counterpoint in Choir II with long melismas on "supra." Choir I responds with similar gestures, but the second group joins at the end of their phrase to emphasize "Spiritus Sanctus." The three iterations of "alleluia" that follow ( $\mathrm{mm} .43-51$ ) are more melismatic than the previous "alleluia" section. Verse 11 of the scripture is set with the most extended homophonic passage: a dialogue of a short gesture ("magnalia Dei") in a progression of fifths. The antiphonal exchanges conclude in measure 62 with a virtuosic flourish in the Tenor I (Figure 4.22). Most of the remainder of the motet is a repetition of prior material, creating a tripartite structure similar to "Audi Hymnum." The imitation from measure 30 through 43 returns in measure 63 , but the content of the two tenor parts is exchanged. The first two measures of the Altus I in the next phrase also have a slightly different rhythm (mm. 70-71 in contrast to mm. 3738). The first "alleluia" that follows is new material (mm. 77-79), but after that Vincentius resumed the repetition by using the material from measures 44 through 50 in measures 80 through 86. Again,


Figure 4.21: Dialogue in Vincentius "Apparuerunt Apostolis," mm. 8-11


Figure 4.22: Dialogue in Vincentius "Apparuerunt Apostolis," mm. 60-63
the two tenor parts are switched, and the final cadence is reworked. The newly-composed section that concludes the piece is a grand polyphonic texture with the whole ensemble that begins with two sets of duets: the two bassus parts and the two discantus parts.

Since "Apparuerunt Apostolis" was published in the Promptuarium Musicum, it is the only piece in this project for which there is more than one continuo source. The Basis Generalis in the Promptuarium is quite different from that in the Florilegium Portense (Figure 4.23). First, the Promptuarium continuo part consists of two staves. ${ }^{27}$ The upper staff is in tenor clef, and the lower line is mostly in bass clef, although it does use tenor clef for one passage in the second line. This allows the player to switch between choirs more naturally as opposed to the often abrupt transitions in the Florilegium. The two-staff format also displays the lowest line of both choirs in tutti passages. Secondly, the Basis Generalis part in the Florilegium Portense is texted, but the continuo of the Promptuarium is not. This is a helpful feature of the Bodenschatz anthology in that the continuo player can follow the vocal parts more easily. Next, the barlines on the Promptuarium part are not regular. They seem to align more with the shifts between different points of imitation, and they do not correspond to the regular meter displayed in the barlines of the Florilegium Portense continuo..$^{28}$ This is a primary-source contribution to the case for altering the length of measures in a modern edition to better fit the music.

Finally, the placement of accidentals in the Promptuarium Musicum continuo part is more specific than in the Bodenschatz anthology. As discussed in Chapter 2 (beginning on page 30), the placement of accidentals in the Basis Generalis of the Florilegium is not consistent, and one must use context to determine whether the bass note or the chord should be modified. For example, it would be unlikely that the first two sharps in the second line would inflect the D in the context of G Mixolydian, but a D-major chord occurs often. In the Promptuarium part, the placement of the alterations is more precise. Accidentals that affect the chord are placed on a line or space above the note (often above the entire staff in the upper line), while accidentals that affect the note are placed directly adjacent
27. Not all of the pieces in the second volume of the Promptuarium Musicum use two staves in the continuo. Works for less than eight parts have only one staff except for number 64, Domenico Brunetti's setting of "Ave verum corpus" for seven voices. Additionally, three motets for eight voices only have a single staff for the continuo part: numbers 30, 39, and 47.
28. As noted in Chapter 2, the irregular barring of the Promptuarium is more similar to the system in the second volume of the Florilegium than the regular metrical barring of the 1618 publication (see Chapter 2, page 28).

(a) Promptuarium Musicum

Bayerische Staatsbibliothek München, 4 Mus.pr. 450-1/4, p. 935, urn:nbn:de:bvb:12-bsb00077793-9
Figure 4.23: Basis Generalis part of Vincentius "Apparuerunt Apostolis"

(b) Florilegium Portense

Library of Congress, Music Division, M1490.B7, p. 1510, 2010456596
Figure 4.23, continued: Basis Generalis part of Vincentius "Apparuerunt Apostolis"
to it. In "Apparuerunt," this is critical in two places in the Basis Generalis: the G\#s near the end of the third line and the beginning of the fourth (transcribed in Figure 4.24). Although both accidentals appear in the Florilegium continuo part, it is not explicitly clear whether they are calling for a $\mathrm{G} \#$ to be played or indicating a G-major chord. There are no G-minor chords nearby, so one might deduce that the accidental is intended to inflect the note, but there is no such sharp in either part that the Basis Generalis line is representing (Bassus I, m. 25, note 3 or Bassus II, m. 27, note 3). In this case, the specificity of the Promptuarium continuo part demonstrates that an accidental must be added to the vocal lines. The addition of the G\#s necessitates FHs for a logical melodic line, although one F $\#$ already appears in the Promptuarium Bassus I part in measure 25 (note 2). This section represents the most significant differences between the Promptuarium and Florilegium versions of "Apparuerunt" in that most of the accidentals that appear in the former were not duplicated in the latter. It is important to note that, because some of the accidentals in question appear in the Florilegium continuo part but not the vocal parts, the Basis Generalis in the Bodenschatz anthology was probably copied from the equivalent Promptuarium Musicum partbook rather than constructed anew from the vocal parts. With all of the accidentals in place, each "alleluia" has a shift from A minor to A major or E minor to E major before a dominant cadence to G or D respectively. The Florilegium keeps most of the dominant cadences but eliminates the shift in the predominant chords in the vocal parts. ${ }^{29}$ Such a change is consistent with other alterations in the arrangements of motets for more than eight voices (discussed in the next chapter), where the editions in the Bodenschatz anthology avoids major and minor chords with the same root in close proximity. It is speculated that this is to make the piece more accessible to amateur singers in schools and smaller parishes or to fit with regional tastes regarding dissonances. The conflict between the vocal parts and the continuo, however, calls into question whether the omission of the accidentals was intentional. If deliberate changes were made, would it not seem likely that those would be communicated to the copyist of the continuo part? If Vincentius himself produced the Basis Generalis part in both anthologies, should his original version take precedence? The Florilegium usually explicitly indicates accidentals where they might be implied

[^32] be assumed to be mimic the material from Choir II in measures 25 and 26.


Figure 4.24: Discrepancies in accidentals in Vincentius "Apparuerunt Apostolis," mm. 24-28 Notes in red and in boxes do not have an accidental in the Florilegium Portense Bracketed accidentals in the Basis Generalis are editorial
in other publications, so it is not likely that Bodenschatz expected the performer to raise the pitches on their own. The specificity of the Promptuarium continuo part discussed above and the inclusion of the harmonic shifts in the Florilegium Basis Generalis partbook were sufficient cause to include all the accidentals in the edition for this project.

Unfortunately, there are more discrepancies between the two versions of "Apparuerunt Apostolis." Although the Florilegium Portense usually marks cadential accidentals, the editor or copyist missed two sharps in the Discantus I that are present in the Promptuarium: the c\#" at note 3 of measure 21 and the $f \sharp$ " at the beginning of measure 54 . Additionally, there are accidentals missing from the Florilegium that are necessitated by other parts. In measure 23, the Bodenschatz anthology is missing the $\mathrm{F} \sharp$ in the Tenor I in order to agree with the continuo and the Altus I. In measures 60 and 63 , sharps are required in the Altus I to fit with the continuo and the Tenor I and Discantus II respectively (see Figure 4.22 above). Conversely, in measure 20, the Promptuarium has the Altus II ending with an FH as part of a cadence in D major, but the entrance of the other choir overlaps by a semiminim, and the Discantus I has an F. In this case, the Florilegium is more correct with an $f^{\prime}$ in the Altus II. In addition to the many issues with accidentals, there are a few rhythmical problems in "Apparuerunt." In measure 45, the Basis Generalis parts of both sources do not match the Bassus I (Figure 4.25a), but in the repetition at measure 81, the two parts align (Figure 4.25b). Therefore, the


Figure 4.25: Continuo discrepancy in Vincentius "Apparuerunt Apostolis" (Florilegium Portense)
continuo part in measure 45 has been corrected to match. Additionally, the Florilegium has different rhythms for the Discantus II and Bassus II at the end of measure 78 (Figure 4.26). Instead of the original rhythm of semiminim-fusa-fusa, the Bodenschatz anthology has fusa-fusa-semiminim as the last three notes of the measure in both parts. Not only does this contradict the rhythm in the Basis


Figure 4.26: Rhythmic discrepancy in Vincentius "Apparuerunt Apostolis," m. 78

Generalis, it creates undesirable dissonances. Finally, there are many small discrepancies between the two sources regarding the length of melismas. These are cited in the critical notes.

The final three motets originally for eight voices in this project were composed by Andreas Berger. Born in Saxony in 1584, Berger made his way to Augsburg and worked in a legal capacity under the title "Kaiserlicher Notar." In 1606, he became a singer in the court chapel at Stuttgart and would later act as a composer to the duke. There is a contemporary report that he was a "good musician and a fine composer," but he failed to win the post of Kapellmeister and was later dismissed when the chapel choir was diminished. He had other teaching, clerical, and musical posts including Kapellmeister to the count of Öttingen. In 1641, Berger moved to Ulm, where he died in $1656 .{ }^{30}$ Although Berger's music is not known today, Riemer includes him in a list of great masters of good repute from Augsburg along with Hassler, Gumpelzhaimer, and Erbach. ${ }^{31}$

[^33]A few of Berger's works have been published in score, but they are not readily available to performers. The most recently published is his "Da pacem Domine" for ten voices, included in a 2012 volume of the Denkmäler der Tonkunst in Bayern Neue Folge series. ${ }^{32}$ Originally published in 1635, the header in each of the partbooks designates the piece as a "Concertum." ${ }^{33}$ This is the last surviving work by Berger: a "Magnum tricinium tergeminum" published in Ulm in the 1640s was lost. ${ }^{34}$ " Da pacem Domine" is for two groups of five voices each, named "chori superioris" and "chori inferioris" in the partbooks, perhaps indicating some use of favoriti. The opening line quotes the beginning of the Gregorian chant on the same text, which is imitated in each voice of Choir I and later by Choir II. The range of the vocal parts is quite wide, from low $C$ in the Quintus of the second choir to a high $a "$ in the Primus of Choir I. While the lowest pitch rarely occurs, the $D$ one step above is sung often as is the high $a$ ", making transposition difficult. The texture of the "in diebus" section is interesting in that Berger created many duets within the ten-voice texture (Figure 4.27). These pairs present an ascending scale spanning a third while being a third apart themselves. There is also one instance of three voices presenting the text together, with two parts from the first choir in harmony with the Quartus from the Choir II (mm. 39-40). A few measures later the Quintus from Choir I joins with the same Quartus from the second choir. These are the only occurrences of individual parts from a choir joining with one from the other group. The rest of the piece features antiphonal exchanges, including a section in triple meter. That section is followed by a complete semibreve silence and a tutti polyphonic ending.

The two other modern publications of Berger's works were released in German music periodicals in the early 20th century. These are and "O Trauern, Angst, und Klagen" and the "Canzon ocatavi modi," the first and last pieces in Berger's volume of German secular songs, Threnodiae amatoriae. ${ }^{35}$ The "Canzon" has also been recorded on an album of chamber music by members of the Berlin

[^34]
(a) $\mathrm{mm} .39-47$

Figure 4.27: Texture in Berger "Da pacem Domine"


Figure 4.27, continued: Texture in Berger "Da pacem Domine"

Philharmonic, first released on vinyl in 1982 and reprinted in other formats since. ${ }^{36}$ The Threnodiae contains fifteen four-voice works and two pieces for eight voices listed as dialogues in the index: "Warum wilt mich verlassen?" and the "Canzon." All of the pieces are in German, except for the "Canzon," which is untexted and features long, running lines (Figure 4.28). The four-voice works are


Figure 4.28: Opening of Berger "Canzon ocatavi modi," mm. 1-6
strophic and rather short.
Berger's first publication was the Harmoniae seu cantiones sacrae of 1606. The collection contains twenty-five Latin motets, four of which have two sections and one which is divided into four parts (Table 4.2). The publication includes an eight-voice motet in two sections by Caspar Solfleisch, who is referenced as a "poor musician" in the roster of the court at Innsbruck in 1607. ${ }^{37}$ It is unclear how he was acquainted with Berger. As one might expect, the pieces in the Harmoniae with fewer parts are more polyphonic than those with more voices. Kirwan seems to have had access to the scores

[^35]| Index | Title | Voices |
| :--- | :--- | :--- |
| I | In principio creavit Deus | 4 |
| II | Haec est voluntas eius | 4 |
| III | Verba mea auribus percipe | 4 |
| IV | Quare fremuerunt gentes | 4 |
| V | Quarite primum regnum Dei | 5 |
| VI | O Jesu Christe, miserere | 5 |
| VII | Justus ut palma florebit | 5 |
| VIII | Ah alme Deus, serva nos | 5 |
| IX | Audite haec omnes gentes | 5 |
| X | Exaudi Deus deprecationem (Prima pars) | 6 |
| XI | Quoniam tu Deus (Secunda pars) | 6 |
| XII | Eructavit cor meum verbum | 6 |
| XIII | Exurge Deus, \& miseris | 6 |
| XIV | Dominus regnavit, exultet | 6 |
| XV | Quam dilexi legem tuam | 6 |
| XVI | A Domino gressus hominis | 7 |
| XVII | Domine Dominus noster (Prima pars) | 7 |
| XVIII | Quid est homo (Secunda pars) | 7 |
| XIX | Domine ne in furore tuo (Prima pars) | 7 |
| XX | Laboravi (Secunda pars) | 7 |
| XXI | Discedite à me (Tertia pars) | 7 |
| XXII | Erubescant (Quarta pars) | 7 |
| XXIII | Beata gens cuius Deus (Prima pars) | 8 |
| XXIV | Anima autem (Secunda pars) | 8 |
| XXV | Expectans expectavi | 8 |
| XXVI | Confitebor tibi Domine | 8 |
| XXVII | Judica me Deus | 8 |
| XXVIII | Cantate Domino* | 8 |
| XXIX | Jubilate Deo omnis Terra* | 8 |
| XXX | Omnes gentes (Prima pars) $\dagger$ | 8 |
| XXXI | Psallite (Secunda pars) $\dagger$ | 8 |
| XXXII | Laudate Dominum* | 8 |
|  |  |  |

Table 4.2: Contents of the Harmoniae seu cantiones sacrae (* indicates publication in the Florilegium Portense)
( $\dagger$ indicates works by Caspar Solfleisch)
based on his commentary on the volume. He claims that Berger's shorter motives are less successful than his longer contrapuntal figures but praises the antiphonal writing of the polychoral works and "imaginative word-painting, including quite startling discords." ${ }^{38}$ Kirwan suggests that the motets resemble those by Hassler that were published in Augsburg around the same time. Since the volume was published four years after the Florilegium Selectissimarum Cantionum, Berger's motets were not included in that volume.

Berger's "Jubilate Deo," indexed as the twenty-fourth work in the Harmoniae seu cantiones sacrae, was published as the ninety-eighth motet in the Florilegium Portense. The text is Psalm 99. The eight voices are divided into high and low choirs, with the Bassus I joining the two discantus parts and the Altus I in the upper choir, similar to the texture in Vincentius's "Apparuerunt Apostolis." Written in G Mixolydian, the motet is mostly comprised of homophonic antiphonal dialogue, although some imitation and longer, melismatic writing occurs. The tessitura of the highest voice is higher than other pieces in the anthology, with the Discantus II frequently reaching high $a$ ". Overall, Berger used a surprising number of leaps in the vocal writing of this piece, such as the fifths or fourths and distinctive octave leap of the opening motive, which are followed by circling scales in descent (Figure 4.29). Throughout the piece, Berger repeated gestures in the opposite choir before moving on to the next line of text. Thus, Choir II takes up the opening motive at the cadence of the first choir's phrase, followed by a tutti statement with a melisma on "terra" in three of the parts (mm. 13-14). Berger continued to use the opening line of text with some antiphonal homophony before another tutti statement with a similar melisma. The phrase that follows begins with a duet by the Discantus I and Bassus I with the Discantus II in contrary motion (m. 22). This phrase is repeated almost verbatim in the lower choir (see Figure 4.34 below). Berger followed with more homophony, this time beginning the motive with syncopation. After an extended section of rapid polychoral exchanges, the rhythm slows greatly as Choir I begins a section in slower rhythm (Figure 4.30). In this phrase, Berger exposed a single note in the Discantus II by pausing the other parts in a striking fashion. He does this twice in the phrase that follows in Choir II (mm. 47 and 49). In the antiphonal exchanges that follow these

[^36]

Figure 4.29: Opening of Berger "Jubilate Deo," mm. 1-5


Figure 4.30: Slower rhythm in Berger "Jubilate Deo," mm. 37-41
two longer sections, there is a brief section in triple meter (mm. 59-66). More dialogue follows until the end of the piece, including octave leaps on "laudate" (mm. 69-70). The last phrase that ends the piece is preceded by a minim rest in all parts, and Berger embellished the ending with melismas on the first syllable of "ejus."

All of the motets by Berger in the Florilegium Portense have many discrepancies from the versions in the Harmoniae seu cantiones sacrae. It is possible that Bodenschatz did not have a reliable copy of Berger's music since the publication of the Harmoniae was later than most of the sources for music in the Florilegium. The motets might have been transmitted to the editor by some means other than the
printed publication, such as a handwritten copy in which the discrepancies could have been introduced. On the other hand, Bodenschatz may have simply wished to make more changes to these pieces. In "Jubilate Deo," the most obvious alteration is near the end of the piece. In the Florilegium, the rhythm of both choirs in measure 83 is lengthened, and the entrance of the second choir is delayed (Figure 4.31). The augmentation is perhaps easier to execute and removes the suspensions that occur in the original at the beginning of the measure. The music that follows is unchanged, including the tutti rest, but all parts are offset by a semibreve because of the earlier augmentation. Another significant difference between the two editions occurs in the triple section. In Berger's original, the rhythmic values are half of what is written in the Florilegium, so that the semibreve is perfect in the Harmoniae but the breve is perfected in the Bodenschatz anthology. Both versions have a meter of $\frac{3}{2}$, but only the Bodenschatz has the $\Phi$ signature before the fraction. The ${ }_{2}^{3}$ sign alone is listed by Praetorius as indication of sesquialtera, a proportional relationship resulting in a slower tempo, while the fraction in conjunction with the $\Phi$ sign is indicative of the faster tripla relationship. ${ }^{39}$ While Praetorius admits that many musicians "indiscriminately make use of one [signature] for another," ${ }^{40}$ Berger's use of smaller note values at a slower tempo has the same approximate result as the longer note values of the Florilegium at a faster tempo. Thus, as long as the performer of the Bodenschatz edition does not apply a sesquialtera relationship to the augmented rhythm, the intention of the composer should be retained. Therefore, a tripla relationship, where three semibreves in the triple meter are equivalent to one semibreve in the duple meter, is suggested in the edition of "Jubilate." Two other rhythmic discrepancies arise in the Altus I line shortly after the triple section (Figure 4.32). In measures 69 and 70, the version in the Florilegium simplifies the rhythm and aligns it with the Bassus I. It is possible that Berger was using the anticipation to minimize the parallel movement, but the change in the Florilegium has been retained since it reflects the goal of rhythmic simplification. The changes that Bodenschatz made in the measures that follow, however, have not been retained in this project. First, the choice to keep the Altus I on G for the last note of measure 71 leaves the chord without a fifth. Secondly,
39. Michael Praetorius, Syntagma Musicum III, trans. and rev. Jeffery T. Kite-Powell (Oxford: Oxford University Press, 2004), 71-72.
40. Praetorius, 73.

(a) Harmoniae seu cantiones sacrae

Figure 4.31: Ending of Berger "Jubilate Deo," mm. 82-86

(b) Florilegium Portense

Figure 4.31, continued: Ending of Berger "Jubilate Deo," mm. 82-86


Figure 4.32: Rhythmic discrepancies in Berger "Jubilate Deo," mm. 69-74
the syncopation that follows in the Florilegium is more complex and not in alignment with the other parts, particularly the early arrival on the word "est" in measure 72 . Thus, while the simplification in the Bodenschatz version has been retained in the first two measures, the original publication was preferred in the rest of this example.

As in othermotets, the editor of the Florilegium was not consistent in his treatment of ornamentation. In measure 11, the Bodenschatz version does not contain a cadential neighbor figure in the Altus II that exists in Berger's original. In the phrase prior, though, the editor did not remove the same figure from the Discantus II at the end of the equivalent phrase. Thus, the attached edition leaves both of the ornaments from the Harmoniae. Near the end of the motet, the editor adds a flourishing ascending scale to the Bassus I (Figure 4.33). While this is an obvious addition of ornamentation, it

(a) Harmoniae seu cantiones sacrae

(b) Florilegium Portense

Figure 4.33: Ornamentation in Berger "Jubilate Deo," mm. 80-81
is odd that Bodenschatz did not repeat the gesture with the Bassus II in the next measure when that part has the same source material in the Harmoniae. Finally, while the Basis Generalis generally acts
as a basso sequente and follows the vocal parts exactly, the editor departs from following the Discantus II in the second measure of the motet by adding a quick anticipatory fusa in order to prepare the suspension that happens as the second voice enters (see Figure 4.29 above).

Finally, there are a number of discrepancies between the two versions with regard to accidentals. The section from measure 22 to 26 contains four notes that have a sharp in the Harmoniae seu cantiones sacrae but not in the Florilegium Portense (Figure 4.34). As stated previously, the first phrase sung by Choir I in this passage is repeated in the lower voices of the second choir. This repetition allows for comparison of the accidentals between the two iterations, which shows that even Berger's original publication is inconsistent. In measure 25, for example, the Harmoniae has an F\# in the Altus II, but the identical material in the Discantus II a few measures earlier does not. Similarly, the lower neighbor tone in measure 23 of the Discantus I is raised in Berger's original but not in the Tenor II at the end of this passage. The Fs are raised in the ascending scales of both the Altus I and Tenor I in the Harmoniae, but it seems clear that the removal of all the accidentals in the section was intentional in the Florilegium. These modifications strengthen the cadence at the end of each phrase by avoiding D-major tonalities earlier. Later in the motet, the Florilegium omits a G\# in the Altus I in the section with slower rhythm (see Figure 4.30 above). In the Harmoniae, Berger started this section with an E-minor chord but then uses an E-major triad in the second half of measure 39 to lead to A minor. The raised third is not used in Bodenschatz's edition, likely because of the proximity to the previous E-minor tonality. A few measures later, the Florilegium editions adds a $B b$ in a cadential chord leading to A in measure 43 (Figure 4.35). The Harmoniae used a raised F\# neighbor tone in the Discantus II in that measure, but the Bodenschatz edition has an F to avoid dissonance with the Bb in the Bassus I . The Florilegium also adds a Bb in the Discantus II in measure 44, but both versions have the lowered note on the first note of the Discantus I in that measure, lending credence to its use in the bassus part previously. Finally, towards the end of the motet, the edition in the Florilegium Portense modifies the pitches in the Altus II part from the original (Figure 4.36). In measure 75 and 77, the Harmoniae contains two consecutive F\#s, but Bodenschatz changed the second of those to E in both cases. This was probably to vary the harmonic progression since an $\mathrm{F} \sharp$-minor chord in the same voicing appears


Figure 4.34: Accidental discrepancies in Berger "Jubilate Deo," mm. 22-26
Notes in red and in boxes have a $\#$ in the Harmoniae seu cantiones sacrae but not in the Florilegium Portense


Figure 4.35: Cadential harmony in Berger "Jubilate Deo" (Florilegium Portense), mm. 42-45


Figure 4.36: Altered pitches in Berger "Jubilate Deo," mm. 74-77
two notes later. The Florilegium does not raise the Cs in the Tenor II in both of the F\#-minor triads, but these are considered to be errors.

Following Berger's "Jubilate Deo" in the Florilegium Portense is his setting of Psalm 97, "Cantate Domino." In accordance with the order of the Psalms, "Cantate" occurs just before "Jubilate" in the Harmoniae seu cantiones sacrae as the twenty-eighth work in the index. Like "Jubilate Deo," "Cantate Domino" has a high and low choir, with a bassus part in each. The range of the Bassus I is quite a bit higher than that of the Bassus II: from $c$ to $g$ ' compared to $F$ to $a$. Choir II also contains an altus voice
and two tenor voices, while the upper group consists of two discantus parts and one altus. The motet is in C major and contains a large number of tutti phrases. The piece begins with open fifths and figuration comprised of undulating melismas finally resulting in a full minor triad on the dominant in the third measure (Figure 4.37). Near the end of the first phrase, the four voices of the lower choir


Figure 4.37: Opening of Berger "Cantate Domino," mm. 1-5
imitate a shorter undulating figure (Figure 4.38). By varying the distance between iterations in each


Figure 4.38: Imitation in Berger "Cantate Domino," mm. 9-13
voice, the pairings of voices change throughout the phrase. First, the outer parts move together and the two tenor parts are in duet in measure 10. Then in the next measure, the Altus II and Tenor II are homorhythmic, followed by the Tenor I and Bassus II. Before the cadence of this phrase, the Altus I of Choir I enters in the middle of measure 12 to begin the higher voices' version of the opening theme. The "mirabilia" figure in the upper group is similar to that in Choir II, except that it begins with a grouping of three voices (the Discantus II, Discantus I, and Bassus I). After a tutti statement,
a complete minim rest occurs. Interestingly, the C in the Basis Generalis of the Florilegium is tied through the rest in the vocal parts. While Berger clearly wrote a silence in the vocal parts, the editor of the continuo part has attempted to mitigate that for some reason, perhaps to assist the singers in finding the next pitch even though the harmony does not change. The next motive on "canticum" is repeated in each choir in close antiphonal exchange (mm. 27-31). In Choir II, the word for "song" is set with melismas in contrary motion in the Tenor I and Bassus II. In the upper choir, the Bassus I mirrors the prior ascending figure while the two discantus parts descend. Another tutti section follows with increased polyphony (mm. 31-35). After some shorter antiphonal exchange and a clever tutti on "omnis terra" (all the earth), there is a close polychoral dialogue of "et exultate" (mm. 43-44). The "et psallite" has an implied triple meter, and Berger cleverly dilineates the next "psallite" with a very different texture of melismatic polyphony (Figure 4.39). In measures 55 through 58, the composer


Figure 4.39: Texture contrast in Berger "Cantate Domino," mm. 45-48
writes very simple music with scalar melismas to depict trumpets on the "in tubis ductilibus." This is followed by the first short triple section on "jubilate" (mm. 62-67). More antiphonal exchanges occur before another triple meter passage on "alleluia," beginning on measure 81 . Before the tutti "alleluia" that concludes the triple section, the Basis Generalis again continues holding a note through a minim rest in the vocal parts (m. 87). Both of the triple sections are interesting in that they are preceded by only a semibreve. Since the editions in this project follow the regular bar lines of the Basis Generalis, each of the triple-meter passages begin in the middle of a measure. The first section in triple meter is also followed by a half-measure: a dotted minim and semiminim in all parts before the next full
measure. Following the second triple section, the last two measures of the piece are a brief codetta in duple meter with scalar melismas in several parts.

As in "Jubilate Deo," there are many discrepancies between the two sources of "Cantate Domino," particularly regarding rhythm. The first example demonstrates the practice of simplification seen frequently in the Florilegium. In measure 5, the Bodenschatz anthology does not contain the syncopated suspension of the original Tenor I (Figure 4.40). While this does affect the harmony, the Florilegium


Figure 4.40: Simplification in Berger "Cantate Domino," mm. 4-6
version is easier for the singer to execute. Later, Bodenschatz altered the Discantus I part in measures 20 and 21 (Figure 4.41). The $a$ ' minim in the Harmoniae seu cantiones sacrae creates a dissonance

(a) Harmoniae seu cantiones sacrae

(b) Florilegium Portense

Figure 4.41: Discrepancy in Berger "Cantate Domino," mm. 20-21
with the Discantus II and Bassus I on the second semiminim of measure 21 in addition to the text underlay being different from the other parts. The B-minor chord created by the F\# in Berger's version is aurally surprising. Bodenshatz removed this with the melisma up to the $d$ ", but that change created an incomplete triad. Another rhythmic simplification occurs later in measure 37, where some parts have regular semiminim rhythms but others have dotted figures in the original version (Figure 4.42).

(a) Harmoniae seu cantiones sacrae

(b) Florilegium Portense

Figure 4.42: Rhythmic simplification in Berger "Cantate Domino," mm. 37-38

Bodenschatz simplified the rhythm of the Discantus I, Bassus I, and Bassus II as compared to their counterparts in the Harmoniae seu cantiones sacrae, and Vincentius made the corresponding alterations in the Basis Generalis, indicating an intentional change. The lengthening of the C in the bass line at the end of measure 37 necessitated raising the Tenor I part by step to the third of the chord. Bodenschatz might have moved the Tenor II down to $g$ but instead left the $b$ to create a seventh chord. There are two additional points to note in this passage. First, Bodenschatz changed the last note of the Discantus II part in measure 38 to stay on the $d$ " rather than leap to the $g$ ", but that note is already sounding in the Discantus I, so the original was retained in that instance. Secondly, the second
note in measure 38 of the Florilegium Tenor II part is an error and a hand correction to $g$ can be seen in the Library of Congress copy. Near the end of the piece, the Florilegium corrects an error in the original: on the third note of the Discantus I part in measure 84, the Harmoniae seu cantiones sacrae has a minim, but Bodenschatz changes this to a semibreve. Not all of the rhythmic alterations in the Florilegium Portense were retained in this project, however. In measures 27 through 29, the Discantus I and Tenor I each have two descending figures in contrary motion to the bassus parts. In the Florilegium, all four of these are notated with a semiminim and two fusae, but they appear with a dotted semiminim and two semifusae in Berger's original (Figure 4.43). Bodenschatz's modification

(a) Harmoniae seu cantiones sacrae

(b) Florilegium Portense

Figure 4.43: Rhythmic discrepancy in Berger "Cantate Domino," mm. 27-28
or error lengthened two dissonances between C in the Tenor I part and D in the Bassus II. The answer in the upper choir is centered around the dominant, making the relationship between the Bassus I and Discantus I less dissonant, but the lengthening of the $d$ " in the Discantus I still clashes against the $e$ in the Bassus II. The last significant rhythmic discrepancy occurs in measure 40 of the Tenor II part (Figure 4.44). The lengthening of the $c$ ' in the Florilegium creates a different chord over the $F$ in the

(a) Harmoniae seu cantiones sacrae

(b) Florilegium Portense

Figure 4.44: Discrepancies in Berger "Cantate Domino," mm. 39-41

Bassus II and necessitated an alteration of the underlay, which does not line up with the rest of the
parts at the beginning of measure 41 . Thus, the original version has been retained in this passage. At first glance, the added dot might be an error, except that the rhythm at the end of the phrase was altered to accommodate it. The $\mathrm{C} \#$ at the beginning of measure 39 , however, has been removed in accordance with the Florilegium version. Finally, it is important to note that while the triple section in "Jubilate Deo" had smaller note values in the Harmoniae seu cantiones sacrae as compared to the Florilegium Portense (see page 108 above), they are identical in "Cantate Domino." Both versions use a $\Phi$ signature followed by ${ }_{2}^{3}$ and have the breve as perfect.

In addition to the rhythmic discrepancies, there are several differences in pitch between the two versions of "Cantate Domino." In all but one case, the version from the Florilegium Portense was retained in the attached edition. First, in measure 8, Bodenschatz added a cadential sharp that likely would have been performed when reading from the original edition (Figure 4.45). The same alteration


Figure 4.45: Harmonic alteration in Berger "Cantate Domino" (Florilegium Portense), mm. 7-8
occurs again in the Altus I part in measure 19. Shortly before the latter addition, the Florilegium edition does not contain two sharps that exist in the original in measure 16 (Figure 4.46). Note also that the parallel unison between the Quinta and Septima at the beginning of measure 16 in the Harmoniae seu cantiones sacrae was fixed in the Bodenschatz anthology by replacing the second note in the lower voice with a $g^{\prime}$. Finally, two pitch changes were made in the two discantus parts near the middle of the piece (Figure 4.47). First, Bodenschatz moved the resolution of the $4-3$ suspension


Figure 4.46: Discrepancy in Berger "Cantate Domino," mm. 16-17

(a) Harmoniae seu cantiones sacrae

(b) Florilegium Portense

Figure 4.47: Pitch discrepancies in Berger "Cantate Domino," mm. 33-36
earlier in measure 34 of the Discantus I part. This is also reflected in the figure in the Basis Generalis. Secondly, in measure 36, Berger moved the Cantus part from $e$ " to $c$ ", but Bodenschatz kept the part on the $e$ ". The C is doubled in many other parts including at the unison. This may be the motivation for the editorial change, but the other part with an E (the Bassus II) changes to an F while the E is still being held in the Discantus II. This potential dissonance is likely the reason that Berger doubled the $c$ ", and it seems that Bodenschatz either missed it or was not concerned. Whatever the reason, the original part has been retained in measure 36 to prevent the dissonance.

Lastly, there are two areas where the text underlay differs between the two versions. At the end of measure 45 and overlapping into measure 46, the Florilegium has an $i j$ indication in the Altus I
and Bassus I, which represents the prior word "psalite," but has the word "Domino" in all the other parts, including the Basis Generalis. The Harmoniae seu cantiones sacrae, however, has an explicit "psallite" in the lowest voice and an $i i$ or $i j$ indication in the other parts. Confusion arises since the text is "et psallite. Psallite Domino" and because the punctuation in these sources is often unreliable. However, it seems logical to align the conclusion of the dance-like material of measure 45 and the ending of the first sentence. Then the new "Psallite Domino" text begins with the scalar material that follows (see Figure 4.39 above on p. 116). The final text discrepancy occurs in measures 58 and 59. Here, the Florilegium has "et sono tubae" in all parts except for the Altus I, which reads "et voce tubae." Berger's original and the Liber usualis also have "voce," so that word has been used in the edition.

The final motet by Andreas Berger in the Florilegium Portense is his setting of "Laudate Dominum." The piece is the final work in the Harmoniae seu cantiones sacrae and sets the final psalm, Psalm 150, which contains many references to musical instruments in the text. While the prior two motets by Berger had a bassus voice in each choir, "Laudate" has both discantus and both altus parts in the first choir, while the second choir contains the tenor and bassus voices. This creates a more dichotomous texture. The ranges are also a bit wider, notably in the Altus I ( $a-d$ ") and Bassus II ( $F-c^{\prime}$ ). "Laudate" is in F major and begins in duple meter. Since each line of text starts with the word "laudate," Berger often has antiphonal dialogue or a tutti texture at each iteration of this word, as opposed to other motets where each phrase begins with a single choir and then may conclude with all voices. On eight of these entrances, Berger begins with only the highest discantus voice on an $f^{\prime \prime}$, followed quickly by either the rest of the Choir I (three times in mm. 18, 36, and 58) or all the voices (five times in mm. $4,12,28,42$, and 47). He does not use this technique at the beginning of the piece or when the lower choir begins the phrase (mm. 22 and 50). In the first two lines of text, the choirs present the first two words together and then have dialogue for the rest of the sentence. At measure 18, Berger starts the phrase with just the higher choir. After some dialogue, the next tutti contains a circle-of-fifths progression, where the harmony accentuates the repetition of text (Figure 4.48). The


Figure 4.48: Harmonic progression in Berger "Laudate Dominum," mm. 25-28Florilegium Portense Basis Generalis part with lyrics from Bassus II
phrase that follows is characterized by six of the parts moving independently in descending triads to depict "in sono tubae," while the lowest voices of each choir move together in slow semibreves (Figure 4.49). Soon after, the cithara is illustrated with interesting voice pairings in the upper choir, where the middle two voices rise together opposite the outer parts (Figure 4.50). As one might expect, the sonic depiction of the timpani in measures 45 and 46 is quite static, alternating between F and $\mathrm{B} b$-major chords, followed by a tutti declamation of "et choro" by all voices in the ensemble. The next two phrases demonstrate chains of suspensions. First, the upper altus voice is rhythmically offset from the other voices in the higher choir, creating movement from root-position triads to first-inversion chords as the entire texture ascends (Figure 4.51). This ascent is followed by a similar descending gesture in the other choir, where the lowest tenor voice creates the suspensions, which are then followed by a scales in contrary motion to emphasize "benesonantibus" (see Figure 4.62 below). The section that follows is in triple meter, led by the highest choir. After the second choir enters, the dotted, dance-like rhythms on "cymbalis" continue until the conclusion of the phrase. Once the second choir has finished its statement, the two groups repeat the word "jubilationis" together before a return to duple meter for the final section of the piece. The final twenty-eight measures of the piece are an extraordinary demonstration of counterpoint in the context of an eight-voice motet. Whereas the first section of the the piece prior to the triple-meter portion had very little repetition of text, the conclusion sets just one line "omnis spiritus laudet Dominum," with many repetitions of the word for "praise." The passage is characterized by many undulating scales, often in duets, in all but the lowest bassus part. That voice has a remarkably slow, deliberate scale in breves, beginning at low $F$, rising all the way to $c$ ' at measure 84 , and falling back to $F$ by measure 95 . The foundational voice then ascends another fifth to $c$ for the final cadence. Riemer cites this line as an example of Augenmusik, depicting the text visually in the partbook. He does not say what he believes is being implied by the


Figure 4.49: Text painting in Berger "Laudate Dominum," mm. 30-33


Figure 4.50: Voice pairing in Berger "Laudate Dominum," mm. 40-42


Figure 4.51: Chain of suspensions in Berger "Laudate Dominum," mm. 49-50
shape of the line, saying "individual symmetrical figures are used in the composition merely for their own sake", but Halter suggests that the rising and falling shape "expresses the swelling of the song of praise. ${ }^{" 11}$ It is important to note that in the Florilegium Portense version, the continuo line follows the scale in the Bassus II part until measure 82, where the Bassus I joins a third lower (Figure 4.52). The Basis Generalis coincides with the Bassus II again in measure 85 where the two bassus parts converge in their crossing. The piece ends with a two-measure pedal on the dominant before the cadence to F major.

[^37]

Figure 4.52: Bassus duet in Berger "Laudate Dominum," mm. 81-84
"Laudate Dominum" contains more discrepancies between the Harmoniae seu cantiones sacrae and the Florilegium Portense than "Jubilate Deo" or "Cantate Domino." Whereas most of the changes Bodenschatz made to "Cantate Domino" were retained for this project, Berger's original version of "Laudate Dominum" was deemed more correct in most cases. With regards to rhythm, in measure 16, it appears that Bodenschatz attempted to simplify the rhythm of the Bassus I part by changing the $d$ ' dotted semiminim and $g$ fusa to a $d^{\prime}$ minim, but this change creates a parallel-fifth motion with the Bassus II, which was likely the cause for the anticipation of the G in Berger's original (Figure 4.53). In measure 50, two discrepancies exist in the discantus parts. The first in the Discantus II part is


Figure 4.53: Rhythmic discrepancy in Berger "Laudate Dominum," m. 16
a familiar difference involving fusae and semifusae: the Harmoniae seu cantiones sacrae descends from the $g$ " with semifusae, but the Florilegium uses fuase which both conflict with the E and F in the Altus II (Figure 4.54). Therefore the original rhythm was retained in that voice. In the other


Figure 4.54: Rhythmic discrepancies in Berger "Laudate Dominum," m. 50
discantus voice, however, the Florilegium seems to have an intentional suspension added to the part.

In that version, the $d "$ in the Discantus I is held so that it clashes with the $e$ ' in the Altus II. The 7-6 figure in the Basis Generalis confirms the change, so Bodenschatz's version was retained for this voice. The text underlay of the two versions also differs in this measure: the emphasis on the middle syllable of "organo" in the Florilegium is awkward and clearly differs from the Harmoniae, so the original underlay has been retained even though the Florilegium melisma is explicit in both voices. In the triple-meter section, a minor discrepancy exists. In measure 65, the Harmoniae seu cantiones sacrae has regular semibreves in one part while all the other parts in this section have a dotted rhythmic pattern, so the Florilegium altered the rhythm to match the other voices (Figure 4.55). It is unclear

(a) Harmoniae seu cantiones sacrae

<cym-ba-lis,»
(b) Florilegium Portense

Figure 4.55: Rhythmic discrepancy in Berger "Laudate Dominum," m. 65
whether the original is in error or if the longer rhythm was to mitigate the leap of the fifth, but the alteration in the Florilegium has been retained for this project. The closing section of the piece has many differences in text underlay, some of which also result in a rhythmic discrepancy. For example, in measure 79, the version in the Bodenschatz anthology adds an iteration of "laudet" that does not exist in Berger's original. Thus, the two semibreves of the Harmoniae are divided into three notes in the Florilegium to account for the erroneous additional syllable (Figure 4.56). Another rhythmic

(a) Harmoniae seu cantiones sacrae

(b) Florilegium Portense

Figure 4.56: Rhythmic discrepancy in Berger "Laudate Dominum," mm. 78-79
discrepancy in the closing section of the piece occurs in measures 87 to 89 , where the version in the Florilegium has several different note values compared to the Harmoniae (Figure 4.57). The original ligature in measure 87 is disregarded in the anthology and the following melisma is therefore delayed. Additionally, the G and F semiminims in the Florilegium version result in parallel unisons with the


Figure 4.57: Rhythmic discrepancies in Berger "Laudate Dominum," mm. 87-89

Tenor I. Thus, the version from the Harmoniae seu cantiones sacrae has been retained. The last rhythmic discrepancy of note occurs at the end of the piece in the lower altus part. In the Harmoniae, the ligature aligns with the final note of the other parts and, although odd to have a leap on the final syllable, mitigates the potential for parallel octaves with the Bassus II. In the attached edition, this has been transcribed as an $f$ ' semibreve followed by an $f$ longa, which would end with the rest of the parts. The Florilegium, however, added an extra longa after the ligature that would be transcribed beyond the final measure of the piece (Figure 4.58), so this version was not used. Finally, in comparison with

(a) Harmoniae seu cantiones sacrae, Octava

(b) Florilegium Portense, Altus II

Figure 4.58: Ending of Berger "Laudate Dominum"
the prior two pieces by Berger, the rhythmic values of the triple section are the same between the two versions, and that passage ends with a partial measure, like the first triple-meter section in "Cantate Domino." Interestingly, that semibreve (m. 72) has a fermata in all of the parts of the Harmoniae seu cantiones sacrae and two of the Florilegium voices (the Discantus II and Altus II).

In addition to the rhythmic discrepancies, there are many differences between the two versions of "Laudate Dominum" regarding accidentals and pitch. The first is in measure 6, where the Discantus II has an added sharp in the Florilegium that likely would have been added by a performer of the original edition. Towards the end of the piece (m. 80), Bodenschatz's version corrects an error in Berger's original in that the latter has a $B \nmid$ in the Bassus I while the Tenor I has a Bb. The remaining discrepancies are not solved as clearly. In measure 19, the Discantus I of the Bodenschatz version
has a B at the cadence leading to C major, while no such accidental exists in the Harmoniae seu cantiones sacrae. It is likely an omission, but perhaps Berger was attempting to avoid a tritone with the F in the other discantus voice. In this project, the raised pitch from the Florilegium was chosen. In the section with voice pairings at measures 40 and 41 (see Figure 4.50 above), the inner voices of Choir I move in parallel fourths, ending the chain at B and E. In both sources, the B in the altus is lowered, but the E in the discantus is not. The E that follows in the higher discantus voice, however, is lowered in the Harmoniae only. It is unlikely that the inner voices would move together into a tritone, and the Eb in Berger's original suggests that both discantus parts should sing that pitch, so the Eb from the Harmoniae has been used in the Discantus II and added to the Discantus I as musica ficta. A few minor pitch discrepancies exist as well. In measure 33, the lowest altus part in the original moves from F to $\mathrm{B} b$, but Bodenschatz changed the second note to a D , avoiding a doubling with the Bassus II and providing an elongated third to the chord (see the last measure in Figure 4.49 above). Shortly thereafter in measure 39, however, the Florilegium version creates a parallel fifth between the two discantus parts by lowering the second note in the Discantus I (Figure 4.59). This may have

(a) Harmoniae seu cantiones sacrae

(b) Florilegium Portense

Figure 4.59: Pitch discrepancy in Berger "Laudate Dominum," mm. 38-39
been a transcription error, or perhaps the editor was trying to create a smoother scale. Regardless, the oversight in the Bodenschatz anthology has not been retained in this project. Another attempt at improving voice leading in the Florilegium has been retained, though. In measure 84, the original created a leap of a fourth in the lower discantus voice by placing an $A$ in between a $B b$ and $D$, but the Bodenschatz version uses an intermediary C instead (Figure 4.60). There are no potential parallels with the C in other voices, so that pitch has been retained in favor of smoother voice leading. Unfortunately, there is one place where both sources have an error in pitch. The third note of the Tenor I


Figure 4.60: Pitch discrepancy in Berger "Laudate Dominum," mm. 84-85
in measure 63 is a D in both the Harmoniae and Florilegium, but there is a C in three other voices as part of an F-major chord.

