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Volume II contains all six masses from Missarum Quator Vocum cum Basso Continuo ad Organum part books held in Marsh’s Library, Dublin. These masses have all been converted to the Phrased Notation System by Kevin O’Carroll without reference to other sources.
Abstract

A 1984 performance of Sicut Cervus by Palestrina raised in this writer’s mind questions regarding the performance of Renaissance polyphony by non-specialist choirs. The initial questions developed into one which asked if a printed edition could materially impact a performance.

Subsequent research has indicated that such questions have been asked since the 1930’s, when editors such as Heinrich Besseler attempted to address performance issues relating to Renaissance polyphony through a modified notational style known as mensurstrich. An examination of a selection of editorial styles from 1905 to modern times used in Ireland shows how various editorial styles attempted to deal with problems associated with the performance of Renaissance polyphony.

This writer’s musical training, and over forty years’ experience of directing amateur choral groups, has resulted in a unique set of skills being brought to bear on the topic. The writer has devised a notation system which seeks to minimise the impact of modern notation conventions on the performance of Renaissance polyphony while supporting elements of performance known to have been addressed in Renaissance choristers’ training.

Music notation is a communication tool. However, Renaissance music notation is a communication tool not generally understood by non-specialist choristers and so requires transcription into some form of modern script which can be understood and used to facilitate performance.

In private rehearsals, public performances and independent trials, the Phrased Notation System has been examined in detail and has shown promise in supporting non-specialist choristers in the performance of Renaissance choral music while, at the same time, garnering acceptance by the choristers who use the system.
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Chapter One: Introduction

1.1 Introduction

On the third of March, 1984, I raised a question which would, thirty-one years later, be central to this doctoral research. The occasion was my wedding at which Waterford cathedral choir sang *Sicut Cervus* by Palestrina. I was the director of this choir at that time but on the day in question the choir was conducted by a friend of mine. The performance was not what I had expected from the choir. I was aware of every single crotchet in what was a rather strict pulse. There was no real flow to the music and imitative phrases didn’t resemble each other. The word that came to my mind on that day to describe the performance was ‘lumpy’. The questions the performance raised, were how it is that Renaissance polyphony can be made to sound ‘lumpy’? Why do I hear every beat? Why does it not flow? Over the next twenty-five years, variations of this experience and the questions it raised for me about performance practice returned frequently.

By 2007, I had intuitively identified five issues as possible reasons for the nature of the performance back in 1984. These issues were the presence of bar-lines and their associated accents, the lack of phrasing in both music and text, inappropriate breathing points, a lack of understanding of text, and inappropriate pronunciation of text.

The identification of the five issues was not as a result of methodical study and analysis but rather as a result of my ongoing choral practice working with non-specialist amateur choirs. Over time, I wondered if presenting the music in a modified notational style might have an impact on the actual sound generated by the choir. The creation of this early modified notation system was a result of intuition, rather than formal study.

In 2007, I was studying at Texas Tech University in the USA and had an opportunity to test my theory regarding the impact of notation on the performance of choristers. This was the start of my formal research into the area of notation and the development of the Phrased Notation System (PNS), which is explored in this dissertation. More specifically, this dissertation explores the creation of a notation system which is easily read by choristers and which addresses the five issues mentioned above.
As will be seen in chapter three, my intuitive and experiential response to a sonic experience resonated with the writings and experiences of other choral directors. Writing of the use of bar-lines in early music, Robert Donnington states

Bar-lines are found as occasional conveniences at very early periods. Few of these bar-lines occur at regular and consistent intervals of time; nor do they always appear at the same places in different copies of the same work. Except in dance or dance-influenced music, there were [sic] no regular intervals of time. There was no unit in the structure corresponding to our modern word ‘measure’ in its sense of bar (Donnington 1963, p.69)

Acknowledging the familiarity of modern performers with bar-lines and the significant role bar-lines play in establishing cohesion between performers, it is important that any solution to the issues raised by the presence of bar-lines should not raise additional problems in terms of a loss of orientation vis-à-vis the other singing parts. This will be of major concern in the design of the new notation system.

The issues of music phrasing and the importance of the phrasing of the text are similarly recognised as important aspects of early music performance. John Butt tells us that Niklaus Harnoncourt was ‘perhaps the first to stress that music and its performance before the nineteenth century involved a different aesthetic attitude, one stressing the speech-like and rhetorical aspects of music’ (Butt 2002, p.3). Harnoncourt’s assertions in relation to the importance of text are borne out by the writings of researchers into the lives of Renaissance choristers.

The 2008 book Young Choristers 650-1700, edited by Susan Boynton and Eric Rice, contains a series of twelve essays based on archival records. These records provide information regarding the training of young choristers in England, France, Spain, Germany, and Italy. In his essay, ‘From Mozos de Coro towards Seises: Boys in the musical life of Seville cathedral in the fifteenth and sixteenth centuries’, which is included in this collection, Juan Ruiz Jiménez informs us that the choirmaster in the Seville cathedral had to be ‘skilled in grammar and chant’ (Jiménez 2008, p.86). A 1499 document quoted in the same essay states that the choirboys ‘were taught the reading and grammar skills essential to the comprehension and pronunciation of the texts they had to read and sing’. Jiménez continues by informing us that in 1551 the cathedral of Seville hired Francisco Guerrero to work with the boy singers. His duties included teaching the boys to read, write, and sing the responses, verses, antiphons,
lessons and the martyrology. He would also have to teach them to sing plainchant, polyphony, counterpoint, and composition (Jiménez 2008, pp. 90-91).

Another essay in the collection of twelve is by Alejandro Enrique Planchart and discusses the choirboys in Cambrai, France in the fifteenth century. Here, again, reference is made, not only to the hiring of the *magistri puerorum*, but also to the hiring of grammar teachers. Of particular interest is the rule which Planchart says indicates that the ‘choristers were encouraged (and eventually required) to speak Latin rather than French, even among themselves’ (Planchart 2008, p.127).

These references to the training of choristers leaves little room for doubt regarding the skills in phrasing, pronunciation and understanding of Latin texts required of Renaissance choristers. Any notation system which promotes such phrasing, pronunciation, and understanding will work towards improved performance by diverting that performance from issues contra-indicated by chorister training in Renaissance times.

1.1.1 My experience in Ireland

A high level of phrasing, pronunciation and understanding has not always been in evidence in choirs and groups with whom I have worked in Ireland. This is not surprising, given some of the editions used by those choirs. The 1977 Novello publication of Gabriel Fauré’s *Messe Basse & other sacred works*, edited by Desmond Ratcliffe, contains translations by the editor, which do not always convey the actual meaning of the original Latin text. *Ave verum corpus natum de Maria Virgine* is translated as *Jesu, Word of God Incarnate, of the Virgin Mary born*. A frequently used translation is *Hail, true body, born of the Virgin Mary*. The translation of this same text provided by Rutter in *European Sacred Music* is more sympathetic to the original – though still not a fully accurate translation - *Hail true Body given for us, Born of Mary Virgin maid*. Today, choirs are far more likely to perform in the original language while providing a written translation for audience members, as necessary. Thus, the skill of the composer in marrying the music to specific words in the Latin text is retained while audience understanding is supported.

---

1 Master of the boys.
Part of the skill of the composer is the manner in which music and text complement each other. Choral music of the Renaissance frequently used word painting,\textsuperscript{2} wherein the music reflects the meaning of the text. Where translations are used, this relationship between text and music is not always maintained. Though it is not reasonable to require modern choristers to speak Latin, it is certainly possible to present them with a system of notation which ensures that the meaning of the text is fully understood and where a preferred pronunciation is supported. Jane Flynn’s essay, entitled ‘Thomas Mulliner - An apprentice of John Heywood?’, confirms that this pre-occupation with Latin was not restricted to central Europe, as might be implied from the earlier quotations from European sources. Flynn tells us that music apprentices in England in the 1560’s ‘would have been expected to continue their study of pricksong\textsuperscript{3}, faburden, descant, organ-playing and Latin grammar’ (Flynn 2008, p.173).

One final extract from *Young Choristers 650-1700* comes from Noel O’Regan, who provides significant detailed information on the training of Roman choirboys under Virgilio Mazzocchi at St. Peter’s in Rome.\textsuperscript{4}

Every morning the boys spent one hour “nel cantar cose difficili e malagevoli per l’acquisto della esperienza” (singing difficult and awkward things to acquire experience), a second hour “nel essercizio del trillo,” and another on *passage* (the ornamental figuration patterns that were memorized [sic] and practiced by singers); an hour was spent studying *lettere* and an hour exercising in front of a mirror with the *maestro* listening. Every afternoon there was a half-hour of theory, a half-hour of “contrapunto sopra il canto fermo,” an hour learning “contrapunto sopra la cartella (a slate with staves) and another hour on *lettere*. Any remaining time was spent practicing the *clavicembalo* or composing a psalm, motet, or canzonetta (O’Regan 2008, p.232).

O’Regan does not suggest that this level of intense training was typical for all choirs but it does provide an insight into how aspects of music (virtuoso singing, improvised

---

\textsuperscript{2} The use of musical gesture(s) in a work with an actual or implied text to reflect, often pictorially, the literal or figurative meaning of a word or phrase. A common example is a falling line for ‘descendit de caelis’ (‘He came down from heaven’) (Carter, T. “Word-painting”, *Grove Music Online*). [accessed 04/07/2017]

\textsuperscript{3} Partsongs.

