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Michael Praetorius was one of the most prolific and innovative Lutheran composers of the early seventeenth century. His *Megalynodion Sionia* ("The Magnificats of Zion") is a collection of fourteen Magnificats for use in Vespers services. The compositions in the collection present a series of complicated issues that modern editors and performers must unravel to be able to perform this music. The most common method for performing Magnificats at this time was *alternatim*, in which different musical groups alternated in performing verses. For eleven of the Magnificats in *Megalynodion*, only six of the twelve verses are supplied by Praetorius. Appropriate sources for the other verses must be identified. Also, there was a tradition in the Lutheran church of inserting chorales between the verses of the Magnificat on feast days. The chorales would be songs associated with the occasion, for example Christmas or Easter. Praetorius gives important instructions to prospective performers as to how these insertions should be chosen and performed.

Eleven of the Magnificats are parodies of works by other composers, Orlando di Lasso in particular. Parody technique is the use of polyphonic music by another composer as source material for a new composition. It was a very typical compositional
method of the sixteenth century. Lasso started a Continental tradition of using parody technique in the Magnificat; in this collection Praetorius follows in his footsteps. One must take all these issues into account in attempting to create modern performing editions of this music. The study culminates in performing editions of two Magnificats from the collection.
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Chapter One

MICHAEL PRAETORIUS

Michael Praetorius was born in 1571, in Creutzburg, Germany.¹ He often signed his name “Michael Praetorius Creutzburgensis” in honor of his birthplace, or he simply signed his initials “M.P.C.,” a usage which will be appropriated for this document. His father taught theology in various Latin schools, as did many of the men in the Praetorius family. As a musician, MPC was the exception in a family that tended to produce teachers and preachers. His branch of the family is not to be confused with a different Praetorius clan in Hamburg, which produced several prominent organists and composers, including Jacob Praetorius and Hieronymus Praetorius.

Doctrinal conflict among different Lutheran factions caused the family to relocate several times. In 1573, they settled in Torgau, where Praetorius’s father was a colleague of Johann Walther at the Lateinschule. MPC attended the Lateinschule and studied music with Michael Voigt, the successor of Walther. In 1582 MPC entered the University of Frankfurt an der Oder; he left to attend the Lateinschule in Zerbst in 1584, but returned to Frankfurt an der Oder in 1585. After the death of his brother ca. 1587, with whom he had been living, Praetorius became the organist of St. Marien, Frankfurt, and began his career as a professional musician. He was sixteen years old and had reached the end of his formal education.

In 1595 Praetorius became the organist for the court of Duke Heinrich Julius of Brunswick-Wolfenbüttel. He married Anna Lakemacher in 1603, and they had two sons. In 1604 he was appointed Kapellmeister in Wolfenbüttel. The next few years were quite productive, seeing the publication of the majority of his musical collections. He also had a number of prominent professional accomplishments during this time.

Duke Heinrich died in 1613, and the loss of his chief patron led to many changes for MPC. Elector Johann Georg of Saxony requested that Praetorius spend his year of mourning in the electoral court in Dresden, where he served as assistant to Rogier Michael. While there, Praetorius met Heinrich Schütz. MPC was also exposed to the latest trends in Italian music, which heavily influenced his future compositions. He officially returned to Wolfenbüttel in 1616, but he had several extended absences for temporary engagements elsewhere. The Hofkapelle began to decline, and MPC was not reappointed as Kapellmeister in 1620. By that point his health had begun to fail. He died on February 15, 1621, which may have been his fiftieth birthday.²

Praetorius and the History of Lutheran Church Music

Michael Praetorius was one of the most prolific and innovative composers of Lutheran church music. In the early days of the Protestant Reformation, music for the Lutheran service was mostly borrowed from Roman Catholic sources. Martin Luther and others started to compose and adapt melodies for vernacular congregational songs known as chorales, which became the distinctive music of the Lutheran church. As a body of

² February 15, 1571 is often given as MPC’s birthdate, but there is some debate as to whether that date is accurate. If it is, then he did indeed die on his 50th birthday.
chorale literature began to develop, Protestant composers started to use them as the basis for polyphonic compositions. Composers such as Johann Walther and publishers such as Georg Rhau sensed the need to supply the young church with the necessary music for its services, and they set about systematically producing collections of music to accomplish this purpose. In the years 1528-1548, Rhau published sixty collections of music in his effort to provide Lutheran churches and schools with a well-rounded and functional repertoire of music. In these collections, chorale-based compositions, along with music borrowed from the Catholic liturgy, formed the backbone of the musical component of Lutheran liturgy. The chorale-based compositions tended to use chorale melodies as cantus firmi, following the general practice of the sixteenth century. The melodies would appear in the tenor part, and an imitative framework would be built around them.

In the late sixteenth century, composers started to take a new approach, known as the “cantional” style. In cantional chorale settings, the melody is set in the topmost voice and harmonized either homophonically or with simple counterpoint in the lower voices. Hymnbooks containing these types of settings are known as cantiones, and a number of such books were published in the late sixteenth and early seventeenth centuries. The earliest cantional was published in 1586 by Lucas Osiander. The title makes clear its intended purpose: Fünftzig geistliche Lieder und Psalmen. Mit vier Stimmen, auff Contrapuncts weise (für die Schulen und Kirchen im lüblichen Fürstenthumb Würtenberg) also gesetzt, das ein gentze Christliche Gemein durchauß mit singen kan [Fifty Spiritual Songs and Psalms in Four Voices, Set in Contrapuntal Style

---


for the Schools and Churches in the Honorable Principality of Württemberg, So that an Entire Christian Congregation Is Able to Sing Along Throughout]. In the preface Osiander states that he has “placed the chorale in the discant [top voice] so that it is truly recognizable and every amateur can sing along.” In cantional style the melody is more prominent in the overall texture than in its previous placement in the tenor, making it easier for the congregation to hear it and sing along. Cantional chorale settings were on the rise at a time when congregations were starting to sing more in worship services. 

By the time Praetorius joined the ranks of professional Lutheran church musicians, the Protestant Reformation was seventy years along, and a core repertoire of chorales had developed. MPC apparently had a particular interest in the chorale, evidenced by the fact that the vast majority of his compositions are based on chorale melodies. Most of Praetorius’ chorale settings are cantional, and his explicit interest in including the congregation shows that he valued increased congregational participation. However, later in his career he fell under the influence of the new concerted style of music coming out of Italy, from composers such as Gabrieli and Viadana. MPC and his Lutheran contemporaries—including the famous trio of Schütz, Scheidt, and Schein—started to write music in this vein, beginning a stylistic sea change in Protestant music. By the mid-seventeenth century, concerted music had become the rule.

---


6 Herl has much to say in Worship Wars in Early Lutheranism about the myth of congregational participation in Lutheran services. Congregational singing actually took many years to catch on in most places. The cantional period was one of increased congregational participation, but the rise of concerted music in the middle and late Baroque minimized the congregational aspect of service music. It was not until later in the eighteenth century that significant congregational singing became the norm.
The Musical Publications of Michael Praetorius

It appears from the large scope of Praetorius’ musical publications that he was attempting to do for his generation what Georg Rhau did in the early Reformation. With the exception of *Terpsichore*, a collection of instrumental dances, his publications represent a calculated effort to present a well-rounded repertoire of music for all the various liturgical and educational needs of the Lutheran church. The following is a chronological listing of his publications and their corresponding volumes in Praetorius' collected works.⁷

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Title of publication</th>
<th>Volume in collected works</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><em>Musae Sioniae</em> I (1605)</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><em>Musae Sioniae</em> II (1607)</td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><em>Musae Sioniae</em> III (1607)</td>
<td>3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><em>Musae Sioniae</em> IV (1607)</td>
<td>4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><em>Musae Sioniae</em> V (1607)</td>
<td>5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><em>Musarum Sionarum</em> (1607)</td>
<td>10</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><em>Musae Sioniae</em> VI (1609)</td>
<td>6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><em>Musae Sioniae</em> VII (1609)</td>
<td>7</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><em>Musae Sioniae</em> VIII (1610)</td>
<td>8</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><em>Musae Sioniae</em> IX (1610)</td>
<td>9</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><em>Missodia Sionia</em> (1611)</td>
<td>11</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><em>Hymnodia Sionia</em> (1611)</td>
<td>12</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><em>Eulogodia Sionia</em> (1611)</td>
<td>13</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><em>Megalynodia Sionia</em> (1611)</td>
<td>14</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><em>Terpsichore</em> (1612)</td>
<td>15</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><em>Urania</em> (1613)</td>
<td>16</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><em>Litaniae</em> (1613)</td>
<td>20</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><em>Polyhymnia caduceatrich</em> (1619)</td>
<td>17</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><em>Polyhymnia exercitatrix</em> (1620)</td>
<td>18</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><em>Puericinium</em> (1621)</td>
<td>19</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Some volumes contain compositions mostly in German, while others are in Latin. The primarily German resources include the nine volumes of *Musae Sioniae*, which present chorale settings that fulfill all the liturgical requirements of the church year. The compositions vary in size and complexity from simple harmonizations to large multi-choir motets. Praetorius notes that volumes VI-VIII are “set in simple counterpoint so that the congregation can join in.”\(^8\) In particular, volume VII provides service music for the German version of the Mass. Also in German are *Urania* and *Litaniae*, which contain German hymns and litanies. In these German volumes, MPC has provided the music necessary for the German Mass, both for choir and congregation.

The motets of *Musarum Sionarum* and the hymns of *Hymnodia* are in Latin. In *Missodia*, MPC provides Latin settings of the musical components of the Mass. *Megalynodia* and *Eulogodia* provide music for Vespers and Compline, respectively. These volumes contain music for the Latin Mass and for Vespers (when Compline was observed, it was appended to the end of the Vespers service).

Other collections come later in Praetorius’ career. They consist of large-scale motets written in the new concerted style that was spreading from Italy to the rest of Europe. With these collections, MPC is hoping to spur German musicians to move forward stylistically into the modern Italian mode.

Towards the end of *Syntagma Musicum III*, Praetorius includes a list of all the music he had published or intended to publish.\(^9\) A number of collections are included in that list that apparently existed in manuscript form but were never published. They


include more Latin and German sacred music, especially large-scale concerted works, as well as more collections of instrumental music, both sacred and secular. Unfortunately, none of this music has survived.

The Syntagma Musicum

In addition to these collections of music, MPC also published a three-volume musical encyclopedia called the *Syntagma Musicum*. Volume I (1615) is a learned discourse in Latin on the history of music. It is divided into two books. Volume I, Book I deals with the theology and history of sacred music and the use of instruments in worship in ancient times. It was meant for Lutheran clergy and other educated people, “in particular, for the upper ranks of the church hierarchy.”¹⁰ An important aim of Book I was to give theological legitimacy to the tradition of Latin chant and psalmody within the Reformation movement, as a defense against those who regarded it as papist and sought do away with it. Volume I, Book II is a treatment of the instruments and secular music of ancient times; it is not available in an English translation.

The other two volumes are more practical in nature and are written in German, indicating a target audience that did not necessarily have a Latin education. *Syntagma Musicum* II (1618/19) contains a wealth of information on the musical instruments of Praetorius’ day.¹¹ It includes woodcut illustrations of scale models of various

---


instruments, which provide modern scholars with some of the most specific information available about their design and construction. It also provides much information about the history of the organ and how organs were built, maintained, and tuned in that period. Volume III (1619) is a musical dictionary and guide to performance practice. Praetorius gives very practical information on the definitions of musical terms, concepts, and notational symbols. He also endeavors to enlighten German musicians on the latest developments in Italian music, so that they can perform the new music in the appropriate way. For scholars and performers interested in issues of late Renaissance and early Baroque performance practice, *Syntagma Musicum* III is an invaluable primary resource. For Praetorius’ own music, it is a definitive resource. According to MPC, a fourth volume of the *Syntagma Musicum* was planned that would contain instruction on the technique of composition, but this volume was never published. It is not known whether it existed in manuscript form or—like many projects he had planned—was left undone by Praetorius at the time of his death.

---

When the Reformation began, much of the liturgy of the new Lutheran church was brought over wholesale from Roman Catholic practice. Luther wanted to reform what he saw as the abuses of Catholicism, but he valued much of the liturgy and music and wanted to retain it in his new movement. In 1523, Luther published the *Formula missae*, a Latin liturgy for Lutheran worship. In 1526, he published the *Deutsche Messe*, outlining a German language liturgy. In the preface to the *Deutsche Messe*, Luther stated that the two liturgies served different purposes. The ideal form of worship was to worship in spirit, without the need for orders of worship, but only the most spiritually mature were able to do this. The service orders were meant as “a means of education, to indoctrinate and train those in worship who are not yet able to worship for themselves.”

Thus, it was essential that the worshipers understand what was going on and progress in their spiritual training. The simpler German service order was for small towns and villages with mostly uneducated parishioners and with little or no musical establishment:

> If the simple laity, the young, and the beginners in worship are to participate with understanding in the worship, the complete service must be in the vernacular; and if the people themselves are to perform the musical materials (no choirs being available in most cases), then something must be provided to replace the Latin chant and the polyphonic settings.  

---


14 Ibid., 69.
The Latin service order was intended for the well-educated congregations which would be found in larger cities, especially at churches associated with schools. These churches would more likely have trained cantors able to chant in Latin and have the musical forces available to perform polyphony.

Because Vespers services were outside of the Mass and were considered lesser services, their service orders were not as regulated as the Mass. Local practices were allowed more leeway, and there was more variation from place to place in these services. However, despite the variability possible in Vespers, the Magnificat is generally the one constant. In service orders, it is almost never allowed to be omitted. Luther thought that the “Vespers services should serve particularly the youth.”15 Vespers services were held daily in schools; because only the students attended these weekday services, they primarily served an educational function. Luther favored the use of Latin so that the schoolchildren could practice reading and chanting in Latin. Because of Luther’s efforts to retain Latin usage where possible, in Lutheran Vespers “the monody [monophonic chant] of the ancient church, and especially the psalm-tones, was preserved as a living tradition which continued well into the eighteenth century.”16

Only Sunday Vespers were attended by the full church body, and these services were geared more to the general congregation. Catechism was heavily emphasized, contributing to the theological training of the church body. Music was also emphasized, especially on festival days, when additional music would be performed. “This process of


the musical elaboration of Vespers was begun under Luther’s guidance.”\(^{17}\) Over time, more flexibility crept into the service order. For special occasions, alternate music could replace the standard fare, extra motets could be added, and grand concerted settings of the Magnificat would be performed. By the time of Praetorius, “[a]ll the major feasts of the church year, that is, Christmas, Easter, Pentecost, and Trinity, as well as such special days as Advent Sunday, Ascension Day, and others were celebrated” with special musical Vespers, and “the season of Lent and Passion Week were not neglected” either.\(^{18}\) Leaver believes that the Passions of Bach, the *Membra Jesu nostri* cantatas of Buxtehude, and other such compositions were composed for Vespers.\(^{19}\) Precedent for these later compositions would have been set in the liturgical practice of earlier times, likely in Praetorius’ own time.

The most common way to perform the Magnificat was in *alternatim*. The Magnificat consists of twelve verses of text (ten Biblical verses, plus the two-verse “Gloria Patri” doxology). According to Winfried Kirsch, from the beginning of the sixteenth century until the early seventeenth century “the vast majority of polyphonic Magnificat settings use only half of the…verses of the canticle, usually only the even-numbered verses beginning with ‘Et exultavit.’”\(^{20}\) The music for the other verses was usually supplied by singing the plainchant Magnificat in the psalm tone that corresponded to the tone used in the polyphonic verses. Chant and polyphony would alternate with each other verse-by-verse throughout the canticle. In eleven of the fourteen Magnificats

\(^{17}\) Leaver, “Lutheran Vespers,” 151.

\(^{18}\) Ibid., 156.

\(^{19}\) Ibid., 156.

in *Megalynodia Sionia*, only the even-numbered verses are set polyphonically, just as Kirsch described.

*Alternatim* could consist of more than just the alternation of chant and choral polyphony. The organ Magnificat was also a widespread genre. Usually, the odd-numbered verses would be supplied with chant; in place of the even-numbered verses, the organ would play versets\(^{21}\) that were based on the plainchant Magnificat. Most often, the chant would be used as a *cantus firmus*. There are eight possible chant melodies, one for each Psalm Tone. A number of composers published cycles of organ Magnificats that contained settings for all eight tones. It is common to pass the *cantus firmus* among different parts in the different verses. These organ Magnificats could also be partially or entirely improvised.

The early seventeenth century was the high point for *alternatim* performance in the Lutheran church. It was used for the Magnificat and other psalm-based genres and for chorales. Praetorius seems to have a special affinity for *alternatim* practice. His performance instructions often deal with how to distribute his music among alternating forces to create antiphonal effects. In his definition of the term *concerto* in *Syntagma Musicum* III, he says that it comes from the Latin verb *concertare*, meaning “to contend with one another.” He goes on to say that “this type of composition is to be called a concerto primarily if low and high choirs are heard in alternation with each other and

---

\(^{21}\) A word about the distinction between a “verse” and a “verset”: Verses are divisions of text within psalms, canticles, and other scriptural texts. In *alternatim* practice, when a verse of scripture is set polyphonically or when instrumental music is substituted for it, the resulting piece of music is called a verset. Thus, when one refers to the text of the Magnificat, it is divided into verses. When one refers to *alternatim* settings of the Magnificat, the polyphonic sections of music are versets.
Thus, for Praetorius, *alternatim* represented both a venerable liturgical tradition and a defining characteristic of the burgeoning new style of Italian music.

---

Chapter Three

THE MAGNIFICATS OF MICHAEL PRAETORIUS

The Magnificat is an integral part of the Vespers service of the Lutheran church, a liturgical element that was retained from Roman Catholic practice. In the time of Praetorius, both Latin and German versions of the text were sung. Some Lutheran congregations retained the use of Latin for many years after the Reformation, while others decried the use of Latin as popish. Overall, one can make the loose generalization that use of German equated with more simple, congregational modes of activity, whereas more grand and ceremonial occasions tended to call for Latin. Depending on the circumstances, both languages were in use in most congregations.

There are twenty-three extant Magnificat settings by Praetorius. Eight German Magnificat settings are spread among various publications. The other fifteen settings use the Latin text, and all but one are gathered in a single volume: the Megalynodia Sionia of 1611.

Overview of Megalynodia Sionia

Megalynodia is a transliteration of the Greek word meaning “to magnify or extol,” so the title of the collection translates as “The Magnificats of Zion.”23 Praetorius uses such transliterations in the titles of many of his publications. Also, Praetorius uses

megalynodia as a synonym for Magnificat in his discussion of the genre in *Syntagma Musicum* I.  

In the preface to *Megalynodia Sionia*, MPC states that he composed the works therein some years earlier in Regensburg. He visited Regensburg in 1602-1603, so it is likely that the compositions date from this time, even though they were published later. Thus, these are among Praetorius’ earliest known compositions, and they are generally regarded as juvenilia. The prominent use of parody technique in the collection lends credence to this idea, since parody was a common pedagogical tool for young composers of that time.

*Megalynodia Sionia* is a collection of fourteen Magnificat settings. The first eleven Magnificats are intended for *alternatim* performance; only the even-numbered verses are set polyphonically. The music for the odd-numbered verses must be supplied from another source. These eleven pieces are also all parodies of motets or madrigals by well-known composers of the generation immediately preceding Praetorius: Lasso, Marenzio, Wert, and Sweelinck. For Vespers services on important festival days, it was common in MPC’s time to insert chorales appropriate to the day between each pair of Magnificat verses. For the first three Magnificats in the collection, Praetorius provides suitable chorales in between the Latin sections to demonstrate this practice. His intent was that his readers would learn from these examples and then treat the other Magnificats similarly.

---


Table 3.1. Contents of *Megalynodia Sionia*

1. Magnificat super Angelus ad pastores
2. Magnificat super Ecce Maria et Sydus ex claro
3. Magnificat super Surrexit Pastor bonus
4. Magnificat super Cantai già lieto
5. 1. Magnificat super Valle che de lamenti
6. 2. Magnificat super Valle che de lamenti
7. Magnificat super Dolorosi martyr
8. Magnificat super Elle est à vous
9. Magnificat super Se’l disse mai
10. Magnificat super Mentre qual viva
11. Magnificat super In te Domine speravi
12. Magnificat super Chorale melos Germanicum
13. Magnificat a8
14. Magnificat super Ut re mi fa sol la

The final three works in the collection are complete settings of the Magnificat text. Number twelve, “Magnificat super Chorale melos Germanicum,” is an eight-voice double choir setting (SATB/SATB). Rather than being segmented by verse, it is simply divided into *prima pars* and *secunda pars*. It is essentially a Latin version of Praetorius’ own German Magnificat setting “Meine Seel erhebt der Herren” from *Musae Sioniae I* (1605).²⁷ It is difficult to determine which was composed first, considering the early dating of the contents of *Megalynodia*. Since Praetorius states that the Magnificats in *Megalynodia* are revised versions of earlier compositions, the original German Magnificat was most likely composed for publication in *Musae Sioniae I* and then adapted to the Latin text for use in *Megalynodia Sionia*. Compositionally, both versions

---
are based on the monophonic German Magnificat melody, which corresponds to the *tonus peregrinus*.\(^{28}\) The melody is used as a *cantus firmus*.

Magnificat number thirteen is also an eight-voice double choir setting (SSAT/ATTB). It is a reworking of Praetorius’ only Latin Magnificat that appears outside of *Megalynodia Sionia*. The other setting appears in his collection *Musarum Sionarum Motectae et Psalms Latin*

Both are based on the monophonic Magnificat chant for Tone 5. The chant melody appears loosely in the discant as a *cantus firmus*. Scholz regards the version in *Megalynodia* as the later composition, which is in keeping with the likely timeline proposed above for “Magnificat super Chorale melos Germanicum.”\(^{29}\)

It is a revision of the earlier composition, rather than a parody. In fact, the latter version is somewhat simplified and slightly shorter than the former. It is through-composed in one large movement. There is a full cadence followed by rests in the middle of the piece, just before “Suscepit Israel,” which could serve as a dividing point; but Praetorius does not indicate the next section as a *secunda pars*. The cadence comes immediately after the text “et divites dimisit inanes” [and the rich are sent away empty], so it could be for the sake of text painting, the empty space of the rests representing the emptiness of the rich. Both Magnificats twelve and thirteen have triple meter sections near the end, showing the influence of Gabrieli-era Venetian motets.

---

\(^{28}\) Cook, “Troped Polyphonic Magnificat,” 20n24, states that “the famous ‘Klug Gesangbuch,’ originally published as *Geistliche Lieder auffs new gebessert zu Wittenberg. D. Mart. Luth.* (Wittenberg, 1533) contains the Magnificat set to the *tonus peregrinus*, as did most subsequent Lutheran hymnals.” The *tonus peregrinus* or “wandering tone” is so called because the reciting tone changes from the first half of the verse (A) to the second (G). In Catholic liturgy it is associated with Psalm 113, *In exitu Israel*; the “wandering” designation could also be related to the textual theme of the psalm.

“Magnificat super Ut re mi fa sol la” is the final work in the collection. It is a six-voice setting (SSATTB) on a significantly larger scale than any of the other pieces in the book. Each of the twelve verses is set as an individual movement. These individual movements are comparable in length to the longest polyphonic versets of the first eleven Magnificats, but since Praetorius sets all twelve verses, it comes out to be about twice the length of any other work in the collection. MPC uses the hexachord as a cantus firmus, treating it in a wide variety of ways over the course of the work.

