

From Renaissance 'Fuga' to Baroque Fugue: The Role of the "Sweelinck Theory Manuscripts"

by

PAUL WALKER

Jan Pieterszoon Sweelinck has long been recognized as one of the most important teachers in the history of music. During the first half of the seventeenth century, Sweelinck's German organ students held many of the best positions in north and central Germany, and the keyboard music that they composed during that period is rivaled in importance only by the works of the Roman organist Girolamo Frescobaldi. Although Sweelinck's most famous pupil, Samuel Scheidt, worked in central Germany, it was in north Germany, particularly the city of Hamburg, that Sweelinck's influence was most enduring. Johann Mattheson, in the biographical article on Sweelinck for the *Grundlage einer Ehrenpforte*, called him the "hamburgischer Organistenmacher";¹ and in fact Sweelinck's Hamburg students Heinrich Scheidemann and Jacob Praetorius and their students Johann Adam Reincken and Matthias Weckmann played key roles in the musical life of one of the leading musical cities in seventeenth-century Europe. Finally, Johann Sebastian Bach paid homage to Sweelinck's legacy when as a student in nearby Lüneburg he journeyed to Hamburg to hear the aging Reincken play.

Mattheson also stated that Sweelinck studied with Zarlino in Venice and that he taught from his own translation of Zarlino's *Istitutioni*. No archival evidence has ever surfaced to support the claim of a Venetian sojourn, and most scholars now agree that Sweelinck almost certainly did not study directly with Zarlino. He did, however, teach from *Le institutioni*, as three manuscripts that we will call the "Sweelinck theory manuscripts" make clear. These manuscripts were first described by Robert Eitner in 1871² and further discussed in 1891 in separate articles by Max Seiffert³ and Hermann Gehrman.⁴ In 1901 Gehrman edited them for vol. 10 of the Sweelinck Complete Works,⁵ but since that time no thorough reconsideration of the material has been undertaken, despite important new information that has come to light.

Although the two most important manuscripts, both in Hamburg, were lost in World War II,⁶ Gehrman's edition enables us to reconstruct their contents almost completely.⁷ The largest,

1 Johann Mattheson, *Grundlage einer Ehrenpforte* (Hamburg: the author, 1740), pp. 331-333.

2 Robert Eitner, *Über die acht, respektive zwölf Tonarten und über den Gebrauch der Versetzungszeichen im XVI. und XVII. Jahrhunderte nach Joh. Peter Sweelinck*, in: *MfM* 3 (1871), pp. 133-151.

3 Max Seiffert, *J. P. Sweelinck und seine direkten deutschen Schüler*, in: *VfMw* 7 (1891), pp. 178-186.

4 Hermann Gehrman, *Johann Gottfried Walther als Theoretiker*, in: *VfMw* 7 (1891), pp. 483-493.

5 Jan Pieterszoon Sweelinck, *Werken*, vol. 10: *Composition Regeln Herrn M. Johan Peterssen Sweling*, ed. H. Gehrman, Leipzig: Breitkopf & Härtel, 1901; reprint ed., Farnborough, England: Gregg International Publishers, 1968).

6 On the fate of the Hamburg library at the end of World War II, see Hans Joachim Marx, *Johann Matthesons Nachlaß: Zum Schicksal der Musiksammlung der alten Stadtbibliothek Hamburg*, in: *AMl* 55 (1983), pp. 109-113 & 116. Marx reports that some of the library's holdings have since turned up and are now to be found in the Deutsche Staatsbibliothek, Berlin (DDR). My inquiry concerning the two Hamburg theory manuscripts, however, elicited a negative response from Dr. Ursula Winter of the Deutsche Staatsbibliothek's Handschriftenabteilung in a letter dated 12 August 1985.

7 See especially Gehrman's introduction to the edition, pp. i-iii, from which much of the following summary is taken.

Hamburg Ms. N.D. VI 5383, which Gehrman labeled Ms. A, bore the title page "Composition Regeln Herrn M: Johan Peterssen Sweling". It comprised three parts. The first (comprising pp. 1-275) was mostly derived from books III and IV of Zarlino's *Istitutioni*. It consisted of material on simple counterpoint of 2, 3, 4, and more voices, the modes, "fugue", and invertible counterpoint, and it included some musical examples not to be found in Zarlino's 1558 edition. The second part (pp. 280-351), separated from the first by several blank pages, introduced additional material on invertible counterpoint that was not taken from Zarlino. The third (pp. 354-371), also preceded by blank pages, concluded the manuscript with excerpts drawn from part II.

