

„Fugue“ as a Genre Designation in the Early Seventeenth Century

PAUL WALKER

In the first two decades of the seventeenth century, at least five German musicians used the word „fugue“ as the title for a piece of music. Valentin Haussmann included two fugues for instrumental ensemble in his collection of *Neue fünfstimmige Paduane und Galliarde* published in 1604¹. Three years later, the Straßburg organist Bernhard Schmid the Younger published a *Tabulaturbuch* that included twelve pieces – written by Andrea Gabrieli, Adriano Banchieri, and other Italians – that he designated „Fugues or, as the Italians name them, Canzoni alla francese“². A similar tablature book was published in 1617 by Johann Woltz, who included in it twenty fugues from the pen of Simon Lohet, a former organist at the court of Württemberg in Stuttgart³. Keyboard fugues by Hans Leo Hassler, who died in 1612, also survive. Finally, Michael Praetorius signaled a new direction in fugal theory when in his *Syntagma musicum* III of 1619 he advocated using the word „fugue“ as a synonym for the Italian word „ricercar“. We today find nothing surprising about a plethora of fugues in German Baroque music; after all, the first name that most musicians first associate with fugue is Bach, the quintessential German Baroque composer. What is surprising, then, is to learn that before 1600 the word „fugue“ was almost never used as a genre designation except with reference to canon, and that Italians continued well into the seventeenth century to avoid its use for pieces based on non-canonic imitation. Why did a number of Germans, then, suddenly favor the title „fugue“ for instrumental pieces that in the past had always carried such titles as *ricercar* or *canzona*? In order to explain this important change in terminological usage, we must first consider the meaning of the word „fugue“ in the late Middle Ages and Renaissance.

Fugue began its musical life as a genre designation. The earliest known reference to the word in a musical context appears in a treatise from the first half of the fourteenth century entitled *Speculum musicae* and written by Jacobus de Liège. Jacobus wrote⁴:

Dividitur autem discantus simpliciter in discantum truncatum qui hocketus dicitur, in discantum copulatum qui copula vel velox discantus dicitur, in discantum simpliciter prolatum et hic discantandi modus locum habet in discantibus ecclesiasticis vel organicis in omni sua parte mensuratis, in conductis, in motellis [sic], in fugis, in cantilenis vel rondellis.

(Discant is divided into *discantus truncatus*, called hocket; *discantus copulatus*, called copula or rapid discant; and *discantus prolatus*. This last method of discant can be found in ecclesiastical discant (that is, organum in which all of the parts are mensural), in conductus, in motets, in fugues, in cantilenas, and in rondeaux.)

- 1 For a modern edition, see Franz Bölsche (ed.), *Melchior Franck, Valentin Haussmann: Ausgewählte Instrumentalwerke*, Leipzig 1904 (= DDT 16), pp. 169–174.
- 2 A facsimile was published by Broude Brothers in 1967. A more recent facsimile and complete modern edition by Clyde William Young, *Bernhard Schmid d. Ä.: Orgeltabulatur 1577*. 1. Teil: *Faksimile*, 2. Teil: *Übertragung*, Frankfurt/M. 1997 (= EdM 97/98).
- 3 J. Woltz, *Nova Mysices Organicae Tabulatura* [...], Basel 1617. A facsimile was issued by Forni editore (Bibliotheca Musica Bononiensis IV/53, Bologna 1970). There is also a complete modern edition by Manfred Hug: Johann Woltz, *Orgel-Tabulatur*, Bd. 1–4, Stuttgart 1994.
- 4 Jacobus Leodiensis, *Speculum musicae* Book 7, ed. Roger Bragard, American Institute of Musicology 1973 (= Corpus scriptorum de musica 3/7), p. 24. The translation is my own, as are all translations in this article not otherwise attributed.

„Fuga“, a noun meaning „flight“ or „fleeing“, is related to both the Latin verbs „fugere“, „to flee“, and „fugare“, „to chase.“ Its vernacular equivalents are „chace“ and „caccia“, nouns that likewise designate a chase or hunt. In the fourteenth century, all three terms – „fugue“, „chace“, and „caccia“ – acquired the same musical meaning, namely, a piece of music consisting either entirely or principally of two or more voices in canon. Musicians chose to draw upon the analogy between canonic imitation and the hunt apparently because canon involves a second voice which „chases after“ the first while the first „flees before“ it. By the fifteenth century, the two vernacular terms had largely fallen from use, and fugue was the term of choice. Example 1 (Appendix p. 222) shows such a fugue. This is a composition entitled *Die minne fueget niemand* by the early fifteenth-century Minnesänger Oswald von Wolkenstein. It is a contrafactum of a French song entitled *Talent m'est pris*, a piece that is called „chace“ in its fourteenth-century source, the Ivrea Codex. Example 1a shows Oswald's piece as it appears in the Ms. 2777 of the Austrian National Library in Vienna (fol. 33)⁵. The inscription „fuga“ can be seen just above the top staff. Example 1b is a transcription, following the edition in DTÖ 18.

In the fourteenth century both „chace“ and „caccia“ had served as genre designations even though the former generally indicated a piece in which every voice participated in the canon whereas in the latter only the two upper voices were canonic over a freely-composed tenor. In the next century, canonic technique came more and more to be incorporated into pieces that, like the caccia, also included non-canonic voices. In this case, the word fugue seems most often to have been applied only to the canonic voices, not to the piece as a whole. Example 2 (Appendix, p. 223) gives the opening measures of a French song by Guillaume Dufay. Of course, the textual incipit can serve as the piece's title, but below that we find „Fuga duorum temporum,“ a fugue after two tempora. The inscription accompanying Contratenor II indicates that this part is made „concordant with the fugue.“ We in the twenty-first century would use the word „canon“ in precisely the same way. Canonic imitation may be the predominant compositional technique in Dufay's song, but we would not call the entire piece a canon; the canon is in the upper two parts.

Also in the fifteenth century, the word fugue expanded in meaning so that now it might designate the compositional technique itself. Johannes Tinctoris, in his dictionary of musical terms published in 1475, defined „fuga“ as „the sameness („idemtitas“) of the voice parts in a composition. The notes and rests of the voice parts are identical in (rhythmic) value, (in their) name (i. e., hexachord syllable), (in their) shape, and sometimes even (in their) location on the staff“⁶. Here fugue is not a piece of music governed by canonic technique. It is the technique itself; the quality of having made the voice parts identical. Our modern-day word „canon“ likewise allows for such a meaning. When we say that „Bach employs canon in the Goldberg Variations“, we mean that the technique figures prominently. Perhaps the best-known use of the word „fugue“ in this sense is Josquin's *Missa ad fugam*, or „Mass by means of fugue.“

5 A facsimile of the entire manuscript is available as *Oswald von Wolkenstein, Handschrift A*, commented by Francesco Delbono, Graz 1977 (= *Codices selecti phototypice impressi* 59), from which this reproduction is taken.

6 „Fuga est idemtitas [sic] partium cantus quo ad valorem nomen formam et interdum quo ad locum notarum et pausarum suarum.“ Johannes Tinctoris, *Terminorum musicae diffinitorium*, ed. and translated by Carl Parrish, London 1963, pp. 32–33. The translation is my own..