Praetorius begins Megalynodia Sionia with a sizeable preface. The first section is in Latin and consists mostly of dedicatory rhetoric and historical and theological musings concerning the Magnificat. In particular, MPC draws parallels between the Magnificat and other Biblical canticles, especially the canticles of Miriam (Exodus 15) and Hannah (1 Samuel 2). Praetorius also expounds on the relationship of the Magnificat and these Old Testament canticles in Book I of Syntagma Musicum I.30 Of more worldly interest is the second part of the preface, Nota ad Lectorum Musicum, which Praetorius addresses to musicians. It begins and ends with short Latin sections, but it is primarily in German. Musicians were not necessarily classically educated, and Praetorius wanted to make sure his target audience understood his instructions, so he wrote in the vernacular. This section is entirely practical in nature; in it, MPC provides explanations and recommendations on all sorts of specific issues related to the music in the collection. Not only was this information useful for the musicians of his time, it is invaluable for those today who wish to understand how Praetorius envisioned the performance of this music. See Appendix 1 for an English translation of the Nota ad Lectorum Musicum.

Issues in the Study of *Megalynodia Sionia*

The various issues that must be addressed to gain an understanding of the music in *Megalynodia Sionia* can be divided into three categories:

1. Determining what music is necessary and appropriate to add to that which is provided in the collection to create a performance version that reflects the performing traditions of the time. For most of the Magnificat settings in *Megalynodia*, the music in the published collection represents only about a third of the music needed to create a fully-formed performance edition.

2. Analysis of the music, especially with regard to the use of parody technique as a compositional method.

3. Weighing how particular performance practice issues come to bear on this music, especially in light of MPC’s own writings in prefaces to his publications and in the *Syntagma Musicum*.

   For the first three Magnificats in the collection, Praetorius inserts chorales between the verses, as was common on important feast days. He gives guidance in the preface for how to choose chorales to interpolate within the other Magnificats in the collection, as well as different options for the first three Magnificats. It is important to understand how to choose appropriate music for these interpolations; these issues will be addressed in chapter 4.

   Most of the music is meant for *alternatim* performance, in which case only the even-numbered verses of the Magnificat are set polyphonically. There are a number of
issues to consider in choosing music for the other verses. The methodology for choosing music for the odd-numbered verses will be addressed in chapter 5.

Praetorius followed in a long tradition of emulation and homage when he decided to parody the works of respected masters of his time. More specifically, he was following in the footsteps of Orlando di Lasso in using parody in the Magnificat genre. Praetorius greatly admired Lasso, who died in 1594, less than ten years before MPC composed this music. Megalynodia could be viewed both as the culmination of a compositional learning experience and as a tribute to a great master. Also, analysis of Praetorius’ use of parody technique may shed some light on his thinking about the music. The use of parody is discussed in chapter 6.

MPC’s life spanned the end of the Renaissance and the beginning of the Baroque period. It was a time of fertile experimentation, and Praetorius himself went through a remarkable stylistic metamorphosis over the course of his career. His writings provide a wealth of practical information concerning issues of performance practice, which is very helpful in developing an understanding of how his music might be performed in an historically-informed manner. However, in a time of such change his various recommendations do not necessarily apply equally to all his compositions. One must discriminate among his various prescriptions and proscriptions to find how they fit this particular collection. Performance practice issues will be discussed in chapter 7.

---

31 For compliments paid to Lasso in MPC’s writings, see Syntagma Musicum III, trans. Kite-Powell, 6, 23.
Table 3.2. Published Magnificats of Michael Praetorius

**Musae Sioniae I** (1605)
- no. 5, “Meine Seel erhebt den Herren,” double choir, SATB/SATB

**Musae Sioniae V** (1607)
- no. 44, “Meine Seel erhebt den Herren,” SATTB
- no. 45, “Meine Seel erhebt den Herren,” SSATTB
- no. 46, “Meine Seel erhebt den Herren,” SATB

**Musarum Sionarum Motectae et Psalmi Latini** (1607)
- no. 33, “Magnificat,” double choir, SSAT/ATTB

**Megalynodia Sionia** (1611)
- no. 1, “Magnificat super Angelus ad pastores”
- no. 2, “Magnificat super Ecce Maria et Sydus ex claro”
- no. 3, “Magnificat super Surrexit Pastor bonus”
- no. 4, “Magnificat super Cantai già lieto”
- no. 5, “1. Magnificat super Valle che de lamenti”
- no. 6, “2. Magnificat super Valle che de lamenti”
- no. 7, “Magnificat super Dolorosi martyr”
- no. 8, “Magnificat super Elle est à vous”
- no. 9, “Magnificat super Se’l disse mai”
- no. 10, “Magnificat super Mentre qual viva”
- no. 11, “Magnificat super In te Domine speravi”
- no. 12, “Magnificat super Chorale melos Germanicum”
- no. 13, “Magnificat a8”
- no. 14, “Magnificat super Ut re mi fa sol la”

**Urania** (1613)
- no. 6, “Meine Seel erhebt den Herren,” double choir, SATB/SATB
- no. 22, “Meine Seel erhebt den Herren,” three choirs, SATB/SATB/SATB

**Polyhymnia Caduceatrix et Panegyrica** (1619)
- no. 40, “Meine Seel erhebt den Herren,” four choirs and basso continuo

**Puericinium** (1621)
- no. 14, “Meine Seel erhebt den Herren,” three choirs and basso continuo

**textual variants:**
- **Musae Sioniae V** (1607)
  - nos. 160 and 161, “Mein Seel, o Gott, muss loben dich,” SATB

**Musae Sioniae VI** (1609)
- no. 176, “Mein Seel erhebt zu dieser Frist,” SATB
- no. 182, “Meine Seel erhebt den Herren mein,” SATB
The German Magnificat Settings

One should not overlook the eight German Magnificats found in other collections of Praetorius’ music. The most well-known German translation of the Magnificat text begins “Meine Seel erhebt den Herren” (see Appendix 2). It first appeared as the text of a chorale, set to the melody of the *tonus peregrinus*, which is Tone 9 of the psalm tones to which the Latin Magnificat was chanted. The *tonus peregrinus* quickly became the *de facto* German Magnificat melody. In polyphonic settings of the German Magnificat, the *tonus peregrinus* frequently appeared as a *cantus firmus* or as the basis for the melodic material of the top voice.

Example 3.1. Transcription of first verse of German Magnificat set to *tonus peregrinus*

The earliest Magnificat setting published by Praetorius is found in *Musae Sioniae* I (1605). It is the German version of the “Magnificat super Chorale melos Germanicum” from *Megalynodia Sionia*, which has already been discussed above on page sixteen. The next three Magnificats are found in *Musae Sioniae* V (1607), grouped together consecutively, numbers 44 through 46. Number 44 is a simple SATTB homophonic setting with the *tonus peregrinus* in the top voice. It is subdivided verse-by-verse, but it is not strictly strophic. There is some variety in the harmonization of the verses. Number 46 is even simpler: it is a strophic SATB setting of the *tonus peregrinus*, with the music
printed once, and the words of all eleven verses underlaid as they would be in a hymnal.

For both of these Magnificats, the first half of the first verse is set as a solo intonation, with the harmonization beginning with the second phrase of text. These two settings flank number 45, which is a more complex, larger-scale composition for six parts (SSATTB); it is subdivided verse-by-verse, with multiple scoring changes over the course of the eleven verses:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Verses 1-2</th>
<th>tutti</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Verse 3</td>
<td>SST</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Verse 4</td>
<td>ATTB</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Verse 5</td>
<td>SATTB</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Verses 6-11</td>
<td>tutti</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

It is also based on the tonus peregrinus, but the mode is transposed up a fourth to a G final, instead of the normal D final. However, the work uses high clefs, so it should be performed at a lower pitch than what is notated.32 One notable bit of text painting is the use of triple mensuration as the Holy Trinity is invoked at the start of the Gloria Patri. Praetorius does this in several of his German Magnificat settings.

The next two settings of the German Magnificat appear in Urania (1613). MPC’s stated purpose for Urania is to demonstrate various methods for using alternatim and composing for multiple choirs, yet “in simple counterpoint so the congregation can sing

---

32 High clefs or chiavette are an unusual aspect of 16th and century music. Some pieces, instead of using the normal soprano-alto-tenor-bass clef combination, used the combination of treble-mezzo-alto-baritone clefs.

Clefs were also indicators of range, and the second combination is for pieces written in a higher range than the normal “low” clefs. However, many theorists stated that pieces written in the high clef combination were actually supposed to be transposed down into a similar range to pieces written using the low clefs. MPC endorses this view in Syntagma Musicum III, trans. Kite-Powell, 93. For more information see Patrizio Barbieri: “Chiavette,” Grove Music Online ed. L. Macy (Accessed April 9, 2008), <http://www.grovemusic.com>.
The first Magnificat is number 6 in the collection. It is essentially a simple homophonic harmonization of the traditional *tonus peregrinus* melody, comparable to numbers 44 and 46 in *Musae Sioniae V*. What sets it apart is that Praetorius demonstrates how one can expand a simple chorale setting into a grander double-choir version. The verses are split between the two choirs (SATB/SATB), which sing similar but slightly varied harmonizations of the chorale. The verses are distributed as follows:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Verses</th>
<th>Choir 1</th>
<th>Choir 2</th>
<th>tutti</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1, 3, 5, 8</td>
<td>Verse 2, 4, 7, 9</td>
<td>Verse 6, 10, 11</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

The tutti sections are scored for eight parts, but the soprano and bass parts of the two choirs double each other, so the voicing is actually SAATTB. In the preface to *Megalynodia Sionia*, Praetorius recommends that when performing chorales in *alternatim* one should “[a]lways in the last stanza…and occasionally in the middle, have both choirs together.”

The second Magnificat in *Urania* is number 22 in the collection. It is a through-composed three-choir setting (SATB/SATB/SATB) in one large movement. It is based on the *tonus peregrinus*, but in a freer fashion. It is patently *figuraliter* music, with much more imitative polyphony and musical variety than the double-choir setting. If Praetorius truly expected his congregation to sing along, they must have been an exceptional group.

---


34 Cook, “Troped Polyphonic Magnificat,” 162. The quotation is from the preface of *Megalynodia Sionia*. A complete translation is included in Appendix 1.

35 The term *figuraliter* (figural) describes music that is in harmony and may make use of polyphony. Figural music is meant for the trained musicians of the choir. The congregation sings *choraliter* (unison).
The closing work in the landmark *Polyhymnia caduceatrix et panegyrica* collection (1619) is a monumental Magnificat setting for four choirs and basso continuo. The work is in four large movements, each made up of shorter sections of various scoring combinations. The four choirs are distributed as follows:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Choir 1</th>
<th>Chorus Voces Concertatae (SSATB, vocal soloists)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Choir 2</td>
<td>Chorus vel Capella (SATB, large vocal choir)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Choir 3</td>
<td>Chorus Sex Instrumentorum (six instrumental parts)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Choir 4</td>
<td>Chorus Capella plena (large SATB choir of singers, instruments)</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Praetorius also includes a separate *basso continuo* part, which would have required yet another group of instruments. The *tonus peregrinus* is not a significant compositional element in this work. The final of the work is D, the same as the *tonus peregrinus*, and the chant melody is quoted in the opening vocal duet and occasionally throughout the work, but otherwise the Magnificat is freely composed. At this point in his stylistic development, Praetorius is more interested in the new Italian style than in historical precedent. In the preface to *Polyhymnia caduceatrix*, MPC refers to “the new, highly developed musical arts…that in about the last six or seven years [have become important] as much in Germany as in Italy.”

The compositions in this publication exemplify the recent stylistic developments in motet composition, particularly in the music of Giovanni Gabrieli and Lodovico Viadana. The purpose of this publication was to show German musicians the proper way to play in this new style. The work is perhaps Praetorius’ grandest, most ambitious composition. He describes it himself as “very long” and

---


37 Boudreaux, “Michael Praetorius’s *Polyhymnia Caduceatrix,*” 2. In *Polyhymnia caduceatrix*, MPC includes an extensive preface with general performance instructions for the music, as well as specific directions for each individual composition.
Example 3.2. Page from *Polyhymnia Caduceatrix* Magnificat showing polychoral scoring and quotation of *tonus peregrinus* in cantus of choirs 1, 2, and 4 at “und mein Geist”
reckons that it could take up to half an hour to perform.\textsuperscript{38}

The closing composition in \textit{Puericinium} (1621) is the final Magnificat published by Praetorius. It is another large-scale work, though not as sprawling as the one in \textit{Polyhymnia caduceatrix}. For three choirs plus basso continuo, it is divided into three movements. The three choirs use the following forces:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Choir</th>
<th>Description</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Choir 1</td>
<td>Choro favorito/Voces concertatae (SSSATB vocal soli)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Choir 2</td>
<td>Capella Fidicinia (SATB, string consort)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Choir 3</td>
<td>Chorus pro Capella (SATB, large choir)</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

The work opens with a ritornello in triple mensuration on the text “Meine Seel erhebt der Herren und mein Geist freuet sich Gottes meines Heilandes” (verse one of the Magnificat). The ritornello returns five more times over the course of the work; each movement closes with it. In its final appearance, the ritornello is set to the text of the “Gloria Patri”—another invocation of the Trinity with triple meter. In the ritornello, the melody of the top soprano part is a paraphrase of the ever-present \textit{tonus peregrinus}. In a clever bit of text painting, Praetorius also quotes the \textit{tonus peregrinus} at the text “Wie es war von Anfang” (“as it was in the beginning”). This Magnificat seems to be a synthesis of the aggressive stylistic newness MPC exhibits in \textit{Polyhymnia caduceatrix} with more traditional compositional elements often found in earlier German Magnificat settings.

In addition to the settings of “Meine Seel erhebt den Herren,” Praetorius set three other textual variants of the German Magnificat text. All of the settings are simple four-part homophonic harmonizations with the words for all verses underlaid in hymnbook style. None use the \textit{tonus peregrinus} melody.

“Meine Seel erhebt den Herren mein” Musae Sioniae VI, 182
“Mein Seel erhebt zu dieser Frist” Musae Sioniae VI, 176
“Mein Seel, o Gott, muss loben dich” Musae Sioniae V, 160 & 161

In Praetorius’ list of his complete works in Syntagma Musicum III, four additional Magnificat settings are listed among the contents of several collections of his music that are now lost. There was a Latin Magnificat for six choirs in Polyhymnia heroica, a collection of grand pieces that included parts for trumpets and timpani. The Polyhymnia leiturgica contained masses and Magnificats adapted to the new Italian style. In it were two Latin Magnificats in falsobordone with German interludes, also written for six choirs. The inclusion of German interludes indicates that these Magnificats were troped as well. Finally, there was a three-choir Latin Magnificat in Polyhymnia X, a collection of motets and other Latin compositions.
The first three Magnificats of *Megalynodia Sionia* are troped. A troped polyphonic Magnificat is any “polyphonic setting of the Latin Magnificat text to which additional text and music have been added, relating the Magnificat to a specific church festival.”\(^\text{39}\) In the first three Magnificats, Praetorius inserts German chorales specific to particular liturgical occasions between the Latin Magnificat verses. The first and second Magnificats are troped for Christmas; the third is troped for Easter. The music inserted between the verses is different in both style and voicing from the music of the Magnificat verses; it is mostly four-part, homophonic writing, with syllabic text setting. The chorale melody is almost always in the top voice.

According to Larry Cook, the troped polyphonic Magnificat is an “exclusively German phenomenon, and restricted to the Lutheran church,”\(^\text{40}\) and the earliest known troped Magnificats date from the early to mid-sixteenth century. Robert Scholz traces the pre-history of the troped Magnificat back to a much earlier and broader tradition of inserting extra textual and musical material between the verses of the Magnificat.\(^\text{41}\) However, the rise of the troped polyphonic Magnificat as more narrowly defined in this

---

\(^{39}\) From the opening sentence of Larry Cook, “The German Troped Polyphonic Magnificat,” 1. Cook provides much excellent information on troped polyphonic Magnificats. The term has been used by several writers. In 1n1 Cook cites earlier German writers from whom he has inherited the term. The inclusion of the term “polyphonic” is to distinguish the polyphonic troping process from troped plainchant, which is something entirely different. From this point on, further mention of troped Magnificats should be understood to imply polyphonic, unless otherwise stated.

\(^{40}\) Ibid., 10.

\(^{41}\) Scholz, “17th-Century Magnificats,” 34-36.
study comes in post-Reformation Germany. The latest known example of a troped Magnificat is J. S. Bach’s *Magnificat in E♭*, from 1723. From the mid-sixteenth to mid-eighteenth centuries, the troping of Magnificats was a widespread practice among Lutheran composers such as Michael Praetorius, Heinrich Schütz, Samuel Scheidt, and J. S. Bach. Magnificats can have either interior tropes or exterior tropes: with interior tropes, the additional music and text are incorporated within the settings of the Latin verses; exterior tropes are additional songs that are inserted between the verses. The Magnificats of *Megalynodia Sionia* fall into the second category.

Magnificats with exterior tropes are probably better viewed as a way of combining different pieces of music to serve a particular liturgical purpose, rather than unified compositions in and of themselves. For some of these Magnificats, both the music of the polyphonic Latin versets and the tropes are the work of the same composer. However, there was also a common practice of using an already composed Magnificat and interpolating various additional chorales or motets appropriate to a particular occasion to create a compiled troped Magnificat. The chorales and motets that were inserted in these compiled Magnificats are referred to as *rotulae* or *laudes*. Several composers published collections of *rotulae*. The earliest known example of such a collection is the *Dreissig geistliche Lieder* (1585) by Joachim a Burck. Cook suggests that MPC’s own *Musae Sioniae*, volumes V (1607) and VI (1609), could also be intended, at least in part, to serve the same purpose.43


43 Ibid., 29.
In the preface to *Megalynodia Sionia* (see Appendix 1 for the full text), Praetorius mentions that he has provided tropes between the verses of the first three Magnificats in the collection. However, he suggests a number of alternatives for other songs that could be used, mostly chorale settings from *Musae Sioniae* V and VI. He also suggests various vocal and instrumental combinations that could be used to perform the tropes. He also includes the disclaimer that he does “not mean to presume on those who know better ways.”

In addition, he mentions using Magnificats by other composers to create compiled troped Magnificats; he specifically endorses a *Magnificat quinti toni a5* by Lasso. All in all, his approach to Magnificat troping is quite pragmatic.

Praetorius’ flexible attitude toward the use of his own music, along with the general practice of compiling Magnificats using pre-existing music and the existence of *rotulae* publications, indicates an atmosphere of interchangeability surrounding troped polyphonic Magnificats. The first three Magnificats in *Megalynodia Sionia* are exemplars of a process that Praetorius was demonstrating and propagating through the publication. They each represent one possible way in which a Magnificat can be troped. By examining these compositions and reading Praetorius’ suggestions and recommendations on the troping process, one could replicate the technique to create many more Magnificats in a similar fashion.

---

44 Cook, “The German Troped Polyphonic Magnificat,” 159.
“Magnificat super Angelus ad Pastores”

The first Magnificat in *Megalynodia Sionia* is the “Magnificat super Angelus ad Pastores.” In between the Latin versets, Praetorius inserts the following chorales appropriate to the Christmas season:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Verse</th>
<th>Chorale</th>
<th>Source</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>2</td>
<td>Puer natus in Bethlehem</td>
<td><em>M.S. VI</em>, 38, 39</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4</td>
<td>In natali Domini</td>
<td><em>M.S. VI</em>, 75</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>6</td>
<td>Herz, Sinn und unser Gmüte</td>
<td><em>M.S. VI</em>, 66</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>8</td>
<td>Heut lobt die werte Christenheit</td>
<td><em>M.S. VI</em>, 68</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>10</td>
<td>Vom Himmel kömmt ein neuer Engel</td>
<td><em>M.S. VI</em>, 50</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>12</td>
<td>Parvulus nobis nascitur</td>
<td><em>M.S. VI</em>, 42</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

All of the settings are SATB, homophonic, with mostly syllabic text setting. The only deviation from SATB voicing is in “Herz, Sinn und unser Gmüte,” which opens SAT but then switches to SATB in the closing section. In four of the songs, only one verse of text is underlaid; three of these songs are in German and the fourth is macaronic. In the other two, there are two verses of underlying text, one in Latin and then the same text in German (likely implying a choice of language, rather than the performance of both verses). “Puer natus in Bethlehem” is the macaronic chorale. It is a combination of two different settings, one following immediately after the other; both use the first verse of the chorale, the first in Latin and then in German. All of the chorales are in G Dorian, the same mode and final as the Magnificat. In the table above, listed after the title of each chorale is the setting in *Musae Sioniae* VI upon which it is based. The versions in *Megalynodia Sionia* all display a certain amount of compositional reworking, but there is a clear relationship between them and their original models. A transcription of “Heut lobt die werte Christenheit” is provided in Example 4.1; it exemplifies the typical characteristics of the interpolated chorales.
Example 4.1. Transcription of interpolated chorale “Heut lobt die werte Christenheit”

In the preface to *Megalynodia*, MPC suggests several alternatives that could be substituted for the chorale settings that he provided for the “Magnificat super Angelus ad Pastores.” He says that one could

replace the German songs included in the first Magnificat with a stanza from the Christmas song “Christus wir sollen loben schon” (in the key of
G Minor ([Clave GbMoll], the key in which each stanza of the Magnificat ends) between each verse of the Magnificat; the Christian congregation singing in unison [choraliter] and the choir in parts [figuraliter]. Thus a verse of the Magnificat alternates with a stanza of the chorale until they are completed.\(^{45}\)

Instead of using a different chorale after each verse, here Praetorius suggests interspersing multiple stanzas of a single chorale over the course of the Magnificat.

There are two settings of “Christus wir sollen loben schon” in Musae Sioniae VI: numbers 19 and 20. Both are cantional SATB harmonizations, similar in style to the original tropes. There are three settings of the chorale in Musae Sioniae V. Number 56 is also a simple SATB harmonization. Number 57 is a more extended, elaborate SATB harmonization. It is the work of someone besides MPC; the composer attribution is marked Incerti. Six stanzas are provided, the minimum needed to fully trope a Magnificat. Number 58 is an SSATTB polyphonic motet that uses the chorale melody as a cantus firmus in the bass and soprano parts, around which is woven a freely composed imitative texture.

Praetorius provides two important pieces of information in the above passage from the preface. First the musical insertions need to match the mode and final of the Magnificat. “Christus wir sollen loben schon” appears in Musae Sioniae V and VI in untransposed Dorian. MPC alerts musicians that it would need to be transposed to G Dorian (with a B♭ in the key signature) to accord properly with the Magnificat. Tonally, this chorale is an interesting case. The final of the mode is D, but the melody ends on E. Each setting in Musae Sioniae V actually ends on a different chord: 56 on A major, 57 on C major, and 58 on E major. MPC regards the chorale to be in Dorian mode, and considers it appropriate to pair with the “Magnificat super Angelus ad Pastores,” even

\(^{45}\) Cook, “The German Troped Polyphonic Magnificat,” 159.
though the versets of the Magnificat and the stanzas of the chorale will not cadence on the same chords. Apparently, for Praetorius the final cadence is not always a definitive indicator of mode.

The other important piece of information imparted here is that congregational participation is expected in the chorales, at least at times. The tropes that appear in *Megalynodia* are all cantional, as are most of the alternative pieces MPC suggests. By using primarily cantional chorale settings, Praetorius is registering his intent that the congregation participate in the singing of the tropes. What then should one do with a polyphonic *cantus firmus* motet like “Christus will sollen loben schon,” *Musae Sioniae* V, number 58? Obviously, it would not be one in which the congregation would participate. However, there is more information to examine before one can determine whether this fact disqualifies it altogether for use as a trope.