There are many differences in text underlay between the two versions, particularly in the closing contrapuntal section as mentioned previously. In most of these cases, the version from the Harmoniae has been retained to follow a consistent pattern: the most prominent melisma in the section ("laudet") is set to have a long note at the end of the melisma on the first syllable rather than moving to the second syllable at the onset of the long note (see Figure 4.52 above). Some specific discrepancies are worth noting, however. In measure 74 and 75 , Berger was unfortunately not explicit in the melisma in the Octava voice, using an $i i$ indication. The Florilegium appears to have a melisma on the second syllable of "omnis," which is awkward and inconsistent with the surrounding parts (Figure 4.61). Again, it is possible that the melisma on the first syllable is meant to understood by the performer, so


Figure 4.61: Melisma in Berger "Laudate Dominum" (Florilegium Portense), mm. 74-75
it has been explicitly changed in the attached edition. In measures 82 through 85 , the Harmoniae has two $i i$ indications in the highest discantus voice, but the Florilegium has three iterations of the word "laudet" and begins the first word too early, breaking the guideline mentioned above for melismas in this section. Even though Berger's original melismas are not explicit in this passage, it can be surmised that the first $i i$ should align with the other discantus part in duet (see m. 83 in Figure 4.52 above). A few of the changes in the Florilegium have been retained, however. In the closing section,
the Harmoniae has an $i i$ at measure 78 for the higher bassus voice, indicating a repetition of the word "spiritus." Most of the other voices, however, have moved on to the next line of text, and the gesture in the part mirrors the upcoming measures in which the text is "laudet." The Florilegium changes the text to "laudet" for the Bassus I in measure 78 accordingly, so that has been retained. Slightly before the triple section, there is another change in underlay in measures 55 and 56 (Figure 4.62). The original version has a melisma only on the third syllable of "benesonantibus," but Bodenschatz


Figure 4.62: Underlay discrepancies in Berger "Laudate Dominum," mm. 54-57
added a melisma on the first syllable as well. The Florilegium melisma is perhaps easier to execute in that the dotted figure at the beginning of the phrase is on one syllable and the stressed third syllable is more emphasized because it occurs at the lowest point in the scale. Since the same change occurs in three parts, it is interpreted to be intentional, and is therefore retained in this project.

The eight-voice motets discussed in this chapter represent a range of styles, but the amount of polyphony and melismatic writing in them is perhaps surprising to those who are more acquainted with the polychoral motets of composers such as Gabrieli. Even the style of Handl's "Veni Sancte Spiritus" is much less conservative than his "Cantate Domino," discussed in the next chapter. The melismatic writing in pieces like Vincentius's "Apparuerunt Apostolis" and the polyphonic conclusion of Berger's "Laudate Dominum" are not only interesting examples of compositional technique but also illustrate the influence of Renaissance-style polyphony on this transitional genre.

As compared to the pieces by Fabricius, Bodenschatz made many more changes to the eightvoice motets discussed in this chapter. The simplification of the triple-meter section in "Veni Sancte Spiritus" is the most signficant alteration, followed by the augmentation of the ending of Berger's "Jubilate Deo." Many more discrepancies exist, however, as well as a large number of errors in the Florilegium, particularly regarding text underlay. Even in the case of Bodenschatz's own motet, "Audi Hymnum," there are differences between the versions in the Florilegium Selectissimarum Cantionum and Florilegium Portense. The number of discrepancies, especially in the motets by Berger, call into question whether Bodenschatz's versions sufficiently represent the composers' intentions. While this is a valid concern, were it not for the Florilegium Portense we might not have encountered motets by Berger and Bodenschatz. For modern editors, the anthologies simply require a keen attention to detail and consultation of concordances to create a usable edition like the musical scores in this document.

## Chapter 5: Arrangements of motets for more than eight voices

The Florilegium Portense contains three eight-voice motets that were originally published for more than eight voices: "Exsultate, justi" and "Benedicam Dominum" by Andrea Gabrieli and "Cantate Domino" by Jacob Handl. "Benedicam Dominum" and "Cantate Domino" were both written for twelve voices, while "Exsultate, justi" was composed for ten. Other than the listing of Bodenschatz as collector and editor on the cover of the Florilegium partbooks, we have no information about who the arranger was, if multiple arrangers were involved, or the process by which the altered versions came to be in the Florilegium. In fact, if one were not aware of the original number of voices, one would have no indication these pieces are arrangements of the original versions. They could have been arranged by Bodenschatz himself or by Calvisius, or they could have simply been acquired by one of the cantors from some other source. Both of Gabrieli's motets were included in the second volume of Lindner's Sacrae Cantiones in their original voicing, and it is likely that the 1588 anthology was the source for the arrangement of those pieces. While the arranger and purpose of the altered versions are unknown, a study of how the arrangements were constructed and altered is still worthwhile.

Andrea Gabrieli's "Exsultate, justi" sets Psalm 32:1-5 and is labeled as number 36 in the first volume of works by the Gabrielis, published in $1587 .{ }^{1}$ The collection is in two volumes, the first of which contains forty-three sacred pieces in Latin. ${ }^{2}$ Of the pieces in the first volume, all but five are by Andrea Gabrieli, and most are motets. There is one setting each of the Kyrie (in three sections, increasing from five voices, to eight, then to twelve), Gloria (sixteen voices), Sanctus (twelve parts), and Magnificat (also for twelve voices). The motets in the volume range from six voices to sixteen, the most common scoring being for eight voices, which occurs in thirteen pieces. Originally for ten voices, "Exsultate, justi" displays many of the typical characteristics of a conservative polychoral style: homophony among each choir, little counterpoint, with short phrases passed between the choirs antiphonally followed by tutti sections for emphasis or closure. The motet is in duple meter

[^38]throughout. The staggered entrances on "exsultate" are reminiscent of a processional fanfare, and circular melismas accentuate the word "Domino" (Figure 5.1). The choirs trade several homorhythmic


Figure 5.1: Opening of Gabrieli "Exsultate, justi" (Concerti), mm. 1-5
motives followed by tutti cadences (mm. 12-29), but counterpoint finally appears in undulating scalar passages accentuating the words "psallite" and "cantate." The rhythmic motion comes to a sudden halt at measure 47 when the second choir sings "quia" in harmonically stagnant semibreves, followed by the first choir. This compositional decision captures one's attention for the text that follows, and the rhythmic motion resumes until a poignant use of silence at measure 55 (Figure 5.2). Gabrieli writes a semibreve rest for the entire ensemble before the phrase "Diligit misericordiam et judicium," the first two words of which are sung by all but one voice. Another semibreve rest in measure 61 sets off a repetition of the previous phrase, adding significant emphasis to this verse of text. The only changes in the repetition are that the Nona and Decima parts exchange lines and the music falls in the meter differently since the intermediary rest is only half of a measure. The remainder of the piece contains shorter antiphonal exchanges, particularly the "plena est terra" figure, which is echoed after only a semibreve and repeated many times. The closing section (mm. 68-75) is repeated verbatim (mm. 76-83) before a brief coda.
"Exsultate, justi" is arranged for eight voices as the fifteenth motet in the Florilegium Portense. By examining only the incipits from the original publication and the arrangement (Figure 5.3), one can already observe several differences between the two versions. First, the clefs of Gabrieli's original


Figure 5.2: Silences in Gabrieli "Exsultate, justi" (Concerti), mm. 55-62



(b) Florilegium Portense

(a) Concerti

Figure 5.3: Incipits of Gabrieli "Exsultate, justi"
demonstrate that the two choirs differ in overall range: the first choir is comprised of higher voices, including two soprano clefs and two alto clefs, while the second choir has lower voices overall. This is in contrast to the choirs of the Florilegium version, which are generally equal in voicing, although some of the clefs do indicate higher parts such as the use of a treble clef in the Discantus II part, alto clef for the Tenor I, baritone clef for the Bassus I, and mezzo-soprano clef for the Altus II. The discrepancy between the choirs of Gabrieli's 1587 version and the edition in the Florilegium hints at the difficulty of maintaining the polychoral texture with fewer voices, which will be discussed shortly. The second observation to be made from the incipits regards tonal center: the first pitches of Choir II and the key signature of the 1587 version point to A minor, while the edition in the Florilegium is in D minor, a fourth higher. If one examines the ranges of the original (Table 5.1a), one notices that they are quite low. The highest voice (Cantus) only ascends to $e$ ", while the lowest voice (Bassus) reaches

| Part | Range |
| :--- | :--- |
| Cantus | g'-e" |
| Altus | $\mathrm{a}-\mathrm{c} "$ |
| Septima | $\mathrm{a}-\mathrm{a}$, |
| Octava | $\mathrm{a}-\mathrm{a}$, |
| Nona | $\mathrm{g}-\mathrm{a}$ |
| Decima | $\mathrm{g}-\mathrm{a}$ |
| Tenor | $\mathrm{c}-\mathrm{e}^{\prime}$ |
| Sextus | $\mathrm{c}-\mathrm{c}^{\prime}$ |
| Quintus | $\mathrm{A}-\mathrm{a}$ |
| Bassus | $\mathrm{C}-\mathrm{d}$ |


| Part | Range |
| :--- | :--- |
| Discantus II | $\mathrm{a}^{\prime}-\mathrm{g} "$ |
| Discantus I | $\mathrm{c}-\mathrm{f} "$ |
| Altus II | $\mathrm{c}^{\prime}-\mathrm{c} "$ |
| Altus I | $\mathrm{g}-\mathrm{a}$ |
| Tenor I | $\mathrm{f}-\mathrm{a}$ |
| Tenor II | $\mathrm{d}-\mathrm{f}$ |
| Bassus I | $\mathrm{d}-\mathrm{d}$ |
| Bassus II | $\mathrm{F}-\mathrm{g}$ |
| (b) Florilegium Portense |  |

(a) Concerti

Table 5.1: Ranges in Gabrieli's "Exsultate, justi"
to $C$. Comparing the ranges of the edition in the Florilegium (Table 5.1b), we see that the lowest note of the Bassus II is indeed one fourth above that of the Bassus in the 1587 edition but the highest note of the highest voice (Discantus II) is only a minor third higher, indicating that the lowest part has been largely retained while the highest voice has been reworked to avoid the $a$ " that would have resulted from direct transposition. While the prevailing pitch level in Venice was essentially the same as that of German Chorton, roughly $a^{\prime}=465$, the Italians used another pitch level, tuono corista, meaning choir
pitch, which was about $a^{\prime}=415$ and equivalent to German Kammerton. ${ }^{3}$ If the arranger was attempting to convert "Exsultate, justi" from tuono corista to Kammerton, which is unlikely given that vocal parts were usually written in Chorton, a transposition up by a whole tone would have been adequate, but the transposition of a fourth in the arrangement does not fit this logic. Transposition of a fourth does, however, fit the practice of adjusting pieces with chiavette, or high clefs. ${ }^{4}$ As mentioned above half of the parts in the Florilegium version use high clefs (Tenor I, Bassus I, Discantus II, and Altus II), but the other half do not. Eichhorn states that when this mixture of clefs occurs that transposition is unlikely because of total range. ${ }^{5}$ Praetorius supports this, stating that compositions with a "range of three octaves, such as $F$ to $a$ " or $G$ to $g \# "$, etc. . . . cannot be transposed by a fourth or fifth, but must be performed as set by the composer, or, for the sake of the discant singers, they may be lowered one tone." ${ }^{6}$ The range from the low $F$ in the Bassus II to the high $g$ " in the Discantus II would seem to fit this rule. Most importantly, if all of the parts in the Florilegium edition were intended to be performed a fourth lower, there would have been no need to rework the ranges of the highest parts to avoid $a$ " as demonstrated below. Therefore, it would seem that overall range was the most likely cause of the transposition. More study would be required to see if Andrea Gabrieli's compositions tended to be lower in pitch than his contemporaries in Venice or if there is indeed some regional difference in pitch to explain the need for the Florilegium edition to be a fourth higher. Finally, one can see from the incipits that the rhythmic values of the initial notes have not been changed in the arrangement.

Since the polychoral texture is the defining trait of these motets, one might expect the arranger to retain contiguous groups of voices by reducing each choir from five voices to four and altering a few notes to ensure complete triads. In most cases, however, he elects to retain the musical lines rather than the vertical texture, so that in the beginning of the Florilegium version, the Bassus II joins the first choir in presenting the opening material. ${ }^{7}$ The dissemination of material between choirs becomes

[^39]even more pronounced throughout the remainder of the piece: in many cases, two voices join with the opposite choir. These crossings of choirs could create significant problems in performance. Andrea Gabrieli's nephew, Giovanni, intended some lines in his works to be performed by soloists and others to be performed by more singers, known as favoriti and ripieno forces respectively. ${ }^{8}$ Although it is not explicitly clear if that practice would have been applied to this piece by the elder Gabrieli, by changing the grouping of musical material, the arranger has potentially shifted musical lines that might have been intended for soloists to the larger ensemble. ${ }^{9}$ It is unknown exactly how early the cori spezzati practice of divided choirs started at the Basilica of St. Mark where Gabrieli worked, ${ }^{10}$ but Praetorius describes multiple physical distributions of performing forces for polychoral motets. ${ }^{11}$ Thus, a challenge may arise if a cantor performing the arrangement were to position Choir I and Choir II in different locations: the Bassus II might have difficulty staying in rhythm with Choir I at the beginning, for example.

While the first phrase of the piece is quoted contiguously, the arranger soon begins to fragment phrases by joining together several parts from the original. Often this requires alteration of pitches, rhythm, or text underlay at the joint in order to facilitate better voice leading or account for range. Changes in each of these categories are evident in the first phrase of the Altus II in the arrangement (Figure 5.4). Whereas the Nona part of the original has a ligature in measure 10, the second note of that ligature is divided in the arrangement to complete the word "justi" and transition to the quotation of the original Decima part. The arranger might have quoted both the second and third notes of the Decima part in measure 10, but the two leaps created by the $f^{\prime}$ are more disjunct than the use of the $a^{\prime}$. The Nona part in measure 11 is quite disjunct, which may have been the reason the arranger avoided using it. Another example of careful voice leading is at the juncture of measures 24 and 25, where the Discantus I, Discantus II, and Altus II all depart from their original quotation to another note in the triad that creates a more comfortable interval. Unfortunately, not all of the fragmentation

[^40]

Figure 5.4: Revoicing in Gabrieli "Exsultate, justi," mm. 9-12
was handled so deftly in the Florilegium edition. In measure 36 , the arranger avoided the high $a$ " mentioned in the above discussion of range above by transposing the original Cantus part an octave down (Figure 5.5). The part that had been carrying the original Cantus line prior to measure 36,


Figure 5.5: Voicing changes in Gabrieli "Exsultate, justi" (Florilegium Portense), mm. 34-38
the Discantus II, switches to the Altus material with the fourth note in the measure transposed an octave up to facilitate better voice leading to the phrase that follows. In an odd choice, the editor composed new material for the Altus I part in this passage, which results in a parallel unison with the Discantus I on the move from $a^{\prime}$ to $g^{\prime}$ in measure 36. The second note of the Altus I part in measure 36 has therefore been changed to an $f^{\prime}$ in the final edition. It is interesting to note the arranger chose not to use the Decima part in this measure, perhaps because its dotted rhythm falls differently in the meter from the other parts. In measure 52, the shifting between original parts caused the editor to
make changes in underlay and pitch (Figure 5.6). In the original, the Nona part enters before the

(a) Concerti (transposed)

(b) Florilegium Portense

Figure 5.6: Voicing changes in Gabrieli "Exsultate, justi," mm. 50-54
other voices of Choir I. In the arrangement, the Discantus I carries the first four notes of the Nona, but the tessitura of that part is rather low for the Discantus I. The arranger changed the next $d^{\prime}$ to a $b b$ ' to facilitate a switch to the Decima part by the third note of measure 52, but he extended the final syllable of "opera" in order to shift to the underlay of the Decima part by the next measure. That original part had a repeated $d$ " in measure 52 , but using those pitches would have created a very odd figure on one syllable, so the editor changes the semiminim to $c$ " to make a smoother melisma. This adds a bit of dissonance against the $b$ " in the Discantus II part (not shown in Figure 5.6), but it passes quickly. The editor might have repeated the word "omnia" between measure 51 and 52 , using smaller note values to shift the underlay earlier and avoid changing pitches. Such a change would have been consistent with other transitions where the rhythm of a single voice is compressed so that it can reference two parts from the original. ${ }^{12}$ It is also worth noting in this passage that most of the
12. See discussion on page 155 of Tenor II in measure 22 of "Benedicam Dominum" and Figure 5.16b.

Nona part, which is rather active, has been abandoned in the Florilegium edition and the Altus I part was largely free composition. One can also observe that the original Cantus part has been transposed down in the Altus II in order to avoid the high $a$ ".

The editor made many other changes in voicing throughout the piece. First, there are several other examples avoiding the high $a$ " in the discantus parts. In measures 19 and 20, for instance, the Discantus II quotes the original Altus $c$ " for two minims rather than the $a$ " that occurs in the original Cantus line. The Cantus line is transposed down by octave nine times, while it appears at its original pitch level twenty-three times. Another goal of the voicing changes seems to be eliminating doubled notes of the triad. In measure 6 , for example, the third note of the Bassus I is changed to $g$, avoiding

(a) Concerti (transposed)

(b) Florilegium Portense

Figure 5.7: Revoicing in Gabrieli "Exsultate, justi," m. 6
doubling the two $c^{\prime}$ semiminims in the Tenor I (Figure 5.7). This change thickens the texture by adding a fifth above the root in the Bassus II. Some changes in voicing, however, have the opposite effect and create incomplete triads. On the third note of measure 21, a change on behalf of range from $a$ " to $f$ " in the Discantus II leaves the chord without a third until the Altus II moves. Similarly, in measure 40, the Tenor I has a $d^{\prime}$ ' in the Florilegium but an $a$ in the original publication. In this case, the editor chose to omit the fifth here and double the root of the Bassus I. Therefore, the edition for this project retains the $a$ of the original. Finally some voicing changes seem to be made for sonic purposes. In measure 54, the second note of the Tenor II is lowered an octave to $d$, whereas the original $d$ ' would have made for better voice leading. It seems that a lower root was desired here rather than allowing the lower voices in the tutti entrance that follows to create contrast.

The editor's changes to the eight-voice version of "Exsultate, justi" are not all related to reducing a ten-voice piece to eight voices. In addition to freely composing some lines as mentioned above, the arranger altered the content in several instances. Many of these changes seem to be for the purpose of simplifying rhythm in the same vein as the major change in Handl's "Veni Sancte Spiritus" (see page 85) but on a smaller scale. The changes, however, are not always consistent. In measures 43 and


Figure 5.8: Rhythmic simplification in Gabrieli "Exsultate, justi," mm. 43-45

44, the editor simplified the original Nona part and made it more regular in the Altus I by removing the syncopation in measure 43 and adding the dotted rhythm in measure 44 to match the other parts (Figure 5.8). Oddly, the original Tenor part has no syncopation, but the arranger added one in the Florilegium version by delaying the entrance of the Tenor I by a semiminim and retaining the first minim length. It would have been more consistent to keep the original rhythm of two minims in the Tenor I. ${ }^{13}$

The arranger also changed some of the written ornamentation in the "Exsultate" but was again inconsistent. In measure 74 of the Florilegium, the flourish from the original Nona part has been removed and simplified to a skip (Figure 5.9). This simplification occurs again at the repetition in


Figure 5.9: Removal of ornamentation in Gabrieli "Exsultate, justi"
measure 82. In other passages, though, the editor added ornamentation that did not exist in the original
13. One should also note the avoidance of the high $a$ ' in the Tenor I by transposing those pitches down an octave. That pitch does occur in the same voice part in measure 14, but it is part of a scale and would have been more difficult to rewrite.
publication, such as the cadential neighbor tones in the Discantus II in measure 31 (Figure 5.10). The

(a) Concerti (transposed)

(b) Florilegium Portense

Figure 5.10: Addition of ornamentation in Gabrieli "Exsultate, justi," mm. 30-32
arranger also made changes in other parts at points of ornamentation for the purpose of clarity. In measure 58 of the original edition, the Altus has a 4-3 suspension, but the original Octava part already contains the third on the moment of suspension (Figure 5.11a). In order to make the suspension clearer


Figure 5.11: Alteration of ornamentation in Gabrieli "Exsultate, justi"
in the arrangement, the editor removes the conflict between the two notes by changing the $e^{\prime}$ to a $g$ ' in the Discantus II, which quotes the original Octava. The same change occurs again in measure 64 of the Florilegium version when the passage is repeated.

One harmonic change in "Exsultate, justi" is notable. In measure 53, the arranger of the Florilegium version added a sharp to the $c$ " in the Discantus II and to the $f^{\prime}$ in the Altus II in order to create a D-major cadence in the middle of a phrase (Figure 5.12) that has a cross relation with the next chord. The accidentals are confirmed by the figures in the continuo line. While one might expect an altered major third at the end of a phrase in this style (which can be observed in the next measure), it is odd that it occurs earlier, especially when the unique underlay of the original Cantus part (quoted in the Altus II) obscures a cadential feel. The addition of a major third in the Florilegium version is in contrast to the practice in the arrangement of Gabrieli's "Benedicam Dominum," where the editor repeatedly chose to avoid cross relations and tended to keep phrases in the minor mode. This passage also exhibits an added cadential ornament in the Altus II part in measure 54.

(a) Concerti (transposed)

(b) Florilegium Portense

Figure 5.12: Cross relation in Gabrieli "Exsultate, justi," mm. 53-54

The most significant changes that the editor made in the Florilegium edition of "Exsultate, justi" are the deletion of the semibreve rests in measures 55 and 61 . The 1587 version is displayed at original pitch as Figure 5.2 on page 136, while the arrangement is Figure 5.13. As previously noted, these rests set off this passage from the rest of the Psalm, and the exact repetition of the phrase adds emphasis. Especially if one imagines the performance of this piece in a reverberant space, the silence followed by the tutti entrance allows this line of text to be clearly heard and understood. Not only was the semibreve rest removed in the arrangement, but the editor began measure 55 with only four parts and the remaining voices enter one minim later. The editor shortened several notes in most of the parts and altered the underlay, although the Bassus II part is unchanged except for being displaced one semibreve earlier. As noted above, the repetition that follows a few bars later in the 1587 publication is exact except for the exchange of the Nona and Decima parts. The editor of the version in the Florilegium, however, started the repetition with even fewer parts than before. Whereas the four tenor and bass parts started the phrase in measure 55, measure 61 begins with a higher texture, the two soprano parts and a tenor part, and the remaining voices enter a minim later. The editor also


Figure 5.13: Removal of silences in Gabrieli "Exsultate, justi" (Florilegium Portense), mm. 55-61
changed the distribution of quotations in the repetition. In the first half of the phrase (mm. 61-64), the parts in the Florilegium that quoted the original Nona and Decima parts (Discantus I, Discantus II, and Altus II) repeat their prior material rather than exchanging content as the voices in the original did. This is a simplification on behalf of the performers as a repetition is easier to execute than new material. The editor was again inconsistent, though, in that he exchanged the parts that quote the Septima and Octava (the Altus I and Altus II), making them different in measures 64 through 66 than they were in measures 58 through 60. This exchange does not occur in the original publication, and nullifies the prior simplification.

The reason for removing the silences in the Florilegium edition is not immediately clear. Assuming that the arrangement was done expressly for the anthology and not obtained from some other source, perhaps the editor thought that while the silence would work in a reverberant space like St. Mark's, it may not be as effective in an academic classroom, refectory, or even a smaller parish. Perhaps he thought the corporate rest would be a trap for students to make a mistake and that it was easier for them to stay focused if their line had less interruption. While this is all speculation, it is odd that the editor chose to rework the parts in addition to deleting the rest. Due to the length of the original phrase, the repetition in the 1587 version falls in the other half of the meter; that is, what began on the second half of measure 55 happens at the beginning of the measure 62 . Thus, as long as the phrases were affected by a semibreve (half a measure in these editions), it would seem to be appropriate to the composer. The editor of the arrangement could have simply deleted the two rests so that both phrases start at the beginning of the measure rather than having to alter the rhythmic values within each phrase. Furthermore, the staggered entrances of each phrase in the Florilegium version soften the attack of the nearly tutti onset in the original. It is doubtful that the editor sought to de-emphasize this line of text describing God's mercy and judgment on theological grounds, but that is the effect that these changes have. The inconsistencies in quoting the original voices are also odd: if the editor was attempting to simplify the first part of repetition by not moving the Nona and Decima quotations to different parts, why then did he exchange the Septima and Octava fragments a few measures later when that alteration is not even in the original publication? It would have made more sense to either
copy the first exchange of material as it is in the 1587 version or to treat both sections the same and favor horizontal repetition for the sake of simplicity. Again, the logic behind these choices is not clear.


Andrea Gabrieli's "Benedicam Dominum" is a setting of Psalm 33:2-6. It was first published as number 38 in the 1587 volume. The motet is cited in the Florilegium Portense and the Leipziger Kirchen-Andachten as appropriate for the Feast of John the Baptist. ${ }^{14}$ It is also listed in the Leipziger Kirchen-Andachten under the twelfth Sunday after Trinity. ${ }^{15}$ The work is for twelve voices, which are grouped as three choirs of four voices each. The motet is in G Dorian, but frequently employs a lowered sixth (Eb). The overall style is similar to that of "Exsultate, justi," but there is more antiphonal dialogue between the choirs. Gabrieli also experimented with overlapping phrases in this motet, which creates a flow of overlapping textures as opposed to the rigid dichotomy of choirs in "Exsultate." The first example of this technique is in the passage starting around measure 22 (see discussion on page 155 below and Figure 5.16a). Whereas the antiphonal exchanges prior to this section allow each choir to complete the phrase before the next entrance, the dialogue in this section overlaps in both the "laudabitur" and "anima mea" phrases. The composer also varied the order in which the choirs enter. In the first phrase, Choir I is followed by Choir III then Choir II, but in the second phrase Choir I is answered by Choir II then Choir III. In addition, the "anima mea" in Choir II is split into two different entrances, and the Duodecima voice of Choir III joins in the latter. Even more rhythmic staggering occurs at "et illuminami" in measures 65 through 68. Like the repetition of "diligit misericordiam et judicium" in "Exsultate, justi," Gabrieli repeated a line of text for emphasis in "Benedicam Dominum:" "magnificate Dominum mecum: et exaltemus nomen ejus in idipsum." In "Exsultate," the composer only repeated the line once, but in "Benedicam," he went further. To begin, the first half of verse 4 of the Psalm is presented in Choir II with fairly slow and regular rhythm starting in measure 32, then Choir I sings the entire phrase. Lastly, Choir III starts another repetition

[^41]15. Würdig, 289.
but it is interrupted by Choir II and the eight voices sing the syncopated second half of the verse in dialogue. Like "Exsultate, justi," there is a dramatic use of silence at measure 54, where the previous phrase with eight voices is cleared with a minim rest that is followed by a nearly tutti entrance: two voices each from Choir II and III enter shortly after the rest. This rest is not as large as the semibreve rest in "Exsultate." Finally, like the ending of "Exsultate, justi," "Benedicam Dominum" closes with a more rhythmic section of shorter phrases. The "non confundentur" figure begins with Choirs I and II together followed by Choir III, but individual voices break off into their own rhythms with close entrances thereafter. Like the treatment in the previous motet, this closing section is repeated before a final two-measure coda.
"Benedicam Dominum" is arranged for eight voices as the third piece in the Florilegium Portense. Again, contrasting the incipits of the original to the arrangement is helpful (Figure 5.14). While "Exsultate, justi" was comprised of two five-voice choirs, the twelve parts in "Benedicam Dominum" function as three four-voice choirs. While there are two more parts in the total texture, this grouping enabled the editor to maintain the division of choirs more easily when that the ranges cooperate. Indeed, the editor of the Florilegium edition placed the first statement entirely into Choir I, and Choir II enters together with their repetition of the opening text. Like "Exsultate," the choirs in the 1587 version of "Benedicam" are not equally voiced. In the first choir, the voices trend higher: the clefs in each of the Altus, Tenor, and Quintus are a line lower than they would normally be. The third choir conversely has lower voices, including the Bassus which uses a sub-bass clef. The clefs of the arrangement also show some inequality in that the clefs of the Altus I, Tenor I, and Bassus I are higher than their counterparts in Choir II, like they were in "Exsultate." Next, the incipits of the 1587 version show one flat in the key signature, which does not occur in the Florilegium edition. While also looking at the pitches of the first entrance, one can see that the arrangement is a fifth higher than the original, whereas the transposition of "Exsultate, justi" was by ascending fourth. The ranges of the lowest and highest voices in the original "Benedicam" (Table 5.2a) are generally equivalent to those in "Exsultate" (Table 5.1a), but there are more parts in the bass range, which could have justified transposing by fifth instead of fourth. More likely though, a key of C Dorian (a fourth higher than
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(b) Florilegium Portense
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Figure 5.14: Incipits of Gabrieli "Benedicam Dominum"

| Part | Range |
| :--- | :--- |
| Cantus | d'-eb" |
| Septima | $\mathrm{c} \sharp-\mathrm{d}^{\prime \prime}$ |
| Altus | $\mathrm{c}^{\prime}-\mathrm{c}^{\prime \prime}$ |
| Decima | $\mathrm{g}-\mathrm{g}^{\prime}$ |
| Tenor | $\mathrm{f}-\mathrm{g}^{\prime}$ |
| Nona | $\mathrm{d}-\mathrm{f}$ |
| Octava | $\mathrm{c}-\mathrm{c} "$ |
| Duodecima | $\mathrm{B} b-\mathrm{d}^{\prime}$ |
| Quintus | $\mathrm{B} b-\mathrm{c}^{\prime}$ |
| Undecima | $\mathrm{F}-\mathrm{b} b$ |
| Sextus | $\mathrm{F}-\mathrm{g}$ |
| Bassus | $\mathrm{C}-\mathrm{e} b$ |


| Part | Range |
| :--- | :--- |
| Discantus I | a '-g" |
| Discantus II | e '-g" |
| Altus I | $\mathrm{c}^{\prime}-\mathrm{c} "$ |
| Altus II | $\mathrm{g}-\mathrm{b} \mathrm{b}^{\prime}$ |
| Tenor I | $\mathrm{f}-\mathrm{a}$ |
| Tenor II | $\mathrm{f}-\mathrm{f}$ ' |
| Bassus I | $\mathrm{c}-\mathrm{d}^{\prime}$ |
| Bassus II | $\mathrm{G}-\mathrm{b} b$ |

(b) Florilegium Portense
(a) Concerti

Table 5.2: Ranges in Gabrieli's "Benedicam Dominum"
the original G Dorian) was not a common mode of the day, but D Dorian would have been more acceptable. Looking at the ranges of the arrangement (Table 5.2b), we see that the Bassus II range matches that of the original Bassus after transposition, possibly indicating little alteration, while the ranges of the Discantus I and Discantus II have been reworked so that neither voice goes above $g$ ".

The most puzzling difference between the incipits of "Benedicam Dominum" is that the original has a mensuration sign of $c$, while the edition in the Florilegium uses $\Phi$. One can see that although these signs are different, the rhythmic values of the initial notes are the same. Praetorius addresses the two signs by saying that most often the C sign is used for pieces with shorter note values (usually madrigals), while $\Phi$ is found in works with less rhythmic motion (usually motets). ${ }^{16}$ He says, therefore, that works in C should have a slower tempo and pieces in $₫$ ought to be faster "so that a mean would be observed between the two extremes, lest the slower tempo produce weariness in the listeners' ears or the faster tempo lead to an abyss, just as the Sun's horses dragged away Phaëton when the chariot no longer obeyed the reins." ${ }^{17}$ Praetorius goes on to say that while tempo can be decided by the performer based on harmony and text, works for multiple choirs should be "very slow and solemn. ${ }^{18}$ He mentions that the younger Giovanni Gabrieli uses exclusively $\Phi$ in his compositions,
16. Praetorius, Syntagma Musicum III, 69-70.
17. Praetorius, 70.
18. Praetorius, 70.
while other composers are not very discerning as to when to apply either mensuration. ${ }^{19}$ Andrea Gabrieli's "Benedicam Dominum" perhaps has slightly more rhythmic motion than "Exsultate, justi," which uses the $\Phi$ sign, and the close antiphonal exchanges between the three choirs might necessitate a slower tempo. Further examination of Gabrieli's works would be required to determine whether his use of mensuration signs is intentional or if he falls into the category of composers mentioned by Praetorius who are less discerning. If Gabrieli indeed intended for this motet to be taken at a slower pace by using a specific mensuration sign, this has not been reflected in the Florilegium arrangement. Tempo should, of course, be judged based on the performing forces and the space, but it is unfortunate that this potential clue to the composer's intentions was erased in the altered edition.

The arranger fragmented phrases of the source material slightly less in "Benedicam Dominum"than in "Exsultate, justi." As mentioned above, this is likely because "Benedicam" is comprised of fourvoice choirs rather than groupings of five. The original Bassus part is reproduced almost entirely in the Bassus II part, communicating the importance of the fundamental bass line. The only alterations to that part in the Florilegium edition are a few additional notes in measures 23 and 24 and a difference in syllabification in measures 27 and 28 (both displayed in Figure 5.16). The Bassus IIalso contains a quotation of the original Quintus part in measures 35 through 40. The first fragmentation of material occurs in measures 12 through 15 (Figure 5.15). This passage in the original begins with the highest choir (Choir I), so the parts must already be distributed across choirs in the Florilegium for the sake of range. After the first phrase, the high $a$ " in the Cantus part necessitates shifting other parts, so the arranger placed the Cantus line in the Altus II down an octave. The editor could have put the original Tenor line in the Florilegium Altus I and had the Discantus I sing the original Altus line, but instead he decided to shift all the quotations down an octave for this half-phrase. ${ }^{20}$ The next half-phrase shifts back to the same parts that were quoting the original in the first phrase. The arranger thus created a short antiphonal passage and change in octave where none existed in the Gabrieli's original. Furthermore, he decided to add new material to the Altus I line in the first half of measure 14 but chose to

[^42]20. Note that the editor decided to add interest for the Tenor I in measure 13 by making the last note an $f^{\prime}$; he could have repeated the $d^{\prime}$, which was the original Altus note and also avoided two skips in the same direction.


Figure 5.15: Fragmentation in Gabrieli "Benedicam Dominum," mm. 12-15
omit the original Cantus part in the second half. This is an especially odd choice since the Cantus carried the third of the A-major chord (the leading tone) at the cadence. The editor could have had the Discantus I present the Cantus part or changed the first note in measure 15 of the Tenor I to cH '. While the A-major chord is incomplete, the arranger added a minor third to the D chord in measure 13 by changing the sixth note in the Altus I from $d^{\prime}$ ' to $f^{\prime}$ rather than the original $d^{\prime}$, highlighting yet another inconsistency in triad completion. As an aside, the text in the two versions differs in this example because the editor of the version in the Florilegium explicitly interprets the $i j$ in the original to only refer to "in ore meo." This might be possible, except that two $i j$ markings would be required to fill measures 14 and 15 , but only one appears. It is unlikely that a second $i j$ marking is missing in three parts of the original.

In the passage that follows (measure 15 through 19), material that is in Choir II in the 1587 publication is divided into two different voicings in the Florilegium edition. The editor chose to transpose the original Septima part down an octave in the Florilegium Altus II even though it only ascends to $g$ ", but the next phrase is low enough to be quoted at pitch in the Discantus I. A similar fragmentation occurs at measures 35 through 40. This phrase is exclusively contained in Choir I in the original, but the editor transposed the first half of three voices by octave and placed them in lower voices. The highest voice is not fragmented but is also transposed down. These changes, again, create antiphonal texture and change in tessitura where such did not exist in the original. There is one reworking of range, however, that does not change the texture in measures 45 through 48 . In that passage, the high notes in the first half of original Cantus phrase are transposed down into the Altus I in the arrangement, and the same voices that were singing simply switch quotations for the second half of the phrase. No new voices or transpositions are added. This more conservative approach by the editor makes the material closer to the original and the former passages might have benefited from it.

The passage beginning at measure 22 features the overlapping entries mentioned previously (Figure 5.16), which create an editorial challenge in reducing the number of voices. In the analysis, one can see that after all voices of the original Choir I have been quoted in the phrase that overlaps into measure 22, only two of the voices of the next entrance in Choir III (mm. 22-23) and two of the


Figure 5.16: Gabrieli "Benedicam Dominum," mm. 22-28

(b) Florilegium Portense

Figure 5.16, continued: Overlapping entries in Gabrieli "Benedicam Dominum," mm. 22-28
voices in the following entrance of Choir I (mm. 23-24) are quoted exactly, while the arranger chose to use all four voices of Choir II (mm. 22-24). Perhaps he saw the phrase in Choir II as more contiguous and therefore more important. The editor also made some interesting additions to this section. In measure 22 of the arrangement, the Tenor II enters with the original Choir III on the first pitch of the Undecima part, but the rhythm is compressed in order to shift to the original Octava part in the next measure. As mentioned previously, the arranger also added four notes to the Bassus II part in measures 23 and 24, which do not conform to any original part in rhythm or pitch and have a different phrase of text than the surrounding voices at that moment. Perhaps the editor thought that the thick texture needed bass support even though there is none in the original. Another difficult passage of close antiphonal entrances occurs at measures 62 through 65. In that section, the editor leaves out in the second and third words of the phrase "accedite ad eum" in the first entrances of the Discantus I and Discantus II, so that those parts represent the rhythms of two of the original choirs (Figure 5.17).


Figure 5.17: Part combination in Gabrieli "Benedicam Dominum" (Florilegium Portense), mm. 62-65

As seen in other motets in the Florilegium, the arrangement includes some accidentals not in the original that would have likely been executed by the performer. These are usually cadential like the $\mathrm{C} \#$ in the Tenor II at measure 11 that precedes a D-major chord. Once again, the editor was inconsistent, as a nearly identical figure at measure 6 in the Discantus I has no accidental. In measure 19, however, the editor altered the pitches in a helpful manner. In this measure in the original, the Nona part has $\mathrm{B} b \mathrm{~s}$, but there is no accidental on the Bs in the Sextus part. The Florilegium edition fixes this by using $\mathrm{B} b \mathrm{~s}$ in both the Bassus I and Discantus II. The most interesting harmonic changes are contrary to the alterations in measure 53 of "Exsultate, justi" (Figure 5.12), where the editor added a cross relation to the Florilegium edition. In "Benedicam," the editor chose to avoid cross relationships in
three passages. In measure 30 of the original publication, the phrase starts with a D-major chord with the $\mathrm{F} \sharp$ in the Decima part, but the second half of the phrase uses a D-minor chord with Fs in the Duodecima and Altus only a measure later. The arranger of the edition in the Florilegium eliminated this conflict by removing the initial accidental in the Altus I, which quotes the original Decima line. In the 1587 publication, that phrase also ends with a D-major cadence in measure 32, but the arranger changes the cadence to D-minor, likely because of the upcoming F in the Discantus I (quoting the Septima). In measure 40, the editor alters two parts to avoid a cross relation around C (Figure 5.18). The voices in the original version cadence on A major with the $\mathrm{C} \#$ in the Altus part, but the Decima

(a) Concerti (transposed)

(b) Florilegium Portense

Figure 5.18: Cross relation in Gabrieli "Benedicam Dominum," mm. 35-40
has a C later in that measure. To avoid this discrepancy, the arranger changed the part that quoted the Altus (Discantus I) to an E and rewrote the B-A motion in the original Tenor part (quoted in the Discantus II) to B-C. The same Discantus II part also contains the upcoming phrase that originally
had the C , so this change has been executed with smooth voice leading. It should be noted that the cross relation between A major in measure 38 and C major in measure 39 was retained. For some reason, the arranger elected to leave this conflict and change the other, perhaps because the root of the chord changes between measures 38 and 39 (A major and C major), while both chords in question in measure 40 are based on A . There is another avoidance of cross relations around C at measure 72 (Figure 5.19). The proximity of the A-major chord and the A-minor chord is even closer in this


Figure 5.19: Cross relation in Gabrieli "Benedicam Dominum," mm. 70-73
passage than in measure 40 and features another choir entering on the second tonality, making the harmonic contrast even more striking and difficult. In the Florilegium edition, the arranger chose not to use a $\mathrm{C} \#$ from the original Cantus part in the Discantus I. He also decided to repeat the $c$ " before skipping to $e "$ in order to reinforce the former pitch as the Tenor II enters. This makes the entrance of the latter voice much easier than in the 1587 version, where the Octava must enter on a C directly
after the $\mathrm{C} \#$ in the Cantus. The editor might have also used a C because the upcoming chords in measure 73 are A minor. ${ }^{21}$ This passage is repeated starting at measure 78, with the same change in harmony occurring at measure 80. It is worth noting that the editor chose to keep the cross relation in measure 12 between the D-major chord and the F-major chord (see Figure 5.15 above). Again here, as in measure 38 and 39, these are two chords with different roots, which may have influenced the arranger's decision to retain the original. One additional note in this section: in the Florilegium partbooks, the editor changed the second note of the Discantus II part in measure 71 to be a $c$ ", which creates parallel octaves with the Tenor II. The same issue occurs at the repetition of this material in measure 79. It is unclear why the editor would make a change that creates such problems, so the original $a$ ' pitch has been retained in both measures.

Just as the editor made changes to "Exsultate, justi" to simplify rhythm, there are alterations in the same vein in "Benedicam Dominum." These are applied inconsistently, though, such that some rhythmic complexities are actually added in the Florilegium edition. The passage just after the tutti silence is a good example of alteration (Figure 5.20). In measure 57, the dotted rhythms of the original Septima and Nona parts were removed in their quotations in the Discantus I and Altus II. The Discantus I part is also edited to avoid the high $a$ " in the original Septima. The augmentation of the first $e$ ' in the Altus II, while simplifying the rhythm, briefly increases the dissonance that note has against the D-minor harmony. The editor also decided to alter the underlay, which necessitates changing the dotted semibreve in measure 58 to three minims. The arranger could have left the "ni" syllable on the fourth note of measure 57 and not had to add those repeated notes when the texture of the surrounding voice parts is more stagnant. The melisma on the unstressed, ending syllable of "meis" that is created by this change is also slightly awkward. Finally, it is noteworthy that after the changes to the Discantus I and Altus II, the arranger chose to leave the more complex syncopations and dotted rhythms of the original Duodecima part, quoted in the Tenor I of the Florilegium edition. At the end of the piece, the editor removes syncopation in the Discantus II part, but he also shortens the penultimate note so that the final syllable occurs earlier than in the Tenor II, which is the only

[^43]
(a) Concerti (transposed)

(b) Florilegium Portense

Figure 5.20: Rhythmic alteration in Gabrieli "Benedicam Dominum," mm. 56-59
other part to have motion in the last measure (Figure 5.21).
Not all the rhythmic changes make the parts in the Florilegium edition less complex, however. There are several instances where the editor added ornamentation to the arrangement. In measures 23 and 24 of the Florilegium version, the Tenor I and Tenor II parts have added suspensions that do not exist in the original (see Figure 5.16 above). At the same time, the rhythm preceding the suspension in the Tenor I has also been altered from the off-beat dotted figure in the Tenor part of the 1587 version. Several cadential neighbor tones are also added as they were in "Exsultate, justi." In measures 60 and 62, both the Discantus I and Discantus II have ornamental additions, and the Discantus II has a written C\# that was not explicit in the original. In measures 69 through 72, two of

(a) Concerti (transposed)

(b) Florilegium Portense

Figure 5.21: Rhythmic alteration in Gabrieli "Benedicam Dominum," mm. 85-86
these changes occur in the Altus I and Discantus II (Figure 5.22). In the Altus I, the editor added an


Figure 5.22: Ornamentation in Gabrieli "Benedicam Dominum," mm. 69-72
accidental to the second $f^{\prime}$ that was only implied in the original. Interestingly, he also chose to alter the rhythm of that part in measure 72. It appears the arranger was trying to create a dialogue of the figure with dotted minim and two fusae- between the Altus I and Discantus II, as there is no harmonic reason to reduce the values of the E and D in the Altus I . These ornamental figures occur again in
measures 78 and 80 when this passage is repeated, but the explicit $\mathrm{F} \sharp$ does not occur in the Altus I there.

As in "Exsultate, justi," the arranger of "Benedicam Dominum" made other compositional changes outside of those related to voicing, harmony, and ornamentation. One interesting alteration occurs in measures 27 and 28, where the editor has changed the word division of "mansueti" (see Figure 5.16 above on page 157). In the original publication the word is set with four distinct syllables, but in the Florilegium, "su" and "e" are combined into one note. One possible reason for this is that Latin was pronounced differently according to region during this time. In Germany, the letter " $u$ " in combinations with other vowels was pronounced as either a fricative consonant or a glide (depending on the region) rather than a distinct vowel as the Italians would, thus dividing this word into only three syllables. ${ }^{22}$ Gabrieli's writing in measure 27 was syncopated, so the editor is able to simplify that rhythm by augmenting some notes and eliminating others. The pitch content is the same. While this is an interesting change for the way it affects the musical material, it also provides a very useful insight as to the origin of the arrangement. If the German pronunciation of Latin is indeed the cause for this change in word division, that would indicate that the eight-voice version was arranged by a German speaker, increasing the likelihood that Calvisius or Bodenschatz arranged the piece himself rather than acquiring it from Italy.

