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ABSTRACT

In 1618, a German clergyman and musician named Erhard Bodenschatz published a collection of 115 motets under the title *Florilegium Portense*. A second volume of 150 pieces appeared three years later. Both collections contain motets of five to eight voices mostly in Latin, though a few are in German. They contain works of Hassler, Lasso, Gabrieli, and a host of lesser-known composers—as well as several pieces by Bodenschatz himself.

The purpose of the collection was to provide a repertory of motets of high quality for practical liturgical use. The collection includes music by both German and Italian composers, and the style of the music ranges from Palestrina-like counterpoint to Venetian polychoral style. Both volumes were published with a figured *basis generalis* to facilitate performance with organ accompaniment in the Baroque practice that was just then in its infancy. *The Florilegium Portense* is an important collection because it was so widely used throughout central Germany; it was still being reprinted a century after its first publication.

There is very little published scholarship on the *Florilegium Portense*. There is no modern edition of the collection, and although some of the pieces are available in
various *Gesamtausgabe* and *Denkmäler* editions, most of the music remains unedited.
The purpose of this project is to explain the significance of this collection, to briefly summarize the style of the music it contains, and to offer a modern edition of four motets from the collection that have not previously been published.
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PART I:

TEXT
INTRODUCTION

From the time of the Reformation to the death of Bach, Lutheran church music developed from an inherited tradition of music by Josquin and others to a fully developed and unique artistic expression that came to be epitomized in Bach’s sacred cantatas. In many ways, the Lutheran musical tradition was influenced by foreign styles and genres; the concerted style, polychoral writing, and the cantata are all of Italian origin. Other elements of the tradition were indigenous to Lutheran practice, such as the chorale and the chorale prelude. The result was a fusion of styles, such as one finds in the sacred concertos of Schütz and Schein. One genre that remained important to the tradition throughout this entire period was the Latin-texted motet in 16th-century contrapuntal style. At first, motets were not actively cultivated by Protestant composers; the infant Lutheran church drew on the body of pre-existing works by Josquin and those of his school while they began providing music based on German texts and chorales. Around the turn of the 17th century there was a renewed interest in motet composition by German composers. The model for this generation of motets was the works of Orlando di Lasso.1

1 Blume, 192, ff.; Rubsamen, 232.
As the Italian style began to influence German music, the motet became a point of departure for new styles, such as the hybrid sacred concertos of the first half of the 17th century. Also at this time, there was a concern to collect, edit, and disseminate the finest works of the old style. The result was a number of large collections that contained a fascinating juxtaposition of motets in 16th-century counterpoint alongside new motets in a mixed style that was heavily Italian. After 1600, the Latin-texted motet was not as much cultivated, but the motet collections appearing just before and after 1600 continued to serve the Lutheran church’s musical needs in this regard for well over a century.

By far the most important, influential, and best-known collection of this type was a two-volume anthology called *Florilegium Portense*. Its editor was a Thuringian musician and clergyman named Erhard Bodenschatz.² Bodenschatz published a collection of 89 motets in 1603 for use at the electoral school at Pforta, where he was cantor. In 1618, he revised and expanded that collection to 115 motets under the title *Florilegium Portense* and had it published at Leipzig; a second volume of 150 pieces appeared three years later. Both volumes contain motets of five to eight voices.³ The repertoire in both volumes is overwhelmingly in Latin, although a handful of German-texted motets appear in each. The *Florilegium Portense* contains works by the well-known masters of its day, such as Hassler, Lasso, both Gabrielis, Michael Praetorius, Viadana, and a host of lesser-known composers such as Agazzari, Calvisius, Croce, Erbach, Melchior Franck, Gumpelzhaimer, Marenzio, Pallavicino, Hieronymus Praetorius, Roth, Vecchi, and Vulpius. It also contains three pieces by Bodenschatz

³ FP I contains 1 four-voice motet, and FP II contains 1 ten-voice motet; eight-voice motets predominate in both volumes.
himself. The purpose of the collection was to provide a repertory of motets of high quality for practical liturgical and school use. The dates of composition for the repertory fall between 1560 and 1620. Even though the genre of Latin-texted motets in 16th-century counterpoint was starting to become old-fashioned by the end of this period, most of the motets are from the era contemporaneous with or immediately preceding the publication of the *Florilegium Portense*, although a few pieces in the collection date from as far back as the 1560’s.

A fusion of late Renaissance and early Baroque styles is clearly apparent in the collection. Some of the motets are in strict 16th-century counterpoint, and some are vertically conceived; some are generated by Lasso-like points of imitation for each section of text, and some are polychoral in the Venetian style. Others exhibit a curious blend of all of these elements. Another area of interest in the collection is in the area of performance practice; both volumes were published with a *Basis Generalis* to facilitate performance with continuo, a Baroque practice that was just then in its infancy. In addition, the repeated occurrence of certain clef combinations (especially in the second volume) suggests the intention of performance with instruments.4

One index of the importance of the *Florilegium Portense* was its widespread use throughout the region. Almost every town in the region, even the very smallest ones, had a copy.5 Its enormous popularity was long lived, enjoying reprints over a century after its first appearance. Bach would likely have known it from his student days, and he purchased copies of it for use in the Thomaskirche as late as 1729.6 Scholarly interest in

---

4 Riemer/Gottwald, 771.
5 Ibid.
6 Schulze, 199; Eichorn, 60-61.
the collection is two-fold: first, for what it tells us about the German and Italian
compositional practice around 1600, and second, for what it tells us about practices in
Lutheran liturgical music in the 17th and 18th centuries. There is little published
scholarship on the *Florilegium Portense*. There is no modern edition of the collection,
though some of the pieces are available in various *Gesamtausgaben* and *Denkmäler*
editions. The existing literature on the collection is almost entirely in German, and the
only work of any real significance is a 1928 dissertation by Otto Riemer.7 There are also
several very brief articles from the same era. In English, the only citations are a page-
long article on Bodenschatz in the 1904 edition of *Grove’s Dictionary of Music and
Musicians*, and an even shorter article in the most recent edition.

The primary purpose of the present document is to offer editions of four motets
from the *Florilegium Portense* which, as far as can be determined, have not been
published since its original appearance in the early part of the 17th century. Along with
the presentation of the scores themselves, the study has several secondary goals, both
musicological and bibliographical. Among the musicological goals is a summary of the
importance of the collection as a whole. Another goal is to provide enough background
on the musical and stylistic aspects of the era to provide a framework against which to
understand the four selected motets (Chapter 1). The bibliographic goals are (1) to
briefly summarize the very small body of literature relevant to the topic as an aid to
future research and (2) to trace sufficiently the publication histories of the four selected

---

7 Otto Riemer, *Erhard Bodenschatz und sein Florilegium Portense*. Schöningen: Buch- und Kunstruckerei,
Kaminsky, 1928.
motets to establish that their publication here represents scholarship that is a unique contribution (Chapter 2).

It is hoped that this project will draw attention to the importance of the collection and to facilitate its future study. The ultimate goal of such a study would be that the *Florilegium Portense* would someday appear in a modern edition; this document should be a small first step toward that end.
CHAPTER 1
THE FLORILEGIUM PORTENSE

*Florilegium Portense* is the name of a motet collection edited by Erhard Bodenschatz and published in two volumes: *Florilegium Portense continens CXV selectissimas cantiones* in 1618 and *Florilegii musici Portensis sacras harmonias sive motetas* in 1621. Both parts were printed in Leipzig by the house of Abraham Lamberg.\(^8\)

The collection contains Latin- and German-texted motets for five to eight voices; although the first volume contains one four-voice motet and the second volume contains one ten-voice motet, the overwhelming majority of pieces in both volumes is for eight voices. Volume I (1618) favors German composers, Handl, Lasso, and Hieronymus Praetorius being best represented. The second volume (1621) is just the opposite: Italian composers predominate, even though the composer of the largest number of works is Martin Roth, a German. The first volume (FP I) contains 115 motets while the second volume (FP II) is larger, containing 150 motets. An earlier collection edited by Bodenschatz and published in 1603, entitled *Florilegium selectissimarum cantionum* (FSC), contains 89 motets, 82 of which are included in the 1618 edition. Even though the

\(^8\) Stauffer, 520.
1603 *Florilegium selectissimarum cantionum* may be rightly considered a first edition of the enlarged 1618 collection (one commentator calls it an “Ur-Florilegium”)\(^9\), the term “Florilegium Portense” refers specifically to the two volumes of 1618 and 1621. There is one further editorial project of Bodenschatz that has the word “Florilegium” in the title, and this is the *Florilegium selectissimorum hymnorum* (the so-called ‘klein Florilegium’) of 1606. This contains four-voice hymn settings, and is not connected to the music under discussion here.\(^{10}\)

**ERHARD BODENSCHATZ**

Not much is known of Bodenschatz’s life aside from the places where he lived and the positions that he held.\(^{11}\) Born at Lichtenberg around 1576, he received his early musical training at the electoral school at Dresden and then at the Pforta Gymnasium—known colloquially as Schulpforta—an electoral school that specialized in the arts and humanities, located on the Saale River near Naumburg, about 30 miles southwest of Leipzig. In the last years of the 16\(^{th}\) century, he was admitted to the university in Leipzig where he studied theology and music. In 1600 he received an appointment to return to Schulpforta as cantor; this was to be the only musical position he would hold in his life. In 1603 he left Schulpforta for nearby Rehausen, where he served as pastor for five years. In 1608 he accepted a call to be pastor at Gross-Osterhausen, near Querfurt, about 60

---

\(^9\) Eichorm, 65.  
\(^{10}\) Riemer (1928), 54  
\(^{11}\) Ibid., 3-9.
miles west and slightly north of Leipzig, where he died in 1636. It was while he was at Gross-Osterhausen (as pastor, and not as cantor) that he published the *Florilegium Portense*.

The years that Bodenschatz spent at Schulpforta both as a student and as cantor must have been extremely happy ones, and it appears that he maintained a life-long relationship with the school. When he moved from Schulpforta to the neighboring village of Rehausen in 1603, Bodenschatz could have and almost certainly did stay in contact with his successors and former colleagues. He seems to have been particularly close to Martin Roth, who was cantor at Schulpforta from 1606 to 1608. Roth’s work would figure prominently in the second volume of the *Florilegium* over a decade later. Even after Bodenschatz moved to Gross-Osterhausen in 1608, he would have kept track of life at Schulpforta through his sons, whom he sent to study there in their early teens. This life-long connection and affection is clearly exemplified by the editing projects Bodenschatz undertook, almost all of which were shaped in one way or another by his time at Schulpforta. The *Florilegium Portense* is named for the school (“Flowers of Schulpforta”), and the title page of the 1618 edition clearly states its purpose as illustrating the pieces used in singing before and after meals at the school (“in Illustri Gymnasio Portensi ante & post cibum sumtum nunc temporis usitatas”). This title page also identifies the editor not by any of the pastoral posts he held, but as the former cantor of the Pforta Gymnasium (“Lichtenbergense Gymnasii Portense olim Cantore”).

The title page makes no mention of another name that is equally important to the appearance of the *Florilegium Portense*: Seth Calvisius, cantor at Schulpforta from 1582 to 1594, and Bodenschatz’s teacher during his time as a student there. Calvisius left
Schulpforta for Leipzig to become cantor of the St. Thomas church, where he served until his death in 1615.\textsuperscript{12} Today we think of Calvisius as one of the minor figures in the line of *Thomas-Cantors* leading up to Bach, but at the turn of the 17\textsuperscript{th} century, he was one of the leading musical influences in Germany. Calvisius was a Renaissance man by any measure; he was an able astronomer, and was friends with the noted astronomer Johannes Kepler. At Schulpforta, he taught history as well as music and music theory. As a composer, he was considered one of the foremost contrapuntists of his day. His main music theory work, *Melopoeia* (1592), was the first to make the principles of Zarlino’s *L’istitutioni harmoniche* (1558) available in the German language.\textsuperscript{13} In any event, music study with Calvisius would have carried significant meaning in musical circles and Bodenschatz’s devotion to his teacher was clearly apparent in both his compositional and editorial activities.

Calvisius’s time at Schulpforta was noteworthy in several regards. First of all, the length of his tenure there—from 1582 to 1594—was much longer than any of the other cantors of that era. There were two cantors between the time Calvisius left in 1594 and the time that Bodenschatz arrived in 1600, and Bodenschatz himself stayed for only three years. Bodenschatz’s successor also left after three years and Bodenschatz’s friend Roth held the post from 1606 to 1608.\textsuperscript{14} The dozen years that Calvisius held the office—a period of time equal in length to the tenures of his four immediate successors—were more than enough to have a significant impact on the culture and reputation of the school. Another notable aspect about Calvisius’s time in Schulpforta is that those years were

\textsuperscript{12} For biographical information on Calvisius, see Adrio/Gottwald, 847-848.
\textsuperscript{13} Adrio/Gottwald, 2001, 847.
\textsuperscript{14} Riemer (1928), 65-66. Kirwan, 781.
spent not only teaching, but assembling a body of music with which to teach. Singing Latin-texted motets was central to a liberal arts education at that time; Luther writes about the importance of Latin-school students singing in Latin as a part of their language study. In addition, the repertoire used in this context was the means by which the principles of counterpoint and composition were taught. So by assembling a repertory, Calvisius was in effect developing a curriculum. This large, unpublished repertory/curriculum was gathered with great care; it influenced a generation of musicians, including Calvisius’s successor at St. Thomas, Johann Hermann Schein, who was a student at Schulpforta under Roth. It was this body of music with which Bodenschatz was trained as a young man, and this same body of music he edited and published his last year at Pforta as the *Florilegium selectissimarum cantionum*.

The impact that Calvisius had on Bodenschatz’s training and subsequent musical activity is hard to overstate. Not only was Calvisius’s effort the basis for Bodenschatz’s *magnum opus*, but almost every large scale composition and editing project that Bodenschatz undertook was modeled on some previous work of Calvisius (see Table 1.1):
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Calvisius</th>
<th>Bodenschatz</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1597: <em>Harmonia cantionum ecclesiasticarum</em>: Kirchengesänge und geistliche Lieder D. Lutheri und anderer frommen Christen</td>
<td>1608: <em>Harmoniae angelicae, das ist ... Lieder und ... Psalmen D. Martini Lutheri und anderer</em></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1597: <em>Harmonia cantionum ecclesiasticarum</em>: Kirchengesänge und geistliche Lieder D. Lutheri und anderer frommen Christen</td>
<td>1608: <em>Harmoniae angelicae, das ist ... Lieder und ... Psalmen D. Martini Lutheri und anderer</em></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1605: <em>Der Psalter Davids gesangweis vom Herrn D. Cornelio Beckern ... verfertiget</em>, 4vv</td>
<td>1607: <em>Psalterium Davids</em>, 4vv.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1599: <em>Bicinia septuaginta ad sententias evangeliorum anniversorum ... additi sunt viginti canones</em> (enlarged 1612)</td>
<td>1615: <em>Bicinia XC. selectissima ... praecipuorum festorum totius anni composite</em></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>‘Singet dem Herren ein neues Lied,’ 8vv. (ms)</td>
<td>‘Lobet den Herren,’ 6vv. (ms)</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Table 1.1: Comparison of selected works by Calvisius and Bodenschatz

Bodenschatz’s 1606 *Florilegium selectissimorum hymnorum* (the so-called *Klein Florilegium*) is in fact a collection of four-voice arrangements of hymns by Calvisius. As late as 1615—the year of Calvisius’s death—Bodenschatz published a collection of 90 bicinia, his own compositions, which is based on a similar collection by Calvisius from 1599. Furthermore, the *Florilegium Portense*, especially the first volume, was based on the large *unpublished* body of music assembled by Calvisius for instruction at the school:

> On one side [we have] the very learned Calvisius, with his high education and acclaimed spiritual, musical, and organizational ability - on the other side
Bodenschatz, who seizes the moment and has the sense of a genius in regard to current times, modernity, and practicality. Even though constructing these antagonisms tends to limit us, it seems that the one whose discernment and competence structured the idea and concept of the collection, must have been Calvisius.  

The way in which Bodenschatz patterned his musical activity so deliberately on Calvisius’s work can be understood in at least two ways. On the one hand, it is clear that Bodenschatz looked upon his teacher’s music with devotion, even reverence. One can understand that Bodenschatz would want to bring honor to his mentor, and by his bringing the fruits of Calvisius’s labor to the public in such a substantial and enduring way, Bodenschatz showed that imitation can indeed be the sincerest form of flattery. On the other hand, one might also draw the conclusion that selecting and assembling the musical content of the *Florilegium Portense*, especially its first volume, was entirely the work of Calvisius. Bodenschatz need have gone no further than the choir library at his own school to find all the music he needed, and it might seem that it was merely Bodenschatz’s ambition and business acumen that was responsible for the printed edition. The precise truth of the matter is difficult to determine.

Indeed, a few biographical and documentary details give us reason to question the exact nature of the relationship between the two men. After graduating from Schulpforta, Bodenschatz went to study at Leipzig; in 1600 he applied for an organist position at the St. Thomas church, doubtless hoping that Calvisius would help him by his influence. We have no evidence that Calvisius did or did not intercede on Bodenschatz’s behalf, but we know that Bodenschatz did not receive the job. At the same time, it is entirely possible

---

15 Eichhorn, 61.
that Calvisius had a hand in securing the appointment as Schulpforta cantor for his former pupil in the same year; again, we simply do not know.

The most tantalizing piece of evidence relevant to this question is a dedicatory poem written by Calvisius for the 1603 *Florilegium selectissimarum cantionum*, nine years after he had left Schulpforta for Leipzig. This poem, written in Latin, is the only documentary evidence we have in this matter, and it tells us several things about Calvisius and his relationship to Bodenschatz and the *Florilegium Portense*. First of all, the very fact that such a poem was included at all is an indication that Bodenschatz wanted Calvisius’s name connected with the project. It is by no means an unsafe assumption that Bodenschatz felt indebted to Calvisius for his role in assembling the music in the collection, not to mention his own training as a musician. The invitation to write a preface would have been a way for Bodenschatz to honor Calvisius and celebrate the publication of the music he collected over so many years. Second, the literary style of the poem is evidence that Calvisius was a learned and well-read man. It is written in Latin verse, and contains imagery from his other area of expertise, astronomy. Third, the fact that he was willing to make a prefatory contribution to the publication would imply that Calvisius, too, had warm feelings for Schulpforta and respect, if not fondness, for his former student. The content of the poem seems to bear out this conclusion. Calvisius remembers his time as “choir leader of the famous gate” and then intimates that he is disappointed by the decline of music at the school since his time. This assessment is almost certainly leveled at his successor, one Christoph Lisberger, as he then goes on to

---

16 Full text and translation of Calvisius’s poem is in Appendix D.
17 “Pforta” in Latinized German means “gate.”
praise Bodenschatz for the diligence which he brought to the task of restoring the choirs.\textsuperscript{18} But then come the lines which provoke the most interest: referring to the publication of the collection itself, there is a twinge of bitterness when Calvisius states quite clearly that he himself had interest in publishing a collection of motets used at the school. He writes that the circumstances were never favorable enough to set the project into motion, and that the “envious fates” were against him. Calvisius then addresses Bodenschatz directly: “Winged creatures build nests from blooming grasses, and the honeybee sucks out something better and brings about honey… You have succeeded in finding better patrons who promote your intentions, so that as a result your fame will rise up to the heavenly realms.”\textsuperscript{19}

The effect of such pointed language, in print for all to see, can only be imagined. There is no further recorded communication between the two, but it is difficult to reach any conclusion other than that this would have caused a rift between them. Yet Bodenschatz continued to use Calvisius’s music as a source for his compositional and editorial activities; his \textit{Florilegium selectissimorum hymnorum} of 1606, his \textit{Psalterium Davids} of 1607, and his 1615 collection of \textit{Bicinia} were all based on collections that Calvisius had previously published. With respect to the \textit{Florilegium Portense} collections themselves, Bodenschatz’s treatment of Calvisius and his music is mixed. Calvisius’s prefatory poem does not appear in the revised and expanded 1618 edition, even though most of the other prefatory material is retained. Even though the \textit{Florilegium Portense I} contains 26 more motets than the \textit{Florilegium selectissimarum cantionum}, the number of

\textsuperscript{18} Riemer (1928), 57.
\textsuperscript{19} Bodenschatz, \textit{Florilegium selectissimarum cantionum}, preface.
Calvisius’s pieces is reduced from seven to two. Yet two additional Calvisius motets are included in the *Florilegium Portense* II, and the placement of those two pieces within the collection is significant. Bodenschatz includes only one of his own compositions; it appears following one of Calvisius’s motets and is followed by the other (FP II 62, 63, and 64). By placing his piece between Calvisius’s pieces, it is as if the editor is claiming the heritage of his late mentor by connecting his music, literally, with that of Calvisius.

So we see that the musical and personal relationship between the two Schulpforta cantors was complex. To what degree did Calvisius resent Bodenschatz for attaining a level of fame in publishing that he could not achieve? What was Bodenschatz’s reaction to Calvisius’s dedicatory poem? Why was the 1618 *Florilegium* purged of nearly all mention of Calvisius’s name and music when Bodenschatz had so blatantly patterned his compositions and publications on Calvisius’s in the preceding decade? After Calvisius’s death in 1615, did sentiment revitalize Bodenschatz’s devotion to his late teacher? The exact nature of the relationship will probably always be left to speculation, but one point is beyond question: Calvisius had a decisive role in shaping the musical development of his student and, ultimately, the repertoire of the *Florilegium*.

While Bodenschatz’s primary importance is as an editor of collections, his own compositions (a few of which are included in the both volumes of the *Florilegium Portense*) show that he was an able composer. Knowing what we know about the way Bodenschatz patterned his editorial work on Calvisius begs the question: was Bodenschatz’s music also modeled on Calvisius’s style? A four-voice *Magnificat* of 1599 and the 90 bicinia display “considerable artistic merit and effectively combine an
early Baroque inclination towards word-painting with supple vocal lines."\textsuperscript{20} The three motets of Bodenschatz in the \textit{Florilegium} in particular suggest that for all of his devotion to and imitation of Calvisius, Bodenschatz seems to have exhibited a compositional voice that was somewhat independent of and more conservative than that of his teacher. Bodenschatz may rightly be considered a lesser light among German musicians of that era, but his pedigree of musical training, the positions he held, and the enduring popularity of his publications suggest that Bodenschatz must have been an able scholar, composer, teacher, and theologian.