Another chorale Praetorius suggests for use as a trope is ”Puer natus in Bethlehem,” specifically the settings found in *Musae Sioniae* V, numbers 84 and 86. Number 84 is a simple, cantional SATB harmonization similar in style to the music already provided in the Magnificat. There are 19 verses (ten in Latin, with the other nine being the German version of the Latin), more than enough for troping. Number 86 is a different story. It is a group of five settings of “Puer natus” in progressively increasing numbers of parts (SA-SAT-TTBB-ATTBB-SATTBB). The first three sections are marked *Sola voce* [solo voice]. They are meant to be performed by a solo singer with instruments playing the other parts. The SAT setting is shown in Example 4.2. It is a straightforward homophonic harmonization, but the melody is in the middle voice, rather than the top. As with two of the original interpolations supplied by MPC for “Magnificat
super Angelus ad Pastores,” both the Latin and German text for each chorale verse is set beneath, so that the musicians may choose which language to sing.

Example 4.2. SAT harmonization of “Puer natus in Bethlehem,” M.S. V, no. 86

The other two sections call for the full ensemble; they are marked Chorus, a term that can refer to both instrumentalists and singers. The SATB harmonization is provided in Example 4.3. Even though the setting is more elaborate, it is still homophonic. The melody is in the top part in the score, but the “Alto” part actually lies in a higher vocal range than the Cantus, so the harmonization is not strictly cantional, even though it looks so on paper. However, it would not be particularly difficult for the
Example 4.3. SATTBB harmonization of “Puer natus in Bethlehem,” *M.S. V*, no. 86
congregation to sing along if desired. Six verses are needed are needed to fully trope the Magnificat. *Musae Sioniae* V, number 86 has five distinctive settings, but each of them is underlaid with two verses of the chorale text, so one would just need to repeat one of the sections. Also, switching the texts of the verses among the harmonizations would be quite simple, and would give one flexibility to distribute the voicings and texts at will between the verses of the Magnificat.

“Magnificat super Ecce Maria et Sydus ex claro”

“Magnificat super Ecce Maria et Sydus ex claro” is the second Magnificat in *Megalynodia Sionia*. It is also troped for Christmas:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Verse</th>
<th>Chorale Text</th>
<th>Model</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>v. 2</td>
<td>Lobt Gott ihr Christen alle</td>
<td><em>M.S. VI</em>, 70</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>v. 4</td>
<td>En Trinitas speculum</td>
<td><em>M.S. VI</em>, 41</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>v. 6</td>
<td>Geborn ist Gottes Söhnelein</td>
<td>N/A</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>v. 8</td>
<td>Freut euch ihr lieben Christen</td>
<td><em>M.S. VI</em>, 58</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>v. 10</td>
<td>Magnum nomen Domini</td>
<td><em>M.S. VI</em>, 54</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>v. 12</td>
<td>Dem neugeborenen Kindelein</td>
<td><em>M.S. VI</em>, 72</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

As before, the table above lists the chorales in *Musae Sioniae* VI that are the models for each of the settings used in the Magnificat. Most of the tropes in this Magnificat are almost direct borrowings, with very little reworking except for transposition where necessary. The two exceptions to this are 1) “Lobt Gott ihr Christen alle,” which is substantially revised and includes a newly-composed closing *parlando* section; and 2) “Geborn is Gottes Söhnelein,” the only trope selection in all of *Megalynodia* that is not based on a model found in another of MPC’s publications.

Once again, the chorale settings Praetorius interpolates are mostly SATB, homophonic, and syllabic. There is a bit more textural and metrical variety than in the
“Magnificat super Angelus ad pastores.” “Lobt Gott ihr Christen alle” alternates between SA and SATB, as well as duple and triple meter. There are three verses of the chorale “Geborn ist Gottes Söhnelein,” with progressively expanding voicings (SA-SAT-SATB). The concept is similar to that of “Puer natus in Bethlehem” from Musae Sioniae V, number 86. “Magnum nomen Domini” is SATB throughout, but it changes mensuration three times (C3-C-C3-C). Also, more verses are included in some of the chorales. Two of the German chorales have only one verse. As before, there are two chorales that include two verses—one being in Latin and the other being the German equivalent.

“Geborn is Gottes Söhnelein” sets three macaronic verses. “Dem neugebornen Kindelein,” the closing chorale, has two verses of German. All of the insertions are in F Lydian, the same mode and final as the Magnificat. (The B♭ in the key signature essentially turns it into major mode; Lydian was often altered in this way.) Generally speaking, despite a little more variety, they are very similar to the interpolations in the first Magnificat.

Praetorius suggests alternatives for this Magnificat as well, this time in a three-part scheme. First, he offers several possible chorales to use after the second verse of the Magnificat (which is the first polyphonic section of the composition):

after “Et exutavit,”…“Allein Gott in der Höh sei Ehr” (the first stanza), or “Ein Kindelein so löbelich,” or “Gelobet seist du Jesu Christ” (first and last stanzas).46

“Allein Gott in der Höh sei Ehr” is the German Gloria. There are six settings of it in Musae Sioniae V:

| M.S. V, 18 | ST |
| M.S. V, 19 | STB |
| M.S. V, 20 | SSST |

46 Cook, “The German Troped Polyphonic Magnificat,” 159-160.
| M.S. V, 21   | SATB |
| M.S. V, 22   | SATTB |
| M.S. V, 23   | SATTTB |

Number 21 is a simple, homophonic four-part harmonization, very much in keeping with the style of the other tropes found in *Megalynodia*. The other settings are more motet-like in style, with imitative entries and a fair amount of free polyphonic writing. These certainly would not do for the average congregation to sing. However, they are all settings of the first stanza only, so they remain within the textual scope of MPC’s recommendation. There are also three settings of this chorale in *Musae Sioniae VI*: numbers 168, 169, and 170. All three are simple cantional settings of the first stanza.

There are three settings of “Ein Kindelein so löbelich” in *Musae Sioniae V*. Number 78 is a standard homophonic four-part harmonization, while number 79 is an ambitious polyphonic SSATB motet. Number 77 is a three-part motet (SSB); the chorale melody is used as a *cantus firmus* in longer notes in the bass part, with a freely-composed, more rhythmically-active imitative duet set above it. A transcription of the opening measures of number 77 is provided in Example 4.4. The writing in the upper voices is quite disjunct and rhythmically complex. It is neither melodically nor textually related to the chorale. The note values in the *cantus firmus* are twice as long as they would typically be in a straightforward congregational setting of the chorale. This version of the chorale is obviously not well-suited for congregational participation and is quite dissimilar to the style of the preceding interpolations. However, if congregational engagement is not a definitive requirement for the interpolations, then perhaps settings like this may still have a role in troping these Magnificats.
Example 4.4. Opening of “Ein Kindelein so löbelich,” Musae Sioniae V, number 77

The third chorale suggested by Praetorius is “Gelobet seist du Jesu Christ.” There are numerous settings of this chorale available in Musae Sioniae V and VI:

- M.S. V, no. 60 SAT
- M.S. V, no. 61 STT
- M.S. V, no. 62 SSAT
- M.S. V, no. 63 SATB
- M.S. V, no. 64 STTB
- M.S. V, no. 65 SATTB
- M.S. V, no. 66, 67 SSATB
- M.S. VI, no. 21 SATB
- M.S. VI, no. 22 SATB
- M.S. VI, no. 23 SATB
- M.S. VI, no. 24 SATB

As with the previous chorales, the selections in Musae Sioniae V consist of one simple SATB homophonic harmonization (number 63) and then an assortment of polyphonic
motet-style settings more in the vein of the “Ein Kindelein so lōbelich” setting in Example 4.4. Number 64 is of interest; it is a short motet by Johann Walther, with the chorale melody used as a *cantus firmus* in the tenor part. Numbers 66 and 67 are a large-scale motet setting with *prima* and *secunda pars*. The four settings in *Musae Sioniae* VI are all simple homophonic harmonizations.

The second part of MPC’s scheme carries through verses 4, 6, 8, and 10 of the Magnificat. He suggests using verses 1-4 of “In dulci jubilo,” placing one stanza after each of the Magnificat verses:

After “Quia fecit” the first stanza of “In dulci jubilo” may be used. After “Fecit potentiam,” the second stanza of “In dulci jubilo,” (“O Jesu parvule”); following the “Esuriente,” the third stanza, “O Patris caritas;” and after “Sicut locutus,” the fourth stanza, “Ubi sunt gaudia.”

Perhaps not coincidentally, *Musae Sioniae* V, number 83 is a four-verse homophone setting of “In dulci jubilo.” There are three other settings in *Musae Sioniae* V that are more polyphonic. *Musae Sioniae* VI contains three more harmonizations in cantional style.

One might have noticed a pattern emerging of MPC’s use of cantional chorale settings as tropes and the consistent availability of similar settings among the chorales he suggests as alternatives in the preface. However, in the third part of his alternative version of “Magnificat super Ecce Maria et Sydus ex claro,” there is a departure from this pattern. MPC makes the following recommendations for music to insert after the twelfth (and final) verse of the Magnificat:

> “Joseph, lieber Joseph mein,” or “Resonet in laudibus” *(a7)*, numbers 29 and 30 in *Eulogodia Sionia* in which I have shown the manner of arranging it. Or if one prefers, he may use “Singt ihr lieben Christen all”

---

*Cook, “The German Troped Polyphonic Magnificat,”* 160.
(no. 91 in *Musae Sionia V*) since it has the same melody as the “Resonet.”
Or numbers 88, 92, 93, 94, etc. may be used.\(^{48}\)

The only setting of “Joseph, lieber Joseph mein” in *Musae Sioniae V* or VI is an SATTB motet by Johann Walther in volume V, number 87. The melody is not in the top voice, but is spread between the Alto and Second Tenor. The motet is essentially homophonic, and despite the frequent use of polychoral effects (SAT/TTB) the melody appears uninterrupted throughout, so the congregation could conceivably sing along.

Not so with the settings of “Resonet in laudibus” from *Eulogodia Sionia* (1611). Number 29 is a six-voice motet (SSATTB). It is a mix of homophonic and polyphonic writing. At times, the melody is easy to follow, but at other times imitative entries and motivic repetition create a swirling texture too complex to follow without a written part. Also, Praetorius switches frequently between duple and triple mensuration, creating some very interesting cross-rhythms when he converts the original triple meter motives into duple meter. Number 30 is for seven voices (SSSSATB). The top four Soprano parts basically function as an equal voice motet, full of intertwining imitation and echo effects. The bottom three parts are less polyphonic. They generally enter to create grander homophonic sections which frame the imitative material. “Singt ihr lieben Christen all” (*Musae Sioniae V*, number 91) is scored for two choirs (SS/SSATB). Upon examination, it is found to be almost the exact same composition as the seven-part “Resonet in laudibus” from *Eulogodia Sionia*. The only substantive differences are that a six bar duple meter section found in “Resonet in laudibus” is omitted in “Singt ihr lieben Christen all,” and that the text is Latin in one and German in the other. The scoring in “Singt ihr lieben Christen all” highlights the antiphonal possibilities between the two

\(^{48}\) Cook, “The German Troped Polyphonic Magnificat,” 160.
pairs of soprano voices; this element is less clear in “Resonet in laudibus” because the parts are in a different order in the score. Example 4.5 shows the opening of the seven-part “Resonet in laudibus,” *Eulogodia Sionia*, number 30. One can see the textural alternation between the soprano “quartet” and the full tutti, as well as the echo effects employed among the soprano parts. This composition is grander and more complex than the interpolations MPC has previously suggested. This chorale would be the closing musical statement of the overall work. It seems Praetorius is indicating that ease of congregational participation may be sacrificed in order to provide an impressive ending to the Magnificat.

Example 4.5. Opening of “Resonet in laudibus,” *Eulogodia Sionia*, number 30
MPC also suggests using *Musae Sioniae V*, “numbers 88, 92, 93, 94, etc.,” to close the Magnificat:

- **M.S. V, no. 88**  Quem pastores laudavere
- **M.S. V, no. 92**  Resonet in laudibus
- **M.S. V, no. 93**  Omnis mundus jocundetur
- **M.S. V, no. 94**  Seid fröhlich und jubilieret

Each verse of “Quem pastores laudavere” starts with monophonic antiphony among four choirs of children and then finishes with a section of SATB homophony. Number 92 is a straightforward homophonic SATTB setting of “Resonet in laudibus.” The other two are simple SATB harmonizations. In all of these settings the melody is in the top voice.

These suggestions represent less grandiose closing options. Praetorius is providing
leeway in choosing how to end the Magnificat to individual music directors, depending perhaps on their practical situation or their convictions regarding the importance of congregational participation. With the “etc.” at the end of the list, Praetorius gives the reader permission to consider other simple, homophonic settings of Christmas chorales beyond these he has mentioned. Once again, MPC does not mean for his suggestions to be taken as definitive. He is illustrating the range of options that he considers appropriate, leaving it to his readers to make their own decisions on specific tropes.

“Magnificat super Surrexit Pastor bonus”

The third Magnificat in Megalynodia Sionia, and the only one troped for Easter, is “Magnificat super Surrexit Pastor bonus.” The chorales that are inserted between the versets, along with the settings in Musae Sioniae VI upon which they are based, are as follows:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Verse</th>
<th>Chorale</th>
<th>Source</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>v. 2</td>
<td>Erstanden ist der heilig Christ</td>
<td>M.S. VI, 139</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>v. 4</td>
<td>Wir wollen alle fröhlich sein</td>
<td>M.S. VI, 144</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>v. 6</td>
<td>Freu dich du werte Christenheit</td>
<td>M.S. VI, 145</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>v. 8</td>
<td>Zu dieser Österlichen Zeit</td>
<td>M.S. VI, 148</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>v. 10</td>
<td>Alleluia ist ein fröhlich Gesang</td>
<td>M.S. VI, 140</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>v. 12</td>
<td>Heut triumphieret Gottes Sohn</td>
<td>M.S. VI, 142</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Four of the chorales in this Magnificat (those after verses 2, 6, 10, and 12) show more compositional reworking than their counterparts in the other two Magnificats, because MPC takes SATB harmonizations and revoices them for SSAT (essentially a treble ensemble—perhaps for a choir of schoolchildren). In all of them, the Soprano is retained unchanged. The Bass parts in the originals are mostly retained as well, though with numerous octave transpositions to raise the range. The Alto and Tenor do a fair amount
of swapping of material to adapt the original parts from AT to SA. Though the other two harmonizations are SATB, they are also reworked. Both are transposed from F to C, and the drop in range of a fourth requires Praetorius to essentially employ in reverse the same process he uses to adapt the SSAT harmonizations from SATB.

In the *Megalynodia* preface, Praetorius offers the following suggestions for other compositions that can be used as tropes for “Magnificat super Surrexit Pastor bonus”:

In the third Magnificat, instead of the German songs given here between each verse, numbers 132, 133, and 135 from *Musae Sioniae* V may be used. Two or three verses, one after the other, of “Erstanden ist der heilige Christ” may be sung with the congregation.  

All three pieces he mentions are settings of “Erstanden ist der heilige Christ.” Numbers 132 and 133 are simple cantional SATB harmonizations. Number 135 is a more ambitious multi-sectional work, similar to “Puer natus in Bethlehem,” *Musae Sioniae* V, number 86 (one of the alternate suggestions for “Magnificat super Angelus ad Pastores”). Praetorius distributes the 19 verses of the chorale over five different sections of various voicings:

- **SSATTBB**: vv. 1, 2, 3, 18, 19
- **SSS**: v. 4
- **SS**: vv. 5, 6
- **TTBB**: vv. 7, 9, 11, 13, 15, 17
- **SSS**: vv. 8, 10, 12, 14, 16

The first section is labeled *Choro et Organo et Instrumentis*; the other four sections have the heading *Sola voce*. Thus, the piece begins and ends with the full ensemble, and the verses in between are for soloists. The opening bars of “Erstanden ist der heilige Christ” in the SSATTBB voicing are provided below in Example 4.6. Despite the expanded *divisi* and the addition of instruments, it is still a homophonic, cantional harmonization.

---

In *Musae Sioniae V*, the chorale appears with an F final. It would need to be transposed to C in order to use it with “Magnificat super Surrexit Pastor bonus.” Praetorius’ method for transposing the other chorale interpolations for this Magnificat could be used as a model for how to handle this process.

Example 4.6. Opening of “Erstanden ist der heilge Christ,” *Musae Sioniae V*, no. 135

There are no explicit performance directions in *Musae Sioniae V* for the other two settings of this chorale, but MPC explains in the *Megalynodia* preface how he would arrange number 133, fleshing out the simple harmonization to create antiphonal effects:
As soon as the first verse of the Magnificat, namely the “Et exultavit” is finished, performed with viols da gamba and organ, I have the first stanza of “Erstanden ist der heilige Christ” performed by four singers and a small flute [Flötelein] and organ or regal. For the second stanza, the viols, positive, and a boy to sing the soprano line should be placed in a position in the church approximately opposite. Have the third stanza performed again by the previous four singers, flute, and regal. Then perform the “Quia fecit” in the same manner as “Et exultavit;” and again thereafter three stanzas (nos. 4, 5, and 6) of “Erstanden ist der heilige Christ” and so on until the end of the hypothetical Magnificat. In the same way one can also employ German songs [Psalmen] set in simple counterpoint [contra puncto] with which the congregation sings along.50

Here Praetorius proposes singing three verses of the chorale between each pair of Magnificat verses, which makes clearer his earlier statement that “two or three verses, one after the other, of “Erstanden ist der heilige Christ” may be sung with the congregation.” It follows that one could apply a similar approach to number 135, using its different voicing combinations antiphonally. Praetorius suggests that the same approach can be used for other “German songs set in simple counterpoint”—other homophonic chorale harmonizations. Most of the tropes up until now have just included one or two verses of a given chorale, but this latest recommendation shows that one need not be married to the one-verse-at-a-time pattern.

Drawing Conclusions

This study has examined all of the tropes provided in the Magnificats as printed, as well as the alternatives suggested by Praetorius in his preface. Based on this information, what guidelines can be established for selecting tropes that MPC would most likely deem appropriate for the Magnificats of Megalynodia Sionia? There are two

factors to consider: 1) what kinds of compositions would be musically suitable; 2) which liturgical occasions would be appropriate for performance of troped Magnificats. One should be mindful that the scope of these conclusions is intentionally limited. Since the present discussion focuses on Praetorius’ own music and writings, any conclusions that are drawn can only be considered definitive in regard to Praetorius. In the broader musical and liturgical practice of Lutheran communities in the early 17th century, his is only one voice in a chorus of many. The reach of his advice beyond his own music is open to question.

Judging from the tropes that Praetorius provides in the *Megalynodia Sionia*, the obvious first option for musically appropriate selections are simple cantional chorale settings, like those found in *Musae Sioniae V* and especially *Musae Sioniae VI*. All but one of the tropes included in the publication are based on chorale settings from *Musae Sioniae VI*, and almost all of MPC’s suggested alternatives come from volumes V and VI. At their most typical, the tropes display the following characteristics:

- They set a single verse of a chorale.
- Tonally, they must match the mode and final of the Magnificat; Praetorius makes ready use of transposition to suit his purposes.
- SATB is the most common voicing, but SSAT (treble ensemble?) is also featured prominently.
- Praetorius makes some use of some textural variety, but the music is mostly four-part homophony.
- Most often, the tropes are set cantionally, a texture meant to facilitate congregational participation.
Praetorius makes explicit appeals for congregational participation in the preface, so the suitability of the music for congregational use must be considered.

All that said, among the alternative scenarios MPC outlines in the preface, several of his suggestions fall outside the prototypical characteristics delineated above. The first assumption to put aside is that a simple four-part harmonization is a simple four-part harmonization. Praetorius highlights several ways that such settings can be fleshed out to create more colorful and variegated performance experiences. He especially favors creating antiphonal effects by placing ensembles of various vocal and instrumental combinations across the sanctuary from each another and alternating between them from verse to verse. More will be said about these possible performance options in chapter 7.

The compositions specifically suggested by Praetorius that go beyond the typical qualities are often multi-sectional, use multiple voicings, employ divisi of up to seven parts, can be antiphonal, and sometimes call explicitly for instruments in addition to voices. However, to a one they are mostly or entirely homophonic, with the chorale melody presented clearly in a rhythmically conventional fashion in one of the Soprano parts. Despite the additional textural and timbral variety, this style of writing conforms to what MPC calls “simple counterpoint.” Chorale settings with these characteristics are still within bounds, and might be especially appropriate for use after the final verse of a Magnificat. The more polyphonic motet-style chorale settings that are so often found in Musae Sioniae V are most likely beyond the scope of what MPC would consider appropriate.
Appropriate Liturgical Occasions

For what liturgical occasions would troped Magnificats be appropriate? The three major church festivals of Christmas, Easter, and Pentecost are the occasions most commonly cited. All extant troped Magnificats are related to one of these three feast days. The majority of troped polyphonic Magnificats are for Christmas. They are associated with the ancient German tradition of *Kindleinwiegen* [rocking the Christ child], in which the congregation would act out the Christmas story and gather around a manger scene and sing lullabies to the Christ child. However, Praetorius adds a *nota bene* to the end of the preface to his *Urania* (1613) in which he gives some further advice on troping Magnificats:

> In my *Megalynodia*, at the beginning, I have set three Magnificats between [the verses of] which there are German songs for Christmas and Easter. And one can do the same for nearly all the feasts throughout the entire church year, according to one’s own pleasure. Thus, one selects the loveliest German songs that are appropriate to a certain day, and between each verse of the Magnificat (sung by the choir with soloists [*Cantores*] and instruments) sings one or two stanzas of a German song…. He follows this statement with a table in which he suggests chorales appropriate to other feast days (see Appendix 3 for a full translation). He gives suggestions for Easter and Pentecost, holidays already generally associated with troped Magnificats. However, he goes on to broaden the liturgical options, mentioning other occasions, such as the feasts of the Annunciation, Ascension, Trinity, the Visitation of Mary, St. John the Baptist, and

---

52 See Larry Cook’s extensive discussion of *Kindleinwiegen* in “The German Polyphonic Troped Magnificat,” 298-318.
53 Ibid., 27.
St. Michael. Another telling quote is found in *Syntagma Musicum* III. While defining the term *intermedio*, Praetorius states that “[a]n *intermedio* is inserted between the acts of comedies…as other songs are always inserted in masses, Magnificats, and motets….”

Perhaps Praetorius does not exactly mean that songs are “always” inserted in Magnificats, but he clearly expects that songs will be frequently inserted in Magnificats. He is so sure that his readers will share this expectation, he uses it as an analogy to help define an unfamiliar foreign term. Despite the fact that there are no surviving troped Magnificats for occasions outside of Christmas, Easter, and Pentecost, Praetorius would certainly approve of a broader application of the practice.

---

54 *Syntagma Musicum* III. Trans. Kite-Powell, 122.
MUSIC FOR THE ODD-NUMBERED MAGNIFICAT VERSES

For the first eleven Magnificats in *Megalynodia Sionia*, Praetorius only supplies music for the even-numbered verses. As noted earlier in chapter 3, this arrangement reflects standard practice. On the surface, these Magnificats are obviously intended for *alternatim* performance. However, in the preface to *Megalynodia Sionia*, Praetorius make no mention of supplying music for the missing verses. Rather, when he talks about the alternation of the Latin verses with the German tropes, he says that “a verse of the Magnificat alternates with a stanza of the chorale until they are completed.”55 There are two possible explanations for this omission. Either Praetorius assumes so completely that his contemporaries would understand the *alternatim* format that he does not even bother to discuss it, or he only intends for the verses he has set to be performed.

On this issue, Larry Cook notes that the Magnificat was sometimes performed without the odd-numbered verses. He cites a quote from Johann Crüger, found in the preface to Crüger’s *Laudes Dei Vespertini* (1645). Crüger inveighs against the “irresponsible common practice” of omitting the chanted verses so that it does not begin with “Magnificat anima mea Dominum,” but with “Et exultavit,” and, even worse, the “Gloria Patri et Filio” is completely skipped over, so that after “Sicut locutus est, etc.,” one immediately goes to “Sicut erat” as if “Gloria Patri” were of no more importance than “Sicut erat.”56

---

55 Cook, “The German Troped Polyphonic Magnificat,” 159.

56 Quoted in Cook, “The German Troped Polyphonic Magnificat,” 163.
Apparently the practice was fairly widespread, if Crüger sees fit to refer to it as common. Of course, Praetorius had been dead for more than twenty years by the time this statement is published, and *Megalynodia* predates it by thirty-four years. Much could have changed in that span of time.