Once composers around 1500 began to experiment in a more systematic fashion with non-canonic imitation, they faced the difficulty of devising an appropriate terminology to describe what they produced. As we know, the solution that ultimately carried the day allowed for three terms: canon, fugue, and imitation. In the sixteenth century, however, most musicians seem simply to have expanded the meaning of the word „fugue“ so that it continued to encompass all types of imitative counterpoint. If we examine the various ways in which musicians of the late Renaissance employed the word, we find that these can be grouped into three principal categories.

In the first place, fugue continued to serve as the title for a piece of music in which all voices participated in a single canon. Example 3 is taken from *Musica Teusch*, a collection of instrumental music published in Nürnberg in 1532 by Hans Gerle. The piece (no. 7), written for four gambas, carries the inscription „Das is ein fug[.] geen all stim auss dem Discant“ (that is a fugue, all voices proceed from the discant), and the voices enter at equal time intervals, each a fifth below the preceding voice. As the sixteenth century progressed, canons of this sort appeared less and less frequently in collections of music for performance and more and more frequently in theoretical or pedagogical texts. Elementary music texts for the German *Lateinschule* almost invariably include canons for the students to sing, and even as late as the 1730s these pieces are called fugues. Frequently each piece would be preceded by the rule (or „canon“) according to which the single notated voice was to be realized polyphonically; for example, „Fuga in subdiapente post duo tactus“ (a fugue at the fifth below after two tactus). It seems strange to us today to realize that J. S. Bach's first encounter with the word *fugue* probably came when he sang canons while a schoolboy in Ohrdruf.

Example 3: Hans Gerle, *Das ist ein fug geen all stim auss dem Discant*, opening measures⁷

The musical score consists of four staves, labeled Discant, Altus, Tenor, and Bassus. The Discant staff is in G major and 4/4 time. It begins with a whole note G4, followed by a half note A4, and then a quarter note B4. The other three staves (Altus, Tenor, Bassus) each begin with a whole note, each a fifth below the Discant voice: Altus starts on D4, Tenor on A3, and Bassus on E3. The Discant voice continues with a half note C5, a quarter note D5, and then a quarter note E5. The other voices follow this pattern, each entering a fifth below the previous voice. The score is divided into two systems of four staves each.

⁷ My edition is adapted from that found in Albert Lavignac and L. de la Laurencie, *Encyclopédie de la musique et dictionnaire du Conservatoire* 1/3, Paris 1914, pp. 120–121.

One interesting terminological wrinkle can be seen in Example 4 (Appendix, p. 224), which shows the beginning of an anonymous fugue for forty voices published in Spain in 1557. The piece seems at first puzzling, since the four voices with which it begins are barely imitative at all. If one compares the entrance of the second choir in m. 9 with the beginning of the first, however, one discovers that what is being imitated is not a melodic line or theme but the entire polyphonic complex generated by the first choir. The piece concludes with ten SATB choirs sounding at once, each imitating exactly the texture produced eight measures previously by the preceding choir.

The second way in which musicians adapted the word „fugue“ likewise represented a carry-over from earlier usage. It appears most perfectly in the music of Adrian Willaert and the theory of Gioseffo Zarlino, both of whom continued to think of fugue primarily in linear terms even though their compositions contained much imitation that was not canonic. In his *Istitutioni harmoniche* of 1558, Zarlino tried very hard to convince musicians that the fifteenth-century meaning of fugue as exact imitation should be retained. The four categories of imitative counterpoint that he devised were distinguished one from the other primarily according to whether or not one voice imitated exactly the intervals and rhythms of another and only secondarily on whether the second voice continued to imitate the first for the entire piece or whether that imitation broke off at some point⁸. Zarlino touched only obliquely on the idea of first devising a short theme and then passing it around all the voices. Like Dufay 100 years earlier, Zarlino understood fugue to be a sophisticated compositional technique introduced into a piece on a voice-by-voice basis.

The music of Willaert, Zarlino's teacher, incorporates fugue in exactly this way. Example 5 (Appendix, p. 225) shows the beginning of Willaert's six-voice motet *Salve sancta parens*. Here is how Zarlino describes this piece in *Le istitutioni*⁹:

Si potrà anco pigliare un Canto fermo, & ordinare sopra di lui molte parti: ponendone due, o più l'una all'altra in Fuga continua o legata; come vogliamo dire; come fece [...] Adriano nel motetto; Salve sancta parens.

(One may also take a cantus firmus and arrange many parts against it, of which two or more may be in continuous or, as we call it, strict fugue, as Adrian (Willaert did) in the motet *Salve sancta parens*.)

Each of the top two lines is inscribed „Fuga trium temporum in diapente remissum“ (fugue after three measures at the fifth below). We thus have a double canon with cantus and quintus as one pair and alto and tenor as the other, while sextus and bassus are independent. The alto also carries the cantus firmus. Imitative counterpoint is an important element of this piece, but it is the cantus firmus that determines the overall structure. More generally one can say that for Zarlino and Willaert fugue frequently plays an important compositional role, but it often involves fewer than all the voices, and it seldom defines the structure. Furthermore, non-canonic imitation is conceived not so much as the passing back and forth of a short theme by all voices but rather as the following of one voice by another until such time as the second voice goes its own way.

For the third meaning of fugue, we must direct our attention to the north. Willaert's two great northern contemporaries, Nicolas Gombert and Jacobus Clemens non Papa, abandoned

8 Zarlino's subdivisions of imitative counterpoint are considered at length in my book *Theories of Fugue from the Age of Josquin to the Age of Bach*, Rochester 2000, pp. 9–16.

9 Gioseffo Zarlino, *Le istitutioni harmoniche*, Venice 1558, p. 265. The translation is taken from idem, *The Art of Counterpoint*, transl. by Guy A. Marco and Claude Palisca, New Haven 1968, p. 237.

both canon and cantus firmus technique almost entirely in favor of what we today generally call the sixteenth-century motet style of pervading imitation. A motet in this style proceeds as a series of overlapping points of imitation delineated by cadences, each section characterized by its own line of text and its own musical theme tossed back and forth among the voices. The theorist whose writing best describes these pieces is Gallus Dressler, cantor in Magdeburg at the time he wrote his *Praecepta musicae poeticae* in 1563 and a great champion of the music of Clemens¹⁰. Dressler understood the word fugue to embrace all types of imitative counterpoint, which he subdivided into two categories: one in which all voices performed the same line from beginning to end starting at different times (that is, the study or school canon), the other in which all the voices tossed a brief theme back and forth before coming together in a cadence (that is, a point of imitation). Unlike Zarlino, Dressler made no attempt to retain the horizontal thinking of Tinctoris and Dufay. Fugue was not the relationship between two voices; it was a section of a piece of music. This meaning of the word is captured most succinctly in Michael Praetorius's later description of the motet as „an alternation of harmonies and fugues“, that is, of homophonic passages and sections based on free imitation¹¹. Dressler described at length the way in which composers ought to handle such fugues. Like a well-crafted speech, a motet should have a strong beginning, an interesting middle, and a convincing conclusion. When the motet began with a fugue, therefore, the imitation in that fugue should be particularly carefully handled in order to establish the mode clearly and to get the piece off to a good start. More specifically, the voices should enter only on final and dominant of the mode, and they should retain as much as possible the rhythmic and melodic identity of the theme while at the same time emphasizing important modal notes. Later fugues in the body of the motet could take greater liberties.