\textbf{CONTEXT, FORMAT, CONTENTS}

The \textit{Florilegium Portense} appeared during a high tide of music publishing in Europe. Referring to the period from the middle of the 16\textsuperscript{th} century to the beginning of the Thirty Years’ War, Blume remarks that “indigenous Protestant production of Latin motets greatly increased,” and then goes on to cite (by title, composer, and date) no less than 48 collections of newly-published Latin church music in one paragraph.\textsuperscript{21} The content of these collections encompassed motets of all descriptions: settings of whole Psalms, Psalm part settings, Gospel verses, Epistle verses, Latin gospel series for the whole church year, \textit{bicinia} and \textit{tricinia} for teaching purposes, poetic Latin adaptations of Gospel texts, catechism motets for school children, even Latin-texted settings of German

\textsuperscript{20} Riemer/Gottwald, 771.
\textsuperscript{21} Blume, 166.
hymns.\footnote{22 The 17th century held the same promise for the robust dissemination of German-language liturgical music. The early works of Schein and Schütz (\textit{Psalmen Davids, Israelsbrunlein}, etc.) set the tone, but the Thirty Years’ War dampened the momentum of printing and publishing. It seems that this momentum was never quite recovered; this could be in part why many of the works of Schelle, Krieger, Bernhard, Knüpfer and others of their generation did not appear in print until the \textit{Denkmäler} editions of the 20th century.} To say that there was an abundance of material available for use in the Lutheran liturgy in 1600 is a gross understatement. It is probably also an understatement to say that not all of this material was of the highest quality. Blume judiciously refers to the extant music of this period as “handed down to us, but by no means sifted through.”\footnote{23 Blume, 166.} Yet between 1590 and 1620 there was a concern for the preservation and publication of the very best of the Latin musical tradition going back to Josquin, together with a desire to provide comprehensive collections from which church choirs could draw. This was the context of Calvisius’s work and the purpose of the \textit{Florilegium Portense}. Another collection from that era that accomplished this purpose with singular and long-lasting success was Abraham Schadaeus’s \textit{Promptuarium Musicum}.\footnote{24 \textit{Promptuarii Musici, sacras harmonias sive motetas V. VI. VII. & VIII. vocam}, Strasbour. Pars prima (1611\textsuperscript{1}), pars altera (1612\textsuperscript{2}), pars tertia (1613\textsuperscript{2}), pars quarta (1617\textsuperscript{1}).} This collection was somewhat larger than the \textit{Florilegium}, with 437 pieces in its four volumes. The \textit{Promptuarium Musicum} (PM) was published with a separate figured bass part, “cui basi vulgo generalem dictam, & ad organa musicae instrumenta accomodatam,” a feature that was becoming increasingly commonplace for these types of collections through the second decade of the 17th century. This was not a continuo part in the Baroque sense, but strictly a \textit{basso seguente} with figures. It was prepared and issued separately by Schadaeus’s assistant Caspar Vincentius, who also authored the instructions for its use in a preface.\footnote{25 Kirwan, 653.} Vincentius supervised the publication of the fourth and final volume of the \textit{Promptuarium Musicum} collection after Schadaeus’s retirement; as we shall see,
Vincentius would also become involved with the publication of the *Florilegium*. Like the *Florilegium*, the *Promptuarium* contained motets of five to eight voices, but the repertoire was selected and was organized according to a different principle than the *Florilegium*. The express emphasis, stated clearly on the title page, was to include music not yet published in Germany ("antehac nunquam in Germania editis"). This resulted in an overwhelming prevalence of Italian composers of the most recent generation, much more so than in *Florilegium Portense*. Although a few of the best-known German composers are included (Hassler, Frank, Handl, etc), there are no German-texted pieces—all of the motets in all four volumes are in Latin. In addition, the *Promptuarium* is arranged according to the Sundays and seasons of the church year, clearly implying a liturgical function, as opposed to the *Florilegium*, the stated purpose of which was to illustrate the devotional practice at Schulpforta. Both the *Promptuarium* and the *Florilegium* were reprinted many times, supplying the needs of minor services in large churches for a century and a half.\(^{26}\) Although the two collections were published with seemingly different purposes and contents, we will see that there are some strong correlations between them and that the *Florilegium*, especially Volume II, was strongly influenced by the *Promptuarium*.

Like the *Promptuarium Musicum*, both volumes of the *Florilegium Portense* collection were published in partbook format. Each volume had nine books: Discantus, Altus, Tenor, Bassus, Cantus II, Tenor II, Septima vox/Altus II, and Octava vox/Bassus II along with a *Basis Generalis*. The titles, dedications, and introductions give us some

\[^{26}\text{Riemer/Gottwald, 771.}\]
indication of the context and purpose of the collection. First, as Bodenschatz’s biographer Otto Riemer points out, “it was not common to relate the title to its place of origin.” Riemer suggests that this is an indication of the high reputation of artistic excellence that the school enjoyed throughout the region. As previously mentioned, the title page of the first volume identifies the illustration of devotional practice at the Pforta Gymnasium as the primary function of the collection. This devotional practice evidently included singing polyphonic motets at mealtime (“ante & post cibum”). Although liturgical use of these motets can certainly be assumed, it is not lifted up as the main purpose of the collection: the editor offers the music for use to the glory of God’s name, for the splendor of the church, and for the education of young people (“in Nominis Dei gloriam, Ecclesiarum decus, & studiosae Juventutis usum”). This devotional intent is reinforced by the main preface, written by Bodenschatz himself, which is a brief sermon on the Ambrosian teaching, “Cibus in Ore, Psalmus in Corde.” The dedicatee of the collection is a man called Gottfried Wolffersdorff, a civic official in Weissenfalls who also held an appointment as Inspector for the Pforte Gymnasium. The school Inspector looked after the financial affairs of the institution, and it was a temporary appointment that rotated on an annual basis. It is possible that Wolffersdorff had a hand in funding the publication of the *Florilegium*, or at least that he used his influence to secure cooperation from other school officials in support of its publication. The preface includes three dedicatory poems written by various school officials and colleagues: one by Justinius Bertuchius, the rector at Schulpforta from 1601 to 1626; one by Hieronymus Kromayer,

---

27 See Appendix E for a full summary of the title pages and prefatory material of both volumes.  
28 Riemer (1927), 51.  
29 Ibid.
the assistant rector of the school during Bodenschatz’s time there; and one by the Naumburg clergyman Johannes Müllmann. All three of these poems are in Latin verse, and they are formulaic in their praise of music and their celebration of the publication of the edition. All of this prefatory material is followed by alphabetical and seasonal indices of the music in the collection.

The arrangement of the title page and preface material of the second volume of the *Florilegium* is similar to the first, but less elaborate. Here there is only one dedicatory poem, this one written by Johannes Pandeccheus, Superintendent of the church at Sangerhausen. Bodenschatz’s dedication names two members of the Saxon electorate, Frederick Meyer and Theodore Mostel, both of whom had served year-long terms as the school Inspector for Schulpforta. The preface also includes alphabetical and seasonal indices of the music in the collection. The main difference between this and the first volume is the purpose of the collection as stated on the title page, which specifically highlights two elements. First, this volume is intended as a liturgical resource, not a devotional or educational one. Volume II explicitly offers music for the Sundays and feast days of the entire church year (“diebus Dominicis in communi: partim vero in specie Festis solennioribus, per totius anni curriculum inserviunt”). Second, the title page advertises the inclusion of a figured bass to facilitate organ accompaniment, as well as accommodating the use of instruments (“cum adjecta Basi Generali ad Organa Musiquam instrumenta accommodata”). These two elements were also features of the first volume, but they were not explicitly stated on the title page. In addition, even though Bodenschatz still identifies himself as the former Cantor of the Pforta

---

30 Ibid., 58.
Gymnasium, he does not evoke the illustration of the Schulpforta musical practice as a defining element of the collection. This slight difference on the title pages reflects a large difference in the musical content of the two volumes, as will be discussed later in this chapter.

Also important is what is not found in the titles and prefaces of the *Florilegium Portense*: musical instruction. Neither preface offers any direction into how to perform the motets. Even the second volume, which specifically mentions the possibility of instrumental accompaniment, offers no instruction on how such accompaniment might be executed. One might expect a collection of this period, especially a collection the stated purpose of which is the instruction of young people, to offer some musical guidance. Vincentius’s figured bass parts for the *Promptuarium Musicum*, for example, included lengthy introductions with explanations on how to realize the figures. In the *Florilegium*, the prefaces expound only on the edifying power of music, and not the technical aspects of its performance.

Because the editorial history of the *Florilegium Portense* spanned two decades, a comparison of the various volumes gives us not only some insight into Bodenschatz’s process, but a glimpse of the progression of musical style at the beginning of the 17th century. First of all, it is necessary to ask why Bodenschatz returned to the music in the *Florilegium selectissimarum cantionum* as a basis for an expanded collection of motets 15 years after its first publication. One answer is that the *Florilegium selectissimarum cantionum* was published with a large number of errors, and the *Florilegium Portense I* was offered as a revised and corrected edition (“editio altera ab ipso autore auctior et emendation reddita”). Even so, both volumes of the *Florilegium* in their final forms are
far from error-free. Another possible factor is the fact that Calvisius had died in 1615. Perhaps Bodenshchatz was moved to re-examine the repertoire he first knew at Schulpforta as a remembrance of Calvisius, or perhaps he now felt liberated to publish free of guilt and without the possibility of a second rebuke from his mentor. This is pure supposition; no evidence outside of the simple chronology of events exists to suggest or refute a connection between Calvisius’s death and the *Florilegium* project. There was, however, another unquestionable and pressing stylistic reason for a new edition, one that has already been alluded to: the addition of a figured bass part. By 1618, all four volumes of the *Promptuarium Musicum* had been published with a *basis generalis*, and figured bass parts were prepared for many collections from the late 16th and early 17th centuries that were originally published without them. This shift in performance practice was too pervasive and important for Bodenschatz to ignore, and the fact that both volumes of the *Florilegium* include a separate figured bass part was certainly one of the factors contributing to its popularity and longevity.\(^3^1\) The person who prepared the *basis generalis* for both the 1618 and 1621 *Florilegium* volumes was almost certainly none other than the aforementioned Caspar Vincentius (or Vincentz).\(^3^2\) Vincentius is not credited on the title page, but one of his “less-popular” (“weniger gefragten”) motets is included in Volume I and four in Volume II, perhaps as payment for his effort in this connection.\(^3^3\)

---

\(^3^1\) The practice of adding figured basses to earlier collections in the period was so prevalent that it is possible that had Bodenschatz not overseen the addition of a figured bass part to the FSC collection, some one else would have.

\(^3^2\) Eichhorn, 65.

\(^3^3\) Ibid.
The content of the *Florilegium Portense* I is predominated by Latin-texted works for six to eight voices by German masters of the end of the 16th century. Less than a third of the composers in the collection are of Italian origin, and only four of the 115 motets have German texts. The core of the collection is the repertoire collected by Calvisius during his time at Schulpforta, represented chiefly by the works of Jacobus Gallus and Orlando di Lasso. These two composers account for fully one quarter of the music in Volume I and their works, dating from ca. 1560 to 1585, represent the oldest pieces in the collection. This core of pieces also includes three works of Andrea Gabrielli, three of Hassler, two of Tiburzio Massaino, as well as the two motets by Calvisius himself. A second layer of works can be recognized as being music that Bodenschatz collected and performed during his time at Schulpforta (1600-1603). Composers in this category include Erbach (5 pieces), Fabricius (5 pieces), Hieronymus Praetorius (6 pieces), Giovanni Gabrielli (2 pieces), and Bodenschatz himself (2 pieces). A third layer is very clearly differentiated as works not appearing in 1603 that were added to the 1618 edition. In addition to the five Calvisius motets that were not included, there were two others that were removed; the rest of the collection was taken over unchanged. Of the thirty-three new pieces, eight were from the *Promptuarium Musicum*, including works of Bianciardi, Viadana, Christian Walliser, Nikolaus Zangius, and of course Vincentius. Also added in 1618 were four more motets by Hieronymus Praetorius, three by Berger, three by Melchoir Vulpius, an additional piece by Giovanni Gabrielli, and single works of Melchoir Franck, Adam Gumpelzhaimer, and Martin Roth, among others. Even though these motets are of later origin, their style and character is

---

34 A table of contents for both volumes of the *Florilegium Portense* are given in Appendices A and B.
not radically different from the rest—they do not stick out as “added” pieces. So aside from the addition of a thoroughbass, the *Florilegium Portense* I does not show a significant departure of focus from that of the *Florilegium selectissimarum cantionum*; the intent seems to have been merely to revise, expand, and update the existing collection.

By contrast, the second volume of the *Florilegium* does show a significant departure of principle from the first. That departure can be explained to a great degree by the appearance of the *Promptuarium* in the previous decade. In fact, a large proportion of the repertoire in Volume II was taken from that source; no fewer than 83 of the 150 motets here were previously published in the *Promptuarium Musicum*. Like Volume I, the contents of the collection are motets for mostly eight voices, many for double choir. Also like the first volume, Latin-texted pieces are in the majority; only twelve of the 150 motets have German texts. Whereas preference was given to German composers in the first volume, however, here the Italians predominate. This radical shift in focus may be partially attributed to Caspar Vincentius’s involvement with the *Florilegium* project. This is not to say that Bodenschatz would not have been influenced by the *Promptuarium* even if he had not collaborated with Vincentius; it is unthinkable that a musician and publisher of such stature would not have had intimate knowledge of such a significant collection. Nonetheless, it should be remembered that Vincentius published the fourth volume of the *Promptuarium Musicum* in 1617 and edited the *basis generalis* for the *Florilegium Portense* I in 1618. This means that he almost certainly would have been working on both projects simultaneously, and it is likely that both editors would have had access to all the music in both collections. Indeed, we do find some overlap between the
Promptuarium Musicum IV and the Florilegium Portense I; eight of the 33 motets added to the 1618 Florilegium (nos. 88, 89, 93, 94, 95, 102, 103) which had originally been published in the 1603 Florilegium selectissimarum cantionum were included by Vincentius in the Promptuarium Musicum IV. The overlap in repertoire between the Promptuarium series and Volume II of the Florilegium is even more significant.\textsuperscript{35}

Even though we find works of established masters from the end of the 16\textsuperscript{th} century such as Agostino Agazzari, Giovanni Croce, Giovanni Gabrieli, Luca Marenzio, Philippe de Monte, Pallavicino, Annibale Stabile, Orazio Vecchi, and Lodovico Viadana, the bulk of the collection is devoted to Italian composers of the younger generation: Balbi (4 pieces), Belli (2 pieces), Bertolosiis (3 pieces), Bianciardi (2 pieces), Borsari (2 pieces), Capilupi (2 pieces), Gabussi (2 pieces), Leoni (5 pieces), Os culati (2 pieces), Pacelli (3 pieces), Parma (3 pieces), Savetta (4 pieces), Stefanini (3 pieces), Valcampioni (4 pieces), and Zucchini (2 pieces), among others. The few Germans included are largely the same as in the first volume: Demantius, Erbach, Franck, Hartmann, Hassler, Hieronymus Praetorius, Steucke, Vulpius, Walliser, Weissersee, and Zangius. Volume II includes single works by Buel, Aichinger, and the Flemish composer Luyton, three composers who were not included in the first volume. In addition, there are the two motets by Calvisius, one by Bodenschatz, and four by Vincentius that have already been discussed. The register of composers in Volume II of the Florilegium bears a much closer resemblance to an index of the Promptuarium (especially Volume I) than it does to

\textsuperscript{35} The full tables of contents for the Florilegium selectissimarum cantionum, FP I, FP II, and all four volumes of the Promptuarium musicum are given in Åke Davidsson’s Catalogue Critique et Descriptif des Imprimés de Musique des XVI et XVII Siècles. (Uppsula, 1952).
that of the *Florilegium selectissimarum cantionum*. The adoption of the *Promptuarium Musicum* as a model applies not only to the selection of content of the *Florilegium* Volume II, but also to its organization and intended use. The title page no longer evokes the devotional practice of the Pforta school, but specifies an openly liturgical intent (“Qui partim diebus Dominicus in communi partim vero in specie festis solemnibus, per totius anni curriculum inserviunt”). Volume I contains a liturgical index, and the motets are loosely ordered in the collection by liturgical use. In the second volume, this organization is much stricter, to the point where the motets appear in order of liturgical function with headings. The title page also touts the inclusion of a *basis generalis* part and the possibility of *instrumenta accommodata*, a prime feature of the *Promptuarium Musicum* and a considerable selling point for any collection of this era.

An important step in scholarship in the *Florilegium* took place in 1980 when Werner Braun established that thirteen of the anonymous motets in Volume II were actually from a 1601 collection of eight-voiced Latin motets by Adam Gumpelzhaimer.\(^{36}\) The full details of Braun’s findings will be discussed when one of these motets is analyzed in Chapter 6, but the discovery has some significant implications for our understanding of the collection as a whole. First of all, it should be noted that Volume II was printed with a comparatively high percentage of anonymous motets: 18 out of 150, or twelve per cent of the entire collection, were listed as anonymous or unknown. Needless to say, the discovery that only five of those motets are anonymous and thirteen of them are *by the same composer* dramatically changes our understanding of the form of

the collection. Aside from Bodenschatz’s friend Martin Roth, no other composer was given anywhere near this kind of preference in Volume II. Second, the discovery gives us insight into Bodenschatz’s editorial priorities for the second volume; specifically, it shows that he possessed a level of musical discrimination. Knowing a composer sets up an expectation; not knowing a composer forces one to deal with the music alone. In preparing his collection, Bodenschatz was looking for pieces of a specific type, namely modern sounding pieces in the Italian style with vertically conceived harmonies that lend themselves to performance with continuo, and he was willing to include pieces that fit that description even if the composer was not known. Third, this is yet another indication of the complete amalgamation of German and Italian styles in this genre. Considering the parameters of the rest of the collection, it is highly unlikely that Bodenschatz would have included these motets had he known their authorship; he almost certainly assumed that the anonymous source from which he took them was an anthology of motets by various Italian authors.37

There is one curious aspect of the *Florilegium Portense* II: if one discounts the thirteen Gumpelzhaimer motets that Bodenschatz thought to be anonymous, Martin Roth is by far the most represented composer of the collection. This is incongruous on several levels: first, Volume II is much less focused on music from Schulpforta itself and more on music of Italy. Second, even the most favored composers in the collection are given no more than four or five pieces while Roth is given fifteen, amounting to ten per cent of the whole. The details of Roth’s role at Schulpforta and his relationship to Bodenschatz help to explain this seeming imbalance. We already know that Roth and Bodenschatz
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37 Braun, 134.
were acquainted with each other, and were probably friends. Even from what little we
know about Roth’s life, it seems that his role at Schulpforta must have been an important
one. He was apparently talented and respected as a teacher, and like Bodenschatz, he was
also ordained. After serving as cantor at Schulpforta for two years, he was elected to the
post of vice-director of the school succeeding Kromayer, who wrote one of the prefaces
to Volume I. He died in 1610, barely thirty years old; even in an age when death was so
much more a part of the fabric of everyday life than now, the loss of such a young and
promising personality must have left an impression. Riemer argues vigorously that
Bodenschatz was “not just honoring a deceased friend” but that Roth’s “work justifies
this remarkable preference.”38 It is true that Roth’s works display solidity of craft and
modernity of style. Furthermore, the inclusion of Roth’s pieces as well as his and
Calvisius’s was a way for Bodenschatz to reinforce the connection to Schulpforta implied
by the title, a connection that was made more tenuous by the Italian focus of the
collection. Still, the inclusion of so many of his works is out of proportion to the design
of the collection as a whole and must have been a conscious decision on the part of the
editor. Indeed, Roth is given editorial priority on several levels. His setting of Allein zu
dir Herr Jesu Christ is the first motet in the collection. Because of its use as an advent
text, it appears first in the liturgical index; because of its incipit, it appears first in the
alphabetical index. Therefore, Roth’s name appears more than any other composer, first
in both tables of contents, and first in the music itself. It is beyond doubt that honoring
the life and work of Martin Roth was one of Bodenschatz’s editorial priorities in the

38 Riemer (1928), 66.
preparation of Volume II. It is well that Bodenschatz set such a priority, since the only works of Roth’s that have come down to us are those that Bodenschatz included here.

The 1621 *Florilegium* is so different in form and focus from the earlier volume that it has been suggested that Bodenschatz was not its principal editor.\(^{39}\) There seems to be little evidence for this assertion; on the contrary, the form of the 1621 collection seems to be quite in keeping with Bodenschatz’s previous editorial activity. He was above all a man of his time with a keen sense of what was practical and popular. We have seen that it was Bodenschatz’s established procedure to pattern his works on pre-existing models; in this instance, the model is Schadaeus instead of Calvisius. The inclusion of such a disproportionate number of motets by Roth in such an otherwise Italianate collection also seems to be incontrovertible evidence in support of Bodenschatz as editor, since the personal connection between the two seems to be the only explanation for their inclusion to such a degree. So while Volume I was an update of the *Florilegium selectissimarum cantionum*, Volume II was patterned on a different model; its dual purpose seems to have been to explore a slightly different segment of repertoire, and also to memorialize his friend Roth.

Neither the *Florilegium selectissimarum cantionum*, nor the *Florilegium Portense* I or II seem to have made it a priority to offer music that was new or unknown. This is in contrast to the stated purpose of the *Promptuarium*. Indeed, nearly all of the works in the three *Florilegia* were taken from pre-existing editions; the goal of the collection was not to bring unknown pieces to light, but to collect useful motets into a single source. According to a concordance of several bibliographical indexes of the three *Florilegia*, as

\(^{39}\) Braun, 134-135.
few as 29 out of the 272 motets in the three volumes were appearing in print for the first time. Of those works, 27 are by Calvisius, Roth, and Bodenschatz himself — those most directly connected with the Pforta Gymnasium.

One final note about the size and structure of the *Florilegium* gives us insight into Bodenschatz’s piety. The fact that Volume II has 150 motets, the same as the number of Psalms contained in the Old Testament of the Bible, may not be coincidental. There is an obvious parallel in form and function between the two: the Psalms were understood to be Israel’s hymn book, with songs of praise, penitence, instruction, lament, and celebration. Likewise, the *Florilegium*, especially the second volume with its liturgical organization, was offered as a comprehensive and versatile resource for church and school use. There is a further parallel between the structure of the Psalms and of Volume II that has to do with the placement of the first and last items in each. Psalm 1 begins, “Happy are those who do not follow the advice of the wicked, or take the path that sinners tread, or sit in the seat of scoffers; but their delight is in the law of the LORD, and on his law they meditate day and night.”40 The first motet in the *Florilegium Portense* II is Roth’s *Allein zu dir, Herr Jesu Christ*, an ascription of praise to Christ and a prayer for Christ’s guidance and protection. While the texts are not absolutely analogous, both can be understood as an invocation as well as a statement of purpose for the collections they introduce. The parallel between the last motet and the last psalm is exact: FP II, 150 is Giovanni Croce’s *Laudate Dominum*, a setting of Psalm 150. A one-to-one relationship between all or any of the psalms with the motets in Volume II does not exist, but it seems that in the number, variety, and comprehensive subject matter of the motets and
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40 Psalm 1:1.
especially by the selection of the first and last motets, Bodenschatz—both as pastor and editor—is evoking the character and function of the book of Psalms.

MUSICAL AND STYLISTIC ASPECTS OF THE COLLECTION

All of the music in the *Florilegium Portense* was composed between 1560 and 1620. The contents of the *Florilegium*, especially when the two volumes are taken together as a whole, show a wonderful overlap of what we would understand to be late Renaissance and early Baroque styles. Because the overwhelming majority of the motets are for eight voices, the collection has a very large preponderance of double choir writing. All of the music is quite accessible, both in the sense that the printed edition of the original is easy to read and that the music itself is vocally straightforward. There are, however, two aspects of the 16th- and 17th-century performance practice that are foreign to our modern musical practice, and require some explanation: the inclusion of a *basis generalis* and the notation of some motets in the *chiavetti*.