Praetorius speaks to this situation himself (somewhat indirectly) in Volume I of *Syntagma Musicum*. He mentions that he possesses a manuscript of Johann Walther (now lost): Walther had been working on a complete liturgical anthology of plainchant suitable for use in Lutheran worship, but he had left it unfinished at his death. Praetorius goes on to quote at length from Walther’s manuscript, which is unusual considering that Volume I of *Syntagma Musicum* is a learned Latin treatise, while the excerpt from Walther is in German. Praetorius must have considered Walther’s comments to be particularly important. In the quote, Walther is arguing for the continued use of plainchant in Lutheran worship. He says,

> All Christians must acknowledge in regard to these [chants], that they contain a lofty [and] rich understanding of Holy Scripture, and when they are sung with devotion and attention, they powerfully stir human hearts to God and stimulate [them] to praise him.\(^{57}\)

According to Robin Leaver, “Praetorius’ purpose in including Walther’s words was to endorse the continued use of chant forms in Lutheran worship.”\(^{58}\) Thus, it is highly unlikely that Praetorius would be one to bastardize *alternatim* tradition by omitting the chanted verses. Rather, he would link arms with Crüger and stand against such a thing. Bearing this in mind, it is more likely that when Praetorius refers in the preface to alternating each verse of the Magnificat with a stanza of a German song, he is using the

---


\(^{58}\) Robin Leaver, *Luther’s Liturgical Music: Principles and Implications*, (Grand Rapids, MI: Eerdmans, 2007), 240.
word “verse” to refer collectively to the matched pairs of Magnificat verses as they are performed in alternatim, one chanted and the other performed polyphonically.

Praetorius goes on in Syntagma Musicum I to endorse the work of Lucas Lossius, who published Psalmodia, hoc est, Cantica sacra veteris ecclesiae selecta in 1553. It is a comprehensive collection of plainchants for use in Lutheran worship. After its initial publication in Nuremberg, it was reissued five times during the second half of the sixteenth century by Georg Rhau, Luther’s principal publisher in Wittenberg. According to MPC,

[T]hat torch, which Walther was unable to carry un-extinguished to the desired goal, has been taken up by Lucas Lossius…. Indeed, that work [the Psalmodia] was helpful, not only to those who devote themselves to sacred music in schools and churches, who were assisted by its many careful labors of transcription, but at the same time, to all the pious, who were concerned for and love divine worship. 59

The Psalmodia was one of the major liturgical resources for Lutheran churches and schools from the late sixteenth century into the early seventeenth century, “perhaps the most widely known” collection of chant for use in Lutheran services. 60 It is also the first likely candidate presented here as a suitable source to supply the Magnificat chants for the odd-numbered verses of the Magnificats in Megalynodia Sionia (a facsimile reproduction of the eight psalm tones from Psalmodia is included below). 61 Even before the Reformation, German lands were developing a chant tradition that was divergent


61 Reproduced from Lucas Lossius, Psalmodia, hoc est, Cantica sacra veteris ecclesiae selecta (Wittenberg: Georg Rhau, 1561; facsimile repr., Stuttgart: Cornetto-Verlag, 1996), 343v-344r.
Figure 5.1. Reproduction of Magnificat chant tones from Lossius, *Psalmodia*
from Latin chant as practiced in Italy, Spain, and France.\(^6\) Thus, the Magnificat tones in the *Liber usualis* and other sources that reflect mainstream Latin practice differ to some degree from German chant sources, so they are not the best match for German music.

One must find sources of German origin.

Another source of plainchant to consider is the *Vesperarum precum official*... published by Georg Rhau in 1540. It predates the *Psalmodia* by more than a decade. It is a collection of music for Vespers that Rhau compiled from the music of various composers. It includes simple *falsobordone* settings of the Magnificat by Johann Walther in all eight psalm tones. From these settings, one can determine the monophonic tones that Walther was using for his Magnificats. Presumably, these tones would be the same as those in his unfinished *magnum opus* that later came to be in Praetorius’ possession. Furthermore, these psalm tones accord almost exactly with the Magnificat tones from Lossius’ *Psalmodia*, showing a close link between the two. From a musical and liturgical standpoint, this convergence of key Lutheran primary sources from Martin Luther’s own favored printing house places Praetorius firmly in the orbit of Wittenberg.

Choosing an Appropriate Psalm Tone

At first glance, it would seem safe to assume that mode and tone are synonymous, so that if one knows the mode of a given piece, then one can easily match it to the psalm...
Though the concept of modes had originally arisen from psalmody, certain elements of psalm tone tonality and the standard eight modes had grown apart over the years. Frans Wiering describes very insightfully how mode had become the province of the theoretician and was generally written about prescriptively, while tone was the province of the practitioner and was more rooted in actual practice and allowed for more variation. As Harold Powers succinctly puts it, “[P]salm-tone tonalities and the corresponding tonalities of the octenary modal system are not necessarily going to be the same.” In general, this divergence is not an issue, because psalm tones were generally paired with polyphonic music based on those selfsame psalm tones, so the monophony and polyphony were from the same side of the theoretical divide. However, with the advent of the parody Magnificat, the situation changes. Parody Magnificats, such as those in Megalynodia Sionia, are based on motets and madrigals which inhabit the world of the “octenary modal system.” They are still meant to be performed in alternatim with monophonic psalm tones, but there is not a direct correlation between tone and mode. In other words, a polyphonic verse in Mode 1 (Dorian) is not necessarily a good tonal match for Psalm Tone 1. How then do composers of parody Magnificats (and modern editors and performers) go about properly relating their polyphonic verses to the plainchant?

---

63 It bears mentioning that there are several varieties of psalm tone for each tonal category. Each tone has a ferial version (the simplest), a festal version (more decorative, meant for Sundays and feast days), and a canticle tone (the fanciest, for canticles such as the Magnificat, rather than the regular psalms). For simplicity’s sake, in this study all of these are referred to collectively under the general term “psalm tone.”


Orlando di Lasso was the originator of the parody Magnificat tradition (a couple of English predecessors aside). He also wrote a significant number of Magnificats that were based on the psalm tones. His publication *Patrocinium musices*, volume 7 (1587), contains thirteen parody Magnificats, and Lasso himself assigns a psalm tone to each. Also, his son Rudolph published a large posthumous edition of over one hundred of Orlando’s Magnificats, each assigned a tone. From these two collections, one can draw comparisons between the works based on psalm tones and the parody works and use Lasso’s own classification of his compositions to work towards an understanding of how he represents psalm tones in the parody compositions.66

Drawing on Harold Power’s concept of tonal types,67 David Crook categorizes all of Lasso’s Magnificats by tonal type. A tonal type consists of three elements: 1) the key signature, whether the B is natural (*durus*) or flat (*mollis*); 2) the clefs used in the piece, whether they indicate a high or low range (clefs are directly related to range in the Renaissance, so they are a definitive indicator of *ambitus*); 3) the final, the “root” of the final chord. For example, a composition with a B♭ in the key signature, low clefs, and a G final would have the tonal type **♭-low-G;** another with no key signature, high clefs, and a G final would be _♯-high-G;_ and so forth. Because of the difficulty that Renaissance scholars themselves had in translating the rules of mode from monophony to polyphony, there is great confusion about exactly how mode is signified in polyphonic music. Powers proposes tonal types as a collective framework of defining characteristics that

66 David Crook, *Orlando di Lasso’s Imitation Magnificats for Counter-Reformation Munich* (Princeton: Princeton UP, 1994). Chapter 4 “The Representation of Psalm-Tone Categories in Imitation Magnificats,” 85-146, is a thorough-going discussion of these issues. The proceeding discussion is entirely indebted to Crook. Crook prefers the term imitation, rather than parody. For further explanation regarding the use of these terms, see p. 78n.

helps one categorize the modality of polyphonic music. He also believes that
Renaissance composers themselves were aware of these characteristics and used them in
a self-consciously referential way. Therefore, comparing Lasso’s use of tonal types in his
parody and non-parody Magnificats can shed light on Lasso’s own understanding of how
he was relating the parody compositions to specific psalm tones (see table 5.1).

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Tone</th>
<th>Tonal Type</th>
<th>Number of Magnificats</th>
<th>Total</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>One</td>
<td>♭-high-G</td>
<td>10</td>
<td>13</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>One</td>
<td>♭-low-D</td>
<td>3</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Two</td>
<td>♭-low-G</td>
<td>17</td>
<td>17</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Three</td>
<td>♭-low-(A)E</td>
<td>4</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Three</td>
<td>♭-low-E</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>7</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Three</td>
<td>♭-low-C</td>
<td>1</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Three</td>
<td>♭-low-A</td>
<td>1</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Four</td>
<td>♭-low-E</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>10</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Four</td>
<td>♭-low-(A)E</td>
<td>3</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Five</td>
<td>♭-low-A</td>
<td>5</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Five</td>
<td>♭-low-(D)A</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>7</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Five</td>
<td>♭-high-F</td>
<td>1</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Six</td>
<td>♭-low-F</td>
<td>11</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Six</td>
<td>♭-high-C</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>13</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Six</td>
<td>♭-low-F</td>
<td>1</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Seven</td>
<td>♭-high-A</td>
<td>12</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Seven</td>
<td>♭-high-G</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>20</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Seven</td>
<td>♭-low-D</td>
<td>3</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Seven</td>
<td>♭-high-D</td>
<td>1</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Eight</td>
<td>♭-low-G</td>
<td>14</td>
<td>14</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Source: Crook, *Lasso’s Imitation Magnificats*, table 4.10. When a final is listed with a preceding
letter in parentheses, it indicates that at least one verse of the Magnificat cadences on a note other
than the final, with the alternate cadence point being shown in parentheses.
Indeed, some very distinct trends emerge. One can see that for each tone a particular tonal type predominates, though all but two tones employ multiple tonal types. Also, no tonal type is used to represent more than one tone. Notice that the finals of each tonal type often match the final of the corresponding mode (or its transposition), but not always. Following suit for Praetorius, here are the tonal types for the Magnificats in *Megalynodia Sionia* (see table 5.2).

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Magnificat</th>
<th>Tonal Type</th>
<th>Tone (based on Lasso)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1. Angelus ad Pastores</td>
<td>b-low-G</td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2. Ecce Maria &amp; Sydus ex claro</td>
<td>b-low-F</td>
<td>6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3. Surrexit Pastor bonus</td>
<td>#high-C</td>
<td>6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4. Cantai già lieto</td>
<td>#low-D</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5. 1. Valle che de lamenti</td>
<td>b-low-G</td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>6. 2. Valle che de lamenti</td>
<td>b-low-G</td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>7. Dolorosi martyr</td>
<td>#low-E</td>
<td>4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>8. Elle est à vous</td>
<td>#high-G</td>
<td>7</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>9. Se’l disse mai</td>
<td>#high-A</td>
<td>9</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>10. Mentre qual viva</td>
<td>#high-C</td>
<td>6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>11. In te Domine speravi</td>
<td>b-low-F</td>
<td>6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>12. Chorale melos Germanicum</td>
<td>#low-D</td>
<td>9</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>13. Magnificat a8</td>
<td>b-low-F</td>
<td>6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>14. Ut re mi fa sol la</td>
<td>#low-G</td>
<td>8</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

One may immediately notice that Magnificats 9 and 12 are classified as Tone 9, which lies outside of the standard eight-tone system. Tone 9 is the *tonus peregrinus*, common in Lutheran music as the melody for the German Magnificat. Lasso actually categorized one of his own Magnificats as Tone 9. It had the tonal type of #low-D, but all of the Bs in the piece were actually flat, making it essentially b-low-D, the *mollis* transposition of #high-A. That is the tonal type of the antiphon for the “In exitu Israel” psalm, the only
instance in Catholic liturgy where the *tonus peregrinus* is used. Apparently, Lasso made this connection and labeled his Magnificat Tone 9. His son Rudolph categorized the same Magnificat as Tone 7 in the posthumous edition, following the more standard use of that tonal type.68 In Lutheran liturgy, however, Tone 9 was widely used, so for Praetorius these Magnificats have been left as Tone 9.

However, it is unsafe to assume that Praetorius subscribed to the use of tonal types to represent psalm tones in the same way Lasso did. Praetorius was probably well aware that he was following in Lasso’s footsteps compositionally, but as MPC stood on the cusp of a new era, there is no guarantee that he was thinking about modal theory in the same way. Praetorius says nothing about psalm tones in the preface to *Megalynodia* and very little about them in *Syntagma Musicum*. However, he does give us three important pieces of information. First, he entitles Magnificat number 12 “super Chorale melos Germanicum.” It is based on the German Magnificat Tone 9 melody (the *tonus peregrinus*), which is used loosely as a *cantus firmus* in the discant. Second, he provides an intonation for Magnificat number 13 (a through-composed eight-voice setting). The intonation is for Tone 5, which is also used loosely as a *cantus firmus* in the discant. These two bits of information create the possibility of self-reference. One can know with certainty that the tonal types of these two pieces apply to these specific psalm tones.

The third thing Praetorius tells us is found in his *nota bene* regarding *Megalynodia Sionia* in the preface to *Urania*. He says:

> [O]ne must be careful to observe the B-natural in Hypothonian since there is no corresponding Magnificat tone. If it is present, the Magnificat octaví toni must be used in its place, and the German songs transposed down a fourth [i.e., from C to G] (which suits the instruments best, and of itself gives a lovelier harmony). If one should transpose the German songs

---

68 Crook, *Lasso’s Imitation Magnificats*, 136-137.
down a fifth, so that it is then somewhat dull, then the sexti toni must be used, etc. 69

Hypoionian is Mode 12. In Syntagma Musicum, MPC endorses the twelve-mode system: the original eight medieval modes, plus two modes with an A final (Aeolian, Hypoaeolian) and two modes with a C final (Ionian, Hypoionian). At the same time, some writers were extending the “rule of twelve” to the psalm tones as well. In Hamburg, Franz Eler published the Cantica sacra (1588), a collection of liturgical chant similar in scope and purpose to Lossius’ Psalmodia. It has been called “a kind of Hamburg Liber ususalis,” 70 and it was widely known in Praetorius’ time. 71 In it, Eler proselytizes strongly for a universal twelve-mode system. He goes so far as to provide new psalm tones for Tones 9-12. 72 If Praetorius subscribed to Eler’s system of twelve psalm tones, then he would not lack for a psalm tone for Mode 12. Since MPC says that Hypoionian has no corresponding psalm tone, he still holds to the traditional eight tones.

MPC’s solution for providing a tone for Mode 12 is revealing. In the Syntagma Musicum, he says that Hypoionian (which commonly employs high clefs) needs to be transposed down either a fourth or a fifth so that it will be in a comfortable range for singers. 73 When transposed down a fourth, it has the same ambitus and final (G) as Mode


73 Syntagma Musicum III, trans. Kite-Powell, 93.
8 (Hypomixolydian). It will also have the same final as Tone 8, which he recommends using for it. When transposed down a fifth, Hypoionian shares the ambitus and final of Mode 6 (Hypolydian), as well as the final of Tone 6, which he recommends for this transposition. In these recommendations, Praetorius is showing a tendency to regard the final as a defining element for both mode and tone. Wiering points to the singular importance given to the final as a determiner of mode in some treatises of this time.74

MPC’s title for the section in Syntagma Musicum III dealing with the modes states that he will show “how to recognize quite easily the mode or tone of a composition [emphasis added],”75 but he only gives one method, as though determining one is the same as determining the other. To some degree, MPC seems to conflate the concepts of tone and mode.

In his instructions on determining mode, Praetorius considers two characteristics to be definitive: 1) final; and 2) range of voice parts (a polyphonic adaptation of ambitus). He provides a series of diagrams, first in staff notation and then in organ tablature, in which he shows the final and the typical ranges of the voice parts for each mode.76 By comparing the finals and voice part ranges of a given polyphonic composition to the diagrams, one can determine the mode (or tone) of the composition. Using MPC’s own methodology, table 5.3 shows the modal designations of all the Magnificats in Megalynodia Sionia. Considering that Megalynodia is divided into three sections (numbers 1-3 are alternatim works with added tropes; 4-11 are alternatim works without

74 Wiering, Language of the Modes, 83, 90 ff.
added tropes; 12-14 are full settings), Praetorius has published the collection in modal order within the sections.

Table 5.3. Modes of Magnificats in *Megalynodia Sionia*

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Magnificat</th>
<th>Mode and final</th>
<th>Mode number</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1. Angelus ad Pastores</td>
<td>Hypodorian (G)</td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2. Ecce Maria &amp; Sydus ex claro</td>
<td>Lydian (F)</td>
<td>5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3. Surrexit Pastor bonus</td>
<td>Hypoionian (C)</td>
<td>12</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4. Cantai già lieto</td>
<td>Dorian (D)</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5. 1. Valle che de lamenti</td>
<td>Hypodorian (G)</td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>6. 2. Valle che de lamenti</td>
<td>Hypodorian (G)</td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>7. Dolorosi martyr</td>
<td>Hypophrygian (E)</td>
<td>4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>8. Elle est à vous</td>
<td>Hypomixolydian (G)</td>
<td>8</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>9. Se’l disse mai</td>
<td>Hypoaeolian (A)</td>
<td>10</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>10. Mentre qual viva</td>
<td>Hypoionian (C)</td>
<td>12</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>11. In te Domine speravi</td>
<td>Hypoionian (F)</td>
<td>12</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>12. Chorale melos Germanicum</td>
<td>Dorian (D)</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>13. Magnificat a8</td>
<td>Lydian (F)</td>
<td>5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>14. Ut re mi fa sol la</td>
<td>Hypomixolydian(G)</td>
<td>8</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

There are two modes represented that do not have numerical cognates among the psalm tones. As per Praetorius’ instructions noted earlier, the Mode 12 Magnificats should be paired with either Tone 8 or Tone 6. The model composition for “Magnificat super In te Domine speravi” is in Hypoionian with a C final, but the Magnificat itself is Hypoionian with an F final. Praetorius incorporates the downward transposition of a fifth into his Magnificat. Thus, it should be matched with Tone 6 specifically. “Magnificat super Se’l disse mai” is in Mode 10, also beyond the 8 tone system. It is in high clefs, so it would be transposed down, most likely by a fourth. The new final would be E, the same as Tone 4. Also, though the “Magnificat super Chorale melos Germanicum” fits
Mode 1 by virtue of final and range, in terms of psalm tones it belongs to Tone 9, the *tonus peregrinus*.

Factoring in these changes, how do the results compare between the two methods of assigning appropriate tones to the Magnificat verses? Table 5.4 shows the results side by side. At this point, ten out of fourteen are in agreement, a significant number. With this many concordances, it is safe to say that Praetorius and Lasso must have shared some common ideas about the use of tonal type to represent tone or mode.

Table 5.4. Initial comparison of two methods

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Magnificat</th>
<th>Equating tone/mode (shared finals)</th>
<th>Tonal types (Lasso)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1. Angelus ad Pastores</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2. Ecce Maria &amp; Sydus ex claro</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3. Surrexit Pastor bonus</td>
<td>8/6</td>
<td>6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4. Cantai già lieto</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5. 1. Valle che de lamenti</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>6. 2. Valle che de lamenti</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>7. Dolorosi martyr</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>8. Elle est à vous</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>7</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>9. Se’l disse mai</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>9</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>10. Mentre qual viva</td>
<td>8/6</td>
<td>6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>11. In te Domine speravi</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>12. Chorale melos Germanicum</td>
<td>9</td>
<td>9</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>13. Magnificat a8</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>14. Ut re mi fa sol la</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>8</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

However, there is one tonal type designation that needs to be revised. As established earlier, the “Magnificat a8” is based on Tone 5, so even though its tonal type denotes Tone 6 to Lasso, Praetorius has used it to signify Tone 5. “Magnificat super Ecce Maria & Sydus ex claro” shares the same tonal type, so it can also be considered Tone 5, in which case the discrepancy for these Magnificats would disappear. Making
these two changes, our revised results are seen below in table 5.5. At this point, twelve of fourteen Magnificats are in agreement between the two methods that have been used to classify them. These results are not systematically perfect, but they certainly narrow the field considerably. In the absence of complete certainty, table 5.5 represents the most informed options available to the modern performer for pairing the polyphonic Magnificats of *Megalynodia Sionia* with monophonic psalm tones.

### Table 5.5: Final results

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Magnificat</th>
<th>Equating tone/mode</th>
<th>Tonal types</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1. Angelus ad Pastores</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2. Ecce Maria &amp; Sydus ex claro</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3. Surrexit Pastor bonus</td>
<td>8/6</td>
<td>6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4. Cantai già lieto</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5. 1. Valle che de lamenti</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>6. 2. Valle che de lamenti</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>7. Dolorosi martyr</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>8. Elle est à vous</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>7</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>9. Se’l disse mai</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>9</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>10. Mentre qual viva</td>
<td>8/6</td>
<td>6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>11. In te Domine speravi</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>12. Chorale melos Germanicum</td>
<td>9</td>
<td>9</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>13. Magnificat a8</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>14. Ut re mi fa sol la</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>8</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

The Psalm Tones

The monophonic psalm tones below represent several different sources. First is the *Vesperarum precum* of Georg Rhau and the *Psalmodia* of Lucas Lossius. These sources are close to Praetorius, and with one exception, they are identical. For purposes

---

77 As they appear in Mattfeld, *Rhaw’s Publications for Vespers*, 357.
Example 5.1. Transcriptions of the eight monophonic psalm tones
of comparison, several other versions have been included. One is a generic “sixteenth century German” psalm tone, published by Illing without attribution. To highlight the differences between German and Latin chant schools, a “sixteenth century Roman” version (also from Illing) and the modern version in the Liber usualis have also been included.

Psalm tones are broken down into four sections. The *initium* (intonation) is the opening motive. The *tuba* is the reciting tone. Often in the German versions, there is a *flex*, a change in pitch, in the *tuba* during the second half of the verse. The *mediatio* is the mediant cadence that falls between the halves of the verse. The *terminatio* is the final cadence. The German and Latin versions agree on the *tubae* for all the verses. It is in the other three elements of the tone where significant variations can be found.

There is one more source that is of significant interest. Samuel Scheidt’s Tabulatura nova (1624) was one of the largest and most definitive publications of Lutheran organ music in the early seventeenth century. It is in three volumes, and the third volume contains liturgical music for Vespers, including a cycle of organ Magnificats in all eight tones. In his Magnificat settings, Scheidt uses the psalm tone very clearly as a *cantus firmus*. Thus the monophonic tones that he used can be reconstructed from the organ works. In the appendix to Harald Vogel’s 2002 edition of Tabulatura nova, these Magnificat tones are provided. In general, they agree very closely with the German tones above. The only two exceptions are the endings for Tone

78 Compiled by Scholz, “17th Century Magnificats,” 4-12.


1 and Tone 3. In both cases, the variations are concordant with Eler’s *Cantica sacra* instead. What sets this version of the psalm tones apart is that they are written in rhythmic notation. The evidence is not clear regarding the manner of chant performance in the early seventeenth century. Some sources call for even performance in uniformly long note values, while others seem to indicate rhythmic differentiation among syllables.\(^{81}\) It is uncertain which mode of performance was intended by Scheidt, but both can be regarded as possibilities.\(^{82}\) However, in *Syntagma Musicum I*, Praetorius states that plainchant “uses equal notes, without increase or decrease of value….”\(^{83}\) Perhaps Praetorius is speaking historically on this point (he does go on to say that the practice was instituted by Moses, David, and Solomon), but in general MPC is a plain speaker who says what he means. Most likely, Praetorius comes down on the side of even performance in uniformly long note values. In any event, Vogel’s rhythmic version of Tone 8 (the tone most represented in *Megalynodia Sionia*) has been included in example 5.2 in the hopes of stirring up controversy.