\textsuperscript{4} Mazzocchi was *maestro* at St. Peter’s from 1629 to 1646.
counterpoint, text setting and keyboard proficiency) were addressed, in St Peter’s Basilica, Rome, in the 1600’s.

This arts practice research project is created out of my experience and is created for my practice. It is not designed to supplant other notational styles intended to address some of the same issues as those addressed here. It merely adds to the ‘box of tools’ available to choral directors. As in many situations, there is no ‘one size fits all’ in terms of performance supports for Renaissance choral performance.

While this research is grounded in palaeographic investigation, its motivation is primarily pedagogical. The goal is not the interpretation of original printed sources - though this will form part of the study - but a performance to assist and guide non-specialists away from practices contra-indicated by Renaissance training sources. Certainly, palaeographic knowledge is a necessary part of understanding the original sources and transcribing such sources into notation easily understood by today’s choristers. The extent of palaeographic investigation engaged in as part of this research is sufficient to address the particular issues encountered in the transcription process of the chosen Renaissance publication.

Legitimacy for this arts practice research resides in my lived experience in relation to Renaissance polyphony. This lived experience is influenced by all of my musical activity and, therefore, a short look at that experience, and the elements which influenced it, is appropriate.

1.2 Situating Self/ Situating Practice

I grew up in a very musical family. My father was a violinist, teacher, and church music composer; a man who, along with my mother, instilled in his children the value and rewards of hard work and dedication. All my surviving siblings direct choirs or work as professional instrumentalists and music teachers.

One of the earliest, formative moments of my musical development occurred through receipt of a scholarship at eleven years of age. The scholarship was part of a scheme

---

5 The term palaeography, as used in this dissertation, refers to the study and interpretation of specified published music of the Renaissance rather than the study of the notation or ancient script itself.
6 I use the word ‘surviving’, as my brother Declan died in 1994.
known as the *Schola Cantorum*\(^7\), which was set up by in 1970 by the Irish Episcopal Conference to train boys\(^8\) as the next generation of Catholic Church musicians. The scheme was designed as a conservatoire type school within a standard secondary boarding school. The hope was that scholars from the scheme would, in time, become the next generation of church organists and choirmasters. Access to such specialised training was almost non-existent in 1970’s Ireland and so the scheme attracted high calibre budding musicians. With only four scholarships awarded in any one year, there were a total of twenty ‘Scholas’\(^9\) in the school at any one time. Amongst the ‘Scholas’ while I was there, were many boys who would go on to hold senior educational and performance posts, both in Ireland and further afield. My contemporary ‘Scholas’ included:

- Dr John O’Keeffe, Director of Sacred Music in St Patrick’s College, Maynooth and Director of Choral Groups at Maynooth’s National University,
- Professor Harry White, who has occupied the Chair of Music at University College Dublin since 1993,
- Pádraic Ó Cuinneagáin, who lectures in piano and academic studies at Dublin Institute of Technology Conservatory of Music and Drama and is currently Programme Chair for the MMus programme, and
- Donal Doherty, for many years Head of Music Services at the Western Education and Library Board in Northern Ireland.

Being surrounded by this level of intellect and musicianship stimulated discussion and challenged opinions. The director of the *Schola Cantorum* at the time was Rev. Frank MacNamara, a skilled musician, a graduate of UCD and Maynooth, and an Associate of the Royal College of Organists. Rev. MacNamara was imbued with a deep love of Renaissance choral music and, as a result of his interest, students were regularly exposed to and performed music of that era. Thus began my love of Renaissance polyphony.

---

\(^7\) For further information, see http://www.scholacantorum.ie or *The Encyclopedia of Music in Ireland* or http://www.scholacantorum.ie

\(^8\) Though the scheme was originally set up for boys, it has been open to both boys and girls for many years.

\(^9\) Though the proper term referring to those on scholarship is ‘scholars’, we referred to ourselves colloquially as ‘scholas’.
Renaissance polyphony fascinated me, not only by the inter-dependence of the voice parts, but also by the various effects which could be generated through skilled writing. One composition which Rev. MacNamara performed with his students and which especially resonated with me was *Ascendit Deus* by Jacobus Gallus (Handl), in which the composer engages in some very effective word painting with the text *in voce tubae* (with the sound of trumpets). This text is enunciated by various voice parts in quick succession, in imitation of a trumpet fanfare (see Example 1.1).

![Example 1.1. Jacobus Gallus (Handl): Ascendit Deus extract](image)

*Ascendit Deus* was the piece I would use when experimenting with my new notation system in America some forty years later. MacNamara also introduced me to the music of Viadana and over the years I have performed many of that composer’s short motets and continue to be fascinated by the level of invention and skill displayed in these compositions.

In addition to learning piano and organ as part of the *Schola Cantorum* system, learning a wind instrument was also a requirement. In my case, I had already started to play the trumpet but was asked to switch to French horn, as it appeared I might possibly have an embouchure more suited to that instrument. These possibilities were realised and I was awarded a further scholarship to attend the Royal Irish Academy of Music, studying French horn under the tutelage of Victor Malirsh, principal horn of
Having joined the Irish Youth Orchestra at fourteen years of age, I would become section leader some years later. In time, I would progress to a stage where I played with most of the professional orchestras in Ireland as and when additional horns were required. Playing with the RTE National Symphony Orchestra, RTE Concert Orchestra, Irish Film Orchestra, and Wexford Opera Festival orchestra – in addition to working as a freelance player for many orchestras and theatre presentations – provided me with professional orchestral experience that was uncommon amongst choral conductors. This experience, not only gave me an opportunity to perform at the highest levels in the country, but included working with professional conductors with varying styles, approaches, and opinions.

My first engagement as a professional conductor came when I took over as organist and choirmaster at the Cathedral of the Most Holy Trinity, Waterford in 1981, aged twenty-one. I was appointed to the post upon the death of my father, who was my predecessor in the role. My mother regularly reminds me that I would likely not have had all the opportunities I have had if my father had not died at such a young age – fifty-nine.

Though I was professionally engaged as choirmaster at the cathedral, there were no experts locally available from whom I could ask advice on issues relating to choral direction. In the early 1980’s, I had no access to books on conducting, even if I had been aware of them. What computers existed, were found in banks and government departments. There were almost no home computers and certainly no Google or internet. I was effectively operating in choral isolation. Any problems I encountered were resolved through my own intuition and experimentation, through trial and many errors. However, this experiential learning was key in my development, both as a conductor and as a musician. I had to figure out for myself what worked and what did not work, even if I did not have the academic awareness or education to support or justify my decisions. Reflecting on the situation, I can now see that I was, unwittingly, heavily engaged in informal practice-based research, subconsciously using my years of experience in singing at the Schola Cantorum, together with my other musical experiences, to guide me in what felt and sounded right. The extent to which this informal research was well founded was underlined in 1988 by an adjudicator’s

---

10 The RTESO was subsequently renamed the RTE National Symphony Orchestra.
11 As commented on in an interview with Josephine O’Carroll, 06/12/2014.
positive comments following a performance of *Rejoice in the Lord Always* by John Redford; ‘A profound thank you for singing the music of this period so well – so in style – really lovely’.12

Further indications that I was on the right road came when, in 2007, I decided to do a Diploma in Choral Conducting13 in preparation for my American studies. At this time, I still had very little formal tuition in conducting and no tuition whatsoever in choir management, rehearsal technique, vocal technique etc. It was therefore rewarding to read the examiner’s comments:

You were full of constructive ideas and thoughtfully considered strategies. You made excellent points about your approach to warm ups, for example. A clear headed sense of purpose was displayed with evidence that several aspects of choral training (and administration) have been thought through thoroughly. Your approach to programme building, vocal development, choir management etc. all impressed. The choir … benefit greatly from your confident and effective direction and convincing artistic awareness.14

These skills, which included a sense of vocal development, choir management, effective direction, and artistic awareness, were subsequently underpinned through the Master of Music in Performance studies, which, in turn, added to my understanding of the needs of a non-specialist choir in the performance of Renaissance polyphony.

In 1997, another watershed moment marked the beginning of a journey which brought me from intuitive practice based research to a more rigorous and formal process of research at Masters and subsequently at Doctoral level. I attended the conference of the Association of British Choral Directors in Sunderland where I met Dr John Dickson. Dickson was a conducting teacher and clinician working at Texas Tech University in Lubbock, Texas. He was presenting a masterclass in choral conducting and I volunteered as one of the students. I subsequently travelled to the UK to take some lessons from Dickson while he was a visiting Fellow at the University of Cambridge. Dickson became my supervisor when, in 2007, I studied at Texas Tech University (TTU) for a Master of Music Performance in Choral Conducting. This

---

13 The Associated Board of the Royal Schools of music examined for this diploma qualification but played no role in setting a programme of study or providing mentors or tutors. Thus, this qualification was achieved exclusively on foot of self-taught experiences.
period of study was only possible due to the incredible support of my wife, Deirdre, who remained at home in Ireland with our three children. Though without formal musical training, Deirdre has been singing in choirs since she was a child and regularly provides feedback, which is as insightful as it is valuable. In terms of my gaining an understanding of how an untrained musician experiences and learns Renaissance polyphony, her input over the many years has been hugely educational for me.