The first two parts of Ms. A were in one hand; they appeared to Gehrman to have been written in a relatively short period of time, since the handwriting was very consistent. Part III was copied and signed by Johann Adam Reincken. In his attempt to identify the first scribe, Gehrman discovered a marginal note near the beginning of part I that was initialed M. W.⁸ He confirmed Matthias Weckmann's autograph by comparing the handwriting with that of another supposed Weckmann autograph, the Lüneburg manuscript K.N. 206.

On the question of dating the manuscript, Seiffert had already shown that the material of part I existed before 1630, since Johann Crüger had included some examples from it (examples not found in Zarlino) in his *Synopsis Musica* of that year.⁹ Gehrman conjectured that Weckmann copied down the first two parts of Ms. A while studying with his teacher Jacob Praetorius in about 1640. At a later time Weckmann must have given the manuscript to his friend Reincken, who added part III.

The other two manuscripts were both based on the same material as part I of Ms. A. The first of these, Hamburg Ms. N.D. VI 5384 (Gehrman's Ms. B), was clearly Reincken's work; he had signed the title page and dated it 1670. It comprised two parts. The first was entirely original and addressed consonances and dissonances, the modes, "fugue", proportions, and text setting. The second dealt only with fugue and invertible counterpoint, and, although not an exact copy, its text was very closely related to that of part I of Ms. A. The last manuscript, East Berlin theory Ms. 865 (Ms. C), was signed "Burchardus Gramman" and dated 1657. Gehrman compared them and found that the Berlin manuscript and part I of Ms. A were essentially identical. His conclusions about the three manuscripts are summarized in Table 1.

Gehrman found a great deal of material in the manuscripts that was not taken from Zarlino's 1558 edition. The amplification took three forms: (1) Reincken's remarks of 1670;¹⁰ (2) the entirely new material on invertible counterpoint that made up parts II and III of Ms. A;¹¹ and (3) a number of anonymous musical examples in part I of Ms. A and its concordances.¹²

All of this additional material played a key role in Gehrman's evaluation of the importance of the manuscripts. Because Gehrman credited Sweelinck with putting together part I of Ms. A, he implied that Sweelinck himself wrote many of the anonymous examples that were added to

8 "Allhierher gehört die Regel, daß sich alle halbe tacte was bewegen soll, und in derselben steckt dieses alles M. W." (Gehrman's edition, p. 11.).

9 Seiffert, *Sweelinck*, pp. 180-181. The pieces include several that are attributed in the Sweelinck manuscripts to either Sweelinck or John Bull but that are given anonymously in Crüger's book. It is therefore impossible for the copyist of Ms. A to have gotten them from Crüger.

10 Discussed by Gehrman on p. 50, fn. 2, of his edition.

11 Discussed on p. 86, fn. 1.

12 Discussed on p. 66, fn. 2, and p. 72, fn. 1. The only composers named were Sweelinck and John Bull.

Zarlino.¹³ On the other hand, the new material on invertible counterpoint in parts II and III seemed to Gehrmann too advanced for Sweelinck's generation, and he suggested as the probable author one of Sweelinck's direct students, most likely Jacob Praetorius.¹⁴ Thus, in evaluating the contributions of the "Sweelinck school" to baroque theory, Gehrmann concluded that Sweelinck (through the additions to part I of Ms. A), his students (through the material in part II of Ms. A), and his students' students (i.e., Reincken, through part I of Ms. B) had done more than simply bring Zarlino's *Istitutioni* to Germany; they had considerably expanded and advanced it in the process.¹⁵ Furthermore, Gehrmann saw Reincken's 1670 remarks on fugue as the culmination of a steady development in the Sweelinck school's work with imitative counterpoint, and he implied that the path by which the theory of fugue traveled from its home in renaissance Italy to the fertile ground of baroque Germany led from Zarlino through Sweelinck to Praetorius and Scheidemann to Weckmann and Reincken and ultimately to the music of J. S. Bach.¹⁶

Gehrmann's conclusions have been accepted by most modern scholars of fugal theory, but they must now be reevaluated. In the first place, most of Sweelinck's supposed additions to *Le institutioni* must be given back to Zarlino himself. Nearly all of the anonymous examples in part I of Ms. A that Gehrmann was unable to locate in Zarlino's 1558 edition come from the revised 1573 edition. Second, Werner Braun cast doubt on the insularity of the Sweelinck school when he reported in 1968 that part II of Ms. A was identical in content with the invertible counterpoint treatise, East Berlin theory Ms. 913, ascribed to Johann Theile.¹⁷ Braun suggested that the manuscript could not have been written much before 1670, when Theile would have been only twenty-four years old, and thus that it was more or less contemporaneous with Reincken's Ms. B. Since Theile studied with Heinrich Schütz at about this time, Braun conjectured that Weckmann, the copyist of the manuscript and himself a former Schütz student, was responsible for bringing the material to Hamburg.