Contrary to the decision in "Exsultate, justi" (see page 146), the editor decides to retain the tutti silence that occurs in measure 54 of "Benedicam Dominum" (Figure 5.23). This is perhaps because, as stated above, the minim rest in "Benedicam" is shorter than the semibreve silence in "Exsultate." The phrase that follows is mostly freely composed and contains some questionable editorial decisions, in addition to the issues in the Altus II discussed above (beginning on page 161). The Tenor II line in measures 56 and 57 is more disjunct than any in the original, and the rhythm of the Discantus II part is an odd choice since the underlay is contrary to all the other parts in measure 54 and 55. This author considered that the semibreve rest in measure 54 of the Discantus II part could be a minim rest, but

[^44]

Figure 5.23: Silence in Gabrieli "Benedicam Dominum" (Florilegium Portense), mm. 54-59
since the part aligns with the others on the second note of measure 56 , it was deemed that such a mistake was unlikely. Another change, augmentation of the "tri" syllable, would be required to make the suggested alteration work. It appears that the editor of the Florilegium arrangement attempted to make the Altus I and Discantus II line up with the Bassus II in measure 57, as the lowest part is the only voice in the original with the dotted rhythm in that particular measure.

The closing material of the piece is particularly interesting because of the fragments that the editor chose to use and those he left out of the arrangement. The most prominent motive in the "non confundentur" section is a rising fourth and descending half-step neighbor tone, first seen in the original Cantus part in measures 72 and 73 (Figure 5.24). This motive occurs in one of the parts at each iteration of this phrase, which indicates compositional importance. The editor includes most of them but chose not to quote the instance from the Undecima part in measure 74. Even more strangely, he quoted the very simple Decima part in two voices there, the Discantus II and Tenor II, and the omission of the recurring motive leaves the final A chord in that measure without a third. The arranger must have valued the simplicity of the repeated notes in the original Decima part over the importance of the ascending fourth motive, and he used the repeated $a$ ' again in the next measure of the Discantus II. Gabrieli cleverly augmented the first three notes of the last ascending fourth motive in the Septima part in measures 75 and 76, perhaps to signal the end of the section, but the editor of the Florilegium version also omitted that instance. Gabrieli accompanied the ascending motive with its inversion (descending fourth followed by ascending half-step neighbor) in a few parts: the Altus in measure 73, the Tenor in measure 74, and the Cantus in measures 74 and 75. Again, the editor used some of these figures but not the last. Furthermore, he actually displaced some material in horizontal time. A phrase spanning measures 73 and 74 in the original Nona part is quoted in measures 74 and 75 of the Altus I, and a scalar figure followed by leaps in measures 75 and 76 of the Cantus is used earlier in measures 74 and 75 by the Altus II. It seems odd that the arranger moved material from the vertical context that Gabrieli intended, given that there is so much music available in the thick twelvepart texture and that significant motivic figures are ignored. When this closing passage occurs again, most of the parts are repeated verbatim in the original, except that Gabrieli alters the last measure


Figure 5.24: Closing of Gabrieli "Benedicam Dominum," mm. 72-75

(b) Florilegium Portense

Figure 5.24, continued: Closing of Gabrieli "Benedicam Dominum," mm. 72-75
of the Decima, Duodecima, and Undecima parts in measure 83 as compared to measure 75 . Only the Undecima part was quoted in the Florilegium edition in the Bassus I, but the editor chooses to repeat the material from the first iteration rather than use Gabrieli's altered material (Figure 5.25). The repetition is not only simpler for the performer because they have already sung it once but also


Figure 5.25: Differences in Gabrieli "Benedicam Dominum," mm. 75-76 and 83-84
because the material that the editor avoids using is syncopated.


Jacob Handl's "Cantate Domino" is a setting of Psalm 149 for twelve voices. The motet is thirtyfifth in the first volume his Opus Musicum. ${ }^{2324}$ The first volume of Handl's monumental project was published in 1586 and contains pieces for the beginning of the church year: Advent, Christmas, Epiphany, and most of Lent. As in the other volumes, the 103 motets are organized by liturgical season and then by number of voices. "Cantate Domino" is exceptional in that there is only one other motet for twelve voices, "Tribus miraculis," and these two are surmounted in texture only by the sixteen-voice "Laudate Dominum." All three of these pieces are in the Christmas to Epiphany section. The rest of the volume is comprised of nineteen motets for four voices, twenty-six for five, thirty for six, one for seven, twenty-one for eight, one for nine, and two for ten voices. "Cantate Domino" is in F major and duple meter throughout. The style is even more conservative than the two works by Gabrieli discussed above in that there is less counterpoint, more homophony, and longer
23. Jacob Handl, Tomus primus operis musici (Prague: Jiří Nigrin, 1586), http://digital.slub-dresden.de/id1670295079.
24. See page 81 above for a discussion of the Opus Musicum.
phrases with less antiphonal exchange. Generally, the note values are longer and rhythms are less complex, although there is a fair amount of syncopation, such as the dance-like quality of the "et psalterio" figure in measures 20 and 21. Handl seems to use suspensions more often than Gabrieli at cadential points. Like the ending of the two Gabrieli pieces, the closing of "Cantate Domino" contains shorter, more rhythmical phrases that are exchanged several times between choirs (mm. 62-66), but the last few measures contain two iterations of a tutti phrase that is preceded by a complete silence. This break is only the length of a minim. Other than the final phrase, the ending section in "Cantate Domino" does not repeat as in the two Gabrieli motets.
"Cantate Domino" is arranged for eight voices as the forty-ninth motet in the Florilegium Portense. Again, an examination of the incipits of the two versions will reveal some basic differences between them (Figure 5.26). The twelve parts in the original version are divided into two choirs of six voices each. As in "Exsultate, justi," since each choir contains more than four voices, each phrase will be split across the two choirs of four voices in the Florilegium version. This is evident in the incipit: three voices in each group present the first phrase while the Discantus I and the Altus II begin with rests. The distribution of parts within each choir of the original is again not equal: the first choir contains two cantus parts, two altus parts, one tenor, and one bass; the second choir is the opposite with one cantus and one altus part and two tenor and two bassus parts. The clefs in both the Opus Musicum and Florilegium versions are as expected based on the voices, however. Unlike the two motets by Gabrieli, Handl's work has not been transposed: the key signature and starting pitches in both versions indicate F major. The ranges of the voices are also similar (Table 5.3). Since the piece has not been transposed, the editor does not need to rewrite parts to avoid extremes of range. The Altus and Bassus parts do trend rather low, however. Less reworking of parts implies that less octave transposition is necessary in this arrangement as opposed to the many adjustments that were made in "Exsultate, justi" and "Benedicam Dominum." The similarity in pitch and range, likely resulting from more similar practices between the arranger and Prague than with Venice, will result in fewer pitch changes between the two versions. Finally, the meter and rhythmic values are identical between the two pieces.


Figure 5.26: Incipits of Handl "Cantate Domino"

| Part | Range | Part | Range |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| Choir I Cantus I | f'-g" | Discantus I | f'-g" |
| Choir I Cantus II | $c^{\prime}-\mathrm{f}^{\prime \prime}$ | Discantus II | $c^{\prime}-\mathrm{f}^{\prime \prime}$ |
| Choir II Cantus | f'-d" | Altus II | $\mathrm{g}-\mathrm{a}$ ' |
| Choir I Altus I | $\mathrm{f}-\mathrm{a}$, | Altus I | $\mathrm{f}-\mathrm{a}$ |
| Choir I Altus II | $\mathrm{f}-\mathrm{a}$ | Tenor I | d-d' |
| Choir II Altus | $\mathrm{f}-\mathrm{a}$ | Tenor II | c-d' |
| Choir II Tenor I | d-f' | Bassus I | F-bb |
| Choir I Tenor | d-d' | Bassus II | F-a |
| Choir II Tenor II | c-d' | (b) Florilegium Portense |  |
| Choir I Bassus | F-bb |  |  |
| Choir II Bassus I | F-a |  |  |
| Choir II Bassus II | F-g |  |  |

(a) Opus Musicum

## Table 5.3: Ranges in Handl's "Cantate Domino"

Like the arrangement of "Exsultate, justi," the polychoral texture that exists in Handl's original version of "Cantate Domino" is completely obscured in the edition in the Florilegium since the editor chose to retain the horizontal material, which is usually six simultaneous parts. Thus, every phrase uses some voices of Choir I and some of Choir II in the arrangement. There is much less fragmentation of individual phrases than in the Gabrieli motets, however, likely because less adjustments of range were necessary due to the similarity of pitch, as discussed above. Nearly all the quotations in the Florilegium edition end in the same part in which they began. There are some exceptions, though. At the end of the first phrase in the piece, the two tenor parts trade source material (Figure 5.27). The editor also added syncopation to the Tenor I where there was none in the source, presumably to match the rhythm of the other tenor part. There are no problematic issues of range to explain this voice exchange, but the switch does reduce the number of consecutive leaps in the Tenor I part of Handl's original from three to two. The only other fragmentation in the piece occurs at measure 22, where the phrase from the original Choir II is joined by Choir I in a tutti declamation of "psallant ei" (Figure 5.28). At this juncture in the arrangement, the Tenor I shifts from quoting the Tenor I of Choir II to the Tenor of Choir I, and the Tenor II in the Florilegium picks up the Choir II Tenor I material. The next short phrase contains free material in the Altus I and another quotation in the Tenor I. In keeping with choices of simplification in the motets by Gabrieli, the editor omitted the


Figure 5.27: Voicing in Handl "Cantate Domino," mm. 4-7

(a) Opus Musicum

o, et psal-te - ri - o psal-lante - i, psal-lante - i. Qui-a be-ne-

o, et psal-te - ri - o psal-lante - i, psal-lante - i. Qui-a be-ne-

(b) Florilegium Portense

Figure 5.28: Voicing in Handl "Cantate Domino," mm. 21-24
syncopated figure from four of the original parts in measure 23: Choir I Altus II, Choir I Bassus, Choir II Altus, and Choir II Tenor II. This passage also contains the first of only five transpositions of
a phrase by octave: the Tenor II presents material from the original Choir II Cantus transposed down in measures 23 and 24.

As discussed above, the similarity of pitch and range did not necessitate as many transpositions as in the motets by Gabrieli. The remaining examples of transposition in "Cantate" are in the last few measures of the piece (see Figure 5.36 below). There are however several times where the editor shifts one or two pitches in a phrase to facilitate voice leading or eliminate unnecessary leaps. This occurs most often in the altus parts. In measure 18, for example, the original Altus II of Choir I begins with a low $f$ that is followed by a leap up to $f^{\prime}$ (Figure 5.29a). The lower pitch is transposed up in the

(a) Opus Musicum

(b) Florilegium Portense

Figure 5.29: Transposition in Handl "Cantate Domino," mm. 18-19

Florilegium edition. Such changes, in addition to improving voice leading, aid in the overall tessitura of the altus parts as the low $f$ is used fairly frequently in Handl's original. That pitch would not have been as problematic for male falsettists of the time as they are for female altos today. Contradicting the adjustment in measure 18, the editor later added a low $f$ for the Altus I in measure 30 where it did not exist in the original (Figure 5.30). Perhaps the editor sought to reinforce the $f$ of the Bassus I


Figure 5.30: Transposition in Handl "Cantate Domino," mm. 29-30
since the higher $f^{\prime}$ was already doubled in the Discantus II, but this change creates a voice crossing with the $a$ in the Tenor I in addition to using a pitch which the arranger avoided in other places. It is again an inconsistent and questionable editorial decision. Some transposition by octave seems to have been done to avoid unisons with other parts. An example of this is the second note of the Tenor I in
measure 60 , which was changed from an $f^{\prime}$ that would have been in unison with the Altus I to an $f$. Similar changes occur in the Bassus II part in measures 67 and 70, where the notes for both iterations of the first syllable of "sanctis" would have been in unison with the $B b$ in the Bassus I (see Figure 5.36 below). The first was changed to $f$ and the second to $d$. It seems that the editor was striving for a richer texture, even though Praetorius supports the use of unisons because choirs may be separated in the space and to allow for the sound to be uninterrupted if a performer were to breathe. ${ }^{25}$

One of the most interesting aspects of Handl's motet is that the composer in two instances divided a choir of six voices into smaller groups. The first example of such writing occurs for Choir I in measures 10 through 13 (Figure 5.31). The first "et filiae Syon," is sung by four higher voices before


Figure 5.31: Texture in Choir I of Handl "Cantate Domino" (Opus Musicum), mm. 10-15
the Altus II and Bassus enter. The next phrase of text is in groups of three: outer voices (Cantus I, Altus II, and Bassus II) trade rhythmic entrances with inner voices (Cantus II, Altus I, and Tenor). In the two Gabrieli pieces, the arranger sometimes shifted such dialogue to new parts to create a different texture, but the original voicing is intact in this passage of the arrangement. In fact, the entire phrase from measure 7 to measure 15 is presented contiguously in the Discantus I, Altus I, and all parts of Choir II. In measures 46 through 49, the division of parts within choirs is even more pronounced

[^45](Figure 5.32a). At the entrance of "increpationes," each choir is divided into two groups and the onsets are staggered so that each of the four subgroups begins the phrase at a different point in the measure. Each voice begins their phrase with the same dotted figure. First, the Cantus I, Altus I, and Altus II of the first choir enter, followed by the Cantus II, Tenor, and Bassus of the same choir. Note that the Cantus II and Tenor have shorter note values after the dotted figure in order to make the stressed penultimate syllable of "increpationes" fall on the next measure with the other voices, but the Bassus echoes the longer note values of the first group, creating a sort of syncopated or displaced rhythm in the next two bars. While Choir I was divided evenly into two groups of three voices, the parts in Choir II are split into sets of four and two. The entrances of the first choir are followed by the Altus, Tenor I, Tenor II, and Bassus II of Choir II. The Cantus and Bassus I of that group enter last. Again the voices that enter later have semiminims after the dotted figure so that all six voices land on the fifth syllable together, as Choir I did. After each voice in the texture sings the stressed syllable, the rhythms diverge, creating even more varied rhythmic texture. The Cantus of Choir II joins the Bassus of Choir I in the syncopated rhythm in measure 48.

Handl's texture in this section is more difficult to duplicate in eight voices than the last, but the arranger does include each rhythmical entrance with some variations (Figure 5.32b). Two of the three original voices in Choir I that enter at the beginning of the measure are included: the Cantus is quoted in the Discantus I and the Altus II material appears in the Altus II. The original Altus I of Choir I is omitted. Interestingly, whereas the voices that enter on this beat were in the same choir in the original version, the editor placed the two quotations into seperate choirs in the Florilegium edition. Depending on the performance scenario, this could enhance the antiphonal dialog in this passage even more. A similar approach is taken for the next entrance: two out of three original parts (Tenor and Bassus of Choir I) are divided among the choirs of the arrangement (Tenor I and Bassus II). The third entrance at the middle of the measure is treated slightly differently, though. The editor again used two parts even though there were four Choir II voices that enter here in the original, but he composes a new line in the Tenor II with a similar rhythm. The first few notes are a sort of hybrid of the original Tenor I and Tenor II lines. The shorter rhythmic values of this new part in measure 47 cause the

(a) Opus Musicum

Figure 5.32: Texture in Handl "Cantate Dominum," mm. 46-49

(b) Florilegium Portense

Figure 5.32, continued: Texture in Handl "Cantate Dominum," mm. 46-49
stressed syllable not to line up with its counterparts: the Altus I and Bassus I. There are also changes made to the Altus I to avoid the leaps in the original and to facilitate a shift to a different quotation in the next measure. The three parts that enter in the middle of the bar in the Florilegium edition are again divided between Choir I and Choir II. Finally, of the two voices in Choir II that enter last in measure 46 of Handl's original version, only the Cantus is retained. Since the arrangement contains only two bassus parts and they are already quoting the lowest parts of the two original choirs, there was not a voice left that could sing the original Choir II Bassus I part that enters last in measure 46. Since only one tenor part had entered by the middle of the measure, it was logical to have three voices enter at that point.

The final issue of voicing to note occurs in the section of overlapping dialogue of "gloria haec est" in measures 62 through 66 (Figure 5.33). Since the second entry overlaps with the first, the last note of the first phrase in several parts is shortened in the arrangement so that those voices can present the second phrase. This is a simpler version of the technique of rhythmic compression seen in a similar scenario in "Benedicam Dominum" (see page 155). The effect here, though, is that some voices have the onset of "gloria," which begins with a prominent consonant, after other voices. For example, when the Bassus I and Tenor II enter with the second phrase, the subsequent entrance of the Discantus I, Altus I, Tenor I, and Altus II just a semiminim later might be jarring to the listener. While the editor's solution is a practical and necessary one, the change weakens the rhythmic onset as compared to six simultaneous parts as in Handl's version and creates a stronger sense of syncopation rather than the hemiola-like feeling of the original rhythm of "gloria."

As in the other arrangements, the editor of "Cantate Domino" added a few accidentals to the edition in the Florilegium that likely would have been executed by the performer. These include some raised Błs in measure 44 of the Tenor I and measure 45 of the Discantus II. There are fewer significant harmonic changes in "Cantate" than in the motets originally by Gabrieli, but they do exist. In the middle of the first phrase of the motet, Handl's original contains a D-major chord in between two G-minor triads. This is not a cadential moment, and the editor of the arrangement changed the $\mathrm{F} \#$ to an F in the Bassus II. Later in the piece, the Florilegium version avoids a cross relation at a


Figure 5.33: Texture in Handl "Cantate Dominum," mm. 62-66


Figure 5.33, continued: Texture in Handl "Cantate Dominum," mm. 62-66
cadence, in a similar way to the arrangement of "Benedicam Dominum" (see discussion beginning on page 159). In the original, the long phrase that begins at measure 36 comes to a cadence halfway through on a $D$-major triad. This chord is followed by one based on $B b$, creating a conflict between $F \#$ and F . The arranger chose to avoid this conflict by changing the original $\mathrm{D}-$ major chord to D minor. Although Handl separated the Altus II leap from $f \#$ ' to $b b$ with a rest, the perfect fifth from $f^{\prime}$ to $b b$ in the arrangement is easier to execute (Figure 5.34).


Figure 5.34: Harmonic change in Handl "Cantate Domino," mm. 38-39

As previously stated, Handl frequently wrote suspensions at cadence points in "Cantate Dominum," so there was little room for the editor to add ornamentation. There are a few examples of additional material though. In measure 14, the arranger added a neighbor tone to Handl's suspension in the Discantus I part (Figure 5.35). In the following measure, there is also an embellishment of the original

(a) Opus Musicum

(b) Florilegium Portense

Figure 5.35: Ornamentation in Handl "Cantate Domino," mm. 14-15

Choir II Tenor I part. The scalar approach to the $c$ ' that was added to the Tenor I in the arrangement also moves the entrance to the downbeat of the measure, which makes the rhythm less difficult. Since the Tenor I is singing the $a$ that the original Tenor II part held, this note was adjusted to $c^{\prime}$ ' in the Florilegium Tenor II. Finally, at the cadence in measure 38 and 39 where the cross relation was
avoided, the editor added a suspension in the Discantus I, strengthening the cadence in the middle of the phrase.

The arrangement of Handl's "Cantate Domino" has less free composition than in the Gabrieli motets. There are some small changes of individual notes, such as the second note of the first measure, where the Altus I and Bassus I trade chord tones in their quotations of Choir II in the 1586 version. The reason for this change is unclear. A similar alteration was made to the first note in measure 54 of the Altus I and Tenor I parts. In the original, the two tenor parts cross for two notes, so while the change in the Florilegium edition makes the Altus I part more disjunct, the editor reduced the number of notes in which that part is crossed with the Tenor I to one. This may have been the motivation for the arranger to make such an alteration. The most significant change to Handl's original comes at the closing of the piece (Figure 5.36a). While the editor retained the tutti silences in measures 66 and 69 , contrary to the change in "Exsultate, justi," he changed the way the last phrase is repeated. In Handl's original, all of the parts at the second iteration of "omnibus sanctis eius" are exactly the same as the first except that they fall in the other half of the meter and the final note is elongated. In the Florilegium arrangement, only three of the parts repeat their material: the Altus I, Bassus I, and Bassus II, disregarding the one alteration to the Bassus II in measure 70 discussed above (see page 175). The Discantus I and Discantus II parts are higher at the latter phrase, giving an effect of more emphasis at the repetition that does not exist in the original publication. As mentioned previously, there are four instances of transposition in this passage, but a few parts are also quite fragmented in their quotations. The editor of the arrangement made a creative decision for the sake of variety in the repetition of the phrase, whereas Handl was more simplistic and conservative. While "Cantate Domino" is simpler in style overall than the motets by Gabrieli, the arranger's decision to avoid repetition is not consistent with his other decisions to make the pieces easier to perform.

(a) Opus Musicum

Figure 5.36: Ending of Handl "Cantate Dominum," mm. 66-71

(b) Florilegium Portense

Figure 5.36, continued: Ending of Handl "Cantate Dominum," mm. 66-71

As noted at the beginning of this chapter, there is no information in the anthologies to indicate that the three pieces are arrangements unless one is aware of the number of voices in each of the original compositions. These three arrangements are quite different from their original models, however. The most significant variation is that the polychoral texture has been completely lost. Even in "Benedicam Dominum," which originally consisted of choirs made up of four voices and was therefore more likely to maintain the integrity of those groupings, there are only four phrases in the Florilegium edition that are contained entirely within one of the two choirs (mm. 1-11 and mm. 40-45). This feature that was compromised is the defining trait of the genre, hence these piece are usually referred to as polychoral motets. Since the arranger preferred to maintain the linear material of each part rather than the vertical, one must wonder if the texture of the pieces carried as much importance to him as has been generally described in history. If that was the case, did that discrepancy extend to other musicians in the region or even outside of Germany? The anecdotal accounts of polychoral music and the number of compositions that utilize it would indicate that is not true. Perhaps he did not have the skill or time necessary to rework the voice leading in order to maintain the vertical structure, or perhaps he simply thought that discarding so much of the composers writing was worse than sacrificing the polychoral style. Regardless of the reason, the composers' vision of the motets has been severely altered by changing the texture.

Additionally, as noted above, the distribution of material between choirs in the Florilegium editions creates several challenges for performers. First, there is more continuous singing for each line: one part may be covering quotations of several phrases that would have been sung by others in the original version, increasing the potential for fatigue. Although most the connections between quotations were handled adroitly, shifting between the original lines might also be more difficult to execute. Secondly, as mentioned previously, if the two choirs performing the arrangement are spaced apart during their performance, it may be difficult for the musicians to maintain a common pulse. This challenge would be especially relevant in a large, reverberant space. Similarly, if performers take Schütz's suggestion that polychoral pieces use multiple organs, one for each choir, some singers could
be far away from the accompanying instrument. ${ }^{26}$ Finally, if the composers intended for some choirs to be sung by soloists, this practice could not be applied in the same way in the arrangement.

The arranger only used portions of most of the voices in the arrangements of these three motets, but the material from the lowest parts are always included, as noted above in "Benedicam Dominum" (page 153). Along with the addition of the continuo part, this reflects the importance of the bass line in the transition to the Baroque. The occasional omission and transposition of the highest voices would indicate that these parts were less important: there is little sense of melody in these works, although such an idea is slightly in conflict with the editor's decision to preserve horizontal material over vertical texture.

Aside from the changes in voicing, the editor's decisions regarding ornamentation, harmony, and rhythmic simplification are quite inconsistent within each piece and between the three motets (if one assumes the same arranger for all three). This could a lack concern for such consistency, practices evolving over time, or any number of causes. Assuming that Bodenschatz arranged all three works, this should call his editorial abilities into question. The creative decisions, such as altering repetitions or removing silences, make the arrangements quite different from the originals. In the current mindset of accuracy and urtext editions, one might call these arrangements inauthentic representations of the original compositions. Such a judgment, while perhaps true, misunderstands the purpose of any arrangement and possibly the goal of the entire Florilegium Portense. First, arrangements of choral works generally make a piece more accessible to performers, either by changing the performing forces, language, or some other trait. Modern composers often publish their pieces with multiple voicings, converting a piece from mixed voices to treble voices for example. While some may certainly prefer a specific version over another, one must be careful in discrediting the validity of other editions. These motets in the Florilegium share the same goal as arrangements today: to enable more ensembles to perform the piece. If a choir was not able to sing motets with ten or twelve parts, these versions enabled them to experience and perform these works by Handl and Gabrieli. They were also more easily published in eight partbooks than the originals. Even though the arrangements are not identical

[^46]to the composers' original publications, they have value to the ensembles that might perform them. As mentioned in Chapter 1, the title page of the anthology mentions that the motets contained therein are used at the Schulpforta around meals and that they are for educational use. ${ }^{27}$ The massive volume assembled by Bodenschatz was not for the purpose of studying compositional technique, although that may have occurred in musical lessons, but for the purpose of performance in the school. The changes that the arranger made such as writing in cadential accidentals, eliminating cross relations, and simplifying rhythm were presumably made to make the music more accessible to the students, even if the editor was inconsistent and not always thorough. That goal must be considered when one assesses the value of these arrangements. It is unfortunate that there is no indication that these three motets are arrangements in the partbooks and though an examination of the anthology did not reveal any other pieces with fewer parts than the original compositions, there may be other motets in the volume that have been so altered. If an ensemble is capable of performing the original versions of Gabrieli and Handl's motets, those publications more closely represent the composers' intentions. The versions in the Florilegium, however, may be welcome repertoire to others, provided the scores have been carefully edited.
27. Bodenschatz, Florilegium Portense, 1r.

## Chapter 6: Conclusion

The motets presented in this document are a diverse but representative sample of the music from the Florilegium Portense. The works for six voices by Albinus Fabricius are examples of pieces for fewer voices and are more polyphonic. His style consists of smooth counterpoint with occasional moments of homophony. He also frequently uses smaller ensembles within the choir, often creating a dichotomy of the four highest voices against the four lowest voices, with the two middle parts common to both groups. There is also diversity within the eight-voice motets. Those by Berger, Bodenschatz, and Vincentius tend to use more polyphony than those by Gabrieli and Handl, which are simpler and more conservatively written. The balance of polyphony and homophony in these motets confirms the polychoral motet as a transitional genre between the Renaissance and the Baroque styles.

The three arrangements presented in Chapter 5 provide interesting insight into the values of the day and the editors' abilities. ${ }^{1}$ First, the genre-defining trait of having multiple, distinct groups within the piece (i.e. polychoral) is discarded in favor of retaining linear material. This signifies that either the horizontal line was still more important than the vertical, demonstrating a retention of Renaissance values, or that it was simply easier for the editor to use existing lines than to revoice each chord to maintain distinct groupings of parts. Regardless of the reason, the polychoral texture is lost in these arrangements. Conversely, we do see that the lowest part is preserved nearly verbatim, emphasizing the important of the bass as these pieces transition toward the Baroque. On a practical note, the changes in voicing in the arrangements result in performance challenges, especially if the performing forces are separated physically, if multiple continuo instruments are used, or if soloists are employed. The arrangements do, however, provide choirs the opportunity to sing a version of these works if divisi into eight parts is more manageable than ten or twelve.

The Florilegium is unfortunately plagued with errors. It is impossible to credit these to any particular stage of the process: source material, copying to score, editing, creating parts, or printing. The

1. Again, it is unknown whether Calvisius or Bodenschatz made the arrangements themselves or acquired them elsewhere, except that the syllabification of one word in "Benedicam Dominum" points to a German editor (see discussion beginning on page 164).
three motets by Berger are particularly rife with mistakes. This may indicate a source of poor quality for these works. As discussed in Chapter 2, the small format of the publication often makes the text underlay difficult to align with the rhythms. These factors cause one to imagine that the singing from the Florilegium partbooks was often quite difficult, requiring many corrections before or during rehearsal.

In addition to the errors, the Florilegium contains discrepancies with the composers' originals that are purposeful, deemed such because of repetition or congruence with surrounding parts. With the exception of "Gaudent in caelis," in which the differences are mostly mistakes, the motets by Fabricius are largely unaltered in the anthologies. There are more alterations in the motets for eight-voices, though. The most significant of these changes are the simplification of the triple-meter section of Handl's "Veni Sancte Spiritus" and the augmentation of the ending of Berger's "Jubilate Deo." Other pieces have smaller changes, usually regarding ornamentation, avoiding adjacent parallel harmonies, and rhythmic simplification. These alterations, however, are applied inconsistently within individual pieces and certainly across multiple works. If we assume that the alterations were all made by the same person, which is unlikely, the lack of consistency demonstrates a haphazard approach to editing, at least from a modern perspective.

Due to the errors and intentional changes, it would be easy to dismiss the Florilegium Portense as a failure in accurately transmitting the music of the composers contained therein. While it is true that there are many differences between the composers' originals and the versions in the anthologies, to discredit Bodenschatz's collections on those grounds overlooks the scenario of the time and the purpose of the collection. First, transmission of musical scores was still done by hand in many cases. It is possible that Calvisius and Bodenschatz had very few of the composers' original publications as a reference: the sources they received may have been altered or flawed from the beginning. To collect those works and produce up to nine parts for each piece by hand was a massive task and one that was sure to contain mistakes. In addition, the concept of an urtext score is a modern idea that did not exist during Bodenschatz's day. Composers and performers altered works to fit the performing situation at hand, exemplified most clearly in Bach's many reworkings of his own compositions and others'
throughout his career. Thus, the editors would have had few misgivings about editing the motets for their own purposes. Secondly, any critiques about the accuracy of the collection, while true, do not negate that the Florilegium was very successful because Bodenschatz identified repertoire that was useful to ensembles in schools and churches. ${ }^{2}$ The anthology was compiled as a practical resource for choirs, not as an archival source of the music therein. In that way, it is especially useful to modern scholars and performers as an index of popular works of the day to help us understand what choirs would have performed in study and worship. Modern performers can use the liturgical indices from the anthologies and documents like the Leipziger Kirchen-Andachten to pair the Florilegium motets with scripture readings in worship or with other repertoire in a concert setting.

Even though the changes and errors should not discredit the success of the Florilegium, they cannot be ignored. As stated above, they illuminate the realities of the time, but they also demonstrate the priorities of the editors as teachers at the Schulpforta. In simplifying rhythms and smoothing harmonic shifts, Calvisius and Bodenschatz show us the musical challenges they deemed too difficult for their students. This is a unique insight into the musical education of the students and the process of their teachers. Today, if one is performing an edition from the Florilegium, one should be aware of the changes that have been made and ensure that the editor has compared the version in the anthology with the composer's original publication and made those discrepancies clear. The editions included here do differ from the composer's published works in that they include most of the intentional alterations in the Florilegium, but all available sources have been thoroughly examined and compared so that the edition is reliable and usable.

There is still much music of this period that has not been published in modern editions. More works from the Florilegium remain unedited, particularly those that are singular examples of a composer. The two volumes of Adam Gumpelzhaimer's Sacrorum Concentuum still remain unpublished today. Outside of the Florilegium, there are many works cited in this document that require attention: the Magnificats and bicinia of Erhard Bodenschatz, the works of Caspar Vincentius, the Harmoniae seu cantiones sacrae and Threnodiae Amatoriae of Andreas Berger, and the Cantiones Sacrae of Al-

[^47]binus Fabricius. In the case of Fabricius, the manuscripts held in Regensburg offer the opportunity to study the progression from earlier versions of the motets to the published versions, a rarity for this period. Other musicological studies might include analyzing the differences in extant copies of the Florilegium to try and determine if there was a planned progression of printings, continuing to assess where the anthology was used, and attempting to credit some of the anonymous pieces in the collection as Braun has done with Gumpelzhaimer's music. ${ }^{3}$ There are surely more intentional changes to be found in other pieces, some perhaps even more significant than those found in this study. If it were possible to determine, tracing how Calvisius and Bodenschatz obtained the source material could lead to an even greater understanding of what they changed and why.

Finally, I must echo Mark Chaney's call for more performances of the motets from the Florilegium. ${ }^{4}$ There has been more interest in the music from the collection recently, demonstrated by recordings and concert performances, and I hope that this will continue. The works presented in this study exemplify the diversity of sacred music of this period, demonstrating the blending of homophony that is typically associated with polychoral motets with the contrapuntal writing of earlier styles. Studying and performing the motets provides a richer understanding of this diverse genre, the transition from the Renaissance to the Baroque, and the musical education and repertoire of singers in the seventeenth and eighteenth centuries. The indices and editions that follow provide many opportunities for performers and scholars to immerse themselves in the music of the Florilegium Portense.

[^48]
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## Appendix A: Florilegium Portense Liturgical Index

## De Adventu Christi triplici

1. Humiliationis
2. Ingrediente Domino
3. Hierusalem gaude

Zalamella 5
Zangius 8
82. Hierusalem Gallus [Handl] 6
83. Non auferetur

Meiland 8
86. Non auferetur

Roth 7
87. Hosianna
84. Veni Domine
von Hessen 8
Gallus 8
2. Glorificationis
47. Domine, quando veneris Gallus 6
85. Gloria tibi Domine H. Praetorius 7
36. Veniet tempus Gallus 8
37. Audi tellus Gallus 8
3. Sanctificationis
102. Domine Jesu Christe non sum dignus Walliser 8
26. Cor mundum

Pevernage 6
5. Man wird zu Zion

Hausmann 8
38. Non vos relinquam Fabricius 6

## De Nativitate Christi

| 50. | Angelus ad Pastores | Lassus | 5 |
| ---: | :--- | ---: | :--- |
| 52. | Angelus ad pastores | H. Praetorius | 8 |
| 53. | Quam vidistis pastores | A. Gabrieli | 8 |
| 89. | Cum natus esset Jesus | Walliser | 8 |
| 112. | Hodie Christus natus est | G. Gabrieli | 8 |
| 57. | A Domino factum est | Hassler | 8 |
| 113. | Magnum Haereditatis | Merulo | 8 |
| 114. | Corde natus | Vulpius | 8 |
| 111. | Hodie nobis coelorum | Viadana | 8 |
| 90. | Hodie Christus natus est | Anonymus | 8 |

Hisce possunt annecti cantiones: Cantate, Laudate, Exultate, Iubilate, Benedicam.

## De Novo anno

54. Das alte Jahr Calvisius 8
55. Das alte Jahr M. Praetorius 8
56. Audi hymnum Bodenschatz 8

## De Festo Epiphaniae

55. Surge, illuminare H. Praetorius 8
56. Cum natus esset Jesus

Walliser 8
5. Man wird zu Zion sagen Hausmann 8

## De Festo Purificationis Mariae

92. Herr nu lestu deinen Demantius 6
93. Nunc dimittis Anonymus 5

## De Festo Annunciationis Mariae

57. A Domino factum est istud Hassler 8
58. Ave gratia plena Bianciardi 6
59. Surge propera [H.] Praetorius 8
60. Quam pulchra es Bodenschatz 5

## De Passione Domini

60. Tristis est anima Lassus 5
61. Adoramus te Gallus 6
62. Filiae Ierusalem Gallus 8
63. Ecce, quomodo moritur Gallus 4
64. Non vos relinquam Fabricius 6
65. O Domine Iesu Christe [G.] Gabrieli ${ }^{1} 8$

## De Festo Palmarum

Vide cantiones Advent. Humiliationis
Am grünen Donnerstage
63. Dominus Jesus Gallus 6
102. Domine Jesu Christe Walliser 8

Vide plures Cantiones de Passione Domini

1. Misattributed to Andrea Gabrieli.

## De Resurrectione Christi

65. Alleluia in resurrectione
66. Tulerunt Dominum
67. Tulerunt
68. Angelus Domini
69. Surrexit Christus spes mea
70. Domine Dominus noster

Gallus 8
H. Praetorius 8

Massaino 8
Erbach 6
Zangius 8
Erbach 8

Hisce annectantur: Cantate, Exultate, Laudate, Iubilate, Bendedicam

## De Ascensione Christi

69. O Viri Galilaei Boschetti 8
70. Domine, Dominus noster Erbach 8
71. Non vos relinquam Fabricius 6
72. Iam non dicam Gallus 6
73. Iam non dicam Phinot 8

## De Festo Pentecostes

70. Veni Sancte Spiritus

Gallus 8
71. Hodie completi sunt
[G.] Gabrieli ${ }^{2} \quad 7$
72. Hodie completi sunt

Gallus 8
95. Apparuerunt Apostolis Vincentius 8
26. Cor mundum Pevernage 6
5. Man wird zu Zion Hausmann 8

Hisce annecti possunt: Cantate, Exultate, Iubilate, Laudate, Benedicam

## De Festo Trinitatis

| 73. | Adesto Unus Deus | Neander | 8 |
| ---: | :--- | ---: | :--- |
| 74. | Duo Seraphim | Ingegnieri | 8 |
| 75. | Te Deum Patrem | H. Praetorius | 8 |
| 76. | Te Deum Patrem | Erbach | 8 |
| 110. | Benedicta sit | Gumpelzhaimer | 8 |
| 108. | Lobet den Herrn | Groh | 8 |

[^49]
## Die Joannis Baptista

104. Omnes gentes plaudite Steuccius [Steucke] 8
105. Benedicam Domino [A.] Gabrieli 8

## Die Petri \& Pauli

| 31. | Domine Dominus noster | Erbach | 8 |
| ---: | :--- | ---: | :--- |
| 7. | Audi hymnum | Bodenschatz | 8 |
| 18. | Cantate | Ammon | 8 |
| 115. | Deus spes nostra | Vulpius | 8 |

## De Festo Visitationis Mariae

57. A Domino factum
58. Surge propera
59. Quam pulchra es Bodenschatz 5

## De Festo Michaelis Archangeli

79. Gaudent in coelis Fabricius 6
80. Gaudent in coelis Walliser 8
81. Factum est silentium H. Praetorius 8

## Appendix B: Florilegii Musici Portensis Liturgical Index

## De Adventu Domini nostri Jesu Christi

1. Allein zu dir Herr [Jesu Christ]
2. Anima mea
3. Canite tuba in Sion
4. Hosanna [Filio David]
5. Ierusalem Gaude
6. Obsecro vos fratres

Roth 8
Weissensee 8
Pallavicino 8
Weissensee 8
Demantius 8
Gattus [Gatto] 8

## De Nativitate Christi Salvatoris

73. Alleluia Cantate Domino
74. Angelus ad pastores
75. Allein zu dir, Herr Jesu Christ
76. Claritas Domini
77. Ierusalem gaude
78. Hodie Christus [natus est]
79. Hodie Christus natus est
80. Populi omnes [iubilate]
81. Puer, qui natus est [nobis]
82. Puer, qui natus est [nobis]
83. Quem vidistis pastores
84. Quid concinunt [pastores]

Hassler 8
Zangius 6
Roth 8
Vincentius 8
Demantius 8
Balbus [L. Balbi] 7
Erbach 8
Roth 8
Valcampi 6
Praetorius 8
Osculati 8
Bianciardi 6

Hisce possunt annecti: Benedic. es Domine, Exultate, Iubilate, Laudate.
De Novo anno
80. Iam plausus iterent
82. Osculetur me osculo
81. Quid concinunt pastores
84. Sit nomen Domini [benedictum]

## De Festo Epiphaniae

83. Gloria tibi, Domine
84. Sit nomen Domini [benedictum]
85. Stellam quem viderant [Magi]

Demantius 8
Bertholusius 7
Bianciardi 6
Borsarus [Borsari] 8

Vincentius 8
Borsari 8
Phil[ippe] de Monte 7

## De Festo Purificationis Mariae

86. Nunc dimittis [servum tuum] Stabile 8
87. Senex puerum portabat Valcampi 6

## De Festo Annunciationis Mariae Semper Virginis

88. Plaudat nunc organis [Alvise] Balbi ${ }^{1} 8$
89. Beata es Virgine Maria Stefanini 7
90. Ecce tu pulchra es Borsari 8
91. Angelus Domini Parma 8

## De Passione Domini

92. Ave rex noster
Bianciardi
8
93. O Domine Jesu Christe Leoni 8
[95]. ${ }^{2}$ Ponam inimicitias Roth 8
94. Tristis est anima mea Agazzari 8

## De Festo Palmarum

71. Hosanna Filio David Weissensee 8

Am grünen Donnerstage
14. Domine Jesu Christe Luyton 6
68. Cibavit nos [Dominus] Belli 8

1. Misattributed to Ludovico Balbi.
2. Misnumbered as 85 .

## De Resurrectione Christi

96. Christus resurgens Stefanini 5
97. Alleluia Surrexit [Christus] Baglioni 6
98. Quem quaeris
Vecchi 6
99. Expurgate vetus fermentumBuel 6
100. Angelus Domini ..... Leoni 8
101. Alleluia Laetamini Steuccius [Steucke] 8
102. Cognoverunt discipuli
Casali 8
103. Dum Rex gloriae ..... Ignoratus 8
104. Maria Magdalena Incertus [Gumpelzhaimer] ${ }^{3} 8$
105. Surgite populi
106. Tulerunt Dominum [/ Cum ergo flerent]
Vecchi 8
107. Vespere autem $\operatorname{Sab}$ [bathi]Savetta 8
108. Singet dem Herren ..... Roth 8
De Ascensione Christi
109. Dominus regnavit Roth ..... 8
110. Domini est terra ..... Capilupi 8
111. Exurgat Dominus ..... Pacelli ${ }^{4} 8$
112. Exivi à Patre ..... Dulcini 8
113. Iam non dicam ..... G. Gabrieli 8
114. O Viri Galilaei ..... Croce 8
115. Nun lob mein Seel ..... Walliser 5
116. Ich danke dir ..... Bodenschatz 8
117. In nomine Iesu Stefanini 8
De Festo Pentecostes
118. Dum complerent[ur / Cum ergo essent]
119. Ich danke dir
120. Intonuit de coelo
121. Hodie completi sunt
122. Hodie completi sunt

Pallavicino 8
Bodenschatz 8
Aichinger 6
Valcampi 6
Catalani 8

Hisce annecti possunt: Cantate, Exultate, Iubilate, Laudate.
3. As discussed in Chapter 1, none of the motets by Gumpelzhaimer are credited in the Florilegii Musici Portensis.
4. Misattributed to Pinelli.

## De Festo Sanctissimae \& Individuae Trinitatis

119. Duo Seraphim ..... Croatti 8
120. Invocamus te ..... Anonymus 8
121. O Altitudo [divitiarum] Osculati 8
122. Te Deum Patrem ..... Valcampi 6
123. Tibi laus, [tibi gloria] Anerio 8
124. Te Deum Patrem Bertholusius 8
125. Tres sunt, qui [testimonium] ..... Pacelli 8
126. Lobe den Herren ..... Anonymus 8
127. Lobe den Herren ..... Hartmann 8
128. Nun lob mein Seel

## Die Festo Joannis Baptista praecursoris Domini nostri Iesu Christi

127. Et tu Puer [Propheta] Vincentius 8
128. Fuit Homo [missus a Deo] ..... Praetorius 5
129. Puer, qui natus est [nobis] ..... Praetorius 8
130. Puer, qui natus est [nobis] Valcampi 6
De Festo Petri [\&] Pauli
131. Tu es Petrus Franck ..... 8
132. Petre amas me ..... Leoni 8
De Festo Visitationis Mariaæ
133. Beata es Virgo Mar[ia] Stefanini ..... 7
134. Ecce tu pulchra es ..... Borsari 8
De Festo Michaelis Archangeli
135. Audivi vocem [de coelo] Belli 6
136. Factum est praelium [/ Et audivi vocem] ..... Tribioli 6
137. Factum est praelium ..... Balbi 8
138. Factum est silentium Porta 8
139. Venit Michael [Archangelus] Incertus [Gumpelzhaimer] 8

## De Beatis Martyribus

136. Cantabant Sancti Regio 8
137. Hi sunt, qui venerunt [/ Dignus es] ..... Stabile 8
138. Hic est vere Martyr ..... Agazzari 8
139. Sanctis Apostolis140. Audivi vocem [Angelorum]Zucchini 7
Leoni ..... 8
140. Gaudent in coelis Demantius 8
141. Exultemus Domino Bagni 8
142. Laudate DominumPerini 7
143. Iubilate DeoPallavicino 8
144. Exultavit cor meum [/ Arcus fortium] ..... Parma 8

# Appendix C: Leipziger Kirchen-Andachten Motets 

FPI— Florilegium Portense, 1618<br>FPII— Florilegii Musici Portensis, 1621<br>Vulp. I- Cantionum Sacrarum, Pars Prima, 1602<br>Vulp. II— Selectissimarum Cantionum Sacrarum, Pars Secunda, 1603<br>Vulp. III— Opusculum novum selectissimarum cantionum sacrarum, 1610

## Dominica I. Adventus

Jerusalem gaudio magno- FPI, 82 [Handl] and 88 [Zangius]; FPII, 72 [Demantius]
Canite tuba in Sion- FPII, 70 [Pallavicino]
Hosanna Filio David— FPII, 71 [Weissensee]; [FPI,] 87 [von Hessen]

## Dominica II. Adventus

Veni, veni Domine \& noli tardare, relaxa facinora plebi tuae- FPI, 84 [Handl]
Veniet tempus, in quo faluabitur- FPI, 36 [Handl]

## Dominica III. Adventus

Anima mea expectat Dominum- FPII, 2 [Weissensee]; Vulp. II, 9

## Dominica III. Adventus

Ex Respons. Non auferetur- FPI, 83 [Meiland], 86 [Roth]
Fuit homo a Deo- FPII, 128 [H. Praetorius]

## In Festo Nativitatis Christi

Cum natus esset Jesus- FPI, 89 [Walliser]
Claritas Domini- FPII, 79 [Vincentius]
Angelus ad Pastores- FPI, 50 [Lassus] and 52 [H. Praetorius]; FPII, 74 [Zangius]
Surgite Pastores- FPII, 78 [Biancardi]
Quem vidistis Pastores?- FPI, 53 [A Gabrieli]
Quid concinunt Pastores?- FPII, 81 [Biancardi]
Hodie Christus natus est— FPI, 112 [G. Gabrieli]; FPII, 75 [Balbi]. Sq. [76 by Erbach]
Hodie nobis coelorum- FPI, 111 [Viadana]

# In Festo Circumcisionis Christi sive Novi Anni 

In Nomine Jesu- FPII, 112 [Stefanini]
Sit Nomen Domini, FPII, 84 [Borsari]
Jam plausus iterent- FPII, 80 [Borsari]
O Jesu mi duclissime msc.
Salve cordis gaudium. Msc.