At TTU, I had an opportunity for the first time to systematically investigate the reasons for, and trial possible solutions to, the issue of the ‘lumpy’ sounds I had heard so many years earlier.

My time in the United States was central to my development as a conductor and a musician in one other way. By the time I started studying in the United States, I had already been conducting for about thirty years. Though my passion for choral music had been life-long, my conscious, critical and academic engagement with the art only commenced in 2007 when I embarked on a Masters in Music at Texas Tech University. The first request of my conducting professor was for a paper on my personal choral philosophy. I was unaware such a thing existed or that I might have a choral philosophy. By the end of the assignment I had managed to give a voice to a number of previously unrecognised and unspoken tenets which I had subconsciously been implementing from the start of my conducting career.

One of those unrecognised tenets was that it was my job as a choral director to assist a choir achieve its potential, whatever that might be. In this way, taking a level two choir to level five would be a tremendous success, while maintaining a level seven choir at level seven would not be so rewarding, despite the additional aesthetic fulfilment offered by the higher level of musicality and performance. The identification of this philosophy revealed my practice as being not just a conductor but also being a music educator – albeit within the non-formal educational sphere of community music making.

This recognition of myself as a conductor/music educator would be the real starting point for my research into the performance practice of non-specialist choristers singing Renaissance polyphony.

On return to my employment in Ireland, I found settling back into work in a bank very difficult. The financial industry had changed significantly and the culture now
prevalent within the industry was one with which I had severe moral and ethical problems. I was regularly in conflict with senior management regarding these issues and eventually the strain affected my health. As a result, I spent six-months on extended sick leave before returning to work on a part time basis. This enforced absence provided me with time and space to seriously consider my future. It went a long way towards formulating what would become my second career. In December 2009, aged fifty, I was offered a redundancy package from my employment of twenty-nine years. Though financial insecurity would soar, so too would job satisfaction. I would finally have the opportunity to follow my own dreams and ambitions.

The initial PNS trials in the USA consisted of presenting a motet in standard modern music notation to a choir and having them sing it. The sheet music was then replaced with an edition which used an early form of my developing notation system. Postgraduate colleague, Alexa Vogelzang, who was a singer in those trials, remarked in an interview that the sound was ‘instantly different…a huge contrast between the first writing – with the bar-lines and the adapted work that you had done’. Shortly afterwards, Vogelzang commenced her doctoral thesis in which she would compare the impact of my notation system on the performance of Renaissance polyphony with that of a performance of Renaissance polyphony using standard modern notation. Due to a serious illness two years later, she was not in a position to complete her research. Her decision to stop the research meant that if my thoughts and experiments were ever to see the light of day I would have to undertake the research myself. Thus, I decided to embark on this Arts-practice PhD.

Many threads have come together to bring me to this point. My family background gave me the work ethic and discipline required to take on academic research; my time at the Schola Cantorum provided me with the ability to question norms and to seek alternative solutions; my time as a cathedral musician taught me to think on my feet as a performing conductor but also to think outside the box when addressing problems; and my American experience gave me the confidence in my ability, providing the testing ground for my fledgling notation system. It further revealed my identity, not just as a conductor, but as a conductor/music educator. My illness provided me with the time and space to work out what was important in my life. These individual threads

\[15\] Vogelzang interview, 02/10/2015.
combine to harness intellectual capacity and performance experience in devising a notation system which aims to promote the improved performance of a genre of music which continues to enjoy the support of choristers, centuries after its composition.

1.3 Arts Practice Research

In order to investigate a new notation system for use by non-specialist choristers, I am using an arts practice mode of inquiry. Research in relation to the arts is a wholly accepted form of academic research but the creation of art itself as a form of research, as a method of analysis, and in presentation, is relatively new. In the case of visual arts, for example, art historians and analysts earn their doctorates by investigating, chronicling, and interpreting the work of artists such as Picasso. It was Picasso who (with Matisse and Duchamp) developed a new artistic form known as cubism. Yet, the co-founder of cubism would have had serious challenges in having the creation of his works accepted by academia as worthy of a research doctorate, had he been interested in achieving such a qualification. Those who create art, modify techniques, and develop new styles have had to argue for acceptance within the academic arena, whereas those who report on such creations, modifications and developments have a long history of acceptance within academia. As Coessens, Crispin & Douglas put it, ‘the artist often functions at the crossroads of tradition and new technology, of the culturally acceptable and personal rebellion’ (Coessens et al. 2009, p.31). However, the artist is also increasingly viewed as a reflexive practitioner, capable of generating new knowledge through practice. This is the basis on which arts practice research has emerged in recent years as a growing presence in arts research.

The establishment of practice-based doctorates has raised certain questions, such as those relating to the quality of the writing and the issue of rigour. Fiona Candlin in her paper, ‘Practice-based Doctorates and Questions of Academic Legitimacy’, writes that ‘the issue here is how we re-think what is meant by scholarly, rather than to unquestioningly try to squeeze art practice into the regulatory forms of academia’ (Candlin 2000, p.100). This comment is made in the context of a discussion that ‘scholarly writing’ is not necessarily a synonym for ‘academic writing’ and that scholarship can be defined in wider terms than that supported by traditional academia. Candlin continues,
by maintaining that artwork needs to be underpinned and clarified by written commentaries it deems the artwork to be competent as research only through theoretical elucidation and thereby keeps a traditional image of academia in place. Moreover, such a formulation retains the oppositional relation between art as predominantly anti-intellectual and written work as properly academic. In effect, it does not open out the boundaries of academia to acknowledge different ways of thinking and working, but reduces art practice to the conventions of academia (Candlin 2000, p.101).

The style of writing itself also comes in for comment, in that writing which is not formulated in traditional academic fashion can be seen to be of less scholarly value. Again, Candlin comments,

Academic writing is a mode of practice that is to some extent determined by form. If writing is not a simple means of communication but carries all kinds of extra assumptions and codes within its structure and terminology, then it cannot straightforwardly explain or clarify art practice. Writing has its own form that interprets its status as pure signifier and prevents it from being a completely stable point from which to judge the artwork. Consequently, once writing is considered to be a practice it ceases to be a means of simply explaining or underpinning artwork (Candlin 2000, p.100).

The issue of rigour is also subject to close scrutiny when practice-based research is undertaken. The paper entitled ‘Rigor and Practice-led Research’16, by Michael Briggs and Daniela Büchler looks at the issue in some detail and examines ‘the problem of rigor in design research as illustrative of the more general problem of whether design research needs to have special conditions or criteria applied to it’ (Briggs & Büchler 2007, p.62). Initially, the authors set out what it is that makes practice-based research different:

Research without practice includes, for example, both traditional empirical scientific work in which artifacts [sic] provide evidence for the conclusions in a written research report; and research conducted in the library such as research into English literature. This seems to be synonymous with the dominant model of academic research, and therefore it can be inferred that research “with” practice i.e., practice-based research, must be different from this kind of academic research. If practice-based research is thought of as different from established models of academic research, it is understandable why certain research-defining criteria such as rigor would need to be revisited (Briggs & Büchler 2007, p.63).

16 The Americanised spelling of words (for example ‘rigor’) is only used in the context of a direct quotation. In all other instances European spelling is utilised.
Following various discussions of how performance-based research is regarded, Briggs & Büchler proceed to discuss the origin of the word rigour, establishing that it does not mean rigid, as in the phrase *rigor mortis*, but rather takes its meaning from the French word *rigueur*, meaning harshness or severity. Its use in the area of research therefore implies an ‘unyielding severity of process that leads to valid conclusions’ (Briggs & Büchler 2007, p.65). This demand for rigour is equally important in arts practice research:

There is broad agreement in the sector that the key qualities of the completed arts/humanities doctoral researcher should be a capacity for original and autonomous thinking, and ability to command a field of knowledge, research skills (the ability to frame and explore research questions, and the ability to frame and test a hypothesis and manage a project), and understanding of the appropriate research methods, the ability to produce a cogent argument and, conversely, to engage in critical thinking, and an ability to communicate at a high level (Briggs & Büchler 2007, p.67).

In the final analysis, to paraphrase Briggs & Büchler, what is essential is that the writing and the rigour attest to the validity of the method by testing its structure and determining whether the claims of the outcome can be substantiated by the method. A valid method must provide a rigorous connection between the research question and its answer. Rigour is more important in validating the outcome than the rigour of the competencies that are used to put the method into practice (Briggs & Büchler 2007). In terms of researching the impact of modified notation on the performance of Renaissance polyphony, the use of arts practice as a research method appeals through its mixed-method flexibility and its ability to capture ethnographic responses, not only from the audience members who experience the overall performance, but also from the choristers whose personal performances are individually impacted through their direct engagement with the new notation. An arts practice approach with performance at its heart, provides a strong connection between the initial research question and the answers to that question. Arts practice includes the ultimate test, that of performance. Research through arts practice emerged in the 1980’s in Scandinavia and the UK. Since then, this form of research has developed in Australia, South Africa, France, and Canada (Kershaw in Smith & Dean 2009, p. 105). Various titles have been given to this type of research, each title designed to provide a precise focus on that which suits
the writer’s preference. These include practice in research, practice as research, practice through research, practice led research, practitioner researcher, and more. An explanation of three of these titles follows.