In a recent article, Kerala Snyder has questioned the identities of both the copyist of Ms. A and the author of part II.¹⁸ She accepts the opinions of Bärbel Roth¹⁹ and Friedrich Wilhelm Riedel²⁰ that many of the supposed Weckmann autographs, including Lüneburg Ms. K.N. 206 with which Ms. A was compared, are not authentic. Furthermore, she finds Theile's authorship of part

13 "Praetorius und Weckmann geben aber im 1. Hauptteil von Ms. A thatsächlich die originale Sweelinck'sche Lehre wieder. [...] Wesentliche Praetorianische Zusätze finden sich jedoch nicht in diesem Teile." Gehrmann, introduction, p. iii.

14 Sieffert considered Heinrich Scheidemann the most likely candidate. See Seiffert, *Sweelinck*, p. 181.

15 "Aus all dem ist zu ersehen, daß die eigentliche Sweelinck'sche Lehre auch reich an originaler Arbeit ist und daß ihre Bedeutung darin besteht, nicht nur die Zarlino'sche Lehre nach dem Norden verpflanzt, sondern auch zeitgemäß erweitert und zugleich eine Verquickung des Zarlino'schen und nordischen Kontrapunktes angestrebt zu haben. Für das Letztere sprechen die vielen originalen Beispiele bei Fuge und doppeltem Kontrapunkt." Gehrmann, introduction, p. iv.

16 See especially Gehrmann, *Walther*, pp. 490-491.

17 Werner Braun, *Zwei Quellen für Christoph Bernhards und Johann Theiles Satzlehren*, in: *Mf* 21 (1968), pp. 459-466.

18 Kerala J. Snyder, *Dietrich Buxtehude's studies in learned counterpoint*, in: *JAMS* 33 (1980), pp. 544-564.

19 Bärbel Roth, *Zur Echtheitsfrage der Matthias Weckmann zugeschriebenen Klavierwerke ohne Cantus firmus*, in: *AML* 36 (1964), pp. 31-36.

20 Friedrich Wilhelm Riedel, *Quellenkundliche Beiträge zur Geschichte der Musik für Tasteninstrumente in der zweiten Hälfte des 17. Jahrhunderts* (= Schriften des Landesinstituts für Musikforschung Kiel, vol. 10; Kassel: Bärenreiter, 1960), p. 95.

II unlikely at such an early point in his career. The collection of masses that Theile published in 1673 seems too immature to suggest that he was capable of putting together a sophisticated theory treatise at that time. Instead, Snyder feels that the treatise had already been written by 1670, that Theile himself consulted it when he first came to north Germany in the early 1670s, and that he later appropriated it for his own teaching. No candidate is put forward for authorship of the treatise.

Most recently, two American scholars, working independently, have undertaken thorough studies of the supposed Weckmann autographs and have restored most of them to Weckmann. Both Alexander Silbiger²¹ and Curtis Lasell²² now find Lüneburg K.N. 206 to be authentic, and Ms. A can once again be considered Wecksmann's hand. The identity of the author of part II and the date of its conception will be addressed toward the end of this article. Meanwhile, a careful study of the theories of fugue by Zarlino, Sweelinck, Reincken, and other contemporaries produces a clearer picture of both the legacy of Sweelinck's teaching and the theoretical activities of the younger members of the Sweelinck school.

In the third part of his famous *Istitutioni harmoniche* of 1558, Gioseffo Zarlino treated imitative counterpoint in two chapters, the first devoted to what he called "fugues," the second to "imitations".²³ The terms "fugue" and "imitation" were not new. The Latin word *fuga* is a noun meaning "flight" or "fleeing". Musicians first adopted it in the fourteenth and fifteenth centuries to describe the compositional technique of canon, apparently because the technique involves one voice that "flees before" the others which "chase after" it.²⁴ Like the modern word "canon", "fugue" was also sometimes used during this period as the title for a piece of music that featured the technique of "fugue". When the technique of free imitation rose to prominence about 1500 at the hands of Josquin des Prez and his contemporaries, the word "fugue" was simply expanded in meaning to embrace all imitative counterpoint, whether canonic or free. About the same time, the word "imitation" was introduced to music as an occasional synonym for "fugue".

Zarlino was the first theorist to distinguish between the two words, but he did not do so by assigning one to the older canonic technique and the other to the more innovative free imitation, as we might expect. Instead, he tried to recapture as much of the original meaning of "fugue" as possible while at the same time updating it in accordance with the latest styles. Johannes Tinctoris had defined "fugue" in his dictionary of musical terms written about 1472 as "the sameness [or "identicalness", if you will] of the voice parts of a composition with respect to their rhythmic value, hexachord syllable, shape, and sometimes even location on the staff".²⁵ Zarlino retained

21 Alexander Silbiger, preface to his edition of Matthias Weckmann, *Four sacred concertos* (= Recent Researches in the Music of the Baroque Era, vol. 46; Madison, Wisconsin: A-R Editions, 1984), p. xxvi, fn. 11.