## Domin. Post F. Circumcisionis

Domine quid multiplicasti \&c. (Ps 3)— FPI, 25 [Lassus]; FPII, 21 [Gumpelzhaimer]

## In Festo Epiphaniorum

Gloria Tibi Domine-FPII, 83 [Vicentius]
Stellam quam viderunt- FPII, 85 [de Monte]
Surge, illuminare- FPI, 55 [H. Praetorius]
Magi videntes. Msc.
In hoc Festo gratulamini. Msc.

Dom. I post. Epiphan.
Quam dilecta tabernacula- FPII, 48 [Patarto]
Deus respice in me-FPI, 4 [Erbach]
Ex Epist. Rom 12, Obsecro vos- FPII, 43 [Gatto]

## Dom II post Epiphan.

Beatus vir qui timet Domin.- FPI, 13 [Handl]
Beati omnes, qui timet- FPII, 5 [Gumpelzhaimer]
Foedera conjugii- FPII, 27 [Gumpelzhaimer]

## Dom. III post Epiphan.

Ex Intr. De Profundis [FPII, 17- Riccio]
Ex Respons. Domini est terra- FPII, 19 [Capilupi]
Ex. Antiph. Domine Jesu Christe, non sum est- FPI, 102 [Walliser]
Cum descendisset Ex Evang.- Vulp. I, 10

## Dom. IV post Epiphan.

Deus spes nostra \& fortit.- FPI, 115 [Vulpius]
Levavi oculos meus-FPI, 42 [Lassus]; FPII, 38 [Gumpelzhaimer]
Deus adjutor fortis- [FPI, 14 by Eremita]

## Dom. V. post Epiphan

ex Antiph. Accedentes Servi- Vulp. I, 15
Cor mundum [FPI, 26 by Pevernage]

## Domin. Septuagesimae

Exiens homo primo- Vulp. I, 17

## Domin. Sexagesimae

Deus miseratur- FPI, 43 [Bischoff]; FPII, 15 [Pallavicino]
Cum turba plurima-Vulp. I, 20

## Dom. Quinquages. Sive Esto mihi

In te Domine speravi- FPII, 69 [Pallavicino]
Confitemini Domino— FPI, 44 [Lassus]; FPII, 8 [Capilupi]
Coecus quidam Sedebat-Vulp. I, 30

## Dom. Invocavit Sive Quadrages.

Ponam inimicitias- FPII, 95 [Roth]
Ave Rex noster- FPII, 92 [Biancardi]

## Dom. Reminiscere

Tristis est anima mea- FPI, 60 [Lassus]; FPII, 94 [Agazzari]
Filia Jerusalem- FPI, 62 [Handl]

## Dominica Oculi

O Domine Jesu Christe- FPI, 41 [G. Gabrieli]; FPII, 93 [Leoni]
Adoramus Te Jesu Christe- FPI, 61 [Handl]

## Dominica Laetare

Moteta repetuntur passionales ex praec.

## Dom. Judica

Passionales repetuntur ex praeced.

Dom. Palmarum

Ingrediente Domino- FPI, 81 [Zalamella]
Hosianna Filio David- FPI, 87 [von Hessen]
Domine Dominus noster- FPI, 31 [Erbach]
Post Passionem ex. Matthew decantatam- Ecce quomodo moritur Justus [FPI, 64 by Gallus]

## Fer. IV Die Viridium sive; Die Coena Dominica

Dominus Jesus Christus,\&c.- FPI, 63 [Handl]
Ego sum panis vivus- FPI, 24 [Handl]
Cibavit nos- FPI, 28 [Bassano]; FPII, 68 [Belli]

## Fer. V. Die Parasceves

Motetae Pass. Quarae D. Rem. \& Oculi

## In Festo Paschali

Dum Rex Gloriae- FPII, 107 [Anonymous]
Vespere autem Sabbathi- FPII, 148 [Gumpelzhaimer]
Maria magdalena ibant- FPII, 106 [Gumpelzhaimer]
Quem quaris Maria?- FPII, 98 [Vecchi]
Tulerunt Dominum - FPI, 66 [Massaino], Seq [67 by H. Praetorius]; FPII, 102 [Savetta]
Angelus Domini- FPI, 68 [Erbach]; FPII, 103 [Leoni]
Ex Epost Expurgate vetus- FPII, 99 [Buel]
F.2. Surrexit Christus- FPI, 94 [Zangius]

Cognoverunt Dominum- FPII, 100 [Casali]
Alleluja in resurrectione- FPI, 65 [Handl]
Alleluja laetamini- FPII, 104 [Steucke]
F.3. Domine Deus noster (Ps. 8)— FPI, 31 [Erbach]

Surgite populi- FPII, 101 [Vecchi]
His jungantur; Cantate \&c Vid. F.3. Nativ.

## Dom. Quasimodogeniti

Ex Responsorio Christus resurgens- FPII, 96 [Stefanini]
Jam nom dicam— FPI, 78 [Gallus]; FPII, 110 [G. Gabrieli]
Ex Epist. 1. Job 5. Tres sunt, qui- FPII, 122 [Pacelli]

## Dom. Misericordias Domini

Alleluja surrexit— FPII, 97 [Baglioni]
Ex. Respons. Surrexit Pastor bonus- Vulp. I, 38

## Domin. Jubilate

Jubilate Deo- FPI, 30 [Giovanelli], 32 [Marenzio], 48 [Weissensee], 96 [error: 98- Berger]; FPII— 34 [Gumpelzhaimer], 66 [Gabrieli], Sq. [67—Marenzio], 145 [Pallavicino]

## Dominica Cantate

Cantate- FPI, 18 [Blasius], 21 [Anonymous], 33 [Orologio], 49 [Handl], 96 [H. Praetorius], 99 [Berger]; FPII, 10 [Pacelli]
Ex Resp. Deus canticum novum- FPI, 17 [Fabricius]
Ex Antiph. Non vos reliquam- FPI, 38 [Fabricius]

## Domin. Vocem Jucunditatis seu Rogate

Exivi a Patre- FPII, 109 [Dulcini]
Pater noster, qui \&c- FPI,1 [Hassler]; FPII, 65 [listed on this line in error]
Oremus [praeceptis]- FPII, 65 [Walliser]
Vocem jucunditatis— Vulp. II, 13. ex Introit.

## Festo Ascensionis

Ex Introitus. Omnes gentes plaudite- FPI, 104 [Steucke]
Exurgat Deus- FPII, 108 [Pacelli]
Benedictus es Dominus- FPII, 6 [Gabussi]
Intr. Ex Epist. O viri Galilaei- FPI, 69 [Boschetti]; FPII, 111 [Croce]
His adde Jubilate Vide F.3. Nativ
Dominus regnavit. Msc. [Josquin? Also FPII, 11 by Roth]

## Dom. Exaudi

Deus adjutor fortis- FPI, 14 [Eremita]
Exaudiat Te Dominus- [FPI, 22 by Fabricius]

## In Festo Petecostes

Veni Sancte Spiritus, reple- FPII, 116 [Zangius]
Veni S. Spiritus \& emitte— FPI, 70 [Handl]
Ex Evang. Si quis diligit me- Vulp. II, 15 [also FPII, 51 by Roth]
Ex Resp. Apparuerunt Apostolis- FPI, 95 [Vicentius]
[Collect. Cor mundum crea in me Deus- FPI, 26 by Pevernage]
F.2. Ex Evang. Sic Deus dilixit- Vulp. I, 26; Vulp. III, 13

Intonuit Dominus de caelo- FPII, 117 [Aichinger]
F.3. Annecti possunt ex Bod. Cantate.

Vide Fer. 3. Nat. Buccinate. msc.

## In Festo Trinitatis

Ex Intr. Benedicta sit— FPI, 110 [Gumpelzhaimer]
Adesto unus- FPI, 73 [Neander]
Invocamus Te- FPII, 118 ex Ant. [Anonymous]
Te Deum Patrem ingenitu- FPI, 75 [H. Praetorius] Sq. [76 by Erbach];
FPII, 121 [Valcampi], 124 [Bertolusiis]
Duo Seraphim— FPI, 74 [Ingegnieri]; FPII, 119 [Croatti]
Tibi laus, Tibi gloria- FPII, 123 [Anerio]
Ex Epist. O altitudo- FPII, 120 [Osculati]

Dom. I post. Fest. Trinitat.
Ex Antiph. Homo quidam erat— FPII, 29 [Vulpius]; Vulp. I, 6
Beatus vir qui timet (Ps 112)— FPI, 13 [Handl]

Dom. II. Post Trinit.
Venite ad me omnes- FPII, 61 [Bertolosiis]
In Domino Deu gaudebimus- FPII, 32 [Roth]

## Dom. III. Post Trinit.

Ex Resp. Pater peccavi- FPII, 45 [Pinelli]
Domine Jesu Christe- FPII, 14 [Luyton]

Dom. IV. Post Trinit.
Domine quis habitabit (Ps 15)— FPI, 45 [Erbach]; FPII, 13 [Guyton] and 16 [Anonymous]

Dom. V. Post Trinit.
Nisi Dominus aedificaverit- FPI, 12 [Anonymous]
Praeceptor per totam— Vulp. I, 18

Dom. VI. Post. Trinit.
Ecce quam bonum- FPII, 23 [Gumpelzhaimer]

Dom VII. Post. Trinit.
Ex Intr. Omnes gentes plaudite- FPI, 104 [Steucke]
Cibavit nos- FPI, 28 [Bassano]; FPII, 68 [Belli]

Dom. VIII. Post. Trinitat.
Iniquos odio habui- FPII, 35 [Marenzio]

Dom IX. Post Trinit.
Domini est terra- FPII, 19 [Capilupi]
Beatus vir qui timet- FPI, 13 [Handl]

## Dom. X. post Trinit.

Super flumina Babyl.— FPI, 101 [Vulpius]; FPII, 56 [Savetta]
Hymnum cantate nobis- FPI, 39 [Massaino]
In convertendo Domino- FPI, 40 [Lassus]

## Dom. XI. Post Trinit.

Cor mundum crea- FPI, 26 [Pevernage]
Tribularer si nescirem- FPII, 55 [Leoni]
Domine Jesu Christe- FPII, 14 [Luyton]

Dom. XII. Post. Trin.
Intr. Ex Ps. 67. Deus in adjutorium— FPI, 46 [Lassus]; FPII, 20 [Gumpelzhaimer] Benedicam Domino- FPI, 3 [A. Gabrieli], 105 [H. Praetorius], Sq. [106 by Franck]
Egressus Jesus- Vulp. I, 21

Dom. XIII. Post Trinit.
Domini est terra- FPII, 19 [Capilupi]
Homo quidam - Vulp. II, 44, Seq. [45]

Dom. XIV. Post Trinit.
Factum est dum iret-FPI, 25 [Vulpius]
Repleatus os- FPI, 10 [Handl]

Dom. XV. Post Trinit.
Ex. Antiph. Matt. 6. 33. Quarite primum- FPI, 6 [Calvisius]; FPII, 47 [Zangius]

Dom. XVI. Post Trinit.
Media vita- FPI, 27 [Handl]
Si bona suscepimus- FPII, 53 [Hassler]
Ibat Jesus - Vulp. II, 60

Dom. XVII. Post Trinit.
Exurgat Deus- FPII, 108 [Pacelli]
Cum invitatus fueris- Vulp. I, 73

Dom. XVIII. Post Trinit.
Ex. Resp. Congregati sunt-FPII, 7 [Roth]
Deus adjutor fortis- FPI, 14 [Eremita]

Dom. XIX. Post Trinit.

Populi omnes- FPII, 44 [Roth]
Turbabor msc.
Ecce adduxerunt illi— Vulp. II, 23

## Dom. XX. Post Trinit.

Quam pulchra es-FPI, 59 [Bodenschatz]
Simile est regnum coelorum- Vulp. I, 24

Dom. XXI. Post Trinit.
Qui [habitat in atjutorio Altissimi] in protectione- FPII, 50 [Viadana]
In Te Domine- FPII, 69 [Pallavicino]

Dom. XXII. Post Trinit.
Domine, quando veneris- FPI, 47 [Handl]
Ex Intr. De profundis- FPII, 17 [Riccio]

Dom. XXIII. Post Trinit.
Exultat cor meum- FPI, 2 [Anonymous]
Confitebor Tibi in toto- FPI, 11 [Lassus]

Dom. XXIV. Post Trinit.
In te Domine speravi- FPII, 69 [Pallavicino]
Ecce mulier- Vulp. I, 7
Primas quidam— Id. [Vulp.] II, 17. Seq. [Vulp. II, 18]

Dom. XXV. Post Trinit.
Audi tellus- FPI, 37 [Handl]
Veniet tempus- FPI, 36 [Handl]

## Dom. XXVI \& XXVII post Trin.

Domine quando venris- FPI, 47 [Handl]
Gloria Tibi Domine- FPI, 85 [H. Praetorius]
Sub clausulam anni veteris canitur.
Laus \& perennis gloria. Msc.

## Festo Purificationis Mariae

Nunc dimittis- FPI, 56 [Anonymous]; FPII, 86 [Stabile]
Ex Antiph. Senex puerum portabat- FPII, 87 [Valcampi]
Verbum caro factum est. msc. [Hassler?]

Festo Annunciationis Mariae
Angelus Domini- FPII, 91 [Parma]
Ave gratia plena-FPI, 93 [Biancardi]
Beata es Virgo Maria- FPII, 89 [Stefanini]
A Domino factum est- FPI, 57 [Hassler]
Surge propera-FPI, 58 [H. Praetorius]
Quam pulchra es-FPI, 59 [Bodenschatz]

## Festo Johannis Baptista

Moteta ex Respons. Fuit homo missus a Deo- FPII, 128 [H. Praetorius]
Et tu puer- FPII, 127 [Vicentius]
Puer qui natus est— FPII, [1]25 [Valcampi], Sq. [126 by H. Praetorius]
Omnes gentes plaudite- FPI, 104 [Steucke]
Benedicam— FPI, 3 [A. Gabrieli]

## Festo Visitationis Mariae

Vide in F. Annuntiat. Adde in Sup.
Plaudat nunc organis- FPII, 88 [Balbi]
Ecce tu pulchra es- FPII, 90 [Borsari]
Magnificat, \& Congratulamini msc.

## Festo Michaelis

Factum est praelium - FPII, 132 [Tribioli], Sq. [133 by Balbi]
Factum est silentium - FPI, 77 [H. Praetorius]; FPII, 134 [Porta]
Audivi vocem de coelo- FPII, 131 [Belli]
Venit Michael Archangelus- FPII, 135 [Gumpelzhaimer]
Gaudent in coelis- FPI, 79 [Fabricius]; FPII, 141 [Demantius]

## In Festis Apostolorum

Sanctis Apostolis inclyta gaudia pangamus.- FPII, 139 [Zucchini]
Cantabant Sancti- FPII, 136 [Regio]
Hic est vera martyr- FPII, 138 [Agazzari]
Hi sunt qui venerunt- FPII, 137 [Stabile]
In Specie F. Matthiae. Venite ad me- FPII, 61 [Bertolosiis]
In Specie F. Petri Pauli. Tu es Petrus- FPII, 129 [Franck] Petre amas me- FPII, 130 [Leoni]

## Festo poenitentiali

Tribularer, si nescirem— FPII, 55 [Leoni]

In Dedicatione novi Templi
Audi Domine hymnum - FPI, 7 [Bodenschatz]
O quam metuendus- FPI, 29 [Handl]
Sanctificavit Dominus tabern- FPII, 54 [Erbach]
Exultemus Domino— FPII, 143 [Bagni]

## In Electione Novi Senatus

Exaudiat Te Dominus- FPI, 22 [Fabricius]

Sub initium lectionum Scholast
Sis praesens Deus- FPI, 23 [Fabricius]
Deus meus ad Te- FPII, 18 [Hassler]
O quam metuendus- FPI, 29 [Handl]

## In Nuptiis

Beatus vir qui timet (Ps 112)— FPI, 13 [Handl]
Beati omnes, qui timent- FPII, 5 [Gumpelzhaimer]
Felix oter \& amplius- FPII, 26 [Gumpelzhaimer]
Jubilate Deo- FPII, 66 [G. Gabrieli]
Nisi Dominus aedificaverit- FPI, 12 [Anonymous]
Non est bonum hominem- FPII, 42 [Roth]
Osculetur te- FPII, 82 [Bertolosiis]
Quam pulchra es-FPI, 5[9] [Bodenschatz]
Tota pulchra es- FPII, 58 [Balbi]
Ecce tu pulchra- FPII, 90 [Borsari]
Tempore Veris: Surge propera- FPI, 58 [Praetorius]; FPII, 52 [Roth]
Veni in hortum - FPII, 59 [Vincentius], Sq. [60 by Roth] \& msc.
Haec est dies quam fecit. msc.

## In Conviviis

Ecce quam bonum- FPII, 23 [Gumpelzhaimer]
Gemmula carbunculi- FPII, 28 [Anonymous]
In Domino Deo gaudebimus [FPII, 32 by Roth?]

## In Funeribus

Media vita in- FPI, 27 [Handl]
Si bona suscepimus- FPII, 53 [Hassler]
Nunc dimittis- FPI, 56 [Anonymous]; FPII, 86 [Stabile]
Ecce quomodo moritur- FPI, 64 [Handl]

## Part II:

## Scores

## Texts and Translations

## 3 - Andrea Gabrieli - Benedicam Dominum

Benedicam Dominum in omni tempore: semper laus ejus in ore meo.
In Domino laudabitur anima mea: audiant mansueti, et laetentur. Magnificate Dominum mecum: et exaltemus nomen ejus in idipsum Exquisivi Dominum, et exaudivit me: et ex omnibus tribulationibus meis eripuit me. Accedite ad eum, et illuminamini: et facies vestrae non confundentur.

Psalm 33:2-6, Biblia Sacra Vulgata
Orthography from Liber Usualis, 1962, p. 293

I will bless Jehovah at all times:
His praise shall continually be in my mouth.
My soul shall make her boast in Jehovah:
The meek shall hear thereof, and be glad.
Oh magnify Jehovah with me,
And let us exalt his name together.
I sought Jehovah, and he answered me, And delivered me from all my fears. They looked unto him, and were radiant; And their faces shall never be confounded.

Psalm 34:1-5, American Standard Version

## 7 - Erhard Bodenschatz - Audi Hymnum

Audi, Domine, hymnum et orationem meam, quam servus tuus orat coram te hodie:
ut sint oculi tui aperti et aures tuae intentae super domum istam die ac nocte.

Adapted from 1 Kings 8:28-29.

Hear, O Lord, my hymn and prayer, which your servant prays before you today: that your eyes be open and your ears attentive over this house day and night.

## 15 - Andrea Gabrieli - Exsultate, justi

Exsultate, justi, in Domino: rectos decet collaudatio.
Confitemini Domino in cithara:
in psalterio decem chordarum psallite illi.
Cantate ei canticum novum:
bene psallite ei in vociferatione.
Quia rectum est verbum Domini, et omnia opera ejus in fide.
Diligit misericordiam et judicium:
misericordia Domini plena est terra.

Psalm 32:1-5, Biblia Sacra Vulgata
Orthography from Liber Usualis, 1962, p. 279D

Rejoice in Jehovah, O ye righteous:
Praise is comely for the upright.
Give thanks unto Jehovah with the harp:
Sing praises unto him with the psaltery of ten strings.
Sing unto him a new song;
Play skilfully with a loud noise.
For the word of Jehovah is right;
And all his work is done in faithfulness.
He loveth righteousness and justice:
The earth is full of the lovingkindness of Jehovah.

Psalm 33:1-5, American Standard Version

## 17 - Albinus Fabricius - Deus, canticum novum

Deus canticum novum cantabo tibi: in psalterio, decachordo psallam tibi.

Psalm 143:9, Biblia Sacra Vulgata
Orthography from Liber Usualis, 1962, p. 308
Quia delectasti me, Domine, in factura tua:
et in operibus manuum tuarum exsultabo.
Psalm 91:5, Biblia Sacra Vulgata
Orthography from Liber Usualis, 1962, p. 775

I will sing a new song unto thee, O God:
Upon a psaltery of ten strings will I sing praises unto thee.

Psalm 144:9, American Standard Version

For thou, Jehovah, hast made me glad through thy work:
I will triumph in the works of thy hands.
Psalm 92:4, American Standard Version

## 22 - Albinus Fabricius - Exaudiat te Dominus

Exaudiat te Dominus in die tribulationis: protegat te nomen Dei Jacob.

Mittat tibi auxilium de sancto: et de Sion tueatur te.
Memor sit omnis sacrificii tui: et holocaustum tuum pingue fiat.
Tribuat tibi secundum cor tuum: et omne consilium tuum confirmet.
Laetabimur in salutari tuo:
et in nomine Dei nostri magnificabimur.

Impleat Dominus omnes petitiones tuas[.]
Psalm 19:2-7a, Biblia Sacra Vulgata
Orthography from Liber Usualis, 1962, p. 929

Jehovah answer thee in the day of trouble; The name of the God of Jacob set thee up on high;
Send thee help from the sanctuary,
And strengthen thee out of Zion;
Remember all thy offerings,
And accept thy burnt-sacrifice;
Grant thee thy heart's desire, And fulfil all thy counsel. We will triumph in thy salvation,
And in the name of our God we will set up our banners:
Jehovah fulfil all thy petitions.
Psalm 20:1-5, American Standard Version

## 23-Albinus Fabricius - Sis praesens Deus

Sis praesens Deus alme, meis spes unica rebus, cunctaque praesidio tolle sinistra tuo.

Saepe sacro dignare locum spiramine nostrum visere,
visere, ne Sathanas tentet adire fores.
Angelus hic habitet, supera quem mittis ab arce, ut pacis statuat foedera sancta tuae. Nos benedic bonitate tua, ne saeva tyrannis damnatas cogat turpiter ire vias.

Be present, dear God, sole hope for my affairs, and take away all adversities with your protection.
Deem it worthy often to look on our state with your holy spirit, to look on, lest Satan try to approach our doors. Let an angel dwell here, whom you send from the sky above, to establish the holy covenants of your peace. Bless us with your goodness, lest the fierce tyrant basely compels [us] to go the ways of the condemned.

## Translation by William R. Schoedel

## 38 - Albinus Fabricius - Non vos relinquam

Non vos relinquam orphanos, sed veniam ad vos iterum,

John 14:18, Biblia Sacra Vulgata
Orthography from Liber Usualis, 1961, p. 899
et gaudebitis, alleluia.

I will not leave you orphans:
I [will] come unto you [again].
John 14:18, American Standard Version
and you will rejoice, alleluia.

Adapted from John 16:22b, Biblia Sacra Vulgata
Orthography from Liber Usualis, 1961,
p. 899-900

## 49 - Jacob Handl - Cantate Domino

Cantate Domino canticum novum;
laus ejus in ecclesia sanctorum
Laetetur Israel in eo, qui fecit eum; et filae Sion ex[s]ultent in rege suo.
Laudent nomen ejus in choro;
in tympano, et psalterio psallant ei;
Quia beneplacitum est Domino in populo suo; et exaltavit mansuetos in salutem.
Ex[s]ultabunt sancti in gloria;
laetabuntur in cubilibus suis.
Ex[s]ultiones Dei in gutture eorum;
et gladii anciptes in manibus eorum; ad faciendam vindictam in nationibus; increpationes in populis.
Ad alligandos reges eorum in compedibus; et nobiles eorum in manicis ferreis. Ut faciant in eis judicium conscriptum; gloria haec est omnibus sanctis ejus.

Psalm 149, Biblia Sacra Vulgata
Orthography from Biblia Sacra Vulgatae, 1824, ed. Leander van Ess, vol. 2, p. 123 (1590 variants)

Sing unto Jehovah a new song,
And his praise in the assembly of the saints.
Let Israel rejoice in him that made him:
Let the children of Zion be joyful in their King.
Let them praise his name in the dance:
Let them sing praises unto him with timbrel and harp.
For Jehovah taketh pleasure in his people:
He will beautify the meek with salvation.
Let the saints exult in glory:
Let them sing for joy upon their beds.
Let the high praises of God be in their mouth, And a two-edged sword in their hand;
To execute vengeance upon the nations,
And punishments upon the peoples;
To bind their kings with chains, And their nobles with fetters of iron;
To execute upon them the judgment written:
This honor have all his saints.

Psalm 149, American Standard Version

## 70 - Jacob Handl - Veni Sancte Spiritus

Veni Sancte Spiritus, et emitte caelitus lucis tuae radium. Veni pater pauperum, veni dator munerum, veni lumen cordium. Consolator optime dulcis hospes animae, dulce refrigerium. In labore requies, in aestu temperies, in fletu solatium. O lux beatissima reple cordis intima tuorum fidelium. Sine tuo numine nihil est in homine nihil est innoxium. Lava quod est sordidum, riga quod est aridum, sana quod est saucium. ${ }^{1}$ Flecte quod est rigidum, fove quod est frigidum, rege quod est devium. Da tuis fidelibus, in te confidentibus, sacrum septenarium.
Da virtutis meritum, da salutis exitum, da perenne gaudium.

Sequence for Pentecost
Orthography from Liber Usualis, 1962, p. 880-881

Come, Holy Spirit, and send down from heaven the ray of your light. Come, father of the poor, come, giver of gifts, come, light of the hearts. Best consoler, sweet host of the soul, sweet refresher.
Rest in work, cooling in heat, comfort in crying. O most blessed light, fill the innermost hearts of your faithful. Without your power nothing is in man, nothing innocent.
Clean what is dirty, water what is dry, heal what is wounded. Bend what is rigid, heat what is cold, lead what has gone astray. Grant to your faithful who trust in you, your sevenfold holy gift. Grant us the reward of virtue, grant us final salvation, grant us eternal joy.
https://www.cpdl.org/wiki/index.php /Veni_Sancte_Spiritus

[^50]
## 79 - Albinus Fabricius - Gaudent in caelis

Gaudent in caelis animae Sanctorum, qui Christi vestigia sunt secuti:
et quia pro ejus amore [fuderunt,] sanguinem suum fuderunt, ideo cum Christo regnabunt in aeternum. ${ }^{2}$

Sequence for Pentecost
Orthography from Liber Usualis, 1962, p. 1160

The souls of the saints rejoice in heaven, they who have followed in the footsteps of Christ;
and because they shed their blood for love of Him, they shall reign with Christ forever.
https://www.cpdl.org/wiki/index.php /Gaudent_in_coelis

## 95-Caspar Vincentius - Apparuerunt Apostolis

Apparuerunt Apostolis dispertitae linquae tamquam ignis, alleluia;
seditque supra singulos eorum Spiritus Sanctus, alleluia.
Loquebantur variis linguis Apostoli magnalia Dei, alleluia.

Acts 2:3,11, Biblia Sacra Vulgata
Orthography from Biblia Sacra Vulgatae, 1824, ed. Leander van Ess, vol. 2, p. 156 and Liber Usualis, 1961, p. 884-885

And there appeared unto [the disciples] tongues parting asunder, like as of fire[, alleluia]; and [the Holy Spirit] sat upon each one of them[, alleluia].
We hear them speaking in our tongues the mighty works of God[, alleluia].

Acts 2:3,11, American Standard Version

[^51]
## 98 - Andreas Berger - Jubilate Deo

Jubilate Deo omnis terra:
servite Domino in laetitia.
Introite in confessione, ${ }^{3}$
in exsultatione.
Scitote quoniam Dominus ipse est Deus:
ipse fecit nos, et non ipsi nos.
[Nos autem] populus ejus, et oves pascuae ejus:
introite portas ejus in confessione,
atria ejus in hymnis:
confitemini illi.
Laudate nomen ejus:
quoniam suavis est Dominus,
in aeternum misericordia ejus,
et usque in generationem et generationem veritas ejus.

Psalm 99, Biblia Sacra Vulgata
Orthography from Liber Usualis, 1962, p. 221

Make a joyful noise unto Jehovah, all ye lands.
Serve Jehovah with gladness:
Come before his presence
with singing.
Know ye that Jehovah, he is God:
It is he that hath made us, and we are his;
We are his people, and the sheep of his pasture. Enter into his gates with thanksgiving, And into his courts with praise:
Give thanks unto him, and bless his name.
For Jehovah is good;
his lovingkindness endureth for ever, And his faithfulness unto all generations.

Psalm 100, American Standard Version

## 99 - Andreas Berger - Cantate Domino

Cantate Domino canticum novum:
quia mirabilia fecit.
Jubilate Deo, omnis terra:
cantate, et exsultate, et psallite.
Psallite Domino in cithara, in cithara et voce psalmi: in tubis ductilibus, et voce tubae coroneae.
Jubilate in conspectu regis Domini: moveatur mare, et plenitudo ejus: orbis terrarum et qui habitant in eo. Alleluia.

Psalm 97:1,6-8, Biblia Sacra Vulgata Orthography from Liber Usualis, 1962, p. 388

Oh sing unto Jehovah a new song;
For he hath done marvellous things[.]
Make a joyful noise unto Jehovah, all the earth: Break forth and sing for joy, yea, sing praises.
Sing praises unto Jehovah with the harp; With the harp and the voice of melody. With trumpets and sound of cornet
Make a joyful noise before the King, Jehovah.
Let the sea roar, and the fulness thereof; The world, and they that dwell therein[.] Alleluia.

Psalm 98:1a,4-7, American Standard Version
3. Liber Usualis: "in conspectu ejus" ("before him").

## 100 - Andreas Berger - Laudate Dominum

Laudate Dominum in sanct[uario] ${ }^{4}$ ejus:
laudate eum in firmamento virtutis ejus.
Laudate eum in virtutibus ejus:
laudate eum secundum multitudinem magnitudinis ejus.
Laudate eum in sono tubae:
laudate eum in psalterio et cithara.
Laudate eum in typano, et choro:
laudate eum in chordis, et organo.
Laudate eum in cymbalis benesonantibus:
laudate eum in cymbalis jubilationis:
omnis spiritus laudet Dominum.
Psalm 99, Biblia Sacra Vulgata
Orthography from Liber Usualis, 1962, p. 221

Praise God in his sanctuary:
Praise him in the firmament of his power.
Praise him for his mighty acts:
Praise him according to his excellent greatness.

Praise him with trumpet sound:
Praise him with psaltery and harp.
Praise him with timbrel and dance:
Praise him with stringed instruments and pipe.
Praise him with loud cymbals:
Praise him with high sounding cymbals.
Let everything that hath breath praise Jehovah.
Psalm 100, American Standard Version

[^52]
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## 7. Audi Hymnum

Erhard Bodenschatz
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## 15. Exsultate, justi

Psalm 32:I-5 (Vulgate)
Andrea Gabrieli
(1532/3-1585)















## 17. Deus canticum novum

Psalm 143:9 and 91:5 (Vulgate)
Albinus Fabricius
(?-1635)












22. Exaudiat te Dominus

Psalm 19:2-7a (Vulgate)
Albinus Fabricius (?-1635)













## 23. Sis praesens Deus










38. Non vos relinquam

John 14:18 \& 16:22b



 quam or - pha - nos,







## 49. Cantate Domino

Psalm 149
Jacob Handl






tem, in_sa-lu-tem. Ex-sul-ta-buntsanc-ti in glo-ri-a; lae - ta-bun-tur in cu-bi-li-bus su-is. Ex-sul-ta-ti-

tem, in_sa-lu-tem. Ex-sul-ta-buntsanc-ti in glo-ri-a; lae - ta-bun-tur in cu-bi-li-bus su-is.

tem, in_sa-lu-tem. Ex-sul-ta-bunt sanc-ti in glo - ri - a; lae - ta-bun-tur in cu-bi-li-bus su-is. Ex-sul-ta-ti-






haec est, glo - ri-a haec est, glo - ri-a haec est om - ni-bus sanc-tis e - jus, <om-ni-bus sanc-tis e - jus.»


## 70. Veni Sancte Spiritus

Sequence for Pentecost
Jacob Handl




um.







est ri - gi-dum,fo-ve quod_ est fri - gi-dum, re-gequod est de - vi - um.









## 79. Gaudent in caelis

Antiphon for the Common of Martyrs
Albinus Fabricius
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## 95. Apparuerunt Apostolis

Acts 2:3,II























## 98. Jubilate Deo

Psalm 99 (Vulgate)
Andreas Berger (1584-1656)



















## 99. Cantate Domino

Psalm 97 (Vulgate): r, 4-7
(1584-1656)









ex-sul-ta-te, «etex-sul - ta-te, <et ex-sul - ta - te,> et psal-li-te, psal-li-te, <psal-li-te.> Psal -


ex-sul-ta-te, «etex-sul - ta-te, et ex-sul - ta - te, et psal-li-te, psal-li-te, <psal-li - te.>


et ex-sul - ta-te, <et ex-sul - ta-te,> <etex-sul-ta-te,> et psal-li-te, psal-li-te, <psal-li - te.>

et ex-sul - ta-te, «etex-sul - ta-te,> <etex-sul-ta-te,> et psal-li-te, psal-li-te, psal-li - te.








$\left[\phi_{2}^{3}\right]$

o. Al - le - lu - ia,
<al - le - lu - ia,> <al - le - lu - ia,>




## roo. Laudate Dominum
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## Benedicam Dominum

Psalm 33:2-6 (Vulgate)
Andrea Gabrieli
(1532/3-1585)


re:

re:



In Do - mi-no lau-da-bi-tur,

 In Do-mi - no lau-da-bi - tur,



 num me-cum:












## Benedicam Dominum

Psalm 33:2-6 (Vulgate)
transposed by ascending fifth
Andrea Gabrieli
(1532/3-1585)







au
di - ant man - su - e -ti
et__ lae-ten-tur.



et ex-al-te - mus no - mene-jus in id-ip -










## Exsultate, justi

Psalm 32:I-5 (Vulgate)
Andrea Gabrieli (1532/3-1585)















## Exsultate, justi

Psalm 32:I-5 (Vulgate)
transposed by ascending fourth















## Cantate Domino

Psalm 149
Jacob Handl













## Veni Sancte Spiritus

Sequence for Pentecost
Jacob Handl (1550-1591)

 - te cae-li - tus_ lu-cis tu-ae ra- di - um.__


i - um.




te - na - ri - um, s sep - te - na - ri - um. Da vir - tu - tis me - ri - tum,



# Jubilate Deo 

mm. 8o-86 from Harmoniae Seu Cantiones Sacrae (Augsburg, 1606)

Psalm 99 (Vulgate)



## Editorial Methods

The title of each motet is listed as in the index of the text source (e.g. Liber Usualis) minus any additional lines to help distinguish multiple texts with the same incipit. If a text source is not available, the listing from the table of contents of the Florilegium Portense is used. Composer names and dates are listed as in their respective articles on Oxford Music Online.

Parts are labeled according to their partbooks in the Florilegium Portense but are organized into choirs based on texture. Within those choirs, voice parts are organized by overall tessitura. For example, that Discantus II may have a higher overall range than Discantus I and will therefore be the higher staff in the score. Bar lines have been added to all vocal parts. If the original bar lines of the Bassus Generalis part differ from the editorial additions, the original bar lines are solid while the editorial are dashed. Notes that are dotted or extend over a barline are divided with ties, as are some which would cross the middle of the bar to conform with modern metrical rules.

Clefs have been modernized to treble and bass clefs, while the originals are displayed in the incipits. Meter signatures have been retained in duple time. The numerators of triple meters have been removed and the original sign is noted above the top staff and continuo line. Pitches, key signatures, and note lengths are transcribed at their original values unless otherwise noted. Pitches in the editorial notes are indicated using the Helmholtz system, in which middle C is $c^{\prime}$.Any editorial additions including notes, rest, augmentation dots (other than for perfections in triple meters) are in brackets. Editorial ties are dashed. Ligatures are marked with closed horizontal brackets and coloration (most often minor color) is indicated with open horizontal brackets.

Accidentals not in the source but necessitated by modern bar lines have been placed in brackets (most often occurring with repeated notes). If accidentals are explicit in any source but already exist in the measure, they are not reprinted (occurs most often in cadential figures). Cautionary accidentals are in parenthesis. Editorial accidentals (musica ficta) are placed above the staff. In the Basis Generalis, editorial figures are placed above the staff in brackets and assume the application of any musica ficta in the vocal parts. Any editorial accidentals altering the bass note are within the staff in brackets to avoid confusion with figures. Raised thirds indicated with a sharp in
the original have been corrected to naturals where applicable. Suspensions involving the third with chromatic alteration have been modernized to remove the second numeral (e.g., $4 \sharp 3$ becomes $4 \sharp$ ) . Any clefs besides bass clef have been converted to treble clef. If the pitches require too many ledger lines, the treble clef has been converted to a bass clef surrounded by brackets. Bracketed clefs are also used when clef changes are missing in the original source, which are also described in the critical notes. Extension lines in continuo part to indicate a held chord or notes are added. Indications such as "tasto solo" are editorial and given in brackets.

Spellings and punctuation have been unified when a suitable text source is available (indicated in the sources for each piece). Commas and semicolons are applied by the editor when repetitions occur. Word division is determined according to Chapter 11 of the Chicago Manual of Style. Text repetitions denoted by ij or ii in all sources are denoted by angle brackets $(\rangle)$ around each phrase corresponding to the ij or ii symbol. If a phrase is explicit in any source, the angle brackets are omitted and the discrepancy is noted.

## Editorial Notes

## 3. Andrea Gabrieli - Benedicam Dominum

## Sources

FP - Bodenschatz Florilegium Portense (Leipzig, 1618)
FSC - Bodenschatz Florilegium Selectissimarum Cantionum (Leipzig, 1603)
Gab - Gabrieli Concerti di Andrea et di Gio. Gabrieli (Venice, 1587) - pitch references below are transposed
LU - Liber Usualis (New York, 1962)

| FP \#17 | FSC \#17 | Gab \#36 | LU p. 293 |
| :--- | :--- | :--- | :--- |
| Discantus (D1) | Discantus | partbooks not equivalent |  |
| Altus (A1) | Altus | (arrangement) |  |
| Tenor (T1) | Tenor |  |  |
| Bassus (B1) | Bassus |  |  |
| Sextus (D2) | Sextus |  |  |
| Septima (A2) | Septima |  |  |
| Quintus (T2) | Quintus |  |  |
| Octava (B2) | Octava |  |  |
| Basis Generalis (BG) |  |  |  |

## Minor Discrepancies

Mm. 3-10, all, FP and FSC: "Domino;" Gab and LU: "Dominum."
M. 14 note 5-m. 15 note 2, T1, FP and FSC: ij; Gab: explicit underlay.
M. 14 note $1-$ m. 15 note 2, D2, FP and FSC: explicit; Gab: ij.
M. 19 note 2-m. 20 note 1, D2, FP and FSC: ij; Gab: explicit underlay.
M. 20 note $1-\mathrm{m} .22$ note 3, T1, FP and FSC: ij; Gab: explicit underlay.
M. 22 note $5-\mathrm{m} .23$ note 3, T2, FP: ij; FSC and Gab: explicit underlay.
M. 24, T1, notes 2-6, FP and FSC: ij; Gab: explicit underlay.
M. 24 note $2-\mathrm{m}$. 25 note 1, D2, FP and FSC: ij; Gab: explicit underlay.
M. 26 note $1-\mathrm{m} .27$ note 1, A1, FP and Gab: explicit underlay; FSC: ij.
M. 26 note $2-\mathrm{m} .27$ note 3, D2, FP and FSC: ij; Gab: explicit underlay.
M. 26 note $2-\mathrm{m} .27$ note 1, T2, FP and FSC: ij; Gab: explicit underlay.
M. 29 note $5-\mathrm{m} .30$ note 4, D1, FP and FSC: ij; Gab: explicit underlay.
M. 29 note 5-m. 30 note 4, D2, FP and FSC: ij; Gab: explicit underlay.
M. 30 note $1-\mathrm{m} .31$ note 2, A1, FP and FSC: ij; Gab: explicit underlay.
M. 30 note $1-\mathrm{m} .31$ note 2, T1, FP and FSC: ij; Gab: explicit underlay.
M. 30 note $5-\mathrm{m} .31$ note 2, B1, FP and FSC: ij; Gab: explicit underlay.
M. 31 note $1-\mathrm{m} .32$ note 1, D1, FP and FSC: ij; Gab: explicit underlay.
M. 31 note $1-\mathrm{m} .32$ note 1, D2, FP and FSC: ij; Gab: explicit underlay.
M. 31 note $3-\mathrm{m}$. 32 note 1, B2, FP and FSC: ij; Gab: explicit underlay.
M. 40 note $1-$ m. 43 note 1, A2, FP and FSC: ij; Gab: explicit underlay.
M. 40 note $1-\mathrm{m} .43$ note 1, T2, FP and Gab: explicit underlay; FSC: ij.
M. 40 note $1-\mathrm{m} .43$ note 1, B2, FP and FSC: ij; Gab: explicit underlay.
M. 43 note $1-$ m. 45 note 1, A1, FP and FSC: ij; Gab: explicit underlay.
M. 43 note $1-$ m. 45 note 2, T1, FP and FSC: ij; Gab: explicit underlay.
M. 48 note $2-$ m. 50 note 3, D2, FP and FSC: ij; Gab: explicit underlay.
M. 52 note $2-$ m. 53 note 3, A1, FP and FSC: ij; Gab: explicit underlay.
M. 52 note $2-$ m. 53 note 3, T1, FP and FSC: ij; Gab: explicit underlay.
M. 52 note $2-\mathrm{m} .53$ note 4, A2, FP and FSC: ij; Gab: explicit underlay.
M. 54 note 3-m. 55 note 3, T1, FP and Gab: melisma on "om" from m. 54 note 3 through m. 55 note 3 ; FSC: no melisma indicated.
M. 56 note 5-m. 57 note 5, D1, FP: melisma on "o" from m. 56 note 5 through m. 57 note 3; FSC and Gab: melisma on "o" from m. 56 note 5 through m. 57 note 5.
M. 61, A2, notes 2 and 3, FP: noteheads are cut off; FSC and Gab: bb’ dotted minim, bb’ semiminim.
M. 64 note $1-\mathrm{m} .65$ note 4, A1, FP and FSC: ij; Gab: explicit underlay.
M. 64 note $2-\mathrm{m} .65$ note 1, D2, FP and FSC: ij; Gab: explicit underlay.
M. 64 note 1-m. 65 note 4, T2, FP and FSC: ij; Gab: explicit underlay.
M. 66 note $6-\mathrm{m} .67$ note 5, D1, FP and Gab: explicit underlay; FSC: ij.
M. 66 note 2-m. 67 note 1, T1, FP and FSC: ij; Gab: explicit underlay.
M. 67 note $4-\mathrm{m} .68$ note 5, B1, FP: ij; FSC and Gab: explicit underlay.
M. 70 note $6-\mathrm{m} .72$ note 4 , A1, FP and FSC: ij; Gab: explicit underlay—clarifies melisma.
M. 70, T1, note 3, FP and FSC: explicit bd.
M. 70 note $3-\mathrm{m}$. 72 note 5, D2, FP and FSC: ij; Gab: explicit underlay.
M. 73 note $3-\mathrm{m}$. 74 note 4, D1, FP and FSC: ij; Gab: explicit underlay.
M. 73 note 3-m. 74 note 2, T1, FP and FSC: ij; Gab: explicit underlay.
M. 73 note $3-$ m. 74 note 1, D2, FP and FSC: ij; Gab: explicit underlay.
M. 74 note $3-\mathrm{m}$. 75 note 1, T1, FP and FSC: ij; Gab: explicit underlay.
M. 74 note $5-\mathrm{m} .75$ note 4, B1, FP and FSC: ij; Gab: explicit underlay.
M. 74, A2, notes 1-5, FP and FSC: ij; Gab: explicit underlay.
M. 74 note $6-\mathrm{m} .75$ note 7, A2, FP and FSC: ij; Gab: explicit underlay.
M. 74 note $1-\mathrm{m} .75$ note 1, B2, FP and FSC: ij; Gab: explicit underlay.
M. 75 note 5-m. 76 note 5, D1, FP and FSC: ij; Gab: explicit underlay.
M. 75 note $8-\mathrm{m}$. 76 note 4, A2, FP and FSC: ij; Gab: explicit underlay.
M. 75 note $2-\mathrm{m}$. 76 note 2, B2, FP and FSC: ij; Gab: explicit underlay.
M. 78 note $2-\mathrm{m}$. 79 note 3, T1, FP and FSC: ij; Gab: explicit underlay.
M. 78, T1, note 3, FP and FSC: explicit 4 .
M. 78 note 3-m. 80 note 2, B1, FP and FSC: ij; Gab: explicit underlay.
M. 78 note $3-\mathrm{m}$. 80 note 5, D2, FP and FSC: ij; Gab: explicit underlay.
M. 81 note $3-\mathrm{m}$. 82 note 4, D1, FP and FSC: ij; Gab: explicit underlay.
M. 81 note $3-\mathrm{m}$. 82 note 1, D2, FP and FSC: ij; Gab: explicit underlay.
M. 81 note $4-\mathrm{m}$. 82 note 2, T2, FP: two ij under this phrase; FSC and Gab: one ij.
M. 82 note $3-\mathrm{m}$. 83 note 4, A1, FP and FSC: ij; Gab: explicit underlay.
M. 82 note $5-\mathrm{m} .83$ note 4, B1, FP and FSC: ij; Gab: explicit underlay.
M. 82 note $2-\mathrm{m} .83$ note 1, D2, FP and FSC: ij missing; Gab: ij.
M. 82, A2, notes 1-5, FP and FSC: ij; Gab: explicit underlay.
M. 82 note 6-m. 83 note 7, A2, FP and FSC: ij; Gab: explicit underlay.
M. 83 note $2-\mathrm{m}$. 84 note 2, T1, FP and FSC: ij; Gab: explicit underlay.
M. 83 note $2-\mathrm{m} .84$ note 2, B2, FP and FSC: ij; Gab: explicit underlay.
M. 84 note $3-\mathrm{m}$. 86 note 1, T1, FP and FSC: ij; Gab: explicit underlay.
M. 84 note $3-\mathrm{m}$. 86 note 1, B1, FP and FSC: ij; Gab: explicit underlay.
M. 85 note $1-$ m. 86 note 2, D2, FP and FSC: ij; Gab: explicit underlay.