**Practice-based research** ‘refers to the broad domain of research in and through arts-practice, while acknowledging that a diversity of approaches is possible within this broad domain’ (Higher Education and Training Awards Council 2010, p.8). One of the core features of practice-based research is that though practice is used as the primary method, the output is that of a paper thesis.¹⁷

**Practice as research** (hereafter PaR) takes the view that practice is research. Nelson acknowledges that ‘for some established arts scholars, PaR is not accepted as a respectable methodology and is seen to tarnish newly-established arts and media sub-disciplines’ (Nelson 2013, p.4). He goes on to state that much of the literature on PaR is ‘dominated by the presentation of case studies which do not always bring out clearly what constitutes research (as subtly distinct from professional practice)’. This difficulty is further acknowledged by Nelson’s assertion that not all practice constitutes research. He stresses ‘the significant difference between a new iteration of a creative practice and an original ‘academic’ research inquiry to yield new knowledge’. Nelson concluded that ‘know-how’ (embodied cognition) combined with ‘know-what’ (knowledge gained from critical reflection and reflexivity), in relation to ‘know that’ (the equivalent of traditional academic knowledge), together aim to bring out substantial new insights in an academic research context (Nelson 2013, pp.42-47).

**Artistic research** can be defined as knowledge of the process of creativity, not its outcomes (Coessens *et al.* 2009, p.26). Frayling states that for designers ‘doing is designing for these people – not systematic hypotheses, or structures of thought or orderly procedures; but potting-shed, hit-and-miss, sorry I blew off the roof but you know how it is darling, craft-work’ (Frayling 1993, p.2)

Elements of each of these three types of research contribute to my understanding of arts practice research.

The particular terminology used in this research is that of **arts practice research**, a term which seeks to embody elements of practice based research, practice as research.

¹⁷ Though a paper thesis is included in arts practice research, it is not the only output; performance contributes to 50% of the research.
and artistic research. The UK Council for Graduate Education (Frayling et al. 1997) document was a landmark in the area of arts practice research. In his 2005 discussion of this paper, Dr Gearóid Ó Conchubhair notes that the guiding principles and the goal of a PhD study should be that the work makes a recognisable contribution to knowledge and understanding in the chosen field of study (Ó Conchubhair 2005, p.23). Nimkulrat also draws on the UK Council for Graduate Education document when she writes

The practice-based doctorate advances knowledge partly by means of practice. An original/creative piece of work is included in the submission for examination. It is distinct in that significant aspects of the claim for doctoral characteristics of originality, mastery and contribution to the field are held to be demonstrated through original creative work (Nimkulrat 2007, p.2).

She continues by quoting Coumans - ‘The artist/designer, therefore must also demonstrate that he [sic] possesses sufficient knowledge to justify the choices he [sic] has made’ (Coumans, 2003). John Freeman states ‘It is the tension between the ephemeral qualities of performance and the permanence of a thesis that puts the search into research’ (Freeman 2010, p.65).

Though much has been written on the composition and performance of Renaissance polyphony, it is not possible to state precisely how this music sounded. Years of experience in singing and conducting this material does, however, provide some insights as to what will and will not work in practice. My own experience, together with the experience of others working in the area, gleaned through interviews, informs the creative process of the notation system, which will in turn inform future performances. Performance informs the musicology, which in turn informs the performance – a form of cyclical learning. As Brydie-Leigh Bartleet says in her 2009 article, *Behind the Baton*, ‘All of it means nothing until it’s realised’ (Bartleet 2009, p.719). In other words, unless they inform the performance of music, purely paper-based investigations are irrelevant.

This blending of research and performance and the mutual dependence of one on the other is referred to by Howard Mayer Brown and Stanley Sadie:

In a sense, scholars and performers need opposite emphases: performers should learn that there are no simple right answers to most of their most pressing questions, however necessary it may be for them to find a single solution
appropriate for a particular performance and scholars that only through the study of performing traditions can certain kinds of questions regarding the nature of the written evidence be illuminated and that answers to certain of their questions can be reached with enough patient work, if sometimes by means of fairly circumstantial arguments. We shall never really understand a repertory of music until we have learned how it sounds in performance, but good performances and ‘understanding’ alike depend heavily on archival, literary, iconographical, analytical and purely philological studies (Mayer Brown and Sadie 1989, p.x).

There are other issues which need to be discussed when considering arts practice research. According to Coessens, Crispin & Douglas, ‘New research challenges the assumptions of old beliefs. It creates fear that takes many forms’ (Coessens et al. 2009, p.18). New forms of research are challenging to the status quo. Nelson comments that when it comes to performance as research, ‘it is evident that many colleagues in academia remain to be persuaded’ (Nelson 2013, p.24). Similarly, Candlin states that ‘Practice-based PhDs are also the focus of much anxiety but, significantly, these anxieties reach beyond personal doubt and are often shared by supervisors, examiners and senior academic management’. She continues, noting that ‘Practice-based candidates not only have to deal with their individual project but contend with both the constitution of their PhD as such and the implications of doctoral study for their professional identity’ (Candlin 2000, p.2).

Candlin goes on to write that, in many cases, supervisory emphasis has been placed upon the written component. She states ‘While the creative work may demonstrate originality and so on, it is actually only the written research that can adequately clarify those factors and provide a basis for judgement.’ Who then judges the artwork? Can it be judged by an artist working outside academia? Again, Candlin addresses these questions:

An artist could potentially make the same statement as an academic … but it would lack value and status as an academically legitimate pronouncement. That is not to say that the declarations artists make do not have any status, but that they are constituted differently and have force in different arenas. … Pragmatically, this means that the practice-based PhD potentially demands at least two sets of incompatible competencies, one that satisfies the demands of the university and one that looks to the non-academic structures of art production’ (Candlin 2000, p.4).
Given that it is the universities that confer the academic qualifications, it is, therefore, wholly understandable that ‘students were worried that the PhD might steer them away from art practice and towards overly academic concerns’ (Candlin 2000, p.2). Candlin also notes the anxiety experienced by students when examiners focus exclusively on the written component and do not treat the performative elements as being of equal value, in both the research investigation and the presentation of its outcomes. A movement such as a practice-based PhD requires an acknowledgement from academia that there are other forms of learning which require other forms of assessment. This change may be underway but that does not mean that it is without tension and anxiety.

Merely accepting the requirement of a two-part assessment system does not resolve the matter entirely. Once more, Candlin has asked the pertinent question - ‘Should practice-based doctoral students be expected to write theses of the same proficiency as conventional PhD students’? (Candlin 2000, p.4)

The anxiety is not exclusively on the academic side, however. As Coessens, Crispin and Douglas ask, ‘Should we translate our practices into an uncongenial language? What might we betray by translating it – or as the Italians put it ‘traduttore tradittore’ translation is a betrayal’ (Coessens et al. 2009, p.22). Though many world class performing musicians have performance qualifications and some even have impressive academic research qualifications, few ever use the academic title of ‘Dr’ when promoting their performance work. According to Candlin, ‘precisely because practice-based PhDs are institutionally uneasy, candidates are neither recognised as academics nor are their careers necessarily furthered as artists’ (Candlin 2000, p.5).

As previously stated, it would have been possible to carry out a paper-based exercise of creating a new notation system based on an awareness of the abilities of non-specialist choirs borne out of my experience. However, in such a scenario the research would have been lacking in any indication that the notation system could achieve the intended impact on performance or to what degree it might be effective, let alone suggest that it may be a possible alternative to other systems already in existence. Musical observation can only occur through performance, which implies that research of the sort being undertaken here must be undertaken using performance as a significant element in the research.
1.4 Methodological Approaches

A variety of methodological approaches are used in this research. The primary method of inquiry is my practice. This practice is an accumulation of the various elements which constitute my performance over forty years and which have, or have had, a significant bearing on my research.

The second approach consists of elements which document the research. They include interviews with practitioners, teachers and editors; audio visual recordings of rehearsals and performances; an autoethnographic examination of the progress of this research; ethnographic examination of the responses of others to this research; journal writing describing modifications of the PNS on foot of feedback from others; and information gleaned from focus groups and their responses to PNS used in performance. These methods are used to gather my experience and the experience of others and how that experience is altered through the use of PNS. 18

The third group of inquiry methodsjew involve more standard historical and musicological approaches. These include library research, and transcriptions of original manuscripts into modern notation. This group also includes the use of computer notation programmes, both for text and for musical notation.

There are a number of other research approaches which work qualitatively with live experience. Activity theory, for example, provides a robust framework for exploring systemic understandings of human behaviour. However, as discussed earlier in this chapter, arts practice analysis is predicated on reflexive particularism and has developed its own, rigorous methods of investigation, taking practice as a point of departure. Activity theory looks at human behaviour within the context of ‘systems’ while arts practice emphasises the particularly of the individual’s experience.