22 Letter to the writer dated 11 August 1985. Lasell is preparing a chapter on the Weckmann autographs for his dissertation on the "Origins of the Lüneburg keyboard tablatures".

23 Chapters 51 and 52 in the original 1558 edition, 54 and 55 in the expanded 1573 edition.

24 Concerning early uses of the term, see F. Alberto Gallo, *Caccia*, in: HmT (1973).

25 "Fuga est idemitas [sic] partium cantus quo ad valorem nomen formam et interdum quo ad locum notarum et pausarum suarum." Johannes Tinctoris, *Terminorum Musicae Diffinitorium*, ed. and trans. Carl Parrish (London: The Free Press of Glencoe, division of Collier-Macmillan Ltd., 1963), p. 32-33. This translation is my own. On the dating of the *Diffinitorium*, see Heinrich Hüschen, *Johannes Tinctoris*, in: *New GroveD* 18, p. 839.

"identicalness" of voice parts in rhythm and intervals as the essential characteristic of "fugue". In other words, if one voice imitated another in such a way that it reproduced *exactly* the rhythmic values and intervals of the first voice, the technique involved was "fugue". This exact imitation might last from beginning to end of the piece, as in a canon, or it might be broken off after only a few notes, as in free imitation. Zarlino called the former *fuga legata*, "bound" or "tied fugue", and the latter *fuga sciolta*, "loose" or "free fugue".

To the word "imitation", Zarlino assigned the essential characteristic of *approximateness* of imitation with respect to rhythm and intervals. For example, the following voice might reproduce the major thirds of the leading voice as minor thirds, it might halve or double the note values, or it might alter an occasional note of the leading voice for the sake of the part-writing. The technique of "imitation" could also be carried from beginning to end, in which case it was called *imitatione legata*, or for only part of the piece, in which case it was called *imitatione sciolta*. Zarlino's system thus included four primary classifications of imitative counterpoint, summarized in Table 2.

Zarlino pointed out that "fugue" was possible only when the imitation took place at a perfect interval, i.e., at the unison, fourth, fifth, or octave. Such a statement would have been superfluous seventy-five years earlier. Because Tinctoris had insisted that the hexachord syllables of the imitating voice should be identical to those of the leader, no other intervals of imitation were possible. There were only three hexachords, the "natural" (on C), the "hard" (on G), and the "soft" (on F), and therefore a given sequence of syllables (say, ut-re-mi-fa) could only be expressed three ways (i.e., C-D-E-F, G-A-B-C [at the fifth], or F-G-A-B flat [at the fourth]). The replacement of the hexachord system by the octave solmization system made it necessary for Zarlino to specify the relationship between interval of imitation and exactness of imitation.

Nevertheless, a perfect interval of imitation did not automatically produce exact imitation. Any imitative counterpoint written at the fourth or fifth would be melodically exact only so long as the voices remained within the bounds of their respective hexachords. For example, if the two voices began on C and G respectively, and the first voice moved beyond the bounds of the natural hexachord to B natural, the second voice would answer not with F sharp but with F natural. This was not sufficiently exact for "fugue", but it did satisfy the definition of "imitation". Moreover, an augmentation canon at the octave would also be described as "imitation" rather than "fugue", since its note values would not be exactly reproduced by the answering voice. Thus, Zarlino's technique of "imitation" could take place at any interval, perfect or imperfect.²⁶

Zarlino added a fifth technique of imitative counterpoint which he called "part fugue and part imitation". The example that he gave was of a canon at the fifth in which the voices did in fact step beyond the bounds of their respective hexachords in such a way that F natural was answered by B natural three times. Zarlino noted that although such examples were usually called "fugue", the imitation was not exact enough to be so called.

As recorded in part I of Ms. A, Sweelinck's teaching of imitative counterpoint differed in no important respect from Zarlino's.²⁷ The approach was a practical one. The material from Zarlino

26 On this point, see further James Haar, *Zarlino's definition of fugue and imitation*, in: JAMS 24 (1971), pp. 226-254.

27 See Gehrman's edition, pp. 59-61.

no's two chapters on "fugue" and "imitation" was presented as a series of examples with accompanying text rather than as a text with accompanying examples, and Zarlino's explanations of the various terms and their proper usage were reduced to a series of brief "captions" that attempted to explain both the examples and the concepts behind them. All of Zarlino's examples were to be found in proper order, and they were labeled according to the original five categories, translated literally into "gebundene Fuge", "gebundene Imitation", "ungebundene Fuge", "ungebundene Imitation", and "halb Fuge, halb Imitation". (These terms are also included in Table 2.)