## Significant Discrepancies

M. 11, T2, note 3, FP and FSC: $\mathrm{c} \sharp$ '; Gab: c'.
Mm. 13-15, all, FP and FSC: repeat "in ore meo" twice; Gab: one ij, indicating a complete repetition of "semper laus ejus in ore meo."
M. 13, A1, note 6, FP and FSC: f'; Gab: d'-voice leading.
M. 13, BG, note 2, FP: f'-T1: f.
M. 14, T1, note 5, FP and FSC: f'; Gab: f—voice leading.
M. 14, D2, note 1, FP and FSC: d"; Gab: c"-FP and FSC alter harmony by extending T2 pitch.
M. 14, A2, note 4, FP and FSC: f' minim; Gab: d' semiminim.
M. 14, T2, note 4, FP and FSC: minim; Gab: semiminim—alters harmony.
M. 15, A1, note 2, FP and FSC: f $\sharp^{\prime}$; Gab: d'.
M. 18, T1, note 2, FP and FSC: c'; Gab: c\#'.
M. 19 note $1-\mathrm{m}$. 22 note 3, D1, FP and FSC: "In Domino laudabitur, in Domino"; Gab: "laudabitur, in Domino laudabitur."
M. 19, B1, notes 2 and 3, FP and FSC: bb; Gab: b-BG: bb.
M. 22, D2, notes 2 and 3, FP and FSC: d' d'; Gab: g a-Gab pitches doubled by freely composed T2.
M. 23, T1, FP and FSC: minim rest, a minim, a semiminim, d' minim, cł' semiminim; Gab: minim rest, semiminim rest, a dotted semiminim, a fusa, d' semiminim, c廿' minim—creates suspension.
M. 23, T2, notes 1 and 2, FP and FSC: c'; Gab: $\mathrm{ct}^{\sharp}$.
M. 24, D2, note 6, FP and FSC: c $\sharp$ "; Gab: c".
M. 24, T2, notes 2 and 3, FP and FSC: d' minim, cł’ semiminim; Gab: d' semiminim, c ${ }^{\prime}$ ' minim-creates suspension.
M. 24 , BG, notes 3 and 4 , FP: $\sharp$ over note 3 .
Mm. 27-28, all, FP and FSC set "mansueti" as three syllables; Gab sets as four—all parts differ slightly.
M. 29, A1, note 2, FP and FSC: bb’; Gab: b'.
M. 29, BG, note 1, FP: f-T1: f'.
M. 29, BG, note 4, FP: f-T1: f'.
M. 30, D1, note 3, FP and FSC: c $\ddagger$ "; Gab: c".
M. 30, A1, note 1, FP and FSC: $\mathrm{f}^{\prime}$; Gab: $\mathrm{f} \sharp$ '.
M. 30, B2, FP and FSC: semibreve rest, d dotted minim, a semiminim; Gab: semibreve rest, semiminim rest, d minim, a semiminim-Gab matches other parts and BG.
M. 31, D1, note 4, FP and FSC: c $\ddagger$ "; Gab: c".
M. 31 note $1-\mathrm{m} .32$ note 1, D2, FP and FSC: d" minim, a’ semiminim, a’ minim, a’ minim; Gab: d' semiminim, d' semiminim, a minim, a semiminim-FP and FSC matches other parts.
M. 32, A1, note 1, FP and FSC: $\mathrm{f}^{\prime}$; Gab: $\mathrm{f} \sharp^{\prime}$.
M. 32, A2, note 2, FP and FSC: c'; Gab: c $\sharp$ '.
M. 34, A2, notes 2-6, FP and FSC: f' dotted minim, e' fusa, d' fusa, e' minim; Gab: f' semibreve, e' minim-ornament added.
M. 34, BG, note 1, FP: 65 figure.
M. 36, BG, note 3, FP: f-B2: g.
M. 37, T2, notes 2-6, FP and FSC: a dotted minim, $g \sharp$ fusa, $f$ fusa, $g$ minim; Gab: a semibreve, $g$ minim—ornament and $\sharp$ added.
M. 40, D1, note 2, FP and FSC: e"; Gab: c丸" -harmony altered in D2.
M. 40, D2, notes 2 and 3, FP and FSC: c"; Gab: a' in both overlapping parts-Gab: c\#" in Altus.
M. 42, T2, notes 2-6, FP and FSC: c' dotted minim, b fusa, a fusa, b minim; Gab: c' semibreve, b minim-ornament added.
M. 43 note 6-m. 44 note 2, A1, FP and FSC: e' e'; Gab: g' g'—revoiced with D2.
M. 43 note $2-$ m. 44 note 2, D2, FP and FSC: g' g' g'; Gab: e' e' e'-revoiced with A1.
M. 44, B1, note 4, FP: a; FSC and Gab: b.
M. 45, T1, FP and FSC: semibreve rest, minim rest.
M. 45, B2, note 4, FP and FSC: b; Gab: bb-b in BG.
M. 48, T1, note 1, FP and FSC: f'; Gab: f—BG: f.
M. 50, D2, note 2, FP and FSC: $g \sharp^{\prime}$; Gab: g'.
M. 52, T1, note 1, FP and FSC: c'; Gab: c $\sharp$ '- $\sharp$ in BG and D2.
M. 53, T1, note 1, FP and FSC: f'; Gab: f $\not{ }^{\prime}$.
M. 54, BG, note 2, FP: c-B2: d.
M. 55, A2, note 1, FP and FSC: f'; Gab: a'.
M. 55, B2, notes 1 and 2, FP and FSC: minim, minim; Gab: dotted minim, semiminim.
M. 56, T1, notes 2-4, FP and FSC: c' semiminim, g minim, b minim; Gab: g minim, b minim, b semiminim -FP/FSC adds complexity while Gab aligns with D1.
M. 56 note 5-m. 57 note 1, B1, FP and FSC: d'; Gab: d-voice leading.
M. 57, D1, notes 3-6, FP and FSC: f" fusa, d" fusa, f" minim, e" minim; Gab: f" dotted semiminim, $g$ " fusa, $a$ " minim, $a$ " semiminim—simplify syncopation and decrease range.
M. 57 note $1-\mathrm{m} .59$ note 1, A2, FP: "ni" on m. 57 note 6 and m. 58 note 2 (after page break in partbook) with "meis" melisma unclear; FSC: "ni" on m. 57 note 5 with "meis" melisma unclear; Gab: "ni" on m. 57 note 4 with melisma on "me" throughout m. 58-change of rhythmic values necessitates change in underlay.
M. 57, A2, notes 1-6, FP and FSC: d' semiminim, e' semiminim, f' semiminim, d' semiminim, e' minim, c' minim; Gab: d' dotted semiminim, e' fusa, f' semiminim, d' semiminim, e' semibreve-FP and FSC increases dissonance with D1.
M. 58 note $1-\mathrm{m} .59$ note 1, T1, FP and FSC: dotted breve; Gab: semibreve.
M. 58, A2, note 1, FP and FSC: f' minim, f' minim, f' minim; Gab: dotted semibreve.
M. 60, D1, notes 2-6, FP and FSC: d" dotted minim, c" fusa, b' fusa, c" minim; Gab: d" semibreve, c" minim-ornament added.
M. 61 note 4-m. 62 note 3, D2, FP and FSC: d" dotted minim, c" fusa, b' fusa, cł" minim; Gab: d" semibreve, c" minim—ornament and $\sharp$ added.
M. 61, A2, note 1, FP and FSC: minim rest, a’ minim; Gab: a' semibreve-should mirror A1 m. 59.
M. 62, A1, note 3, FP and FSC: f'; Gab: e'-mirror D1 m. 63, D2 m. 64.
M. 63, T1, note 1, FP and FSC: e'; Gab: a.
M. 64, T2, note 1, FP and FSC: semiminim rest, a semiminim; Gab: a minim—Gab matches other parts.
M. 64, BG, note 3, FP: semiminim-B1 and T2: minim.
M. 65, D1, note 3, FP and FSC: a'; Gab: a"-voice leading.
M. 65, A2, notes 3 and 4, FP: dotted semiminim, fusa; FSC and Gab: semiminim, semiminim.
M. 66, T1, notes 4 and 5, FP and FSC: dotted semiminim, fusa; Gab: semiminim, semiminim.
M. 67, D2, notes 3 and 4, FP and FSC: a' a'; Gab: c" c".
M. 69 note $4-\mathrm{m}$. 70 note 4 , A1, FP and FSC: $\mathrm{g}^{\prime}$ dotted minim, $\mathrm{f}^{\prime}$ fusa, e' fusa, $\mathrm{f} \sharp$ ' minim; Gab: g semibreve, f minim-ornament and $\sharp$ added.
M. 70, BG, note 1, FP: 6 figure exists but not raised.
M. 71 note $4-\mathrm{m}$. 72 note 3, A1, FP and FSC: minim, dotted minim, fusa, fusa with melisma on "trae; Gab: semibreve, semiminim, semiminim with melisma on melisma on "ves"-mirroring rhythmic values of added ornament in D2.
M. 71, T1, note $1, \mathrm{FP}$ and Gab: g; FSC: $\mathrm{g} \sharp$.
M. 71, D2, note 2, FP and FSC: c"; Gab: a'-FP and FSC create parallel octaves with T2.
M. 71 note $4-\mathrm{m} .72$ note 4 , D2, FP and FSC: $\mathrm{a}^{\prime}$ dotted minim, $\mathrm{g}^{\prime}$ fusa, $\mathrm{f}^{\prime}$ fusa, $\mathrm{g}^{\prime}$ minim; Gab: $\mathrm{a}^{\prime}$ semibreve, g' minim-ornament added.
M. 72, D1, note 2, FP and FSC: c" c"; Gab: ct" e"-avoid cross relation with T2.
M. 73, T1, notes 4 and 5, FP and FSC: c' e'; Gab: e' c'.
M. 73, T1, notes 4 and 5, FP and FSC: c' e'; Gab: e' c'.
M. 73, B1, note 2, FP and FSC: b; Gab: a-a in second iteration in m. 81.
M. 73, B1, note 3, FP and Gab: semiminim; FSC: minim.
M. 76, D1, note 4, FP and FSC: c $\ddagger$ "; Gab: c"-BG: $\sharp$.
M. 77 note $4-\mathrm{m}$. 78 note 4 , A1, FP and FSC: g' dotted minim, f' fusa, e' fusa, $\mathrm{f}^{\prime}$ minim; Gab: g' semibreve, $\mathrm{f}^{\prime}$ minim-ornament added.
M. 78, A1, note 4, FP and FSC: no accidental— $\#$ in BG and at first iteration in m. 70.
M. 78, BG, note 1, FP: 6 figure exists but not raised.
M. 79 note $4-$ m. 80 note 3 , A1, FP and FSC: minim, dotted minim, fusa, fusa; Gab: semibreve, semiminim, semiminim—FP and FSC: ij, but assumed to mirror mm. 71-72; Gab: explicit with melisma on "ves."
M. 79, T1, note 1, FP and FSC: g\#; Gab: g.
M. 79, D2, note 2, FP and FSC: c"; Gab: a'-FP and FSC create parallel octaves with T2.
M. 79 note $4-\mathrm{m} .80$ note 4, D2, FP and FSC: a' dotted minim, $\mathrm{g}^{\prime}$ fusa, $\mathrm{f}^{\prime}$ fusa, g ' minim; Gab: a' semibreve, g' minim-ornament added.
M. 80, D1, note 2, FP and FSC: c" c"; Gab: cł" e"-avoid cross relation with T2.
M. 81, T1, notes 4 and 5, FP and FSC: d' e'; Gab: e' c'-FP and FSC: c' e' at first iteration in m. 73.
M. 84, D1, note 2, FP and FSC: c $\ddagger$ "; Gab: c"-BG: $\sharp$.
M. 84, B1, notes 1 and 2, FP and FSC: semibreve, semibreve-minim, minim at first iteration in $m$. 76.
M. 85, D2, FP and FSC: minim rest, minim, minim, minim; Gab: minim, semibreve, minim—simplify syncopation.

## 7. Erhard Bodenschatz - Audi Hymnum

## Sources

FP - Bodenschatz Florilegium Portense (Leipzig, 1618)
FSC - Bodenschatz Florilegium Selectissimarum Cantionum (Leipzig, 1603)

| FP \#23 | FSC \#23 |
| :--- | :--- |
| Discantus (D1) | Discantus |
| Sextus (D2) | Sextus |
| Septima (A2) | Septima |
| Tenor (T1) | Tenor |
| Altus (A1) | Altus |
| Quintus (T2) | Quintus |
| Bassus (B1) | Bassus |
| Octava (B2) | Octava |
| Basis Generalis (BG) |  |

## Minor Discrepancies

M. 9, D2, note 5, FSC: explicit $\ddagger$ necessitated by line break.
M. 10, BG, notes 1 and 2, FP: 6 figure is over the dot of note 1 .
M. 19, T2, notes 1 and 2, FP: bb dotted minim, g semiminim; FSC: bb dotted minim, g semiminim, a semiminim, $b b$ dotted minim, $g$ semiminim-extraneous notes in FSC.
M. 26, BG, notes $1-3$, FP: 6 figure is between note 1 and note 2 .
M. 28, B1, note 4, FP: minim in Hamburg copy, semiminim in LOC copy; FSC: minim.
M. 28, BG, notes 5 and 6, FP: 6 figure is over note 5 .
M. 29, D2, note 2, FP: minim in Hamburg copy, semiminim in LOC and SLUB copies; FSC: minim.
M. 29 note 3-m. 30 note 4, A2, FP: explicit underlay; FSC: ij.
Mm. 30-32, T2, FP: "aperti, et aures tuae"; FSC: "et aures tuae intentae"-FP aligns with other parts.
M. 31, BG, notes 1 and 2, FP: 6 figure is over note 1 .
M. 34, BG, notes 1 and 2, FP: 6 figure is over note 1 .
M. 43, D1, note 2, FP and FSC: extraneous ij.
Mm. 43-45, T1, FP: explicit underlay; FSC underlay differs likely due to note discrepancies.
M. 43, BG, notes 5 and 6, FP: 6 figure is closer to note 6.
M. 44 note $3-\mathrm{m} .45$ note 6 , T1, FP: explicit underlay; FSC: ij.
M. 45 note $1-$ m. 46 note 4 , T1, FP: "istam, die ac nocte" with no melisma; FSC: "die, die ac nocte" with melisma on "noc"-caused by earlier text problem.
M. 50 note $5-\mathrm{m} .52$ note 1, D1, FP and FSC: ij missing.
M. 53, BG, notes 2 and 3, FP: 6 figure is over the dot of note 2 .
M. 57, BG, notes 2 and 3, FP: 6 figure is over note 2 .
M. 57, BG, notes 5 and 6, FP: 6 figure is over note 5 .
Mm. 58-60, T2, FP: "aperti, et aures tuae"; FSC: "et aures tuae intentae"-FP aligns with other parts as in mm. 30-32.
M. 63, BG, notes 1 and 2, FP: 6 figure is over note 1 .
M. 71 note $2-\mathrm{m}$. 72 note 2 , T1, FP: ij; FSC: "super domum"-rhythm is different.
M. 73, T1, notes 2 and 3, FP: included in ij; FSC: explicit underlay.
M. 80 note $2-\mathrm{m} .82$ note 1, D2, FP: ij; FSC: explicit underlay.

## Significant Discrepancies

M. 3, D2, note 2, FP: c"; FSC: bb'.
M. 11, BG, note 1, FP: erroneous 765 figure removed.
M. 28, T2, note 3, FP: d'; FSC: c'.
M. 32, BG, note 2, FP: erroneous 765 figure removed-perhaps intended for m .33.
M. 39, T2, notes 3 and 4, FP: minim, minim; FSC: semiminim, semiminim-FP: semiminim, semiminim at second iteration in m. 67.
M. 39, B2, notes 6 and 7, FP: dotted semiminim, fusa; FSC: semiminim, semiminim—BG: semiminim, semiminim.
M. 40, T1, FP: semibreve rest, minim rest; FSC: minim rest.
M. 42, BG, note 4, FP: minim—B2: semiminim.
M. 43 note 5-m. 44 note 2 , T1, FP: g semiminim, $g$ semiminim, c' semiminim, f minim; FSC: g minim, d' minim, semiminim rest.
M. 44, D1, note 1, FP: semiminim rest, c" semiminim; FSC: c" minim.
M. 49, B1, note 1, FP: semibreve; FSC: minim.
M. 56, T2, note 3, FP: d'; FSC: c'.
M. 57, A1, notes 4-6, FP and FSC: melisma on "per" on notes 4 through 6-match first iteration at m. 29 (no melisma).
M. 63, A2, note 2, FP and FSC: d'-f' at first iteration in m. 35.
M. 64, A1, note 1, FP: semiminim; FSC: minim.
M. 66, BG, note 5, FP: erroneous 6 figure removed.
M. 67, B2, notes 6 and 7, FP: dotted semiminim, fusa; FSC: semiminim, semiminim—BG: semiminim, semiminim.
M. 71 note $5-\mathrm{m}$. 72 note 2 , T1, FP: g semiminim, g semiminim, c' semiminim, f minim; FSC g minim, d' minim, semiminim rest,
M. 72, D1, note 1, FP: semiminim rest, c" semiminim; FSC: c" minim.
M. 74, D2, notes $1-3$, FP and FSC: b’, d", c"-bb’, d", c\#" at first iteration in m. 46; D1: bb; BG: $\sharp$.
M. 79, T1, note 1, FP: semiminim; FSC: minim—minim at first iteration in m. 51.
M. 80 note $2-$ m. 82 note 1, T2, FP: "die, die ac nocte"; FSC: "die ac nocte" with melisma on "noc"-FSC aligns with other parts.

## 15. Andrea Gabrieli - Exsultate, justi

## Sources

FP - Bodenschatz Florilegium Portense (Leipzig, 1618)
FSC - Bodenschatz Florilegium Selectissimarum Cantionum (Leipzig, 1603)
Gab - Gabrieli Concerti di Andrea et di Gio. Gabrieli (Venice, 1587) - pitch references below are transposed

| FP \#17 (d minor) | FSC \#17 (d minor) | Gab \#38 (a minor) | LU p. 279D |
| :--- | :--- | :--- | :--- |
| Discantus (D1) | Discantus | partbooks not equivalent |  |
| Altus (A1) | Altus | (arrangement) |  |
| Tenor (T1) | Tenor |  |  |
| Bassus (B1) | Bassus |  |  |
| Sextus (D2) | Sextus |  |  |
| Septima (A2) | Septima |  |  |
| Quintus (T2) | Quintus |  |  |
| Octava (B2) | Octava |  |  |
| Basis Generalis (BG) |  |  |  |

## Minor Discrepancies

M. 2, A1, FP: missing "justi, in."
M. 6 note $1-\mathrm{m} .9$ note 1, D1, FP and FSC: ij; Gab: explicit underlay.
M. 9 note $2-$ m. 12 note 3, D1, FP and FSC: ij; Gab: explicit underlay when parts correspond.
M. 13 note $1-$ m. 14 note 2, D1, FP: "rectus."
M. 19 note $4-\mathrm{m}$. 21 note 3, D1, FP and FSC: ij; Gab: explicit underlay.
M. 19 note $4-\mathrm{m} .21$ note 3, B1, FP and FSC: ij; Gab: explicit underlay.
M. 23 note 2-m. 24 note 3, D1, FP and FSC: ij; Gab: explicit underlay.
M. 23 note $2-$ m. 24 note 3, B1, FP and FSC: ij; Gab: explicit underlay.
M. 26 note 2-m. 27 note 3, T1, FP and FSC: ij; Gab: explicit underlay.
M. 26 note 2-m. 27 note 3, D2, FP and FSC: ij; Gab: explicit underlay.
M. 26 note $2-\mathrm{m} .27$ note 3, A2, FP and FSC: ij; Gab: explicit underlay.
M. 28 note 3-m. 29 note 2, D1, FP and FSC: ij; Gab: explicit underlay.
M. 28 note 3-m. 29 note 4, A1, FP and FSC: ij; Gab: explicit underlay.
M. 28 note 3-m. 29 note 4, T1, FP: ij; FSC and Gab: explicit underlay.
M. 28 note $9-$ m. 29 note 8, B1, FP: ij; FSC and Gab: explicit underlay.
M. 28 note 3-m. 29 note 2, D2, FP and FSC: ij; Gab: explicit underlay.
M. 28 note 5-m. 29 note 4, A2, FP and FSC: ij; Gab: explicit underlay.
M. 28 note $3-\mathrm{m}$. 29 note 2, T2, FP and FSC: ij; Gab: explicit underlay.
M. 29, D1, note 2, FP and FSC: explicit eদ.
M. 37, D2, note 3, FP and FSC: $f \sharp$ "; Gab: f".
M. 38 note 2-m. 39 note 2, D1, FP and FSC: ij; Gab: explicit underlay.
M. 39, B1, note 3, FP and FSC: ct’'; Gab: c'. $^{\text {' }}$
Mm. 45-46, A1, FP: missing ij; FSC: ij; Gab: explicit underlay.
Mm. 45-46, B1, FP and FSC: ij; Gab: explicit underlay.
M. 45 note $7-$ m. 46 note 6, A2, FP and FSC: ij; Gab: explicit underlay.
M. 60, A2, note 2, FP and FSC: f\#; Gab: f.
M. 68 note $4-\mathrm{m} .70$ note 3, A2, FP and FSC: ij; Gab: explicit underlay.
M. 71 note 5-m. 72 note 4, D2, FP and FSC: ij; Gab: explicit underlay.
M. 71 note $5-\mathrm{m} .72$ note 4, A2, FP and FSC: ij; Gab: explicit underlay.
M. 72 note $5-\mathrm{m} .74$ note 3, D1, FP and FSC: ij; Gab: explicit underlay.
M. 72, D1, note 6, FP and FSC: explicit e $\ddagger$; Gab: e.
M. 72, T1, notes 2-6, FP and FSC: ij; Gab: explicit underlay.
M. 72 note $2-$ m. 73 note 2, B2, FP and FSC: ij; Gab: explicit underlay.
M. 73, T1, FP and FSC: ij; Gab: explicit underlay.
M. 73 note 3-m. 74 note 2, D2, FP and FSC: ij; Gab: explicit underlay.
M. 73 note $3-\mathrm{m}$. 74 note 2, A2, FP and FSC: ij; Gab: explicit underlay.
M. 73 note 3-m. 74 note 2, B2, FP and FSC: ij; Gab: explicit underlay.
M. 76 note $4-\mathrm{m} .78$ note 3, A2, FP and FSC: ij; Gab: explicit underlay.
M. 79 note 5-m. 80 note 4, D2, FP and FSC: ij; Gab: explicit underlay.
M. 80, D1, note 6, FP and FSC: explicit eł; Gab: e.
M. 80 note $5-\mathrm{m} .81$ note 2 , D2, FP and FSC: ij; Gab: explicit underlay.
M. 80, A2, notes 5 and 6, FP and FSC: ij; Gab: explicit underlay.
M. 80 note $2-\mathrm{m}$. 81 note 2, B2, FP and FSC: ij; Gab: explicit underlay.
M. 81 note $4-\mathrm{m} .82$ note 2, D1, FP and FSC: ij; Gab: explicit underlay.
M. 81, T1, FP and FSC: ij; Gab: explicit underlay.
M. 81 note $3-\mathrm{m} .82$ note 2, A2, FP and FSC: ij; Gab: explicit underlay.
M. 81 note $3-$ m. 82 note 2, B2, FP and FSC: ij; Gab: explicit underlay.
M. 82 note $3-\mathrm{m}$. 84 note 1, B2, FP: ij; FSC and Gab: explicit underlay.

## Significant Discrepancies

M. 4, A1, note 3, FP: fusa; FSC and Gab: semiminim.
M. 5 , BG, note 1 , erroneous $\sharp$ removed.
M. 6, B1, note 3, FP and FSC: g; Gab: c'.
M. 10, A2, note 3, FP and FSC: a'; Gab: a' in Nona, f' in Decima.
M. 16, D1, note 4, FP and FSC: c $\ddagger$ "; Gab: c".
M. 16, BG, note 1, FP: c-hand-corrected in Munich copy.
M. 17, T1, FP: semibreve rest; FSC: minim rest.
M. 17, D2, note 1, FP and FSC: $\mathrm{f} \sharp$ "; d".
M. 19, A1, note 2, FP and FSC: g'; Gab: g.
M. 21, D2, note 3, FP and FSC: f"; Gab: a"-range.
M. 21 note $4-\mathrm{m} .22$ note 3 , D2, FP: melisma on "in" from m. 21 note 4 through m. 22 note 2; FSC unclear; Gab: melisma on "ci" from m. 22 note 1 through note 3-mirror D1 m. 23 and 24, which is ij in FP.
M. 22, D2, note 4, FP and FSC: c $\ddagger$ "; Gab: c".
M. 22, BG, note 1, FP: figure is 655 -extraneous 5 removed.
M. 24, D1, note 2, FP and FSC: $\mathrm{f}_{\neq \prime}$; Gab: f'.
M. 24 note $4-$ m. 25 note 1, D1, FP and FSC: c"; Gab: g'-revoiced with D2 and A2.
M. 24 note $1-\mathrm{m} .25$ note 1, D2, FP and FSC: e"; Gab: c" in Altus, e" in Cantus—revoiced with D1 and A2.
M. 24 note $1-$ m. 25 note 1, A2, FP and FSC: g'; Gab: e" (upcoming quotation is transposed)-revoiced with D1 and D2.
M. 24, T2, notes 2 and 3, FP and FSC: a c'; Gab: d' g—FP and FSC double B1.
M. 24, BG, note 1, FP: 3 figure exists but not raised.
M. 26, D2, note 2, FP and FSC: c"; Gab: g'-voice leading.
M. 27, T1, note 3, FP and FSC: c'; Gab: e'-both pitches are doubled, Gab is better voice leading.
M. 28, D1, note 5, FP and FSC: g'; Gab: d".
M. 28, T2, note 1, FP and FSC: a; Gab: d'.
M. 29, A1, note 3, FP and FSC: $\mathrm{f} \sharp$; Gab: $\mathrm{f}-\mathrm{f}$ " in D2.
M. 29, T2, note 1, FP and FSC: a; Gab: d'-voice leading (avoid parallel octaves after change to D1 in m .27 ); also mirrors previous measure.
M. 30, A1, notes 1 and 2, FP: "li" on note 1; FSC and Gab: "li" on note 2.
M. 31, D2, notes 2-5, FP and FSC: f" dotted minim, e" fusa, d" fusa; Gab: f" semibreve-ornament added.
Mm. 34-38, T1, FP: minim rest; FSC: semibreve rest, longa rest, breve rest, semibreve rest, minim rest.
M. 36, A1, notes 2 and 3, FP and FSC: a' semibreve, g' minim—parallel unison with D1.
M. 36, D2, note 4, FP and FSC: g"; Gab: g'-voice leading.
M. 39, A2, FP and FSC: longa rest-should be breve rest.
M. 40, T1, note 1, FP and FSC: d'; Gab: a-d' results in no fifth.
M. 41, T2, note 1, FP and FSC: g; Gab: c'.
M. 42, T1, notes 1 and 2, FP: "e" melisma starts on note 1; FSC and Gab: melisma starts on note 2.
M. 43 note $1-\mathrm{m} .44$ note 2 , A1, FP and FSC simplify syncopation in Gab.
M. 44, T1, notes 1 and 2, FP and FSC: semiminim rest, minim, semiminim; Gab: minim, minim—perhaps prefiguring D 2 m .45.
M. 45, T1, notes 4-6, FP and FSC: a a a; Gab: a' a' a'.
M. 45 note 2-m. 46 note 3, D2, FP and FSC: d" d" d" d"; Gab: d' d' d' d'.
M. 52, D1, note 4, FP and FSC: c"; Gab: d"-repetition of d" on same syllable due to change in text is awkward.
M. 52 note $4-\mathrm{m} .53$ note 2, D2, FP and FSC: d" cł" d"; Gab: g' c" a'—FP and FSC change cadence here.
M. 53, A2, note 3, FP and FSC: $\mathrm{f} \sharp$ '; Gab: f'—different cadence.
Mm. 53-54, BG, bar line missing.
M. 54, A2, notes 1-3, FP and FSC: a' semiminim, g' fusa, f' fusa; Gab: a' minim—added ornament.
M. 54, T2, note 2, FP and FSC: d; Gab: d'.
M. 55, all, Gab: all parts have at least a semibreve rest; FP and FSC rework to erase silence, offsetting the rest of the piece.
M. 56 note $3-$ m. 57 note 1, B1, FP and FSC: d'; Gab (m. 57, note 2): d.
M. 56 , BG, note 1 , erroneous $\sharp$ removed.
M. 57, D1, notes 3 and 4, FP and FSC: minim, minim; Gab (m. 58, notes 1 and 2): dotted minim, semiminim.
M. 58, A1, note 1, FP and FSC: g'; Gab (m. 58, note 4): e'-less conflict with suspension in D2.
M. 58, T2, note 2, FP and FSC: a; Gab (m. 59, note 1): f'.
M. 60, BG, note 2, FP: 3 figure exists but not raised.
M. 62 note $1-\mathrm{m} .63$ note 2, T1, FP and FSC: melisma on "ri" from m. 62 note 4 through m. 63 note 2 ; Gab ( m .63 , notes $1-3$ ): melisma on "git" on m .62 notes $1-3-\mathrm{FP} / \mathrm{FSC}$ melisma includes repeated pitches; Gab melisma aligns better with other voices.
M. 62 note $3-\mathrm{m} .63$ note 1, B1, FP and FSC: d'; Gab (m. 63 note $3-\mathrm{m} .64$ note 1): d.
M. 63, D1, notes 3 and 4, FP and FSC: minim, minim; Gab (m. 64, notes 3 and 4): dotted minim, semiminim.
M. 64, A1, note 1, FP and FSC: g'; Gab (m. 65, note 1): e'-less conflict with suspension in D2.
M. 64, T2, note 2, FP and FSC: a; Gab (m. 65, note 2): f'.
M. 65 note $2-$ m. 66 note 1, A1, FP: "ju" on m. 65 note 3; FSC and Gab: "ju" on m. 65 note 2 with clear melisma on "di."
M. 65 note $4-\mathrm{m} .66$ note 1, T1, FP and FSC: g a; Gab (m. 66 note-m. 67 note 1 ): bb d'—match FP/FSC m. 59-60.
M. $65, \mathrm{BG}, \mathrm{FP}: 76$ figure is over note 1 , but should be over note 4 .
Mm. 67-68, T1, FP rests: semibreve, breve, semibreve; FSC: semibreve, breve, minim; Gab (mm. 68-69): breve, semibreve, minim-FP is incorrect, Gab matches barlines best.
M. 74, A2, note 1, FP and FSC: a' minim; Gab (m. 75, notes 1-4): a' fusa, g' semifusa, f' semifusa, e' semiminim-omits ornament from Gab.
M. 76, BG, notes 2 and 3, FP: 6 figure is placed over accidental for note 3, but should be over note 2 .
M. 82, A2, note 1, FP and FSC: a' minim; Gab (m. 83, notes 1-4): a' fusa, g' semifusa, f' semifusa, e' semiminim-omits ornament from Gab.
M. 83, B1, note 2, FP and FSC: g; Gab (m. 84, note 2): d.

## 17. Albinus Fabricius - Deus canticum novum

## Sources

FP - Bodenschatz Florilegium Portense (Leipzig, 1618)
FSC - Bodenschatz Florilegium Selectissimarum Cantionum (Leipzig, 1603)
Fab - Fabricius Cantiones sacrae (Graz, 1595)
LU - Liber Usualis (New York, 1962)
FP \#17 FSC \#17 Fab \#14 LU p. 308 and 775
Discantus (D1) Discantus Quinta
Sextus (D2) Sextus Discantus
Altus (A)
Tenor (T1)
Quintus (T2)
Altus Altus
Tenor Sexta
Quintus Tenor
Bassus (B) Bassus Bassus
Basis Generalis (BG)

## Minor Discrepancies

M. 3 note 3-m. 5 note 1, A, FP and FSC: ij; Fab: explicit underlay.
M. 4, A, note 3, FP and FSC: bb; Fab: bদ.
Mm. 12-14, D1, FP and FSC: explicit underlay; Fab: ij.
M. 12, T1, note 2, FP and FSC: f; Fab: f $\sharp$.
M. 12 note $2-$ m. 14 note 3, T2, FP and FSC: explicit underlay; Fab: ij.
M. 16 note $2-$ m. 17 note 1 , B, FP: semibreve rest, minim rest, minim rest; FSC and Fab: minim rest, semibreve rest, minim rest-FSC and Fab follow barlines.
M. 17 note $1-\mathrm{m} .18$ note 4, B, FP and FSC: ij; Fab: explicit underlay.
M. 19, A, note 4, FP and FSC: bb; Fab: b .
M. 33, A, notes 2 and 3, FP and FSC: ij; Fab: explicit underlay.
Mm. 36-37, A, FP and FSC: breve rest; Fab: semibreve rest, semibreve rest.
Mm. 37-40, A, FP and FSC: explicit underlay; Fab: ij.
M. 37 note $5-$ m. 40 note 1, T1, FP and FSC: ij; Fab: explicit underlay.
M. 43 note $3-$ m. 45 note 2, A, FP and FSC: ij; Fab: explicit underlay.
M. 43 note $1-\mathrm{m} .45$ note 1 , T2, FP: melisma on "in" on m. 43 notes 1-3; FSC: melisma unclear;

Fab: ij.
Mm. 44-47, D2, FP and FSC: ij; Fab: explicit underlay.
M. 45 note 3-m. 47 note 1, A, FP and FSC: explicit underlay; Fab: ij.
M. 45 note $2-$ m. 47 note 1, T2, FP and FSC: ij; Fab: explicit underlay.
M. 46, D2, notes 4 and 5, FP and FSC: c" bb'; Fab: cł" bb’ .
M. 47 note $2-$ m. 49 note 1, D1, FP and FSC: ij; Fab: explicit underlay.
M. 47 note 1-m. 49 note 1, T1, FP: explicit underlay; FSC and Fab: ij.
Mm. 47-48, T2, FP and FSC: breve rest, minim rest; Fab: semibreve rest, semibreve rest, minim rest.
M. 54, T1, note 6, FP and FSC: f; Fab: f $\sharp$.
Mm. 57-60, D1, FP and FSC: ij; Fab: explicit underlay.
M. 64 note 3-m. 65 note 4, D1, FP and FSC: explicit underlay; Fab: ij.
M. 65 note 1-m. 67 note 2, T1, FP and FSC: explicit underlay; Fab: ij.
M. 67 note 1-m. 68 note 2, T2, FP and FSC: ij; Fab: explicit underlay.
M. 68 note 3-m. 70 note 1, T2, FP and FSC: explicit underlay; Fab: ij.
M. 70, A, notes 3 and 4, FP and FSC: bb c'; Fab: b $\ddagger$ c $\sharp^{\prime}$.
M. 72 note 2-m. 74 note 1, T1, FP and FSC: ij; Fab: explicit underlay-clarifies melisma.
Mm. 73-74, T2, FP: "bo" appears near m. 73 note 1; FSC and Fab: "bo" appears under m. 74 note 1.

## Significant Discrepancies

M. 8, BG, FP: b only.
M. 11, B, note 3, FP: e minim, eb semiminim; FSC and Fab: eb semiminim.
M. 12, BG, note 1, FP: 65 figure is horizontal.
M. 14 note $2-\mathrm{m} .15$ note 1, A, FP and FSC: semibreve, minim rest; Fab: dotted semibreve, no rest-match D1.
M. 19, B, FP and FSC: melisma on "de" (notes 1-3); Fab: melisma on "chor" (notes 3-5)—BG matches FP and FSC melisma.
M. 20, A, note 3, FP: c' but with stem down (all other c' notes have stem up); FSC and Fab: d'.
M. 20, BG, note 2, FP: dotted semiminim.
M. 29, T2, notes 3 and 4, FP and FSC: c' and bb fusae; Fab: c' semiminim-better voice leading.
M. 33 note $3-$ m. 34 note 1, BG, FP: two semibreves with distinct syllables and no tie-B1: breve.
M. 36 note $5-$ m. 37 note 2, T1, FP and FSC: minim, minim; Fab: dotted minim, semiminim-match D1 in m. 35 and D2 in m. 39.
M. 37, BG, note 1, FP: 65 figure is horizontal.
M. 46, BG, note 3, FP: 3 figure exists but not raised.
Mm. 47-50, B, FP and FSC: ij only; Fab: ij then "tua", indicating no melisma within the ij besides the ligature.
M. 48, BG, note 3, erroneous 56 figure removed.
M. 49, BG, FP: 7 figure exists but not lowered.
M. 53, BG, notes 3 and 4, FP: 65 -should be reversed.
M. 54 note $4-$ m. 55 note 1, D1, FP: "rum" on m. 55 note 1; FSC and Fab: melisma on "rum" starting on m .54 note 4.
M. 54, BG, note 4, FP: 6 figure exists but not raised.
M. 63, BG, note 3, FP: minim-B: semibreve.
M. 64, T1, FP: "bo" on note 3; FSC and Fab: melisma on "bo" starting on note 1.
M. 66, BG, notes 3 and 4, FP: clef change missing until next line which occurs at m. 67 note 1 .
M. 67, BG, note 2, erroneous 6 figure removed.
M. 70, BG, note 1, FP: 3 figure exists but not raised.
M. 70 , BG, note 2 , erroneous $\sharp$ removed.
M. 73, A, notes 2 and 3, FP and FSC: semibreve minim; Fab: minim semibreve.

## 22. Albinus Fabricius - Exaudiat te Dominus

## Sources

FP - Bodenschatz Florilegium Portense (Leipzig, 1618)
FSC - Bodenschatz Florilegium Selectissimarum Cantionum (Leipzig, 1603)
Fab - Fabricius Cantiones sacrae (Graz, 1595)
LU - Liber Usualis (New York, 1962)
FP \#22
Sextus (D2)
Discantus (D1)
Altus (A)
Tenor (T1)
Quintus (T2)
FSC \#22 Fab \#25 LU p. 929
Sextus Discantus
Discantus Quinta
Altus Altus
Tenor Tenor
Quintus Sexta
Bassus (B) Bassus Bassus
Basis Generalis (BG)

## Minor Discrepancies

M. 3, A, note 3, FP and FSC: f'; Fab: f $\ddagger$ '.
M. 5, D1, note 9, FSC has an odd tail on this note.
M. 9, A, notes 3 and 4, FP: g' $g \not \sharp^{\prime}$; FSC: g' g'; Fab: $g \not \sharp^{\prime} g^{\prime}$.
M. 11 note $8-$ m. 12 note 5, D1, FP and FSC: ij; Fab: explicit underlay.
M. 11 note $4-\mathrm{m} .12$ note 2, A, FP and FSC: ij; Fab: explicit underlay.
M. 14, A, note 3, FP and FSC: $\mathrm{f}^{\prime}$; Fab: $\mathrm{f} \sharp$ '.
M. 18 note 1-m. 19 note 1, D1, FP and FSC: explicit underlay; Fab: ij.
M. 18 note 1-m. 19 note 1, A, FP and FSC: ij; Fab: explicit underlay-clarifies melisma.
M. 18 note $1-\mathrm{m} .19$ note 1, B, FP and FSC: explicit underlay; Fab: ij.
M. 22, D1, note 5, FP and FSC: c"; Fab: c\#".
M. 23 note $2-$ m. 25 note 1, D1, FP and FSC: ij; Fab: explicit underlay.
M. 24, A, FP and FSC: $\mathrm{g}^{\prime}$; Fab: $\mathrm{g} \not \mathrm{f}$ '.
M. 26, A, note 1 , FP: syllable missing.
M. 26 note 7-m. 27 note 1, A, FP: "se" syllable appears on m. 27 note 1; FSC and Fab: "se" appears on m .26 note 7.
M. 27, BG, notes 3 and 4, FP: figures are shifted right, over the clef change.
M. 30, B, note 3, FP and FSC: f; Fab: f $\sharp$.
M. 31, D1, note 4, FP and FSC: f "; Fab: $\mathrm{f} \not \mathrm{\#}$ ".
M. 31, B, note 3, FP and FSC: f; Fab: f $\sharp$.
M. 31 note $7-$ m. 32 note 6 , B, FP and FSC: ij; Fab: explicit underlay.
M. 34 note 3-m. 35 note 2, T1, FP: ij; FSC and Fab: explicit underlay.
M. 35 note $1-$ m. 36 note 2, T2, FP and FSC: ij; Fab: explicit underlay.
Mm. 36-38, D1, FP and FSC: explicit underlay; Fab: ij.
M. 36, B, notes 3-7, FP and FSC: ij; Fab: explicit underlay.
M. 37 note 2-m. 38 note 1, D2, FP and FSC: underlay unclear.
M. 37, D2, note 6, FP and FSC: c"; Fab: c\#".
M. 41 note $4-$ m. 42 note 1, T2, FP and FSC: ij; Fab: explicit underlay.
M. 42, B, notes 2-5, FP and FSC: explicit underlay; Fab: included in ij.
Mm. 46-47, T2, FP and Fab: ij; FSC: explicit underlay.
M. 46 note $1-$ m. 47 note 1, B, FP and FSC: ij; Fab: explicit underlay.
M. 49 note $7-$ m. 50 note 6, D2, FP and FSC: ij; Fab: explicit underlay.
M. 49 note $7-$ m. 50 note 6, T2, FP and FSC: explicit underlay; Fab: ij.
M. 50 note $7-$ m. 51 note 6, D2, FP and FSC: ij missing; Fab: ij.
M. 50 note $8-$ m. 51 note 6, D1, FP and FSC: ij; Fab: explicit underlay.
M. 50 note $7-\mathrm{m} .51$ note 7, A, FP and FSC: ij; Fab: explicit underlay.
M. 50 note $7-$ m. 51 note 6, T1, FP and FSC: ij; Fab: explicit underlay.
M. 50 note $7-$ m. 51 note 6, T2, FP and FSC: ij; Fab: explicit underlay.
M. 50 note $7-$ m. 51 note 6, B, FP: ij; FSC and Fab: explicit underlay.