1.4.1 Approach 1: My Practice

One of the advantages of having been involved in music making over so many decades is the variety of experiences on which I can draw. As a French horn player, the sheet music used when playing an orchestral piece contains no music other than that of the

18 The University of Limerick ethics regulations prohibit the inclusion of the complete transcripts of interviews, focus group responses, and journaling, either in the main body of the dissertation or in an appendix.
horn part I am playing. This is, in effect, what Renaissance choristers would have called a ‘part-book’. An awareness of how different sections of this ‘part-book’ can be identified as a melodic solo, an element of counterpart or a harmonic underpinning can only be gleaned through experience. Such experience contributes to an awareness of what guidance non-specialist choristers will require in any notation system.

The compositions of J.S. Bach are amongst some of the most important pieces in the canon for any organist. Though this music was written after the Renaissance period, it did contain many of the disciplines which were central to choral writing of the earlier period. The fugues of Bach require the organist to be able to identify the ebb and flow of individual motifs. Such awareness is at the heart of an understanding of the imitative choral writing of late Renaissance composers.

Though French horn and organ playing aid an understanding of how Renaissance music can be performed, they are no substitute for actually performing material from that era. It is not possible for an experienced musician to engage fully with this genre of music without quickly gaining an understanding of the importance of text and the extent to which word painting plays a role, in both composition and performance. Similarly, an experienced musician will always phrase the music so as to highlight the importance of dissonance without ever exaggerating to the extent of undermining the essential diatonic tonality of the music. These skills may be read about in a book but can only be learned through the experience of singing the material. Kruse agrees with this assessment and makes the comment that ‘some things learned cannot be taught’ (Kruse 2012, p.200).

As a teacher of conducting, I frequently stress the need for analysis of form and structure of compositions. Here, again, this skill feeds an understanding of how music is, not only composed, but also performed.

As in any skill, the more you perform the more you learn. Over four decades of programming Renaissance polyphony in concerts, I have worked on hundreds of individual compositions, each with a unique challenge to be understood and overcome. Overcoming these challenges one at a time results in tiny incremental learning. The

---

19 Manuscripts or printed books that contain music for only a single voice (whether human or instrumental) of a composition, as opposed to those sources (scores, choirbooks, table-books etc.) that supply the complete music. (Morehen, J. & Rastall, R. *Grove Music Online*) [accessed 04/07/2017]
understanding and insight gained over a lifetime contributes to a level of awareness which, when brought to bear on a new edition or notation system, prompts non-specialists towards a higher level of performance.

Part and parcel of concert work is the provision of programme notes for audience members. As a music educator, I am keen to increase the listener’s awareness of a composer’s situation at the time of writing. I do this in a manner which entertains and educates. In some cases, the historical research required produces information which provides insights into how a composer might have performed their own work. Notwithstanding William Byrd’s position within the royal court of Protestant Elizabeth I, he remained a life-long Roman Catholic. Given that Catholic rituals would have taken place in private homes, there is reason to believe that his Mass for Four Voices and Mass for Five Voices may have been very specifically named. Rather than masses in four or five parts, these masses may have been for four or five people to sing in private catholic homes where full choirs would have drawn far too much attention to what would have been an illegal celebration of the Roman Catholic liturgy. Knowing that these masses may have been written for individual voices certainly contributes to an understanding of the nature of how their performance was conceived by the composer. Thus, continuous research into the life and works of various composers has built up a level of awareness without which any new edition would be poorer.

A final element of my performance practice which contributes to my research is my conducting. I have been conducting amateur and professional groups for decades. Though many of my choristers would say that they have learned a lot from me in that time, the learning was not all in one direction. Over that period, I have come to know what a community choir can achieve. I have learned what elements of performance in Renaissance polyphony they find most difficult and what elements they find relatively straightforward. I have been educated by choristers on aspects of performance where non-specialists need additional support. All of this education feeds directly into my understanding of what needs to be included in any new notation system designed to assist non-specialist choristers with improved performance practice.

To omit the learning achieved from my practice to date, even if it were possible, would be to ignore knowledge and experience which can be brought to bear on the research
being carried out. The inclusion of practice as a method of enquiry, not only applies to past experiences, but also applies to performances associated directly with this research. It is not possible to hear, analyse, or scrutinise any performance without bringing to bear all of one’s historic experiences. Thus, performances provide key material necessary to address the research question.

**1.4.2 Approach 2: Documenting Practice**

Building a robust and rigorous framework for the documentation of practice is an essential component of arts practice research. Because the experiences being documented are highly personal and include the experiences of the researcher, arts practice researchers have gravitated towards methods associated with autoethnography (which are sensitive to reflexive analysis) and narrative inquiry (which favours ‘storied’ rather than analytical approaches to interpretation). Writing in *Blood, Sweat & Theory*, John Freeman says

> In a research context, autoethnography implies experiential knowledge, containing not only the period of the study in question but also the interweaving of past and present knowledge (Freeman 2010, p.182).

Kruse quotes Creswell (2007) and Ellis (2004), stating that ‘An overriding premise of autoethnography is that the author examines himself inwardly and outwardly while engaged in a particular event or experience’ (Kruse 2012, p.295). He continues by quoting Duncan (2004): ‘autoethnographies are self-case studies that portray an insider’s contextual knowledge of a particular setting or experience, follow conventional tenets of ethnographic research and serve a valuable role within the qualitative research paradigm’ (Kruse 2012, p. 296). As I progressed through this research, I used that contextual knowledge to include, exclude, or modify elements of the phrased notation system which my experience informed me needed to be so dealt with.

Given the level of personal investment within autoethnography, the writing style does not always conform to the norms of academic writing, as noted by Heewon Chang: ‘Autoethnography is reader-friendly in that the personally engaging writing style tends to appeal to readers more than the conventional scholarly writing’ (Chang 2008, p.52).
Through visual stimuli, my aim in creating a new notation system is to prompt appropriate choral responses consonant with historically informed performance practice. The extent of the music education of the non-specialist and primarily amateur choristers, for whom this notation system is intended, is such that they will not have had the academic education which might automatically promote an appropriate performance. However, they can learn from visual images provided by the notation system, despite that lack of formal education. This approach is one that would be supported by Koopman –

I argue that community music naturally accords with innovative concepts of learning such as authentic learning, situated learning and process-directed learning, thus presenting an excellent place for developing musical competence (Koopman 2007, p.153).

Though my practice informs what I do in terms of performance and therefore the various elements contained within the new notation system, it would be presumptuous of me to consider that my experience alone is sufficiently complete to take into account all elements worthy of consideration. To this end, an important aspect of my ethnographic work includes interviews with key practitioners, recorded discussions through rehearsals with choristers, and focus group responses following performances. This research has also benefitted from an independent assessment of PNS by post-graduate students from the University of Louisiana.

1.4.2.1 The Interviews

Heewon Chang describes interviewing as a ‘staple data collection technique employed in ethnographic fieldwork’ (Chang, 2008, p.103). Chang continues,

when applied to autoethnography, interviews with others fulfil a different purpose: they provide external data that gives contextual information to confirm, complement, or reject introspectively generated data (Chang 2008, p.104)

Of those interviewed as part of this research, nine are renowned choral directors and music educators. The purpose of the interviews with these people was to establish their professional opinion regarding the performance practice of Renaissance polyphony. It was also an opportunity to discover relevant performance elements I
might have overlooked in my initial preparation. Interviewees included those who
direct exclusively professional specialist ensembles, those who direct non-specialist
professional groups, and those who direct high-quality amateur groups. It also
includes a number of conducting teachers, those who educate and train the professional
conductors of tomorrow.

The interviewees were selected, not only for their performance work, but also for their
other work as editors and/or educators. There follows a list of the interviewees,
together with details regarding their experience as performers, editors, and/or
educators. The first five interviewees listed below have wide experience in creating
editions of Renaissance polyphony for commercial publishing houses. The diversity
of approach of these editors ensured that commentary regarding my proposed system
of notation would be viewed from a variety of perspectives.

- Simon Halsey CBE\textsuperscript{20} is consultant editor for Faber Music’s Choral Programme
  Series. He is chorus director of the City of Birmingham Symphony Chorus
  and of the London Symphony Chorus. From 2001-2015, he was chief
  conductor and artistic director of the Berlin Radio Choir. Halsey is professor
  and director of choral activities at the University of Birmingham and
  International Chair of Choral Conducting at the Royal Welsh College of Music
  and Drama.

- Jeremy Summerly\textsuperscript{21} founded Oxford Camarata in 1984 and has recorded over
  forty albums, many of which contain music from the Renaissance era. Since
  1989, he has been a lecturer at the Royal Academy of Music (RAM) in London
  where he now holds the post of senior academic studies lecturer. Summerly
  also chairs the Continuing Professional Development Programme at the RAM.
  He has edited a collection of Medieval Songs and Carols for Faber Music.

- John Rutter\textsuperscript{22} is an internationally known composer and conductor of the
  Cambridge Singers. Apart from his compositional work, Rutter was Director
  of Music at Clare College, Oxford for four years. He co-edited four volumes
  of Carols with Sir David Willcocks for Oxford University Press. He has also
  edited several collections for that company including \textit{Opera Choruses} (1995)

\textsuperscript{20} See http://www.bach-cantatas.com/Bio/Halsey-Simon.htm
\textsuperscript{21} See http://www.marykaptein.com/files/documents/users/6ea9ab1baa0efb9e19094440c317e21b.pdf
\textsuperscript{22} See http://www.johnrutter.com/biography/
and *European Sacred Music* (1996). Roughly half of the compositions included in this latter publication are by composers born before 1600.