The inclusion of a separate figured bass part illustrates one of the most interesting aspects of the collection. The first two decades of the 17th century saw an enormous increase in the publication of printed collections of sacred music, and especially of Latin-texted polyphonic motets. Not only were new motets being composed, but also there was a great deal of interest in collecting and publishing motets of previous generations. It was assumed, however, that this music would be performed in the then newly-emerging concerted style with continuo, regardless of the age or style of any individual piece. As
previously noted, the inclusion of a continuo part with a motet collection would have been unknown in the previous century, but by 1610-1620 it was becoming the norm. In fact, many earlier motet collections had a continuo part added—sometimes years after they were first published—either by the original editor or someone else. This application of continuo practice to older music was so pervasive that by 1648 Schütz famously wrote in the preface to his *Geistliche Chormusik* that some younger composers were no longer trained in the “strict contrapuntal style without basso continuo” and that they should “bite open the hard nut” of good counterpoint.\(^{41}\) Even so, Schütz goes on to write:

> Finally, if some of our organists should like to play portions of my work presented here and intentionally written without basso continuo accompaniment, and should not mind scoring them or transferring them to tablature, I hope that the trouble thus spent thereon will not only give them no regret but that this music will yet truly convey its intended effect.\(^{42}\)

This is another illustration of the Italian influence and the dissolution of stylistic boundaries: not only was music being composed in a mixture of old and new styles, but it was being performed that way.

The organ bass that was published with the *Florilegium* is not an independent continuo part in the Baroque sense, but a *basso seguente*, a written-out part of the lowest-sounding voice with figures to indicate the harmonies. An exception is Lasso’s *Tristis est anima mea* (FP I, 60), which does have—and did have originally—an independent continuo part.\(^{43}\) The figured bass for the Florilegium was likely prepared by Caspar Vincentius. The evidence for this assertion is that the style, figuring, clefing, and format of the organ bass part matches that of previous projects which we know to be the work of

---

\(^{41}\) Buelow, 29.
\(^{42}\) Ibid., 30.
\(^{43}\) Eichorn, 65.
Vincentius.\textsuperscript{44} Vincentius’s output in this regard had been considerable; we already know that he edited the organ bass that was included with the entire \textit{Promptuarium Musicum} series. He also prepared an “extensive and competent” figured bass for Lasso’s \textit{Magnus opus musicum}, which was published in 1604 after the composer’s death.\textsuperscript{45} More than most continuo parts, the \textit{basis generalis} in the \textit{Florilegium Portense} is very carefully notated. Not only is it well-figured, but it is also fully texted. In addition, the clefs change according to which part has the lowest sounding voice. The continuo part is also barred. As in some organ tablature, the barring does not occur at regular intervals; in many cases, the placement of the bars corresponds to major cadences or other structural events in the music. Because it gives so much information, the \textit{basis generalis} functions somewhat like a score; the organist sees the harmony, the text, and the texture:

\textsuperscript{44} Ibid.
\textsuperscript{45} Ibid.
Example 1.1: Valcampi, *Senex puerum portabat*, mm. 1-8 (original clefs)
In this instance, the cleffing of the *basis generalis* part shows the entrance of the various voices.

In almost every case, the continuo part that appears in the *Florilegium* is not original to the composition. This presents a set of decisions for the modern editor and performer. In some recent published editions of music from the *Florilegium*, the *basso seguente* is not included in the edition because the score itself eliminates the need for a separate part that shows only the lowest sounding voice. Indeed, the importance of this part to the successful performance of the motets is marginal. In some cases, the style of the music is such that a *basso seguente*, whether original or not, is perfectly in keeping with the style of the music. This is especially true for many of the polychoral Venetian style works. In pieces written in a more conservative style, however, the inclusion of a *basso seguente* imposes something that is not inherent to the style of the music. In some of the strictly contrapuntal motets (or strictly contrapuntal passages of motets that have a variety of styles) the continuo part can obfuscate the textural clarity of the independent voices. On the other hand, we can be sure that performance of the music with continuo was the practice in the 17th century. We can also be sure that the inclusion of a figured bass was one of the factors that helped the collection remain in use for such a long time.

In the editions offered in this document, the *basis generalis* was included, both because the goal of the score was to show what is in the source and because it was the practice to use continuo at the time that the collection was published. The decision of whether or how to use instrumental accompaniment is left to the performer based on the style of the piece.
Even though an exhaustive summation of the stylistic and performance related aspects of the Florilegium is by no means the purpose of this study, any discussion of this collection must at least touch upon matters of clef combinations, implied transposition, and use of instruments: specifically, the issue of the *chiavetti*. The reasons for the use of the *chiavetti*, the so-called high clefs or transposing clefs, as opposed to the *chiavi naturali*, the usual combination of soprano, alto, tenor and bass clefs, is not entirely understood. The use of *chiavetti* was easily recognizable by the appearance of what we know as the treble clef (a G clef on the second line). Our best scholarship is that these clef combinations had some connection with showing mode. They also have the practical effect of avoiding ledger lines in printed music. We do know that use of the *chiavetti* implied some sort of transposition, usually a downward transposition into the range of the *chiavi naturali*. The practice was so widespread and universally accepted that a continuo part written in the baritone clef (F clef on the third, rather than the fourth line) would have to be marked *sonate come stà* (“play as it stands”) in order to prevent the organist from automatically transposing. The interval of transposition could be as little as a step, as much as a fourth or fifth, or more rarely a third. Many 16th- and 17th-century theorists give guidance on the rules for dealing with this transposition. Perhaps the most relevant instruction with regard to the Florilegium in particular would be Praetorius’s
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46 Discussion of chiavetti in this study will be largely limited to practical considerations of individual motets. For a fuller discussion of transposing clefs in general and in this style of music in particular, see H. Federhofer: ‘Hohe und tiefe Schlüsselung im 16. Jahrhundert’, Festschrift Friedrich Blume, ed. A.A. Abert and U. Pfannkuch (Kassel, 1963), 104–11. See also Barbieri (2001); Riemer (1928), 94-97, and Eichorn, 66.

47 Barbieri, 599.

48 Eichorn, 66.
Syntagma musicum (1619), in which he specifies transposition down by a fourth or fifth depending on the key signature.

The chiavetti issue is a subcategory of the topic of 16th- and 17th-century pitch in general. The distinction between Chorton and Kammerton as well as the various pitch standards in use in different geographical locations makes the question of the exact pitch at which any given piece was performed extremely complicated. That discussion, while fascinating, is not central to an understanding of the music in the Florilegium. It is sufficient to say that a variety of transpositions were used in various circumstances; in the end, the point of the transposition seems to have been to put the singers’ voices in a comfortable range. The use of chiavetti and their implications for modern performance will be specifically addressed in connection with Adam Gumpelzhaimer’s setting of Jubilate Deo (FP II, 36) in Chapter 6.
CHAPTER 2
REVIEW OF LITERATURE

The historical significance of the *Florilegium Portense* has been acknowledged and documented for well over a century. Those who have studied and written about the history of German church music in the early 17th century are aware of its importance. The *Florilegium Portense* is prominently mentioned both in Winterfeld’s *Der evangelische Kirchengesang und sein Verhältniss zur Kunst des Tonsatzes* (Leipzig, 1843-47) as well as in Blume’s *Geschichte der evangelischen Kirchenmusik* (Potsdam, 1931, 1965). Brief articles in sacred music journals and music encyclopedias have appeared from time to time as far back at 1897.  These articles typically profile Bodenschatz’s life, attempt to put the collection in its historical context, and survey the composers represented in the collection. A few of the more in-depth articles attempt to deal with the stylistic and performance practice issues presented by the music in the collection.

To a large degree, the importance of the collection arises from the fact that it remained in widespread use for such a long time; we are able to document its presence in
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49 See Schmidt (1897), Grove (1904), Riemer (1949), Roche (1974), and Beer (1995).
the choir libraries of many important churches and schools into the 18th century. This is possible because cantors, as civil servants accountable to local governments, were generally required to file an inventory of their respective church or school choral libraries from time to time. Many of these records are extant, and some are published. For example, we know the contents of the library at the St. Michael School in Lüneburg at the turn of the 18th century when Bach was a student there.50 We also have a list from St. Mary’s Church in Lübeck, where Tunder and Buxtehude worked. Though cataloged in 1814, all of the music dates from between 1611 and 1674.51 From Leipzig, we have an inventory of the music and instruments at the St. Thomas Church catalogued by Johann Schelle and dated 18 January 1679. This list includes an addendum by Schelle’s successor Johann Kuhnau written twenty years later.52 The Schelle/Kuhnau document is especially valuable because the collection itself is no longer extant.53

Aside from being fascinating for their own sake, these inventories confirm our expectations as to what kind of repertory was used: a repertory of music mostly in Latin—primarily polyphonic mass settings, some Magnificat settings, and a large number of motets and motet collections of the kind described previously. The entire Promptuarii Musicum collection and both volumes of the Florilegium Portense were used in both Lübeck and Leipzig. Even though the Florilegium is not on the Lüneburg inventory, the impressive catalog of over a thousand titles contains many of the same composers from

51 Evidence that the music listed in the inventory was in Lübeck during the period under discussion is circumstantial; see Snyder (1987), 93-94, 493.
52 Schering, Arnold. “Die alte Chorbibliothek der Thomasschule in Leipzig.” Archiv für Musikwissenschaft 1 (1918-1919): 275-88. Inventories of the three church and school choir libraries cited here are, because of their importance, the most readily available.
the period under discussion. These lists tell us that the repertory in the *Florilegium* and some of the other collections of its time was known and used, even when the taste in current musical style had long since changed.

Indeed, one of the primary reasons that the collection is so famous in our time is that it was used by Bach. This connection was first put forward by Arnold Schering, and was documented in his *Johann Sebastian Bachs Leipziger Kirchenmusik: Studien und Wege zu ihrer Erkenntnis* (Leipzig, 1936). In addition to the choir library inventories, Schering points to a receipt for the purchase of a reprinted edition of the *Florilegium* for use in the St. Thomas School in Leipzig in 1729.⁵⁴ Even though Schering draws some erroneous conclusions about the publication history of the *Florilegium* based on this evidence, the finding that this collection was known and used by Bach over a century after its appearance is an indication of its importance.

For all of our awareness of the existence of the *Florilegium*, there has been only one attempt at a comprehensive and in-depth study of its contents. This was a dissertation by Otto Riemer, ‘Erhard Bodenschatz und sein *Florilegium Portense,*’ written in 1927 for the University at Halle, where Riemer’s advisor was none other than Arnold Schering. The title accurately describes the priorities of the document in that Riemer writes as much about Bodenschatz himself as he does about the collection. Riemer attempts to give a picture of Bodenschatz’s life and times; he offers a detailed biographical sketch of Bodenschatz as well as a lengthy discussion of his musical style, with special emphasis on his compositions that do not appear in the *Florilegium*. Riemer then describes the context of church-music compilations from the Reformation era.
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⁵⁴ Schulze, 199.
through the early 17th century, beginning with Josquin. This part of the paper would have been necessary if not ground-breaking in 1927. It is not nearly as relevant now as when it was published, because the story of the 17th century Latin-texted motet in Germany has been well-documented in the meantime.55 The strongest portion of the discussion is where Riemer actually details and comments on the contents of the collection. Not only does Riemer systematically summarize the composers in each volume, but he gives a summary and commentary on the prefatory material. This narrative is rich in context and detail, as Riemer uses civic and school archival records to provide information about the dedicatees, rectors, and other school officials who write and are written about in the collection’s prefaces. Riemer gives special attention to the relationship between Calvisius and Bodenschatz and dedicates a great deal of space to a discussion of the famous dedicatory poem, a German translation of which is given in his text. Again, this discussion is not as careful and objective as one might hope (for example, it not clear that the poem was published in 1603 and not in 1618) but it is still sufficient to acquaint the reader with the problem. The last third of Riemer’s study is devoted to what Riemer terms *Der Stilwelt des Florilegiums*. In this section, Riemer’s purpose is to illustrate the “unique versatility” (einer solchen Vielseitigkeit)56 of the collection, which he does with admirable detail and numerous musical examples. He deals with mixture of styles, pointing out stylistic elements that are retrospective and contrasting them with those that are forward-looking. Toward the end of the paper, Riemer also addresses the performance-related matters of the *basis generalis* and the *chiavetti* as they apply to the

55 See Blume, 127 ff., Wolff (2001), and Roche (1974).
56 Riemer, 68.
collection. While the analytical and stylistic discussion is very strong, the examination of the performance practice issues is not as helpful; a later commentator would dismiss Riemer’s treatment of the *chiavetti* problem in particular as being done in a “somewhat helpless way” (“freilich auf einigermaßen hilflose Weise”). 57 Certainly Riemer’s perspective does not bring the best modern scholarship to the matter, but nevertheless his discussion of the music itself is at a level of detail not available from any other source, even 80 years after it was written. It is clear that Riemer has examined most if not all of the music in the collection—an impressive and tedious task, considering that he is discussing a source for which there is no score. Accordingly, not only is he able to make observations about individual composers and motets, but he is also able to comment on the collection as a whole. The document concludes with an index of the contents of both volumes; it gives the title, composer, and voicing of each piece as well as the source of the text (either scriptural citation or poet), the liturgical function as listed in the *Index specialis continens Cantiones praecipuorum Festorum anni* of the edition itself, and even the musical incipit spelled in note names. The arrangement of the index, however, is not ideal; the works are arranged alphabetically by text incipit in a numbering system that has nothing to do with numbering system in the collection. Still, it gives a great deal of information about the source. For all its inaccuracies and shortcomings, Riemer’s work remains the most thorough and detailed discussion of the *Florilegium Portense*.

A master’s thesis written by Clifford Halter in 1958 is little more than a condensed and simplified version of Reimer’s dissertation in English, to the point of including many of the same musical examples and copying over the index of contents.

57 Eichorn, 66.
unaltered. Even though it offers no new scholarship, it does make the broad outlines of Reimer’s discussion available in English. A comment in the preface, however, offers one intriguing bit of information: Halter, writing in 1958, says that a “professor at the University of Michigan is engaged presently in [the] process” of transcribing the *Florilegium*. The professor’s identity is not revealed, nor does Halter say whether a printed edition was expected. In any event, no printed edition has appeared.

A more recent contribution to *Florilegium* research was a chapter by Holger Eichhorn in a collection of essays entitled *Musik zwischen Leipzig und Dresden* edited by Michael Heinemann and Peter Wollny (Leipzig, 1996). This densely-written essay is not intended to be an introduction to the *Florilegium Portense*. It assumes a great deal of prior knowledge about the music of that era, but it offers useful insight into the context of the *Florilegium* and its relationship to other similar contemporaneous collections. The thrust of the article is to tear away the myth that has become attached to the *Florilegium* and objectively try to re-capture the importance of the collection for its own sake and put it in the context of its own time. Aside from this perspective, two specific aspects of this article are especially valuable. First, Eichhorn clarifies the relationship of Bach to the collection by correcting some of the false assertions made by Schering and repeated by Blume that Bach purchased copies of the collection on multiple occasions and that reprints of the *Florilegium* were occurring as late as 1747. The truth, explained by Eichhorn, is that Bach purchased a copy of the *Florilegium* only one time in 1729, and
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59 Halter, 1.
that it was most likely a surplus of a large print run that had been produced earlier.\textsuperscript{60} The fact that the collection is so famous in our time exclusively because of its connection to Bach is, Eichhorn asserts, a distortion if not an embarrassment (“Peinlichkeit”); the collection should be understood and evaluated on its own terms.\textsuperscript{61} Second, Eichhorn offers a table of contents of the collection at the end of his essay, along with images of the title pages and tables of contents of both volumes. From a research standpoint, this is by far the most valuable portion of the article. This index, unlike the one prepared by Riemer and reproduced by Halter, is extremely well planned and well presented, and it communicates a great deal of information that was not previously available in such a concise and accessible way. For every motet, the table gives text incipit, composer, voicing, and final. In addition, the table gives the clefs in which each part is notated, allowing the reader to see at a glance which clef combination is in use for any given motet, and to easily compare clef combinations among motets. The table also lists the city and year of publication for each of the motets. This edition history is not comprehensive, nor is it completely free of error; but still it represents an enormous amount of bibliographic research and it is extremely helpful in giving a sense of the relative age and geographic origin of the motets. Because it was published after 1980, Eichhorn’s is the only index of the \textit{Florilegium} to list the 13 ‘anonymous’ Gumpelzhaimer motets in Volume II under Gumpelzhaimer’s name.

Bibliographic information on the collection and its contents has also been readily accessible for a long time. Both volumes are cited in Robert Eitner’s \textit{Bibliographie der

\textsuperscript{60} Eichorn, 60.

\textsuperscript{61} Ibid.
*Musik-Sammelwerke des XVI. und XVII. Jahrhunderts* (Berlin, 1877) and a list of the motets in both volumes appears in the 2nd edition of Grove in 1904. The RISM entries are helpful as well, especially if one is trying to locate a copy or a microfilm of the source. Another bibliographic resource that was indispensable to this study was Åke Davidsson’s *Catalogue Critique et Descriptif des Imprimés de Musique des XVIe et XVIIe Siècles* (Uppsvula, 1952). Though not as comprehensive in scope as RISM, the entries in this catalog give much more information about each source than appear in RISM. It gives the entire text of the title page, a summary of what appears on each page in the preface, and the entire contents of the collection arranged by composer. Using this source, one is able to compare the contents of the 1603 and 1618 *Florilegium* volumes, and one can precisely determine the overlap of repertoire between the *Florilegium Portense* and the *Promptuarium Musicum*. It should be noted that both RISM and Davidsson were published before 1980, and therefore they list the 13 Gumpelzhaimer motets in Volume II as being anonymous. The value of these bibliographic references is enormous; between the entries in the Davidsson catalogue and the table in Eichhorn, one can gather a massive amount of information about the source without ever even seeing the music.

As for the music itself, many of the pieces in the *Florilegium Portense* are readily available in modern editions. Certainly the works of the best-known composers (especially from Volume I) like Hassler, Gallus, Lasso, and Gabrieli are widely published and need not be discussed here. More insight into the context of the collection might be gained by examining music by composers from the secondary rank of importance, bringing to light music that has not been edited, performed, studied and discussed. This
raises a crucial issue: given that the *Florilegium Portense* is such an important and well-known collection, why does so much of its music remain unedited? The task of transcribing the printed notation from partbooks, while time-consuming, is relatively straightforward. Certainly many who specialize in this period of music history have taken the trouble: Riemer, Eichhorn, and Halter’s unnamed professor among them. There are, however, some possible reasons why this collection has not reached a wider audience. First of all, much of the musical interest in this period has focused on events in Italy where the rise of opera and innovative techniques of dissonance treatment were giving birth to a new musical style. Even in Germany, the Latin-texted motet which had been a primary genre of 16th century sacred music was giving way to other forms in the new style. By 1619, we already have the large-scale sacred concertos of Schütz’s *Psalmen Davids*, and Schein’s madrigalistic *Fontana d’Israel* appears in 1623. These stylistic trends are apparent in some of the motets in the *Florilegium* but on the whole, the function of the *Florilegium* was to make 16th century music available for 17th century performance practice. Even though assigning teleological relationships to musical styles is almost always problematic, the *Florilegium* should be understood as transitional.

Another reason that no edition has appeared is likely that the vast majority of composers in the *Florilegium* are of secondary fame, if not completely unknown. This situation is self-perpetuating: composers who are unknown because they are not published continue to be unknown and tend to remain unpublished. Still, it is surprising how much music of this period is still unknown. It is to be hoped that this study will be a small step toward bringing this repertoire to light.
For a project of this size and scope, it was deemed appropriate to transcribe one motet of each voicing represented in the *Florilegium*—that is to say, one motet each of five, six, seven, and eight voices. There was also a desire to edit music that had not been previously published, thereby offering something new to musical scholarship. Clearly, the notion of choosing four motets to edit from 265 is necessarily an extremely arbitrary proposition. Nevertheless, the choice was made carefully so that the selected motets and their composers would illustrate something unique and valuable about the collection.

The motets chosen were:

1. Erhard Bodenschatz: *Quam pulchra es*  
   motet for 5 voices (FP I, 59)

2. Curtio Valcampi: *Senex puerum*  
   motet for 6 voices (FP II, 87)

3. Martin Roth: *Lieblich und schön seyn*  
   motet for 7 voices (FP II, 36)

4. Adam Gumpelzhaimer: *Iubilate Deo*  
   motet for 8 voices (FP II, 34)

The criteria for these selections were as follows:

- The choice of three pieces from Volume II and one from Volume I represents the relative size of the two volumes. The first volume is more heavily populated with composers who are better known and published such as Hassler, Lasso, Gabrielli, etc.

- Likewise, the high proportion of works by Gumpelzhaimer and Roth in Volume II made it necessary to select at least one work of each.

- It was necessary to select one work by Bodenschatz himself, so that it would be possible to represent his voice both as editor and also as composer.

- It was important to select some German composers and some Italian, as well as to represent both German- and Latin-texted motets.
• The selection of Valcampi represents a composer who was important in his time (four of his motets are in the *Florilegium Portense* and ten are in the *Promptuarium Musicum*) but is completely unknown today.

• The selection reflects a contrast of textual ideas: the well-known, oft-set general hymn of praise *Iubilate Deo* contrasts with the little-known and very specific narrative text *Senex puerum*.

• Gumpelzhaimer and Valcampi represent works that were popular and widely published; Roth’s and Bodenschatz’s music was more closely tied to a specific location and purpose.

There is no presumption that these four motets are representative of the collection as a whole, nor that any generalities about the collection can be made based on these four alone. Rather, they are meant to contrast with each other and illustrate various aspects of the collection. Nonetheless, it is hoped that these motets will be valued for their respective musical worth and that they will offer a glimpse into the aesthetic of another era.

The publication histories of Bodenschatz and Roth are quite straightforward. Their works are known to us only through collections that Bodenschatz himself published. Although the original sources of all of Bodenschatz’s collections are extant and microfilm copies of those sources are reasonably easy to locate, there have been no modern editions of any of them. The very few individual pieces of Bodenschatz that have been published are minor works, not widely available, and not germane to this discussion. As for Roth, the matter is even simpler: his compositions do not appear in any other source before or after the *Florilegium Portense*, and all we have from him is the sixteen motets Bodenschatz includes there. Even though the motets of Bodenschatz and Roth in the *Florilegium Portense* have been known and studied by those interested
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62 See Bibliography for complete publication histories of all the composers discussed.
enough to seek them out, the assertion that these works have not appeared in print is a relatively safe one.

The music of Curtio Valcampi presents a similarly uncomplicated editorial lineage. The entire extant body of his sacred output was first published in Venice in 1601 in a collection entitled *Sacrarum cantionum* Volume 1, although there does not appear to have been a subsequent volume. The collection contains 23 of Valcampi’s 6-voice Latin motets along with a single motet of one Giovanni Francesco Possidoni. Although this is the original source for the four motets that appear in the second volume of the *Florilegium*, it is almost certainly not the source that Bodenschatz had open on his work table: that source was likely Schadaeus’s *Promptuarii Musici*. In fact, Valcampi is even better represented in *Promptuarium* than in the *Florilegium*, with at least one motet in each of the four volumes. The four motets that are included in the *Florilegium* are from the first three volumes of the *Promptuarium*, which had been in print for nearly a decade in 1621. Aside from Valcampi’s 1601 *Einzeldruck*, no further edition of Valcampi’s sacred works has ever appeared. The fact that a parody mass on one of his *Promptuarium Musicum* motets was written in 1630 suggests that his music was known and valued by his contemporaries.\(^{63}\) We also have knowledge of Valcampi the madrigalist: two of his madrigals for five voices were published in Copenhagen in a 1605 collection entitled *Giardino nuovo bellissimo di vari fiori musicali scieltissimi*, which enjoyed a reprint the following year.\(^{64}\) Even so, Valcampi is a complete unknown today; his name does not even appear in the *New Grove*. The fact that Valcampi is represented

\(^{63}\) Eitner, 297.
\(^{64}\) see RISM 1606\(^5\).
with multiple motets in the two towering *Mottensammlungen* of his era speaks to the perceived worth of his work during his lifetime.