Dressler's description fits well almost any motet of Clemens. He himself cited as an example Clemens's *Concussum est mare*, the first thirty-three measures of which is given as Example 6 (Appendix, p. 226). The first fugue (m. 1–17) treats its thematic material much more regularly than does the second (m. 17–33). For example, every statement of the first theme, with the text „concussum est mare“, begins on either the final or the dominant of the mode (C or G) and leaps upward either a fourth or a fifth. On the other hand, the next theme, with the text „contremuit terra“, enters not only on C and G but also on E (in the bass, m. 24), B (superius, m. 26), and D (contratenor, m. 30). The intervals of the second theme are also frequently altered. For instance, its opening leap is at various times a fourth, a fifth, a third (contratenor, m. 26–27), and an octave (tenor, m. 29). Much of this freedom is due to the greater emphasis on stretto in the second fugue; whereas the second theme is stated nineteen times in seventeen measures, the first is stated only ten times in as many measures.

Similar use of the word fugue appears in an instrumental piece entitled *Ein gut trium mit schönen fugen*, published in 1536 by the German lutenist Hans Newsidler. Example 7 offers the opening measures of this piece. Like *Concussum est mare*, Newsidler's trio begins with a relatively strict (although much briefer) fugue, followed by a fugue whose theme is more freely handled.

10 The treatise is edited by Bernhard Engelke in: *Geschichts-Blätter für Stadt und Land Magdeburg* 49/50 (1914/15), pp. 213–250. On fugue in particular, see pp. 241–248.

11 „[...] eo quod Harmoniae & fugae invicem quasi commutentur [...]“. Michael Praetorius, *Syntagma musicum* III, *Termini musici*, Wolfenbüttel 1619, reprint Kassel etc. 3/1978 (= DM I/15), p. 6.

Example 7: Hans Newsidler, *Ein gut trium, mit schönen fugen* (*Ander Theil des Lautenbuchs*, 1636), fol. D3^v¹²

These then were the principal meanings of the word *fugue* in the sixteenth century. When used as a title, *fugue* generally designated a canon; when as a compositional technique, it referred to imitative counterpoint of any sort (despite Zarlino's attempt to restrict it); when used to describe a portion of a piece of music, it most often designated what we today call a point of imitation, although it also continued to apply to two or more voices composed in canon. One additional meaning rounds out our survey. Around 1600 a number of Italians used *fugue* in the sense of „a theme to be treated imitatively“. For instance, in a collection of *ricercari* published in 1603 by the Neapolitan organist Giovanni Maria Trabaci, we find such titles as *Ricercar primo tono con tre fughe*, a *ricercar* in the first mode with three *fugues*. Perhaps the most famous composer to use the word in this way was Claudio Monteverdi. The six-voice Mass with which his 1610 collection opens is composed with ten „*fugues*“ taken from a Gombert motet; these *fugues* are even spelled out before the piece begins.

The one way in which *fugue* was almost never used during the sixteenth century was the way in which we use it today, namely, as the title for a piece of music based on one or more thematic units that are treated in some manner of systematic imitation and that form the basis for the entire piece. Vocal works, of course, required no title, and in any case they most often proceeded as a series of points of imitation such that the theme(s) of the opening point never returned once point two had begun. When in 1540, however, the Venetian composers Julio Segni and Adrian Willaert published a set of instrumental pieces exploring just this sort of systematic imitation, they began a tradition of instrumental *fugue* that has continued uninterrupted to the present day. Segni and Willaert could have called the pieces they created „*fugue*“, but they chose instead the Italian word „*ricercar*“, meaning to research or study, a word already in use to describe prelude, improvisatory pieces, primarily for lute. In other words, their choice of title emphasized the nature and purpose of the compositions rather than the primary technique employed in them. Later in the century, other Italians began to adapt lively, freely imitative Parisian-style chansons for keyboard and to write newly-invented instrumental pieces in that style. These pieces were likewise not called *fugues*, but „*canzoni alla Francese*“, an indication of their origin.

12 My edition is adapted from that given in DTÖ 37 (Jahrgang 18/2), pp. 24–25.

There exist from the sixteenth century only a very few pieces based on non-canonic imitation that are called fugue. I know of only four such pieces: a *Fuge la morie* by the late-fifteenth-century composer Johannes Martini¹³, a piece entitled *Ad Dominum cum tribularer. Fuga en .4. con el tiple* by Antonio de Cabezón¹⁴, a *Duorum vocum egregia fuga* by Martin Luther's colleague Johann Walter¹⁵, and a keyboard intabulation of Ludwig Senfl's *Maria zart* that is called *fuga optima* by the compiler of the manuscript in which it is preserved.

The last of these is particularly interesting. Senfl's setting of *Maria zart* (Example 8a; Appendix, p. 228) places the cantus firmus in long notes in the bass, with the other voices engaged in „Vorimitation“ above it. The intabulation is by Hans Buchner, an organist in Konstanz, who (as Example 8b makes clear) simply transcribed Senfl's original and ornamented it with characteristic keyboard figurations. The manuscript containing Buchner's intabulation describes it as *Fuga optima quatuor vocum*, a fine fugue with four voices. One cannot be entirely certain in this case whether the „fine fugue“ is the piece of music or the technique of fugal imitation which is „particularly well displayed“ in the piece. Since there is precedent for the former meaning in the pieces of Martini, Cabezón, and Walter, however, it seems to me the more likely interpretation. In all probability composers and performers used the word „fugue“ more loosely than did contemporary theorists. It takes no great leap of imagination to call such a piece a fugue, since fugue is after all the predominant technique. Analogous reasoning had allowed fourteenth-century Italians to retain the title „caccia“ for pieces in which only two of the three voices actually participated in the canon.

When at the dawn of the seventeenth century Giulio Cesare Monteverdi took it upon himself to answer the criticism leveled at the madrigals of his brother Claudio, he distinguished between the new, innovative practice embodied in his music and the established, classic practice of the preceding century. As he so memorably put it, in the *Prima Prattica* „the words are mistress of the harmony“, whereas in the *Seconda Prattica* „the harmony, from being the mistress, becomes the servant of the words“¹⁶. There was no compositional technique more affected by this formulation than fugue. Vincenzo Galilei and his colleagues in Florence had complained long before 1600 that in order „to carry out a fugue“, composers do not seem to care „whether a voice sings the beginning of a text [...] while another voice sings the middle or end at the same time, or even the beginning, middle, or sometimes the end of another verse or thought“, and they „often pronounce the same words many times over without reason, repeating four and six times the same thing [...]“¹⁷. Fugal counterpoint, then, was ill-suited to vocal music in the modern style, where words held sway, and composers such as Monteverdi and Heinrich Schütz largely avoided it. As late as the middle of the seventeenth century, the theorists Marco Scacchi and Christoph Bernhard continued to asso-

13 Johannes Martini, *Secular Pieces*, ed. Edward G. Evans Jr., Madison 1975 (= *Recent Researches in Music of the Middle Ages and Early Renaissance* 1), p. 26.

14 Antonio de Cabezón, *Collected Works III: Versos & Fugas*, ed. Charles Jacobs, Brooklyn 1976, pp. 38–40.

15 Johann Walter, *Complete Works* 4, p. 107. This is one of twenty-seven pieces titled fugue, and the only one that is not a canon.