The manuscript defined the technique of "fugue" as imitative counterpoint at the unison, fourth, fifth, or octave; the imitation was exact. The technique which the manuscript called "imitation" took place at the second, third, sixth, and seventh; the imitation in this case was not exact. But this is not an entirely correct reading of Zarlino. As we have just seen, imitative counterpoint at a perfect interval does not guarantee exactness of imitation (i.e., "fugue"), and the technique called "imitation" was not limited to the imperfect intervals. Sweelinck was not alone in his misreading of Zarlino; two of Zarlino's own Italian disciples, Giovanni Maria Artusi²⁸ and Orazio Tigrini,²⁹ made exactly the same mistake in separate treatises based on *Le istituzioni*.

Sweelinck's terminology occasionally strayed from his own definitions. For instance, both techniques of "fugue" and "imitation" were grouped under the heading "Here follow various sorts of fugues". This reference to all imitative counterpoint as "fugue" was of course exactly the imprecise and common kind of terminology that Zarlino had tried so hard to abolish. Sweelinck also used the word "canon" as a synonym for "gebundene Fuge" and "gebundene Imitation", even though Zarlino had insisted that since it literally meant "rule" or "law" it should apply only to the rule by which such a piece was composed, not the piece itself. Sweelinck's occasional misuses of Zarlino's terminology, like his misreading of the definitions, seem to have been inadvertent. No conscious dissatisfaction with Zarlino's original plan is apparent.

Careful study of Gehrman's edition reveals that he found many differences between part I of Ms. A and part II of Ms. B in wording, ordering of material, and inclusion of occasional new examples, but not of essential meaning.³⁰ Thus, the two manuscripts were almost certainly copied from different sources. Exactly how they emanated from the common source of Sweelinck's private instruction remains unclear. It is tempting to imagine that the two different versions represent a form of "class notes" taken by two different students, for example, Scheidemann and Jacob Praetorius. Perhaps Sweelinck dictated the material to each student individually at private lessons. The surviving evidence is unfortunately too meager to support such specific hypotheses. Nevertheless, although the exact form of Sweelinck's instruction is yet unknown, its purpose remains clear: to introduce to students the compositional methods and theories of Zarlino's *Istituzioni*.

28 Giovanni Maria Artusi, *L'arte del contraponto* (Venice: Vincenzi and Amadino, 1586), pp. 31-32. This material is essentially the same in the second edition (Venice: Giacomo Vincenti, 1598; reprint ed., Hildesheim: Olms 1969), pp. 62-63.

29 Orazio Tigrini, *Il Compendio della musica* (Venice: Ricciardo Amadino, 1558; reprint ed., New York: Broude Brothers, 1966), pp. 104-109 & 116-123.

30 General differences are summarized in footnote 1, p. 59. Other differences are discussed in numerous footnotes on pp. 59-84.

In 1670, half a century after Sweelinck's death, Johann Adam Reincken reexamined certain topics of music theory in light of current musical practice. The remarks on imitative counterpoint found in part I of Ms. B emphasized the relationship between imitation and the modes, a topic not discussed by Sweelinck, and they focused particularly on the compositional technique known today as the "tonal answer". Although it was a technique used by composers since at least the early sixteenth century, the tonal answer received its first theoretical justification at the hands of Italian theorists in the early years of the seventeenth century. Its subsequent development and the path by which it came to be known in German lands supply the key to a proper understanding of Reincken's remarks.

The first theorist to prescribe the tonal answer was Girolamo Diruta, author of the important organ instruction book *Il Transilvano*. In the *Seconda parte del Transilvano* of 1609, Diruta recommended that a composition's opening point of imitation follow certain rules in order to make the mode immediately recognizable to the listener.³¹ These rules specified (1) that the theme ought to begin on either the mode's final or its dominant (at this period, the dominant was always a fifth above the final); (2) that the theme's melodic motion ought to emphasize both notes; and (3) that the answer of the theme also ought to emphasize both final and dominant. Diruta gave the example of a theme in D dorian that began on the final D and proceeded upward to the dominant A; its answer should ascend from the dominant A not a fifth to the note E but only a fourth to the final D. He added that the procedure was not necessary in the body of a composition, after the mode was well established, but he disapproved of most imitative compositions that did not begin with a tonal answer because, as he put it, the listener frequently could not identify the mode.