## Significant Discrepancies

M. 5 note 6-m. 6 note 1, D1, FP and FSC: "nis" on m. 5 note 6 with melisma; Fab: "nis" on m. 6 note 1 -unify with majority of parts.
M. 10 note $8-$ m. 11 note 1, T1, FP: c' c'; FSC and Fab: a a.
M. 11, A, notes 1-3, FP and FSC: "to" on note 3; Fab: "to" on note 1 with melisma through note 3 -unify with T2 and B.
M. 13 note $5-\mathrm{m} .14$ note 1 , A, FP: dotted minim; FSC and Fab: minim.
M. 21, A, note 1, FP: dotted semiminim; FSC and Fab: dotted minim.
M. 27, A, notes 4-7, FP: no clear melisma; FSC: melisma on "tu"; Fab melisma on "um"-FSC aligns better with other parts; could be implied in Fab to be on the stronger syllable.
M. 29, BG, note 3 , erroneous 6 figure removed.
M. 34, A, notes 3 and 4, FP: two fusae; FSC and Fab: two semifusae.
M. 34, A, FP: semibreve rest, minim rest; FSC and Fab: minim rest.
M. 38, A, note 1, FP and FSC: $f \natural^{\prime} ;$ Fab: f $\sharp$ '.
M. 40, BG, notes 5 and 6, FP: $6-5$ over note 5 -this is backwards.
Mm. 49-50, BG, barline missing.
M. 54, A, FP and FSC: $a \neq ’$; Fab: $a^{\prime}$.

## 23. Albinus Fabricius - Sis praesens Deus

## Sources

FP - Bodenschatz Florilegium Portense (Leipzig, 1618)
FSC - Bodenschatz Florilegium Selectissimarum Cantionum (Leipzig, 1603)
Fab - Fabricius Cantiones sacrae (Graz, 1595)

FP \#23
Discantus (D1)
Sextus (D2)
Altus (A)
Quintus (T2)
Tenor (T1)
Bassus (B)
Basis Generalis (BG)

FSC \#23 Fab \#9
Discantus Quinta
Sextus Discantus
Altus Altus
Quintus Sexta
Tenor Tenor
Bassus Bassus

## Minor Discrepancies

M. 2, D2, notes 2 and 3, FP: alma; FSC and Fab: alme.
M. 3 note 3-m. 4 note 1, A, melisma unclear in FP.
M. 12, A, note 1, FP: Viscere; FSC and Fab: Visere.
M. 13, T1, notes 3 and 4, FSC: $\mathrm{g} \sharp \mathrm{f} 4$.
M. 13, T1, note 7, FP and FSC: f $\sharp$; Fab: f.
M. 15 note $4-\mathrm{m} .16$ note 3, A, FP and FSC: ij; Fab: explicit underlay.
M. 16, D1, note 1, FSC and FP: explicit 4 .
M. 29, A, note 1, explicit $\ddagger$ in all sources.
M. 31 note 5-m. 33 note 4, D2, FP and FSC: explicit underlay; Fab: ij.
M. 33 note 5-m. 35 note 4, D1, FP and FSC: explicit underlay; Fab: ij.
M. 33 note 1-m. 35 note 4, T2, FP and FSC: explicit underlay; Fab: ij.
M. 33 note $1-$ m. 35 note 4, B, FP and FSC: explicit underlay; Fab: ij.
M. 35 note $5-$ m. 38 note 1, D1, FP and FSC: ij; Fab: explicit underlay.
M. 35 note 1-m. 38 note 1, D2, FP and FSC: ij; Fab: explicit underlay.
M. 35 note 5-m. 38 note 1, A, FP and Fab: explicit underlay; FSC only: ij.
M. 35 note 5-m. 38 note 1, T2, FP and FSC: ij; Fab: explicit underlay-use of FP altered notes necessitates angle brackets here.
M. 35 note 1-m. 38 note 1, T1, FP and FSC: explicit underlay; Fab: ij.
M. 35 note 5-m. 38 note 1, B, FP and FSC: ij; Fab: explicit underlay.

## Significant Discrepancies

M. 3, T1, note 4, FP: bb semiminim; FSC and Fab: c' minim.
Mm. 3-4, BG, barline omitted.
M. 6, A, notes 2-6, FP and FSC: melisma on "tol"; Fab: melisma on "le" or implied.
Mm. 8-9, BG, barline omitted.
M. 13, T1, notes 1 and 2, FP: two seminims; FSC and Fab: minim.
M. 13, T1, notes 7 and 8, FP: fusa; Fab and FSC: semifusa.
M. 15, BG, notes 4 and 5, FP: semiminim, dotted semiminim—match rhythm of other parts.
M. 18, A, notes 1-6, FP and FSC: melisma on "ar;" Fab: melisma on "ce" or implied.
M. 18, A, notes 3 and 4, FP: fusa; Fab and FSC: semifusa.
M. 22, A, note 1, FP: c $\sharp^{\prime}$; Fab and FSC: c'.
M. 29, A, notes 3 and 4, FP: fusa; Fab and FSC: semifusa.
M. 35, A, notes 4 and 5, FP: dotted minim and semiminim; FSC and Fab: two minims.
M. 36, T2, note 3, FP and Fab: bb; FSC: $c^{\prime}$.
M. 37, T2, note 4, FP only: additional c' semibreve before longa.
Mm. 37-38, BG, barline omitted.

## 38. Albinus Fabricius - Non vos relinquam

## Sources

FP - Bodenschatz Florilegium Portense (Leipzig, 1618)
FSC - Bodenschatz Florilegium Selectissimarum Cantionum (Leipzig, 1603)
Fab - Fabricius Cantiones sacrae (Graz, 1595)
LU - Liber Usualis (New York, 1962)

| FP \#38 | FSC \#38 | Fab \#4 | LU p. 899-900 |
| :--- | :--- | :--- | :--- |
| Discantus (D1) | Discantus | Discantus |  |
| Sextus (D2) | Sextus | Quintus |  |
| Altus (A) | Altus | Altus |  |
| Tenor (T1) | Tenor | Tenor |  |
| Quintus (T2) | Quintus | Sexta |  |
| Bassus (B) | Bassus | Bassus |  |
| Basis Generalis (BG) |  |  |  |

## Minor Discrepancies

M. 8 note $1-\mathrm{m} .12$ note 1, D1, FP and FSC: explicit underlay; Fab: ij.
M. 9 note 1-m. 11 note 1, D1, melisma clearer in FSC than FP.
M. 10 note $1-\mathrm{m} .13$ note 1, B, lyrics explicit in FSC only.
M. 13, BG , note 1,43 figure is over the barline rather than the note.
M. 14 note 1-m. 17 note 4, D2, FP and FSC: ij; Fab: explicit underlay.
M. 14 note $4-$ m. 17 note 3, T2, FP and FSC: ij; Fab: explicit underlay.
M. 14 note $1-\mathrm{m} .17$ note 2, B, FP and FSC: ij; Fab: explicit underlay.
M. 17 note 1-m. 20 note 1, D1, FP and FSC: explicit underlay; Fab: ij.
M. 17 note $4-$ m. 21 note 2, T2, FP and FSC: explicit underlay; Fab: ij.
M. 19 note $1-$ m. 21 note 3, D2, FP and FSC: explicit underlay; Fab: ij.
M. 20 note $2-$ m. 24 note 1, D1, FP and FSC: ij; Fab: explicit underlay.
M. 20, A, notes 2-4, melisma clearer in FSC than FP.
M. 21 note 4-m. 24 note 1, A, FP and FSC: explicit underlay; Fab: ij.
M. 21 note 3-m. 24 note 1, T2, FP and FSC: ij; Fab: explicit underlay.
M. 22 note 1-m. 24 note 4, D2, FP and FSC: ij; Fab: explicit underlay.
M. 25 note $2-$ m. 26 note 3, T1, FP and FSC: ij; Fab: explicit underlay.
M. 26, T2, notes 2-5, FP: ij; FSC and Fab: explicit underlay.
M. 28 note 2-m. 30 note 1, T2, FP and FSC: ij; Fab: explicit underlay.
M. 38, all, FSC time signatures are ${ }_{3}^{2}$ rather than ${ }_{2}^{3}$.
M. 40 note 1-m. 41 note 3, D1, FP: two iterations of ij; FSC: ij; Fab: explicit underlay.
M. 40 note $1-$ m. 41 note 1, A, FP and FSC: ij; Fab: explicit underlay.
M. 40 note $1-$ m. 41 note 3, T1, FP and FSC: ij; Fab: explicit underlay.
M. 41 note $2-$ m. 43 note 1, A, FP and FSC: ij; Fab: explicit underlay.
M. 42 note 1-m. 43 note 1, D1, FP and FSC: explicit underlay; Fab: ij.
M. 42 note 1-m. 43 note 1, T1, FP: ij; FSC and Fab: explicit underlay.
M. 42 note $1-$ m. 43 note 1, T2, FP: ij; FSC and Fab: explicit underlay.
M. 42 note $1-$ m. 43 note 1, B, FP and FSC: ij; Fab: explicit underlay.
M. 43 note $2-$ m. 45 note 1, T2, FP and Fab: explicit underlay; FSC: ij.
M. 44 note $1-$ m. 45 note 1, A, FP and FSC: explicit underlay; Fab: ij.
M. 46 note 1-m. 47 note 1, D2, FP and FSC: ij; Fab: explicit underlay.
M. 46 note 1-m. 47 note 1, T1, FP and FSC: ij; Fab: explicit underlay.
M. 46 note $1-$ m. 47 note 1, T2, FP: ij; FSC and Fab: explicit underlay.
M. 46 note $1-$ m. 47 note 3, B, FP and FSC: ij; Fab: explicit underlay.
M. 47, A, note 1, explicit দ in FP and FSC but not in Fab.
M. 48 note 1-m. 49 note 4, D1, FP and FSC: ij; Fab: explicit underlay.
M. 48 note 1-m. 49 note 3, T2, FP and FSC: ij; Fab: explicit underlay.
M. 49 note $2-\mathrm{m} .51$ note 1, A, FP and FSC: ij; Fab: explicit underlay.
M. 50 note $1-\mathrm{m} .51$ note 1, D1, FP and FSC: explicit underlay; Fab: ij.
M. 50 note $1-\mathrm{m} .51$ note 5, T1, FP: ij; FSC and Fab: explicit underlay.
M. 50 note $1-\mathrm{m} .51$ note 5, B, FP and FSC: ij; Fab: explicit underlay.
M. 51 note $2-$ m. 53 note 1, D1, FP and FSC: ij; Fab: explicit underlay.
M. 51 note 2-m. 53 note 1, D2, FP and FSC: ij; Fab: explicit underlay.
M. 51 note $2-$ m. 53 note 1, T2, FP: ij; FSC and Fab: explicit underlay.
M. 52, A, notes 1 and 2, coloration not present in Fab.
M. 52 note $1-\mathrm{m} .53$ note 1, T1, FP and FSC: ij; Fab: explicit underlay.
M. 52 note $1-$ m. 53 note 1, B, FP and FSC: ij; Fab: explicit underlay.

## Significant Discrepancies

M. 2, A, note 2, FP: semiminim; FSC and Fab: minim.
M. 3, D1, notes 3-5, melisma only clear in Fab.
M. 5, D2, notes 3-5, melisma only clear in Fab.
M. 6, D1, note 1, FP: $f \sharp{ }_{\#}^{\prime}$; FSC and Fab: f'—\# in BG.
M. 11, BG, notes 2 and 3, 6 figure over note 2 should be over note 3 .
$\mathrm{Mm} .14-15$, BG , barline is not printed although space appears.
M. 28, BG, notes $1-3,6-5$ figure is printed over note 1 but should be over note 3 .
M. 30, BG, note 1, FP: d-B: Bb.
M. 32 note $2-$ m. 33 note 1, D2, FP and FSC: missing word "et"; syllablification adjusted—should mirror T2 part in m. 36.
Mm. 34-35, BG, barline missing.
Mm. 38-53, BG, FP: measures in BG contain six semibreves-dotted barlines are editorial.
Mm. 41-42, BG, barline missing.
M. 51, T1, notes 2-5, Fab has an additional ij here, but disregarded-doesn't match general text setting or bassus part.

## 49. Jacob Handl - Cantate Domino

## Sources

FP - Bodenschatz Florilegium Portense (Leipzig, 1618)
FSC - Bodenschatz Florilegium Selectissimarum Cantionum (Leipzig, 1603)
OM1 - Handl Opus Musicum Tomus Primus (Prague, 1586)
VUL1822 - ed. Leander van Ess Biblia Sacra Vulgatae Editionis (Tübingen, 1824) - with 1590
variants to match OM1
FP \#49
Discantus (D1)
Altus (A1)
Tenor (T1)
Bassus (B1)
Sextus (D2)
Septima (A2)
Quintus (T2)
FSC \#49 OM1 \#35
VUL1822, vol. II, p. 123

Octava (B2)
Basis Generalis (BG)
Discantus partbooks not equivalent
Altus (arrangement)

Tenor
Bassus
Sextus
Septima
Quintus
Octava

## Minor Discrepancies

M. 11 note $2-\mathrm{m} .12$ note 1, D1, FP and FSC: ij; OM1: explicit underlay.
M. 11 note $2-$ m. 12 note 1, D2, FP and FSC: ij; OM1: explicit underlay.
M. 11 note $2-\mathrm{m} .12$ note 1, T2, FP and FSC: ij; OM1: explicit underlay.
M. 13, A1, notes $1-3$, FP and FSC: ij; OM1: explicit underlay.
M. 13, D2, notes 2-4, FP and FSC: explicit underlay; OM1: ij.
M. 13, B2, notes 1-3, FP and FSC: explicit underlay; OM1: ij.
M. 18 note 6-m. 19 note 1, B1, FP and OM1: ij; FSC: explicit underlay.
M. 18 note 6-m. 19 note 1, A2, FP and FSC: ij; OM1: explicit underlay.
M. 19, A1, notes 2-5, FP and FSC: ij; OM1: explicit underlay.
M. 19, B1, notes 2-5, FP and FSC: ij; OM1: explicit underlay.
M. 19 note $2-\mathrm{m}$. 20 note 1, D2, FP and FSC: ij ij; OM1: explicit underlay.
M. 19 note $5-\mathrm{m} .20$ note 1, T2, FP and OM1: ij; FSC: explicit underlay.
M. 20, D1, note 1, FP and FSC: "in"; OM1 and VUL1822: "et."
M. 21 note $2-\mathrm{m} .22$ note 1, D2, FP and FSC: ij; OM1: explicit underlay.
M. 23 note 2-m. 24 note 1, B1, FP and FSC: ij; OM1: explicit underlay.
M. 23 note $2-\mathrm{m} .24$ note 1, T2, FP and FSC: ij; OM1: explicit underlay.
M. 26 note $6-\mathrm{m} .27$ note 1 , D2, FSC: $\sharp$ is placed before m. 27 note 1 .
M. 33, T1, note 4, FP and FSC: f; OM1: f $\sharp$.
Mm. 42-44, D2, FP and FSC: breve rest, semibreve rest, minim rest; OM1: semibreve rest, breve rest, minim rest-OM1 follows barlines.
M. 44, T1, note 6, FP and FSC: $\mathrm{b} \ddagger$; OM1: bb.
M. 57, D2, note 3, FP and FSC: c"; OM1: $\mathrm{c} \ddagger$ ".
M. 59 note $2-\mathrm{m} .62$ note 1, B2, FP and FSC: ij; OM1: explicit underlay.
M. 63 note 3-m. 64 note 2, T1, FP: ij; FSC and OM1: explicit underlay.
M. 63 note 3-m. 64 note 2, A2, FP and FSC: ij; OM1: explicit underlay.
M. 64 note 3-m. 66 note 2, A1, FP and FSC: ij; OM1: explicit underlay.
M. 64 note 1-m. 66 note 2, D2, FP and FSC: ij; OM1: explicit underlay.
M. 64 note 3-m. 65 note 2, A2, FP and FSC: ij; OM1: explicit underlay.
M. 65 note 3-m. 66 note 2, D2, FP and FSC: ij missing; OM1: explicit underlay.
Mm. 69-71, A1, FP and FSC: ij; OM1: explicit underlay.
Mm. 69-71, T1, FP and FSC: ij; OM1: explicit underlay.
Mm. 69-71, B1, FP and FSC: ij; OM1: explicit underlay.

## Significant Discrepancies

M. 1, A1, note 2, FP and FSC: e'; OM1: g'-switched with B2.
M. 1, A1, note 3, FP: semiminim; FSC and OM1: minim.
M. 1, B2, note 2, FP and FSC: g; OM1: e-switched with A1.
M. 2, B2, note 4, FP and FSC: f; OM1: f $\ddagger$.
M. 7, T1, FP: f breve, minim rest; FSC: f breve, semibreve rest.
M. 9, A2, note 2, FP and FSC: $\mathrm{f}^{\prime}$; OM1: d'-FP and FSC results in parallel octaves with D1.
M. 11, A2, note 2, FP and FSC: a'; OM1: g'.
M. 13, D1, note 3, FP and FSC: f" minim; OM1: f' semiminim.
Mm. 13-14, D1, FP: one explicit "exultent," no melisma apparent; FSC: one explicit "exultent," melisma on "su" from m. 14 note 2 with ending unclear; OM1: two ij markings representing "exultent."
M. 14, D1, notes 4 and 5, FP and FSC: e fusa, d fusa; OM1: e semiminim—ornament added.
M. 15, D1, note 2, FP and FSC: $\mathrm{f}^{\prime}$; OM1: a'-voice leading.
M. 15, T1, FP and FSC: a dotted minim, $b b$ semiminim, $c^{\prime}$ minim, $g$ minim; OM1: minim rest, c' semibreve, g minim-ornament added.
M. 15, T2, note 2, FP and FSC: c'; OM1: a-necessitated by T1 embellishment.
M. 18, A1, note 1, FP and FSC: f'; OM1: f.
M. 18, D2, note 7, FP and FSC: c"; OM1: a'—OM1 is more consistent with other parts.
M. 19, D2, note 2, FP and FSC: c"; OM1: a'.
M. 20, A2, note 2, FP and FSC: e'; OM1: g'.
M. 21, D2, note 5, FP and FSC: f'; OM1: a'-FP and FSC results in parallel octaves with B2.
M. 25, D1, notes 1 and 2, FP: c" minim, c" minim; FSC: d" minim, d" semiminim; OM1: c" minim, d" semiminim.
M. 25, A1, notes 5 and 6, FP and FSC: semiminim, semiminim; OM1: dotted semiminim, fusa- B 1 is dotted in all sources.
M. 25, T1, notes 5 and 6, FP and FSC: semiminim, semiminim; OM1: dotted semiminim, fusa- B 1 is dotted in all sources.
M. 25, D2, notes 5 and 6, FP and FSC: semiminim, semiminim; OM1: dotted semiminim, fusa- B 1 is dotted in all sources.
M. 25, BG, note 3, FP: c-B1: Bb.
M. 30, A1, notes 2 and 3, FP and FSC: f; OM1: f'.
M. 32, A2, note 4, FP and FSC: bb; OM1: d—range.
M. 37, A1, note 5, FP and FSC: a'; OM1: a.
M. 37, D2, note 5, FP and OM1: minim; FSC: semiminim.
M. 38, D1, notes 5 and 6, FP and FSC: minim, semiminim; OM1: semiminim, minim—suspension added.
M. 39, A2, FP and FSC: f'; OM1: $\mathrm{f} \not \mathrm{f}^{\prime}$.
M. 42, T1, note 1, FP and FSC: c'; OM1: a-c' creates parallel octaves with B2.
M. 42, A2, note 1, FP and FSC: c'; OM1: a-voice leading.
M. 43, BG, note 3, FP: 3 figure exists but not raised.
M. 44, D2, note 4, FP and FSC: c"; OM1: d".
M. 45, D2, note 5, FP and FSC: ba'; OM1: bb'.
M. 45 note $5-\mathrm{m} .46$ note 1, T2, FP and FSC: c' c'; OM1: c c.
M. 45, B2, note 2, FP and FSC: c; OM1: e.
M. 46, T1, notes 5 and 6, FP and FSC: a' a'; OM1: $\mathrm{f}^{\prime} \mathrm{f}^{\prime}$.
M. 46, BG, note 1, FP: A—B1: c.
M. 47, A2, note 1, FP and FSC: $\mathrm{a}^{\prime}$; OM1: a.
M. 47 note $2-$ m. 48 note 1, B2, FP and FSC: f minim, f minim, d semibreve; OM1: f semibreve, d minim, d minim.
M. 50, BG, note 3, FP: 3 figure exists but not raised.
M. 51, B2, note 2, FP and FSC: G; OM1: g.
M. 52, D1, note 6, FP and FSC: c"; OM1: c $\sharp$ "-BG: $\sharp$.
M. 54, A1, note 1, FP and FSC: d'; OM1: bb—switched with T1.
M. 54, T1, note 1, FP and FSC: bb; OM1: d'-switched with A1.
M. 54, BG, note 2, FP: G-B1: F.
M. 55, A1, note 2, FP and FSC: $\mathrm{f}^{\prime}$; OM1: f—range.
M. 55, T2, note 1, FP and OM1: dotted minim; FSC: minim.
M. 56, B2, note 1, FP and FSC: semibreve; OM1: minim rest, minim.
M. 58, BG, note 3, FP: 3 figure exists but not raised.
M. 60, T1, note 2, FP and FSC: f ; OM1: $\mathrm{f}^{\prime}$-avoid unison with A1.
M. 64, T2, note 5, FP and FSC: d'; OM1: d.
M. 65, A2, note 2, FP and FSC: f'; OM1: c'.
M. 65, T2, note 1, FP and FSC: d'; OM1: d.
M. 67, B2, note 4, FP and FSC: f; OM1: B $b$-avoid unison with B1.
M. 68, A2, FP: no melisma indicated; FSC: melisma on "jus" on notes 2-4 or implied; OM1: melisma on "e" on notes 1-3.
M. 70, B2, note 1, FP and FSC: d; OM1: Bb—avoid unison with B1.

## 70. Jacob Handl - Veni Sancte Spiritus

## Sources

FP - Bodenschatz Florilegium Portense (Leipzig, 1618)
FSC - Bodenschatz Florilegium Selectissimarum Cantionum (Leipzig, 1603)
OM2 - Handl Opus Musicum Secundus Tomus (Prague, 1587)
LU - Liber Usualis (New York, 1962)

| FP \#70 | FSC \#70 | OM2 \#57 |
| :--- | :--- | :--- |
| Discantus (D1) | Discantus | Sexta |
| Altus (A1) | Altus | Septima |
| Tenor (T1) | Tenor | Quinta |
| Bassus (B1) | Bassus | Octava |
| Sextus (D2) | Sextus | Discantus |
| Septima (A2) | Septima | Altus |
| Quintus (T2) | Quintus | Tenor |
| Octava (B2) | Octava | Bassus |

## Minor Discrepancies

M. 9, A1, FP and FSC: ij; OM2: explicit underlay.
M. 15, B2, notes 2-4, melisma unclear in FP.
M. 21, T1, melisma unclear in FP and FSC.
Mm. 23-24, T1, melisma unclear in FP and FSC.
M. 32, BG, notes 3 and 4, FP: 43 figure is over note 4 .
M. 52 note $2-\mathrm{m} .53$ note 1, T2, FP and FSC: ij; OM2: explicit underlay.
Mm. 52-54, Choir 2, LU: in-no-xi-um; CMOS: in-nox-i-um (not an explicit example).
M. 61, BG, notes 3 and 4, FP: 43 figure is over note 4.
Mm. 86-88, D1, FP and FSC: explicit underlay; OM2: ij.
Mm. 86-88, T1, FP and FSC: ij; OM2: explicit underlay.
Mm. 86-88, B1, FP and FSC: ij; OM2: explicit underlay.
Mm. 87-89, D2, FP and FSC: ij; OM2: explicit underlay.
M. 87 note $1-\mathrm{m} .89$ note 1, A2, FP and FSC: explicit underlay; OM2: ij.
Mm. 87-89, T2, FP: ij; FSC and OM2: explicit underlay.
Mm. 87-89, B2, FP and FSC: ij; OM2: explicit underlay.
Mm. 89-91, D1, FP and FSC: ij; OM2: explicit underlay.
M. 89 note 2-m. 92 note 1, A2, FP and FSC: ij; OM2: explicit underlay.
M. 92 note $2-\mathrm{m} .96$ note 1, A2, FP and OM2: ij; FSC: explicit underlay.
Mm. 93-96, T2, FP and OM2: ij; FSC: explicit underlay.
Mm. 93-96, B2, FP and FSC: explicit underlay; OM2: ij.
M. 100 note $2-\mathrm{m} .101$ note 2, B2, FP: salutis; FSC and OM: virtutis.
Mm. 116-118, D2, FP: ij; FSC and OM2: explicit underlay.
M. 121 note $1-$ m. 123 note 1, A1, FSC: missing ij or text for this phrase.
M. 121 note $3-\mathrm{m} .122$ note 2, A2, melisma unclear in FP.
M. 123, T1, note 1, FSC has a semibreve then four spurious notes here (d' semibreve, d semibreve, d breve, d' semibreve) and an extra ij after the final printed "gaudium."

## Significant Discrepancies

Mm. 1-2, BG, erroneous tie removed (noted in incipit)—probably meant for next barline.
M. 4, BG, note 4, FP: 6 figure exists but not raised.
Mm. 4-5, BG, FP: barline missing.
M. 5, T1, note 1, FP: b; FSC and OM2: bb—BG: bb.
M. 6, BG, 3 figure exists but not raised.
M. 7, B1, note 1, FP and FSC: bb; OM2: b-BG: bb, which is canceled on note 3 .
M. 15, A2, note 1, FP and FSC: bb'; OM2: b'-BG: bb.
M. 15, B2, note 2, FP: g; FSC and OM2: f.
M. 21, BG, note 3, FP: 3 figure exists but not raised.
M. 30, BG, note 2, FP: 65 figure.
M. 37 note $2-\mathrm{m} .38$ note 1, D1, FP: no melisma indicated; FSC: melisma on "a" from m. 37 note 3 through m. 38 note 1; OM2: melisma on "be" on m. 37 notes 2-3.
M. 39 note $2-\mathrm{m} .40$ note 4, T1, FP and FSC: "si" on m. 39 note 3 with melisma on "re" on m. 40 notes 2-3; OM2: "si" on m .39 note 2 with melisma on "ple" on m .40 notes 2-4-duet with B1.
M. 43 note 3-m. 44 note 3, A1, FP: no melisma specified; FSC: denotes melisma on "o" but without clear alignment; OM2: melisma on "o" from m .43 note 3 through m. 44 note 3.
M. 47, T2, notes 3 and 4, FP and FSC: " $о$ " melisma starts on note 4; OM2: " 0 " melisma starts on note 3 .
M. 49, D2, note 3, FP: e'; FSC and OM2: d'.
M. 57 , BG, notes 1 and 2 , FP: $\sharp$ is before note 2 .
Mm. 59-62, Choir 1, OM, FP, and FSC: "rege quod est devium;" LU: "sana quod est saucium."
M. 60, A1, note 1, FP: minim rest, f semibreve; FSC and OM2: f semibreve, minim rest.
M. 60, T1, FP: erroneous "rege" on notes 1-2, melisma on "quod" on notes 3-4; FSC: erroneous "rege" on notes 1-2, no clear melisma; OM2: melisma on "quod" on notes 1-4.
M. 62 note $1-\mathrm{m} .68$ note 1, Choir 2, OM: "fove quod est languidum, riga quod est aridum, sana quod est saucium;" FP, FSC, LU: "flecte quod est rigidum, fove quod est frigidum, rege quod est devium."
M. 62, D2, note 1, FP: semibreve; FSC and OM2: minim.
M. 64, B2, note 3, FP and FSC: B; OM2: Bb-BG: Bb.
Mm. 68-125, BG, FP: measures in BG contain six semibreves-dotted barlines are editorial.
M. 81, D1, note 3, FSC: d"; FP and OM2: b'-FSC has no third in chord.
M. 81, BG, note 3, erroneous 6 figure removed.
M. 82, D1, note 3, FP and FSC: c"; OM2: c $\ddagger$ ".
M. 83, A1, FP and FSC: dotted breve; OM2: breve, semibreve rest.
M. 83, B2, note 1, FP: c; FSC and OM2: d.
M. 85, BG, note 2 , erroneous $b$ removed.
M. 86, T1, note 3, FP: c'; FSC and OM2: c $\not{ }^{\prime}-\sharp$ in BG.
Mm. 87-96, all, FP and FSC differ dramatically in rhythm and some in pitch from OM2 (mm. 87-94), except for the B1 part in FSC, which matches that in OM2.
M. 87, D1, note 3, FP and OM2: c\#"; FSC: c"- $\#$ in BG.
M. 93, D1, note 3, FP and FSC: c"; OM2 (m. 91, note 3): cł".
M. 96, B1, all sources have perfected breve-rest is editorial.
M. 96, D2, FP and FSC: breve, semibreve rest; OM2 (m. 93-94): longa that extends to the end of the measure.
M. 107, B2, note 2, FP and FSC: semibreve; OM2 (m. 105, note 2): breve.
M. 108, D2, note 2, FP and FSC: g'; OM2 (m. 106, note 2): g $\not{ }^{\prime}$-FP and FSC have $g \nRightarrow$ ' at the prior iteration of this music (m. 79).
M. 110, BG, note 3, erroneous 6 figure removed.
M. 111, D1, note 3, FP and FSC: c"; OM2 (m. 109, note 3): cł".
M. 112, D2, note 1, FP and FSC: f'; OM2 (m. 110, note 1): $\mathrm{f} \sharp$ '-marked in BG and FP and FSC have $\mathrm{f} \sharp$ at the prior iteration of this music (m. 83).
M. 114, D2, note 1, FP: f'; FSC and OM2 (m. 112, note 1): f $\sharp$ '.
M. 114, BG, note 2 , erroneous $b$ removed.
M. 115, T1, note 3, FP: c'; FSC and OM2 (m. 113, note 3): c $\sharp$ ’ $\sharp$ in BG.
Mm. 116-125, all, FP and FSC differ dramatically in rhythm and some in pitch from OM2 (mm. 114-121), except for the B1 part in FSC, which matches that in OM2.
M. 116, D1, note 3, FP and OM2 (m. 114, note 3): c丸"; FSC: c" $\ddagger$ in BG.
M. 124, T2, note 1, FP and FSC: bb; OM2 (m. 120, note 1): b—D1: bb'.

## 79. Albinus Fabricius - Gaudent in caelis

## Sources

FP - Bodenschatz Florilegium Portense (Leipzig, 1618)
FSC - Bodenschatz Florilegium Selectissimarum Cantionum (Leipzig, 1603)
Fab - Fabricius Cantiones sacrae (Graz, 1595)
LU - Liber Usualis (New York, 1962)

| FP \#79 | FSC \#79 | Fab \#1 | LU p. 1160 |
| :--- | :--- | :--- | :--- |
| Discantus (D1) | Discantus | Discantus |  |
| Sextus (D2) | Sextus | Quintus |  |
| Altus (A) | Altus | Altus |  |
| Tenor (T) | Tenor | Tenor |  |
| Quintus (B2) | Quintus | Sexta |  |
| Bassus (B1) | Bassus | Bassus |  |
| Basis Generalis (BG) |  |  |  |

## Minor Discrepancies

M. 6 note 1-m. 9 note 2, D1, FP and FSC: ij; Fab: explicit underlay.
M. 10, B2, note 2, FP and FSC: f; Fab: f $\sharp$.
M. 15 note 1-m. 17 note 1, A, FP and FSC: ij; Fab: explicit underlay-clarifies melisma.
M. 15 note $1-\mathrm{m} .17$ note 2, B2, FP and FSC: explicit underlay; Fab: ij.
M. 16 note $1-\mathrm{m} .17$ note 4, D1, FP and FSC: ij; Fab: explicit underlay-clarifies melisma.
M. 18 note $1-$ m. 19 note 2, B2, FP and FSC: ij; Fab: explicit underlay.
M. 19 note 2-m. 20 note 1, D1, FP and FSC: ij; Fab: explicit underlay.
M. 19 note 1-m. 21 note 1, T, FP and FSC: explicit underlay; Fab: ij.
M. 21, A, note 2, FP and FSC: c'; Fab: c $\sharp$ '.
M. 21 note $1-$ m. 23 note 2, B2, FP and FSC: explicit underlay; Fab: ij.
M. 21 note $1-$ m. 23 note 2, B1, FP and FSC: ij; Fab: explicit underlay.
M. 23, A, notes 2-4, FP and FSC: c' b' c $\sharp^{\prime}$; Fab: c $\sharp^{\prime}$ b c'.
M. 25 note 2-m. 26 note 2, D2, FP and FSC: ij; Fab: explicit underlay.
M. 28 note $4-$ m. 30 note 3, D2, FP and FSC: explicit underlay; Fab: ij.
M. 30 note $1-\mathrm{m} .34$ note 1, B2, FP and FSC: ij; Fab: explicit underlay-clarifies melisma.
M. 32, B2, note 2, FP and FSC: f; Fab: $\mathrm{f} \sharp$.
M. 36, D1, note 2, FP: semiminim in LOC and Hamburg copies, minim in SLUB; FSC and Fab: minim.
M. 36 note 2-m. 38 note 4, B2, FP and FSC: ij; Fab: explicit underlay.
M. 37 note $5-$ m. 40 note 1, D1, FP and FSC: ij; Fab: explicit underlay-clarifies melisma.
M. 37 note 1-m. 38 note 4, D2, FP and FSC: ij; Fab: explicit underlay.
Mm. 37-38, BG, line break probably prevented tie from being printed.
M. 38 note 3-m. 40 note 1, B1, FP and FSC: explicit underlay; Fab: ij.
M. 39, D1, note 4, FP and FSC: f'; Fab: f $\sharp$ '.
M. 44 note $2-$ m. 47 note 1, A, FP and FSC: ij; Fab: explicit underlay-clarifies melisma.
M. 47, A, note 2, explicit $\sharp$ in FP and FSC.
M. 55 note 1-m. 57 note 3, B1, FP and FSC: ij; Fab: explicit underlay.
M. 56, D2, notes 2-4, FP and FSC: ij; Fab: explicit underlay.
Mm. 56-58, B2, FP: ij; FSC and Fab: explicit underlay.
M. 58, D2, note 2, FP and FSC: f'; Fab: f $\ddagger$ '.
M. 60, A, notes 1-3, melisma unclear in FP.
M. 61 note 1-m. 63 note 3, D1, FP and FSC: ij; Fab: explicit underlay.
Mm. 63-65, D2, FP and FSC: ij; Fab: explicit underlay-clarifies melisma.
M. 63 note 3-m. 66 note 1, A, FP and FSC: ij; Fab: explicit underlay.
M. 65, D2, note 2, FP and FSC: c'; Fab: cH'.
M. 69 note $2-\mathrm{m} .70$ note 1, A, FP and FSC: ij; Fab: explicit underlay.
M. 69, T, FP and FSC: ij; Fab: explicit underlay.
M. 70 note $2-$ m. 72 note 1, B2, FP and FSC: ij; Fab: explicit underlay.
M. 71 note 2-m. 73 note 2, D1, FP and FSC: ij; Fab: explicit underlay.
M. 71 note 2-m. 73 note 2, B1, FP and FSC: ij; Fab: explicit underlay.
M. 72 note $1-\mathrm{m} .73$ note 2, T, FP: ij; FSC and Fab: explicit underlay.
M. 73 note $3-$ m. 74 note 2, T, FP and FSC: ij; Fab: explicit underlay.
M. 73 note 3-m. 75 note 2, B1, FP and FSC: ij; Fab: explicit underlay.
M. 74 note 3-m. 76 note 2, D2, FP and FSC: ij; Fab: explicit underlay.
M. 74 note 3-m. 76 note 2, B2, FP and FSC: ij; Fab: explicit underlay.
M. 75 note $2-\mathrm{m} .76$ note 1, A, FP and FSC: ij; Fab: explicit underlay.
M. 75 note $3-\mathrm{m} .76$ note 2, T, FP and FSC: ij; Fab: explicit underlay.
M. 77, T, note 4, FP and FSC: f'; Fab: f $\sharp$ '.
M. 77 note $6-\mathrm{m} .79$ note 4 , T, both melismas unclear in FP and FSC; clarified in Fab.
M. 80 note $1-$ m. 83 note 2, B1, FP and FSC: ij; Fab: explicit underlay.
M. 82, D2, note 2, FP and FSC: c'; Fab: $\mathrm{c} \neq$ ' .
M. 83 note $3-\mathrm{m} .84$ note 1, A, melisma not indicated in FP only.
M. 85, B1, notes 1-3, FP and FSC: ij; Fab: explicit underlay.
M. 86 note $2-$ m. 88 note 2, B2, FP and FSC: ij; Fab: explicit underlay.
M. 86 note $2-\mathrm{m} .98$ note 1, B2, FP has two extra ij; FSC has one extra ij.
M. 88 note 3-m. 90 note 2, D1, FP and FSC: ij; Fab: explicit underlay.
M. 88 note $2-\mathrm{m} .89$ note 2, A, FP and FSC: ij; Fab: explicit underlay.
M. 89 note 3-m. 91 note 1, A, FP and FSC: ij; Fab: explicit underlay-clarifies melisma.
M. 89 note 3-m. 91 note 1, T, FP and FSC: ij; Fab: explicit underlay—clarifies melisma.
M. 89 note 3-m. 92 note 2, B1, FP and FSC: ij; Fab: explicit underlay-clarifies melisma.
M. 90, T, note 4, FP and FSC: f; Fab: f $\sharp$.
Mm. 91-93, B2, FP and FSC: ij; Fab: explicit underlay—clarifies melisma.
M. 93 note 3-m. 95 note 2, D2, FP and FSC: ij; Fab: explicit underlay.
Mm. 95-98, B2, FP and FSC: ij; Fab: explicit underlay.
M. 95 note 3-m. 98 note 1, B1, FP and FSC: ij; Fab: explicit underlay.

## Significant Discrepancies

M. 3, A, notes 4 and 5, FP and FSC: melisma ends on note 4; Fab: melisma ends on note 5-Fab is more consistent with other parts.
Mm. 4-5, BG, barline missing.
M. 6 note $2-$ m. 8 note 2, T, FP and FSC: "gaudent in caelis"; Fab: "in caelis, gaudent."
M. 8, B2, note 1, FP: minim; FSC and Fab: semiminim.
M. 8, B2, note 5, FP: d; FSC and Fab c.
M. 10, B1, note 1, FP: minim; FSC and Fab: semibreve.
M. 10 note $2-$ m. 12 note 1 , BG, FP: three notes with distinct syllables ("lis, caelis") and no ties-B1: longa.
M. 11 note $2-\mathrm{m} .12$ note 2, T, FP and FSC: "in caelis" with melisma on "cae" from m. 11 note 3 through m. 12 note 1 ; Fab: ij ("gaudent") in caelis with no melisma.
M. 14, BG, note 1, erroneous sharp removed.
M. 14, BG, note 1,6 figure exists, but not raised.
M. 15 note $3-\mathrm{m} .16$ note 1, D2, FP and FSC: melisma ends on m. 16 note 1; Fab: melisma ends on m. 15 note 3 -Fab groups upcoming semiminims with one syllable.
M. 18 note 2-m. 2 note, D1, FP: minim; FSC and Fab: semiminim.
M. 21, A, note 5, FP: dotted semiminim; FSC and Fab: dotted minim.
M. 21 note 2-m. 25 note 1, T, FP and FSC: "Sanctorum, animae Sanctorum"; Fab: ij ("animae Sanctorum"), "qui Christi"-ij from Fab seems to be misinterpreted in FP and FSC.
M. 22, D1, note 3, FP: bb; FSC and Fab: b - B1 has bb.
Mm. 27-29, T, FP and FSC: three iterations of "vestigia" with melisma on "ves" on m. 27 notes 1-5; Fab: two iterations of "qui Christi vestigia" with melisma on "qui" on m. 27 notes 1-5-Fab aligns better with B2 and A.
M. 28, T, notes $1-3$, FP and FSC: c' dotted minim, c' semiminim; Fab: c' minim, c' semiminim, c' semiminim-caused by text difference cited above.
M. 29, T, notes 4 and 5, FP and FSC: b minim; Fab: b semiminim, b semiminim—caused by text difference cited above.
M. 30, BG, note 2,6 figure exists, but not raised.
M. 34 note 3-m. 35 note 1, D1, FP and FSC: melisma on "se"; Fab: melisma on "cu"-match upcoming melismas in other parts.
M. 34, B1, notes 2-6, FP and FSC: melisma on "se"; Fab: melisma on "cu"-match upcoming melismas in other parts.
Mm. 35-36, T, FP and FSC: melisma on "cu" on m. 35 notes 1-6, followed in m. 36 by b minim, c' semibreve, c' minim ("ti, sunt se"); Fab: melisma on "cu" on m. 35 notes 1-5, m. 36 consists on b minim, c' dotted semibreve ("sunt se").
M. 37, D1, notes 2 and 3, FP and FSC: melisma ends on note 2; Fab: melisma ends on note 3.
M. 45, B2, notes 3 and 4, FP: no melisma indicated; FSC: melisma ends on note 3; Fab: melisma ends on note 4.
M. 48, A, note 1, FP: minim; FSC and Fab: semiminim.
M. 50 note 1-m. 51 note 5, B1, FSC and FP: melisma on fu; Fab melisma on de-match B2 part, m. 48.
M. 60 note 3-m. 61 note 1, T, FP: melisma ends on m. 61 note 1; FSC and Fab: melisma ends on m. 60 note 3 .
M. 64 note $4-$ m. 65 note 1, T, FP and FSC: semibreve; Fab: dotted semibreve.
M. 64 note 1-m. 65 note 1, B1, FP and FSC: melisma on "o"; Fab: melisma on "Chri"-BG underlay supports Fab.
M. 65, D1, note 2, FP and FSC: f; Fab: f $\sharp$.
M. 66, A, notes 3 and 4, melisma not indicated in any source.
M. 66, A, note 4, FP and FSC: f; Fab: f $\sharp$.
M. 66, B2, notes 1 and 2, FP: melisma appears to end on note 2; FSC and Fab: melisma ends on note 1.
M. 66, BG, note 3, 6 figure exists, but not raised.
M. 72, T, note 1, FP and FSC: semibreve; Fab: dotted semibreve.
M. 75 note $4-\mathrm{m} .76$ note 5, T, FP and FSC: e f; Fab: g a—mirror previous iterations.
M. 77, BG, note 1, 6 figure exists, but not raised.
M. 78, B1, note 2, FP and Fab: $\mathrm{f} \sharp$; FSC: f.
M. 82 note $5-$ m. 83 note 1, D2, FP and FSC: "sto" occurs on m. 83 note 1; Fab: melisma on "sto" from m .82 note 5 to m .83 note 1 -most other cadential figures change syllables.
M. 83 note $2-$ m. 84 note 1, T, FP and FSC: "regnabunt" explicit, which confuses previous ij; Fab: "regnabunt" implied in ij.
M. 83 note $3-\mathrm{m}$. 84 note 3, B1, FP and FSC: melisma on "na" m. 83 note 3 through m. 84 note 2; Fab: melisma on "bunt" m. 84 notes 1-3-BG underlay supports Fab; Fab creates duet with D2.
M. 86, BG, note 3, erroneous sharp removed-match m. 71.
M. 90 , BG, note 1, erroneous sharp removed-match m. 77.
M. 90 , BG, note 1,6 figure exists, but not raised.
M. 91 note 3-m. 92 note 6, A, FP and FSC no melisma; Fab: melisma on "na."
M. 93 note 1-m. 95 note 1, A, FP and FSC: ij; Fab explicit lyrics which differ to syllabification in $\mathrm{mm} .91-92$ - FP and FSC would have produced an odd melisma.
M. 94 note $3-$ m. 95 note 1, B1, FP and Fab: d; FSC: e-BG confirms FP and Fab.
Mm. 97-98, BG, barline missing.