- Simon Carrington\textsuperscript{23} was a member of the performance group King’s Singers from 1968 to 1993. The following year he moved to the United States of America to take up a teaching position at the University of Kansas and later at the New England Conservatory in Boston. He became professor of conducting at the Yale School of Music in 2003 and, in 2009, he was appointed Professor Emeritus at that institution. Carrington has edited a number of publications of Renaissance polyphony for GIA publications, USA.

- Andrew Parrott\textsuperscript{24} founded the Taverner Choir, Consort and Players in 1973, with whom he has made many recordings of pre-classical repertoire. In that same year, he also began conducting the early music group, Musica Reservata. He was appointed principal conductor of the London Mozart Players in 2000 and also directed the period-instrument group the New York Collegium. Parrott is co-editor of the *New Oxford Book of Carols* (1992). He has also published articles in peer reviewed journals.\textsuperscript{25}

- Paul Spicer\textsuperscript{26} currently teaches conducting at the Birmingham Conservatoire, having previously taught conducting at the Royal College of Music, London. He founded the Finzi Singers, with whom he has made many recordings for Chandos Records. Originally an organist, Spicer wrote *A Centenary Appreciation of Benjamin Britten’s Choral Music* for the peer reviewed journal *Organist’s Review*.\textsuperscript{27}

- Stephen Cleobury CBE\textsuperscript{28} was appointed as Director of Music of the Choir of King’s College, Cambridge in 1982 and with this group has many recordings to his name. From 1995 to 2007, he was conductor of the BBC Singers and has been Conductor Laureate with that group since then.

\textsuperscript{23}See [https://simoncarrington.com/](https://simoncarrington.com/)
\textsuperscript{24}See [http://www.bach-cantatas.com/Bio/Parrott-Andrew.htm](http://www.bach-cantatas.com/Bio/Parrott-Andrew.htm)
\textsuperscript{26}See [http://www.choralconnections.com/paul_spicer.html](http://www.choralconnections.com/paul_spicer.html)
\textsuperscript{27}‘A centenary appreciation of Benjamin Britten's CHORAL MUSIC’ is contained in the 2013 publication, *Organists' Review*, 99(3), 6-9.
\textsuperscript{28}See [http://www.stephencleobury.com/](http://www.stephencleobury.com/)
- Patrick Russill is head of Choral Conducting at the Royal Academy of Music, London where he is also professor of organ. He was editor of the Catholic Hymn Book (1998), and has also contributed articles to New Grove. He has written many articles on topics associated with the organ.

- Peter Broadbent is conductor of the choir Joyful Company of Singers. With this non-professional group, he has won several international awards and has appeared many times on BBC and European networks. He has worked with many professional ensembles such as the London Mozart Players, the BBC Singers, and the National Chamber Choir of Ireland. He has also worked with the World Youth Choir and is a regular adjudicator at choral festivals all over the world. For many years, Broadbent was education officer with the Association of British Choral Directors. In this role, he has delivered many international masterclasses.

An in-depth discussion of these interviews will take place in Chapter 3.

1.4.2.2 Rehearsals

The 2012 working paper produced by the National Centre for Research Methods, prepared by Carey Jewitt, states that

"Video is increasingly a significant resource for many contemporary social researchers. It provides a fine-grained multimodal record of an event detailing gaze, expression, body posture and expression. It is arguable that just as the audio recorder gave linguistic theories access to speech and voice, which in turn supported and demanded the development of linguistic theories and methods as well as entire sub-disciplines (e.g. phonetics), video recording has enabled the expansion of the repertoire of researchers (Jewitt 2012, p.2)"

In addition to recording interviews, all rehearsals were recorded in their entirety. In many ways, it is the users of the notation system who dictate the success, or otherwise, of the system. From a chorister’s perspective, the rehearsal sessions provided an opportunity give feedback on the efficacy of the system, the difficulties experienced through its use, and the benefits it confers on performance. It was essential to record all of these comments and determine how the system needed to be changed, in light of this feedback.

---

30 See http://www.singers.com/choral/director/Peter-Broadbent/
What was important in this feedback was, not so much the performance of the music itself, but rather how the choristers interacted with the notation. What did they like, what did they not like and how could I fix it? Occasionally, throwaway comments by choristers resulted in changes in the notation style itself. One such example is where Eoin Power, a chorister for Performance 1, commented that he found it more difficult to know where he was in the score when not singing, as opposed to when he was singing. This comment gave rise to the practice of showing a rest for each beat/tactus, rather than showing two minim rests as a single semibreve rest. This easily implemented change allowed the chorister to simply count off the number of beats before singing again. My personal journal attests to a certain sense of relief at having found a problem that needed to be addressed.

Eoin had difficulty in counting rests in yesterday’s rehearsal. This is the sort of problem I need to hear about so that I can show flexibility in my approach and a willingness to alter stuff based on the feedback of singers. I think it should be easy to fix.  

A further improvement on the issue of counting rests was the inclusion of a count of rests, where the number of rests exceeded three.

Journals tend to be logs or records of daily growth, musings, and insights according to Chang (Chang 2008) and as such are very valuable in tracing the development of research. Unlike memoirs, which may be impacted by subsequent events, journal entries note reality as it was experienced by the writer on the day an entry was written.

As might have been expected, more discussion on the system took place during the first rehearsal for Performance 1 than at any other rehearsal, including the first rehearsal for Performance 2, even though that rehearsal had many more choristers involved. Comments from subsequent rehearsals were, by and large, re-statements of the initial responses recorded at the first rehearsal. The issue of choristers’ responses to PNS are more fully dealt with in Chapter five.

31 Personal journal entry, 15/02/2016
1.4.2.3 Focus Groups

In the paper, ‘Focus Group Research: What Is It and How Can It Be Used’, we are informed that ‘the method of using group interviews was described as long ago as 1926’ and that ‘focus groups are considered to be a qualitative research method’ (Then et al. 2014, p.16).

As was stated earlier in this dissertation, this research arose because of how I reacted to a performance of a piece of Renaissance polyphony. Though the choristers may have felt the new notation system helped them in the performance of this repertoire, it was essential that I discover if audience members noticed any difference in how the music was presented. To this end, a focus group discussion was held immediately after both Performance 1 and Performance 2. In these discussions, audience members were free to ask any questions and make any observations they deemed appropriate. These responses are dealt with in Chapter five.

1.4.2.4 Independent Trial

In both of the performances associated with this research, I had been directly involved in the preparation and direction of the choristers. This constant presence could have resulted in my sub-consciously influencing of the singers’ reaction to the new notation system. To ensure that feedback was free from such potential bias, a group of singers from the University of Louisiana agreed to undertake an independent trial and provide me with feedback from the trial. This feedback is compared with feedback from the Irish choristers associated with the research. The American group were very clear regarding the restrictions they wished to impose on how the video recorded material was used. No individuals were to be identified and material gleaned from the video required prior approval from them before being included in this dissertation. These stipulations required a stand-alone assessment of the American experience, rather than a preferred fully integrated approach to discussing the various topics raised in their discussions, and how these same topics were addressed by their Irish counterparts. In truth, the similarity of the observations and comments from both sides of the Atlantic make this required separation a moot point.
1.4.3 Musicological Approaches

In this research, I have looked to my own history and experience for initial guidance before broadening out and overlaying my thoughts with the thoughts of others. This is precisely the process recommended by Chang when she writes, ‘Unravel your memory, write down fragments of your past and build the database for your cultural analysis and interpretation’ (Chang 2008, p.72). My experience carries with it the societal and cultural framework within which such experience was formed. Sarah Wall notes

Those who complain that personal narratives emphasise a single, speaking subject fail to realise that no individual voice speaks apart from a societal framework of co-constructed meaning. There is a direct and inextricable link between the personal and the cultural. Thus, rich meaning, culturally relevant personal experience and an intense motivation to know are what typify and strengthen autoethnography (Wall 2006, p.9).

In researching the history of performance, there are multiple voices that contribute to the process of creating that history. Those voices include all those performers who have gone before us. Some of those performers will have had limited training whilst others will have been deeply immersed in the specialisations involved in the performance of Renaissance polyphony. In an effort to capture that experience and learning, I have engaged in narrative inquiry with several of today’s experts. Clandenin & Connelly tell us that ‘narrative inquiry is a way of understanding experience. Narrative inquiry is stories lived and told’ (Clandenin & Connelly 2000, p.20). Accessing the stories, thoughts and developed opinions of people such as Jeremy Summerly or Stephen Cleobury allows me to understand their experience and thus bring such experience to bear on my notation work. Leavy writes:

The narrative method or narrative inquiry attempts to collaboratively access participants’ life experience and engage in a process of storying and re-storying in order to reveal multidimensional meanings and present an authentic and compelling rendering of the data (Leavy 2009, p. 32).

Sections of the research contained herein were carried out using paper-based or computer-based methods. These methods included a review of current research, conversion of Viadana masses to the phrased notation system, and a detailing of the
various elements of the notation system. This detailing of the various elements of the notation system provides a justification for the inclusion of such elements.