16 As translated by Oliver Strunk, *Source Readings in Music History*, rev. ed. by Leo Treitler, New York 1998, p. 538.

17 V. Galilei, *Dialogue on Ancient and Modern Music*, transl. Claude Palisca, New Haven 2003 (= *Music Theory Translation Series*), p. 204. The quote appears on p. 82 of Galilei's treatise.

ciate fugue exclusively with the *Prima Pratica*, by this time often called the „stile antico“¹⁸. For instance, Bernhard's chapter on fugue in his *Tractatus compositionis augmentatus* takes all of its musical examples from the works of Palestrina. Fugue and Renaissance-style composition continued their close association in the early eighteenth century, both in music theory (through Johann Joseph Fux's *Gradus ad Parnassum*) and in practice (for instance, the second Kyrie from Johann Sebastian Bach's *B-Minor Mass*).

But if the distinction between the aesthetics of *Prima* and *Seconda Pratica* hinged on the handling of text, what was one to say about instrumental music? Galilei and his colleagues complained of the excessive artifice and lack of expression inherent in the *ricercar*¹⁹, but most musicians seem to have taken their guidance from the Monteverdi brothers and saw nothing wrong with the ongoing cultivation of fugal writing in works for keyboard and instrumental ensemble. Indeed, in their search for a purely musical means to provide coherence for pieces not held together by the narrative thread of a text, organists such as Girolamo Frescobaldi and Jan Pieterszoon Sweelinck clearly recognized the potential inherent in fugue, with its repetition and manipulation of thematic material. For fugue, then, the end result of this revolution in musical style was that the technique maintained an uneasy relationship with vocal music but found a home among organists and composers of instrumental ensemble music, and this remains its home even today.

It was the German musicians mentioned at the outset of this article, however, who first began to call such pieces fugues. Seventeenth-century Italians continued to prefer the traditional expressions „*ricercar*“ and „*canzona alla francese*“. I am aware of only one Italian piece from the entire century that is called a fugue. It appears in a manuscript formerly in the possession of Laurence Feininger, now in the Museo Provinciale d'Arte in Trent, and is ascribed to Ercole Pasquini, Frescobaldi's predecessor as organist of St. Peter's, Rome²⁰. Among the English and Dutch the favorite title for such imitative pieces was „*fantasy*“, whose non-musical meaning allows for just about anything. We need not be too surprised, therefore, to find subsumed under the title „*fantasy*“ both the free-spirited pieces of William Byrd, with their characteristic alternation between fugal imitation and homophonic dance music, and such severe works as the *Chromatic Fantasy* of Jan Pieterszoon Sweelinck.

*

We are now in a position to understand how seventeenth-century Germans came upon the word fugue as a genre designation for non-canonic imitative pieces. Michael Praetorius provides important clues in his well-known definition of fugue from *Syntagma musicum* III²¹:

2. *Fuga: Ricercar*

Fugae nihil aliud sunt, ut ait Abbas D. Ioannes Nucius, quam ejusdem thematis per distinctos locos crebrae resultationes Pausarum interventu sibi succedentes. Dictae sunt autem a fugando, quia vox vocem fugat, idem me-

18 Walker (footnote 8), pp. 143 and 153–154.

19 Galilei (footnote 17), p. 218 (p. 87 in Galilei's treatise).

20 For an edition, see Ercole Pasquini, *Collected Keyboard Works*, ed. W. Richard Shindle, Rome 1966 (= CEKM 12), pp. 22–24.

21 Praetorius (footnote 11), pp. 21–22 (the latter is misnumbered 24).

los de promendo. Italis vocantur Ricercari: RICERCARE enim idem est, quod investigare, quaerere, exquirere, mit fleiß erforschen/ vnnd nachsuchen; Diueil in tractirung einer guten Fugen mit sonderbahrem fleiß vnnd nachdencken aus allen winckeln zusammen gesucht werden muß/ wie vnnd vff mancherley Art vnd weise dieselbe in einander gefügt/ geflochten/ duplirt, per directum & indirectum seu contrarium, ordentlich/ künstlich vnd anmuthig zusammen gebracht/ vnd biß zum ende hinaus geführt werden könne. Nam ex hac figura omnium maxime Musicum ingenium aestimandum est, si pro certa Modorum natura aptas Fugas eruere, atque erutas bona & laudibili cohaerentia rite jungere noverit.

(As the Abbott D. Johannes Nucius says, „Fugues are nothing more than repeated echoes of the same theme on different degrees [of the scale], succeeding each other through the use of rests. They are so called from the act of chasing, because one voice chases the other while producing the same melody.“ In Italy they are called ricercari. RICERCARE is the same thing as ‘to investigate’, ‘to look for’, ‘to seek out’, ‘to research diligently’, and ‘to examine thoroughly’. For in constructing a good fugue one must with special diligence and careful thought seek to bring together as many ways as possible in which the same [material] can be combined with itself, interwoven, duplicated, [used] in direct and contrary motion; [in short,] brought together in an orderly, artistic, and graceful way and carried through to the end. „For by reason of this figure a musical genius must be considered greatest of all if, in accordance with the fixed nature of the modes, he knows how to bring to light suitable fugues and to join them properly and in a coherent way.)

The quotes at the beginning and end (in Latin in the original, indicated in the translation by quotation marks) come from the introductory paragraph of a chapter on fugue published by Johannes Nucius in 1613²². Like Dressler, Nucius was interested exclusively in the sixteenth-century motet. His definition emphasizes the difficulty of fugal technique and describes it as the ultimate test of a composer’s skill. Praetorius’s description of the Italian ricercar stresses precisely this same characteristic: that is, the literal meaning of ricercar – to research or investigate – indicates that such a piece sets out to present its thematic material in as sophisticated and varied a manner as possible. Praetorius seems to have equated the two words using something like the following chain of reasoning. Since fugue was the most important compositional technique of late-Renaissance vocal polyphony; since every German theorist since Dressler considered it the ultimate test of a composer’s ability and the most advanced and learned technique of all; and since of all the genres of instrumental music only the Italian ricercar required the kind of rigor and learned approach prized by late-Renaissance German theorists; therefore, the extended stile antico ricercar was the only instrumental genre worthy of the name fugue.

Modern scholars, in their search for the roots of the late-Baroque fugue, have focused much attention on the imitative fantasies of Sweelinck and the music of his Hamburg students, but one searches in their music in vain for pieces called fugue that match Praetorius’s description. On the other hand, at least three such pieces are attributed to Hans Leo Hassler, the Nürnberg organist and composer who studied in Venice with Andrea Gabrieli in 1584. Willi Apel long ago singled out the ricercari of Andrea Gabrieli as important for turning the ricercar into, as he put it, „the medium of the learned style, the ‘higher counterpoint’“²³. This description also agrees with Praetorius’s, and when we look among the surviving keyboard works of Gabrieli’s German student, we find that Hassler used both ricercar and fugue as titles for keyboard pieces and that they are indistinguishable from each other in purpose, scope, and contrapuntal style.