## 95. Caspar Vincentius - Apparuerunt Apostolis

## Sources

FP - Bodenschatz Florilegium Portense (Leipzig, 1618)
PM - Schadaeus Promptuarium musicum, Pars Altera (Strasbourg, 1612)
VUL1822 - ed. Leander van Ess Biblia Sacra Vulgatce Editionis (Tübingen, 1824)
LU - Liber Usualis (New York, 1962)

| FP \#95 | PM \#50 |
| :--- | :--- |
| Discantus (D1) | Cantus (1. Cho. Cantus.) |
| Sextus (D2) | Altus (1. Cho. Altus.) |
| Altus (A1) | Tenor (1. Cho. Tenor.) |
| Octava (B2) | Bassus (1. Cho. Bassus.) |
| Septima (A2) | V. Vox (2. Cho. Cantus) |
| Tenor (T1) | VII. Vox (2. Cho. Altus.) |
| Quintus (T2) | VI. Vox (2. Cho. Tenor.) |
| Bassus (B1) | VIII. Vox (2. Cho. Cantus.) |
| Basis Generalis (BG) | Basis Generalis |

## Minor Discrepancies

T1, PM VII. Vox part incorrectly lists this piece as à 6 .
B1, PM VIII. Vox part incorrectly noted as 2. Cho. Cantus.
Mm. 6-7, D1, FP: explicit underlay; PM: two ij markings (one extraneous).
M. 6 note 3-m. 7 note 6, B2, FP: explicit underlay; PM: ij.
Mm. 10-11, D2, FP: melisma on "ig" on notes 3 through 5; PM: melisma unclear.
Mm. 10-11, B2, FP: ij; PM: explicit underlay.
M. 10, T1, note 1, PM: explicit $\downarrow$.
M. 10, BG, note 1, FP does not account for D major chord in Choir I.
Mm. 11-14, D1, FP: longa rest, breve rest; PM: semibreve rest, longa rest, semibreve rest—PM respects barlines.
Mm. 11-12, A1, FP: breve rest, semibreve rest; PM: semibreve rest, breve rest—PM respects barlines.
M. 15, A1, note 4, FP: f'; PM: f $\sharp^{\prime}$.
M. 15 note 3-m. 17 note 4, B2, FP: explicit underlay; PM: ij.
M. 17, T1, note 4, FP: f; PM: f $\ddagger$.
M. 17 note 3-m. 18 note 2, T2, FP: ij; PM: explicit underlay.
M. 18 note $1-\mathrm{m} .19$ note 1, T1, FP: ij; PM: explicit underlay.
Mm. 21-23, A2, FP: explicit underlay; PM: ij.
Mm. 21-23, B1, FP: ij; PM: explicit underlay-clarifies melisma.
M. 22 note $2-\mathrm{m} .23$ note 5, D2, FP: explicit underlay; PM: ij.
M. 22 note $1-\mathrm{m} .23$ note 2, B2, FP: explicit underlay; PM: ij.
M. 23 note 3-m. 24 note 3, D1, FP: ij; PM: explicit underlay.
M. 23, A1, note 2, FP: f'; PM: $f \sharp$ '.
M. 24, BG, notes 5 and 6, FP: erroneous barline in between notes 5 and 6 .
M. 26 note $1-\mathrm{m} .27$ note 3, D2, FP: ij; PM: explicit underlay.
M. 26 note $1-\mathrm{m} .27$ note 5, B2, FP: explicit underlay; PM: ij.
M. 27 note $6-$ m. 28 note 5, D1, FP: explicit underlay; PM: ij.
M. 27 note 4-m. 28 note 3, A1, FP: ij; PM: explicit underlay-clarifies melisma.
M. 27 note 6-m. 28 note 5, B2, FP: ij; PM: explicit underlay—clarifies melisma.
M. 28 note $4-\mathrm{m} .30$ note 1, D2, FP: ij; PM: explicit underlay.
M. 28 note $1-\mathrm{m} .30$ note 1, A2, FP: explicit underlay; PM: ij.
M. 28 note $1-\mathrm{m} .30$ note 1, T1, FP: ij; PM: explicit underlay.
M. 28 note $1-\mathrm{m} .30$ note 1, B1, FP: ij; PM: explicit underlay.
Mm. 29-30, A1, FP: explicit underlay; PM: ij.
Mm. 30-36, D1, FP: longa rest, longa rest, longa rest, semibreve rest; PM: semibreve rest, longa rest, longa rest, longa rest-PM respects barlines.
Mm. 30-36, B2, FP: longa rest, longa rest, longa rest, semibreve rest; PM: semibreve rest, longa rest, longa rest, longa rest- PM respects barlines.
Mm. 31-32, all, FP: "super"; PM and VUL1822: "supra."
M. 36, T1, note 4, FP: f; PM: f $\ddagger$.
Mm. 38-39, all, FP: "super"; PM and VUL1822: "supra."
M. 39 note $2-\mathrm{m} .40$ note 1, D1, word missing in PM.
M. 40, BG, notes 3 and 4, FP: 6 figure appears over note 4 .
M. $41, \mathrm{BG}, \mathrm{FP}$ : clef change denoted at line break.
M. 43, A2, note 4, FP: $\mathrm{f}^{\prime} ;$ PM: $\mathrm{f} \sharp^{\prime}$.
M. 48 note $1-\mathrm{m} .51$ note 1, A2, FP: explicit underlay; PM: ij.
M. 48 note $1-\mathrm{m} .50$ note 1, T2, FP: ij; PM: explicit underlay.
M. 50 note $1-\mathrm{m} .51$ note 1, D1, FP: ij; PM: explicit underlay.
M. 52, B2, note 5, FP: b; PM: bb.
M. 52, BG, note 5, FP: $b$ not marked.
M. 53, D2, notes 3-5, FP: $b b^{\prime}, a^{\prime}, b^{\prime} ;$ PM: $b^{\prime}, a^{\prime}, ~ b b^{\prime}-F P B G$ and PM continuo: $b$ over both chords.
M. 56 note $3-\mathrm{m} .57$ note 2, A1, FP: ij; PM: explicit underlay.
M. 56 note 3-m. 57 note 2, B2, FP: ij; PM: explicit underlay.
M. 56, T2, note 5, FP and PM: explicit bদ.
M. 58 note 3-m. 59 note 2, D1, FP: ij; PM: explicit underlay.
M. 58 note 3-m. 59 note 2, D2, FP: ij; PM: explicit underlay.
M. 58 note $3-\mathrm{m}$. 59 note 2, B2, FP: ij; PM: explicit underlay.
M. 58, A2, FP: ij; PM: explicit underlay.
M. 58, T1, FP: ij; PM: explicit underlay.
M. 58, T2, FP: ij; PM: explicit underlay.
M. 58, B1, FP: ij; PM: explicit underlay.
M. 59, T1, FP: ij; PM: explicit underlay.
M. 60 note $3-\mathrm{m} .61$ note 2, D1, FP: ij; PM: explicit underlay.
M. 60 note 3-m. 61 note 2, D2, FP: ij; PM: explicit underlay.
M. 60 note $3-\mathrm{m} .61$ note 2, B2, FP: ij; PM: explicit underlay.
M. 60, T2, FP: ij; PM: explicit underlay.
M. 60, B1, FP: ij; PM: explicit underlay.
M. 61 note 3-m. 62 note 2, D1, FP: explicit underlay; PM: ij.
M. 61 note 3-m. 62 note 2, D2, FP: explicit underlay; PM: ij.
M. 62 note 3-m. 63 note 4, D1, FP: ij; PM: explicit underlay-clarifies melisma.
M. 62 note 3-m. 63 note 5, A1, FP: ij; PM: explicit underlay-clarifies melisma.
M. 62 note $1-\mathrm{m} .64$ note 1, T1, FP: explicit underlay; PM: ij.
Mm. 62-63, T2, FP: ij; PM: explicit underlay.
M. 62 note $1-\mathrm{m} .63$ note 2, B1, FP: ij; PM: explicit underlay.
Mm. 65-66, all, FP: "super"; BG, PM and VUL1822: "supra."
M. 69, T2, note 3, FP: f; PM: f $\sharp$.
Mm. 70-74, A2, FP: longa rest, longa rest, semibreve rest; PM: semibreve rest, longa rest, longa rest-PM respects barlines.
Mm. 71-73, all, FP: "super"; BG, PM and VUL1822: "supra."
M. 73 note $5-\mathrm{m} .74$ note 2, BG, FP: 56 figure appears over m .74 notes 1 and 2.
Mm. 75-77, T2, FP: ij; PM: explicit underlay.
M. 76, A2, note 5, FP: $\mathrm{f}^{\prime} ;$ PM: $\mathrm{f} \sharp^{\prime}$.
M. 77, A2, note 1 , syllable missing in PM.
M. 78 note $4-\mathrm{m} .79$ note 6, D2, FP: explicit underlay; PM: ij.
M. 80 note $3-\mathrm{m}$. 81 note 6 , T1, syllable missing in PM.
Mm. 82-84, A1, FP: ij; PM: explicit underlay-clarifies melisma.
Mm. 82-84, B2, FP: explicit underlay; PM: ij.
M. 84 note $1-$ m. 87 note 1, B1, FP: explicit underlay; PM: ij.
Mm. 87-89, D1, FP: ij; PM: explicit underlay-clarifies melisma.
M. 88 note $7-$ m. 90 note 1, B2, FP: ij; PM: explicit underlay.
M. 89 note $2-$ m. 91 note 3, D2, FP: ij; PM: explicit underlay.
M. 89 note $1-\mathrm{m} .91$ note 1, A1, FP: ij; PM: explicit underlay.
M. 90 note 1-m. 93 note 1, D1, FP: ij; PM: explicit underlay-clarifies melisma.
M. 90 note $2-\mathrm{m} .91$ note 1 , B2, FP: explicit underlay; PM: ij.
M. 90 note 1-m. 91 note 1, B1, FP: ij; PM: explicit underlay.
M. 91 note $4-\mathrm{m} .93$ note 1, D2, FP: explicit underlay; PM: ij.
M. 91 note $2-$ m. 92 note 1, B2, FP: ij; PM: explicit underlay.
M. 91 note $1-\mathrm{m} .92$ note 3, T2, FP: melisma on "le", melisma on "ia" implied by space; PM: no melisma indicated.
M. 91 note $2-$ m. 93 note 1, B1, FP: explicit underlay; PM: ij.
M. 92 note $2-\mathrm{m} .93$ note 1, A1, FP: ij; PM: explicit underlay.
M. 92 note $2-\mathrm{m}$. 93 note 1, T1, FP: explicit underlay; PM: ij.
M. 92 note 4-m. 93 note 3, T2, FP: explicit underlay; PM: ij-ij alignment in PM differs from FP setting.
M. 93 note $2-\mathrm{m} .95$ note 1, D1, FP: explicit underlay; PM: ij.
M. 93 note 2-m. 95 note 1, D2, FP: no melisma indicated; PM: underlay unclear-match other parts as closely as possible.
M. 93 note $2-$ m. 95 note 1, B2, FP: ij; PM: explicit underlay.
M. 93 note $2-\mathrm{m} .95$ note 1, A2, FP: ij; PM: ij missing.
M. 93 note $2-$ m. 95 note 1, T1, FP: ij; PM: explicit underlay.
M. 93, T2, notes 4-7, FP: ij; PM: explicit underlay.

## Significant Discrepancies

M. 4 note $6-\mathrm{m} .5$ note 4, D1, FP: melisma on "di" from m. 4 note 5 through m. 5 note 1; PM: no melisma indicated.
M. 5 note 4-m. 6 note 6, D1, FP: melisma on "lin" from m. 5 note 5 through m. 6 note 5; PM: "linguae" on m . 5 notes 4 and 5 with no melisma indicated.
M. 8, D1, notes 2-7, FP: melisma on " i " from note 3 through note 7; PM: melisma on "quam" from note 2 through note 6-match B2 in m. 8 and A2/B1 in m. 9.
Mm. 8-9, D2, FP: "dispertitae linguae"; PM: "tamquam ignis" (melisma not indicated)—match other parts.
M. 8, A1, notes 3 and 4, FP and PM: no melisma indicated.
M. 10, D1, notes 2-7, FP: melisma on "i" from note 3 through note 7; PM: melisma on "quam" from note 2 through note 6 -match B 2 in m .10 and $\mathrm{A} 2 / \mathrm{B} 1 \mathrm{in} \mathrm{m}$.9 .
M. 11, T2, note 4, FP: minim; PM: semiminim.
M. 12, BG, notes 2-4, FP: clef change is missing until next line in partbook (m. 13 note 1 ).
M. 14, BG, note 2, FP: 65 figure removed- 56 motion in A1, but fifth is retained in A2.
M. 20, A2, note 5, FP: f'; PM: f $\not{ }^{\prime}-\mathrm{D} 1: \mathrm{f}^{\prime \prime}$.
M. 21, D1, note 3, FP: c"; PM: c\#".
M. 21, BG, note 4, FP: 3 figure exists but not raised.
M. 22 note 1-m. 23 note 2, D1, FP: "Alleluia"; PM: "tamquam ignis."
M. 23, T1, note 1 , FP: f; PM: $\mathrm{f} \sharp$ — $\sharp$ in BG and A1.
M. 24, B2, note 3, FP: c'; PM: ç'- $\sharp$ in BG and PM continuo.
M. 25, T1, note 4, FP: c'; PM: c $\sharp$ '.
M. 25 note $6-\mathrm{m}$. 26 note 3 , T1, FP: dotted minim, semiminim, minim; PM: minim, dotted minim, semiminim-PM aligns with T2 in m. 26 and D2 in m. 28.
M. 25, B1, note 2, FP: f; PM: $\mathrm{f} \sharp$-FP and PM continuo: f .
M. 25, BG, note 3, accidental in PM BG appears to be applied to note rather than chord; unclear in FP BG.
M. 26, B1, note 3, FP: c; PM: c $\sharp-\sharp$ in BG and PM continuo.
M. 27, A1, note 4, FP: note missing; PM: d' semiminim.
M. 27, BG, note 3, accidental in PM BG appears to be applied to note rather than chord; unclear in FP BG.
M. 28, D1, note 4, FP: f"; PM: f $\ddagger$ "- $\#$ in BG and PM continuo.
M. 28, B2, note 3, FP: c'; PM: ç'- $\sharp$ in BG and PM continuo.
M. 29, BG, note 2, FP: 3 figure exists but not raised.
M. 30, B2, FP: minim rest; PM: semibreve rest.
M. 35, A2, note 4, FP: semiminim; PM: dotted semiminim.
M. 36, BG, note 1, FP: 6 figure exists but not raised.
M. 37, BG, FP: clef change is missing.
M. 45, BG, note 7, FP: 6 figure exists but not raised.
M. 45, BG, FP and PM: c minim, B minim, A semibreve-FP and PM do not match B1 in m. 45; both match B 1 at second iteration in m .81 .
M. 47, D2, note 7, FP: fusa; PM: semiminim.
M. 47, BG, note 2, FP: 5 figure-presumably refers to 65 motion in D1, but inaccurate due to moving bass.
M. 48, BG, note 1, FP: 3 figure exists but not raised.
M. 52 note $2-\mathrm{m}$. 53 note 1, D1, FP: "variis" with melisma on "va" from m. 52 note 2 through note 4; PM: "variis linguis" with no melisma-PM matches B2.
M. 53 note $2-\mathrm{m}$. 55 note 1, D1, FP: melisma on "va" from m. 53 note 2 through note 4; PM: melisma unclear-FP melisma is awkward and does not match other parts or D1 figure in m. 52 .
M. 54, D1, note 1, FP: f"; PM: f $\sharp "-\sharp$ in BG.
M. 55, BG, note 2, FP: 6 figure exists but not raised.
M. 57, T1, note 6, FP: semiminim; PM: minim.
M. 60 note $5-\mathrm{m} .61$ note 1 , A1, FP: $\mathrm{f}^{\prime} ; \mathrm{PM}$ : $\mathrm{f} \not{ }^{\prime}$ (only indicated once)—overlapping $\mathrm{f} \sharp$ in T1, A2, and BG.
M. 60, T1, note 1, FP: a; PM: e-FP could be for voice leading.
M. 61, T1, notes 3 and 4, FP: d' d'; PM: a a.
M. 62 note $5-\mathrm{m} .63$ note 4, A2, FP: two iterations of "Dei" with melisma on the second "De" on m . 63 notes 1-3; PM: one iteration of "Dei" with melisma on "De."
M. 63, A1, note 5, FP: $\mathrm{f}^{\prime} ; \mathrm{PM}: \mathrm{f} \sharp$ '-overlapping $\mathrm{f} \sharp$ in T 2 and BG.
M. 65, A2, note 2, FP: f'; PM: $\mathrm{f} \sharp$ ’-FP: $\sharp$ at first iteration in m. 31 .
M. 66, BG, note 1, FP: dotted semiminim; PM: dotted minim.
M. 69, BG, note 2, FP: 6 figure exists but not raised.
M. 71 note $2-\mathrm{m}$. 73 note 1, A1, FP: one iteration of "super" with "su" melisma in m .71 from note 2 through note 4 and melisma on "per" in m. 72 from note 1 through note 5; PM: two iterations of "supra" with a melisma on the second "su" from m. 71 note 4 through m .72 note 5-FP melisma over repeated notes; PM matches prior iteration better (mm. 38-39).
M. 71, B2, note 3, FP: b; PM: c'-BG: b.
M. 73, A1, notes 1-3, FP: dotted minim, semiminim; PM: minim, semiminim, semiminim—FP differs due to underlay; PM matches prior iteration better (m. 39, notes 4-6).
M. 74, D1, note 2, FP: dotted semiminim; PM: dotted minim.
M. 74, A1, note 3, FP: semiminim; PM: fusa.
M. 77 note $3-\mathrm{m}$. 78 note 1, BG, FP: erroneous 43 figure removed.
M. 78, D2, notes 5-7, FP: g' fusa, a' fusa, b' semiminim; PM: g' semiminim, $\mathrm{a}^{\prime}$ fusa, $\mathrm{b}^{\prime}$ fusa-PM aligns with BG and A 1 .
M. 78, B2, notes 8-10, FP: e fusa, f fusa, g semiminim; PM : e semiminim, f fusa, g fusa-PM matches BG.
M. 81, BG, note 7, FP: 6 figure exists but not raised.
M. 86, BG, note 4, FP: 3 figure exists but not raised.
Mm. 87-89, B1, FP: melisma on "le" ends on m. 88 note 1; PM: melisma on "le" ends on m. 87 note 6 , necessitating a melisma in the next word indicated by ij .
M. 88, B2, notes 1-6, FP: "le" falls on note 1 with no melisma indicated (understood to be on "ia"); PM: "le" falls on note 2 with a melisma indicated on "lu."
M. 91, B2, note 3, FP: e; PM: f.
M. 93, T2, note 3, FP: g; PM: $\mathrm{f} \sharp$.
M. 93, T2, note 5, FP: a; PM: a $\ddagger$.
M. 95, all, PM has a fermata on final longa in all parts.

## 98. Andreas Berger - Jubilate Deo

## Sources

FP - Bodenschatz Florilegium Portense (Leipzig, 1618)
HSCS - Berger Harmoniae Seu Cantiones Sacrae (Augsburg, 1606)
LU - Liber Usualis (New York, 1962)

FP \#98
Sextus (D2)
Discantus (D1)
Altus (A1)
Bassus (B1)
Septima (A2)
Quintus (T2)
Tenor (T1)
Octava (B2)
Basis Generalis (BG)

HSCS \#29 LU p. 221
Cantus
Quinta
Septima
Octava
Altus
Sexta
Tenor
Bassus

## Minor Discrepancies

M. 5, BG, notes 5-7, FP: 6 figure on note 7 only.
M. 7, D2, note 2, FP: f; HSCS: f $\sharp$.
M. 11 note $1-\mathrm{m} .12$ note 4, D2, FP: explicit underlay; HSCS: ii.
M. 11 note $1-\mathrm{m} .12$ note 4, D1, FP: explicit underlay; HSCS: ij.
Mm. 16-17, D1, FP: explicit underlay; HSCS: ij.
Mm. 16-17, B1, FP: explicit underlay; HSCS: ii.
M. 17, T1, FP: explicit underlay; HSCS: ii.
M. 18, A2, notes 2-4, HSCS: explicit $\ddagger$ on notes 2 and 4.
M. 24, D2, notes 2-5, FP: f" e" f $\ddagger$ " f"; HSCS: f $\ddagger$ " e f $\ddagger$ " f $f$ ".
M. 30, B1, note 4, explicit $\downarrow$ in both sources.
M. 30, B2, note 4, HSCS: explicit $\downarrow$.
M. 31, B2, note 4, HSCS: explicit $\bigsqcup$.
M. 33, BG, notes 2 and 3, FP: 6 figure appears over note 3 .
M. 35 note $3-\mathrm{m}$. 36 note 4, A2, FP: explicit underlay; HSCS: ij.
M. 36 note $1-$ m. 37 note 4, D2, FP: explicit underlay; HSCS: ii.
M. 36, A2, note 4, FP: f'; HSCS: f\#'.
M. 36 note 5-m. 37 note 6, A2, FP: explicit underlay; HSCS: ij.

M. 37, A2, note 2, HSCS: explicit h .
Mm. 37-45, T2, FP: minim rest, longa rest, longa rest, longa rest, breve rest, semibreve rest, minim rest; HSCS: minim rest, semibreve rest, breve rest, longa rest, longa rest, longa rest, minim rest-HSCS follows barlines.
M. 40, BG, notes 3 and 4, FP: 76 figure appears over note 4.
Mm. 45-51, D2, FP: longa rest, longa rest, longa rest, minim rest; HSCS: semibreve rest, longa rest, longa rest, breve rest, semibreve rest, minim rest-HSCS follows barlines.
Mm. 45-51, D1, FP: longa rest, longa rest, longa rest, minim rest; HSCS: semibreve rest, longa rest, longa rest, breve rest, semibreve rest, minim rest-HSCS follows barlines.
Mm. 45-51, A1, FP: longa rest, longa rest, longa rest, minim rest; HSCS: semibreve rest, longa rest, longa rest, breve rest, semibreve rest, minim rest-HSCS follows barlines.
Mm. 45-51, B1, FP: longa rest, longa rest, longa rest, minim rest; HSCS: semibreve rest, longa rest, longa rest, breve rest, semibreve rest, minim rest-HSCS follows barlines.
Mm. 47-49, Choir 2, FP and HSCS: "Nos autem populus ejus"; LU: "Populus ejus."

M. 48, T1, note 2, FP: f; HSCS: f $\ddagger$.
M. 52, B1, note 1, HSCS: explicit $\downarrow$.
M. 52, B2, note 3, HSCS: explicit $\hbar$.
M. 53, B2, note 1, HSCS: explicit 4 .
M. 56 note $1-\mathrm{m} .57$ note 1, T2, FP: explicit underlay; HSCS: ij.
M. 58, A1, note 2, FP: $\mathrm{f}^{\prime}$; HSCS: $\mathrm{f} \sharp$ '.
M. 64 note $1-\mathrm{m} .65$ note 1 , A1, HSCS: explicit $\downarrow$ on each b’ .
M. 68, T2, note 6, FP: c'; HSCS: cł'.
Mm. 71-74, T2, FP: longa rest, semibreve rest, minim rest; HSCS: semibreve rest, longa rest, minim rest-HSCS follows barlines.
Mm. 71-74, B2, FP: longa rest, semibreve rest, minim rest; HSCS: semibreve rest, longa rest, minim rest-HSCS follows barlines.
M. 72, B1, note 4, FP: c'; HSCS: c\#'.
Mm. 74-79, D2, FP: longa rest, longa rest, semibreve rest, minim rest; HSCS: semibreve rest, breve rest, longa rest, breve rest, minim rest-HSCS follows barlines.
Mm. 74-79, B1, FP: longa rest, longa rest, semibreve rest, minim rest; HSCS: semibreve rest, breve rest, longa rest, breve rest, minim rest-HSCS follows barlines.
M. 74, A2, note 3, explicit $\ddagger$ in both sources.
M. 76 note $4-\mathrm{m} .78$ note 1, A2, FP: explicit underlay; HSCS: ii.
M. 76 note $4-\mathrm{m} .78$ note 1, T2, FP: explicit underlay; HSCS: ii.
M. 76, T1, note 3, HSCS: explicit $\downarrow$.
M. 76 note $4-\mathrm{m} .78$ note 1 , T1, FP: explicit underlay; HSCS: ii.
M. 76, B2, note 1, explicit $\downarrow$ in both sources.
M. 77, B2, note 3, HSCS: explicit Ł.
M. 78, T2, note 6, FP: c'; HSCS: c $\ddagger$ '.
M. 78, T1, note 1 , explicit $\bigsqcup$ in both sources.
M. 79, D1, note 2, explicit $\ddagger$ in both sources.
M. 81, B2, note 3, HSCS: explicit 4.
M. 82, A2, note 4, FP: f'; HSCS: $f \sharp$ '.
Mm. 84-86, D2, FP: explicit underlay; HSCS: ij.
Mm. 84-86, D1, FP: explicit underlay; HSCS: ii.
Mm. 84-86, A1, FP: explicit underlay; HSCS: ij.
M. 84 note $4-\mathrm{m} .86$ note 2 , A2, FP: ij; HSCS: explicit underlay.
M. 84 note $4-\mathrm{m} .86$ note 2 , T2, FP: ij; HSCS: explicit underlay.
M. 85, B2, note 6, HSCS: explicit $九$.

## Significant Discrepancies

M. 4 note 4-m. 7 note 5, D2, FP: one iteration of "jubilate Deo" with melisma on "ju" from m. 4 note 4 through m. 5 note 5, melisma on "la" on m. 6 notes 1 and 2, and melisma on "De" from m. 6 note 4 through m. 7 note 4 ; HSCS: two iterations of "jubilate Deo", one explicit and one ii (no explicit melisma)-HSCS is more logical, matches A1 in m. 6.
M. 10 note $6-\mathrm{m} .11$ note 2 , A2, FP: $\mathrm{f} \not$ ' $^{\prime}$ minim, g ' semibreve, $\mathrm{f} \sharp$ ' minim with "te" on m .10 note 7 ; HSCS: $\mathrm{f} \not \ddagger \mathbf{\prime}$ minim, $\mathrm{g}^{\prime}$ dotted minim, $\mathrm{f} \not \mathrm{J}^{\prime}$ fusa, $\mathrm{e}^{\prime}$ fusa, $\mathrm{f} \not \mathrm{g}^{\prime}$ minim with "te" on m. 10 note 6 and melisma on "De" starting on m. 10 note 7—possible simplification; HSCS matches D2 in m. 7 better.
M. 10, BG, notes 4 and 5, FP: erroneous $\sharp$ on note 5 removed-perhaps intended for note 4 .
M. 11 note $3-\mathrm{m}$. 12 note 4, T1, FP: "omnis terra" with melisma on "ter" on m .12 notes 1 through 3; HSCS: "jubilate Deo" with no melisma.
M. 12, D1, note 3, FP: semiminim; HSCS: minim.
M. 14, A1, note 2, FP: semiminim; HSCS: minim.
Mm. 15-16, A1, FP: minim rest; HSCS: minim rest, minim rest.
M. 16, D1, note 3, FP: e"; HSCS: d".
M. 16, A1, notes 1 and 2, FP: $f^{\prime} f \sharp^{\prime} ;$ HSCS: $f^{\prime} f^{\prime}$.
M. 17, T1, notes 1 and 2, FP: $\mathrm{f} \sharp \sharp$; HSCS: $\mathrm{f} \sharp \mathrm{f}-\mathrm{HSCS}$ : second sharp implied.
M. 17, T1, note 2, FP: semiminim; HSCS: fusa.
M. 23, D2, notes 3-5, FP: "te" on note 3 with melisma through note 5; HSCS: "te" on note 5.
M. 23 note $2-$ m. 24 note 1, D1, FP: "te" on m. 23 note 2, melisma on "Do" from m. 23 note 3
through m. 24 note 1; HSCS: "te" on m. 23 note 4, "Do" on m. 24 note 1—FP matches T2 in $\mathrm{m} .25-26$; HSCS is more consistent with A 1 and B 1 in m. 23-24.
M. 23, D1, note 3, FP: c"; HSCS: c丸"-T1 m. 26 not $\sharp$.
M. 23, A1, note 3, FP: $\mathrm{f}^{\prime}$; HSCS: $\mathrm{f} \sharp$ '.
M. 25, A2, note 6, FP: f'; HSCS: f $\sharp$ '—D2 m. 23 not $\sharp$.
M. 25, T1, note 4, FP: f; HSCS: f $\ddagger$.
M. 27, A1, note 2, FP: $\mathrm{f}^{\prime} ;$ HSCS: $\mathrm{f} \sharp$,
M. 32, A1, note 1, FP: f'; HSCS: f $\sharp$ '.
M. 32, BG, note 5, FP: erroneous 4 removed.
M. 33, BG, note 4, FP: erroneous 43 removed.
M. 36, A2, notes 6-9, FP: $f \sharp \not{ }^{\prime}$ dotted semiminim, a' fusa, a’ semiminim, a’ semiminim; HSCS: $f \sharp$, semiminim, a' semiminim, a' dotted semiminim, a’ fusa-FP rhythm aligns with other parts.
M. 37, A1, note 3, FP: f'; HSCS: $f \sharp{ }^{\prime}$.
M. 37, A2, note 5, FP: f'; HSCS: $f \sharp$ '.
M. 39, A1, note 3, FP: g'; HSCS: g $H^{\prime}$.
M. 42, D2, note 4, FP: g"; HSCS: d".
M. 42, BG, note 3, FP: d'-B1: c'.
M. 43, D1, note 3, FP: $\mathrm{f}^{\prime}$; HSCS: $\mathrm{f} \not \mathrm{\prime}$ "—related to change in B1.
M. 43, B1, note 1, FP: bb; HSCS: b.
M. 43 note 3-m. 44 note 1, B1, FP: minim; HSCS: semibreve.
M. 44, D1, note 1, FP: bb'; HSCS: b'.
M. 44, A1, note 4, FP: c'; HSCS: cH'.
M. 48, T2, notes 6-8, FP: g f g\#; HSCS: g f $\sharp$ g.
M. 48 note 2-m. 49 note 2, T1, FP: melisma on "lus" on m. 48 note 3 through 5, "e" on m. 49 note 1, "jus et" on two g minims; HSCS: melisma on "lus" on m. 48 note 3 and 4, "e" on m. 48 note 5, "jus" on m. 49 note 1, "et" on g semibreve.
M. 48, T1, note 3, FP: g; HSCS: g $\sharp$.
M. 51, BG, note 1, FP: 6 figure exists but not raised.
M. 52, D2, note 5, FP: d"; HSCS: c".
M. 53, B2, note 1, FP: semibreve; HSCS: minim—BG: minim.
M. 53, BG, note 3, FP: 6 figure exists but not raised.
Mm. 59-66, all, rhythmic values in HSCS are half of FP.
M. 59, D2, note 2, FP: c"; HSCS: c
Mm. 59-66, BG, FP: measures in BG contain six semibreves-dotted barlines are editorial.
M. 65, BG, note 2, FP: A-B2: G.
M. 69 note $6-\mathrm{m} .70$ note 1, A1, FP: g' semibreve; HSCS: g' dotted minim, d' semiminim.
M. 71 note $4-$ m. 73 note 4, D1, FP: two iterations of "suavis" with no melisma indicated; HSCS: one "suavis", melisma on "a" in m. 72 note 1 through note 3, melisma on "Do" in m. 73 note 2 through 4.
M. 71 note $3-$ m. 73 note 1 , A1, FP: g' minim, e' semiminim, a' minim, a' semiminim, a' dotted semibreve; HSCS: d' minim, a' minim, a’ semibreve, a' minim, a' minim-HSCS aligns with B1, completes chord in m. 71 note 3 .
M. 71, T1, note 2, FP: f\#; HSCS: f.
M. 72, D1, note 3, FP: d"; HSCS: e".
M. 73, BG, note 3, FP: 6 figure exists but not raised.
M. 75, A2, note 3, FP: f'; HSCS: f ${ }^{\prime}$ '.
M. 75, A2, note 4, FP: e'; HSCS: f $\sharp$ '.
M. 76, T2, note 2, FP: c'; HSCS: c $\ddagger$ '- $\sharp$ in BG.
M. 76, BG, note 2, FP: 6 figure exists but not raised.
M. 77, A2, note 1, FP: $\mathrm{f}^{\prime}$; HSCS: $\mathrm{f} \sharp$ '.
M. 77, A2, note 2, FP: e'; HSCS: $f \sharp$,
M. 77, T2, note 4, FP: c'; HSCS: $\mathrm{c} \ddagger$ '.
M. 78, BG, note 2, FP: 3 figure exists but not raised.
M. 79, A1, note 3, FP: f'; HSCS: $f \sharp^{\prime}$.
M. 80, A1, note 1, FP: f $\psi^{\prime}$; HSCS: g'.
M. 80 note $4-\mathrm{m} .81$ note 3 , B1, FP: b fusa, c' fusa, d' minim, g minim, g semiminim; HSCS: b $\ddagger$ dotted semiminim, a fusa, g minim, g semiminim-HSCS matches other parts better, FP is an ornamentation.
M. 81 note $7-$ m. 82 note 6 , A2, FP: ij ("in generationem"); HSCS and LU: "et generationem."
M. 81, T2, note 7, FP: "in"; HSCS and LU: "et."
M. 81, T1, note 7, FP: "in"; HSCS and LU: "et."
M. 81 note $7-$ m. 82 note 6 , B2, FP: ij ("in generationem"); HSCS and LU: "et generationem."
M. 82 note $3-$ m. 84 note 1, D2, FP: d" minim, e" semiminim, d" semiminim, e" fusa, f $\#$ " minim, minim rest, semibreve rest, minim rest, $g$ " dotted minim; HSCS: d" dotted semiminim, e" fusa, $d "$ semiminim, e" semiminim, $f \sharp$ " semiminim, semibreve rest, minim rest, $g$ " dotted minim—FP m. 83 note 4 should be semiminim; significant rhythmic change in FP.
M. 82 note $3-\mathrm{m}$. 84 note 1, D1, FP: b’ minim, a' semiminim, a' semiminim, cł" semiminim, d" minim, minim rest, semibreve rest, minim rest, d" dotted minim; HSCS: b' semiminim, a'
semiminim, a' semiminim, cł" semiminim, d" semiminim, semibreve rest, minim rest, d" dotted minim—significant rhythmic change in FP.
M. 82 note $3-\mathrm{m}$. 84 note 1 , A1, FP: g' minim, a’ semiminim, $f \sharp$ ' semiminim, a’ semiminim, a’ minim, minim rest, semibreve rest, minim rest, $g$ ' semiminim; HSCS: $g$ ' semiminim, a' semiminim, $f \not \sharp$ ’ semiminim, $a^{\prime}$ semiminim, $a^{\prime}$ semiminim, semibreve rest, minim rest, $g$ ' semiminim-significant rhythmic change in FP.
M. 82 note $3-$ m. 84 note 1 , B1, FP: d' minim, ct' semiminim, d' semiminim, a semiminim, d' minim, minim rest, semibreve rest, minim rest, g dotted minim; HSCS: d' dotted semiminim, $\mathrm{c}_{\mathrm{H}}$, fusa, d' semiminim, a semiminim, d' semiminim, semibreve rest, minim rest, g dotted minim-significant rhythmic change in FP.
M. 83 note $1-\mathrm{m} .84$ note 3 , A2, FP: semibreve rest, semiminim rest, $\mathrm{f} \sharp$ ' minim, a' semiminim, $\mathrm{f}^{\prime}$ semiminim, a' semiminim, a' minim, minim rest; HSCS: minim rest, semiminim rest, $\mathrm{f} \sharp$ ' dotted semiminim, a' fusa, $f \sharp$ ' semiminim, a' semiminim, a' semiminim, minim rest—FP m. 84 note 1 should be $f \sharp{ }_{\sharp}^{\prime}$; significant rhythmic change in FP.
M. 83 note $1-\mathrm{m} .84$ note 3 , T2, FP: semibreve rest, semiminim rest, d' minim, e' semiminim, d' semiminim, e' semiminim, $f \sharp$ ' minim, minim rest; HSCS: minim rest, semiminim rest, d' dotted semiminim, e' fusa, d' semiminim, e' semiminim, $f \sharp$ ' semiminim, minim rest—significant rhythmic change in FP.
M. 83 note $1-\mathrm{m} .84$ note 3 , T1, FP: semibreve rest, semiminim rest, a minim, a semiminim, a semiminim, cł’ semiminim, d' minim, minim rest; HSCS: minim rest, semiminim rest, a dotted semiminim, a fusa, a semiminim, $c \nleftarrow$ ' semiminim, d' semiminim, minim rest-significant rhythmic change in FP.
M. 83 note $1-\mathrm{m} .84$ note 3 , B2, FP: semibreve rest, semiminim rest, $d$ minim, $c \sharp$ semiminim, $d$ semiminim, A semiminim, d minim, minim rest; HSCS: minim rest, semiminim rest, d dotted semiminim, $\mathrm{c} \sharp$ fusa, d semiminim, A semiminim, d semiminim, minim rest-significant rhythmic change in FP.
M. 85, B2, note 2, FP: minim; HSCS: semiminim.

## 99. Andreas Berger - Cantate Domino

## Sources

FP - Bodenschatz Florilegium Portense (Leipzig, 1618)
HSCS - Berger Harmoniae Seu Cantiones Sacrae (Augsburg, 1606)
LU - Liber Usualis (New York, 1962)
FP \#99 HSCS \#28 LU p. 388
Sextus (D2) Cantus
Discantus (D1) Quinta
Altus (A1) Septima
Bassus (B1) Octava
Septima (A2) Altus
Tenor (T1) Sexta
Quintus (T2) Tenor
Octava (B2) Bassus
Basis Generalis (BG)

## Minor Discrepancies

M. 10 note 6-m. 11 note 3, B2, FP: explicit underlay; HSCS: ij.
M. 11, A2, FP: explicit underlay; HSCS: ii.
M. 21 note $6-\mathrm{m} .22$ note 3, B1, FP: explicit underlay; HSCS: ii.
M. 22, D2, notes 1-5, FP: explicit underlay; HSCS: ii.
M. 22 note $1-\mathrm{m} .23$ note 1, D1, FP: explicit underlay; HSCS: ii.
M. 22, A1, notes 1-5, FP: explicit underlay; HSCS: ii.
M. 23, A1, note 6, FP: f; HSCS: f $\sharp$.
M. 23 , BG, note 3 , FP: 43 -should be $\sharp 4 \sharp$.
M. 28, B1, note 1, HSCS: possible explicit $\ddagger$ (hard to read).
M. 28 note $4-\mathrm{m} .30$ note 1, T1, FP: explicit underlay; HSCS: ii.
M. 29 note $1-$ m. 30 note 3, D1, FP: explicit underlay; HSCS: ii.
M. 29 note $1-$ m. 30 note 1, A1, FP: explicit underlay; HSCS: ii.
M. 29 note $1-$ m. 30 note 3, B1, FP: explicit underlay; HSCS: ij.
M. 29, B1, note 3, HSCS: explicit natural (notated as sharp).
M. 30, D2, note 6, FP: f; HSCS: f $\sharp$.
M. 34, BG, note 2, FP: 43-should be 343 (naturals added).
M. 37, B1, FP: explicit underlay; HSCS: ii.
M. 37, BG, notes 1-4, FP: notated in bass clef despite being for upper choir.
M. 37, BG, notes 7 and 8, FP: 6 figure over note 8-moved to note 7.
M. 38, A1, notes 4-6, HSCS: explicit $\ddagger$ on notes 4 and 6.
M. 39, T1, note 3, HSCS: explicit $\downarrow$.
M. 41 note 5-m. 42 note 4, T2, FP: explicit underlay; HSCS: ij.
M. 45 note $8-$ m. 46 note 1, A1, FP: explicit underlay; HSCS: ij.
Mm. 46-52, B2, FP: longa rest, semibreve rest, longa rest, breve rest, semibreve rest; HSCS: semibreve rest, longa rest, longa rest, breve rest, semibreve rest-HSCS follows barlines.
M. 48 note $2-$ m. 49 note 1, D2, FP: explicit underlay; HSCS: ii.
M. 48 note $2-$ m. 49 note 8 , A1, FP: explicit underlay; HSCS: ij.
M. 49 note $2-$ m. 50 note 3, D2, FP: explicit underlay; HSCS: ii.
M. 49 note $4-$ m. 50 note 3, D1, FP: explicit underlay; HSCS: ii.
Mm. 52-55, D2, FP: longa rest, semibreve rest, minim rest; HSCS: semibreve rest, longa rest, minim rest-HSCS follows barlines.
M. 54 note $2-\mathrm{m}$. 55 note 1, T1, FP: explicit underlay; HSCS: ii.
M. 59 note $6-\mathrm{m} .61$ note 1, A2, FP: explicit underlay; HSCS: ii.
M. 71 note $1-$ m. 72 note 2, A2, FP: "jubilate Deo"; HSCS: "moveatur mare."
M. 72, B1, FP: explicit underlay; HSCS: ii.
Mm. 75-77, D2, FP: longa rest; HSCS: semibreve rest, breve rest, semibreve rest—HSCS follows barlines.
Mm. 75-77, D1, FP: longa rest; HSCS: semibreve rest, breve rest, semibreve rest—HSCS follows barlines.

## Significant Discrepancies

Mm. 1-12, A1, FP: longa rest, longa rest, longa rest, longa rest, breve rest, semibreve rest; HSCS: longa rest, longa rest, longa rest, longa rest, longa rest, breve rest-FP is missing longa rest; HSCS is missing semibreve rest.
M. 3, BG, note 5 , 3 figure exists, natural added.
M. 4 , BG, note 6 , erroneous 6 figure removed.
M. 5 note $1-\mathrm{m} .6$ note 1, T1, FP: b semibreve, c' minim, g minim, g minim; HSCS: b minim, c' dotted minim, $b$ fusa, a fusa, $g$ semibreve all on "ta" melisma-HSCS matches dotted figure from other parts, but FP represents simplification.
M. 6, BG, note 2 , erroneous 6 figure removed.
M. 8, BG, note 1,6 figure exists but not raised.
M. 8, T2, note 2, FP: f\#; HSCS: f.
M. 10, BG, note 2, erroneous 6 figure removed.
M. 12, BG, note 2, erroneous 6 figure removed.
M. 12, A2, FP: ij (indicating "mirabilia"), melisma on "fe" from note 6 through note 8; HSCS: melisma on "fe" from note 1 through note 8.
M. 15, BG, note 3, FP: b-B1: bb.
M. 16, D2, notes 1-3, FP: dotted minim, fusa, fusa; HSCS: minim, semiminim, semiminim.
M. 16, A1, note 2, FP: g'; HSCS: b'-HSCS creates parallel unison with D1.
M. 16, D2, note 7, FP: f; HSCS: f $\sharp$.
M. 16, A1, note 10 , FP: c; HSCS: c $\sharp$.
M. 19, BG, note 1,6 figure exists but not raised.
M. 19, A1, note 2, FP: f\#; HSCS: f.
M. 20, D2, note 2, FP: e"; HSCS: d"-hand-corrected in LOC copy.
M. 20, BG, note 2 , erroneous 6 figure removed.
Mm. 20-21, D1, FP: c" dotted semibreve, b' minim, a' semiminim, g' semiminim, g' semiminim, a' semiminim, b' dotted semiminim, c" fusa, d" minim with melisma on "a" of "mirabilia" from m. 21 note 5 through note 7; HSCS: c" dotted semibreve, b' minim, a' minim, g' semiminim, a' semiminim, $b \not \square$ ' semiminim, $g$ ' semiminim, $f \sharp$ ' minim with melisma on "qui" in m. 20-FP aligns with chords and other parts better.
M. 21, BG, note 7, erroneous 6 figure removed.
M. 23, D1, notes 2-4, FP: minim; HSCS: fusa, fusa, semiminim.
M. 23, D1, notes 2-7, FP: melisma on "fe"; HSCS: additional ii (mirabilia), "fe" starts on note 7.
M. 23, B1, notes 3 and 4, FP: melisma not evident; HSCS: melisma on "fe" on notes 3 and 4.
M. 25 note $7-$ m. 26 note 1, T2, FP: e' minim, d' semiminim, d' minim with "ta" melisma continuing through m. 25 note 7; HSCS: e' minim, d' dotted minim with "te" on m. 25 note 7.
M. 27, D1, notes 1-3, FP: semiminim, fusa, fusa; HSCS: dotted semiminim, semifusa, semifusa.
M. 27, T1, notes 1-3, FP: semiminim, fusa, fusa; HSCS: dotted semiminim, semifusa, semifusa-possible simplification, but FP causes dissonances.
Mm. 27-28, B2, FP: melisma on "ti" from m. 27 note 2 through m. 28 note 2; HSCS: melisma on "can" from m. 27 note 1 through m. 28 note 1-HSCS matches other parts.
M. 28, T1, notes 4-6, FP: semiminim, fusa, fusa; HSCS: dotted semiminim, semifusa, semifusa-possible simplification, but FP causes dissonances.
M. 28 note 4-m. 31 note 1, B2, FP: melisma on "can" from m. 28 note 4 to m. 29 note 1, melisma on "cum" from m. 29 note 3 through 5, two syllabic iterations of "novum"; HSCS: ij and one iteration of novum-should match melisma in m. 27-28.
M. 28, A1, FP: "cantate"; HSCS: "canticum."
M. 29, D1, notes 1-3, FP: semiminim, fusa, fusa; HSCS: dotted semiminim, semifusa, semifusa.
M. 30, B1, notes 2-4, FP: "ti" on note 3; HSCS: "no" on note 4 (previous word only indicated by ij)-HSCS aligns with other parts.
M. 30, T1, notes 2 and 3, melisma not evident in either source.
M. 33, B1, notes 2 and 3, FP: melisma not evident; HSCS: melisma on "ra" on notes 2 and 3.
M. 34, BG, note 1,4 figure exists but not lowered.
M. 34, D1, note 2, FP: a'; HSCS: bb’.
M. 35, BG, note 2 , clef change missing.
M. 36, D2, note 2, FP: e"; HSCS: c".
M. 36, BG, note 2, FP: semifusa.
M. 37, D1, notes 3 and 4, FP: semiminim, semiminim; HSCS: dotted semiminim, fusa.
M. 37, B1, notes 3 and 4, FP: semiminim, semiminim; HSCS: dotted semiminim, fusa-BG supports FP.
M. 37 note $3-\mathrm{m}$. 38 note 1, T1, FP: d' semiminim, e' semiminim, d' semiminim; HSCS: d' semiminim, d' minim.
M. 37, B2, notes 3 and 4, FP: semiminim, semiminim; HSCS: dotted semiminim, fusa-BG supports FP.
M. 38, T2, note 2, FP: a; HSCS: g-hand-corrected in LOC copy.
M. 38, D2, note 6, FP: d"; HSCS: g"-d" is doubled in D1.
M. 39, T2, note 1, FP: c'; HSCS: cł'.
M. 40 note $1-\mathrm{m} .41$ note 2 , T2, FP: c' dotted minim, $b$ fusa, c' fusa, d' minim, g semiminim, g semiminim, g minim, g semiminim, g semiminim - melisma on "ra" from FP note 1 through 4, ij ("omnis terra"), "can"; HSCS: c' minim, b fusa, c' fusa, d' minim, g semiminim, g minim, g minim, g minim - "ra", melisma on "o" from HSCS note 2 through 4, "mnis terra can"-HSCS aligns with other parts and harmonies.
M. 45, D1, notes 7 and 8, FP: extraneous c" semiminim.
M. 45 note $8-$ m. 46 note 1, D2, FP: "Domino"; HSCS: ii ("psallite").
M. 45 note $8-$ m. 46 note 2, D1, FP: "Domino"; HSCS: ii ("psallite").
M. 45 note $8-$ m. 46 note 1, A2, FP: "Domino"; HSCS: ij ("psallite").
M. 45 note $8-\mathrm{m} .46$ note 1, T2, FP: "Domino"; HSCS: ij ("psallite").
M. 45 note $8-$ m. 46 note 1, T1, FP: "Domino"; HSCS: ii ("psallite").
M. 45 note $8-$ m. 46 note 1, B2, FP: "Domino"; HSCS: explicit "psallite."
M. 47, B1, notes $1-3$, FP: "lite" on notes 1 and 2 before line break; HSCS: "lite" on notes 2 and 3-HSCS is more consistent with other parts.
M. 55 note 4-m. 56 note 1, D1, FP: "duct" on m. 56 note 1 after line break; HSCS: "duct" on m. 55 note 4-inconsistent with other parts, no melisma indicated.
Mm. 58-59, all, FP: "et sono tubae" except in A1; HSCS, LU, and FP A1: "et voce tubae."
M. 60, A2, note 3, FP: f'; HSCS: g'-hand-corrected in LOC copy.
Mm. 63-66, BG, FP: measures in BG contain six semibreves-dotted barlines are editorial.
M. 69, BG, note 3, FP: c-B1 and B2: d.
M. 69, A2, note 4, FP: g'; HSCS: a'.
M. 73, A1, note 1, FP: minim rest, semiminim rest, b' semiminim; HSCS: minim rest, b' minim.
M. 74, BG, note 2, erroneous 6 figure removed.
M. 74, A2, notes 4 and 5, FP: melisma not evident; HSCS: melisma on "e" on notes 4 and 5.
M. 77, B2, note 2, FP: G; HSCS: F.
M. 78, D1, note 1, FP: semiminim in LOC and Hamburg copies, minim in SLUB copy; HSCS: minim.
Mm. 78-79, A1, FP: melisma on "e" from m. 78 note 5 through m. 79 note 2; HSCS: melisma on "ha" on m. 78 notes 1 and 2.
Mm. 82-89, BG, FP: measures in BG contain six semibreves-dotted barlines are editorial.
M. 84, D1, note 3, FP: semibreve; HSCS: minim.
M. 90 note $5-\mathrm{m} .91$ note 3, D2, FP: melisma on "lu" from m. 90 note 5 through m. 91 note 3;

HSCS: "lu" on m. 91 note 3.