Diruta's theory of tonal answers was conceived with the renaissance style in mind, and it was quickly adopted among his Italian contemporaries for the writing of keyboard *ricercars* and vocal polyphony in the *stile antico*. In Germany, however, it remained unknown to all but a few Italian-trained musicians until in 1643 an Italian expatriate, Marco Scacchi, introduced it to the German musical establishment at large. Scacchi, Kapellmeister at the Polish court in Warsaw, published in that year a book entitled *Cribrum musicum*³² in which he criticized in detail a collection of psalms published three years earlier by the Danzig organist and Sweelinck student Paul Siefert.³³ Siefert was a self-styled champion of the *stile antico* who crusaded vigorously against what he considered to be the "abuses" of modern Italian music. Rather than attempt a defense of the modern style, Scacchi chose to challenge him by judging Siefert's psalms according to the rules of sixteenth-century counterpoint. Among the 151 errors that Scacchi identified in them was the incorrect use of a real answer in the opening point of imitation of Psalm 33, the first piece in the collection.³⁴ Its theme began with a rising fifth from D to A and was answered by

31 Girolamo Diruta, *Seconda parte del Transilvano* (Venice: Alessandro Vincenti, 1622 [originally published in 1609]; reprint ed., Bologna: Forni, [1969]), Book III, pp. 11-12. For an English translation, see idem, *The Transylvanian*, trans. Murray C. Bradshaw & Edward J. Soehnen (= Musicological Studies, no. 38; n.p.: Institute of Mediaeval Music, 1984), vol. 2, pp. 94-95.

32 Marco Scacchi, *Cribrum musicum ad triticum Sieferticum* (Venice: Alessandro Vincenti, 1643).

33 Paul Siefert, *Psalmen Davids* (Danzig [now Gdansk, Poland]: Georg Rhetius, 1640).

34 Scacchi, *Cribrum*, p. 11. For a modern edition of the entire first part of Siefert's Psalm 33, see Hermann Rauschnig, *Geschichte der Musik und Musikpflege in Danzig* (Danzig: Kommissionsverlag der Danziger Verlags-Gesellschaft, 1931), pp. 162-163.

another fifth from A to E. Scacchi called upon Diruta's reasoning in his censure of this "error". He insisted that in the opening measures of a composition, clear projection of the mode was more important than exactness of imitation. Therefore, the octave ambitus of the mode (in this case from D to D) should not be overstepped in this context and the only correct answer was the rising fourth A to D.

Siefert tried to defend his psalms by claiming that the northern rules of the *stile antico* differed from those of Italy and that Scacchi bore a personal grudge against him.³⁵ Nevertheless, most German musicians were quick to side with Scacchi.³⁶ Heinrich Schütz, for instance, praised both men and attempted to remain neutral, but he wrote:³⁷

I must acknowledge that as a youth I too was drilled and instructed by my teacher Giovanni Gabrieli of blessed memory in a way similar to that in which Mr. Marco Scacchi teaches Mr. Siefert.

Schütz's works leave little doubt that he sided with Scacchi on the use of tonal answers and that he learned from Gabrieli how to use them systematically. His *Psalmen Davids* of 1619, which "show better than any of his other [works] the force of Gabrieli's example",³⁸ contain numerous instances of tonal answers; the very first piece of the collection begins with a rising fourth D-G answered by a rising fifth G-D.³⁹ Schütz's *Geistliche Chormusik* of 1648, which may have been produced as Schütz's own practical response to the Scacchi-Siefert controversy, also features several instances of fifths answered by fourths and fourths by fifths.⁴⁰ Furthermore, not a single piece in either collection begins with a real answer.

The Italian theory of tonal answers was codified for German musicians by Schütz's pupil Christoph Bernhard. In his famous manuscript treatise of ca. 1660, the *Tractatus compositionis augmentatus*, Bernhard used the modal system to justify in theoretical terms both tonal and real answers,⁴¹ and his position is usually described today as a compromise between Scacchi's insistence on tonal answers and Siefert's insistence on real answers. Bernhard's rules for their use, however, follow the Italian tradition in all essential details. That is, tonal answers were most commonly found at the beginning of a piece, where one needed to project the mode clearly, while real

35 He published his rebuttal with the title *Anticribratio musica ad avenam Schachianam* (Danzig: Georg Rhetius, 1645). Siefert's arguments are summarized in Carl Dahlhaus, *Christoph Bernhard und die Theorie der modalen Imitation*, in *AfMw* 21 (1964), pp. 45-46.

36 Ca. 1649 Scacchi published personal letters written in defense of the Cribrum by a number of prominent German musicians. The publication, entitled *Judicium cribri musici*, is now lost, but a manuscript copy survives in Bologna, Civico Museo Bibliografico Musicale.

37 "Attamen unicum hoc confiteor, et protector, quod hoc simili modo (quo Dominus Marcus Scacchius in Cribro suo Dominum Syfertum) ego in juventute mea a bone memoriae Johanne Gabriele Preceptore meo quoque fuerim instructus ac institutus." Schütz GBr, p. 189. The translation is mine. The letter from which this quote is taken was included in Scacchi's *Judicium cribri musici*.