These pieces are to be found in two of the most important sources for south-German keyboard music of the first half of the seventeenth century: a series of sixteen manuscripts

22 J. Nucius, *Musices poeticae [...] praeceptiones*, Neisse (now Nisa, Poland) 1613, fol. G1^v–G2^r.

23 W. Apel, *The History of Keyboard Music to 1700*, trans. and rev. by Hans Tischler, Bloomington 1972, p. 179.

now housed in Turin, Italy and a single manuscript (numbered 1982) from Padua, both notated in German organ tablature²⁴. The Turin tablatures show us in particularly clear fashion the way in which south German musicians envisioned the word fugue as a genre designation. These manuscripts are quite carefully organized by compositional type, with three (Giordano VI, VII, and VII) devoted entirely to large, impressive fugal pieces of the *ricercar* type with the designations *ricercar*, *fantasia*, and *fuga* variously intermingled. Included among the *ricercari* of Andrea Gabrieli, Claudio Merulo, and Frescobaldi and the fantasias of Sweelinck are a fugue by Peter Philips (designated *Fantasia* in the *Fitzwilliam Virginal Book*)²⁵, one ascribed to Sweelinck²⁶, two fugues of Giovanni Gabrieli²⁷, and the above-mentioned three by Hassler²⁸, as well as several fugal sections excerpted from toccatas by Hassler and given the designation fugue by the compiler of the manuscripts²⁹. All of these fugues, even those excerpted from Hassler's toccatas, are ambitious, extended works on a par with the learned *ricercar*. The evidence suggests that such pieces were virtually never entitled „fugue“ by Italian, Dutch, or English composers. The designation „Fantasia“ in the Fitzwilliam Book is almost certainly Philips's original title, and the works of Sweelinck and Giovanni Gabrieli survive in no other source.

It is difficult to imagine who but Hassler could have been initially responsible for the idea of linking fugue with the Italian *ricercar*. In the preface to *Syntagma III* Praetorius named Hassler as the most distinguished organist of his day and he noted Hassler's training under Andrea Gabrieli. Although Hassler had been dead for seven years when *Syntagma III* was published, he and Praetorius had met as early as 1596 at the dedication of the new organ in Gröningen near Halberstadt. Praetorius's preface takes particular note of the importance of Italian music, and he states that among his sources of information were the reports of those

- 24 A full description and inventory of the manuscripts of Turin, Biblioteca Nazionale, Collezione Giordano, Mss. 1–8, and Collezione Foà, Mss. 1–8, can be found in Oscar Mischiati, *L'intavolatura d'organo tedesca della Biblioteca Nazionale di Torino*, in: *L'Organo* 4 (1963), pp. 1–154. Padua 1982 is described and inventoried in Lydia Schierner, *Die Überlieferung der deutschen Orgel- und Klaviermusik aus der ersten Hälfte des 17. Jahrhunderts*, Kassel etc. 1961 (= Schriften des Landesinstituts für Musikforschung Kiel 12), pp. 50–53. For an article discussing the relationship between the two sources, see Vincent J. Panetta, *Padua 1982 and the Turin Tablatures: Reassessing the Relationship Between Two Keyboard Sources*, in: *L'Organo* 27 (1991/92), pp. 3–20. A second inventory of Padua 1982, compiled by Mischiati, can be found immediately following this article on pp. 21–26. The article *Sources of Keyboard Music to 1660* (New GroveD2 24, p. 31) continues erroneously to list the Padua manuscript as lost.
- 25 In Giordano VII, no. 18, fol. 57v1–62v1, it is titled *Fuga a 4. voc. di Pietro Philippi*. It is no. 84 in the *Fitzwilliam Book*, and can be found in modern edition by Fuller-Maitland, vol. 1, p. 335.
- 26 *Fuga 7. toni* J. P. S. Modern edition in: Jan Pieterszoon Sweelinck, *Opera omnia 1/1: Fantasias and Toccatas*, ed. Gustav Leonhardt, Amsterdam 1974, no. 38, p. 177. There are no known concordances, and Leonhardt expresses doubt about Sweelinck's authorship (see p. LV of the prefatory material).
- 27 Each is titled simply *Fuga*. The pieces have no known concordances and are edited in: G. Gabrieli, *Composizioni per organo* 2, ed. Sandro Dalla Libera, Milan 1958, pp. 28–31 and 32–36.
- 28 *Fuga* J. L. H. (Giordano VII, no. 22, fol. 72v2–763), *Fuga di secondo tono di Gio: Leo Hasler* (Giordano VII, no. 32, fol. 116v1–121v3, also found with exactly the same title in Padua 1982), and *Fuga sexti toni* J. L. H. (Giordano VII, no. 42, fol. 156v1–162v2). A modern edition of the first can be found in Hans Leo Hassler, *Ausgewählte Werke für Orgel (Cembalo)*, ed. Georges Kiss, Mainz 1971, pp. 34–41, for the second in DTB IV/2, pp. 82–87.
- 29 These can be found in Giordano VI, no. 80–90, fol. 1694–200v4. For a modern edition of these works describing how the fugal sections are excerpted, see Hans Leo Hassler, *Toccatas*, ed. Stijn Stribus, Neuhäusen-Stuttgart 1985 (= CEKM 45). There is no evidence that Hassler himself thought of these fugal sections as separate pieces or ever gave them a title.

who had had firsthand experience in Italy (which he himself had not enjoyed). Hassler, the first important German composer to study there, undoubtedly gave Praetorius such a report. One could speculate that Hassler was impressed by Gabrieli's learned *ricercari* and transplanted the genre to Germany with a new but appropriate Latin title of more international character.

To my knowledge only two other German contemporaries wrote fugues of this sort: Christian Erbach and Samuel Scheidt. Erbach followed Hassler as organist in Augsburg. It is hardly surprising that he would also have followed Hassler's example and used the word „fugue“ as a genre designation for large-scale, learned pieces³⁰. Scheidt's case is more interesting. His teacher, Sweelinck, almost certainly used only the word „fantasy“ to designate the sort of learned pieces under consideration, and I would suggest that Scheidt got the idea to use the word „fugue“ for two extended, learned pieces in *Tabulatura nova* (1624) from his colleague and friend Praetorius, either directly or through his reading of *Synagma III*³¹. Otherwise he almost certainly would have continued to title such pieces „fantasies“.

If we turn now to the other important Italian genre of imitative counterpoint, the *canzona*, we find that Praetorius associated the word „fugue“ with it in a much different way. In his definition of *canzona* for *Synagma III*³² Praetorius first described the vocal *canzona*, then added,

Seynd auch etliche ohne Text mit kurtzen Fugen/ vnd artigen Fantasien vff 4.5.6.8. etc. Stimmen componirt: Dahinten an die erste Fuga von fornen meistens repetirt vnd darmit beschlossen wird: Welche auch Canzonen vnd Canzoni genennet werden. Wie dann solcher Art gar viel vnd schöne Canzonen in Italia/ bevorab des Iohan Gabrielis mit wenig vnd viel Stimmen publicirt werden.

(There are also some [canzonas] without text composed with short fugues and agreeable fantasies for four, five, six, eight, etc., voices. At the end the opening fugue is usually repeated, and with that [the piece] concludes. These are also called *Canzonen* or *Canzoni*. Many beautiful canzonas of this type, eith for few or many voices, are published in Italy, particularly by Giovanni Gabrieli.)

Here „fugue“ assumes its more traditional meaning as a point of imitation; the word is not extended in meaning to refer to the entire piece. Similarly Hassler also used the title „*canzona*“ – but never „fugue“ – for a number of pieces in this style. These facts and Praetorius's words imply that the two men reserved the title of „fugue“ exclusively for pieces with the contrapuntal rigor and learned tone of the *ricercar*. Anything less was undeserving of this word.