---


\(^{82}\) A recorded example of the metric style of chanting is *Vespers for St. Michael’s Day by Hieronymus Praetorius*, Weser-Renaissance Bremen, Classic Produktion Osnabrück CPO 999 649-2, 1999.

Example 5.2. Rhythmic version of Tone 8 from *Tabulatura nova*

Verse 1

Ma-gni-fi-cat a-ni-ma me-a Do-mi-num.

Verse 3

Qui-a res-spe-xit hu-mi-li-ta-tem an-cil-lae su-ae;

ec-ce e-nim ex hoc be-a-tam me di-cent om-nes ge-ne-ra-tio-nes.

Verse 5

Et mi-se-ri-cor-di-a e-ius a pro-ge-ni-es

in pro-ge-ni-es, ti-men-ti-bus e-um.

Verse 7

De-po-su-it po-ten-tes de se-de et ex-al-ta-vit hu-mi-les.

Verse 9

Sus-ce-pit Is-ra-el pu-e-rum su-um,

re-cor-da-tus mi-se-ri-cor-di-ae su-ae.

Verse 11

Alternation with the Organ

Usually, *alternatim* practice is defined as monophony alternating with polyphony. The polyphony can be supplied by either the choir or the organ, and it will normally be contrasted with monophonic chant. However, there are other possibilities. Robin Leaver enumerates three possible combinations for *alternatim* during this time period: “1) unison choir alternating with the organ playing in octaves; 2) unison choir alternating with the organ playing in harmony; and 3) choir in harmony alternating with the organ playing in harmony.”

Sunday Vespers was a venue for more elaborate musical performances, and for important church festivals there was an attitude of “festival flexibility” (Leaver’s coinage) that allowed for more variety and grandiosity than on the average Sunday. Frederick Gable also refers to a “threefold *alternatim praxis*” in which chant, vocal polyphony and organ are all used respectively. It is the most extended method of alternation, reserved for particularly festive occasions. Gable states that it seems to be a distinctively northern German practice.

Thus, though the alternation of choral polyphony and organ is not standard practice, it is not outside the realm of possibility for performance of the Magnificats in *Megalynodia Sionia*. Praetorius was well-known as an organist, and he had much to say on the subject of organ playing. He writes at length on it in *Syntagma Musicum* III, instructing organists on how to realize *basso continuo* and how to handle a variety of

---


86 Gable, liner notes for *Vespers for St. Michael’s Day by Hieronymus Praetorius*, 18.
practical issues. He gives very detailed information on organ building and organ registration in *Syntagma Musicum* II, and he also projected a book (never published) entitled *Musica Organica*, which would have been an instruction manual for young organists.\(^{87}\) However, he published very little organ music, and no collections of organ music were projected in his works list in *Syntagma Musicum* III. Perhaps because of the strong improvisational tradition among organists he felt little need to publish music for the instrument. Regardless, there are no extant Magnificat settings for organ by MPC. For these one must look to the music of his contemporaries. There are Magnificat cycles with settings in all eight tones by Hieronymus Praetorius (*Visby Tablature*, 1611), Samuel Scheidt (*Tabulatura nova*, 1624), and Heinrich Scheidemann. There are also three anonymous organ Magnificats in the Celle Tablature (1601) in Tones 6, 7, and 8. These organ settings represent repertoire that is close to Praetorius in both place and time, and thus most suitable to pair with the Magnificats in *Megalynodia Sionia*.

---

\(^{87}\) *Syntagma Musicum* III, trans. Kite-Powell, 209.
RELATIONSHIP OF THE MEGALYNODIA MAGNIFICATS TO THEIR MODELS

A glance at the table of contents of *Megalynodia Sionia* immediately tells the reader that these Magnificats differ from most Magnificat settings of their day. Throughout the sixteenth century, polyphonic Magnificats had primarily been based on the psalm tones, usually using them as *cantus firmi*. The Magnificats of *Megalynodia Sionia* are modeled on motets and madrigals by other composers. Using another polyphonic piece as a model for a new piece of music is known as parody technique.88

Unlike the modern usage of the word parody, there is no negative connotation meant by the term in this context. In the sixteenth century, it was very common for a composer to use a work by another composer as source material for a composition of his own. How closely the new piece resembled the old varied widely, from near-contrafact to barely recognizable. Parody is to some degree the polyphonic equivalent of *cantus firmus* technique. Instead of using a single line of music for compositional structure, one uses the full polyphonic texture.

The use of parody was very common in the masses of the sixteenth century. It was very rarely used in Magnificats (except in a few instances by English composers) until Orlando di Lasso. Lasso inaugurated the practice of writing parody Magnificats on the Continent. He wrote 101 Magnificats, forty of which are parodies. After Lasso, a

---

88 Major caveat: the term “parody” is a source of great controversy. Many scholars decry its use and choose other terms to refer to this procedure. The most-used alternative term is “imitation,” which has its virtues and liabilities as well. I view the term “parody” much the way I view the term “classical music”: it is not ideal, but it is common parlance.
number of composers followed suit, especially those in his circle in Munich. Magnificats based on the psalm tones are much more common, but parody Magnificats are a noticeable subset of the genre in the late sixteenth and early seventeenth centuries.

Composers had various reasons for basing their compositions on source material from others. Three of the main reasons are clearly stated in the title to Howard Mayer Brown’s important article: “Emulation, Competition, and Homage: Imitation and Theories of Imitation in the Renaissance.”

Relating musical imitation to other forms of artistic imitation in the Renaissance, he posits that composers mainly used material by others to learn the art of composition, to improve upon another’s work, or as a gesture of respect. As noted above, Praetorius was a great admirer of Lasso, and the *Megalynodia* Magnificats were originally written when he was a younger and as-yet-unpublished composer. Thus, the music of *Megalynodia Sionia* appears to embody at least two of Brown’s three criteria.

In his study of Lasso’s parody Magnificats, David Crook notes that Lasso had a strong bent towards the use of parody technique, and Crook gives several more reasons for why it may have appealed to Lasso. For one, it allowed Lasso to explore the compositional possibilities of motives, harmonies, or textures of the source pieces in ways that are not present in the originals. As such, “polyphonic derivation in the sixteenth century involves not merely the re-use and re-composition of the model’s music but a continuing process in which the composer developed ideas it contained, or even that

---


90 Crook, *Lasso’s Imitation Magnificats*. As noted earlier, Crook is a proponent of the term imitation rather than parody.
it merely suggested.”91 The use of secular (and sometimes quite indecent) songs as source material seems to go against the ideals of the Counter-Reformation that were gaining ground in Munich later in Lasso’s career. However, Crook argues that in Lasso’s view, using worldly music as the basis for sacred compositions was a way of “purifying” them, serving “to elevate the spirit and sublimate the original musical material. Purification of the music could be brought about through the substitution of its text,” thus redirecting the music toward more holy ends.92

Furthermore, Crook calls for a broadening of what is considered in an analysis of the use of parody. After outlining the various ways modern scholars have attempted to categorize and qualify the use of the terms “parody,” “imitation,” and the like, he notes, “For Lasso, imitatio or Magnificat ad imitationem must have had a less restrictive meaning than it does for modern scholars.”93 To this end, Crook employs the term intertextuality, which he borrows from literary criticism. In its original context, intertextuality refers to the relatedness of the meanings of words or texts. Crook uses the term “to refer to all forms of relatedness between two or more musical texts (i.e., musical compositions).”94 This chapter will address several areas of relatedness between the Magnificats of Megalynodia Sionia, the pieces upon which they are modeled, and the psalm tones with which the polyphonic versets would be combined in liturgical performance.

91 Crook, Lasso’s Imitation Magnificats, 157.
92 Ibid., 81-82.
93 Ibid., 153.
94 Ibid., 155.
Of the fourteen Magnificats in *Megalynodia Sionia*, eleven are parodies of motets or madrigals by other composers. Ten of the source pieces have been located. They were all published in the late sixteenth century by major composers of the generation immediately preceding Praetorius. Lasso is the dominant presence, with five Magnificats based on his motets. The other composers represented are Luca Marenzio (1553-1599) and Giaches de Wert (1535-1596), two well-known madrigalists, and Jan Pieterszoon Sweelinck (1562-1621), an important Protestant Dutch composer who was mostly known for his keyboard music. The titles, composers, and initial publication dates of the source pieces are shown in table 6.1. Praetorius used a combination of two different motets as source material for the second Magnificat, thus the two entries. Wert’s madrigal “Valle che de lamenti miei” was used as the model for both Magnificat five and six.

**Table 6.1. Sources for the Magnificats in *Megalynodia Sionia***

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Title</th>
<th>Composer</th>
<th>Publication</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1. Angelus ad pastores ait</td>
<td>Lasso</td>
<td><em>Sacrae cantiones</em> (Nuremberg, 1562)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2. Ecce Maria genuit nobis</td>
<td>Lasso</td>
<td><em>Selectissimae cantiones</em> (Nuremberg, 1568)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Sidus ex claro veniet</td>
<td>Lasso</td>
<td><em>Patrocinium musices</em>, vol. 2 (Munich, 1569)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3. Surrexit Pastor bonus</td>
<td>Lasso</td>
<td><em>Sacrae cantiones</em> (Nuremberg, 1562)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4. Cantai già lieto</td>
<td>Marenzio</td>
<td>2nd Bk. of Madrigals a6 (Venice, 1584)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5/6. Valle che de lamenti miei</td>
<td>Wert</td>
<td>9th Bk. of Madrigals a5 (Venice, 1588)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>7. Dolorosi martir</td>
<td>Marenzio</td>
<td>1st Bk. of Madrigals a5 (Venice, 1580)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>8. Elle est à vous</td>
<td>Sweelinck</td>
<td>Bk. of Chansons a5 (Antwerp, 1594)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>9. Se’l disse mai</td>
<td>unknown</td>
<td>unknown</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>10. Mentre qual viva pietra</td>
<td>Marenzio</td>
<td>6th Bk. of Madrigals a5 (Venice, 1594)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>11. In te Domine speravi</td>
<td>Lasso</td>
<td>1st Bk. of Motets (Paris, 1564)</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
The identity of the source for “Se’l disse mai” has proven elusive. The words of the title closely resemble the opening of Poem 206 of Petrarch’s *Canzoniere*, “S’il dissì mai, ch’io veng’in odio a quella.” However, Petrarch was very often imitated, and many madrigal texts that appear by their titles to be Petrarch settings turn out to be poems that “begin with a few words borrowed from Petrarch, then go their own way.” Thus, the source could be a setting of another poem with a similar first line. Petrarchan verse was favored by Willaert and many other Venetian madrigalists of his time, so mid-sixteenth century madrigals of Venetian provenance were likely candidates, but they yielded no results. Petrarch’s poem was set by Tromboncino and Palestrina, but both settings have been ruled out as unrelated, as has “S’io’l dissi mai, fortuna” by Cipriano de Rore. No other settings with this opening line are listed in Harry Lincoln’s massive index *The Italian Madrigal and Related Repertories: Indexes to Printed Collections, 1500-1600*. Given that all the other parody models are well-known compositions by major composers, it is strange that “Se’l disse mai” has been so hard to find. Perhaps it will come to light in the future.

As mentioned above, in parody the source material can be used in a wide variety of ways. Praetorius takes a number of approaches to the re-use, manipulation, and development of musical material from the model compositions. Often, different methods are used from one verset to the next, or even within the same verset, and MPC does not seem to be particularly systematic about it. He seems to have a nature that revels in variety.

---


The most obvious form of borrowing is contrafaction, taking the music from one piece and using in another, making only the changes necessary to suit the music to a new text. Praetorius uses this method several times. In “Magnificat super Angelus ad pastores,” the first eight bars of the opening polyphonic verset “Et exultavit” match the first eight bars of the motet almost exactly. The clefs at the beginning of example 6.1b have been left in their original versions. They are in the standard “low” clef combination (soprano, alto, tenor, and bass clefs).

Example 6.1a. Excerpt from MPC, “Magnificat super Angelus ad Pastores,” mm. 1-8
Example 6.1b. Excerpt from Lasso motet, “Angelus ad pastores ait,” mm. 1-8

The “Et exultavit” of “Magnificat super In te Domine speravi” is an even more extended direct quote, with thirteen of its sixteen measures coming directly from the motet. One very noticeable pattern in the Magnificats is that Praetorius opens every one of them by quoting (in varying degrees of strictness) the opening of the model composition from which it is derived. The only slight exception to this is “Magnificat super Elle est à vous,” in which he skips the first three measures of the chanson and starts
his quotation with the fourth measure. This pattern of opening each parody with the
beginning of its model follows solidly in the footsteps of Lasso. He began every one of
his parody Magnificats in this way.\footnote{Crook, \textit{Lasso’s Imitation Magnificats}, 157-158.}

Contrafaction is only possible when the model and its successor have the same
number of parts. MPC adds an additional voice to half of his parody Magnificats (see
table 6.2); in these works, any quotation from the source will of necessity include some
measure of adaptation.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Title</th>
<th>Voicing of model</th>
<th>Voicing of Magnificat</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1. Angelus ad pastores ait</td>
<td>a5 (SATTB)</td>
<td>a5 (SATTB)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2. Ecce Maria genuit nobis</td>
<td>a5 (SATTB)</td>
<td>a5 (SATTB)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Sidus ex claro veniet</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3. Surrexit Pastor bonus</td>
<td>a5 (SSATB)</td>
<td>a5 (SSATB)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4. Cantai già lieto</td>
<td>a6 (SSATTB)</td>
<td>a6 (SSATTB)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5. Valle che de lamenti miei</td>
<td>a5 (SATTB)</td>
<td>a6 (SSATTB)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>6. Valle che de lamenti miei</td>
<td>a5 (SATTB)</td>
<td>a6 (SSATTB)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>7. Dolorosi martir</td>
<td>a5 (SATTB)</td>
<td>a6 (SSATTB)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>8. Elle est à vous</td>
<td>a5 (SSATB)</td>
<td>a6 (SSATTB)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>9. Se’l disse mai</td>
<td>[unknown]</td>
<td>a6 (SSATTB)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>10. Mentre qual viva pietra</td>
<td>a5 (SATTB)</td>
<td>a6 (SSATTB)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>11. In te Domine speravi</td>
<td>a6 (SSATTB)</td>
<td>a6 (SSATTB)</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

In general, Praetorius prefers to take a fairly loose approach to quotation, adapting
the material to his own purposes in a number of ways. The most common is to shuffle
the voices in the manner of a patchwork. Almost always, the bass line remains constant,
but the other voices are swapped around, sometimes very freely. In some instances, a
particular musical purpose can be discerned. Often the first and second tenor or first and
second soprano parts are switched so that the firsts have the higher note at a cadence. At
the end of the final verse of “Magnificat super Surrexit Pastor bonus,” the alto part of the motet is transposed up an octave in the Magnificat to become the highest voice and provide some climactic high notes that aren’t in the motet. The excerpt from the model composition shows that the text is “alleluia.” The corresponding text in the Magnificat is “saeculorum, Amen,” which has two more syllables to fit in the same space. Notice the subdivisions in the Magnificat (rendered as quarter notes in the transcription) as MPC fits “saeculorum” into the space of just two syllables of the model.

Example 6.2a. Excerpt from MPC, “Magnificat super Surrexit Pastor bonus,” mm. 78-85
However, sometimes the exchanging of parts is very extensive for no apparent reason except for the sake of change. The following passage from the “Sicut locutus est” of “Magnificat super Surrexit Pastor bonus” is based on mm. 11-21 of the motet. In example 6.3a, the voice parts from this section of the model composition have been assigned different colors. Notice how jumbled the colors become in example 6.3b as the parts are woven together in the Magnificat.
Example 6.3a. Excerpt from Lasso motet, “Surrexit Pastor bonus,” mm. 11-21
Example 6.3b. Excerpt from MPC, “Magnificat super Surrexit Pastor bonus,” mm. 54-65

But no matter how much Praetorius shifts around the upper parts, the bass is almost always quoted intact. This consistent integrity of the bass part shows that Praetorius is already regarding the bass as the structural voice upon which the others voices are built, thus paving the way for the introduction of *basso continuo* in his
compositions. As opposed to a more linear view of polyphonic texture, he seems to regard the upper voices as interchangeable members that can be swapped at will. This more harmonic outlook is highlighted in the “Quia fecit” of “Magnificat super Ecce Maria et Sydus ex claro.” Praetorius quotes the bass line and the chord progression of the source ("Ecce Maria genuit," mm. 37-44) in mm. 18-26 of the Magnificat, transposed by the interval of a fifth. However, there are only fragmentary quotations of the upper four parts. MPC uses the harmonic progression as a musical element independent of the polyphonic structure of the motet. Praetorius also interpolates an extra measure of new music in the midst of the quotation (m. 22), but the interruption is incorporated seamlessly into the surrounding music and the quotation resumes a measure later.

Example 6.4a. Excerpt from Lasso motet, “Ecce Maria genuit,” mm. 32-45 (with chord progression noted)
Example 6.4b. Excerpt from MPC, “Magnificat super Ecce Maria…,” mm. 16-26 (with chord progression noted)
Moving beyond quotation, Praetorius also employs a more developmental approach at times. He often takes points of imitation and expands on them; or he chooses a particular motive from a model composition and highlights it by using it more extensively in the parody. “Magnificat super Dolorosi martyr” is one in which this developmental approach predominates. In the “Et exultavit,” the first seven measures are a loose quote of the opening of the madrigal. Measures 7-12 are new music, further developing the same motives introduced in the opening. Measures 12-17 are another loose quotation from the madrigal, which is again followed by a section of music (mm. 18-23) that develops motives from the foregoing quotation. In the quotation sections, once again the voice parts of the model are switched around at will, except for the bass.

Example 6.5a. Excerpt from MPC, “Magnificat super Dolorosi martyr,” mm. 1-23
Example 6.5b. Excerpt from Marenzio madrigal, “Dolorosi martir,” mm. 1-28

Excerpt from Marenzio madrigal, “Dolorosi martir,” mm. 1-28
In the “Sicut locutus est” of “Magnificat super Dolorosi martyr,” Praetorius begins the verse with a point of imitation that is based on an imitative motive found in mm. 67-78 of the madrigal. After seven measures of his own music, he merges smoothly into a loose quotation of that very part of the madrigal. Praetorius uses this technique of “anticipatory imitation” a number of times throughout the collection. Though MPC is moving toward a more vertical compositional approach, these examples show that he is also well-versed in the imitative procedures of past generations. Also, notice that the imitative material he quotes in example 6.5b and in example 6.6a both show the use of inversion in the counterpoint.

Example 6.6a. Excerpt from Marenzio madrigal, “Dolorosi martir,” mm. 67-77
Example 6.6b. Excerpt from MPC, *Magnificat super Dolorosi martyr*, mm. 82-95
One developmental procedure that Praetorius seems to be particularly fond of is the use of rhythmic augmentation and diminution. Most typical is the use of augmentation at the end of a verse to create a more climactic final cadence, but he uses rhythmic manipulation in a number of ways. The *seconda parte* of the madrigal “Cantai già lieto” begins with long note values—longs and breves—that progressively give way to breves and semibreves and then even faster note values, creating the effect of a gradual gaining of speed and momentum. Praetorius quotes this section of the madrigal (mm. 99-112) in the “Esurientes” of “Magnificat super Cantai già lieto.” However, he apparently did not care to include Marenzio’s clever rhythmic effect. He quotes mm. 99-100 at a diminution of 4:1 (in modern terms, the whole note of the model becomes the quarter note of the parody). Then mm. 101-105 employ a 2:1 diminution (half note equals the

Example 6.7a. Excerpt from Marenzio madrigal, “Cantai già lieto,” mm. 99-111
Example 6.7b. Excerpt from MPC, “Magnificat super Cantai già lieto,” mm. 40-44

quarter note); mm. 106-112 are quoted without change. Praetorius cancels out the rhythmic acceleration through the use of decreasing degrees of diminution, creating a graceful opening trio that moves along at a steady pace.

He uses rhythmic augmentation for both expressive and practical purposes in the “Esurientes” of “Magnificat super Surrexit Pastor bonus.” He quotes mm. 43-49 of the motet in mm. 44-51 of the Magnificat. It is a fairly direct quote, except for mm. 47-48 of the Magnificat, in which he quotes the model at half speed, doubling all the rhythmic values. By slowing down the harmonic rhythm by half, he adds emphasis to the appearance of the words “et divites dimisit” and creates the space to fit in all the syllables gracefully before resuming normal speed and moving towards the final cadence of the verse.
Example 6.8a. Excerpt from MPC, “Magnificat super Surrexit Pastor bonus,” mm. 40-53
Another element to examine is the relationship between the texts of the model compositions and the Magnificats. They can be related on several levels. Most obvious, Praetorius chose to trope for Christmas two Magnificats that are parodies of Christmas motets. He also chose a Magnificat based on an Easter motet to trope for Easter. The use of motets as models for Magnificats that would share the same liturgical season creates an added layer of meaning. Finding a liturgical theme for a madrigal text is not so straightforward, but with some creativity, one can draw some parallels. Both “Cantai già lieto” and “Elle est à vous” are poems in praise of the beauty and virtue of a particular woman. A sacred parallel would be the Virgin Mary. Though the Lutherans frowned on the worship of Mary, they still celebrated certain Marian feasts, such as the Visitation of Mary, one of the festivals that Praetorius mentions in the preface to *Urania* as an appropriate occasion for a troped Magnificat. “Dolorosi martir” is a poem on the pain and suffering of one in love:
Unbearable punishment, biting ropes, chafing chains  
Whilst I spend the night, the day, the hours, the minutes  
In wretchedness, bewailing my lost love.  
Sad moans, wailing, cries, laments,  
Heavy tears and endless misery  
Are my meat, and the dear tranquility  
Of my life is bitterer than any gall.98

An obvious parallel would be die Leiden Christi [the sufferings of Christ], with perhaps a liturgical home in Lent or Holy Week. Petrarch’s poem “S'il dissi mai, ch'io veng'in odio a quella” is a love poem, but in it are two Biblical allusions: one to the Pharaoh pursuing the Israelites at the Red Sea and the other to Elijah ascending to Heaven in a chariot of fire. In the lectionary, the story of the Red Sea is associated with Easter, and the ascension of Elijah could be equated to the Feast of the Ascension. Of course, these thematic relationships are purely speculative, but Praetorius opened the door regarding the relationship of a model composition and the liturgical assignation of its parodic offspring in the first three Magnificats in the collection, so perhaps mindfulness of such an interrelationship is not unwarranted.

In addition to thematic relationships, the sound and suitability of the text of the model composition as a match for the Magnificat text is also an issue to examine. At points, Praetorius seems to be very attuned to this aspect. In “Magnificat super Ecce Maria et Sydus ex claro,” several verses line up very closely with the syllable count and text stresses of the parallel text in the passage from the model on which they are based. For instance:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Model Composition</th>
<th>Praetorius Composition</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>v. 2 Et exultavit spiritus meus salutari meo</td>
<td>Ecce Maria genuit nobis pueri sonabunt</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>v. 4 Quia fecit mihi magna</td>
<td>Qui tollit peccata mundi</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>v. 12 Genuit nobis</td>
<td>Gloria Patri</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

98 Luigi Tansillo, trans. Geoffrey Marshall in liner notes of Marenzio Madrigali, Concerto Italiano, Opus111 OP 30245, 32. Tansillo was the poet of Lasso’s Lagrime di San Pietro.
There are similar examples in the first “Magnificat super Valle che de lamenti”:

v. 4  Esurientes implevit bonis  
     et divites dimisit  
     Quinci vedea’l mio bene  
     d’infinita doglia

v. 5  Sicut locutus est ad Patres nostros  
     Ov’ancor per usanza_Amor mi mena

There are even several instances of alliteration and assonance between these phrases. Parallelisms like these are not always present, but they are certainly too clear to be coincidental.