Central to the project was the location of original published material from the 16th or 17th centuries. A collection of four masses by Viadana, together with a mass by Zucchini and a mass for the dead by Clemens non Papa was located in Marsh’s Library in Dublin. This collection under the title *Missarum Quator Vocum. Cum Basso Continuo ad Organum, Liber Primus. Item Missa pro Defunctis Clementis non Papae* was published in Antwerp in 1625 by Pierre Phalèse. Prior to conversion of the manuscript to the phrased notation system, an initial transcription into standard modern notation was completed using *The Notation of Polyphonic Music 900 – 1600*, by Willi Apel, as the primary guide. This initial work facilitated an easier transcription into the phrased notation system proper.

The combination of personal experience, contributions from interviewees, and an awareness of historic training norms gleaned from written Renaissance sources provides me with an understanding of a modern approach to the performance of Renaissance polyphony. In another example of how my practice informs my research, it is not possible to direct non-specialist groups in the singing of Renaissance polyphony without gaining a good level of awareness amongst such groups vis-a-vis Renaissance performance practice. Continuous usage of the same music typesetting programme since 1982 provides me with the technical knowhow to produce a notation system which can work towards addressing the five specific issues at the core of my research, noted on the first page of this dissertation.

1.5 Theoretical Underpinnings

Before embarking on the more specific contextual discussion for my topic which will occur in Chapter Two, I include a brief discussion on the theoretical discourse informing my understanding of performance, practice, embodiment, and somatics, all of which underpin an arts practice approach. These form an essential component of my theoretical framework, linked explicitly to an arts practice methodological

---

32 The music notation software utilised in the preparation of the final scores was Finale 2011, with subsequent updates.
framework. I will deal with these under three main headings: performance studies, practice theory, and somatics.

1.5.1 Performance Studies

Much has been written on the topic of performance. The extent to which definition of the terminology separates writers on the topic is remarkable. In his 2003 book, *Performance Theory*, Richard Schechner states that

Performance is an inclusive term. Theatre is only one node on a continuum that reaches from the ritualizations of animals (including humans) through performances in everyday life – greetings, displays of emotion, family scenes, professional roles and so on – through to play, sports, theatre, dance, ceremonies, rites and performances of great magnitude (Schechner 2003, p.xvii).

This broad spectrum approach to performance is not without merit. The approach to arts practice previously discussed, wherein all elements of musical performance impact one another, does seem to resonate significantly with this broader approach to performance.

Schechner does not enjoy universal agreement on this definition of performance, however. Marranca and Guatam, editors of the *Performing Arts Journal*, argue that such a broad approach ‘shifts performance into the realms of social science rather than that of art’ (Marranca and Guatam 1988, p.5). They do, however, acknowledge that ‘theatre belongs in the wider humanist intellectual tradition that encompasses literature, philosophy, architecture, history, music, painting’ (Marranca and Guatam 1988, p.6).

Though this approach is not so strict as to imply that theatre is just what happens on stage, it is certainly a lot more restrictive than Schechner’s in its interpretation of the word ‘performance’. Yet, it is hard to disagree with Schechner when he says that:

Appearances are actualities. And so what is what lies beneath appearances. Reality is constructed through and through, from its many surfaces or aspects down to multiple depths. The subjects of performance studies are both what is performance and the performative – and the myriad contact points and overlaps, tensions and loose spots, separating and connecting these two categories (cited in Phelan and Lane 1998, p.362).
Melrose makes a similar point in her chapter ‘Who Knows - and who cares - about performance mastery?’, when she states:

Attitude is extremely difficult to calculate, impossible to grasp as such, since all we can see are actions – discursive or other – practices of one kind or another, from which attitude (or posture, or inclination) is, rightly or wrongly deduced from a position of external observation (Christie et al. 2006, p.132).

We cannot know of the multiple depths which go to construct a performance merely by observing such performance. We can only truly experience a performance to the extent of our own knowledge and training. Our reactions to any performance will be different according to whether or not we can perform in a similar manner (Christie et al. 2006).

Insofar as we create a performance for other people, it ceases to be a performance and becomes a reality for them unless we are operating within a sphere which recognises that such a performance is not reality. It is through a suspension of reality that theatre as an art form succeeds, even though much of the performance we see on stage is a reflection of reality. Though much of the material quoted relates to stage performance, the points made apply equally to all of the performing arts. Though a violinist is readily seen as performing when playing as a soloist on stage whilst being accompanied by an orchestra, this same artist is also performing when hosting a masterclass with students. However, the masterclass scenario is properly perceived as a very different kind of performance. It is a performance which blurs the boundaries between detached stage performance and the hands-on teaching performance which is very much sited in reality and personal interaction.

For the purposes of my research, the use of the word performance indicates the act of ‘doing’. This ‘doing’ is the culmination of experience, trial, error, education, and all elements of my practice which have informed such ‘doing’. Tracy Davis states that

Experiential knowledge is a cornerstone of performance studies. A culture processes itself through performance, but without knowledge of both the history of referenced performance and contemporaneous circumstances, performance is insufficiently understood as chosen expressions or politics-as-culture constantly undergoing negotiation (Davis 2008, p.5).
A very specific application of the word performance pertains when used in the phrase ‘Performance Practice’. The following is the definition provided by *The Harvard Concise Dictionary of Music and Musicians*, which is relevant to this study:

The conventions and knowledge that enable a performer to create a performance. In the context of notated music, performance practice is usually thought to encompass everything about the performance that is not unambiguously specified in notation. This, however, implies a distinction that is not readily made between what is notated and what is not notated. All notation requires an informed reader for its realization, and thus all notation is fundamentally incomplete. In this respect performance practice is equally important in written and oral musical traditions (p.507).  

1.5.2 Practice Theory

If performance studies emphasise the broad spectrum of activities we call ‘performance’, practice theory is interested in the specialist knowledge that constitutes a practice. In *The Artistic Turn – A Manifesto* Coessens, Crispin and Douglas state that the ‘quest for knowledge in all fields, whether theoretical or practical, whether dealing with processes, events or activities, also pervades the domain of artistic practice’ (Coessens et al. 2009, p.17). Karin Knorr Cetina notes that tacit and habitual aspects of practice are emphasised in contemporary understandings rather than the epistemic potential of practice:

There is widespread consensus today that contemporary Western societies are increasingly ruled by knowledge and expertise. … Fiona Giddens extends the argument to the self, pointing out that today’s individuals engage with the wider environment and with themselves through information produced by specialists which they routinely interpret and act on in everyday life (Schatzki et al. 2001, p.177).

This rule-governed approach to knowledge and expertise is not always seen to be in harmony with artistic research: ‘The very notion of artistic research challenges our culture, which is used to defining research by outcomes that can be transferred reliably

---

33 Strangely, *Grove Music Online* does not contain a separate listing for Performance Practice. An online search associated with Grove offers a link to the Oxford Dictionary of Music where the definition is listed as ‘The way in which mus. is perf., especially as it relates to the quest for the ‘authentic’ style of performing the mus. of previous generations and eras. Its study covers notation, ornamentation, instruments, voice production, tuning and pitch, and the size of ensembles and choruses’.
to other contexts’ (Coessens et al. 2009, p.14). They continue, ‘in contemplating the possibility of artistic research, are we in danger of attempting the impossible, i.e. attempting to get through the ‘eye of the needle’ of science?’ (Coessens et al. 2009, p.21) To repeat what was quoted earlier, ‘Should we translate our practices into an uncongenial language? And what might we betray by translating it – as the Italian goes ‘traduttore tradittore’, meaning that every translation is a betrayal’ (Coessens et al. 2009, p.22). Yet, in every piece of music with which we work, we are working with a translation from the medium of sound into the medium of sight; notation symbols are what we use to bring to life the imagined sounds of the composer, as we translate it back into sound.

Quoting Coessens, Douglas and Crispin again: ‘For some artistic communities and institutions the idea of art being explained without artists, ‘music without musicians’, remains deeply problematic. How else do we gain access to the experience of artistic creativity other than through artists?’ (Coessens et al. 2009, p.23). A musical world inhabited solely by printed sheet music would be silent compared to a world solely inhabited by performing musicians.

In Navigating the Unknown, Bannerman write of the practice of killing and displaying butterflies as objects of study:

> To say that the object presented on a pin is a butterfly presents a dangerous barrier to understanding and enquiry, for it was a butterfly – it is now the corpse of a butterfly, which cannot be seen to exhibit the qualities and nature of a ‘butterfly’ as a living creature’ (Bannerman et al., 2006, p.21).