Many contemporaries, however, appear to have been far less fussy. As mentioned above, a Straßburg organist named Bernhard Schmid published a large tablature book in 1607 with music predominantly by Italian composers. Among the works are twelve designated as „Fugues, or (as the Italians call them) *Canzoni alla francese*“³³. Nearly all of the composers came from northern Italy: Brescia (Florentia Maschera and Antonio Mortaro), Milan (Orfeo Vecchi), Venice (Andrea Gabrieli), Bologna (Adriano Banchieri), and Florence (Cristofano Malvezzi). These pieces do not pretend to be learned, and the contrapuntal rigor varies consid-

30 Erbach's fugues appear in the same sources discussed above. For a modern edition, see Christian Erbach, *Collected Keyboard Compositions III: Fantasias, Fugues, Canzonas*, ed. Clare G. Raynor, Neuhausen-Stuttgart 1973 (= CEKM 36), pp. 13–39.

31 Modern editions of *Tabulatura nova* are plentiful. Perhaps the most notable is vol. 1 of DDT.

32 Praetorius (footnote 11), p. 17.

33 These twelve fugues can be found on fol. M5^r–P6^r of Schmid's print.

erably from one piece to the next. Among the finest is Andrea Gabrieli's *Canzon ariosa*, which Schmid probably took from a print of 1596 edited by Andrea's nephew Giovanni³⁴. The piece's structure is typical of all twelve fugues in Schmid's collection. Within a length that is less than half that of Hassler's fugues Gabrieli's *canzona* offers six brief points of imitation, the last of which is repeated. The opening theme forms the basis for the first two points of imitation, after which it vanishes without a trace. Like those of the Clemens motet examined earlier, the points of imitation (that is, what Praetorius called fugues in this context) after the first are more freely handled. Their themes are shorter and exhibit less well-defined character and shape, and thematic entries appear rather unsystematically and on various notes of the mode. The general style of the piece – especially its almost constant use of non-vocal keyboard figuration – is also somewhat less exalted than that of Hassler's or Scheidt's fugues. Much of its texture is not really contrapuntal at all; rather, the theme serves as melody accompanied with simple chords or standard keyboard figuration.

Ten years after Bernhard Schmid, Johann Woltz published a similar tablature book in Basel, with a similar emphasis on Italian composers. The book included a great many canzonas, not only of the imitative variety preferred by Schmid, but also some of the polychoral variety associated most closely with Venice and Giovanni Gabrieli. Woltz retained the original titles for these pieces, but in the preface referred to the imitative ones as „fugues“ and the polychoral ones as „concertos“. He also included twenty pieces called simply „fugue“ written by Simon Lohet, who was born in Liège ca. 1550 and served as organist in Stuttgart until his death in 1611³⁵. These fugues represent the first body of pieces by a single composer to bear the title, and much has been made of them in the scholarly literature, but they are very modest in almost every respect. In length they scarcely measure up to the Italian imitative canzonas; the average is about half the length of Gabrieli's *Canzon ariosa*. In contrapuntal style they fall far short of stile antico polyphony – one finds numerous exposed examples of parallel perfect consonances, clumsy voice leading, awkward cross relations, and inconsistent use of accidentals (some of which could perhaps be blamed on Woltz). They are in no way comparable to the grand, extended fugues of Hassler³⁶.

Two approaches to structure are evident. Slightly over half of Lohet's fugues comprise either a single point of imitation based on one theme or two shorter ones based generally on either one or two themes. Except for their shortcomings in contrapuntal skill these might be considered equivalent to the opening point of imitation in a stile antico motet or Italian ricercar. Here we rediscover Dressler's meaning of fugue but in a new context: that is, the point of imitation is allowed to stand by itself as an independent piece. Lohet attempts on a few occasions to introduce such learned devices as stretto or thematic inversion, but he invariably

34 The print is *Il terzo libro de ricercari*. A modern edition is available in: Andrea Gabrieli, *Intonationen für Orgel*, ed. Pierre Pidoux, Kassel 2/1967, pp. 29–31. Schmid's version of the piece differs in a few respects. The piece also appears in Woltz's tablature (on p. 306 as numbered in the Forni facsimile), where it is included in a sequence of canzonas and is called simply *Ariosa*.

35 Lohet's fugues appear in Woltz's print on pp. 310–325 (as numbered in the Forni facsimile). For a complete modern edition, see Simon Lohet, *Compositions for Organ*, ed. Larry W. Peterson, Neuhausen-Stuttgart 1976 (= CEKM 25).

36 For this reason it is difficult for me to agree with Klaus-Jürgen Sachs that they serve as exemplars of the learned style („gelehrte Komposition“). See Sachs, *Das Fugenkorpus des Simon Lohet in Johannes Woltz' Tabulaturbuch von 1617*, in: Frank Heidlberger et al. (ed.), *Von Isaac bis Bach: Studien zur älteren deutschen Musikgeschichte. Festschrift Martin Just zum 60. Geburtstag*, Kassel etc. 1991, p. 162.

does so with extremely simple themes and with modest results. Of greater interest, perhaps, is Lohet's second type. Here anywhere from two to four extremely brief points of imitation appear, but only the first presents a true fugal theme in systematic fashion. After this first section the theme disappears and the remaining sections offer extremely simple motivic ideas in quite unsystematic fashion. The result resembles nothing so much as a miniature instrumental counterpart to Renaissance motets such as *Concussum est mare*.

An example of this second type is Lohet's eighth fugue, reproduced in its entirety in Example 9 (Appendix, p. 229). The opening point of imitation (m. 1–17) focuses on a single theme, which it brings in on final and dominant of the mode (G and D) in a relatively orderly way. After a brief interlude (m. 17–24) based on relatively unsystematic imitation of a brief motive, the second point of imitation (meas. 24–35) begins with entirely new thematic material, a three-note descending scalar pattern which is treated more in the manner of a sequence than of a point of imitation. Connoisseurs of the eighteenth-century fugue might recognize a texture associated with the fugal episode, but Lohet has no such purpose in mind. The fugue concludes with a third section (meas. 35–48) in which a four-note descending scale is passed back and forth in parallel thirds and tenths. As in *Concussum est mare*, the successive sections are independent of each other and the material is handled progressively more freely. Unlike the motet, however, Lohet's eighth fugue has no text to hold it together. In the Italian *ricercar* and the Hassler fugue this lack of text was compensated for through the introduction of thematic coherence. Lohet solves the problem by keeping the piece short, and he also compensates for the lack of text by introducing material that is distinctly instrumental in nature. The relative unsophistication of Lohet's fugues suggests that such pieces were usually improvised and that Lohet was simply offering examples for the organist who either wished to learn that art or was unable to do so.

Hausmann's two fugues, published in 1604, form something of a halfway point between Hassler's severity and Lohet's simplicity. The first begins rather like one of Hassler's, with a well-defined theme in long note values that is given an orderly exposition and is accompanied by a countertheme of greater flexibility. In the body of the piece, however, the opening theme is absent for considerable stretches, and other brief motivic ideas of the sort encountered in Lohet's fugues dominate the texture. Aside from *stretto* (which is already present at the beginning of the piece) learned contrapuntal devices play only an incidental role, and the piece concludes with one of the subordinate counterthemes.