Adam Gumpelzhaimer was by far the best-known and most widely published of the four composers under consideration. The collection that concerns us is his 1601 *Sacrorum Concentuum* (Augsburg, 1601), which contains 28 eight-voice Latin motets; this is the original print source of all the motets that appear in both volumes of the *Florilegium*. A second volume of *Sacrorum Concentuum* containing an additional 25 motets was published in 1614. 65 Three of the motets included in the *Florilegium* have been published: *Benedicta sit sancta Trinitas* (*Sacrorum Concentuum* I, No. 25/FP I, 110) was published in 1887 in volume 28 of *Musica sacra: cantiones XVI, XVII saeculorum*, edited by Franz Commer. 66 Closer to our time, there is a 1942 master’s thesis by Frank Carter Campbell in which two eight-voice Latin motets of Gumpelzhaimer are edited: number 8, *Quare Fremuerunt*; and number 17, *Foedera Conjugi*. 67 The second of these, *Foedera Conjugi*, is one of the *ignoratus* pieces in the *Florilegium* (FP II, 27).

Polyphonic and polychoral Latin-texted motets represent a comparatively small corner of Gumpelzhaimer’s considerable output; much of Gumpelzhaimer’s German music, especially his chorale motets, has appeared in print and is fairly accessible. As for music relevant to this discussion, only the few works mentioned here have been published. A caveat: because the motets were thought to be anonymous from 1621 to 1980, it is entirely possible—even likely—that one or more of them may have been published at
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65 None of the motets in the second volume have any connection here, but five of them (numbers 6, 12, 16, 25, and 27) were edited by Otto Mayr in Denkmaler Tonkunst in Bayern (1909).
some time. The subsequent *Musica Sacra* series, for example, spanned half a century under three different editors, and specialized in this sort of repertoire. Combing a publication like this to check all of the anonymous motets was far beyond the range of what was practical for this project, and even if one could find one of the motets in question, it would still be listed as anonymous. One final note: the Gumpelzhaimer *Jubilate Deo* that appears in a 1992 anthology edited by John Gardner and published by Oxford University Press is not the piece from the *Florilegium*—it is a five-voice canon appearing in Gumpelzhaimer’s *Compendium Musicae* (1616\(^{23}\)).

To assert that these motets have never been published anywhere since 1621 is impossible to prove beyond doubt, especially in the case of Gumpelzhaimer. Nonetheless, the preceding discussion has attempted to document the careful bibliographical effort to verify that the motets are, at the very least, not readily available. It is hoped that these editions will represent a fresh contribution to the repertory.
Having discussed Bodenschatz’s editorial activities at some length, I will now turn to his music. Bodenschatz included two of his own pieces in Volume I of the *Florilegium*: *Audi, Dominum, hymnum* (eight voices, FP I, 7) and *Quam pulchra es* (5 voices, FP I, 59). An additional piece, *Ich danke dir*, (eight voices, FP II, 63) was included in Volume II. Both of the pieces in Volume I had also appeared in the *Florilegium selectissimarum cantionum*, which means that they had been written sometime prior to 1603. It is most likely that they were composed for use at the Pforta Gymnasium while Bodenschatz was actually in office as Cantor there (1600-1603).

In the context of the Florilegium Portense collection, *Quam pulchra es* is unusual for several reasons. First of all, it is music scored for five voices that appears in a collection with an overwhelming majority of eight-voice motets. (See Table 3.1)
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Number of Voices</th>
<th>FP I</th>
<th>FPII</th>
<th>Total</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>10</td>
<td>--</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>8</td>
<td>85</td>
<td>116</td>
<td>201</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>7</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>9</td>
<td>13</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>6</td>
<td>16</td>
<td>20</td>
<td>36</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5</td>
<td>9</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>13</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>--</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Total</strong></td>
<td><strong>115</strong></td>
<td><strong>150</strong></td>
<td><strong>265</strong></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Table 3.1: Motets by voicing in the *Florilegium Portense*

Second, it is unusual because of its style. Unlike many motets in the *Florilegium*, this motet does not make use of the polychoral writing; in fact, the style is firmly rooted in 16th-century polyphonic practice. This particular motet seems to be modeled after the Latin motets of Lasso in that the music takes its shape through a succession of independent text-generated musical statements. These sections are either contrapuntally-executed points of imitation that illustrate the text or homophonic passages with a unified rhythmic profile. A third unique aspect of this motet has to do with the source of its text. Although it is from the Song of Solomon, it is not a setting of a particular chapter and verse, but rather a compilation of various partial verses from throughout the book, all of which are combined into a unified whole:
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Text</th>
<th>Chapter, Verse</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Quam pulchra es amica mea</td>
<td>4:1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Formosa mea</td>
<td>--</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>et macula non est in te</td>
<td>4:7</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>favus distillans labia tua</td>
<td>4:11</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>soror mea sponsa</td>
<td>4:9,10, 12; 5:1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>et facies tua decora</td>
<td>2:14</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Table 3.2: Sources of text in *Quam pulchra es*

It is reasonable to assume that selection of these verses—presumably by Bodenschatz himself—was done with the musical setting in mind. In the finished motet, the music is highly sectional: each portion of the text is set in a different musical character. A variety of textural, rhythmic, harmonic, and contrapuntal devices are applied to each portion of the text to create unique and contrasting musical sections. (See Table 3.3)
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>m.</th>
<th>Text</th>
<th>Characteristics</th>
<th>Harmony</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1</td>
<td>quam pulchra es amica mea</td>
<td>imitative; voices very independent;</td>
<td>d-D</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>static harmony; echo effect;</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td><em>strong cadence</em></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>11</td>
<td>quam pulchra es amica mea</td>
<td>triple time; dance-like;</td>
<td>A-d</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>strictly homophonic</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>25</td>
<td>formosa mea</td>
<td>homophonic; semi-antiphonal; different voicings simulate opposing choirs</td>
<td>d-d</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>37</td>
<td>et macula</td>
<td>imitative short; leaping gesture</td>
<td>d-a</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>40</td>
<td>non est in te</td>
<td>descending thirds; syncopated;</td>
<td>a-D</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td><em>strong cadence</em></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>50</td>
<td>favus distillans labia tua</td>
<td>very homophonic; groups of three; dance rhythms</td>
<td>d-D</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>56</td>
<td>soror mea sponsa</td>
<td>melismatic; lyrical; polyphonic; voices independent;</td>
<td>d-D</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>somewhat like beginning</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>63</td>
<td>et facies tua decora</td>
<td>static; plagal harmonies</td>
<td>d-D</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Table 3.3: Formal design of *Quam pulchra es*

The first portion of the text, *Quam pulchra es amica mea*, is given the most attention. It is the only text to be set in two starkly contrasting musical treatments. The opening is in a very traditional style of pervasive imitation. Each voice enters with a motive of an ascending octave followed by a lyrical and melismatic elaboration of the arrival note; the result is rich texture of well-crafted polyphony. After this point of
imitation is fully developed, there is a strong perfect authentic cadence (m. 10). Next, the same text is set in homophonic texture and in triple meter. The dance-like statement of the text is repeated many times, and also concludes with a strong cadence (m. 25). This practice of inserting a triple-time section into a polyphonic Latin motet is typical of late 16th century practice; one thinks of the “alleluias” in Victoria’s very famous setting of *O magnum mysterium*. Unlike the Victoria, however, in this motet the triple section comes at the beginning of the piece rather than near the end. The effect of this design is to impart special meaning to the beginning of the text. By repeating “How beautiful you are, my beloved” so many times and in two distinct textures, that text is elevated in importance and a foundation is laid for the rest of the text in which the specific aspects of the beloved’s beauty are enumerated. The other effect is to give an immediate contrast of two differing textures, both of which are in a traditional style. At once the listener is aware that this is a sacred piece in a traditional style and that the composer is skilled in the compositional practice of that style.

Several of the text-generated points of imitation in the piece musically illustrate the meaning of the words. In the section *et macula non est in te* (“and there is no spot/blemish in you”), the words *et macula* are set in a short leaping gesture:
Example 3.1: Bodenschatz, *Quam pulchra es*, mm. 37-38 (Discantus)

This point of imitation is taken up by all the voices in very close, often overlapping, rhythmic intervals so that the texture becomes animated:

Example 3.2: Bodenschatz, *Quam pulchra es*, mm. 36-39
This depiction of the ‘spot’ or ‘blemish’ is immediately offset by the musical treatment of the words non est in te. Here, there is a very long unbroken chain of descending fourths in two voices, and static harmonic filler in two other voices. The fifth voice has a similar descending fourth motive, but it is displaced one-half a beat from the other voices:

Example 3.3: Bodenschatz, *Quam pulchra es*, mm. 39-43

---

The note lengths in the edition are half of what they are in the original. For consistency’s sake, this discussion will refer to all note values as they appear in the edition. See Critical Notes following the scores in Part II.
Thus, the musical depiction of the text in this passage is accomplished in three ways. First, the length and sequential nature of the descending fourth motive offsets the short and disjunct setting of *et macula*. Second, the rhythmic displacement of the melody in one voice means that the motive is reiterated on every eighth-note subdivision of the measure, resulting in an unbroken wall of sound through which no “blemish” can penetrate. Third, this entire two-measure gesture is repeated three times between mm. 40- and 45, and the text receives further elaboration in mm. 46-49.

There are two places in the motet where homophony is used as a contrast to contrapuntal development of points of imitation. The first is the homophonic setting *quam pulchra es* at the beginning (mm. 12-24). As we know, this passage represents a conservative compositional device often used in 16th century polyphony. The second widespread use of homophonic texture is somewhat more forward looking:
Example 3.4: Bodenschatz, *Quam pulchra es*, mm. 52-55

The small triple groups embedded within the governing tactus lend a sense of syncopation and dance to the texture; this section harkens forward to the textural and rhythmic profile of the Psalm settings in the *Becker Psalter*. This animated affect is immediately offset by the melismatic setting of *soror mea sponsa*:
Example 3.5: Bodenschatz, *Quam pulchra es*, mm. 55-59

The texture of this section is similar to the texture at the beginning of the motet. A long melismatic gesture is treated polyphonically in all of the voices, creating a lyrical effect. The sense of flow and the consonant harmonies are a musical representation of the grace and elegance of the “sister, my spouse.”

The piece is dramatic, skillfully crafted, and well proportioned. If nothing else, it shows that Bodenschatz has command of a basic repertoire of 16th century compositional techniques. Even though most of the piece is in a very conservative style, certain aspects—specifically the animated homophonic setting of *favus distillans labia tua*—show elements of forward-thinking style.
The motet presents some challenges in terms of tempo and meter. All of the pieces in the *Florilegium* are notated in 16th-century mensural notation, which is not so much a system of meter as of proportional relationships among note values based on a tactus, or beat. The writings of the 16th-century theorist Franchino Gaffurio tell us that the tactus should equal the pulse-rate of “a quietly breathing man,” which is generally suggested as a tempo of somewhere between 60 and 80 beats per minute. The mensural sign at the beginning of *Quam pulchra es* is a cut C, or *alla breve*, which implies that this tactus should be assigned to the whole note.\(^69\) In the first measures, the music looks as if it would accommodate a tempo with a very broad whole note as the main metric unit. This becomes impossible later in the piece, however, where the note values become smaller. Note especially mm. 47-52, where both rhythm and text would become completely unintelligible at such a fast tempo. The problem can be alleviated by assigning the tactus to the half note, making the movement half as fast. This tempo broadens out the opening of the motet and perfectly fits the lively dance-like rhythms near the end of the piece. There is a further complication: a passage in triple time where the mensural symbol is a cut circle and three over two. This implies a sesquialtera relationship in which three semibreves in the new tempo fit into the space of two in the old. In other words, the music is still going *alla breve*, but now the breve has three equal subdivisions instead of two. Because the rhythm in this section moves in half notes, one beat to the bar would give this section precisely the gracious dance-like feeling that the music needs. We have already established, however, that the half note, and not the whole

\(^69\) Again, for clarity’s sake, all the note values will be discussed according to how they appear in the edition, i.e. half of what they are in the source. So a breve in the original equals a whole note in the edition.
note, is the proper tactus for the rest of the piece. This adjustment would likewise cut the
tempo of the triple section in half; that section would then be in a slow three and would
ruin the necessary effect. So if the duple section is at a manageable tempo, the triple
section is too slow; in order to get the triple section to work properly, the duple sections
have to be much too fast. In short, the piece presents us with a combination of note
values, rhythmic gestures, and tempo relationships that are so disparate that there is no
tempo that will make the piece work from beginning to end. Some adjustment has to be
made to facilitate performance. The only reasonable solution is to assign a slow tactus to
the half note at the beginning and to change the sesquialtera relationship from three half
notes in the space of two to three half notes in the space of one.

It is even possible that this tripla relationship rather than sesquialtera is what is
implied by the cut circle combined with the 3/2. Though sesquialtera is generally the
“default” meaning of a 3/2 marking in this period, the practice is by no means uniform
and absolute. The internal evidence presented by the music itself must be the final
arbiter; in this case, the internal evidence is overwhelming. The musical point of the
motet seems to be the contrast of its various text-generated musical ideas. All of these
contrapuntal points of imitation and rhythmic gestures are meant to evoke some character
and illustrate some aspect of the text they bear; some are lyrical, some dancelike, some
severe, others light-hearted. The performer is responsible for finding a tempo that allows
all of them to succeed in serving the music. In this style of music it is necessary that
there be a clearly proportional relationship between sections of duple and triple time.
The adjustment of the *sesquialtera* to *tripla* allows the music to fit together easily and naturally while still respecting these principles of proportion so necessary to the style of the music.
If our biographical knowledge of Bodenschatz is sketchy, then our knowledge of Curtio Valcampi’s life is non-existent. The only detail that has come down to us is that in 1602 he was appointed *chori musicici Magistro* at the church of St. Feliciano in Foligno, a province north of Rome.\(^70\) In that same year a collection of his music called *Sacrarum cantionum*, Volume I, was published in Venice. This *Sacrarum cantionum* contained 24 six-voice Latin motets, 23 of which were by Valcampi and one by Giovanni Francesco Possidoni. This is the only original printed edition of any of his sacred works, and it is the original source for the four of his motets that appear in the *Florilegium*. It has been noted that all four of these motets had previously appeared in the various volumes of the *Promptuarium Musicum*, and this is doubtless the source through which Bodenschatz came to know them.

Even though Valcampi is completely unknown today, we have reason to believe that his music was held in high regard during his lifetime. The fact that four of his pieces

\(^70\) Schmidl, 21.
are included in the *Florilegium* is a sign of a strong editorial preference for his music on the part of Bodenschatz. Aside from Roth, no single composer has any more than five motets in Volume II. Of the 61 composers who appear in the collection, the best represented are Leoni and L. Balbi with five motets each, followed Pallavicino, Vincentius, and Valcampi with four pieces each. Furthermore, Valcampi is even better represented in the *Promptuarium Musicum* than in the *Florilegium Portense*. At least one of his works appears in each of the four volumes, totaling fourteen motets in the entire series. All of these works are also from the six-voice *Sacrarum cantionum* collection, except for one: ‘Decantabat populus’ (PM II, 97) is scored for eight voices, not six, and therefore could not have been one of the 23 *Sacrarum cantionum* motets. This indicates that his music was also being circulated in manuscript form, and even allows for the slim possibility of another printed source that is not extant. It seems that through the wide circulation and enormous popularity of the *Florilegium* and the *Promptuarium*, Valcampi’s motets became well known and often performed. They were at least popular enough for the Naumburg organist Georg Vintz (c. 1580-c. 1635) to compose and publish a parody mass on Valcampi’s ‘Hodie completi sunt’ (PM II, 43; FP II, 113) in 1630. Not only did Valcampi’s sacred music enjoy success outside of Italy, but two of his five-voice madrigals were published in Copenhagen in a collection titled *Giardino nuovo bellissimo di vari fiori musicali scieltissimi, Il libro de Madrigali a 5 voc.* This collection, published in 1605, apparently sold well enough to justify a reprint the

---

71 Vincentius may be so well-represented because he was involved in preparing the edition.
72 Eitner, 279.
following year. In it, Valcampi’s works were included alongside music by such accomplished madrigalists as Monteverdi and Pallavicino.

Another index of the perceived value of Valcampi’s works comes from two centuries after he lived. The noted German conductor and composer Friedrich Schneider (1786-1853) prepared a manuscript collection of 16th- and 17th-century sacred choral repertoire which he copied into score and labeled *48 Motetten alter Meister*.73 There are actually 69 motets, as a second volume contains an additional 21 pieces. This self-styled anthology, apparently for Schneider’s own use, contains four- to eight-voice motets by 44 composers; 54 of the works are from the *Florilegium Portense*. Two of Valcampi’s pieces, *Hodie completi sunt* (FP II, 113) and *Te Deum patrem* (FP II, 121) are among the works selected. No works by any of Bodenschatz, Roth, or Gumpelzhaimer are included. One should not attach too much significance to this manuscript; it is not dated, and we do not know whether it was for study, performance, or some other purpose. It certainly does not prove a continuous performing tradition of this music, or that Valcampi’s music was famous at that time. On the other hand, Schneider was in a position to have chosen the pieces he copied with discrimination. He is believed to have conducted the premiere of Beethoven’s *Emperor* Concerto, and Schneider’s own symphonic works were performed by the Gewandhaus Orchestra in Leipzig during his lifetime.74 Furthermore, he knew choral music: he was organist at the St Thomas Church in Leipzig, and he was *Hofkapellmeister* at Anhalt-Dessau for over thirty years. So if the selection of Valcampi’s motets for inclusion in a manuscript such as this can be taken as an

---

73 A microfilm copy of the manuscript is in the Sibley Music Library, Rochester, New York (Film 827).
74 Gehring, Oakeley/Musgrave, 553.
estimation of their worth, Schneider would have been qualified to make such an estimation. In any event, the fact that Valcampi is represented with multiple motets in the two towering Mottensammlungen of his era speaks to the perceived worth of his work during his lifetime.

The first thing that one encounters in Valcampi’s music is the uniqueness of the texts as compared to the other motets in the Florilegium. Unlike most of the motets in the collection, they are settings of liturgical texts, and not Psalm settings or settings of other Biblical texts. In addition, many motets in the Florilegium are more general in nature with regard to their liturgical purpose. Volume I, especially, is populated with a large number of these more ‘generic’ texts; one finds six settings of Cantate Domino and five settings of Laudate Dominum in that volume alone. Valcampi’s motets do not fall into this category. Puer qui natus est nobis, for example, is appointed for the Feast of St. John the Baptist, and its text is so specific as to render it completely unusable in any other context:

Puer qui natus est nobis  
plusquam Propheta est  
Hic est enim de quo Salvator ait  
inter natos mulierum,  
non surrexit major,  
Joanne Baptista.  
The child who is born to us  
is more than a prophet  
It is he indeed of whom the Savior said:  
“Among those born of women  
no greater has risen  
than John the Baptist.” (Matt. 11:11)

While many motets intended for the celebration of certain days and seasons are included in the Florilegium, this degree of specificity is a bit unusual. It turns out that the texts of all of Valcampi’s motets in the Florilegium (as well as most of those in the Promptuarium) are Magnificat antiphons for Vespers. The Sacrarum cantionum therefore must have a collection of proper settings of music for the Divine Office (both
Vespers antiphons and Matins responsories) for various feast days of the year, something along the lines of what Byrd’s *Gradualia* (1605, 1607) attempted to provide for the Mass. Designating the title as *Libro I* probably meant that Valcampi envisioned a multi-volume cycle of works for the entire liturgical year which, for whatever reason, was never completed. The inclusion of these texts in the *Florilegium* tells us at least two things: first, that music for Vespers, especially the well-documented tradition of singing the Magnificat in Latin, was very much alive in central Germany at the beginning of the 17th century. Second, it tells us that Bodenschatz was trying to produce a collection serviceable not only for teaching and devotion, but also to supply music for the liturgical requirements of both the Mass and the Office. More striking still, Volume II contains two settings each of the Magnificat antiphons *Hodie completi sunt* (second Vespers, Pentecost; FP II, 133 and 114), *Te Deum Patrem* (second Vespers, Trinity Sunday; FP II, 121 and 124), and *Puer qui natus nobis* (second Vespers, Feast of St. John the Baptist; FP II, 125 and 126). This further reinforces the notion of the collection as a comprehensive liturgical resource. It also supports the assertion that the 1621 *Florilegium* was more intentionally modeled after the *Promptuarium* than has previously been thought.

*Senex puerum portabat* (FP II, 87) is a setting of a Magnificat antiphon for first Vespers on the Purification of the Blessed Virgin Mary (February 2). Because the first two lines are also the alleluia verse to the gradual for Mass of the same feast, a setting of that text is found in Byrd’s *Gradualia*. This text has a wonderful narrative element that many motet texts in the *Florilegium* do not have:

---

75 See Blume, Herl.
Senex puerum portabat:  
puer autem senem regebat:  
quem virgo peperit,  
et post partum virgo permansit:  
ipsam quem genuit, adoravit.

The old man carried the child, 
but the child ruled the old man; 
him whom the Virgin brought forth, 
and after childbirth remained a virgin, 
him whom she bore, she adored.

This text, like the John the Baptist text, is very closely tied to the Biblical account of the event it describes. In this case, it is the Purification of the Blessed Virgin Mary (the presentation of the infant Christ at the temple in Jerusalem) as it is recorded in the second chapter of Luke’s gospel. The *senex* referred to in the motet is Simeon, a man described as “righteous and devout, looking forward to the consolation of Israel, and the Holy Spirit rested on him.” The identity of the child as the Messiah of Israel is made known to Simeon through divine revelation, whereupon “he took him in his arms and praised God.” This is the Biblical basis for the poetic *Senex puerum portabat: puer autem senem regebat*. The literal English translation of these two lines captures the paradox that the text conveys, but the Latin is much more graceful. David Fraser’s poetic translation, “An ancient held up an Infant, but the Infant upheld the ancient” is less exact as a word-for-word translation, but it better approximates the elegance and proportion of the original. At this point, the focus of the text shifts from Simeon and Jesus to Mary, and the function of the text shifts from narration to commentary. This shift also occurs in the Biblical account. Simeon addresses Mary specifically, telling her that “a sword will pierce your own soul too.” This change in the focus of the antiphon includes a strong doctrinal element to the text, clearly explaining and reinforcing the doctrine of the virgin birth. The final line of the text, *ipsam quem genuit, adoravit* (him

---

whom she bore, she adored), is contemplative, and reflects Mary’s role in Luke’s account of the nativity as a willing servant of God’s purpose (see Luke 1:38, 2:19).