Even more interesting are parallel meanings between the texts. The fourth verse of the Magnificat is “Quia fecit mihi magna” [he that is mighty has done great things for me]. Verse four of “Magnificat super Ecce Maria et Sydus ex claro” is based on a line from the motet: “Qui tollit peccata mundi” ([the Son of God—and Mary] takes away the sins of the world). Theologically, this is significant parallel. In the two verses above from “Magnificat super Valle che de lamenti,” “et divites dimisit” means that God has “sent the rich away empty.” The phrase “d’infinita doglia” means “endless grief.” It is taken from a line in the poem in which the poet says that a place that used to bring him joy and pleasure has “become the home of endless grief.”

Both phrases represent a happier past that has taken a turn for the worst. “Sicut locust est ad Patres nostros” is translated “As it was to our forefathers.” The related line from the madrigal, “Ov’ancor per usanza_Amor mi mena,” is translated “where love still leads me as he always did.” It is an affirmation of the present continuation of love’s past faithfulness, just as the Magnificat verse is an affirmation of God’s past and continuing faithfulness to God’s chosen people. These textual interrelationships between the Magnificats and their models are not always present, but they hint at the variegated possibilities for relatedness—

99 Mark Musa, *The Canzoniere or Rerum vulgarium fragmentum* [of Petrarch]: Translated into verse with notes and commentary (Bloomington, IN: Indiana UP, 1996).
beyond musical borrowing and motivic development—that can and should be considered in Crook’s expanded intertextual approach to the analysis of parody.

Psalm Tone Representation and Parody

The challenge of relating polyphonic Magnificat settings and psalm tones when the polyphony is not based on a particular tone has already been discussed in chapter 5. According to Crook, “One way to ameliorate the absence of the psalm tone was to select a model whose melodic content resembled the shapes and turns of phrase characteristic of the tone.”¹⁰⁰ Lasso did this a number of times in his parody Magnificats. Does Praetorius follow suit?

There are only a few instances of a motivic relationship between the psalm tones and the Magnificats of Megalynodia Sionia, but several of them are significant. Three verses of “Magnificat super Surrexit Pastor bonus” open with figures that prominently feature an ascending fourth leap, which is the defining characteristic of the intonation for Tone 8. “Magnificat super Mentre qual viva” also opens with a prominent ascending fourth. Both of these Magnificats are Mode 12, so depending on the transposition, they could go to either Tone 8 or Tone 6. Perhaps this extra referential tie strengthens the case for Tone 8. The other Mode 12 Magnificat in the collection is “Magnificat super In te Domine speravi.” It is transposed down a fifth, which already indicates that it should be matched with Tone 6. The opening of the “Et exultavit” begins with the same motive as the intonation of Tone 6. It seems that Praetorius may have used motivic reference to the

¹⁰⁰ Crook, *Lasso’s Imitation Magnificats*, 106.
psalm tones to hint at tonal association and transposition levels for these compositions that lack numerical tonal cognates.

There are possible references to the psalm tones in two other Magnificats as well. In the “Et exultavit” of “Magnificat super Ecce Maria et Sydus ex claro,” the opening motive is an ascending F triad, also the initial motive of the intonation for Tone 5. In the final cadence of the same verse, the soprano part is very similar to the terminatio Tone 5 as well. Also, the “Et exultavit” and “Fecit potentiam” of “Magnificat super Dolorosi Martyr” both open with a figure that is similar to the intonation of Tone 4.
PERFORMANCE OPTIONS FOR THE MAGNIFICATS IN *MEGALYNODIA SIONIA*

The Polyphonic Latin Versets of the Magnificat

The following passage from the preface of *Megalynodia Sionia* is Praetorius’ first and only recommendation for how to perform the polyphonic Latin versets of the Magnificats in the collection.

I have the six Latin verses in the first, second and third Magnificats accompanied by five viols da gamba (in the absence of which regular viols, or violins, may be used) and a small positive organ or quiet regal, or a harpsichord with a lute, and not more than one voice actually singing, on either the soprano or tenor part.\(^{101}\)

Despite their resemblance to choral music in the printed score, the Latin versets are more like consort songs, and the choice of solo part and solo singer are of fundamental importance. In Lutheran Germany during Praetorius’ time, the choice between soprano and tenor was basically a choice between a boy or an adult. However, in the *Syntagma Musicum*, Praetorius allows that it is “pleasing at times to hear the tenor part in some compositions sung by a boy an octave higher.”\(^{102}\) In theory, then, the tenor part could also be sung as a solo in the treble octave. In practice, one would have to examine how the octave transposition would affect the polyphonic texture of a given Magnificat to judge whether it would be a viable option. Such revoicing would probably be more practicable in a homophonic texture—in Praetorius’ later works, for example.

---

\(^{101}\) Cook, “The German Troped Polyphonic Magnificat,” 159.

\(^{102}\) *Syntagma Musicum III*, trans. Kite-Powell, 162.
The *Megalynodia* Magnificats are in five, six, and eight parts, so there are multiple soprano and tenor parts in them. MPC gives no specific guidance as to which soprano or tenor part to use for the soloist. There is a good deal of voice crossing, so Soprano 1 and Tenor 1 are not necessarily the highest voice parts throughout. Practically speaking, which voice is most musically interesting or most prominent at final cadences are two key considerations in choosing the solo part. Also, just as in MPC’s time, the availability of good soloists of one voice type or another can also affect the choice of solo part.

In *Syntagma Musicum*, Praetorius divides instruments into two categories: 1) “fundamental” instruments that can “play all voices or parts of a composition and support the entire body and complete sound of all parts…;” 2) “ornamental” instruments which are “melody instruments that can only produce a single part….“103 The positive, regal, harpsichord, and lute are all fundamental instruments. They are present in this instrumentation to undergird the whole proceeding. To some degree, they function as a *continuo* group, about which more will be said in the “Note for Organists” at the end of the chapter.

The strings are ornamental instruments. According to Praetorius in *Syntagma Musicum III*, they are there to sweeten the sound, to “adorn and embellish the music.”104 However, the polyphonic texture of the writing in *Megalynodia* sets it apart stylistically from the homophony of Praetorius’ later style, so perhaps the strings play a more than decorative role in these compositions. MPC calls for five string players. The first three Magnificats in the collection are in five parts, so there is a player on each part, including

---


104 Ibid., 129.
one doubling the singer. For Magnificats with more parts, presumably one would increase the number of players to cover all the parts. For balance, Praetorius suggests if one is having trouble hearing the soloist clearly over the instruments, one could put the string ensemble off to the side and see that they do not play too loudly.\footnote{105 Syntagma Musicum III, trans. Kite-Powell, 127, 180.}

The complement of string players in the Megalynodia Magnificats closely resembles the capella fideliciniae, which MPC discusses at some length in Syntagma Musicum III.\footnote{106 The following discussion summarizes Praetorius’ writing on the subject in Syntagma Musicum III, trans. Kite-Powell, 126-128.} He states that the Italian practice of having a soloist, duo, or trio sing with only continuo accompaniment had not been well-received in Germany. The texture was thought too thin, so he decided to add a capella fideliciniae, a choir of string or wind instruments, to play along and fill out the texture.\footnote{107 The string ensemble could consist of viols or violins (viols are preferable but violins are a serviceable substitute), along with lutes, harps, and other plucked string instruments. The wind ensemble could include sackbuts, cornets, curtals, and recorders. MPC also allows for the use of a mixed consort that includes both strings and winds. The string ensemble is the most common instrumentation, but all of these instrumental groupings are possible incarnations of the capella fideliciniae.} Praetorius makes it clear that he favors the string instruments over the wind instruments, because “the sound and sonority of the viols and violins is continuous, especially charming, and free from breathing.”\footnote{108 Syntagma Musicum III, trans. Kite-Powell, 127.} He allows that the addition of the capella fideliciniae makes the music more pleasing to the ear; however, he includes the proviso that “[i]t remains up to everyone’s pleasure whether to use this consort or omit it, for as it was mentioned in the beginning it only pleases me to arrange it for the approbation of a few listeners….”\footnote{109 Ibid.}
MPC makes further statements regarding the *capella fidelicia* in his discussion of the various styles of motet composition in *Syntagma Musicum* III.\(^{110}\) He advocates creating textural variety by omitting the string instruments in some verses so that the concerted voices will sing accompanied only by the *continuo* instruments. He also states that in smaller performance spaces the strings must play quietly or not at all when accompanying soloists, so that the voices can be heard.

The Magnificats in *Megalynodia Sionia* are not motets per se of the sort that MPC is addressing in *Syntagma Musicum* III, but since their instrumentation bears such a resemblance to the *capella fidelicia*, perhaps one can extend to them Praetorius’ recommendations concerning the *capella fidelicia*. If so, then one can allow the possibility that at times the string instruments could be omitted from the polyphonic Latin versets of the Magnificat, especially if one wishes to use a scaled-down chamber instrumentation. That would leave the solo singer to be accompanied only by the *continuo* as befits the “new Italian convention.”\(^{111}\) And surely that modern Italian flavor would not upset Praetorius.

**For the Interpolations Between the Magnificat Verses**

MPC has two streams of performing suggestions going on side by side in his directions for the German interpolations. On one side, he gives various suggestions for

---

\(^{110}\) MPC outlines twelve different “styles” of motet composition in *Syntagma Musicum* III, part 3, chapter 8. He subdivides the third style into nine different “methods.” The fourth and fifth methods of the third style specifically employ the *cappella fidelicia*. Their full descriptions can be found in *Syntagma Musicum III*, trans. Kite-Powell, 179-180.

\(^{111}\) *Syntagma Musicum III*, trans. Kite-Powell, 126.
ways the singers and instrumentalists of the choir can perform the songs without congregational participation. Then, he has a separate set of recommendations for including the congregation.

MPC’s first suggestion is for the singers of the choir to sing alone [mit Cantoribus alleine] on the German songs. This statement immediately begs the question: when he says “alone,” does he mean a cappella or does he assume the singers will be accompanied by organ or positive? Later in the preface, he states that the singers can perform the German songs alone [per vocales Musicos allein] if no positive or regal is available, meaning that they would sing without keyboard accompaniment. The use of the same term allein in both places seems to indicate that he does indeed refer to a cappella singing. It is interesting that with all the following discussion of varied instrumental and congregational combinations, Praetorius’ first proposal is for the choir to sing a cappella. Most likely, this is because it is the simplest method; his suggestions grow more complicated as he goes further. He also says that the singers of the choir can be joined by wind instruments such as cornetts [zincken] and sackbuts [posaunen]. MPC stipulates that they should be tuned to the organ, but again he does not specify that the organ play along. These groupings of singers and instruments create a basic antiphonal structure:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Viol group</th>
<th>Choir (perhaps with winds)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Magnificat verse 1</td>
<td>Chorale verse 1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Magnificat verse 2</td>
<td>Chorale verse 2 (etc.)</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

MPC’s next recommendations that involve the choir alone come in paragraph twelve of the preface, in reference to the Easter chorale “Erstanden ist der heilige Christ.”
Instead of singing one verse of the chorale between verses of the Magnificat, he proposes singing three verses. For the first and third, one can use four soloists and a recorder [flötelein] with organ or regal. For the second, use viols, positive, and a boy (soprano) to sing the melody, placed across the church from the first ensemble. Putting additional chorale verses between each Magnificat verse serves to lend a larger-scale structure to the overall performance. Since the viols would also be playing for the Magnificat verses, this would create an expanded antiphonal cycle:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Viol group</th>
<th>Recorder group</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Magnificat verse 1</td>
<td>Chorale verse 1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Chorale verse 2</td>
<td>Chorale verse 3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Magnificat verse 2 (etc.)</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

The combination of performers in each group is also a mirror image: four viols with a solo singer in one; four singers with a solo recorder in the other. Praetorius suggests another contrasting pair of ensembles that could be deployed in the same way. On one side, singers alone (if no positive or regal is available); on the other, one or two good sopranos either with viols or with cornetts, sackbuts, and organ. Ever practical, Praetorius is offering an antiphonal arrangement that would fall within the means of a church with no positive or regal.

In addition to the antiphonal effect between the contrasting ensembles, Praetorius states that always [aber allezeit] at the end of the Magnificat, and sometimes in the middle, all the forces should come together. He cites the last five compositions in Musae Sioniae II as good examples to follow. These are all multi-choir works. Usually, around the midpoint and again at the end, all the choirs come together for climactic cadence points. MPC indicates that the same should be done in the Magnificats. Always at the
end, all the musical forces involved should come together. One can also bring the full ensemble together in the middle, but it is not obligatory.

The last variation for the choir is found in Praetorius’ *nota bene* regarding *Megalynodia Sionia* that is appended to his preface for *Urania*. He says that between each verse of the Magnificat one can have four soloists sing one or two stanzas of a German song, accompanied by organ. This is a simple arrangement that would not even require the services of the full choir. Perhaps he dictates organ accompaniment because of the use of soloists, rather than the full choir. Generally, when Praetorius gives directions for the use of solo voices, he dictates that they be combined with a fundamental instrument like organ, positive, regal, or lute.

Including the Congregation in Performing the Interpolations

Theologically, the inclusion of the congregation in the music-making on important feast days accords with Luther’s concept of the priesthood of the believer. The congregants should be participants in the worship experience, not just observers. Praetorius affirms his own desire that the congregation participate in singing the chorales.

It is very lovely and charming to hear when the complete assembly is joined by choirs and organ, dramatizing, as it were, how it will be in Heaven when all the angels and saints of God will join with us in intoning and singing the “Sanctus, Sanctus, Sanctus, Gloria in Excelsis Deo.”

Praetorius is the beneficiary of the development of the cantional style, which allows the congregation to sing in unison while the choir performs a figural version of the same chorale simultaneously. In his essay “Vocal Leisen Settings in the Baroque Era,”

Johannes Riedel distinguishes between two kinds of cantional music, *congregational cantional style* and *choir cantional style.*\(^{113}\) The congregational style is more simple, very much intended for the common people. The choir style is more contrapuntal with more activity in the inner voices. According to Riedel, MPC tends toward the choir cantional style in his chorale settings in *Musae Sioniae* VI-VIII.

When the congregation joins with the choir in the chorales sung between the verses of the Magnificat, Praetorius calls for “the Christian congregation singing in unison [*choraliter*] and the choir in parts [*figuraliter*].”\(^{114}\) *Figuraliter* is a general term for harmonized or polyphonic music.\(^{115}\) Beyond simply meaning “in parts,” it could espouse a number of more complex musical elements. MPC’s various suggestions for including the congregation lie on a continuum that has the congregational style at one end and the choir style at the other. Some of the pieces he recommends would be difficult for the average musically-untrained church attendee to follow, while others are essentially straight from the hymnbook. In selecting appropriate chorale interpolations, both Praetorius and the modern editor are caught in this tension between choosing music that would suit the hypothetical turn-of-the-seventeenth-century Lutheran congregant, and music that shows more of the abilities and possibilities of the choral forces.

The first suggestion Praetorius makes for including the congregation is to:

replace the German songs included in the first Magnificat with a stanza from the Christmas song “Christus wir sollen loben schon”… between each verse of the Magnificat; the Christian congregation singing in unison

---


114 Cook, “The German Troped Polyphonic Magnificat,”159.

115 See definition of *figuraliter* in chapter 3 of this study, 24n35.
[“choraliter”] and the choir in parts [“figuraliter”]. Thus a verse of the Magnificat alternates with a stanza of the chorale until they are completed.¹¹⁶

He simplifies things by choosing one well-known chorale. Rather than using a different song between each verse, the congregation would only have to keep track of one song. The choir and instruments in harmonized homophony would fill out the sound without obscuring the melody. MPC also suggests two settings of “Puer natus in Bethlehem” that could also be used. The first setting is simple and homophonic. The second is more complex, written in five sections, three of which are for soloists. In the second and third section (both for soloists), the melody is not in the top voice. It is a more musically interesting setting, but it would obviously be harder for the congregation to sing along with. Perhaps Praetorius is willing to trade some congregational participation for greater musical variety at times. He says nothing about exactly how the different sections of this setting should be disbursed among the verses of the Magnificat. The final section is SATTBB, but it is a simple homophonic harmonization. If it alone were excerpted from this setting and inserted between each verse, then all the foregoing concern about congregational participation is moot. If Praetorius intend the other sections involving soloists to be used as well—with the congregation sometimes singing, sometimes not—then these questions are valid. Unfortunately, he is silent on the issue.

For the second Magnificat, Praetorius suggests additional chorales that can be treated similarly to “Christus wir sollen loben schon” in the first Magnificat. He states that the congregation should begin each verse alone, with the organ and the rest of the musical forces entering in parts at the second phrase of each verse. He has a very practical reason for this:

¹¹⁶ Cook, “The German Troped Polyphonic Magnificat,” 159.
I like to begin the first line of German hymns in unison (as I have also explained in *Musae Sionia* V, third paragraph of the preface) and continue the following lines in parts. The reason for this is to attract the congregation with the beginning of the chorale and incite them to sing along; otherwise they assume that all the music will be elaborate, and for that reason remain absolutely silent, and do not wish to sing along.\(^{117}\)

It is not entirely clear here whether he intends the congregation to sing the first phrase alone, or if the organ and/or singers would be in unison with them for the first phrase. MPC offers some more information in the third paragraph of the preface to *Musae Sioniae* V, where he recommends that “the children [of the choir] sing the first line of the chorales together with the congregation alone [*alleine*].”\(^{118}\) It has been noted earlier that Praetorius uses the word *allein(e)* in the preface to *Megalynodia Sionia* to indicate a cappella singing, so most likely he means for the trebles of the choir and the congregation to begin without the organ. Also, during the early seventeenth century organ accompaniment of congregational chorale singing was just coming into practice.\(^{119}\) It was not yet in wide use, so Praetorius very well may have regarded unaccompanied congregational singing as the norm. More to the point, most German congregations would have considered it the norm, so if Praetorius wanted to encourage them to start singing, he would use the manner to which they were most accustomed. Also, Herl points out that there is no indication that the organ ever played in unison with the congregation to support chorale singing. From the earliest days of congregational

\(^{117}\) Cook, “The German Troped Polyphonic Magnificat ,” 160.


\(^{119}\) See Herl’s discussion of the advent of congregational accompaniment by the organ in *Worship Wars*, 131-138.
accompaniment, the organ played harmonizations of the chorales. All this information taken together, it is probably safe to say that MPC did not intend for the organ to play in the first phrase of the chorale. The congregation, perhaps supported by the treble singers of the choir, would begin unaccompanied, and then the remainder of the musical forces would enter in harmony on the second phrase.

For the third Magnificat, “[t]wo or three verses, one after the other, of ‘Erstanden ist der heilige Christ’ may be sung with the congregation” between each verse of the Magnificat. Once again, the congregation should be joined by the full musical forces (after the first phrase). When the congregation is involved, it seems that the element of alternation is between the Latin verses performed by a smaller group, and the full assembly coming together on the chorales. It is a simpler design than MPC’s alternation effects for the trained musicians, which is only reasonable.

After the last verse of “Magnificat super Ecce Maria et Sydus ex claro,” Praetorius suggests several pieces that could be used to close the performance:

“Joseph, lieber Joseph mein,” or “Resonet in laudibus” (a7), numbers 29 and 30 in Eulogodia Sionia in which I have shown the manner of arranging it. Or if one prefers, he may use “Singt ihr lieben Christen all” (no. 91 in Musae Sionia V) since it has the same melody as the “Resonet.”

These works are all larger-scale multi-choir compositions, heavily weighted to the choral end of the cantional spectrum. The melody is always in the top part, and excepting a few repetitions and echoes, it proceeds uninterrupted. Conceivably, the congregation could follow along. However, Praetorius’ primary concern seems to be bringing the Magnificat to a grand finish, and he sacrifices ease of congregational participation to achieve this end.

---

120 Herl, Worship Wars, 136.
A Note for Organists

By addressing this section to organists, the author is simply mimicking MPC’s writing in *Syntagma Musicum*. Praetorius addresses all his instructions on playing *basso continuo* on keyboard instruments to “the organist.”\(^{121}\) Apparently, a keyboardist who did not play organ was of little professional consequence. Praetorius includes extensive instructions in *Syntagma Musicum* III for how organists should play *basso continuo*. However, there is no figured bass line at all in *Megalynodia Sionia*. What then should the organist do?

It is a common misconception that *basso continuo* sprang into being fully-formed in the early Baroque. In actuality, it “was nothing more than a new method of notating a practice that had been in existence since at least the late fifteenth century, the practice of providing a simple harmonic accompaniment to a solo singer or ensemble.”\(^{122}\) The new development presented by *basso continuo* was that instead of the accompaniment being written out in tablature or score, it was represented by numerical symbols over an instrumental bass line. But, in practice, keyboard players had been doing much the same thing for many years. Thus, one would expect that the organist, harpsichordist, or other players of fundamental instruments could apply much of what Praetorius says about playing figured bass to playing the music in *Megalynodia Sionia*.

---

\(^{121}\) *Syntagma Musicum* III, trans. Kite-Powell, 134 ff.

However, Gregory Johnston draws a distinction between two styles of keyboard accompaniment in the seventeenth century. On one side is *basso continuo*, which “was vertically conceived and used to supply a full harmonic framework for monodies and concerted works.” On the other is polyphonic keyboard accompaniment, which was more linearly conceived and more appropriate for accompanying polyphonic music. *Basso continuo* was written about extensively because it was a new technology, but existing alongside it in widespread use was the practice of polyphonic accompaniment. It is not discussed as extensively because it was the traditional mode of accompaniment and—“like so many other aspects of period performance practice—was so quietly routine in its day that there was no good reason for spending time on it in formal published writings.” In polyphonic accompaniment, the players would write out all of the parts in score or tablature so that they could perform a polyphonic piece exactly as it was written. Johnston concludes that “it is entirely likely that many works composed in the style of equal-voiced polyphony would have been accompanied from an intabulation or score, whether or not they had been published originally with figured basses.” The Magnificats of *Megalynodia Sionia* certainly fall into this category.

However, Praetorius makes some recommendations in *Syntagma Musicum* III that should probably be taken to heart as well. In particular, he advises organists how to accompany *cappella fidelicia*, the instrumental combination that is essentially employed

---

123 Much of the following discussion is drawn from Johnston’s excellent article “Polyphonic Keyboard Accompaniment in the Early Baroque: An Alternative to Basso Continuo,” *Early Music* 26, no. 1 (Feb. 1998), 51-60+63-64.

124 Ibid., 52.

125 Ibid., 53.

126 Ibid., 59.
in the polyphonic Latin versets of the *Megalynodia* Magnificats. When accompanying this instrumentation the organist must “accompany the singers with fine concordances and suspensions very simply, with no diminutions or figurations.” MPC suggests a regal or reed stop on the organ. He finds that the sound of a flute stop is “too meager and lacks charm;” the regal sound is better as long as “the piece is played sensitively, solemnly, slowly, and without divisions.”

Overall, Praetorius stresses simplicity and lack of ornament in the organ accompaniment.

MPC also says that the *cappella fidicinia* parts present a helpful resource for organists not used to accompanying with the thoroughbass. By reading the string parts, they can see the harmonies written out in score. If such parts do not already exist, MPC recommends that organists copy out the middle parts into tablature, so they can figure out what harmonies they should be playing. He is speaking here to organists who are accustomed to the style of polyphonic keyboard accompaniment, helping them to take steps towards being able to realize a figured bass.