To summarize: In 1600 the word „fugue“ was generally used with one of three meanings: canon, imitative counterpoint in general, or the point of imitation in a motet. In the first two decades of the seventeenth century German musicians added a new meaning: „fugue“ as a non-canonic piece of music. The pieces they produced fall into three categories. The most traditional was a piece comprising a single point of imitation that stood on its own. Several of Lohet's fugues are of this type, and the northern composers Hieronymus Praetorius and Heinrich Scheidemann both contributed such fugues³⁷. The other two ways involved the writing of pieces that were in some way instrumental counterparts of the motet. Many, like

37 See, for instance, the second versus, headed *Alio modo Fuga*, of H. Praetorius's *Magnificat quarti toni*, in: Jeffery T. Kite-Powell (ed.), *The Visby (Petri) Organ Tablature: Investigation and Critical Edition*, Wilhelmshaven 1979 (= Quellenkataloge zur Musikgeschichte 14/15), vol. 14, pp. 44–45; and Scheidemann, *Fuga* [in d], Lüneburg KN 207/15, no. 34, in: Heinrich Scheidemann, *Orgelwerke 3: Praeambeln, Fugen, Fantasien, Canzonen und Toccaten*, ed. Werner Breig, Kassel etc. 1971, p. 27.

Schmid, Woltz, and Lohet, applied the word to pieces that were comparable in basic structural outline to the motet. These fugues, generally less severe in contrapuntal style than the motet, consist of a series of points of imitation without thematic unity and in which an opening point of careful structural design is followed by one or more points of much freer structure. Their stylistic model was the north-Italian canzona. Other musicians reserved the title „fugue“ for instrumental pieces that were comparable to the motet in contrapuntal style and rigor. These pieces followed the motet's structural outline to the extent that they consisted of a series of points of imitation, but since they lacked words they offered by way of compensation a thematic unity that had no place in the motet. The stylistic model for these musicians was the Italian *ricercar*.

Let us now place these conclusions into a broader historical perspective. In its earliest Baroque manifestation fugue was directly associated with the *stile antico*. Since one of the biggest complaints about the „old style“ was the extent to which its fugal textures garbled the text, we need not be surprised to find little writing of this sort in the *stile moderno* vocal music of Monteverdi and Schütz. Nevertheless, one frequently encounters imitative textures of a freer nature in this music. As the seventeenth century progressed, most theorists came to recognize a clear difference between the relatively systematic type of imitative counterpoint inherited from the *stile antico* motet and the newer, more charming, ornamental type of the early Baroque. The first theorist to make this distinction explicit appears to have been Wolfgang Schonsleder, writing in south Germany in 1631³⁸. Schonsleder called the new type „*imitatio*“ and offered as his example the Monteverdi duet of Example 10 (Appendix, p. 230). For models of fugue, by contrast, he referred the reader to the motets of Palestrina and the collection of fantasies published by Frescobaldi in 1608. Although a great deal of early seventeenth-century music lies in the gray area between these two poles, Schonsleder's distinction corresponds surprisingly well to our own understanding of the two words.

A reader familiar with the late-Baroque fugue would probably expect at this point to learn that the use of the word fugue by early seventeenth-century Germans began a tradition leading in a straight line to its use by Bach and Handel, but this is not the case. For reasons stemming in part from the enormous disruption of cultural life brought about by the Thirty Years War, the ideas about fugue espoused by musicians of the first quarter of the century remained largely without immediate consequence. Halle, for instance, the city of Samuel Scheidt, was invaded by foreign troops in 1625, and the musical establishment was largely dispersed the following year and not restored until war's end, only a few years before Scheidt's death.³⁹ Under these circumstances, it is hardly surprising to learn that Scheidt found no student to follow in his footsteps. Although Augsburg lost two-thirds of its population during the war, Christian Erbach managed to produce one student: the Dresden organist, composer, and music publisher Johann Klemm, who studied with Erbach in Augsburg for two or three years in the mid 1610s, before the war started. Klemm published in 1631 a volume of thirty-six of his own fugues, twelve each for two, three, and four voices, and these comprise the single most extensive collection of pieces titled „fugue“ produced in the first

38 Wolfgang Schonsleder, *Architectonice musices universalis*, Ingolstadt 1631, p. 57.

39 See Bernd Baselt, *Handel and his Central German Background*, in: Stanley Sadie and Anthony Hicks (ed.), *Handel: Tercentenary Collection*, Ann Arbor 1987, p. 45.

half of the seventeenth century.⁴⁰ Klemm's fugues remained an isolated experiment, however. While central and south Germany bore the brunt of the war, Hamburg survived relatively unscathed, and its organists Heinrich Scheidemann and Jacob Praetorius took the leading role in keyboard music of the second quarter of the century. These men lavished their best efforts on large-scale chorale-based pieces, however, not on large-scale fugues or fantasies. Thus, at mid-century, when Johann Jacob Froberger „reintroduced“ fugal writing to Germany, the terminology he used – fantasy, *ricercar*, *capriccio*, and *canzona* – was that of his Italian teacher Frescobaldi, not the earlier German fugue of Hassler and Michael Praetorius. Froberger's four designations divide into two main types – the strict type in serious style descended from the old *stile antico ricercar* and the freer type ultimately descended from the *canzona alla francese*. For the latter type, most composers continued to prefer the designation *canzona* or, less often, *capriccio*. Although one contemporary Frenchman, François Roberday, tried in a publication of 1660 to introduce the word *fugue* for the former type,⁴¹ German composers followed Froberger's lead and called this type by its original Italian name, *ricercar*. The word *fugue*, on the other hand, was used in Germany during the second half of the century almost exclusively to designate brief imitative keyboard pieces equivalent to a single point of imitation as found in the old motet or the fugues of Lohet. These brief fugues were frequently associated with *alternatim* performances of the Magnificat, and the most prolific composer by far was Johann Pachelbel. Pachelbel's student Johann Christoph Bach in turn taught keyboard playing to his younger brother Johann Sebastian, and it appears likely that the fugal chorale preludes in the so-called Neumeister Collection at Yale University represent the young Bach's very first attempts at fugal writing.⁴² The way in which Johann Sebastian's conception of fugue grew from the modest single point of imitation to the overwhelming complexity and grandeur of the *Art of Fugue* and the first Kyrie of the *B-Minor Mass* remains one of the great stories in all of Western music.

40 For a modern edition, see Johann Klemm, *Partitura seu Tabulatura italica*, ed. John O. Robison, Madison 1998 (= RRMBE 92).

41 For a modern edition, see François Roberday, *Fugues et caprices*, ed. Jean Ferrard, Paris 1972 (= Le Pupitre 44).

42 These are found in Ms. LM 4708 of the Yale University Library. For a modern edition, see Johann Sebastian Bach, *Orgelchoräle der Neumeister-Sammlung*, ed. Christoph Wolff, Kassel etc. 1985. See also Wolff, *Johann Sebastian Bach: The Learned Musician*, New York 2000, pp. 48–50.

Appendix

Example 1a: Oswald von Wolkenstein, *Die minne füezet niemand*

fuga

Die minne füezet niemand wer da nicht en hat, wan wo er hin gat,
 man spricht du wicht we dir was wilt du mir? ge für hin drat! hast
 min ne füezet nie mand wer da nicht en hat, wan wo er hin gat,
 nicht, so richt dich balde von hin nen! dein min nen dir übel a ne stat.