The text presents three distinct characters both in narrative style and in theological content, and Valcampi’s setting reflects this tri-partite structure. The first section (mm. 1-32) deals with the text Senex puerum portabat: puer autem senem regebat. These two lines of text convey the paradox of the man holding the child at the same time that the child is ruling over the man. Accordingly, equal attention is given to each portion of the text, and both phrases are repeated many times in all of the voices. The style of writing is highly contrapuntal and the text is set in long melsimatic phrases with slowly moving rhythms. There is no cadence between the texts Senex puerum portabat and puer autem senem regebat. Rather, the extended overlap (mm. 16-18) between them is a musical illustration that the two things occurring in the text (potabat and regebat) are happening simultaneously. The restrained character of the music evokes the solemnity of the scene in the temple that the music depicts. This setting nicely establishes the elegance, balance, proportion, and paradox of the Latin text.

This opening section concludes in m. 32 with a very strong cadence on G major; this is a very clear point of transition in both the text and the music. Here the text changes from contemplation to commentary, and this change is reflected in the music in several ways. The text quam virgo peperit is set in a more lively and declamatory style. The text is set in shorter note values, and the melodic contour less restrained than before, giving the music a more animated, almost urgent character. The repetition of the word permansit in mm. 47-52 has an insistent quality that reinforces the meaning of the word. This change in character may be to help reinforce the doctrine that is asserted by this
section of the text. The final section, beginning at m. 52, returns to the lyrical and restrained character of the opening, especially in the setting of the word *adoravit*. This shift also reflects the contemplative nature of the text.

The contrast between first two sections of the piece (mm. 1-32, 32-52) provides balance in the overall structure of the work. The first section is restrained and lyrical, the second is more animated and persistent. The text is set with long notes or melismas in the first section, and the second section is set in a more rhythmic, declamatory style.

Even the head motives of the first points of imitation in each section offset each other with opposing melodic contours:

![Example 4.1: Valcampi: Senex puerum, mm. 1-3 (Cantus), mm. 32-24 (Cantus)](image)

In addition to the balance of surface features in the music, there is an element of contrast and symmetry to the piece on a deep structural level. The conclusion of each of these sections is marked by a very strong cadential arrival by all of the voices. The first of these three arrivals is on G major at m. 32. The cadence at m. 52 is on D major, and the
final G major cadence on m. 77 is further strengthened by two measures of plagal harmonies in mm. 77 and 79. The first section establishes a home “key,” the second section contrasts it, and the final section returns to it. Of course, this style of music predates what we understand as functional tonality, but the analogy of a large-scale tonic to dominant to tonic structure is useful in discussing the contrast and balance inherent in the music.

This motet is composed in the most consistently contrapuntal style of the four pieces under consideration. At first appearance, it looks like a Palestrina-style motet with florid voices and limited use of homophony. Upon closer examination, the piece has one other feature that makes it especially illustrative of its era: the movement in the voices is independent, except for the bass part. Even though the bass is assigned a contrapuntal point of imitation from time to time, it moves for the most part harmonically. It is basically a written-out continuo part that accompanies a polyphonic motet occurring in the other voices. It should be remembered that the basis generalis appearing with this piece in the Florilegium is not original to the composition. Occasionally this added basso seguente actually imposes something on the music that is not inherent to it. In this instance, the constant doubling of the lowest sounding voice would cloud the harmonic and especially the textural function of the written vocal bass line. This aspect of the piece is an example of the “in-between” style of so many pieces in the Florilegium—music that is conceived harmonically but executed contrapuntally.
An alumnus of Schulpforta, Martin Roth (c. 1580-1610) returned to the school to serve as its cantor from 1606 to 1608. It seems certain that Roth and Bodenschatz were acquaintances if not friends, even though they were never at Schulpforta at the same time. Bodenschatz graduated from the school and moved to Leipzig in 1595, the year Roth arrived at Schulpforta as a student. Roth graduated in 1601, only a few months after Bodenschatz’s appointment as Cantor. During Roth’s term as cantor, Bodenschatz was the pastor of the nearby village of Rehausen. While the two men would have met prior to then, this is the most likely period for them to have developed a relationship. Roth’s premature death in 1610 must have been a blow to Bodenschatz. He included one of Roth’s motets in Volume I, and he made the publication of Roth’s music a priority of Volume II, which includes 15 of his motets.

In fact, Roth’s entire extant output is limited to the 16 seven-and eight-voice motets that appear in the *Florilegium Portense*. Because his body of work is so finite his style is easily summarized. In the words of A. Lindsey Kirwan:
[Roth’s] style resembles most closely that of Jacob Handl, particularly in [his] use of choirs of the same pitch and in the resultant unison antiphony which, when applied to very short phrases, becomes almost like an echo. Also common to both composers is a fundamentally diatonic harmony and a syllabic style of contrapuntal writing in which the interest is not so much in the movement of lines as in the juxtaposition of blocks of chords. The harmonic rather than melodic nature of the bass lines is another indication of this tendency towards vertical thinking. An interesting feature of Roth’s eight-part writing is that, although the original division is into identical choirs, he sometimes employs cross-groupings such that high and low vocal groups are contrasted with each other…While he showed little originality in either melody or rhythm, Roth’s attempts at formal organization and his vertical concept of composition are indications of progressive thought.80

This is an apt summary of the style of Roth’s motet for seven voices, Lieblich und schön seyn, which appears as number 36 in Volume II of the Florilegium. The key characteristic of the piece is textural contrast. After a tutti opening, each portion of text is subjected to an extended antiphonal treatment that culminates in a brief concluding statement of the text by all voices in homophonic texture. The scoring for seven voices precludes the possibility of polychoral texture using equal-voiced choirs, so we see the flexible cross-grouping of voices to which Kirwan alludes. Roth uses this device not only for contrast but also for development: in the beginning of each section, the voice groupings are fairly consistent. As shorter segments of text are repeated, the textural groupings become less consistent and the repetitions of the text become closer together, giving the effect of a thickening of texture. This intensification prepares and leads directly to a concluding tutti in which all the voices state the text homophonically. The setting of ein Weib das den Herren fürchtet soll man loben in mm. 5-18 illustrate this procedure:

80 Kirwan, 782.
Example 5.1: Roth, *Lieblich und schön seyn*, mm. 5-18

continued
Similarly, each portion of the text is set with a sort of textural exposition, intensification, and resolution. Throughout the piece we see almost every possible combination of voice grouping, with several versions of high-voice vs. low-voice groupings as well as antiphonal groupings at the same pitch. This sub-species of polychoral procedure is not original to Roth, but it is refreshing nonetheless; the flexibility and ease with which Roth handles the combinations of voices gives a sense of spontaneity and variety to the piece.

Although there are passages where the voices display a degree of independence from one another, this motet is not a highly contrapuntal work. The governing structural
principle is vertical rather than horizontal; in fact, in the passage between measures 5 and 41 almost every note is homophonic and portions of the work have no discernable sense of melody whatsoever. The musical interest is generated by the use of quickly changing blocks of chords, the harmonies of which shift very sharply and sometimes unpredictably. Neither is the fast harmonic rhythm governed by a sense of harmonic progression. In fact, the quickly changing chords and constant shifting between raised and lowered B’s and F’s create a strong sense of harmonic instability. This instability is established in the first eight measures of the piece by a bewildering progression of related but not progression chords:

Example 5.2: Roth, *Lieblich und schön seyn*, mm. 1-8

D A⁴³ D⁷ G C G⁴³ C

continued
Example 5.2 (continued)

This sort of procedure, reflecting modal practice, is used throughout the piece, especially in the first 40 measures. Harmonies of F major, C major, C minor, B-flat major, G major, g minor, D major, and d minor are juxtaposed quickly and seemingly indiscriminately throughout. There are frequent cadences, but they are minimally prepared and quickly abandoned. There are two especially jarring transitions between G major and B-flat major at mm. 17 and 35. Surprisingly, this quick harmonic rhythm is not distracting to the music: quite the opposite. The overall effect is one constant sense of energy and motion. Because the piece derives structural unity through contrast of antiphonal and
tutti treatment of units of text, the constant rhythmic energy and kaleidoscopic effect of 
the surface harmonies add interest and appeal to the work.

The concluding section of this motet is governed by a slightly different set of 
compositional principles than what is described above. First of all, the plan of antiphonal 
treatment followed by a thickening texture leading to a tutti cadence is not as well 
adhered to here as in the preceding sections. After two antiphonal phrases setting the text 
und ihre Werk’ werden sie loben (mm. 32-36), the texture becomes less strictly 
homophonic and the antiphonal procedure is abandoned in favor of a somewhat more 
polyphonic texture in all of the voices. The only other place in the work where we find a 
similarly contrapuntal texture with all of the voices singing is in the first four measures. 
The return to this texture provides symmetry to the piece. Second, a disproportionate 
amount of attention is given to the final portion of text, werden sie loben in den Thoren. 
This text is repeated for nearly twenty measures, and the primary reason of this extended 
repetition is simply a matter of proportion. The phrases in the earlier part of the work 
have been so short and the moments of cadential repose so fleeting that the piece needs a 
long concluding section to give it a sense of arrival and finality. A portion of this 
concluding section has an element of text-painting: in mm. 47-51, there is a strong 
alternation between tonic and dominant in the bass with fanfare rhythms in the upper 
voices. The music has an unmistakably ceremonial character that evokes the notion of 
“singing her praises at the city gates:”
Example 5.3: Roth, *Lieblich und schön seyn*, mm. 47-51

This tonicization of B-flat major in this section is short-lived, however, as a sudden modulatory transition in mm. 51-52 quickly moves the music back to the previous sense of harmonic instability. The final four measures reinforce this feeling by using a plagal cadence instead of a perfect authentic one, and even at that, the voices cadence at different times.

Even though many accidentals are carefully printed in the score, a degree of *musica ficta* on the part of the performer is assumed. Many of these assumptions relate to raised sevenths and picardy thirds in cadential situations; these adjustments are easy for the modern performer to discern and would have been second nature to the singers of the
17th and 18th centuries. There are some other instances in which the constantly shifting and often unpredictable harmonic environment of the piece makes it less obvious which form of a given note is called for. These instances fall into several categories of difficulty. First are notes that are not marked with accidentals but can be sung correctly by listening to the harmonies of the chord that is already sounding to avoid a cross relationship. One example is in the very first measure where a D major chord is struck at the beginning, and the Tenor I has an F on the fourth beat of the measure that needs to be sharped but is not marked. There is a cadence on the downbeat of m. 14 in which the Cantus 2 has the raised third (B-natural) that is two beats long. In the second beat of the same measure, the Cantus 1 has a B-flat that is not marked but needs to be raised to avoid a cross relation. An identical situation with the voices exchanged occurs in m. 25. In all three cases, the figuring of the *basis generalis* confirms that the notes need to be sharped.81 There are several instances in which the method of fitting the tone by listening to the sounding chord will not work, because an adjustment needs to be made to accommodate a chord that is not yet sounding. These situations generally involve a sharped pitch which is repeated and must be lowered to fit into a changing harmony. For example, the F-sharp in the Alto 2 that is the third of a D major chord in m. 5 needs to be lowered in m. 6 to become the fifth of a B-flat major chord. A slightly more complicated situation occurs in m. 27 where a marked F-sharp in the Alto 1 on beat two needs to be lowered on beat four of the same measure to accommodate a B-flat major chord which occurs on the final half beat of the measure:

---

81 Even though the *basso seguente* was likely not figured by Roth himself, the figures are contemporaneous with the music and can be taken with a high degree of authority, especially when they confirm what other evidence already suggests.
Example 5.4: Roth, *Lieblich und schön seyn*, m. 27

Simply put, these examples illustrate challenges presented by the absence of natural signs in the source. These adjustments might be missed at first sight by the singer who is looking only at his or her own part, but the corrections are easily made once the singer knows the harmonic context of the phrase. Being able to see the parts in score makes the solutions obvious. There are, however, two instances in which the correct application of accidentals is not immediately obvious from the source, even when one has access to the score. Both of these involve cadences and the first notes of the phrases that follow them,
in which the notes in question would fit into the chords in both their raised and natural forms. These two problems occur in the Alto 2 in m. 22 and the Tenor 2 in m. 36:

Example 5.5: Roth, *Lieblich und schön seyn*, mm. 20-23
Example 5.6: Roth, *Lieblich und schön seyn*, mm. 33-36

The key to the problem is the principle that the cadence takes place as it is prepared, i.e., almost always with the raised third. The next phrase, which generally begins immediately after the cadence, bears little or no harmonic relationship to the cadence; this is where the shift takes place. This is what generally occurs when the notation is clear, and should be the principle applied to situations where the notation is ambiguous.

If one of the primary characteristics of the *Florilegium Portense* collection is the mixture of styles illustrated by its repertoire, then this motet is representative in that it exhibits a mixture of styles within a single composition. There is a blend of homophonic
and contrapuntal writing and an interesting use of cross groupings of various voices in antiphonal texture. Italian influence is clearly apparent in the polychoral writing, but the syllabic rhythms and quickly-changing harmonies are uniquely German. There are passages in the middle section of the piece that almost sound like Schütz in their text declamation and harmony.

We know that Roth is the composer with the most pieces in the *Florilegium Portense* II, and one will remember that Jacobus Gallus is the best represented composer in Volume I. Despite the obvious differences in focus and content between Volumes I and II, and despite Bodenschatz’s having had personal reasons for including so much of Roth’s music, the fact that Roth’s style is so similar to Gallus’s lends a certain symmetry and consistency of aesthetic to the collection as a whole. An edition of the entire *Florilegium Portense* seems like a large and daunting task; an edition of Roth’s music might be a logical and useful first step.
CHAPTER 6
ADAM GUMPELZHAIMER: JUBILATE DEO
MOTET FOR 8 VOICES (FP II, 34)

Writing about the Italian focus of the *Florilegium Portense* II, Riemer observes that “Jacobs Gallus…is completely ignored; Orlando di Lasso, Dulchius, and Gumpelzhaimer, and even older Italians…must make way for the younger masters.”

The irony of this statement was uncovered in 1980 when Werner Braun was able to determine that 13 of the motets in the collection that were marked “anonymous” or “unknown” were by Adam Gumpelzhaimer. As Riemer notes, one piece by Gumpelzhaimer appears in the first volume, *Benedicta sit sancta Trinitas* (FP I, 110). This piece, as well as the thirteen from Volume II, are all from the same source: a collection called *Sacrorum Concentuum* (Augsburg, 1601), which contained 28 eight-voice Latin motets, all by Gumpelzhaimer. Gumpelzhaimer produced a second volume of *Sacrorum Concentuum* in 1614, with 25 more eight-voiced Latin motets. These two collections, published thirteen years apart, reflect the same shift in practice that was pointed out in the relationship between the *Florilegium selectissimarum cantionum* and

---

82 Riemer, 1927, 60.
the later *Florilegium Portense*: namely, the practice of adding a *basso segente* to “a cappella” choral music in order to facilitate organ accompaniment. Whereas Volume I was published with just the choral parts, Volume II was published with an un-figured bass part supplied by the composer for this purpose, even though the music in both volumes was largely in the same style. All of the Gumpelzhaimer motets in the *Florilegium* are from the *Sacrorum Concentuum* I; this means that the *basis generalis* that appears with them in the *Florilegium* was added by Vincentius and/or Bodenschatz.

The matter of how a motet could be published with the correct composer attribution while thirteen motets from the same collection are then published anonymously only three years later is a question of some interest. It should be pointed out that this era was well before the notions of “copyright” and “intellectual property,” and that music dissemination took place by circulation of manuscript copies as much as, if not more than, the production of printed collections. We see in the example of Schneider’s self-styled “48 Motetten alter Meister” collection that the practice of copying out selected motets from various sources was still alive well into the 19th century. In this process any number of curious situations can occur; parts of whole collections can be separated from each other, music from different collections can end up in the same source, music can be copied with incorrect or anonymous attribution. Hence the source that Bodenschatz actually had open on his copying table can only be imagined. We must surmise that at some point he was working from a manuscript copy of Gumpelzhaimer’s 1601 *Sacrorum Concentuum* (or, less likely, manuscript copies of individual motets from

---

84 A full discussion of this collection (specifically its relevance to the music of Curtio Valcampi) can be found in Chapter 5.
the collection) in order to have included such a large number of motets from the same collection without knowing the author. It is entirely possible that in preparing Volume I Bodenschatz had a correctly attributed manuscript copy of *Benedicta sit sancta Trinitas*, and that some time later he acquired a manuscript copy of other motets from Gumpelzhaimer’s *Sacrorum Concentuum* I with no name or with the title page missing. This would account for the anonymous appearance of those motets in Volume II. Braun hypothesizes that the source Bodenschatz used was a manuscript copy of selected motets from the *Sacrorum Concentuum* I in which the first piece was labeled “Gumpelzhaimer” and the following pieces were not labeled, and that Bodenschatz falsely assumed them to be selected motets by various composers.85 In this era, any of these scenarios is entirely possible. It is certain, however, that the motets were included because Bodenschatz had high regard for the quality of music itself, irrespective of its origin. Furthermore, because of the nature of the repertoire in Volume II it is likely that he thought that the motets were by various composers and that all or most of them were of Italian origin.

Adam Gumpelzhaimer (1559-1625) was cantor at the St. Anna Kirche in Augsburg for nearly half a century.86 He published his compositions prolifically during his lifetime, and more of his works have found their way into print in modern edition than almost any other of the *Florilegium* composers except Lasso, Hassler, Handl, and Gabrieli. During the 17th century he was probably best known for his *Compendium musicae*, a large treatise that was especially valuable for its rich array of musical

---

85 Braun, 133.
As far as we know, Gumpelzhaimer never traveled to Italy, but his Augsburg colleagues Hassler and Aichinger did; the Latin motets in the *Sacrorum Concentuum* collections in particular show that Gumpelzhaimer was certainly skilled in the Italian style. It is therefore not surprising that Gumpelzhaimer would be so well-represented in the second volume of the *Florilegium*, with its focus on the most recent generation of Italian composers. Without knowing the identity of the composer, one could easily mistake the style of these pieces (which had by this time been in print for 20 years) for works by an Italian composer. One might wonder if Gumpelzhaimer, active in Augsburg until his death in 1625, may have acquired a copy of the 1621 *Florilegium Portense* II only to find that a number of the pieces in it were especially familiar.

*Iubilate Deo* (*Sacrorum Concentuum I*, No. 25; *Florilegium Portense II*, No. 34) is a classic example of music in the Venetian polychoral style. The laudatory character of Psalm 100 (*Jubilate Deo omnis terra*) lends itself perfectly to this treatment. The piece is conceived as a double-choir motet, and notated as such in the source; all of the parts are designated either *1.Chori* or *2.Chori*. The two choirs are equal-voiced, as opposed to the contrasting high- and low-voiced choirs or flexible cross groupings found in the music of Roth. The general compositional procedure is to have dialogue between the two choirs of homophonic statements of repeated text, then to combine the two choirs in a cadential passage. This motet does not have a form with regard to melodic/harmonic development, but in terms of textural procedure and dramatic contrast the piece can be clearly divided into three sections:

---

87 Hettrick, 583.
Table 6:1 Formal design of *Iubilate Deo*

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Measures</th>
<th>Section</th>
<th>Characteristics</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1-19</td>
<td>opening section</td>
<td>Antiphonal: Choir I: polyphonic; Choir II, homophonic</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
| 20-70    | middle/main section | Antiphonal: syllabic texture  
          |                                   | Tutti: polyphonic texture        |
| 70-80    | closing section | Tutti: largely homophonic texture        |

The piece, while not quite tonal, is in the major mode and has a strong sense of polarity between implications of tonic and dominant. Strictly speaking, the use of Roman numerals implies a system of functional harmony that does not yet exist in this style of music; nonetheless, Roman numerals are the clearest and most efficient way to show relationships between harmonies in this particular motet and will be used in the following discussion.

The opening section features an extended passage for Choir I alone in which the texture is very polyphonic. There are two symmetrical phrases (mm. 1-7, 8-13) that are generated by Lasso-like points of imitation. This opening is well-crafted but stylistically conservative; evoking the old style of 16th-century counterpoint at the beginning of the piece establishes its function as sacred music. When the second choir takes over at m. 13, it also has two phrases which are shorter and not quite as symmetrical. The first
phrase (mm. 13-17) is in free counterpoint, but the texture and text underlay are more homophonic than before. The second phrase (mm. 17-19), which repeats the text of the first, is strictly homophonic and completely vertically conceived. These 20 measures of exposition establish the sacred function of the piece by use of a contrapuntal style, exposing the format of two opposing equal-voiced choirs, and quickly transporting the listener from conservative motet style to a harmonically conceived polychoral style. The opening gesture also serves as a sort of head motive for the piece.  

Example 6.1: Gumpelzhaimer *Iubilate Deo*, mm. 1-3

88 For reasons that will be explained later in this chapter, the edition is one whole tone lower than the original. Accordingly, all of the musical examples in this chapter will be given in the lower key so as to be consistent with the edition.
This five-note outline of ascending gesture evokes the rhetorical concept of *anabasis*, the lifting up of one’s hands, and is very appropriate for a hymn of praise. Furthermore, the “lifting up” gesture is referred to and developed throughout the piece, especially before cadences:

Example 6.2: Gumpelzhaimer *Jubilate Deo*, mm. 23-24, 41-42
The primary formal aspect of the main middle section (mm. 20-72) is textural contrast, a hallmark of polychoral procedure. This section is constructed of pairs of passages in which the two choirs are opposed antiphonally and then brought together for a cadence. Generally, Choir 1 begins and has a homophonic statement of a brief phrase of text, anywhere between three beats and three measures in length. Choir 2 repeats the same phrase of text in the same rhythm. Sometimes the repeat is an exact echo, sometimes it is a contrasting harmonic structure creating the effect of progression, and sometimes it appears in a sequence. The dialogue between choirs may encompass two or three phrases, after which both choirs come together in a tutti passage. The tuttis always move on to the next section of the text (with the exception of m. 63, where the words “in aeternum” are repeated, rhetorically reinforcing their meaning). The text in the tuttis may be set only once (mm. 30-34, 63-64), a portion of the text may be repeated (mm. 21-25, 39-43), or the entire text may be repeated (mm. 47-54). The lengths of the tuttis are roughly proportional to the lengths of the dialogues that precede them, usually four or five measures (the notable exceptions are mm. 20-21 and mm. 63-64). The tuttis always conclude with a strong and well-prepared cadence, either perfect or half. Very often the beginning of the next antiphonal dialogue elides with the cadence, so that even though there is a strong sense of harmonic arrival, the dramatic energy of the piece is sustained. This sense of contrast and forward motion is reinforced over the long-term structure of the piece by the fact that the cadences of the tutti sections alternate between implications of dominant and tonic. In the middle section of the piece, this pattern of antiphonal-tutti texture followed by a cadence occurs five times (see Table 6.2):
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>m.</th>
<th>Text</th>
<th>Texture</th>
<th>Harmonies</th>
<th>Cadence</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>20</td>
<td>Scitote</td>
<td>Antiphonal</td>
<td>V-I-V</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>21</td>
<td>quoniam Dominus ipse est Deus</td>
<td>Tutti</td>
<td>V</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>26</td>
<td>ipse fecit nos, et non ipsi nos</td>
<td>Antiphonal</td>
<td>I-IV-V-I-V/IV-IV</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>30</td>
<td>populus ejus et oves pascaæ ejus.</td>
<td>Tutti</td>
<td>I</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>35</td>
<td>ltroite portas ejus</td>
<td>Antiphonal</td>
<td>I V/V-V-V-V-V/ii-V/V</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>39</td>
<td>in confessione atria ejus in hymnis</td>
<td>Tutti</td>
<td>V</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>44</td>
<td>confitemini illi</td>
<td>Antiphonal</td>
<td>I-V-IV-I</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>47</td>
<td>Laudate nomen ejus</td>
<td>Tutti</td>
<td>I</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>55</td>
<td>quoniam suavis est Dominus in æternum</td>
<td>Antiphonal</td>
<td>I-vi-bVII-vi-IV-V, V-V/V-V-I-V-V-V-V-V-V-V</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>63</td>
<td>in æternum</td>
<td>Tutti</td>
<td>V</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>64</td>
<td>misericordia ejus et usquae</td>
<td>Antiphonal</td>
<td>V-I-IV-bVII-IV-I-V-V/V, V/V-V/iii-V-V-V-I-V-V-V/ii-V-V</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Table 6.2: Textural variation in mm. 20-70 of *Iubilate Deo*

In addition to the obvious contrast of texture, the antiphonal and tutti sections have harmonic and rhythmic characteristics that are consistently distinct from one another, helping to heighten the sense of contrast. The dialogues are homophonic; the tuttis less strictly so. The rhythms of the antiphonal sections are active and dancelike; likewise, the harmonic rhythm can be very fast. In the tuttis, the rhythms become smoother and the harmonic rhythm becomes slower and simpler; the harmonies in the tuttis are those most closely related to cadential formulas (IV – I – V – I, V - V/V – V, etc.). By contrast, some of the harmonic shifts in the antiphonal sections are quite daring:89

---

89 This quasi-modulatory procedure is typical of Gumpelhaimer’s style; it is the subject of a thesis that discusses this as other motets from the *Sacrorum Concentuum* collections. See Frank Carter Campbell,
Example 6.3: Gumpelzhaimer *Iubilate Deo*, mm. 55-60, 64-68

These brilliant harmonic shifts, in combination with the lively text-generated rhythms found throughout the antiphonal sections, are appropriate to the joyful character of the text.