One mystery surrounding the role of the organist in the Magnificats of *Megalynodia Sionia* is how to determine what additional music the organist would have played beyond the music that has already been discussed in this chapter. Several cryptic comments by Praetorius make it clear that the organist would have played other music between the Magnificat verses. In the preface to *Urania*, he says that “the organist must always respond on the organ between each verse of the Magnificat.” MPC’s opening

---


128 Ibid.

remarks for the mammoth Magnificat in *Polyhymnia caduceatrix* shed some additional light on the matter. While addressing concerns about the length of the piece, he says that “[i]t is well when one considers that the organist is going to improvise enough between the verses in the Magnificat, that when one counts the *tact* and *tempora*, this is very long if one wishes to perform it all.”¹³⁰ Organists were also expected to improvise preludes for concerted works.¹³¹ Apparently, a strong improvisational tradition was at work, but it is unclear exactly what that tradition looked like.


Chapter Eight

PERFORMING EDITIONS

This study concludes with performing editions of two Magnificats from *Megalynodia Sionia*. The first is “Magnificat super Dolorosi Martyr” (SSATTB). The text is included in all parts as in the original publication, but in this author’s performance the Soprano 2 part was used as the solo part, accompanied by strings (violins, violas, and cello) and portative. The foremost reason that Soprano 2 was chosen to be the solo part is because it is the only treble part in the “Quia fecit” verse, which has reduced forces (S2AT1B). Since the musicians would have been performing from parts rather than a score, it is unlikely that the solo voice would switch parts midstream, so Soprano 2 is the only treble part that would serve throughout. It is also prominent at a number of important cadences, and it has a general lyrical quality. On a purely subjective level, the author found neither of the tenor parts musically interesting enough nor texturally prominent enough to serve as the solo voice. The Tone 4 plainchant Magnificat is supplied for the odd-numbered verses. In keeping with the performance practice of singing the notes in uniformly long values, the transcription of the chant has been rendered entirely in half notes.

---

129 These editions were used in performance by the author for a doctoral recital with the University of Miami Collegium Musicum, November 7, 2004. They have since been revised to reflect subsequent progress in the research.

130 In the recital performance, the soprano soloist’s part was not doubled by a string player, but upon further research, the author discovered that all parts of the Latin versets should be played by the strings, including the part of the vocal soloist. This issue is discussed further in chapter 7 of this study, 106-107.
Between the verses of the Magnificat are interspersed six verses of the chorale “O Herre Gott, begnade mich.” The use of a single chorale interspersed between the verses of a Magnificat is one of the possible troping methods espoused by MPC in the preface to Megalynodia Sionia. He suggests using the chorale “Christus wir sollen loben schon” in this fashion with the “Magnificat super Angelus ad Pastores.”\(^1\) “O Herre Gott, begnade mich” is a poetic paraphrase of Psalm 51, a well-known penitential psalm. It is a cantional SATB harmonization taken from Musae Sioniae VII, number 44. Thus, the Magnificat has been imagined as a Lenten or Passiontide work. The fourth mode, with its piquant half-step leading tone above the final, is well-suited to plangency. In general, chorales in this mode are about suffering and repentance, so it would have been difficult to escape these themes. Also, it is in keeping with the correspondence between the text of its model composition and the suffering of Christ.\(^2\)

The second Magnificat is “Magnificat super Mentre qual viva.” Several different voices could easily serve as the solo part. The Soprano 1 and 2 parts both have their merits. In general, Soprano 1 has a higher tessitura and is more texturally prominent, but the Soprano 2 part is generally more rhythmically active. A case could also be made for the Tenor 2 part, although in the low range of the piece it is more of a baritone part. Any of these three voice parts would probably serve well for use as a vocal solo. All of the parts in the polyphonic Latin versets would again be played by strings, and organ would accompany. This Magnificat is one of the Mode 12 (Hypoionian) works that MPC directs to be transposed downward. In this edition, it has been transposed down a fourth.

\(^1\) See earlier discussion in chapter 4 of this study, 33-35.

\(^2\) See earlier discussion in chapter 6 of this study, 100-101.
(Praetorius’ first choice),\textsuperscript{133} which dictates a pairing with the Tone 8 Magnificat chant.\textsuperscript{134}

As before, the chant has been rendered in half notes.

Between the verses of the Magnificat the following Christmas chorales have been interpolated (their locations in \textit{Musae Sioniae} are given in the far right column):

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>After v.</th>
<th>Chorale in Full</th>
<th>Location</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>2</td>
<td>Geborn ist Gottes söhnelein</td>
<td>\textit{M.S. VI}, 61</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4</td>
<td>Lobt Gott ihr Christen allzugleich</td>
<td>\textit{M.S. VI}, 70</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>6</td>
<td>Ein Kindelein so löbelich</td>
<td>\textit{M.S. V}, 78</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>8</td>
<td>Freut euch, ihr lieben Christen all</td>
<td>\textit{M.S. VI}, 57</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>10</td>
<td>Es ist ein Ros' entsprungen</td>
<td>\textit{M.S. VI}, 53</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>12</td>
<td>In dulci jubilo</td>
<td>\textit{M.S. VI}, 33</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

All of these settings are taken from \textit{Musae Sioniae} V and VI. Most of the chorale settings are patently congregational. A departure in the direction of the choir cantional style was made with “Lobt Gott ihr Christen allzugleich,” in which SA parlando sections alternate with more straightforward four-part writing. This setting is very similar to the version of the same chorale that is used as a trope in “Magnificat super Ecce Maria et Sydus ex claro” (and may well have served as its model). However, the version employed in that Magnificat alternates between duple and triple meter, while the version used in this edition stays in duple meter throughout.

In these performing editions, the historical and performance issues raised in chapters 4-6 of this study have been resolved by the editor. Some of these issues, such as the selection of the proper chant tone for the odd-numbered verses, are questions that one must seek to answer correctly. Other issues, such as the choice of particular chorale settings to use as tropes, are not questions to which there is a single answer. The editorial decisions in these matters represent particular solutions chosen among a variety of alternatives.

\textsuperscript{133} \textit{Syntagma Musicum III}, trans. Kite-Powell, 93.

\textsuperscript{134} Cook, “The German Troped Polyphonic Magnificat,” 29.
appropriate options. However, these editions do not specify certain vocal combinations, instrumentation, or other performance issues that have been addressed in chapter 8. Like Praetorius, the editor leaves the prospective music director some leeway to decide these issues individually.

_Megalynodia Sionia_ is one of the largest collections of troped polyphonic Magnificats gathered together by a single composer. Furthermore, thanks to Praetorius’ pedagogical nature, it is the only such publication that includes an “owner’s manual” explaining how the troping procedure can be applied beyond the scope of the specific examples supplied by the composer. The study of this collection not only helps the modern performer understand Praetorius’ own music, but it also opens a window to a largely unwritten but long-lived tradition in Lutheran church music that lasted from the sixteenth century until the time of Johann Sebastian Bach. To this list of remarkable qualities one may also add the use of parody technique in the composition of these Magnificats. Taken together, these characteristics make _Megalynodia Sionia_ a singularly rich publication for historical study. Even more, it is the author’s hope that these studies will culminate in the renewed and continued performance of this music. *Vale et vive*.135

---

135 “Goodbye and live.” These are the closing words of Praetorius’ preface to _Megalynodia Sionia_, trans. Anne Leen, 2008.
Magnificat super Dolorosi Martyr

Verse 1 [take chant verses at a slow steady tempo, but not strictly measured]

\[mf\]

Magnificat anima mea Dominum.

Verse 2 [J.ca. 80]

[S1] [mf]

Et exultavit Spiritus,

[S2] [mf]

Spi - ri - tus

[A] [mf]

Et exul-ta-vit - spi - ri-tus, et exul-

[T1] [mf]

Et exul-ta-vit - spi -

[T2] [mf]

Et
spiritus meus,

meus, exultavit, et exultavit spiritus meus,

exultavit spiritus, et exultavit spiritus meus,

et exultavit spiritus meus,

et exultavit spiritus, et exultavit spiritus meus,
deinen Worten wirst bestehen, so man die Rede richtet.
die Gebein werden fröhlich, die du so hast geschlagen.
deynen Worten wirst bestehen, so man die Rede richtet.
deynen Worten wirst bestehen, so man die Rede richtet.

Verse 3
Quia respexit humilitatem ancillae suae;
ecce enim ex hoc beatum me dicens omnibus generationes.

Verse 4
[mf] [with energy]
Quia fecit mihi, mihi magnam, qui
Quia fecit mihi - magna, mihi magnam, qui
Quia fecit mihi, mihi magnam, qui
mihi magnam,
potens est, qui a fecit mihi magna, mi-

hi-magna, qui potens est, qui a fecit mihi, mi-

tens est, qui a fecit mi-hi ma-gna, ma-

qui a fecit mihi,

ima-gna, qui po-

tens est, et san-

tum no-men

gna, qui po-

tens est, et san-

tum no-men

qui po-

tens est,

et

e-i-us, et san-

tum no-

iae-i-us, et san-

tum, et san-

tum

et san-

tum no-

m-en e-

san-

tum no-

m-en e-

san-

tum no-

m-en e-

san-

tum no-

m-en e-

san-

tum no-

m-en
Chorale: O Herre Gott, begnade mich, verse 2

Sieh, in Un-tug'nd bin ich ge-macht wie mich mein Mut-ter
Zur Wahr-heit hast du a-ber Lust und ga-best mir auch,

hat ge-bracht, In Sün-den mich emp-fang-en Viel Stind hab ich be-
dass ich wusst, die Weis-heit dein ohn Sor-gen, die heim-lisch ist ver-

hat ge-bracht, In Sün-den mich emp-fang-en Viel Stind hab ich be-
dass ich wusst, die Weis-heit dein ohn Sor-gen, die heim-lisch ist ver-

hat ge-bracht, In Sün-den mich emp-fang-en Viel Stind hab ich be-
dass ich wusst, die Weis-heit dein ohn Sor-gen, die heim-lisch ist ver-
gangen, Entstündig mich mit Isop schon, dass ich werde

rein, und wasch mich nur Schnee-weis, auch Freud lass hören mich, dass

die Gebein werden fröhlich, die du so hast geschlagen.
Et misericordia eius a progenie in progenies, timentibus eum.

Feicit potentiam, feicit potentiam,

In brachio suo,

Feicit potentiam in brachio suo,

Feicit potentiam
liche Statt, tilg ab all meine Missheit. Herr, willst in
neu in mir, verwirf mich auch nicht gar von dir. Nimm nicht dein'n

mir erschaffen ein rein Herz, tu ich hoffen. Und
heilgen Geiste von mir, sein Gnad mir leiste.

lass mir wieder kommen her den Trost deins Heils, O

S1

A

T1

B

S1

A

T1

B
Gott, mein Herr, der freie Geist erhalte mich, die Gottlosen
will lernen ich, ihr Wege zu dir kehren.
Deposuit potentates sedes et exaltavit humiles.
plevit bonis, et vivites, et vivites
plevit bonis, et vivites, et vivites diminuit, diminuit
plevit bonis, et vivites, et vivites diminuit, diminuit

...
Chorale: O Herre Gott, begnade mich, verse 4

Von Herr, Blut-schäl-di-gen mich er-rett, O Gott, du mei-nes

von mir auf die Lip-pen mein, mein Mund ver-künd das

S I

[mf]

A

[mf]

T I

[mf]

B

[mf]

Von Herr, Blut-schäl-di-gen mich er-rett, O Gott, du mei-nes

von mir auf die Lip-pen mein, mein Mund ver-künd das

S I

[mf]

Heils ein Gott, dass mein Zung mög er-schal-len, dein G'rech-tig-keit ob

Lo-be dein. Zum Op-fer hast kein Lust-e, ich geb es dir auch

A

[mf]

Heils ein Gott, dass mein Zung mög er-schal-len, dein G'rech-tig-keit ob

Lo-be dein. Zum Op-fer hast kein Lust-e, ich geb es dir auch

T I

[mf]

Heils ein Gott, dass mein Zung mög er-schal-len, dein G'rech-tig-keit ob

Lo-be dein. Zum Op-fer hast kein Lust-e, ich geb es dir auch

B

[mf]

Heils ein Gott, dass mein Zung mög er-schal-len, dein G'rech-tig-keit ob

Lo-be dein. Zum Op-fer hast kein Lust-e, ich geb es dir auch

S I

[mf]

al- len. Brand-op-fer auch gleich al-le-sampt g'fallen dir

son-ste.

A

[mf]

al- len. Brand-op-fer auch gleich al-le-sampt g'fallen dir

son-ste.

T I

[mf]

al- len. Brand-op-fer auch gleich al-le-sampt g'fallen dir

son-ste.

B

[mf]

al- len. Brand-op-fer auch gleich al-le-sampt g'fallen dir

son-ste.
nicht, sind nur ein Tand, für deinen Augen nur ein Hass, die
nicht, sind nur ein Tand, für deinen Augen nur ein Hass, die
nicht, sind nur ein Tand, für deinen Augen nur ein Hass, die

Opfer Gottes sind aber das: ein gar zerbrochen Geiste.

Opfer Gottes sind aber das: ein gar zerbrochen Geiste.

Opfer Gottes sind aber das: ein gar zerbrochen Geiste.

Opfer Gottes sind aber das: ein gar zerbrochen Geiste.

Suscepit Israel puerum suum,

recurratus miseri cordiae suae.
patres nostros, ad patres nostros,
cutus est
ad patres nostros, ad patres nostros, ad patres nostros,

si - cu - tus est ad pa - tres no - - -

[non-legato] [mf] Abraham et semini,
stroms, Abraham et semini, Abraham et semini in saecu-

stroms, Abraham et semini, Abraham et semini in saecu-

stroms, Abraham et semini, Abraham et semini in saecu-

stroms, Abraham et semini, Abraham et semini in saecu-

stroms, Abraham et semini, Abraham et semini in saecu-

stroms, Abraham et semini, Abraham et semini in saecu-

stroms, Abraham et semini, Abraham et semini in saecu-

stroms, Abraham et semini, Abraham et semini in saecu-

stroms, Abraham et semini, Abraham et semini in saecu-
Chorale: O Herre Gott, begnade mich, verse 5

S 1

Ein zer-broch'n und zer-schla-gen Herz, wirst du nicht wer-fen
O Her-re Gott, tu wohl Zi-on, nach dei-nem gu-ten

A

Ein zer-broch'n und zer-schla-gen Herz, wirst du nicht wer-fen
O Her-re Gott, tu wohl Zi-on, nach dei-nem gu-ten

T 1

Ein zer-broch'n und zer-schla-gen Herz, wirst du nicht wer-fen
O Her-re Gott, tu wohl Zi-on, nach dei-nem gu-ten

B

O Her-re Gott, tu wohl Zi-on, nach dei-nem gu-ten

S 1

hin-ter-wärts, und wirst es nicht ver-ach-ten, das kann ich wohl be-
Wil-len schon, Je-ru-sa-lern die Mau-ren, wer-den wie-der er-

A

hin-ter-wärts, und wirst es nicht ver-ach-ten, das kann ich wohl be-
Wil-len schon, Je-ru-sa-lern die Mau-ren, wer-den wie-der er-

T 1

hin-ter-wärts, und wirst es nicht ver-ach-ten, das kann ich wohl be-
Wil-len schon, Je-ru-sa-lern die Mau-ren, wer-den wie-der er-

B

hin-ter-wärts, und wirst es nicht ver-ach-ten, das kann ich wohl be-
Wil-len schon, Je-ru-sa-lern die Mau-ren, wer-den wie-der er-

S 1

tra-ch-ten. Denn wirst du ha-ben Lust und Freud zum Op-fer

A

tra-ch-ten. Denn wirst du ha-ben Lust und Freud zum Op-fer

T 1

tra-ch-ten. Denn wirst du ha-ben Lust und Freud zum Op-fer

B

tra-ch-ten. Denn wirst du ha-ben Lust und Freud zum Op-fer
der Gerechtigkeit, zu den Brandopfern deinem Mut. So
wird man denn die Kälber gut auf deinen Altar legen.
Gloria Patri et Filio et Spiritui Sancto.
et in saecula saeculorum,
nunc, et semper, et in saecula saeculorum,
nunc, et semper, et in saecula saeculorum,
nunc, et semper,

Amen, saeculorum, Amen, saeculorum, Amen, saeculorum, Amen, saeculorum, Amen, saeculorum, Amen, saeculorum,
Chorale: O Herre Gott, begnade mich, verse 6

Ehr sei dem Vater und dem Sohn, dem allgemeinen
Dem heil'gen Geist des selben gleich, der auf uns kommt aus

Ehr sei dem Vater und dem Sohn, dem allgemeinen
Dem heil'gen Geist des selben gleich, der auf uns kommt aus

Ehr sei dem Vater und dem Sohn, dem allgemeinen
Dem heil'gen Geist des selben gleich, der auf uns kommt aus

Ehr sei dem Vater und dem Sohn, dem allgemeinen
Dem heil'gen Geist des selben gleich, der auf uns kommt aus
Gnad sich, Herr, von uns nicht scheid, wer des begehrt, spricht Amen.
Magnificat super Mentre qual viva

Verse 1 [take chant verses at a slow steady tempo, but not strictly measured]

Verse 2 \[J. ca.80\] [with energy]

Michael Praetorius
ed. Sam Spears
in De·o·sa·lu·ta·ri.

in De·o·sa·lu·ta·ri·me·no.

ti·vit·spi·ri·tus

in De·o·sa·lu·ta·ri·me·no.

us

in De·o·sa·lu·ta·ri·me·no.

o, - - - - - sa·lu·ta·ri·me·no.

o, in De·o·sa·lu·ta·ri·me·no.

o, in De·o·sa·lu·ta·ri·me·no.

o, in De·o·sa·lu·ta·ri·me·no.

o, in De·o·sa·lu·ta·ri·me·no.

o, in De·o·sa·lu·ta·ri·me·no.
Chorale: "Geborn ist Gottes Söhnelein"

S1 [mf] [with energy]

Ge - born ist Got - tes Söh - ne - lein zu

A [mf]

Ge - born ist Got - tes Söh - ne - lein zu

T1 [mf]

Ge - born ist Got - tes Söh - ne - lein zu

B [mf]

Ge - born ist Got - tes Söh - ne - lein zu

S1

Beth - le - hem ein Kin - de - lein und liegt in

A

Beth - le - hem ein Kin - de - lein und liegt in

T1

Beth - le - hem ein Kin - de - lein und liegt in

B

Beth - le - hem ein Kin - de - lein und liegt in

S1

ein - em Krip - pe - lein ge - wan - den arm in

A

ein - em Krip - pe - lein ge - wan - den arm in

T1

ein - em Krip - pe - lein ge - wan - den arm in

B

ein - em Krip - pe - lein ge - wan - den arm in
Windelein. Darüber lasst uns

Windelein. Darüber lasst uns

Windelein. Darüber lasst uns

fröhlich sein und machen ihm ein

fröhlich sein und machen ihm ein

fröhlich sein und machen ihm ein

Wiegelein nämlich unsern Herzens

Wiegelein nämlich unsern Herzens

Wiegelein nämlich unsern Herzens

Wiegelein nämlich unsern Herzens
Verse 3

Qui-a respec-xit hu-mi-li-ta-tem an-cil-la匆 su-ac;

ee-ce e-nim ex hoc be-a-tam me di-cent om-nes ge-ne-ra-ti-ones.
mi - hi, qui-a fe - cit mi - hi-ma - gna, qui po - tens est, qui
qui-a fe - cit mi - hi - ma - gna, qui po - tens est,
qui-a fe - cit mi - hi - ma - gna, qui po - tens est, qui
fe - cit mi - hi-ma - gna, qui po - tens est,
po - tens est, qui po - tens est, et san -
qui po - tens est, qui po - tens est, et san -
qui po - tens est, qui po - tens est, et san -
qui po - tens est, qui po - tens est, et san -
qui po - tens est, qui po - tens est, et san -
Chorale: "Lobt Gott, ihr Christen, allzugleich"
Gott, ihr Christen, allzu gleich in seinem höchsten

Thron, der heut aufschliesst sein Himmelreich und schenkt euch seinen

Sohn, und schenkt euch seinen Sohn. der heut aufschliesst sein

Thron, der heut aufschliesst sein

Sohn, und schenkt euch seinen Sohn. der heut aufschliesst sein

Thron, der heut aufschliesst sein
Himmelreich und schenkt euch seinen Sohn, und schenkt euch seinen Sohn, und schenkt euch seinen Sohn, und schenkt euch seinen Sohn, und

Verse 5

Es in progenies, timentious eum.
Feicit potentiam in brachio suo,

In brachio suo, feicit potentiam,

Feicit potentiam in brachio suo,

In brachio suo, feicit potentiam,

Feicit potentiam in brachio suo,

Feicit potentiam, in brachio suo,

In brachio suo, in brachio in potentiam,
in brachio suo, dispersit superbos,
in brachio suo, dispersit men-

in brachio suo, dispersit superbos, dispersit superbos mente cor-dis
men-te cor-dis sui, dis-per-sit su-per-

per-sit superbos, dispersit superbos mente cor-dis

men-te cor-dis sui, dis-per-sit su-per-

sit superbos, superbos-men-te cor-dis sui, dis-per-sit superbos, men-te cor-dis
Chorale: "Ein Kindelein so löblich"

Ein Kindelein so löblich ist uns geboren

heute, wär uns das Kindlein nicht geboren so wär wir allzu-

mal verlorn das Heil ist unser aller ei du süs-ser Jesu Christ,
168

S 1

123

dass du Mensch ge - bo - ren bist, be - hüt uns für der Hül - le.

A

123

dass du Mensch ge - bo - ren bist, be - hüt uns für der Hül - le.

T 1

dass du Mensch ge - bo - ren bist, be - hüt uns für der Hül - le.

B

dass du Mensch ge - bo - ren bist, be - hüt uns für der Hül - le.

128
Verse 7

De - po - su - it po - ten - tes de se - de et ex - al - ta - vit hu - mi - les.

130
Verse 8

S 1

130

Im - ple - vit bo - nis, im - ple - vit bo - nis,

S 2

130

Es - sur - i - en - tes im - ple - vit bo - nis, im - ple - vit

A

130

Es - sur - i - en - tes

T 1

130

Es - sur - i - en - tes im - ple - vit

T 2

Es - sur - i - en - tes im - ple - vit bo - nis
Chorale: "Freut euch ihr lieben Christen"

Freut euch ihr lieben Christen, freut euch von Herzen sehr euch

ist geboren Christus recht gute neue Mär es singen uns die

Engel aus Gottes hohem Thron, gar lieblich tun sie
Verse 9
Suscepit Israel puerum suum,
recompens misericordiae sua.

Verse 10
Si - cut, si - cut locu - tus est,
Si - cut, si - cut locu - tus est,
Si - cut, si - cut locu - tus est,
Si - cut, si - cut locu - tus est,
Si - cut, si - cut locu - tus est,
Chorale: "Es ist ein Ros' entsprungen"

Es ist ein Ros' entsprungen aus einer Wurzel

Es ist ein Ros' entsprungen aus einer Wurzel

Es ist ein Ros' entsprungen aus einer Wurzel

Zart als uns die Alten sungen aus Jesse kam die

Zart als uns die Alten sungen aus Jesse kam die

Zart als uns die Alten sungen aus Jesse kam die

Art und hat ein Blümlein bracht mitten im kalten

Art und hat ein Blümlein bracht mitten im kalten

Art und hat ein Blümlein bracht mitten im kalten

Art und hat ein Blümlein bracht mitten im kalten
Winter wohl zu der halben Nacht.

Verse 11
Gloria patri et filio et spiritui sancto.