38 Joshua Rifkin, *Heinrich Schütz*, in: *New GroveD* 17, p. 21.

39 Heinrich Schütz, *Psalmen Davids* (1619), NSA, vol. 23-25, ed. Wilhelm Ehmann (1971-81). See the opening imitation of nos. 1, 12, 13, 14, 19, and 21.

40 Heinrich Schütz, *Geistliche Chormusik* (1648), NSA 5, ed. Wilhelm Kamlah (1965). See the opening imitation of nos. 1, 2, 3, 8, 15, 18, 21, 24, and 26. On Rifkin's conjecture about the *Geistliche Chormusik* as a response to the Scacchi-Siefert quarrel, see his Schütz, p. 13.

41 Christoph Bernhard, *Tractatus compositionis augmentatus*, ed. Joseph Müller-Blattau in *Die Kompositionslehre Heinrich Schützens in der Fassung seines Schülers Christoph Bernhard*, 2nd ed. (Kassel: Bären-

answers were more acceptable in the body of the work, after the mode was established. Bernhard added further the rule of thumb that themes progressing by leap were more often given tonal answers and themes progressing by step more often real answers. This rule basically follows common sense. The character of a stepwise theme must be drastically altered for a tonal answer, since one of its steps must be answered by either a leap or a repeated note, whereas a leaping theme requires only that one leap be answered with another of slightly different size.

In 1663, Bernhard left Dresden to join his colleague Matthias Weckmann, a fellow Schütz student, in Hamburg, where he became a member of a musical circle that included Weckmann, Reincken, Theile, and Dietrich Buxtehude. Theory and learned counterpoint played an important part in the circle's activities of the late 1660s and early 1670s, as Kerala Snyder has recently pointed out,⁴² and Reincken's theory treatise of 1670 reflected primarily the influence of these colleagues rather than of his teacher's teacher Sweelinck. The very heart of Sweelinck's theory of imitative counterpoint – that is, the five categories of "fugue" and "imitation" – was entirely absent from Reincken's discussion of fugue, even though the two treatises rested side-by-side in Ms. B. At the same time, the topic to which Reincken devoted most of his attention – that is, the proper use of real and tonal answers – was clearly derived from Scacchi's *Cribrum* and Bernhard's *Tractatus* and had no precedent in Sweelinck's work.

Reincken presented several themes of either predominantly stepwise or predominantly leaping motion and discussed, using Bernhard's rules of thumb, how each was most properly used in imitative writing.⁴³ For example, the first theme, which began with a rising fifth D-A, required a tonal answer at the beginning of a composition, while later in the piece a real answer was permissible. A theme that proceeded from D to A by step, on the other hand, required a real answer, but Reincken noted that with a little care the composer could overcome the conflict between imitation and mode. He might, for example, write a real answer at the subdominant, or he might neutralize the offending note of a real answer at the dominant by carefully hiding it within the texture. Reincken concluded with the remark that composers "in the modern style" often paid little attention to the mode in their fugal writing, but that "the best musicians" avoided subverting the mode for the sake of real answers.

The Italian theory of tonal answers also appeared in the anonymous treatise on invertible counterpoint that formed part II of Ms. A.⁴⁴ There the reader was warned that the opening measures of a fugue should clearly project the mode and especially that the first two entries of the theme should avoid overstepping the mode's ambitus. Also included was information on invertible counterpoint at the twelfth and tenth taken directly from Sweelinck's treatise, as well as a great deal of original material on invertible counterpoint at the octave.

The presence of Scacchi's tonal answers lays to rest Gehrman's claim that part II of Ms. A was copied by Weckmann during his student days under Jacob Praetorius. Weckmann returned

reiter 1963), pp. 98-106. For an English translation by Walter Hilse, see *The Music Forum* 3 (1973), pp. 133-144.

42 Snyder, *Buxtehude's studies*. See also Christoph Wolff, *Das Hamburger Buxtehude-Bild*, in: *MuK* 53 (1983), pp. 8-19.

43 Gehrman's edition, pp. 50-55.

44 Gehrman's edition, pp. 86-104.

to Dresden in 1640, three years before Scacchi published his *Cribrum*. Therefore, if we accept Gehrmann's assertion that parts I and II were copied down in a relatively short period of time, we must conclude that Weckmann probably copied them after 1655, when he returned to Hamburg and could once again consult Sweelinck's treatise. Snyder feels that the invertible counterpoint treatise, part II of Ms. A, was probably completed by the early 1660s and that it was consulted in Hamburg by Bernhard, Buxtehude, and later Theile. Since its author worked from Sweelinck's translation and since his work exerted influence almost exclusively in Hamburg and north Germany, it seems reasonable to assume that he was at least a member of the Sweelinck school if not of the later Hamburg circle. Furthermore, the inclusion of Scacchi's tonal answers points to a musician who was also trained in the Dresden tradition of Bernhard and Schütz. The only candidate who fills all of these qualifications, and thus the most likely author of the treatise, is the copyist of the manuscript, Matthias Weckmann. Table 3 provides a revised summary of Ms. A based on these conclusions.