Example 1b: Oswald von Wolkenstein, *Die minne füezet niemand*, edition (transcription)⁴³

Die min-ne füe-get nie-mand wer da nicht en-hat, wan wo er hin-gat, man spricht,
 Die

8 du wicht, we dir, was wilt du mir? ge für-hin drat! hast
 min-ne füe-get nie-mand wer da nicht en-hat, wan wo er hin-gat,
 nicht, so richt dich bal-de von hin-nen! dein min-nen dir ü-bel a-ne stat.

10
 16 man spricht, du wicht, we dir, was wilt du mir?

43 This edition is my own, adapted from that found in Oswald von Wolkenstein, *Geistliche und weltliche Lieder*, ed. Josef Schatz and Oswald Keller, Wien 1902 (= DTÖ 18, Jg. IX/1), p. 183.

Example 2: Guillaume Dufay, *Par droit je puis complaindre*, Oxford, Bodleian Library, Ms. Canon. Misc. 213, fol. 18^v 44

Il n'est ains que nay nul bien. Ains mesens delecte vuis.

Ontenor. pour req. r.

Tout seul ains nul fort metrair. dimonde tout si ne mestren. De nuy d'ouly. espoir ne me fuis la. andeuz mauly que je sousten morist. buect me a. l'atich a. d'etun sui plus moys que nuy. p'auet d.

Par droit je puis bien complaindre regemir qui fuy estent de tristict de poye.

Un seul fort ouprendre ne s'avoie. ne s'oy romet me pui se.

Qu'en me nuit a mecut relongur le spour me fait enpoul lieu queis loie. par d. et de basses sui ne me sui oustenir. p. fortune a si fort me querdis. auant font aus quamis se au doye. a ceporter meguet a soustir.

maintenir :: 2

Ontenor. gardans au fuga :: 2

ontenor. gardans au ontob. r.

44 See the facsimile edition with introduction and inventory by David Fallows, Chicago 1995 (= Late Medieval and Early Renaissance Music in Facsimile 1).

Example 4: Anonymous, *Fuga a 40* (from Henestros, *Libro de cifra*, 1557)⁴⁵

The musical score is presented in three systems, each with two staves (treble and bass clef). The key signature is G minor (one flat) and the time signature is 4/4. The first system begins with measure 1 and includes measure numbers 5 and 10. The second system includes measure numbers 15 and 20. The third system concludes the piece. The notation includes various rhythmic values such as quarter, eighth, and sixteenth notes, as well as rests and accidentals. The piece is a fugue, characterized by its complex, imitative texture.

45 For a modern edition of the entire piece, see Higini Anglès, *La música en la Corte de Carlos V: con la transcripción del „Libro de Cifra Nueva para tecla, harpa y vihuela“ de Luys Venegas de Henestrosa (Alcalá de Henares, 1557)*, Barcelona 1944 (= *Monumentos de la Música Española* II/2), pp. 163–168.

Example 6: Clemens non Papa, *Concussum est mare* (*Cantiones sacrae*, 1554), opening measures⁴⁷

Superius
 Con - cus-sum est ma - - - - - re, con - cus-sum est ma - re,

Contratenor
 Con - cus-sum est ma - - - - re, con - cus - sum est ma - re, con -

Quinta Pars
 Con -

Tenor
 Con - cus-sum est ma - - - re, ma - - -

Bassus
 Con - cus-sum est ma - - -

con - cus - sum est ma - - - - re, con - cus - - - sum est ma -
 cus - sum est ma - - - - re, con - cus - sum est ma - - - - re, con - cus - sum
 cus - sum est ma - - - - re, con - cus - sum est ma - - - - re,
 - - - - re, con - cus - sum est, con - cus - sum est, con - cus - sum est ma - - -
 re, con - - - - cus - sum est ma - re, con -

re,
 est ma - re, con - cus - sum est ma - - - - re et
 con - cus - sum est ma - - - - re et con - tre - mu - it
 - - re, con - cus - sum est ma - re, et con - tre - mu - it ter -
 cus - sum est ma - re, con - cus - - - - - sum est ma - re

47 Adapted from Jacobus Clemens non Papa, *Opera omnia* 14: *Cantiones sacrae* 1554, ed. K. Ph. Bernet Kemper, Rome 1966 (= CMM IV/14), p. 65.

Example 6: Clemens non Papa, *Concussum est mare* (continuation)

19

re et con - tre - mu - it ter - ra, et con - tre - mu - it ter -

con - tre - mu - it ter - - - - - ra, et con - tre - mu - it ter - ra

ter - ra, et con - tre - mu - it ter - ra, et con - tre - - - - mu - it ter - ra

ra, et con - tre - mu - it ter - - - - - ra, et con - tre - mu - it ter - ra,

et con - tre - mu - it ter - ra, et con - tre -

25

- - - - - ra, et con - tre - mu - it ter - - - - - ra et

et con - tre - mu - it ter - - - - - ra,

et con - tre - mu - it ter - ra, et con - tre - mu - it

et con - - - - - tre - mu - it ter - - - - - ra, et con - tre -

mu - it ter - - - - - ra, et con - tre - mu - it ter - - - - - ra,

30

con - tre - mu - it ter - ra, con - tre - mu - it ter - - - - - ra

et con - tre - - mu - it ter - ra, con - tre - mu - it ter -

ter - - - - - ra, ter - - - - - ra

mu - it ter - - - - - ra, dum Mi -

et con - tre - mu - it ter - - - - - ra, dum

Example 9: Simon Lohet, *Fuga octava* (from *Woltz, Tabulatur Buch*, 1617)

The musical score is presented in six systems, each consisting of a treble and a bass staff. The key signature is one sharp (F#) and the time signature is common time (C). The piece is divided into three sections:

- Section I:** Measures 1-13. The treble staff begins with a half note G4, followed by a series of eighth and sixteenth notes. The bass staff provides a harmonic accompaniment with chords and moving lines.
- Section II:** Measures 14-27. This section features more complex rhythmic patterns, including sixteenth-note runs in both staves. A repeat sign is visible at the end of measure 27.
- Section III:** Measures 28-34. This section is characterized by a more static harmonic texture, with the treble staff often holding chords and the bass staff moving in a steady, rhythmic pattern.

Example 10: Claudio Monteverdi, *O beatae viae* (from *Symbolae diversorum musicorum*, ed. Lauro Calvo, Venice 1620)⁵⁰

O be-a-tae vi-ae, o fe-li-ces gres - sus, fe-li-ces gres-sus, be-a-tae vi-ae, o be-a-tae vi-ae, o fe-
 li-ces gres-sus, o be-a-tae vi-ae, be-a-tae vi-ae, fe-li-ces gres-sus,
 O be-a-tae vi-ae, o be-a-tae vi-ae, o fe-li-ces gres - - sus, fe-li-ces gres-sus, be-a-tae
 be-a-tae vi-ae, o be-a-tae vi-ae, o fe-li-ces, o fe-li-ces gres - sus.
 vi-ae, fe-li-ces gres-sus, o fe-li-ces gressus, o be-a-tae vi-ae, o fe-li-ces, o fe-li-ces gres - sus.

50 Edition adapted from Claudio Monteverdi, *Tutte le opere 16/2: Musica religiosa*, ed. Francesco Malipiero, Wien 2/1968, p. 454.