Verse 12
Si - c - cut erat in principio, et nunc, et
et nunc, et nunc, et sem-per, si-cut e-rat,

nunc, et sem-per, et sem-per,

si-cut e-rat,

si-cut e-rat

si-cut e-rat

si-cut e-rat in prin-ci-pi-o,

sae-cu-lo-rum, A-men,

sae-cu-lo-rum

sae-cu-lo-rum, A-men,

sae-cu-lo-rum

sae-cu-lo-rum, A-men,

sae-cu-lo-rum, A-men,
in principio, et in saecula, saeculum, Amen, et in

Amen, si-cut erat in principio, et nunc, et semper,

in principio, et nunc, et semper, et semper, et in

in principio, et nunc, et semper, et in saecula,

men, saeculum, Amen, et in saeculorum, Amen, et in

saecula, et in saeculorum, et in saecula, saeculorum, Amen, et in

Amen, saeculorum, Amen, et in saecula, et in

saecula, in principio, et nunc, et semper, et semper,
Sae - cu - la - sae - cu - lo - rum, A - men, sae - cu - lo - rum,

Sae - cu - lo - rum, A - men, et in sae - cu - la,

Men, et in sae - cu - la - sae - cu -

Sae - cu - la - sae - cu - lo - rum, A - men,

A - men, et in sae - cu -

Sae - cu - lo - rum, A - men,


A - men.


A - men.


A - men.
Chorale: "In dulci jubilo"

\[ \text{S1} \]
\begin{align*}
&\text{\textit{In dulci jubilo,}}
&\text{nun}
\end{align*}

\[ \text{A} \]
\begin{align*}
&\text{\textit{In dulci jubilo,}}
&\text{nun}
\end{align*}

\[ \text{T1} \]
\begin{align*}
&\text{\textit{In dulci jubilo,}}
&\text{nun}
\end{align*}

\[ \text{B} \]
\begin{align*}
&\text{\textit{In dulci jubilo,}}
&\text{nun}
\end{align*}

\[ \text{S1} \]
\begin{align*}
&\text{\textit{singet und seid froh}}
&\text{unser Herzens}
\end{align*}

\[ \text{A} \]
\begin{align*}
&\text{\textit{singet und seid froh}}
&\text{unser Herzens}
\end{align*}

\[ \text{T1} \]
\begin{align*}
&\text{\textit{singet und seid froh}}
&\text{unser Herzens}
\end{align*}

\[ \text{B} \]
\begin{align*}
&\text{\textit{singet und seid froh}}
&\text{unser Herzens}
\end{align*}

\[ \text{S1} \]
\begin{align*}
&\text{\textit{Wonne leit in prae-se-pi-o}}
&\text{und}
\end{align*}

\[ \text{A} \]
\begin{align*}
&\text{\textit{Wonne leit in prae-se-pi-o}}
&\text{und}
\end{align*}

\[ \text{T1} \]
\begin{align*}
&\text{\textit{Wonne leit in prae-se-pi-o}}
&\text{und}
\end{align*}

\[ \text{B} \]
\begin{align*}
&\text{\textit{Wonne leit in prae-se-pi-o}}
&\text{und}
\end{align*}
leuchtet als die Sonne matris in

leuchtet als die Sonne matris in

leuchtet als die Sonne matris in

leuchtet als die Sonne matris in

greimi o, Alphaes et

greimi o, Alphaes et

greimi o, Alphaes et

greimi o, Alphaes et

O, Alphaes et O.

O, Alphaes et O.

O, Alphaes et O.

O, Alphaes et O.
Appendix 1

English Translation of the *Nota ad Lectorem Musicum*

A Note to the Musical Reader

Let the kindly Musician know that I have placed with enthusiasm in this *Megalynodia* these Magnificats, which I had composed a few years ago in Regensburg, in addition to some Latin and Italian Chants, and which I have now reviewed and corrected: And I wished to publish the chant tones for the use of Singers and Organists in differing harmony pertaining to the Psalms or the *Cantica Maiora* [church canticles] (as one may see in the Synopsis of my *Syntagma Musicum*).

2. In the VII. Magnificat, to some people it will perhaps seem difficult to sing “Quia fecit” *a4* because of the leap to the Seventh: nevertheless the singer will easily intone it, if beforehand he should presume an Octave lower of the very closely rising Seventh, to intone it silently to himself with a breath, and quickly he will reach the right pitch of the seventh that is to be sung higher.

3. In the VIII. Magnificat the first four beats [the first two measures of the modern edition] in “Quia fecit” can be omitted, and begun at length after the bracket .

4. In “Fecit potentiam,” let those little notes, which are placed within these brackets [ ], also be omitted, if it pleases, if this Chant seems too long: And because in the same place the beats will not be able to be so suitably distinguished by beginners, the careful Cantor will not at all be troubled to separate these beats by brackets.

5. Because XIV. Magnificat (based upon Ut re mi fa sol la,) was composed by me only as an exercise, if perhaps some Singers might reach it with difficulty with their voice, it can be fittingly performed by the Instrumentalists, in the Violins, Cornetts, and other Musical Instruments or in place of the Madrigal. Moreover how that *Sexdupla* can be chanted and performed at the end, see in the instructions of my *Syntagma Musicum*.

6. Thus it was my intention to demonstrate the manner in which I have organized and presented the first three Magnificats in the church (in case it will be pleasing to some, so that they would want to follow it, although I do not mean to presume on those who know better ways). I have the six Latin verses in the first, second and third Magnificats accompanied by five viols da gamba (in the absence of which regular viols, or violins,

---

136 There is no published English translation of the *Nota ad Lectorem Musicum* from the preface to *Megalynodia Sionia*. Paragraphs 6-12 were written in German, and the translation of this portion of the text is from Larry Cook, “The German Troped Polyphonic Magnificat,” 159-162. Paragraphs 1-5 and 13 were written in Latin. The translation of this portion of the text is by Anne Leen, 2008.
may be used) and a small positive organ or quiet regal, or a harpsichord with a lute, and not more than one voice actually singing, on either the soprano or tenor part.

The German songs which follow after each Latin verse of the Magnificat are performed by the singers [Cantoribus] alone, or joined by the accompaniment of wind instruments (such as zincks and trombones) if they are available, tuned to the organ or regal. In this manner one proceeds from one verse to the next.

7. One may, however, replace the German songs included in the first Magnificat with a stanza from the Christmas song “Christus wir sollen loben schon” (in the key of G Minor [Clave GbMoll], the key in which each stanza of the Magnificat ends) between each verse of the Magnificat; the Christian congregation singing in unison [choraliter] and the choir in parts [figuraliter]. Thus a verse of the Magnificat alternates with a stanza of the chorale until they are completed. Or the settings of “Puer natus in Bethlehem” from Musae Sioniae V, no. 84 or 86, may be sung between the Magnificat verses, joined by the organ.

8. Likewise in the second Magnificat, one may replace the German songs given here with the following: after “Et exutavit,” the entire congregation may begin simultaneously either with “Allein Gott in der Höh sei Ehr” (the first stanza), or “Ein Kindelein so löbelich,” or “Gelobet seist du Jesu Christ” (first and last stanzas). And immediately the organ and entire musical forces [Chorus Musicus] join in in parts on the following lines of the chorale (“Und dank für seine Gnade,” “ist uns geboren heute,” or “Das du Mensch geboren bist,” respectively) and continue to the end of the stanza.

After “Quia fecit” the first stanza of “In dulci jubilo” may be used. After “Fecit potentiam,” the second stanza of “In dulci jubilo,” (“O Jesu parvule”); following the “Esurientes,” the third stanza, “O Patris charitas;” and after “Sicut locutus,” the fourth stanza, “Ubi sunt gaudia.” Thus the entire congregation continues together with the organ, and choir and instruments. After “Sicut erat,” either, “Joseph, lieber Joseph mein,” or “Resonet in laudibus” (a7), numbers 29 and 30 in Eulogodia Sionia in which I have shown the manner of arranging it. Or if one prefers, he may use “Singt ihr lieben Christen all” (no. 91 in Musae Sioniae V) since it has the same melody as the “Resonet.” Or numbers 88, 92, 93, 94, etc. [of Musae Sioniae V] may be used.

9. I like to begin the first line of German hymns in unison (as I have also explained in Musae Sioniae V, third paragraph of the preface) and continue the following lines in parts. The reason for this is to attract the congregation with the beginning of the chorale and incite them to sing along; otherwise they assume that all the music will be elaborate, and for that reason remain absolutely silent, and do not wish to sing along.

10. In the third Magnificat, instead of the German songs given here between each verse, numbers 132, 133, and 135 from Musae Sioniae V may be used. Two or three verses, one after the other, of “Erstanden ist der heilige Christ” may be sung with the congregation. It is very lovely and charming to hear when the complete assembly is joined by choirs and organ, dramatizing, as it were, how it will be in Heaven when all the angels and saints of God will join with us in intoning and singing the “Sanctus, Sanctus, Sanctus, Gloria in Excelsis Deo.”
11. One may also use Orlando di Lasso’s *Magnificat Quinti toni a5*, and other Magnificats which accommodate themselves to the German songs.

12. In this connection I wish also to suggest what form “Erstanden ist der heilige Christ” (*Musae Sioniae* V, no. 133) may be arranged between the Magnificat verses, taking here the opportunity to reflect on the matter somewhat further.

As soon as the first verse of the Magnificat, namely the “Et exultavit” is finished, performed with viols da gamba and organ, I have the first stanza of “Erstanden ist der heilige Christ” performed by four singers and a small flute [*Flölein*] and organ or regal. For the second stanza, the viols, positive, and a boy to sing the soprano line should be placed in a position in the church approximately opposite. Have the third stanza performed again by the previous four singers, flute, and regal. Then perform the “Quia fecit” in the same manner as “Et exultavit;” and again thereafter three stanzas (nos. 4, 5, and 6) of “Erstanden ist der heilige Christ” and so on until the end of the hypothetical Magnificat. In the same way one can also employ German songs [*Psalmen*] set in simple counterpoint [*contra puncto*] with which the congregation sings along. Or one can have one stanza performed by singers alone (if no regal or positive is available), the second stanza with viols, or zincks and trombones and organ, with one or two good sopranos; the third stanza again with the singers, like the first one. The fourth stanza is performed like the second, and so on to the end of the Psalm. Always in the last stanza, however, and occasionally in the middle, have both choirs together, as I have composed in the last five pieces of the second part of the German *Musae Sioniae*, nos. 26-30. And this will be treated more extensively in my *Syntagmate* and in *Psalmodia secunda*, if God allows it.

13. What things moreover will come to be observed in this *Megalynodia*, see in my *Syntagma Musicum*, the Latin work prefixed to the *Liturgodia Sionia*: in which will be found many useful and rare things for Musicians and others; and for the learned many things pleasant to read and worthy to know. Goodbye, and live.
Appendix 2

The Magnificat Text

Magnificat Text in Scriptural Context

The Magnificat text is recorded in the Gospel of Luke. It is spoken by Mary, the mother of Jesus. It is called the “Magnificat” because that is the first word of the text in Latin. Luke 1:26-38 is the story of the Annunciation, when the angel Gabriel visits Mary and tells her that she will become pregnant by the power of God. One commonly held misconception is that the Magnificat is spoken by Mary at the Annunciation as her response to the angel messenger, but this is not so. Her response to the angel is, “Behold, I am the servant of the Lord; let it be to me according to your word.”\(^{137}\) Afterward, she goes to visit her cousin Elizabeth, the expectant mother of John the Baptist. Elizabeth greets her prophetically: “Blessed are you among women, and blessed is the fruit of your womb”\(^{138}\) — words that form the nucleus of the Ave Maria. Mary responds to Elizabeth’s greeting with the poetic Magnificat text.

My soul magnifies the Lord, and my spirit rejoices in God my Savior, for he has looked with favor on the lowliness of his servant. Surely, from now on all generations will call me blessed; for the Mighty One has done great things for me, and holy is his name. His mercy is for those who fear him from generation to generation. He has shown strength with his arm; he has scattered the proud in the thoughts of their hearts; he has brought down the powerful from their thrones, and lifted up the lowly; he has filled the hungry with good things, and sent the rich away empty. He has helped his servant Israel, in remembrance of his mercy, according to the promise he made to our ancestors, to Abraham and to his descendants forever.\(^{139}\)

\(^{137}\) Luke 1:38 (New Revised Standard Version)

\(^{138}\) Luke 1:42

\(^{139}\) Luke 1:46-55
Translations of the Magnificat Text

On the following page is a table with parallel translations of the Magnificat in Latin, English, and German. The Biblical portion of the Latin Magnificat is ten verses long. Verses eleven and twelve are the Gloria Patri, a standard doxology that ends all psalm and canticle texts when they appear in a liturgical setting. The first verse of the German Magnificat is a combination of verses one and two of the Latin Magnificat, so the German version (including the German equivalent of the Gloria Patri) has only eleven verses. The English translation provided below is a slightly altered rendering of the King James Version.
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Latin</th>
<th>English</th>
<th>German</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>v. 1  Magnificat anima mea Dominum;</td>
<td>My soul doth magnify the Lord,</td>
<td>v. 1  Meine Seel erhebt den Herren</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>v. 2  Et exultavit spiritus meus in Deo, salutari meo.</td>
<td>And my spirit hath rejoiced in God my Savior.</td>
<td>v. 2  Denn er hat seine elende Maget angesehen sieh von nun an warden mich selig preisen alle Kindeskind.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>v. 3  Quia respexit humilitatem ancillae suae ecce enim ex hoc beatam me dicent omnes generationes.</td>
<td>For he hath regarded the low estate of his handmaiden: for, behold, from henceforth all generations shall call me blessed.</td>
<td>v. 3  Denn er hat grosse Ding an mir getan der da mächtig ist und des Name heilig ist.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>v. 4  Quia fecit mihi magna qui potens est: et sanctum nomen ejus.</td>
<td>For he that is mighty hath done to me great things; and holy is his name.</td>
<td>v. 4  Und seine Barmherzigkeit währet immer für und für bei denen die ihn fürchten.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>v. 5  Et misericordia ejus a progenie in progenies timentibus eum.</td>
<td>And his mercy is on them that fear him from generation to generation.</td>
<td>v. 5  Er übet Gewalt mit seinem Arm und zerstreuet die hoffärtig sind in ihres Herzen Sinn.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>v. 6  Fecit potentiam in brachio suo: dispersit superbos mente cordis sui.</td>
<td>He hath showed strength with his arm; he hath scattered the proud in the imagination of their hearts.</td>
<td>v. 6  Er stösset die Gewaltigen vom Stuhl und erhebet die Niedrigen.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>v. 7  Deposuit potentes de sede, et exaltavit humiles.</td>
<td>He hath put down the mighty from their seats, and exalted them of low degree.</td>
<td>v. 7  Die Hungrigen füllet er mit Gütern und lässet die Reichen leer.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>v. 8  Esurientes implevit bonis: et divites dimisit inanes.</td>
<td>He hath filled the hungry with good things; and the rich he hath sent empty away.</td>
<td>v. 8  Er denket der Barmherzigkeit und hilft seinem Diener Israel auf.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>v. 9  Suscepit Israel, puerum suum, recordatus misericordiae suae.</td>
<td>He hath helped his servant Israel, in remembrance of his mercy;</td>
<td>v. 9  Wie er geredt hat unsern Vätern Abraham und seinem Samen ewiglich.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>v. 10 Sicut locutus est ad patres nostros, Abraham, et semini ejus in saecula.</td>
<td>As he spoke to our fathers, to Abraham, and to his seed forever</td>
<td>v. 10  Lob und Preis sei Gott dem Vater und dem Sohn und dem heiligen Geiste.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>v. 12 Sicut erat in principio, et nunc, et semper, et in saecula saeculorum. Amen.</td>
<td>As it was in the beginning, is now, and ever shall be, world without end. Amen.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Texts of German Magnificat Variants Set by MPC

Mein Seel, O Gott, muss loben dich

v. 1 Mein Seel, O Gott, muss loben dich/ du bist mein Heil des freuen mich/
Dass du nicht fragst nach weltlich’m Pracht/ und hast mich Armen nicht veracht/ 
Und angesehen mein Niedrigkeit/ von nun an wird man weit und breit/ 
Mich selig preisen jedermann/ denn du hast frosse Ding an mir getan.

v. 2 Du bist auch mächtig lieber Herr/ dein grosse Macht stirbt nimmermehr/
Dein Nam ist aller Ehren wert/ drum man dich billig rühmt und ehrt/
Du bist barmherzig insgemein/ der dich von Herzen fürchtt allein/
Du hilfst dem Armen immerdar/ wann er muss leiden Not und Gfahr.

v. 3 Des Menschen Hoffart muss vergehn/ für deinem Arm kann nicht bestehn/
wer sich verlässt auf seine Pracht/ dem hast du bald ein End gemacht/
Du machst zunächst des Menschen Rat/ das sing, O Herr, dein Wundertat/
Was sie gedenken wider dich/ das gehet allzeit hinter sich.

v. 4 Wer niedrig ist und klein geacht/ an dem übst du dein göttlich Macht/
und machest ihn den Fürsten gleich/ den Reichen arm, den Armen reich/
so tust du auch zu dieser Zeit/ und gedenkst der Barmherzigkeit/
Israel willt du helfen tun/ durch deinem eingebornen Sohn.

v. 5 Wir habens nicht verdient umb dich/ dass du uns bist genädiglich/
zu unserem Vätern ist geschehn/ ein Wort, das hast du angesehen/
ja, Abraham, den teuren Mann, dem hast du selbst einn Eid getan/
und selig preisen jedermann/ und seinem Samen ewiglich.

Mein Seel erhebt den Herren mein

v. 1 Mein Seel erhebt den Herren mein/ mein Geist tut sich erspringen/
In dem der soll mein Heiland sein/ Maria so tut singen/
Mich schlechte Maid, auch Nichtigkeit/ allein hat angesehen/
In mir verbracht, sein göttlich Macht/ all Gschlecht mir Lob verjehen.

v. 2 Sein Nam der ist allen bereit/ und tut all Weit ergötzen/
Die sich in sein Barmherzigkeit/ mit Furcht allzeit tun setzen/
Denn sein Gewalt, vonnander spaltt/ So er sein Arm tut regen/
Was Hoffart treibt, kein Gwalt auch bleibt/ vom Stuhl tut ers bewegen.
v. 3  Was Demut, Gduld und Hunger hat/ Die will er gänzlich speisen/
      Hoch setzen sie, und machen satt/ Damit sein Gwalt beweisen/
      Die Reichen schon, lässt leer hingahn/ Tut sie in Trauern setzen/
      Doch was arm ist, dem hie gebricht/ Will er mit Freud ergötzen.

v. 4  Der Herr nahm auch an seinem Knecht/ den Israel viel frommen/
      Barmherzigkeit die macht das schlecht/ das ser ihn an hat genommen/
      Wie er denn vor den Vätern zwar/ vor langen hat zugesagt/
      Auch Abraham, und was je kam/ vom Samen sein, in Ewigkeit.

v. 5  Ehr sei dem Vater und dem Sohn/ Auch Gott dem heilgen Geist/
      Als er im Angfang war und nun/ de runs sein Gnade leiste/
      Dass wir wandeln, und stets handeln/ zu Ehr göttlichen Namen/
      Wer des begehrt, dem wird gewärht/ Drauf sprechn wir fröhlich Amen.

Mein Seel erhebt zu dieser Frist

v. 1  Mein Seel erhebt zu dieser Frist/ den Herren der so gütig ist/
      Der Geist in mir sich freuet sehr/ meins Heilands, dann mein Gott und Herr/
      Hat angesehen gnädiglich/ seiner Magd elend, drum werden mich/
      Selig preisen all Kindeskind/ bei Gott man solche Gnade findet.

v. 2  Er hat gross Ding an mir getan/ der mächtig ist ohn allem Wahn/
      Des Nam heilig ist allezeit/ Ewig währt sein Barmherzigkeit/
      Bei denen so ihn fürchten rein/ Er übt Gwalt mit dem Arme sein/
      Der Hoffärtigen Mut und Herz/ zerstreut er und wirft hinterwärts.

v. 3  Er stösst vom Stuhl die Gwaltigen/ er hebt die Armn und Hungrigen/
      Füllt er mit seinen Gütern schön/ Und lässt die Reichen leer hingehn/
      Er denket der Barmherzigkeit/ hilft Israel aus allem Leid/
      Wie er hat gredt den Vätern gleich/ Abraham und sein Samn ewiglich.
Appendix 3

Translation of *Nota Bene* Regarding *Megalynodia Sionia* in Preface to *Urania* (1613)

In my *Megalynodia*, at the beginning, I have set three Magnificats between [the verses of] which there are German songs for Christmas and Easter. And one can do the same for nearly all the feasts throughout the entire church year, according to one’s own pleasure. Thus, one selects the loveliest German songs that are appropriate to a certain day, and between each verse of the Magnificat (sung by the choir with soloists [*Cantores*] and instruments) sings one or two stanzas of a German song with four soloists and organ (since, at any rate, the organist must always respond on the organ between each verse of the Magnificat). One must, however, select from the Magnificats of Orlando di Lasso, Caspar Hassler [1562-1618, brother of Hans Leo Hassler], Hieronymus Praetorius, Vulpius, Demantius, or other composers, one which in key or mode accords well with the German songs.

For example:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Feast Day</th>
<th>Magnificat mode</th>
<th>German Song</th>
<th>Setting in Musae Sioniae</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Annunciation</td>
<td>Hypo-Ionian</td>
<td>Gott durch deine Güte, Christ der Welt</td>
<td>V, 159</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Hypo-Dorian</td>
<td>Surrexit Christus hodie</td>
<td>V, 131</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Easter</td>
<td>Dorian</td>
<td>Erstanden ist der heilige Christ</td>
<td>V, 134</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Erschienen ist der herrliche Tag</td>
<td>VI, 143</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Ionian</td>
<td>Erstanden ist der heilige Christ</td>
<td>V, 135</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Wir wollen alle fröhliche seyn</td>
<td>[VI], 144</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Hypo-Ionian</td>
<td>Surrexit Christus hodie 1. 2. vers</td>
<td>V, 132</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Ascension</td>
<td>Hypo-Dorian</td>
<td>Coelos ascendit hodie 1. 2. vers</td>
<td>V, 139</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Dorian</td>
<td>Wir danken dir Herr Jesu Christ</td>
<td>V, 140</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Pentecost</td>
<td>Hypo-Dorian</td>
<td>Spiritus Sancti gratia 1. 2. vers</td>
<td>V, 152</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Trinity</td>
<td>Hypo-Ionian</td>
<td>In unico Trias Deo</td>
<td>VI, 171, 172</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Visitation of Mary</td>
<td>Hypo-Dorian</td>
<td>Wir wollen singen ein Lobgesang</td>
<td>VI, 178</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>St. John [the Baptist]’s Day</td>
<td>Hypo-Aeolian</td>
<td>Mein Seel O Gott muss loben</td>
<td>[V], 161</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>St. Michael’s Day</td>
<td>Hypo-Dorian</td>
<td>Heut singt die liebe Christenheit</td>
<td>V, 162</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

But here one must be careful to observe the B♭ in Hypo-Ionian since there is no corresponding Magnificat tone. If it is present, the Magnificat *octavi toni* must be used in its place, and the German songs transposed down a fourth [i.e., from C to G] (which suits the instruments best, and of itself gives a lovelier harmony). If one should transpose the German songs down a fifth, so that it is then somewhat dull, then the *sesti toni* must be used, etc."140

---

140 Trans. Larry Cook, “The German Troped Polyphonic Magnificat” (Ph.D. diss., University of Iowa, 1976), 27-29. In his translation, Cook unaccountably omits the entries for the feasts of Pentecost, Trinity, and the Visitation of Mary from the original table in the *Urania* preface. These entries have been restored by the author. Also, there are several typographical errors in MPC’s original table. Some were corrected by Cook, but a couple slipped through. These have been corrected by the author and appear in brackets.
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