The tutti that begins at measure 70 has the special function of being the concluding section of the piece, and it therefore has some characteristics that distinguish it from the other tutti sections. Most notably, we find strict homophony that has no melodic interest whatsoever; the music is governed exclusively by text-generated rhythm and vertical harmonies. The note values are much faster than in any other part of the

---

“The Polychoral Motets of Adam Gumpelzhaimer (1559-1625) with Special Emphasis on Modulation.”
piece, and the dotted rhythms on the words *in generationem et generationem* produce a fanfare effect (mm. 70-71). Two measures of fanfare are followed by a semi-polyphonic cadential formula on the words “veritas ejus” (mm. 72-74) that is similar to the cadence passages in the other tutti. The pattern of fanfare followed by cadence is repeated in mm. 74-80 to conclude the piece. This extended tutti that employs both homophonic and polyphonic textures is a dramatic and exciting ending to brilliantly executed piece.

The principles of contrast, progression, and balance are the primary elements that determine the structure of the piece. The main section exhibits the best aspects of the polychoral idiom, using harmonic, rhythmic, and textural contrast to regulate the dramatic flow of the music. Moreover, the extended antiphony at the beginning is balanced by the striking homophonic tutti fanfare at the end. These beginning and ending sections also represent a stylistic progression, beginning with traditional 16th-century counterpoint and ending with the most modern, vertically conceived writing.

This motet is one of about 90 motets in the *Florilegium Portense* that is notated in a clef combination other than the conventional soprano, alto, tenor, and bass clefs. Some of these clef combinations are used to show choirs that are not evenly voiced, i.e., they are scored for a larger proportion of high or low voices. Some clef combinations imply the use of certain instruments in combination with the voices. Most of the non-conventional clef combinations in the *Florilegium* are the *chiavetti*, the so-called high or transposing clefs. All of Gumpelzhaimer’s motets except one (FP II, 148) are in some form of *chiavetti* notation. The clef combination for *Iubilate Deo* is given in Table 6.3:

---

90 See Riemer (1928), 94-97, and Eichorn, 66.
The use of these clefs implied that some sort of downward transposition was expected. This presents the modern performer with a set of choices. These choices are a part of the larger problem encountered in much sacred polyphony of the 16\textsuperscript{th} century, which is independent of the \textit{chiavetti} issue: that is, finding a pitch at which the music is singable by modern choirs without making the alto part too low. With this particular piece the problem is not as acute as in some instances, because the ranges are narrow by modern standards. The alto parts in particular are of a very moderate range. To perform the piece at the notated pitch is workable, but the tessitura is quite high, especially for the sopranos. See Example 6.5:
Example 6.4: Vocal ranges of *Iubilate Deo*, at written pitch

There is a musical advantage to keeping the piece at the notated pitch in that doing so would make the grand fanfare at the end very brilliant indeed. Still, it is not the best or most comfortable solution for the piece as a whole, and it certainly does not approximate a sound that is what the composer may have expected to hear. If one considers what 16th theorists wrote on the matter, and assumes transposition down by a fifth, the result is a completely different piece:

Example 6.5: Vocal ranges of *Iubilate Deo*, transposed down by fifth
At this pitch level the range is comfortable for sopranos but even more comfortable for altos singing the soprano part. The alto part becomes a very comfortable tenor part, and the tenor and bass parts are low in their ranges but easily singable, provided that one has a handful of true basses at one’s disposal. So by transposing the piece down by a fifth, what we really have is a piece for double men’s chorus, or more precisely a piece for a double chorus of men and boys. This is almost certainly how the piece would have been heard in the 17th century.

Another workable, if admittedly “21st century,” solution could be justified by the principle that the use of these clefs was to show mode while minimizing ledger lines, and that the decision of transposition was made according to the comfort of the performers. Transposition downward by a step puts the piece in B-flat and removes the “edge” from the high tessitura in the upper parts. It has the added bonus of being a good key for brass instruments, and their use in this piece would certainly be appropriate both to the performance practice of that era and to the character of the music. Having acquainted the reader with the key and clef combinations of the original, and hoping that the work will find use in conventional SATB choirs, the present edition is offered using this solution.
CHAPTER 7

CONCLUSIONS, SUGGESTIONS FOR FURTHER RESEARCH

Erhard Bodenschatz’s *Florilegium Portense* stands out as one of the best known and longest-used collections of the 17th century. It contains polyphonic and polychoral motets by both German and Italian composers from the period from 1560 to 1620. The repertoire in the first volume is based on the large unpublished body of music assembled by Seth Calvisius during his years as cantor at the Pforta Gymnasium. The second volume focuses largely on Italian composers of the younger generation, and its content and structure is modeled on the contemporaneous *Promptuarium Musicum* collection. The *Florilegium* is best known today because of its association with Bach’s work in Leipzig, but the collection achieved a high level of popularity in the 17th century, presumably because of the utility and beauty of its music.

Bodenschatz achieved great success as an editor, and his musical works show that he was a competent composer. Despite this, the way in which he deliberately and repeatedly patterned his editorial projects so closely after other collections remains enigmatic. What motivated him to publish so prolifically, and why was it that he patterned his work on pre-existing models? The *Florilegium Portense* II was
Bodenschatz’s last project, even though he lived another 15 years after its publication. The Thirty Years’ War all but halted the publication of printed music that had been steadily increasing from 1590 to 1620. It is interesting to wonder what a *Florilegium Portense* III might have looked like, had the course of events been different.

Like much early 17th century German church music, most of the music in the *Florilegium* is still yet to be edited. All of Calvisius’s *Florilegium* motets were published in the 1960’s, and three motets by Vulpius from Volume I appeared in a recent edition of *Musik in der Residenzstadt Weimar*.91 Publication of music by lesser-known composers like these is helpful to our knowledge of the collection and to the era in general. More of these small-scale editorial projects would deepen our understanding; editions of Roth’s and Bodenschatz’s music would be a logical, manageable starting place. Editions of motets from Gumpelzhaimer’s *Sacrorum Concentuum* and Valcampi’s *Sacrarum Cantionem* would also be worthwhile, but there is a certain logic in giving priority to music that appeared in printed collections. The music in a collection reflects not only the editor’s taste, but the editor’s sense of what is current and popular enough to sell. This is all the more true of a collection that was as long-lived as the *Florilegium*.

More important even than the publication of the works in the *Florilegium Portense* is the performance of the music. Learning and singing these motets in our schools and churches not only enriches our understanding of this period, but it fulfills the original devotional and education purpose of the collection, 400 years after it was published.

---

91 See Bibliography, Section II, Modern Editions.
PART II:
SCORES
Erhard Bodenschatz: *Quam pulchra es*
motet for 5 voices (FP I, 59)

Quam pulchra es amica mea
Formosa mea
et macula non est in te
favus distillans labia tua
soror mea sponsa
et facies tua decora

How beautiful are you, my beloved
my beauty,
and there is no spot on you;
your lips are dripping with honey
my sister, my spouse,
and your face is lovely.

Song of Solomon 2:14, 4:1, 7-12, 5:1

Curtio Valcampi: *Senex puerum*
motet for 6 voices (FP II, 87)

Senex puerum portabat:
puer autem senem regebat:
quam virgo peperit,
et post partum virgo permansit:
ipsum quem genuit, adoravit.

The old man carried the child,
but the child ruled the old man;
him whom the Virgin brought forth,
and after childbirth remained a virgin,
him whom she bore, she adored.

Antiphon to the Magnificat at First Vespers,
Purification of the Blessed Virgin Mary (February 2)
Martin Roth: *Lieblich und schön seyn*

motet for 7 voices (FP II, 36)

Lieblich und schön seyn ist nichts
ein Weib das den Herren fürchtet
sol man loben
Sie wird gelobet werden
von den Früchten ihrer Hände
und ihre Werk' werden
sie loben in den Thoren

Charm is deceitful and beauty is vain,
but a woman who fears the Lord
is to be praised.
She will be praised
by the the fruit of her hands
and her works will
praise her at the gates.

Proverbs 31:30-31 (altered)

Adam Gumpelzhaimer: *Iubilate Deo*

motet for 8 voices (FP II, 34)

Iubilate Deo, omnis terra;
Servite Domino in lætitia.
Introite in conspectus ejus
in exultatione.
Scitote quoniam Dominus ipse est Deus;
ipse fecit nos,
et non ipsi nos:
populus ejus,
et oves pascuaæ ejus.
Introite portas ejus in confessione;
atria ejus in hymnis:
confitemini illi.
Laudate nomen ejus,
quoniam suavis est Dominus,
in æternum misericordia ejus,
et usque in generationem
et generationem veritas ejus.

O be joyful in the Lord, all lands;
Serve the Lord with gladness.
Come before his presence
with exaltation.
Know that the Lord, he is God;
it is he that has made us,
and not we ourselves:
we are his people,
and the sheep of his pasture.
Come into his gates with thanksgiving;
and into his courts with a song:
be thankful to him.
Praise his name,
for the Lord is gracious,
and his mercy endures forever,
and from generation
to generation is his truth.

Psalm 100
QUAM PULCHRA ES

Motet for 5 Voices

(Florilegium Portense I, No. 59)

Song of Solomon 2:14, 4:1, 7-12, 5:1

Erhard Bodenschatz
(1576-1636)
Disc. 18

a, quam pul · chra es,

C 2

a, quam pul · chra es,

Alt.

a, quam pul · chra es,

Ten. I

a, quam pul · chra es,

Bas.

18 a,

B. G.
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SENEX PUERUM PORTABAT

Motet for 6 Voices

(Florilegium Portense II, No. 87)

Magnificat Antiphon, First Vespers, Purification of the Blessed Virgin Mary

Curtio Valcampi
LIEBLICH UND SCHÖN SEYN

Motet for 7 Voices

(Florilegium Portense II, No. 36)

Proverbs 31:30-31 (altered)  Martin Roth
(1580-1610)
nichts ein Weib das den Her-ren flüch-tet sol

nichts

ist nichts ein Weib das den Her-ren flüch-tet, sol man

nichts, ein Weib das den Her-ren flüch-tet, sol

nichts,
1. Cant
man loben

2. Cant
sol man loben, ein Weib das den Her-ren fürchtet, sol man

1. Alt
ein Weib, das den Her-ren fürchtet sol man

2. Alt
lo- ben,

1. Ten
man loben,

2. Ten.
ein Weib, das den Her-ren fürchtet, sol man lo-

B
ein Weib, das den Her-ren fürchtet, sol man 45

B. G.
man loben, Sie wird gebührend werden von den Früchten
man loben, sie wird gebührend werden von den Früchten
man loben, man loben, Sie wird gebührend werden, von den Früchten
man loben.
ih-rer Hän-de, sie wird ge-rüh-met wer-den,

ih-rer Hän-de,

ih-rer Hän-de,

ih-rer Hän-de,

sie wird ge-rüh-met wer-den von den Früch-ten ih-rer Hän-

sie wird ge-rüh-met wer-den von den Früch-ten ih-rer Hän-

sie wird ge-rüh-met wer-den von den Früch-ten ih-rer Hän-

Sie wird ge-rüh-met wer-den von den Früch-ten ih-rer Hän-
von den Früchten ihrer Hände
von den Früchten ihrer Hände, von den Früchten ihrer Hände,
von den Früchten ihrer Hände, von den Früchten ihrer Hände,
von den Früchten ihrer Hände.

die, von den Früchten ihrer Hände, die, von den Früchten ihrer Hände, die, von den Früchten ihrer Hände, von den Früchten ihrer Hände,
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von den Früchten
ihrer Hände, von den
de, von den Früchten
ihrer Hände, von den
de, von den Früchten
ihrer Hände, von den
de, von den Früchten
ihrer Hände, von den
Früchten ihr er Hände, und ihre Werk' werden sie
1. Cant
lo - ben, und ihr - e Werk' wer - den sie lo - ben, wer -

2. Cant
lo - ben,
wer - den sie lo - ben

1. Alt
und ih - re Werk' wer - den sie lo - ben, wer -

2. Alt
ben,
wer - den sie

1. Ten.
lo - ben,
wer - den sie

2. Ten.
und ih - re Werk' wer - den sie lo - ben, wer - den sie

B
und ih - re Werk' wer - den sie lo - ben, wer - den sie

B. G.
und ih - re Werk' wer - den sie lo - ben, wer - den sie
1. Cant

den sie loben in den Thoren
werden sie loben in

2. Cant

in den Thoren, werden sie loben in den Thoren, werden

1. Alt

den sie loben in den Thoren, werden

2. Alt

loben in die Thoren, werden sie loben in die Thoren, werden

1. Ten

loben in den Thoren, werden sie loben in die Thoren

2. Ten.

loben in den Thoren, werden sie loben in die Thoren

B

loben in den Thoren, werden sie loben in den Thoren

B. G.

loben in den Thoren, werden sie loben in den Thoren
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1. Cant

2. Cant

1. Alt

2. Alt

1. Ten

2. Ten.

B

B. G.
1. Cant: ren, in den Thoren, in den Thoren
2. Cant: ren, in den Thoren, in
1. Alt: ren, in den Thoren, in den Thoren
2. Alt: ren, in den Thoren, in
1. Ten: ren, in den Thoren, in den Thoren
2. Ten: ren, in den Thoren, in den Thoren
B: ren, in den Thoren, in den Thoren
B. G.: ren, in den Thoren, in den Thoren
den Thoren.

ren, in den Thoren.

den Thoren.

den Thoren.

den Thoren.
IUBILATE DEO

Motet for 8 Voices

(Florilegium Portense II, No. 34)

Psalm 100

Adam Gumpelzhaimer
(1559-1625)
Deo, ommnis termina,
151
Deus, ipsa fecit nos,

us, Deus ipsa fecit nos,

pse est Deus ipsa fecit nos,

us, Deus ipsa fecit nos,
et non ipsi nos populus e ---

et non ipsi nos populus

et non ipsi nos populus e ---

et non ipsi nos Po - pu - lis c - -

et non ipsi nos populus e ---

et non ipsi nos populus e ---

et non ipsi nos populus e ---

et non ipsi nos populus e ---

et non ipsi nos populus e ---

et non ipsi nos, populus e ---

et non ipsi nos, populus e ---

et non ipsi nos, populus ejus,

et non ipsi nos, populus e ---

et non ipsi nos, populus e ---

et non ipsi nos, populus e ---

et non ipsi nos, populus e ---
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C1\n\nA1\n\nT1\n\nB1\n\nC2\n\nA2\n\nT2\n\nB2\n\nB. G."
in generationem et generationem veritas
in generationem et generationem veritas
in generationem et generationem veritas
in generationem et generationem veritas
sque in generationem et generationem veritas
sque in generationem et generationem veritas
sque in generationem et generationem veritas
sque in generationem et generationem veritas
sque in generationem et generationem veritas
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tad e - jus, in ge - ne-ra-tio - nem et ge - ne-ra-tio -

A1 e - jus, in ge - ne-ra-tio - nem et ge - ne-ra-tio -

T1 e - jus, in ge - ne-ra-tio - nem et ge - ne-ra-tio -

B1 e - jus, in ge - ne-ra-tio - nem et ge - ne-ra-tio -

C2 e - jus, in ge - ne-ra-tio - nem et ge - ne-ra-tio -

A2 tas e - jus, in ge - ne-ra-tio - nem et ge - ne-ra-tio -

T2 tas e - jus, in ge - ne-ra-tio - nem et ge - ne-ra-tio -

B2 tas e - jus, in ge - ne-ra-tio - nem et ge - ne-ra-tio -

B. G. tas e - jus, in ge - ne-ra-tio - nem et ge - ne-ra-tio -
CRITICAL REPORT

SOURCES:


**Reproduction:** Microfilm./ [New York : New York Public Library, n.d.]/ 1 microfilm reel : positive ; 35 mm.

GENERAL REMARKS:

1. All note values in the edition are half of what they are in the source.

2. Aside from misprints or inconsistencies, original spellings have been retained.

3. Portions of repeated text indicated in the source by the symbol ‘ij’ are printed in italics.

4. Accidentals printed before a note are original; those printed above a note are editorial.

5. Barring and figures (but not clefs) in the *basis generalis* are as they appear in the source.
Erhard Bodenschatz: *Quam pulchra es*

motet for 5 voices (A, No. 59)

The Cantus II part is labeled Tenor II and is found in the *Sexima Vox* partbook.

m.  **Part:**  **Source:**

2   C2   5th note: dotted semi-minum

39  BG   no barline at end of measure

41  Disc.  3rd note: B-natural (#)

49  C2   4th note: D-sharp

53  Disc.  7th note: fusa (♪)
Curtio Valcampi: *Senex puerum*
motet for 6 voices (B, No. 87)

m.  Part:  Source:

4  BG  F

12  A1  2\(^{nd}\) note: F

14  A1  breve rest instead of long rest

15  BG  semibreve tied to a semibreve instead of breve

16  BG  semibreve tied to a semibreve instead of breve

23  BG  2\(^{nd}\) note is figured 65

24-25  A2  G and F connected by slur

44  BG  1\(^{st}\) note: F-sharp

47  BG  3\(^{rd}\) note: D

51  BG  semibreve tied to a semibreve instead of breve

56  BG  1\(^{st}\) note: A
Martin Roth: *Lieblich und schön seyn*

motet for 7 voices (B, No. 36)

\[ \text{m. Part: Source:} \]

1  A1  breve instead of semibreve
12 B  2\textsuperscript{nd} note: B-flat
14 BG  after 1\textsuperscript{st} note: bass clef omitted
17-18 C1  *gelobet* instead of *gerühmet*
21 C1  “ “
26 BG  beginning of bar: bass clef omitted
28 A2  4\textsuperscript{th} note: D
Adam Gumpelzhaimer: *Iubilate Deo*

motet for 8 voices (B, No. 34)

\[ \text{m. Part: Source:} \]

66 A1 F

76-77 B2 Veritas
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**APPENDIX A:**

CONTENTS OF THE *FLORILEGIUM PORTENSE* I

---

**Comparative Table of Contents of the**

*Florilegium selectissimarum cantionum* (1603)

and the *Florilegium Portesnse* I (1618)

*first column: number in FSC; second column: number in FP I; third column: composer; fourth column: incipit; fifth column: number of voices*

- **Bold** included in both 1603 FSC and 1618 FP I
- **Bold Italic** motets not in FSC added to FP I
- **Italic** motets in FSC removed from FP I
- **§** appearance in collection represents first publication of piece
- **¶** motets from 1603 FSC that were later included in PM
- **‡** motetes from the PM that were later included in the FP I