## 100. Andreas Berger - Laudate Dominum

## Sources

FP - Bodenschatz Florilegium Portense (Leipzig, 1618)
HSCS - Berger Harmoniae Seu Cantiones Sacrae (Augsburg, 1606)
LU - Liber Usualis (New York, 1962)
FP \#100 HSCS \#32 LU p. 683-684
Sextus (D2) Cantus
Discantus (D1) Quinta
Altus (A1) Septima
Septima (A2) Octava
Tenor (T1) Altus
Quintus (T2) Sexta
Bassus (B1) Tenor
Octava (B2) Bassus
Basis Generalis (BG)

## Minor Discrepancies

M. 4 note $1-\mathrm{m} .6$ note 1 , A1, FP: explicit underlay; HSCS: ij.
M. 6, D1, note 1 , explicit $\downarrow$ in both sources.
Mm. 6-9, T2, FP: longa rest, breve rest, minim rest; HSCS: semibreve rest, longa rest, semibreve rest, minim rest-HSCS follows barlines.
Mm. 6-9, B1, FP: minim rest, longa rest, breve rest, minim rest; HSCS: minim rest, semibreve rest, longa rest, semibreve rest, minim rest-HSCS follows barlines.
Mm. 6-9, B2, FP: longa rest, breve rest, minim rest; HSCS: semibreve rest, longa rest, semibreve rest, minim rest-HSCS follows barlines.
M. 13 note 3-m. 14 note 2, D2, FP: ij; HSCS: explicit underlay.
M. 13 note 3-m. 14 note 2, A2, FP: ij; HSCS: explicit underlay.
M. 13 note 6-m. 14 note 6, T1, FP: ij; HSCS: explicit underlay.
M. 13 note 3-m. 14 note 4, T2, FP: ij; HSCS: explicit underlay.
M. 13 note 3-m. 14 note 6, B2, FP: ij; HSCS: explicit underlay.
M. 14 note 3-m. 15 note 2, D1, FP: ij missing; HSCS: ii.
M. 14 note $7-\mathrm{m}$. 15 note 6, T1, FP: explicit underlay; HSCS: ij.
M. 14 note $5-\mathrm{m} .15$ note 4, T2, FP: explicit underlay; HSCS: ii.
M. 14 note $7-$ m. 15 note 6 , B2, FP: explicit underlay; HSCS: ij.
M. 15, D1, note 6, explicit $\ddagger$ in both sources.
M. 20, T2, note 3 , explicit $\bigsqcup$ in both sources.
Mm. 21-22, T1, FP: breve rest; HSCS: semibreve rest, semibreve rest—HSCS follows barlines.
Mm. 21-22, T2, FP: breve rest; HSCS: semibreve rest, semibreve rest—HSCS follows barlines.
Mm. 21-22, B1, FP: breve rest; HSCS: semibreve rest, semibreve rest—HSCS follows barlines.
Mm. 21-22, B2, FP: breve rest; HSCS: semibreve rest, semibreve rest-HSCS follows barlines.
Mm. 22-24, D1, FP: longa rest, semiminim rest; HSCS: semibreve rest, breve rest, semibreve rest, semiminim rest-HSCS follows barlines.
M. 23, BG, notes 2 and 3, FP: 6 figure appears between notes 2 and 3 and 43 figure appears over the next barline.
Mm. 23-32, all, LU: Chri-sti; CMOS: Chris-ti (not an explicit example).
M. 26, D2, notes 2-6, FP: explicit underlay; HSCS: ij.
M. 26, D1, notes 2-6, FP: explicit underlay; HSCS: ij.
M. 26, D1, note 6, explicit $\ddagger$ in both sources.
M. 26, A1, notes 2-6, FP: explicit underlay; HSCS: ij.
M. 26, T1, notes 2-5, FP: $f \sharp^{\prime} f^{\prime} f^{\prime} f^{\prime} ;$ HSCS: $f \not{ }^{\prime} f \sharp^{\prime} f \sharp{ }_{\prime}^{\prime} f^{\prime}$.
M. 26, T1, notes 2-6, FP: explicit underlay; HSCS: ij.
M. 26, T2, notes 2-6, FP: explicit underlay; HSCS: ii.
M. 26, B1, notes 2-6, FP: explicit underlay; HSCS: ij.
M. 27, T1, note 6 , explicit $\downarrow$ in both sources.
M. 29, D1, notes 5-7, FP: $\ddagger$ on note 5 only; HSCS: $\bigsqcup$ on note 7 only.
M. 31 note $3-\mathrm{m} .32$ note 4, T1, FP: explicit underlay; HSCS: ij.
M. 31 note $2-\mathrm{m} .32$ note 3, T2, FP: explicit underlay; HSCS: ii.
M. 31 note $4-\mathrm{m} .32$ note 2, B1, FP: explicit underlay; HSCS: ii.
Mm. 35-36, T1, FP: explicit underlay; HSCS: ii.
Mm. 36-43, T2, FP: longa rest, longa rest, longa rest, semibreve rest, minim rest; HSCS: semibreve rest, longa rest, longa rest, longa rest, minim rest-HSCS follows barlines.
Mm. 36-43, B1, FP: longa rest, longa rest, longa rest, semibreve rest, minim rest; HSCS: semibreve rest, longa rest, longa rest, longa rest, minim rest-HSCS follows barlines.
Mm. 36-43, B2, FP: longa rest, longa rest, longa rest, semibreve rest, minim rest; HSCS: semibreve rest, breve rest, longa rest, longa rest, breve rest, minim rest-HSCS follows barlines.
M. 45 note $4-\mathrm{m} .46$ note 3 , T1, FP: explicit underlay; HSCS: ii.
M. 45 note $4-$ m. 46 note 3, B1, FP: explicit underlay; HSCS: ij.
Mm. 47-51, B2, FP: longa rest, breve rest, semibreve rest, minim rest; HSCS: semibreve rest, longa rest, breve rest, minim rest-HSCS follows barlines.
M. 49, D2, note 2, explicit $\downarrow$ in HSCS.
M. 49 note $5-\mathrm{m} .50$ note 2, D2, FP: explicit underlay; HSCS: ij.
M. 49 note $5-\mathrm{m} .50$ note 2, A2, FP: explicit underlay; HSCS: ij.
Mm. 51-58, D1, FP: longa rest, longa rest, longa rest, semibreve rest, minim rest; HSCS: semibreve rest, longa rest, longa rest, longa rest, minim rest-HSCS follows barlines.
Mm. 51-58, A1, FP: longa rest, longa rest, longa rest, semibreve rest, minim rest; HSCS: semibreve rest, longa rest, longa rest, longa rest, minim rest-HSCS follows barlines.
Mm. 51-58, A2, FP: longa rest, longa rest, longa rest, semibreve rest, minim rest; HSCS: semibreve rest, longa rest, longa rest, longa rest, minim rest-HSCS follows barlines.
M. 53 note $6-\mathrm{m} .54$ note 3, T1, FP: explicit underlay; HSCS: ii.
M. 53 note 6-m. 54 note 3, B1, FP: explicit underlay; HSCS: ij.
M. 53 note $6-\mathrm{m}$. 54 note 3, B2, FP: explicit underlay; HSCS: ii.
M. 55, T2, notes 4-8, FP: explicit underlay; HSCS: ij.
M. 59 note $3-\mathrm{m} .60$ note 2, A1, FP: explicit underlay; HSCS: ij.
Mm. 70-72, A1, FP: explicit underlay; HSCS: ij.
Mm. 70-72, T1, FP: explicit underlay; HSCS: ii.
Mm. 70-72, T2, FP: explicit underlay; HSCS: ii.
Mm. 70-72, B1, FP: explicit underlay; HSCS: ii.
M. 71, D1, note 4, explicit $\downarrow$ in HSCS.
Mm. 74-75, B1, FP: explicit underlay; HSCS: ii.
M. 79 note $1-\mathrm{m} .80$ note 2 , A1, FP: explicit underlay; HSCS: ii.
M. 79 note $1-\mathrm{m} .80$ note 1, T2, FP: explicit underlay; HSCS: ii.
M. 80, D1, FP: explicit underlay; HSCS: ii.
M. 80, T1, FP: explicit underlay; HSCS: ij.
M. 80, T2, notes 2 and 3, FP: explicit underlay; HSCS: ii.
Mm. 82-83, A1, FP: explicit underlay; HSCS: ii.
M. 82, A2, FP: missing ij; HSCS: ii.
M. 84 note $1-$ m. 85 note 1, A1, FP: explicit underlay; HSCS: ii.
M. 84, A1, note 3, explicit $\downarrow$ in HSCS.
Mm. 87-88, A2, FP: explicit underlay; HSCS: ii.
Mm. 88-89, B1, FP: explicit underlay; HSCS: ii.
M. 89, D2, note 1, explicit $\downarrow$ in HSCS.
Mm. 89-91, A1, FP: ij; HSCS: explicit underlay.
M. 90, A1, note 4, FP: f'; HSCS: f\#'.
M. 90, T2, FP: explicit underlay; HSCS: ii.
M. 90, B1, FP: explicit underlay; HSCS: ii.
Mm. 91-92, A2, FP: explicit underlay; HSCS: ii.
M. 91, T1, FP: ij; HSCS: explicit underlay.
Mm. 91-92, B1, FP: explicit underlay; HSCS: ii.
Mm. 91-92, B2, FP: explicit underlay; HSCS: ii.
Mm. 92-93, D1, FP: explicit underlay; HSCS: ii.
Mm. 92-93, A1, FP: explicit underlay; HSCS: ii.
Mm. 93-94, A2, FP: explicit underlay; HSCS: ii.
Mm. 93-94, B1, FP: explicit underlay; HSCS: ii.
Mm. 94-95, D1, FP: explicit underlay; HSCS: ii.
M. 94, T2, FP: explicit underlay; HSCS: ii.
M. 95 note 1-m. 96 note 1, B1, FP: explicit underlay; HSCS: ii.
M. 97, D1, FP: explicit underlay; HSCS: missing ii.
M. 97, A1, note 3, explicit $\ddagger$ in both sources.
M. 98 note 5-m. 99 note 2, D1, notated with ligature and minor color in HSCS only.

## Significant Discrepancies

Mm. 4-9, D1, FP: "in sanctuario, in sanctuario ejus" with melisma on "a" from m. 5 note 3 through m. 6 note 1 and m. 7 note 4 through m. 8 note 4 ; HSCS: ij ("laudate Dominum"), "in sanctuario ejus" starting on m . 6 note 2 with melisma on "a" from m .7 note 2 through m .8 note 4 .
M. 4 note 2-m. 6 note 1, B1, FP: explicit underlay with "te" underneath m. 5 note 3; HSCS:
ii-"te" under m. 5 note 4 aligns with other parts better.
M. 6, D2, note 4, FP: c\#"; HSCS: c"- $\#$ in BG.
M. 9, D2, FP: melisma unclear; HSCS: melisma on "e" on notes 1-2.
Mm. 10-11, T1, FP: melisma on "a" through m. 10 note 11 with no melisma in m. 11; HSCS:
melisma on "a" through m .10 note 10 with melisma on "e" on m .11 note 2 and 3.
M. 10, B2, note 6, FP: d; HSCS: c-BG: c.
M. 12, BG, note 4, erroneous 5 figure removed.
M. 16, B1, note 3, FP: d' minim; HSCS: d' dotted semiminim, g fusa-FP creates parallel fifth with B2.
M. 16, BG, note 3, erroneous 43 figure removed.
Mm. 18-19, D1, FP: "virtutis ejus" with melisma on "e" from m. 18 note 4 through m. 19 note 4; HSCS: "Laudate eum" with same melisma on "e."
M. 19, D1, note 4, FP: b $\square^{\prime}$; HSCS: bb’.
M. 19, BG, note 1, FP: 6 figure exists but not raised.
M. 21, A2, notes 3 and 4, FP: bb b $\ddagger$; HSCS: $b$ q on first note, second note implied.
M. 21, BG, note 1, FP: 3 figure exists but not raised.
M. 22, BG, note 1, FP: 3 figure exists but not raised.
M. 25, A2, notes 1-4, FP: dotted semiminim, fusa, semiminim, semiminim; HSCS: semiminim, semiminim, dotted semiminim, fusa.
M. 26, A1, note 5, FP: g'; HSCS: a'.
M. 26, T2, note 1, FP: bb; HSCS: bদ—A1: b b '. $^{\prime}$.
M. 27, B1, note 3, FP: semiminim; HSCS: minim.
M. 29, BG, note 3, FP: 3 figure exists but not raised.
M. 33, A2, note 2, FP: d'; HSCS: bb.
M. 34, A1, note 3, FP: c"; HSCS: bb’.
M. 35, D2, notes 2-6, FP: melisma on "so" from note 2 through note 4; HSCS: melisma on "tu" from note 4 through note 6 -HSCS aligns with other parts.
M. 35, A1, note 4, FP: minim; HSCS: semiminim.
M. 36 note $2-\mathrm{m} .39$ note 1, A1, FP: ij ("in sono tubae"), "in psalterio" starting on m. 38 note 4 ; HSCS: "laudate eum", "in psalterio" starting on m. 38 note 2 with melisma on "te" on m. 38 notes 4-6.
M. 38 note $4-\mathrm{m} .39$ note 5, D2, FP: melisma on "o" on m. 39 notes 1-5 or not indicated; HSCS: melisma on "te" from m. 38 note 4 through m. 39 note 3.
M. 39, D1, note 2, FP: c"; HSCS: d"-FP creates parallel fifth with D2.
M. 39 note 3-m. 40 note 3, D1, FP: melisma on "o" on m. 39 notes 5-8 or not indicated, "et ci" on m. 40 notes 1 and 2; HSCS: melisma on "te" on m. 39 notes 3-7, subsequent syllables one note later than $\mathrm{FP}-\mathrm{HSCS}$ aligns with other parts.
M. 39, BG, note 2 , replaced 6 figure with 743 .
M. $40, \mathrm{BG}$, note 4 , erroneous 6 figure removed.
M. 41, D2, note 5, FP: e"; HSCS: eb"-D1: e".
M. 41, BG, note 5 , erroneous 6 figure removed.
M. 47 note $2-$ m. 49 note 1, A1, FP: ij ("et choro"); HSCS: "laudate eum."
M. 49, D1, notes 3 and 4, FP: "choro"; HSCS and LU: "chordis."
M. 50, D2, notes 4-6, FP: semiminim, fusa, fusa; HSCS: dotted semiminim, semifusa, semifusa.
M. 50, D2, notes 4-8, FP: melisma on "ga" from note 5 through note 8; HSCS: melisma on "or" from note 4 though note 7 .
M. 50, D1, FP: d" dotted semiminim, c" fusa, c" minim, b' semiminim with melisma on "ga" over notes 4 and 5; HSCS: bb' semiminim, c" dotted minim, b' semiminim with no melisma-Intentional change accounted for in BG figures; editor has altered FP melisma to extend "et" in favor of alignment and word stress.
M. 55 note 4-m. 57 note 1, T1, FP: melisma on "be" on m. 55 notes 4-6, melisma on "nan" from m. 56 note 1 through m. 57 note 1; HSCS: no melisma on "be", melisma on "nan" from m. 55 note 8 through m . 57 note 1 -likely an intentional change since it occurs in three parts.
M. 55 note $8-\mathrm{m} .57$ note 1, T2, FP: melisma on "be" from m. 55 note 8 through m. 56 note 3, melisma on "nan" from m. 56 note 6 through m. 57 note 1; HSCS: no melisma on "be", melisma on "nan" from m. 56 note 4 through m. 57 note 1-likely an intentional change since it occurs in three parts.
M. 55 note 4-m. 57 note 5, B1, FP: melisma on "be" on m. 55 notes 4-6, melisma on "nan" from m . 56 note 3 through m. 57 note 5; HSCS: no melisma on "be", melisma on "nan" from m. 56 note 1 through m .57 note 4-likely an intentional change since it occurs in three parts.
M. 57, B1, note 6, FP: d; HSCS: f.
M. 61, B2, note 1, FP: breve; HSCS: dotted breve.
Mm. 61-70, BG, FP: measures in BG contain six semibreves-dotted barlines are editorial.
M. 63, T1, note 3, FP: d'; HSCS: d'-c in T2, A1, D1.
M. 65, B1, notes 1 and 2, FP: dotted semibreve, minim; HSCS: semibreve, semibreve.
M. 65, BG, note 2, FP: semiminim.
M. 70, B1, note 3, FP: g; HSCS: a.
M. 71, T2, note 3, FP: bb; HSCS: b
M. 71, BG, note 1, FP: 3 figure exists but not raised.
M. 72, all, FP: fermata in D2 and A2 only; HSCS: fermata in all parts.
M. 74 note 2-m. 75 note 1, A2, FP: melisma on "nis" from m. 74 note 3 through m. 75 note 1 ; HSCS: ii-FP melisma does not match other parts or text stress, changed to melisma on "om."
M. 78, B1, FP: "laudet"; HSCS: ii ("spiritus").
M. 79, D2, FP: minim, minim, semibreve with "det, laudet" underlay; HSCS: semibreve, semibreve with continuation of previous "lau" melisma on the first and "det" on the second.
Mm. 80-82, D2, FP: melisma on "det" from m. 81 note 1 through m. 82 note 4; HSCS: "lau" melisma continues in m .81 through m .82 note 4.
M. 80, B1, note 2, FP: bb; HSCS: b - T1: bb.
M. 82 note 5-m. 85 note 6, D2, FP: three explicit iterations of "laudet" with melisma on "det" on m . 83 notes $1-5$, melisma on "lau" from $m .83$ note 6 though $m .84$ note 2, and melisma on "lau" from m. 84 note 4 through m. 85 note 5; HSCS: two ii-first "laudet" should be in duet with D1.
Mm. 83-85, T2, FP: ij ("laudet") "Dominum" with melisma on "Do" on m. 84 notes 1-5 and melisma on "mi" on m. 85 notes 1-5; HSCS: explicit "Dominum, laudet" with melisma on
"num" on m. 84 notes 1-5 and melisma on "lau" on $m$. 85 notes 1-5-subsequent ii in HSCS could not be correctly interpreted as "laudet" in FP version.
M. 84, D1, note 5, FP: c"; HSCS: a'.
Mm. 84-88, B2, FP: ij ("laudet") "Dominum"; HSCS: "Dominum laudet"-HSCS matches B1. M. 85 , D2, note 6 , FP: $g^{\prime}$; HSCS: $f^{\prime}$.
Mm. 87-89, D1, FP: d' semibreve, d' semibreve, a' semibreve, minim rest, c" dotted minim, bb’ fusa, a' fusa, $g^{\prime}$ semiminim, $f^{\prime}$ semiminim, $g^{\prime}$ minim, $g^{\prime}$ minim with underlay "num, laudet, laudet," with melisma on second "lau" from c" dotted minim through second g' minim; HSCS: d' g' ligature (two semibreves), minim rest, c" dotted minim, bb' semiminim, a' semiminim, g' fusa, f' fusa, $g$ ' semibreve, $g$ ' semibreve with underlay "num, laudet" with melisma on "lau" from c" dotted minim through second g' semibreve-FP results in parallel unisons with T1 in m .89 .
Mm. 87-89, T2, FP: one explicit iteration of "laudet"; HSCS: three ii on m. 87, m. 88 note 1 through m. 89 note 1 , and m .89 notes 2-4.
M. 91, A1, notes 5 and 6, FP: c' semibreve; HSCS: c' minim, c' minim—match B1 m. 89, etc..
M. 91, T1, note 1, FP: g' minim, g' semibreve; HSCS: g' dotted minim.
Mm. 93-95, D2, FP: melisma on "lau" from m. 93 note 1 through m. 94 note 1, melisma on "det" from m. 94 note 2 through m. 95 note 3; HSCS: melisma on "lau" from m. 93 note 1 through m .95 note 3 , no melisma on "det."
M. 93, A1, note 5, FP: semiminim in LOC and Hamburg copies, minim in SLUB copy; HSCS: minim.
M. 93, T1, FP: simultaneous f minim and minim rest printed; HSCS: minim rest.
Mm. 94-95, T1, FP: one explicit iteration of "laudet" with unclear placement; HSCS: two ij.
Mm. 95-97, D2, FP: explicit "laudet" starting on m .95 note 4 with melisma on "det" from m .96 note 1 through m. 97 note 4 ; HSCS: ii, likely from m. 96 note 1 through $m .97$ note 5 .
M. 95, D1, note 1, FP: d"; HSCS: c".
Mm. 95-97, A2, FP: "Dominim" with melisma on "Do" from m. 95 note 1 through m. 96 note 3; HSCS: ii ("laudet").
M. 96, A2, note 3, FP: bb minim, bb minim; HSCS: bb semibreve-necessitated by change in lyrics.
Mm. 97-99, D2, FP: explicit "laudet" starting on m. 97 note 5 with melisma on "det" on m. 98 notes 1-5; HSCS: ii, likely from m. 98 note 1 through m. 99 note 1.
Mm. 97-100, A1, FP: "det" placed near m. 99 note 3 with melisma through m. 100 note 1 with "mi" on g' semibreve; HSCS: "det" on m. 100 note 2 with two g' minims for subsequent syllables.
Mm. 97-98, T1, FP: one explicit iteration of "laudet" with melisma on "lau" from m. 97 note 1 through m. 98 note 1 ; HSCS: two ij.
Mm. 98-101, A2, FP: "Dominum", ij ("Dominum"); HSCS: "laudet Dominum".
Mm. 98-99, BG, erroneous tie removed.
M. 99, D2, FP: "Do" melisma starts on note 1; HSCS: "Do" melisma starts on note 2.
M. 99 note 5-m. 100 note 3, D1, FP: c' minim, c" dotted semibreve, c" minim with "det Domi"; HSCS: c' minim, c" minim, c" semibreve, c" minim where m. 99 note 5 is included in previous melisma.
M. 100, T1, note 1, FP: semibreve; HSCS: dotted semibreve.
M. 101, D2, note 1, FP: e"; HSCS: f"-hand-corrected in LOC copy.
M. 101, A2, FP: ligature (f' semibreve, $f$ semibreve), $f$ longa; HSCS: $f^{\prime}$ and $f$ longa in ligature.

## Jacob Handl - Veni Sancte Spiritus (original)

## Sources

OM2 - Handl Opus Musicum Secundus Tomus (Prague, 1587)
LU - Liber Usualis (New York, 1962)
OM2 \#57 LU p. 880-881
Cantus
Altus
Tenor
Bassus
Sexta
Septima
Quinta
Octava

## Significant Discrepancies

Mm. 59-62, Choir 2, OM: "rege quod est devium;" LU: "sana quod est saucium."
M. 62 note $1-\mathrm{m} .68$ note 1, Choir 1, OM: "fove quod est languidum, riga quod est aridum, sana quod est saucium;" LU: "flecte quod est rigidum, fove quod est frigidum, rege quod est devium."
M. 105, Bassus, note 3, OM2: breve.
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    7. Riemer, "Bodenschatz und sein FP," 12; Clifford A. Halter, "A Study of the Florilegium Portense" (master's thesis, University of Michigan, 1958), 23.
    8. Adam Adrio and Clytus Gottwald, "Calvisius, Sethus," Grove Music Online, 2001, accessed September 15, 2021, https://www-oxfordmusiconline-com.proxy2.library.illinois.edu/grovemusic/view/10.1093/gmo/9781561592630.001. 0001/omo-9781561592630-e-0000004621.
[^1]:    17. Chaney, "Four Motets," 194
    18. This is particularly relevant for the arrangements that will be discussed in Chapter 5.
    19. Chaney, "Four Motets," 193.
    20. Erhard Bodenschatz, ed., Florilegium Portense: continens CXV selectissimas cantiones 4. 5. 6. 7. 8. vocum praestantissimorum aetatis nostrae Autorum (Leipzig: Abraham Lamberg, 1618), 1r, https://www.loc.gov/item/2010456596/.
    21. The contents of the Bodenschatz's anthologies have been discussed many times, so only the most important information will be included here. The best index is attached to Eichhorn's article (Eichhorn, "Ein Sammeldruck," 70-74) and includes information about the clefs, tonality, and original publication. The index in Chaney's dissertation has several errors, mostly in numbering.
    22. "Editio altera ab ipso auctior \& emendatior reddita" (Bodenschatz, Florilegium Portense, 1r).
[^2]:    23. Chaney, "Four Motets," 9.
    24. Riemer, "Bodenschatz und sein $F P$," 58-59; Halter, "A Study," 41.
    25. Riemer and Gottwald, "Bodenschatz, Erhard."
    26. Eichhorn, "Ein Sammeldruck," 65.
[^3]:    27. Chaney, "Four Motets," 25.
    28. Martin Staehelin, "Eigentümlichkeiten von und Editionsprobleme bei Motetten-Anthologien des 17. Jahrhunderts. Das Beispiel des Florilegium Portense," in "Musikalische Überlieferung und musikalische Edition: Gesammelte Aufsätze," Nachrichten der Akademie der Wissenschaften zu Göttingen. I, Philologisch-Historische Klasse 2 (2006): 40.
    29. Chaney says that there are four motets with German texts, perhaps counting the number of exclusive texts since "Das alte Jahr" occurs twice (Chaney, "Four Motets," 24).
    30. Erhard Bodenschatz, ed., Florilegii Musici Portensis: sacras harmonias sive motetas V. VI. VII. VIII. X. Vocum ... pars altera (Leipzig: Abraham Lamberg, 1621), http://digital.slub-dresden.de/id48790284X.
[^4]:    31. Chaney counts only 12 works with German text (Chaney, "Four Motets," 25).
    32. "Qui partim diebus Dominicus in communi partim vero in spcie festis solemnibus, per totius anni curriculum inserviunt" (Bodenschatz, Florilegii Musici Portensis, 1r).
    33. Chaney, "Four Motets," 27.
    34. Chaney, 31.
[^5]:    35. Werner Braun, "Kompositionen von Adam Gumpelzhaimer im 'Florilegium Portense," Die Musikforschung 33, no. 2 (1980): 131-35.
    36. Braun, 134.
    37. Chaney, "Four Motets," 16.
[^6]:    38. Chaney, "Four Motets," 26.
    39. The commonalities with between the Promptuarium and the Florilegii Musici Portensis can be most easily seen in the final column of the index found in Chaney's dissertation (Chaney, 182-86).
    40. Riemer and Gottwald, "Bodenschatz, Erhard."
    41. Werner Neumann and Hans-Joachim Schulze, eds., Fremdschriftiche und gedruckte Dokumente zur Lebensgeschichte Johann Sebastian Bachs, vol. 2 of Bach-Dokumente (Kassel: Bärenreiter, 1969), 199.
    42. Neumann and Schulze, 294.
    43. Eichhorn, "Ein Sammeldruck," 60-61.
[^7]:    44. Caspar Würdig, ed., Leipziger Kirchen-Andachten Ander Theil (Leipzig: Justus Reinhold, 1694).
    45. Wilhelm C. Junghans, "Johann Sebastian Bach als Schüler der Partikularschule zu St. Michaelis in Lüneburg, oder Lüneburg eine Pflegstätte kirchlicher Musik," in Bach, ed. Yo Tomita (Burlington, VT: Ashgate, 2011), 56.
    46. Kerala J. Snyder, Dietrich Buxtehude: Organist in Lübeck (New York: Schirmer Books, 1987), 17, 94.
    47. Werner Braun, "Selle, Thomas," rev. Jürgen Neubacher, Grove Music Online, 2001, accessed August 3, 2021, https: //www-oxfordmusiconline-com.proxy2.library.illinois.edu/grovemusic/view/10.1093/gmo/9781561592630.001.0001/ omo-9781561592630-e-0000025370.
    48. "Florilegium Portense," Répertoire International des Sources Musicales, accessed September 28, 2021, https:// opac.rism.info/search?id=993121470\&View=rism.
[^8]:    49. Friedrich Blume, Protestant Church Music: A History, trans. F. Ellsworth Peterson and Theodore Hoelty-Nickel (New York: W. W. Norton \& Company, Inc., 1974).
    50. Günther Stiller, Johann Sebastian Bach and Liturgical Life in Leipzig, ed. Robin Leaver, trans. Herbert J. A. Bouman, Daniel F. Poellot, and Hilton C. Oswald (St. Louis: Concordia Publishing House, 1984).
    51. Lorenzo Bianconi, "The Music of the Lutheran Church: Heinrich Schütz," in Music in the Seventeenth Century, trans. David Bryant (New York: Cambridge University Press, 1987), 133-47.
    52. Bianconi, 134.
    53. Christian Thomas Leitmeir, "Beyond the Denominational Paradigm: The Motet as Confessional(ising) Practice in the Later Sixteenth Century," in Mapping the Motet in the Post-Tridentine Era, ed. Esperanza Rodríguez-García and Daniele V. Filippi (London: Routledge, 2018), 154-92.
    54. Leitmeir, 155.
    55. Leitmeir, 158.
[^9]:    66. Riemer, "Bodenschatz und sein $F P$."
    67. Riemer, 82-84.
    68. Riemer, 98-101.
    69. See Eichhorn, "Ein Sammeldruck," 66; and Chaney, "Four Motets," 43.
    70. Halter, "A Study."
    71. Chaney, "Four Motets," 44.
    72. Halter, "A Study," 1.
[^10]:    84. See Eichhorn, "Ein Sammeldruck," 68; and Staehelin, "Eigentümlichkeiten von und Editionsprobleme," 40.
[^11]:    1. The copy at the LOC is listed as M1490.B7 with scans available at https://www.loc.gov/resource/ihas.200196598.0; the copy at SLUB as Mus.1.C.2,2 and online at http://digital.slub-dresden.de/id487902149; Dr. Becker's facsimile is published in Köln in 1996.
    2. The FSC at SLUB is listed as Mus.Pi.33,2 and available at http://digital.slub-dresden.de/id456199454; the facsimile was published in Stuttgart 2018.
    3. Chaney, "Four Motets," 19-22.
    4. Chaney, 20.
[^12]:    5. As mentioned in the previous chapter, the poem by Calvisius was removed in the 1618 volume. The poem by Shilterus was also eliminated in the revised edition, and the texts by Kromayer and Mülmannus were relocated to follow the indices.
    6. Chaney, "Four Motets," 32.
    7. Rose, "Music Printing in Leipzig," 335.
[^13]:    8. In each of these occurrences in Berger's motets, changing the rhythm from semifusae to fusae creates problems with harmony or other issues, so the original rhythm was therefore retained. See Chapter 5 for more details.
[^14]:    9. For more information on minor color, see Willi Apel, The Notation of Polyphonic Music, 900-1600 (Oxford City
[^15]:    11. Honey Meconi, "Is Underlay Necessary?," in Companion to Medieval \& Renaissance Music, ed. Tess Knighton and David Fallows (New York: Schirmer Books, 1992), 284-85.
    12. See the discussion of Bodenschatz's "Audi Hymnum" in Chapter 4, page 76.
    13. Chaney, "Four Motets," 34.
    14. Eichhorn, "Ein Sammeldruck," 65 and 67.
[^16]:    15. Eichhorn, "Ein Sammeldruck," 65.
[^17]:    18. Eichhorn guesses that those copies were likely leftover from an earlier printing (Eichhorn, "Ein Sammeldruck," 60). Rose echoes this, saying "there are no known editions of Florilegium Portense after 1621, so it is likely that Bach acquired secondhand copies" (Rose, "Music Printing in Leipzig," 339ff).
[^18]:    19. This may have been their practice anyway, although, as previously mentioned, the specificity of clefs and text underlay of the Basis Generalis act as a sort of compressed score that a cantor could use.
[^19]:    1. Walter Blankenburg, "Fabritius [Fabricius], Albinus," Grove Music Online, 2001, accessed March 1, 2021, https: //www-oxfordmusiconline-com.proxy2.library.illinois.edu/grovemusic/view/10.1093/gmo/9781561592630.001.0001/ omo-9781561592630-e-0000009196.
    2. Albinus Fabricius, Ich weiß, daß mein Erlöser lebet, CV 1.587 (Stuttgart: Carus-Verlag, 2006).
    3. Albinus Fabricius, Ich weiß, daß mein Erlöser lebet (Wittenberg: Matthaeus Welack, 1585), http://digital.slubdresden.de/id1680018272.
[^20]:    4. Albinus Fabricius, "Magnificat 'Nel più fiorito Aprile,"" in Parodiemagnificat aus dem Umkreis der Grazer Hofkapelle (1564-1619), vol. 133 of Denkmäler der Tonkunst in Österreich, ed. Gernot Gruber (Graz: Akademische Druck- und Verlagsanstalt, 1981), 62-77.
    5. Ms. 22 (Graz: Universitätsbibliothek Graz), 116v-127r.
    6. The edition in the DTÖ uses measures that are one semibreve in length for the sections in duple meter. The examples in this document are edited by the author and will use measures that are one breve in length.
[^21]:    7. Albinus Fabricius, Cantiones Sacrae Sex Vocum (Graz: Georg Widmanstetter, 1595), http://diglib.hab.de/drucke/2-13-18-musica-5s/start.htm.
[^22]:    8. Blankenburg, "Fabritius [Fabricius], Albinus."
    9. A.R. 775-777 (Regensburg: Bischöfliche Zentralbibliothek).
    10. Getraut Haberkamp, Sammlung Proske Manuskipte des 16. und 17. Jahrhunderts aus den Signaturen A.R., B, C, AN, vol. 1 of Bischöfliche Zentralbibliothek Thematischer Katalog der Musikhandschriften (Munich: G. Henle Verlag, 1989), 41.
[^23]:    11. Riemer, "Bodenschatz und sein $F P$," 61 ; Halter, "A Study," 43.
    12. All citations of the Psalms in this text will use the Septuagint numbering system as the composers were likely working from the Vulgate. The equivalent passages in translations of the Hebrew Bible can be seen in the Text and Translations section of Part II, beginning on page 222.
    13. Würdig, Leipziger Kirchen-Andachten, 278.
    14. Orlando di Lasso, Selectissimae cantiones, vol. 2 (Nürnberg: Theodor Gerlach, 1568), https://stimmbuecher.digital e-sammlungen.de//view?id=bsb00089741.
    15. Orlando di Lasso, Selectissimae cantiones Altera pars, ed. Leonard Lechner, vol. 2 (Nürnberg: Catharina Gerlach / Johann Bergs Erben, 1579), https://imslp.org/wiki/Selectissimae_cantiones,_LV_1579.3_(Lassus,_Orlande_de).
[^24]:    16. Würdig, Leipziger Kirchen-Andachten, 280.
[^25]:    18. The poem uses "omnia" in the second line where the motet uses "cunctaque" (Georg Fabricius, Poematum sacrorum libri XXV (Basel: Oporinus, 1567), 41, http://mateo.uni-mannheim.de/camena/fabr2/Fabricius_poemata_2.html).
    19. Heinrich Hüschen, "Fabricius [Goldschmidt], Georg," Grove Music Online, 2001, accessed March 23, 2021, https: //www-oxfordmusiconline-com.proxy2.library.illinois.edu/grovemusic/view/10.1093/gmo/9781561592630.001.0001/ omo-9781561592630-e-0000009189.
    20. "Sub initium lectionum Scholast" (Würdig, Leipziger Kirchen-Andachten, 305).
[^26]:    1. Riemer and Gottwald, "Bodenschatz, Erhard."
    2. Erhard Bodenschatz, Das schone und Geistreiche Magnificat der hochgelobten jungfrawen Mariae (Leipzig: Henning Grosse, 1599), https://www.bibliotekacyfrowa.pl/dlibra/publication/63732/edition/63745/content.
    3. Riemer, "Bodenschatz und sein $F P$," 18; Halter, "A Study," 28.
    4. Riemer, "Bodenschatz und sein $F P$," 19; Halter, "A Study," 28-29.
[^27]:    5. Riemer, "Bodenschatz und sein $F P$," 19-20.
    6. Erhard Bodenschatz, Psalterium Davidis (Leipzig: Abraham Lamberg, 1607), https://bavarikon.de/object/bav: ELK-MUS-00000BAV80042782.
[^28]:    10. Riemer, "Bodenschatz und sein $F P$," 13; Halter, "A Study," 25.
[^29]:    21. Jacob Handl, Secundus tomus musici operis (Prague: Jiří Nigrin, 1587), http://digital.slub-dresden.de/id16702953 46.
[^30]:    22. The rest of the works for that feast are for six (three motets), five (four pieces), and four voices (five motets).
[^31]:    25. Würdig, Leipziger Kirchen-Andachten, 282.
    26. Liber Usualis, 884-85.
[^32]:    29. The Discantus I has a C in both sources in measure 27 and an F in measure 28 in the Florilegium, but these could
[^33]:    30. A. Lindsey Kirwan and Stephan Hörner, "Berger, Andreas," Grove Music Online, 2001, accessed April 18, 2021, https://www-oxfordmusiconline-com.proxy2.library.illinois.edu/grovemusic/view/10.1093/gmo/9781561592630.001. 0001/omo-9781561592630-e-0000002780.
    31. "Besonders in Augsburg lebte eine Reihe größerer Meister, deren Namen in Deutschland sich eines guten Klanges erfreuten." (Riemer, "Bodenschatz und sein FP," 63); see translation in Halter, "A Study," 44.
[^34]:    32. Andreas Berger, "Da pacem Domine," in Friedensgesänge 1628-1651 Musik zum 30-jährigen Krieg, vol. 22 of Denkmäler der Tonkunst in Bayern Neue Folge, ed. Stefan Hanheide (Wiesbaden: Breitkopf \& Härtel, 2012), 109.
    33. Andreas Berger, Da pacem Domine (Augsburg: Johann Ulrich Schönig, 1635), http://sammlungen.ub.uni-frankfurt. de/urn/urn:nbn:de:hebis:30:2-247465.
    34. Kirwan and Hörner, "Berger, Andreas."
    35. Andreas Berger, Threnodiae Amatoriae (Augsburg: Johann Schultes, 1609).
[^35]:    36. Blechbläser-Ensemble Der Berliner Philharmoniker, "Canzon Octavi Modi Mit 8 Stimmen," track B1 on Kammermusik-Vereinigungen der Berliner Philharmoniker, Deutsche Grammophon 2741 011, 1982, Vinyl.
    37. Christian Fastl, "Solfleisch, Caspar," Oesterreichisches Musiklexikon Online, 2001, accessed April 18, 2021, https: //www.musiklexikon.ac.at/ml/musik_S/Solfleisch_Caspar.xml.
[^36]:    38. Kirwan and Hörner, "Berger, Andreas."
[^37]:    41. "Einzelne symmetrische Figuren werden lediglich um ihrer selbst willen zur Komposition benutzt" (Riemer, "Bodenschatz und sein $F P, " 91$ ); Halter, "A Study," 57.
[^38]:    1. Andrea Gabrieli and Giovanni Gabrieli, Concerti di Andrea et di Gio. Gabrieli (Venice: Angelo Gardano, 1587), http://data.onb.ac.at/rec/AC08816699.
    2. There are forty-four numbered pieces in the index, but the thirtieth piece, "Deus qui beatum Marcum," is the second part of the previous, "O Crux splendidior."
[^39]:    3. Herbert Myers, "Pitch and Transposition," in A Performer's Guide to Seventeenth-Century Music, 2nd ed., ed. Stewart Carter, rev. and exp. Jeffery Kite-Powell (Bloomington: Indiana University Press, 2012), 379-80.
    4. Praetorius, Syntagma Musicum III, 93.
    5. Eichhorn, "Ein Sammeldruck," 68.
    6. Praetorius, Syntagma Musicum III, 95.
    7. The arranger is not always consistent and sometimes does omit voices for unknown reasons, as one can see by the omission of the Nona part in measures 75 and 76, for example.
[^40]:    8. Gary Towne, "Choral Music in Italy and the Germanic Lands," in Carter, A Performer's Guide to Seventeenth-Century Music, 56.
    9. It is interesting to note that, as we saw earlier in other pieces in the Florilegium, Choir II carries the opening music in the original, but Choir I presents that material in the altered version.
    10. Towne, "Choral Music," 58.
    11. Praetorius, Syntagma Musicum III, 172-94.
[^41]:    14. Würdig, Leipziger Kirchen-Andachten, 296.
[^42]:    19. Praetorius, Syntagma Musicum III, 71.
[^43]:    21. The harmony does change to A major in measure 74 in a brief cadence to $D$.
[^44]:    22. Harold Copeman and Vera U.G. Scherr, "German Latin," in Singing Early Music: The Pronunciation of European Languages in the Late Middle Ages and Renaissance, ed. Timothy J. McGee, with A.G. Rigg and David N. Klausner (Bloomington: Indiana University Press, 1996), 262.
[^45]:    25. Praetorius, Syntagma Musicum III, 104.
[^46]:    26. Heinrich Schütz, A Heinrich Schütz Reader: Letters and Documents in Translation, ed. Gregory S. Johnston (Oxford: Oxford University Press, 2013), 16.
[^47]:    2. Eichhorn, "Ein Sammeldruck," 68-69.
[^48]:    3. Eichhorn, "Ein Sammeldruck," 67.
    4. Chaney, "Four Motets," 103.
[^49]:    2. Misattributed to Andrea Gabrieli.
[^50]:    1. All musical sources: "rege quod est devium" ("king that is wayward").
[^51]:    2. Liber Usualis: "ideo cum Christo exsultant sine fine" ("they rejoice with Christ without end").
[^52]:    4. Liber Usualis: "sanctis."