To summarize: Sweelinck and his two generations of students can no longer be credited with gradually creating baroque fugal theory out of Zarlino's *Istitutioni*. Sweelinck translated Zarlino faithfully without attempting in any way to "update" *Le istitutioni*, while his students Scheidemann and Praetorius apparently made no original contributions to music theory. Their students Reincken and Weckmann copied out Sweelinck's work but made no attempt to revise it in light of current musical practice. Rather, they chose in their own treatises to explore the important new theories of imitative counterpoint emanating from Italy, especially the theory of tonal answers. Sweelinck's influence survived primarily in the studies of learned counterpoint undertaken by the members of the Hamburg circle in the 1660s and '70s. These studies were inspired by Zarlino's great canonic examples of invertible counterpoint and produced such works as Buxtehude's famous funeral piece, *Mit Fried und Freud ich fahr dahin*. For their theories of baroque fugue, however, the younger Hamburg theorists turned not to their revered teacher and mentor but to their Italian colleagues.

TABLE 1. Summary of source information for the "Sweelinck theory manuscripts" as determined by Hermann Gehrmann (Sweelinck Complete Works, Vol. X, 1901).

Ms. A – Hamburg Ms. N.D. VI 5383 (now lost)

- I. author: Zarlino and Sweelinck
 contents: from parts III & IV of *Le istitutioni* with many additions
 scribe: Weckmann
 date copied: ca. 1640
- II. author: anonymous (Scheidemann or J. Praetorius)
 contents: invertible counterpoint treatise
 scribe: Weckmann
 date copied: ca. 1640
- III. author: Reincken
 contents: derived from part II
 scribe: Reincken
 date copied: between ca. 1640 & ca. 1670

Ms. B – Hamburg Ms. N.D. VI 5384 (now lost)

I. author: Reincken

contents: original material on dissonances, modes, fugue, invertible counterpoint, meter, and text

scribe: Reincken

date: 1670

II. author: Zarlino

contents: fugue and invertible counterpoint, text similar to part I, Ms. A

scribe: Reincken

date copied: 1670

Ms. C – Berlin (DDR), Deutsche Staatsbibliothek, Mus. ms. theor. 865

author: Zarlino

contents: copy of part I, Ms. A

scribe: "Burchardus Gramman" (otherwise unknown)

date copied: 1657

TABLE 2. Zarlino's fivefold classification of imitative counterpoint.

1. *Fuga legata*: the canonic technique in which the answering voices reproduce precisely all the rhythms and intervals of the first voice throughout the piece. Whole steps are answered by whole steps, half steps by half steps, and semibreves by semibreves.
Called by Sweelinck *gebundene Fuge*.
2. *Imitatione legata*: the canonic technique in which the answering voices reproduce only approximately the rhythms and intervals of the first voice, but continue to do so until the end. For example, in a canon at the second, major thirds might be answered by minor thirds. In an augmentation canon, semibreves might be answered by breves.
Called by Sweelinck *gebundene Imitation*.
3. *Fuga sciolta*: the technique in which the imitating voices reproduce exactly the rhythms and intervals of the leader but only for part, not all, of the piece.
Called by Sweelinck *ungebundene Fuge*.
4. *Imitatione sciolta*: the technique in which the imitating voices neither reproduce exactly the rhythms and intervals of the leader nor carry the imitation through to the end of the piece.
Called by Sweelinck *ungebundene Imitation*.
5. *Parte in fuga, parte in imitatione*: "incorrectly called *fuga* by some musicians". Zarlino's example is of two voices in imitation at the fifth; the second voice reproduces the first exactly except for three F naturals that are answered with B naturals.
Called by Sweelinck *halb Fuge, halb Imitation*.

TABLE 3. Revised summary of source information for Ms. A.

- I. author: Zarlino
contents: parts III & IV of *Le istitutioni*, 1573 ed.
scribe: Weckmann
date copied: probably between 1655 and the mid 1660s
- II. author: probably Weckmann (ascribed to Johann Theile in later manuscripts)
contents: invertible counterpoint treatise
scribe: Weckmann
date copied: probably between 1655 and the mid 1660s
- III. author: Reincken
contents: derived from part II
scribe: Reincken
date copied: after part II