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>FSC</th>
<th>FP I</th>
<th>Composer</th>
<th>Incipit</th>
<th>Voices</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>18</td>
<td>18</td>
<td>Ammon, B.</td>
<td>Cantate Domino</td>
<td>8</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>28§</td>
<td>28</td>
<td>Bassano, G.</td>
<td>Cibavit nos</td>
<td>8</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>—</td>
<td>Berger, A.</td>
<td><em>lubilate Deo omnis terra</em></td>
<td>8</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>—</td>
<td>98</td>
<td>Berger, A.</td>
<td><em>Cantate Domino</em></td>
<td>8</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>—</td>
<td>99</td>
<td>Berger, A.</td>
<td>Laudate Dominum</td>
<td>8</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>—</td>
<td>100</td>
<td>Berger, A.</td>
<td>Ave gratia plena</td>
<td>6</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>43</td>
<td>Bischoff, M.</td>
<td>Deus misereatur nostri</td>
<td>8</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>7*</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>Bodenschatz, E.</td>
<td>Audi, Dominum, hymnun</td>
<td>8</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>59*</td>
<td>59</td>
<td>Bodenschatz, E.</td>
<td>Quam pulchra es</td>
<td>5</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>69</td>
<td>69</td>
<td>Boschetti, H.</td>
<td>O Viri Galliae</td>
<td>8</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>6*</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>Calvisius, S.</td>
<td>Quaerite primum regnum Dei</td>
<td>8</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>54*</td>
<td>54</td>
<td>Calvisius, S.</td>
<td>Das alte Jahr vergangen ist</td>
<td>8</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>85*</td>
<td>—</td>
<td>Calvisius, S.</td>
<td><em>Pater rerum serium</em></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>86*</td>
<td>—</td>
<td>Calvisius, S.</td>
<td><em>Vom himmel hoch</em></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>87*</td>
<td>—</td>
<td>Calvisius, S.</td>
<td>Freut euch und jubiliert</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>---</td>
<td>---</td>
<td>---</td>
<td>---</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>88*</td>
<td>—</td>
<td>Calvisius, S.</td>
<td>Gloria in excelsis Deo</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>85*</td>
<td>—</td>
<td>Calvisius, S.</td>
<td>Jospeh, lieber Joseph mein</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>34</td>
<td>34</td>
<td>Cantoni, S.</td>
<td>Laudate Dominum</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>—</td>
<td>92</td>
<td>Demantius, Chr.</td>
<td>Herr nu lestu deinen Diener</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>19</td>
<td>19</td>
<td>Dulichius,</td>
<td>Exultate iusti</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>Erbach, Chr.</td>
<td>Deus meus</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>31</td>
<td>31</td>
<td>Erbach, Chr.</td>
<td>Domine Dominus noster</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>45</td>
<td>45</td>
<td>Erbach, Chr.</td>
<td>Domine, quis habitabit</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>68</td>
<td>68</td>
<td>Erbach, Chr.</td>
<td>Angelus Domini</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>76</td>
<td>76</td>
<td>Erbach, Chr.</td>
<td>Te Deum</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>26</td>
<td>—</td>
<td>Erbach, Chr.</td>
<td>Nesciens mater</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>14*</td>
<td>14</td>
<td>Eremita, J.</td>
<td>Deus adiutor fortis</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>17</td>
<td>17</td>
<td>Fabricius, A.</td>
<td>Deus, canticum novum</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>22</td>
<td>22</td>
<td>Fabricius, A.</td>
<td>Exaudiat te Dominus</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>23</td>
<td>23</td>
<td>Fabricius, A.</td>
<td>Sis praesens Deus alme</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>38</td>
<td>38</td>
<td>Fabricius, A.</td>
<td>Non vos relinquam</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>79</td>
<td>79</td>
<td>Fabricius, A.</td>
<td>Gaudent in coelis</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>—</td>
<td>51</td>
<td>Fattorini, G.</td>
<td>Repleatur os meum</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>—</td>
<td>106</td>
<td>Franck, M.</td>
<td>Benedictam Domino</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>Gabrieli, A.</td>
<td>Benedictam Domino</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>15</td>
<td>15</td>
<td>Gabrieli, A.</td>
<td>Exultate iusti</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>53</td>
<td>53</td>
<td>Gabrieli, A.</td>
<td>Quam vidistis pastores</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>41</td>
<td>41</td>
<td>Gabrieli, G.</td>
<td>O Domine Iesu Christe</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>71</td>
<td>71</td>
<td>Gabrieli, G.</td>
<td>Hodie completi sunt</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>—</td>
<td>112</td>
<td>Gabrieli, G.</td>
<td>Hodie Christus natus est</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>10</td>
<td>10</td>
<td>Gallus, J:</td>
<td>Repleatur os meum/Exurge gloria mea</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>13</td>
<td>13</td>
<td>Gallus, J.</td>
<td>Beatus vir</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>24</td>
<td>24</td>
<td>Gallus, J.</td>
<td>Ego sum panis vivus/ Et panis, quem ego dabo</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>27</td>
<td>27</td>
<td>Gallus, J.</td>
<td>Media vita in morte sumus</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>29</td>
<td>29</td>
<td>Gallus, J.</td>
<td>O quam metuendum/Orantibus in loco isto</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>36</td>
<td>36</td>
<td>Gallus, J.</td>
<td>Veniet tempus</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>37</td>
<td>37</td>
<td>Gallus, J.</td>
<td>Audi tellus / Ubi Plato</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>47</td>
<td>47</td>
<td>Gallus, J.</td>
<td>Domine, quando venies</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>49</td>
<td>49</td>
<td>Gallus, J.</td>
<td>Cantate Domino</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>61</td>
<td>61</td>
<td>Gallus, J.</td>
<td>Adoramus te</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
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<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>No.</th>
<th>Composers</th>
<th>Titles / Authors</th>
<th>Authors</th>
<th>Pages</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>62</td>
<td>Gallus, J.</td>
<td>Filiae Ierusalem/Tunc incipient</td>
<td>Gallus, J.</td>
<td>8</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>63§</td>
<td>Gallus, J.</td>
<td>Dominus Jesus / Similiter et calicem</td>
<td>Gallus, J.</td>
<td>6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>64</td>
<td>Gallus, J.</td>
<td>Ecce, quomodo moritur/ In pace</td>
<td>Gallus, J.</td>
<td>4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>65</td>
<td>Gallus, J.</td>
<td>Alleluia in resurrectione tua</td>
<td>Gallus, J.</td>
<td>8</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>70</td>
<td>Gallus, J.</td>
<td>Veni Sancte Spiritus</td>
<td>Gallus, J.</td>
<td>8</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>72</td>
<td>Gallus, J.</td>
<td>Hodie completi sunt</td>
<td>Gallus, J.</td>
<td>8</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>78</td>
<td>Gallus, J.</td>
<td>Iam non dicam</td>
<td>Gallus, J.</td>
<td>6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>82</td>
<td>Gallus, J.</td>
<td>Hierusalem gaude</td>
<td>Gallus, J.</td>
<td>6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>84</td>
<td>Gallus, J.</td>
<td>Veni Domine</td>
<td>Gallus, J.</td>
<td>8</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>—</td>
<td>Ghro, J.</td>
<td>Lobet den Herrn</td>
<td>Ghro, J.</td>
<td>8</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>30</td>
<td>Giovanelli, R.</td>
<td>Iubilate Deo omnis terra</td>
<td>Giovanelli, R.</td>
<td>8</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>—</td>
<td>Gumpelzhaimer</td>
<td>Benedicta sit Sancta Trinitas</td>
<td>Gumpelzhaimer</td>
<td>8</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>—</td>
<td>Hartmann, H.</td>
<td>Ist nicht Ephraim</td>
<td>Hartmann, H.</td>
<td>8</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1</td>
<td>Hassler, H. L.</td>
<td>Pater noster</td>
<td>Hassler, H. L.</td>
<td>8</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>9</td>
<td>Hassler, H.L.</td>
<td>Laude Dominum</td>
<td>Hassler, H.L.</td>
<td>8</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>57</td>
<td>Hassler, H.L.</td>
<td>A Domino factum</td>
<td>Hassler, H.L.</td>
<td>8</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5</td>
<td>Hausmann, V.</td>
<td>Man wird zu Zion sagen</td>
<td>Hausmann, V.</td>
<td>8</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>74</td>
<td>Ingegnieri</td>
<td>Duo Seraphim</td>
<td>Ingegnieri</td>
<td>8</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>50</td>
<td>Lassus, O.</td>
<td>Angelus ad Pastores</td>
<td>Lassus, O.</td>
<td>5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>8</td>
<td>Lassus, O.</td>
<td>Laude puerl</td>
<td>Lassus, O.</td>
<td>7</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>11</td>
<td>Lassus, O.</td>
<td>Confitebor</td>
<td>Lassus, O.</td>
<td>8</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>25</td>
<td>Lassus, O.</td>
<td>Domine, quid multiplicati</td>
<td>Lassus, O.</td>
<td>6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>40</td>
<td>Lassus, O.</td>
<td>In convertendo / Convertere</td>
<td>Lassus, O.</td>
<td>8</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>42</td>
<td>Lassus, O.</td>
<td>Levavi oculos meos</td>
<td>Lassus, O.</td>
<td>8</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>44</td>
<td>Lassus, O.</td>
<td>Confitemini Domino Narrate omnia mirabilia /</td>
<td>Lassus, O.</td>
<td>5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>46</td>
<td>Lassus, O.</td>
<td>Deus in adiutorfum meum</td>
<td>Lassus, O.</td>
<td>8</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>80</td>
<td>Lassus, O.</td>
<td>Tristis est anima mea</td>
<td>Lassus, O.</td>
<td>5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>32§</td>
<td>Marenzio, L.</td>
<td>Iubilate Deo omnis terra / Populus eiua</td>
<td>Marenzio, L.</td>
<td>8</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>39</td>
<td>Massaino, T.</td>
<td>Hymnum cantate nobis</td>
<td>Massaino, T.</td>
<td>8</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>88</td>
<td>Massaino, T.</td>
<td>Tulerunt DominumJ Cum ergo flerent.</td>
<td>Massaino, T.</td>
<td>8</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>85</td>
<td>Meiland, J.</td>
<td>Non auferetur sceptrum / Lavabit in vino</td>
<td>Meiland, J.</td>
<td>8</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>—</td>
<td>Merulo, Cl.</td>
<td>Magnum haereditatis</td>
<td>Merulo, Cl.</td>
<td>8</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>—</td>
<td>Moritz v. Hessen</td>
<td>Hosianna Filio David</td>
<td>Moritz v. Hessen</td>
<td>8</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Neander, A.</td>
<td>Adesto Vnus Deus</td>
<td>8</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>---</td>
<td>---</td>
<td>------------</td>
<td>------------------</td>
<td>---</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>33</td>
<td>33</td>
<td>Orologio, A.</td>
<td>Cantate Domino</td>
<td>8</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>26</td>
<td>Pevernage, A.</td>
<td><em>Cor mundum crea in me</em></td>
<td>6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>80</td>
<td>80</td>
<td>Pltinot, Dom.</td>
<td>lam non dicam</td>
<td>8</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>67</td>
<td>67</td>
<td>Praetorius, H.</td>
<td>Tulerunt Dominum / Cum ergo flerent</td>
<td>8</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>52</td>
<td>52</td>
<td>Praetorius, H.</td>
<td>Angelus ad pastores / Parvulus filius</td>
<td>8</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>55</td>
<td>55</td>
<td>Praetorius, H.</td>
<td>Surge, illuminare</td>
<td>8</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>58</td>
<td>58</td>
<td>Praetorius, H.</td>
<td>Surge propera amica mea / Surge propera speciosa mea</td>
<td>8</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>75</td>
<td>75</td>
<td>Praetorius, H.</td>
<td>Te Deum patrem</td>
<td>8</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>77</td>
<td>77</td>
<td>Praetorius, H.</td>
<td>Factum est silentium / Millia millium</td>
<td>8</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>85</td>
<td>Praetorius, H.</td>
<td>Gloria tibi Domine</td>
<td>7</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>98</td>
<td>Praetorius, H.</td>
<td>Cantate Domino</td>
<td>8</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>97</td>
<td>Praetorius, H.</td>
<td>Venite exultemus Domino</td>
<td>8</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>105</td>
<td>Praetorius, H.</td>
<td>Benedicam Dominum</td>
<td>6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>91</td>
<td>Praetorius, M.</td>
<td>Das alte Jahr vergangen ist</td>
<td>8</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>88*</td>
<td>Roth, M.</td>
<td>Non auferetur sceptrum</td>
<td>7</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>104*</td>
<td>Steucke, H.</td>
<td>Omnes gentes plaudite</td>
<td>8</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>35</td>
<td>35</td>
<td>Venturi, St.</td>
<td>Laudate Dominum</td>
<td>8</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>111‡</td>
<td>Viadana, L</td>
<td>Hodie nobis coelorum</td>
<td>8</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>95‡</td>
<td>Vincentius, C.</td>
<td>Apparuerunt Apostolis</td>
<td>8</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>101</td>
<td>Vulpius, M.</td>
<td>Super flumina Babylonis</td>
<td>8</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>114</td>
<td>Vulpius, M.</td>
<td><em>Corde natus ex parentis / Ecce, quem vates</em></td>
<td>8</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>115</td>
<td>Vulpius, M.</td>
<td>Deus, spes nostra/ Venite et videte</td>
<td>8</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>102‡</td>
<td>Walliser, Chr.</td>
<td>Domine Jesu Christe</td>
<td>8</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>89‡</td>
<td>Walliser, Chr.</td>
<td>Cum natus esset Jesus</td>
<td>8</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>103‡</td>
<td>Walliser, Chr.</td>
<td>Gaudent in coelis</td>
<td>8</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>48</td>
<td>48</td>
<td>Weissensee, Fr.</td>
<td>Jubilate Deo</td>
<td>8</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>81§</td>
<td>81</td>
<td>Zalamella, P.</td>
<td>Ingrediente Domino</td>
<td>5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>88‡</td>
<td>Zangius, N.</td>
<td>Hierusalem gaude</td>
<td>8</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>94‡</td>
<td>Zangius, N.</td>
<td><em>Surrexit Christus spes mea</em></td>
<td>8</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>Anonymus</td>
<td>Exultat cor meum</td>
<td>8</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>12</td>
<td>12</td>
<td>Anonymus</td>
<td>Nisi Dominus</td>
<td>8</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>16</td>
<td>16</td>
<td>Anonymus</td>
<td>Laudate Dominum</td>
<td>8</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Page</td>
<td>Line</td>
<td>Composer</td>
<td>Text</td>
<td>Pages</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>------</td>
<td>------</td>
<td>----------</td>
<td>------</td>
<td>-------</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>17</td>
<td>20</td>
<td>Anonymus</td>
<td>Sacerdotes stabant</td>
<td>8</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>51</td>
<td>—</td>
<td>Anonymus</td>
<td>Cor mundum</td>
<td>6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>21</td>
<td>21</td>
<td>Anonymus</td>
<td>Cantate Domino</td>
<td>8</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>56</td>
<td>56</td>
<td>Anonymus</td>
<td>Nunc dimitis</td>
<td>5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>—</td>
<td>90</td>
<td>Anonymus</td>
<td>Hodie Christus natus est</td>
<td>8</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>—</td>
<td>109</td>
<td>Anonymus</td>
<td>Ich hab den Gottlosen</td>
<td>8</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
APPENDIX B:
CONTENTS OF THE FLORILEGIUM PORTENSE II

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Number</th>
<th>Composer</th>
<th>Incipit</th>
<th>Voices</th>
<th>Appearance in PM</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>94</td>
<td>Agazzari, A.</td>
<td>Tristis est anima mea</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>PM 1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>138</td>
<td>Agazzari, A.</td>
<td>Hic est vere Martyr</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>PM 3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>117</td>
<td>Aichinger, G.</td>
<td>Intonuit de coelo Dominus</td>
<td>6</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>123</td>
<td>Anerio, F.</td>
<td>Tibi laus, tibi gloria</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>PM 3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>97</td>
<td>Baglioni, G.</td>
<td>Alleluia. Surrexit Christus</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>PM 2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>143</td>
<td>Bagni, B.</td>
<td>Exultemus Domino</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>PM 2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>88</td>
<td>Balbi, I.</td>
<td>Plaudat nunc organis</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>PM 1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>46</td>
<td>Balbi, L.</td>
<td>Quemadmodum desiderat</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>PM 2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>58</td>
<td>Balbi, L.</td>
<td>Tota pulchra es</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>PM 1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>75</td>
<td>Balbi, L.</td>
<td>Hodie Christus natus est</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>PM 1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>133</td>
<td>Balbi, L.</td>
<td>Factum est praelium</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>PM 2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>68</td>
<td>Belli, Giulio</td>
<td>Cibavit nos Dominus</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>PM 4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>131</td>
<td>Belli, Giulio</td>
<td>Audivi vocem de coelo</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>PM 3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>142</td>
<td>Berti, C.</td>
<td>Isti sunt Triumphatores</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>PM 3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>61</td>
<td>Bertolosiis, V.</td>
<td>Venite ad me omnes</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>PM 3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>124</td>
<td>Bertolusiis, V.</td>
<td>Te Deum Patrem</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>PM 3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>82</td>
<td>Bertolusiis, V.</td>
<td>Osceletur me osculo</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>PM 3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>78</td>
<td>Bianciardi, Fr.</td>
<td>Surgite pastores Alleluia</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>PM 1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>81</td>
<td>Bianciardi, Fr.</td>
<td>Quid concinunt pastores</td>
<td>6</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>92</td>
<td>Bianciardi, Fr.</td>
<td>Ave rex noster</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>PM 1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>63*</td>
<td>Bodenschatz, E.</td>
<td>Ich danke dir</td>
<td>8</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

*appearance in collection represents first publication of piece
<p>| 78 | Borsari, A. | Sit nomen Domini benedictum | 8 PM 1 |
| 84 | Borsari, A. | Ecce tu pulchra es | 8 PM 3 |
| 90 | Buel, Chr. | Expurgate vetus fermentum | 6 PM 2 |
| 99 | Calvisius, S. | Unser Leben wahrhet 70 Jahr | 8 |
| 62 | Calvisius, S. | Zion spricht | 8 |
| 64* | Calvisius, S. | Confitemini Domino | 8 |
| 8 | Capilupi, G. | Domini est terra | 8 |
| 19 | Casali, L. | Cognoverunt discipuli | 8 PM 2 |
| 100 | Catalani, O. | Hodie completi sunt | 8 PM 2 |
| 119* | Croatti, Fr. | Duo Seraphim | 8 PM 4 |
| 111 | Croce, G. | Viri Galilaei | 8 PM 2 |
| 150 | Croce, G. | Laudate Dominum | 8 PM 4 |
| 72 | Demantius, Chr. | Jerusalema gaude | 8 |
| 80 | Demantius, Chr. | Iam plausus iterent | 8 |
| 141 | Demantius, Chr. | Gaudent in coelis | 8 |
| 109 | Dulcini, G. B. | Exivi a Patre | 8 PM 2 |
| 54 | Erbach, Chr. | Sanctificavit Dominus | 8 PM 2 |
| 76 | Erbach, Chr. | Hodie Christus natus est | 8 |
| 30 | Franck, M. | Herr, wenn ich dich nur hab | 8 |
| 49 | Franck, M. | Quem in caelo &amp; in terra | 6 PM 3 |
| 129 | Gabrieli, G. | Tu es Petrus | 8 |
| 66 | Gabrieli, G. | Iubilate Deo | 8 PM 2 |
| 110 | Gabrieli, G. | lam non dicam | 8 PM 4 |
| 149 | Gabrieli, G. | Laudate nomen Domini | 8 |
| 13 | Gabussi, G. C. | Benedictus es Domine | 8 |
| 6 | Gabussi, G. C. | Domine quis habitabit | 7 PM 1 |
| 43 | Gatto, S. | Obscuro vos fratres | 8 |
| 15 | Gumpelzhaimer | Beati omnes | 8 |
| 20 | Gumpelzhaimer | Deus in adiutorium | 8 |
| 21 | Gumpelzhaimer | Domine, quid multiplicati | 8 |
| 22 | Gumpelzhaimer | Ecce nunc benedictice | 8 |
| 23 | Gumpelzhaimer | Ecce quam bonum | 8 |
| 26 | Gumpelzhaimer | Felix, O ter &amp; amplius / Quem timeor Domini | 8 |
| 27 | Gumpelzhaimer | Foedera coniugii | 8 |
| 34 | Gumpelzhaimer | Jubilate Deo | 8 |
| 38 | Gumpelzhaimer | Levavi oculos meos | 8 |
| 40 | Gumpelzhaimer | Moribus in Sanctis | 8 |
| 106 | Gumpelzhaimer | Maria Magdalena | 8 |
| 135 | Gumpelzhaimer | Venit Michael Archangelus | 8 |</p>
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>Name</th>
<th>Title</th>
<th>PMID</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>148</td>
<td>Gumpelzhaimer</td>
<td>Vespere autem Sabbathi</td>
<td>8</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>59</td>
<td>Hartmann, H.</td>
<td>Lobe den Herren</td>
<td>8</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>18</td>
<td>Hassler, H. L.</td>
<td>Deus, Deus meus</td>
<td>6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>53</td>
<td>Hassler, H. L.</td>
<td>Si bona suscepimus</td>
<td>8</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>73</td>
<td>Hassler, H. L.</td>
<td>Alleluia Cantate Domino</td>
<td>8</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>140</td>
<td>Leoni, L.</td>
<td>Audivi vocem Angelorum</td>
<td>8</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>55</td>
<td>Leoni, L.</td>
<td>Tribularer si nesciem / Qui Cananeam</td>
<td>8</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>93</td>
<td>Leoni, L.</td>
<td>O Domine Jesu Christe</td>
<td>8</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>103</td>
<td>Leoni, L.</td>
<td>Angelus Domini</td>
<td>8</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>130</td>
<td>Leoni, L.</td>
<td>Petre amas me</td>
<td>8</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>14</td>
<td>Luyton, Cl.</td>
<td>Domine Jesu Christe</td>
<td>6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>35</td>
<td>Marenzio, L.</td>
<td>Iniquos odio habui</td>
<td>8</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>67</td>
<td>Marenzio, L.</td>
<td>Jubilate Deo</td>
<td>8</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>85</td>
<td>Monte, Ph. de</td>
<td>Stellam quem viderant Magi</td>
<td>7</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>77</td>
<td>Osculati, G.</td>
<td>Quem vidistis pastores-</td>
<td>8</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>120</td>
<td>Osculati, G.</td>
<td>O Altitudo divitiarum</td>
<td>8</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>10</td>
<td>Pacelli, A.</td>
<td>Cantate Domino</td>
<td>8</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>108</td>
<td>Pacelli, A.</td>
<td>Exurgat Deus</td>
<td>8</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>122</td>
<td>Pacelli, A.</td>
<td>Tres sunt, qui testimonium</td>
<td>8</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>15</td>
<td>Pallavicino, B.</td>
<td>Deus misereatur nostri</td>
<td>8</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>69</td>
<td>Pallavicino, B.</td>
<td>In te Domine speravi</td>
<td>8</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>70</td>
<td>Pallavicino, B.</td>
<td>Canite tuba in Sion</td>
<td>8</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>115</td>
<td>Pallavicino, B.</td>
<td>Dum completerunt / Cum ergo essent</td>
<td>8</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>145</td>
<td>Pallavicino, B.</td>
<td>Jubilate Deo</td>
<td>8</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>91</td>
<td>Parma, N.</td>
<td>Angelus Domini</td>
<td>8</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>146</td>
<td>Parma, N.</td>
<td>Exultavit cor meum / Arcus fortium</td>
<td>8</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>48*</td>
<td>Patarto, A.</td>
<td>Quam dilecta tabernacula / Et enim</td>
<td>6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>144</td>
<td>Perini, A.</td>
<td>Laudate Dominum</td>
<td>7</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>45*</td>
<td>Pinelli, G. B.</td>
<td>Pater peccavi</td>
<td>8</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>134</td>
<td>Porta, C.</td>
<td>Factum est silentium</td>
<td>8</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>126</td>
<td>Praetorius, H.</td>
<td>Puer, qui natus est nobis</td>
<td>8</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>128</td>
<td>Praetorius, H.</td>
<td>Fuit Homo missus a Deo</td>
<td>5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>136</td>
<td>Regio, B.</td>
<td>Cantabant Sancti</td>
<td>8</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>17</td>
<td>Riccio, Th.</td>
<td>De profundis clamavi</td>
<td>8</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1*</td>
<td>Roth, M.</td>
<td>Allein zu dir, Herr Jesu Christ</td>
<td>8</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4*</td>
<td>Roth, M.</td>
<td>Benedicat te Deus Israel</td>
<td>8</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>7*</td>
<td>Roth, M.</td>
<td>Congregati sunt in nomine</td>
<td>8</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>11*</td>
<td>Roth, M.</td>
<td>Dominus regnavit</td>
<td>8</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>12*</td>
<td>Roth, M.</td>
<td>Der Herr wird dich segnen</td>
<td>8</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>31*</td>
<td>Roth, M.</td>
<td>Ich hab's gewagt</td>
<td>8</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>32*</td>
<td>Roth, M.</td>
<td>In Domino Deo gaudebimur</td>
<td>8</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>36*</td>
<td>Roth, M.</td>
<td>Lieblich und schon seyn.</td>
<td>7</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>42*</td>
<td>Roth, M.</td>
<td>Non est bonum</td>
<td>8</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>44*</td>
<td>Roth, M.</td>
<td>Populi omnes iubilate</td>
<td>8</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>51*</td>
<td>Roth, M.</td>
<td>Si quis diligat me</td>
<td>8</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>52*</td>
<td>Roth, M.</td>
<td>Surge propera amica mea</td>
<td>8</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>60*</td>
<td>Roth, M.</td>
<td>Veni in hortum meum</td>
<td>8</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>95*</td>
<td>Roth, M.</td>
<td>Ponam inimicitias</td>
<td>8</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>105*</td>
<td>Roth, M.</td>
<td>Singet dem Herren</td>
<td>8</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>56</td>
<td>Savetta, A.</td>
<td>Super flumina Babylonis</td>
<td>8 PM 4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>102</td>
<td>Savetta, A.</td>
<td>Tulerunt Dominum / Cum ergo flerent</td>
<td>8 PM 2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>147</td>
<td>Savetta, A.</td>
<td>Exultate Deo</td>
<td>8 PM 2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>86</td>
<td>Stabile, A.</td>
<td>Nunc dimitis servum tuum</td>
<td>8 PM 1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>137</td>
<td>Stabile, A.</td>
<td>Hi sunt, qui venerunt / Dignus es</td>
<td>8 PM 3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>112</td>
<td>Stefanini, G. B.</td>
<td>In nomine Jesu</td>
<td>8</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>96</td>
<td>Stefanini, G.B.</td>
<td>Christus resurgens</td>
<td>5 PM 2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>89</td>
<td>Stefanini, G. B.</td>
<td>Beata es Virgo Maria</td>
<td>7 PM 1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>104*</td>
<td>Steucke, H.</td>
<td>Alleluia. Laetamini</td>
<td>8</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>132</td>
<td>Tribioli, G.T.</td>
<td>Factum est praelium / Et audivi vocem</td>
<td>6 PM 3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>87</td>
<td>Valcampi, C.</td>
<td>Senex puerum portabat</td>
<td>6 PM 1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>113</td>
<td>Valcampi, C.</td>
<td>Hodie completi sunt</td>
<td>6 PM 2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>121</td>
<td>Valcampi, C.</td>
<td>Te Deum Patrem</td>
<td>6 PM 3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>125</td>
<td>Valcampi, C.</td>
<td>Puer, qui natus est nobis</td>
<td>6 PM 3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>101</td>
<td>Vecchi, Orazio i</td>
<td>Surgite populi</td>
<td>8 PM 2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>98</td>
<td>Vecchi, Orfeo</td>
<td>Quem quares</td>
<td>6 PM 2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>50</td>
<td>Viadana, J. M.</td>
<td>Qui habitat in adiutorio</td>
<td>8</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>57</td>
<td>Viadana, L.</td>
<td>Si acuero, ut fulgur</td>
<td>8</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>59</td>
<td>Vincentius, C.</td>
<td>Veni in hortum meum</td>
<td>6 PM 3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>79</td>
<td>Vincentius, C.</td>
<td>Claritas Domini</td>
<td>8 PM 1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>83</td>
<td>Vincentius, C.</td>
<td>Gloria tibi, Domine</td>
<td>8 PM 1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>127</td>
<td>Vincentius, C.</td>
<td>Et tu Puer Propheta</td>
<td>8 PM 3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>9</td>
<td>Vulpius, M.</td>
<td>Confitebor tibi</td>
<td>7</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>25</td>
<td>Vulpius, M.</td>
<td>Factum est, dum iret Iesus</td>
<td>10</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>29</td>
<td>Vulpius, M.</td>
<td>Homo quidem erat dives / Pater Abraham</td>
<td>6 PM 4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3</td>
<td>Walliser, Chr. Th</td>
<td>An Wasserflissen Babylon</td>
<td>5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>41</td>
<td>Walliser, Chr. Th</td>
<td>Nun lob mein Seel</td>
<td>5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>65</td>
<td>Walliser, Chr. Th</td>
<td>Oremus praecipit</td>
<td>8 PM 4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2</td>
<td>Weissensee, Fr.</td>
<td>Anima mea expectat Dominum</td>
<td>8</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Name</td>
<td>Text</td>
<td>Page</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>---</td>
<td>-----------------------</td>
<td>-----------------------------------------</td>
<td>------</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>33</td>
<td>Weissensee, Fr.</td>
<td>Ich beschwere euch / Sage du mir</td>
<td>8</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>71</td>
<td>Weissensee, Fr.</td>
<td>Hosanna Filio David</td>
<td>8</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>47</td>
<td>Zangius, N.</td>
<td>Quaerite primum</td>
<td>6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>74</td>
<td>Zangius, N.</td>
<td>Angelus ad pastores</td>
<td>6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>116</td>
<td>Zangius, N.</td>
<td>Veni Sancte Spiritus</td>
<td>8</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>24</td>
<td>Zucchini, G.</td>
<td>Exultate Deo</td>
<td>8</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>139</td>
<td>Zucchini, G.</td>
<td>Sanctis Apostolis</td>
<td>7</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>16</td>
<td>Anonymus</td>
<td>Domine quis habitabit</td>
<td>8</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>28</td>
<td>Anonymus</td>
<td>Gemmula Carbunculi</td>
<td>6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>37</td>
<td>Anonymus</td>
<td>Lobe den Herren</td>
<td>8</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>107</td>
<td>Anonymus</td>
<td>Dum Rex gloriae</td>
<td>8</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>118</td>
<td>Anonymus</td>
<td>Invocamus te</td>
<td>8</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
APPENDIX C:

SUMMARY OF TITLE PAGES AND PREFATORY MATERIAL

FLORILEGIUM PORTENSE I, 1618

Fol. (1) r°:

FLORILEGIUM
PORTENSE
continens
CXV
Selectissimas Cantiones 4. 5. 6. 7. 8. Vocum praestantissimorum aetatis nostrae Autorum.

In Illustri Gymnasio Portensi ante & post cibum sumptum nunc temporis usitatas in Nomini Dei gloriam, Ecclesiarum decus, & studiosae Juventutis usum

Collectum & editum
Autore
M. ERHARDO BODENSCHATZ
Lichtenbergense Gymnasij Portensis olim Cantore
Editio altera ab ipso auctior & emendatior reddit

DISCANTUS.
Cum gratia & privilegio Electoris Saxonieae.
LIPSIAE,
Typis & sumtibus Abrahami Lambergi
& Caspari Closemanni,
ANNO M.DC.XVIII

ANAGRAMMA.
Clarißimi & doctorißimi Viri,
M. Justini Bertuchii, Illu-
stris Gymnasij ad Salam Rectoris, in Flori-
legium Bodenschatzi.
(dedicatory poem, in Latin, by Bertuchius)

CELEBRITATE GENE-
RIS PIETATE, VIRTUTIS AC DOCTR-
NAE PRAESTANTIA MULTOQUE RERUM PRÆAE
clarissimarum Usu, Nobilissimo Viro, Domino GODEFRI-
DO à WOLFFERSDORFF, haereditario in Marckersdorff & Dö-
litz, &c, Praefecturae Weissenfelsensis Capitano Spectatissimo: & supre-
mi Syndrii Electoralis, quod Lipsiae est, Assessori dignissimo: nec non
Illustris Gymnasii Portensis Inspectorii Vigilantissimo, Dn. &
Patrono suo, omnibus observantiae Studiis pre-
cipue colendo.
(preface, in Latin, by Bodenschatz, on the Ambrosian proverb, ‘Cibus in Ore:
Psalmus in Corde’)

188
Fol. (2) v°:

*(continuation of dedicatory preface by Bodenschatz. The preface concludes:)*

…Dabantur Osterhuse: die Joannis Baptistae
Anno bati Christi 1617

Tuam Nobilitatem
vera animi reverentia colens,

M. Erhardus Bodenschatz Ecclesiae
Osterhusanae pro tempore Pastor

Fol. (3) r°:

Index generalis Cantionum Flo-
rilegij ad seriem Alphabeti directus.

Fol. (3) v°:

*(conclusion of Index generalis)*

Index specialis continens Cantio-
nes praecipuorum Festorum anni.

Fol. (4) r°:

*(conclusion of Index specialis)*

Fol. (4) v°:

*(dedicatory poem, in Latin, by Kromayer)*

*(dedicatory poem, in Latin, by Müllmann)*

Fol. (5) r°:

*(first page of music: Hassler, ‘Pater noster’)*
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FLORILEGIUM PORTENSE II, 1621

Fol. (1) r°:

FLORILEGII
MUSICI PORTENSIS,
Sacras Harmonias sive Motetas
V. VI. VII. VIII. X. Vocum
E Diversis, ijsqam praestantifìmis aetatis nostrae autoribus
collectus comprehenditis
PARS ALTERA
Quae exhbet concentus selectissimas.
   CL.
Qui parti, diebus Dominicis in communi: partim vero in spe-
cie Festis solennioribus, per totius anni curriculum inserviunt,
cum adjecta Basi Generali ad Organa Musiquam instrument-
ta accommodata

Collectore et Editore
M. Erhardo Bodenschatzio,
Lichtenbergense, Illustris Gymnasii Portensis olim Cant-
tore, nunce Vero temporis Ecclesiae Osterusanae
Pastore.

Septima Vox

Cum Gratia et Privilegio Electoris Saxoniae,
LIPSIAE,
Typis Abrahami Lambergi, & Sumtibus
Gottfridi Grossii Bibliopolae.

ANNO CHRISTI M.DC.XXI

Fol. (1) v°:

AD HUIUS OPERIS AUTOREM.

(dedicator poem, in Latin, by Pandecchi)

Johannes Pandecotheus D. Pastor,
ac Superintendens Sangerhusanus
Anno statis 70. complete
Fol. (2) r°:

Amplißimi, Consultißimis, & Prudentiißimus Viri

Dr. FRIDERICO MEYERO,

Scabinatus Electoralis Lipsae Assesori, & pro tempore, Consuli regenti dignissimo.

Dr. THEODORO MOSTELIO,

J. U. Doctori, supreme Judicij Electoralis Dresdae, quod ab Appellationibis nomen habet, Collegae, itidem Confuli & scabino Electorali meritissimo.

NEC NON
Dominus Aedilibus, & ceteris Ordinis Senatorii Viris honoratissimis, Dominis Patronis & Fautoribus suis plurimum honorandis.

*(dedicatory preface by Bodenschatz)*

Fol. (2) v°:

*(continuation of dedicatory preface by Bodenschatz. The preface concludes:)*

…Dominica Cantate Anno Christi Salvatoris nostri, 1620.

Vestrarum Amplitudinum & Prudentiarum observantissimus.

M. Erhardus Bodenschatz,
Ecclesiae Ecclesiae Osterhusanae Pastor.

Fol. (3) r°:

Index generalis Cantionum huius secundae Florilegii partes, juxta seriem Alphabeti directus.
Fol. (3) v°:

(continuation of Index generalis)

Fol. (4) r°:

(conclusion of Index generalis)

Index specialis continens Cantiones praecipuorum Festorum anni.

Fol. (4) v°:

(conclusion of Index specialis)

Fol. (5) r°:

(first page of music: Roth, ‘Allein zu dir Herr Jesu Christ’
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APPENDIX D:

CALVSIUS’S PREFATORY POEM, 1603

Titan bis decies lumine fulgido
Perlusetavit Olympi roseas domos,
PORTAE cum Cheragus dicerer inclytae,
Diffundit vitreo quam Sala flumine.
Talem constitui iudicio prius
Perpensum, studiis fructiferum modum,
Ut quando dapibus guttura solverent
Vel fames epulis pulsa recederet,
Gaudentes Clarios visere rivulos,
Argutum pueri concinerent melos,
Contextum variis dulcisonis modis,
Et grates aegerent aethereo Patri,
Natu qui moderatur vaga sidera.
Hos cantus etiam reddere publicos
Gaudebam mihi sed restitit invidum
Fatum: non eadem sors mihi prospera
Evenit, tibi iam qualiter obtigit,
Nidos aedificat pennigerum genus,
Ex florentibus herbis & apiculae

Twenty times the sun God with shining rays
crossed the rosy domes
since I was appointed cantor of the famous gate
which shines like the River Saale
Such useful wisdom I introduced
considered in good judgment
and if they opened their throats
to the meal or by food satisfied hunger yielded
gladly looking at the shining stream
the boys a pleasing song together sang,
woven in different sweet-sounding ways
and thanked the heavenly father
who steers the changing stars by its sign.
Publishing these songs pleased me
but the envious fate was against me:
The same luck did not come upon me
like it does for you now,
Winged creatures build nests
from blooming weeds and the honeybee
Exsugit melius, mellaque conficit,
Non ipsis: aliis haec bona serviunt:
Sic & quos studio principio meo
Concentus dederam, tempore postero
Cum spreti ruerent, nec studio pari.
Urgerentur, eos corpus in aureum
Collectos renovis, pluribus additis
Auges, usibus & reddere publiis
Iam gestis, quoniam perplacet hoc opu:
Musarum studiis utile suavisonis.
Qua propter faveo, quod tibi contigit
Nunc fautoribus uti meliusculis,
Qui coeptum studium promoteant tuum,
Ut sic fama domos scansat Olympicas.

Sethus Calvisius, Cantor ad D. Thomae Lipsiae.

Extracts something better, and madeks honey not for itself: these goods will serve others you renew the choirs, through which I had contributed my diligence when they sank, not maintained with eagerness collected into a golden band they increase to a greater number and designate them for public use since this work arouses a great deal of pleasure as necessary for the studies of the sweet Muses therefore I am inclined, because you succeeded in finding better patrons who promote your intentions so that as a result your fame will probably rise up to the heavenly realms.

Seth Calvisius, Cantor of St. Thomas Church, Leipzig
APPENDIX E:

_Quam Pulchra Es_, Edited for Performance

_Song of Solomon 2:14, 4:1, 7-12, 5:1_  
_Erhard Bodenschatz (1576-1636)_

In 4, \( \frac{1}{1} = 76 \)

---

**Discantus**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Staff</th>
<th>Measure</th>
<th>Notes</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1</td>
<td></td>
<td>Quam pul-chra es a-mi-ca me-a quanpul-chra</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**Soprano 2**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Staff</th>
<th>Measure</th>
<th>Notes</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1</td>
<td></td>
<td>Quam pul-chra es a-mi-ca me-a quanpul-chra</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**Altus**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Staff</th>
<th>Measure</th>
<th>Notes</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1</td>
<td></td>
<td>Quam pul-chra es a-mi-ca</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**Tenor 1**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Staff</th>
<th>Measure</th>
<th>Notes</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**Bassus 1**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Staff</th>
<th>Measure</th>
<th>Notes</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

---

**English Translation**

How beautiful are you, my beloved,

---

195
Disc. a, amica me a, amica amica me a; quam pulchra
S 2 a, amica amica mea amica mea; quam pulchra
Alt. amica amica mea amica mea, quam pulchra
Ten. I a, amica mea, amica mea, amica mea, quam pulchra
Bas. a, amica mea, amica mea, amica mea,

Disc. es amica mea quam pulchra es amica
S 2 es amica mea, quam pulchra es amica
Alt. es amica mea, quam pulchra es amica
Ten. I es amica mea, quam pulchra es amica
Bas. quam pulchra es amica
ca mea, quam pulchra es,
ca mea, quam pulchra es, quam pulchra
ca mea, quam pulchra es, quam pulchra
ca mea, quam pulchra, es,
ca mea, quam pulchra es, quam pulchra

disc.  
S 2

cacum pulchra es a mi ca me a for mo sa me
es a mi ca me a for mo so me
es, quam pulchra es a mi ca me a for mo sa me
es, quam pulchra es a mi ca me a for mo sa me

Bas.

my beauty,
non est in te, non est in te, non est in te,
est in te, non est in te, non est in te, non
est in te, non est in te, non est in te, non
est in te, non est in te, non est in te, non
est in te, non est in te, non est in te, non

is not on you
your lips are dripping with honey,
ror, soror mea sponsa
ror, mea sponsa,
ror, soror mea sponsa,
ror, soror mea sponsa,
ror, soror mea sponsa,

and your face is lovely.
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Abbreviations:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Abbreviation</th>
<th>Description</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>FSC</td>
<td>Bodenschatz, Florilegium selectissimarum cantionum (Leipzig, 1603)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>FP I</td>
<td>Bodenschatz, Florilegium Portense, vol 1 (Leipzig, 1618)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>FP II</td>
<td>Bodenschatz, Florilegium Portense, vol 2 (Leipzig, 1621)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>PM I</td>
<td>Schadeus, Promptuarium Muiscum, vol. 1 (Strasbourg, 1611)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>PM II</td>
<td>Schadeus, Promptuarium Muiscum, vol. 2 (Strasbourg, 1612)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>PM III</td>
<td>Schadeus, Promptuarium Muiscum, vol. 3 (Strasbourg, 1613)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>PM IV</td>
<td>Vincentus, Promptuarium Muiscum, vol. 4 (Strasbourg, 1617)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>SC I</td>
<td>Gumpelzhaimer: Sacrorum Concentuum, vol. 1 (Augsburg, 1601)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>SCII</td>
<td>Gumpelzhaimer: Sacrorum Concentuum, vol. 2 (Augsburg, 1614)</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

I. ORIGINAL EDITIONS

Bodenschatz (works):


Setting for 4 voices. Includes biographical details in preface. See: Riemer, 1928; Illing, 1933.

-Harmoniae angelicae, das ist ... Lieder und ... Psalmen D. Martini Lutheri und anderer. Leipzig: 1608.


-Bicinia XC. selectissima ... praecipuorum festorum totius anni composite. Leipzig: 1615.

-Lobet den Herren (6vv). ms. in Naumburg, St Wenzel, Bibliothek.

-Wol dem, der ein tugendsam Weib hat (3vv) ms in Naumburg, St Wenzel, Bibliothek.
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Bodenschatz (editions):


Revised and expanded as FP I, 1618


Four-voice arrangements of hymns by Calvisius.

*Florilegium Portense continens CXV selectissimas cantiones praestantissimorum aetatis nostrae autorum*. Leipzig: 1618. (RISM 1618¹)

*Florilegii musici Portensis sacras harmonias sive motetas ... pars altera ... cum adjecta Basi Generali ad organa musicaque instrumenta accomodata*. Leipzig: 1621. (RISM 1621²)

Calvisius:

*Hymni sacri latini et germanici*. Erfurt: 1594.


*Bicinia septuaginta ad sententias evangeliorum anniversorum ... additi sunt viginti canones*, Leipzig: 1599

Enlarged in 1612 to include 90 works by other composers.

*Der Psalter Davids gesangweis vom Herrn D. Cornelio Beckern ... verfertiget*. Leipzig: 1605.

*Schwanengesang, aus dem 90.Psalms Davids...mit acht Stimmen componiret*. Leipzig: 1616:

Memorial edition of ‘Unser Leben wahret siebzig Jahr’ (FP II, 62)

‘Singet dem Herren ein neues Lied’ (ms) Mus 16, Nr 40 in Pfarrbibliothek, Mügeln.

Gumpelzhaimer:


28 eight-voice Latin motets.

1  *Deus inadjuvator meum intende* (FP II, 20)

2  *Ecce nunc benedicte Domino* (FP II, 22)
4 Levavi oculos (FP II. No. 38)
5 Ecce quam bonum et quam juncundum (FP II, 23)
6 Vespere autem Sabbathi (FP II, 148)
8 Quare fremuerunt (ed. in Campbell, 1942)
9 Venit Michael Archangelis (FP II, 135)
10 Maria Magdeleina et alter Maria (FP II, 106)
12 Jubilate Deo (FP II, 34)
13 Felix o ter et amplius (FP II, 26 – prima pars)
14 Quem timor Domini tenet (FP II, 26 – secunda pars)
17 Foedera Conjugij (FP II, 27; ed. in Campbell, 1942)
18 Beatus mones, qui timent Dominum (PF II, 5)
24 Moribus in sanctis pulchra est (FP II, 40)
25 Benedicta sit sancta Trinitas (FP I, 110)
26 Domine quid multiplicati sunt (FP II, 21)

*Sacrorum Concentuam Octonis vocibus modulandorum cum dupli Basso ad
Organorum usum. Autore Adamo Gumpelzaimero T. B. Civi Augustano. Liber
secundus.* Augsburg: 1614. (RISM)

25 eight-voice Latin motets.

No. 6 in PM IV, 11;
Nos. 6, 12, 16, 25, and 27 ed. in Mayr, 1909

PM IV

No. 11 Domine Jesu Christe (SC I, 25)

*A complete catalogue of Gumpelzhaimer’s works can be found in Mayr, 1909,
lxii-lxv

Valcampi:

*Giardino nuovo bellissimo di vari fiori musicali scelteissimi, Il libro de Madrigali a 5
Facsimile edition: Copenhagen: Musikvidenskabeligt Institut, Københavns
Universitet, 1983.

Ohimè dove è'l mio cor
I tuoi capelli o Filli
Sacrarum cantionem quae volgo Motecta appell. senis vocibus concinnatus, Libro I.
Venice: 1602

23 six-voice Latin motets (plus one motet by Giovanni Franceso Possidoni)

Hodie completi sunt (FP II, 113)
Puer qui natus est nobis (FP II, 125)
Senex puerum portabat (FP II, 87)
Te Deum Patrem ingenitum (FP II, 121)

PM I

3  Canite tuba in Sion
34  Senex puerum portabat (FP II, 87)
26  Tribius miraculis

PM II

97  Decantabat populus*
61  Ego sum panis vivus
43  Hodie completi sunt (FP II, 113)
33  Non turbetur cor vestrum
60  O quam suavis Domine
28  Petite et accipietis

PM III

79  Dum sacrum mysterium
83  O quam gloriosum est regnum
17  Puer qui natus est nobis (FP II, 125)
4  Te Deum Patrem ingenitum (FP II, 121)

PM IV

50  Adaperiat Dominus cor vestrum

*This motet is for eight voices and must therefore from a source other than the Sacrarum cantionem of 1601, which contains only six-voice motets
II. MODERN EDITIONS

**Bodenschatz:**


From *Harmoniae angelicae* (1608).  This is Bodenschatz’ most (and only) well known and widely published work, appearing in a number of church choir motet collections.

**Calvisius:**


Vom Himmel hoch da komm ich her (FSC 86)
Freut euch und jubiliert (FSC 87)
Gloria in excelsis Deo (FSC 88)
Joseph, lieber Joseph mein (FSC 89)


Pater rerum serium (FSC 85)
Vom Himmel hoch da komm ich her (FSC 86)
Freut euch und jubiliert (FSC 87)
Gloria in excelsis Deo (FSC 88)
Joseph, lieber Joseph mein (FSC 89)
Quarite primum regnum Dei (FSC 6; FP I, 6)
Das alte Jahr vergangen ist (FSC 6; FP I, 6)
Zion spricht: Der Herr hat mich verlassen (FP II, 64)
Singet dem Herren ein neues Lied
Unser leben währet siebzig Jahr (FP II, 62)

**Gumpelzhaimer:**


Benedicta sit sancta trinitas a 8 (SC I, 25; FP I, 110)

Quare Fremuerunt (SC I, 8)
Foedera Conjugij (SC I, 17; FP II, 27)


SC II, 6, 12, 16, 25, and 27;
33 other Latin and German works

**Other Modern Editions of Works in the Florilegium Portense:**


Super flumina Babylonis (FP I, 101)
Corde natus ex parentis (FP I, 114)
Deus spes nostra (FP I, 115)
III. OTHER SOURCES


Illing, K. H. *Das Magnificat in der protestantischen Kirchenmusik*. Kiel: 1933.