This is the problem which exists within music. For we cannot see music. We can only hear it. We can certainly see lines, dots, and circular shapes on a page which represent music but this is not music. It is notation. It is a visual representation of the imagined sounds of the composer. This visual representation can only be faithfully translated back into sound if we comprehensively understand the conventions of the initial conversion from sound to notation. All notation needs an informed reader to complete the interpretation of the visual signs given that not everything required for performance is included in the notation. One of the major differences between modern musical scores and those of earlier times is the extent to which composers are now detailing more precisely with how they want the music to sound. In Renaissance
music, this instruction did not even stretch as far as overtly indicating changes in dynamic. Notwithstanding the additional sophistication of modern notation, John Rutter, in interviews, commented that even today not everything a composer wants is actually detailed on the score.\textsuperscript{34}

\textbf{1.5.3 Somatics}

Why do people perform music? Coessens, Douglas and Crispin, suggest it might be due to

\begin{quote}
\begin{center}
a need to embody – literally to become – that which is heard, to BE the music.
It is a visceral, deeply-felt, sense of needing to become one with the sound-world of the musical object (Coessens \textit{et al.} 2009, p.150).
\end{center}
\end{quote}

In no musician can this sense be more somatically felt than in those who use their voice, their embodied instrument. However, even before we begin to vocalise any music, we will have engaged our somatic selves with the performance. Lakoff and Johnson state that ‘our ordinary conceptual system, in terms of which we both think and act, is fundamentally metaphorical in nature’ (Lakoff and Johnson 1980, p.3). These metaphors exist through our cognition and bodily experience. \textit{Love is blind} may be a common saying but our understanding of it is rooted in our experience of an existence without sight or with our eyes closed.

Music as a discipline is far from devoid of somatic metaphors. The pitch is high or low, the sound is bright or dull, the phrase flows, the sound washes over, the voices blend. Musicians are said to breathe life into their instruments. In terms of wind instruments, including the voice, this is both metaphorically and literally true.

In his book, \textit{Performing Live}, Richard Shusterman states that ‘there is nothing real that is not interpreted’ (Shusterman 2000, p.115); ‘If everything we do or experience is always and must be always be interpretation, the notion of interpretation becomes synonymous with all human life and activity, and thus loses any real meaning or specific role of its own’ (Shusterman 2000, p.130). This concept resonates well with Johnson where he states that ‘music is meaningful because it can present the flow of

\textsuperscript{34} Rutter interview, 13/10/2015
human experience, feeling and thinking in concrete embodied forms – and this is meaning in its deepest sense’ (Shusterman 2008, p.236).

In a discussion, one attempts to take feelings out of the determination of what is and what is not art. Shusterman writes ‘There is growing concern, far beyond the academy, that we are being so thoroughly reshaped by our informational technology that our experiential, affective capacities are wearing thin.’ (Shusterman 2000, p.33) Yet, despite these concerns, Shusterman concludes that ‘such an approach is not possible to any other than cyborgs’.

Music, it can therefore be argued, engages the body at all levels – intellectually, emotionally, and physically. The performer must see, understand, and interpret the music notation before adding to it an appropriate layer of emotion. The extent of the emotional layer is hugely dependent on the particular genre and style of music but will always be there at some level. Only when these various elements have been brought together, can a performer bring forth music by physically creating sound, either on an external instrument or with the human voice.

It is not just the performer who is somatically engaged in the performance. The audience member is impacted by the performance experience. The extent to which music can engage on an emotional level was brought home to me some years ago when my young daughter was listening to a recording of Malcolm Arnold’s Peterloo. I noted she was crying and asked her why. Her simple response was that the music was so sad. At five years of age, she was totally unaware of the historical massacre which inspired the music and yet the elegy for the slain brought her to tears in a way no spoken word ever could. Certainly, the listener, no less than the performer, can be engaged intellectually, emotionally and physically with the performance of live music. A 2014 newspaper review of a concert I conducted stated, ‘Lauridsen’s O Magnum Mysterium was breath-taking in its musicality, and it resonated deep within me, and I felt such peace and belonging, among good people’.35 The writer was engaged physically and emotionally with the performance.

The challenge for me in this project is to create a notation system which will engage performers visually, inform them intellectually, and support them physically to more

---

35 Liam Murphy, Munster Express review of Madrigallery concert, 26/01/2014.
appropriate performance practice, thus enhancing the listeners’ experience. An indication that I may be on the right track comes from the convener of the independent trial who experienced an altered perception of performance on the basis of the choristers using PNS notation. This trial and its impact will be discussed at length in Chapter five.

1.6 Conclusion

Much music performance is about giving life to the sounds imagined by the composer, insofar as we can determine what those sounds might have been. However, performance is wider than just sound. We read in Schechner’s work that everything a performer does can be a performance. This implies that everything an audience member perceives in a performance can also be considered a performance. The emotions created by the performance, the understanding of the text through performance, the intellectual resonance with the performance in its use of consonance or dissonance. In other words, everything a performer does and how they do it will impact on the reception of that performance. The listener is impacted by my background through my bringing that background to bear on my performance. The extent to which my preference for emphasis on the dissonance created by a chordal progression, which involves a suspension, impacts directly on the listener. Yet, the notation which indicates a stress at the point of dissonance cannot detail the precise level of stress – too little and the impact is lost, too much and the effect is destroyed. Does this level of stress have to be adjusted over time? What was considered a dissonance in Renaissance times is regarded as consonance in today’s musical world. Is it necessary, therefore, to be less subtle regarding such issues? All of these questions come down to the personal decision of the performer as directed by the conductor.

The answers to these questions can also come down to the education, training, and experience of the conductor. The specialist editor does have a role to play here. Education and support of the performer and/or conductor may include the promotion of stylistic elements of which the performer is unaware. On reading John B. Haberlen’s paper Microrhythms: The Key to Vitalizing [sic] Renaissance Music, I found a firm basis for some of the stylistic elements which for many years I had unwittingly promoted in performance. By building these factors into the notation, a
performer using this notation is encouraged in the use of microrhythms, even though they may have been unaware of the importance of such practices.\textsuperscript{36}

In his book, \textit{Capturing Music}, Thomas F. Kelly states that:

\begin{quote}
what began as a method to represent the general shape of a song evolved over several centuries to become not only a recording but a playback device, allowing musicians to transport music and learn songs they had never heard before (Kelly 2015, p.xiii).
\end{quote}

PNS seeks to continue the development of notation as a ‘playback device’ for Renaissance polyphony.

Simply creating a new notation system, which addresses issues I have raised regarding inappropriate performance practice of non-specialist choirs, will not necessarily resolve all issues. A notation system is simply that – a notation system. It is a tool used to assist in creating a sound – music. A paper based research approach may well address these issues on a theoretical basis, however, it is only in performance that the issues are resolved in practice. Therefore, my research is through arts-practice – a combined theoretical and practical method of research.

The methods used in this research bring a wide range of experiences to bear on the topic. These experiences are not just my own but include those of professional and amateur choristers, of musicians engaged in a wide range of genres, and those who are specialists in Renaissance polyphony. It uses an awareness of how written music notation, both ancient and modern, can impact on sound. It uses a reflexive approach in visiting and revisiting the various elements of the phrased notation system, on the foot of feedback following rehearsals and performances. This feedback is generated, not only by performers, but also by listeners.

Most critically, this research investigates the development, application, and interpretation of a notation system for performing music using an arts practice theoretical frame which interrogates the discussion around performance, practice, and embodied knowledge, as well as employing a variety of arts practice research methods from ethnographic, narrative, and performative traditions. It does so in a manner that acknowledges differing opinions and approaches. It seeks to use the work of other

\textsuperscript{36} A full discussion of microrhythms can be found in Chapter Two.
academics, musicians, and musicologists as a starting point in a journey that, it is hoped, will lead towards an improved performance of Renaissance polyphony.
Chapter Two: Educating through performance editions

2.1 A Music Educator’s Research

Chapter one noted how reflections on my choral philosophy had revealed the extent to which I saw myself as a music educator, in addition to being a conductor. In a similar way, the choristers with whom I work may see themselves as students/learners, in addition to being musical collaborators. Speaking of church choristers, Mok writes:

Their [choristers] music learning should not be taken for granted … membership of church choirs not only gave local musicians an occasion to practice their art but also provided the development of musical skills and interests (Mok 2011, p.14).

The extent to which members of community choirs see themselves as learners or performers is not always clear, as Koopman notes:

Most literature on community music describes specific projects of community music without dealing systematically with educational issues. And if authors do touch on the educative potential of community music, they mainly relate to such general values as self-employment and social empowerment. The development of musical competence as such has been largely neglected (Koopman 2007, p.152).

Yet, it seems self-evident that within a community choral setting, learning does in fact take place, even if the participants do not necessarily comprehend it as such.

Non-formal learning is relatively systematic and (but not necessarily) pre-planned with an explicit intention on the part of both learner and mentor to accomplish a/some specific learning tasks. It is clear that non-formal learning involves some kind of guidance from a mentor. As this type of learning is voluntary, it is not like the compulsory education which is given at school (Mok 2011, p.13).

A conductor working with a choir certainly fits this image of non-formal learning.

In his article, ‘Shaping Identity through Choral Activity: Singers’ and Conductors’ Perceptions’, Colin Durrant states that two of the philosophical principles underpinning the role of a conductor are, to have clear technical and expressive ideas
for presenting music to singers in rehearsal, and to be aware of the composer’s intentions in this respect, the import of the text, and the capacity to enable appropriate responses in the singers and the audience to emerge (Durrant 2005, p.89)

These philosophical underpinnings are a development of some of Durrant’s earlier writing. In his article, ‘Developing a choral curriculum’, Durrant refers to Swanwick (1994) where he quotes Croce’s 1900 theory that musical knowledge has both ‘logical and ‘intuitive’ elements is quoted. He (Swanwick) suggests that intuitive knowledge is central to learning and that it has a significant function in scientific as well as artistic understanding. The logical elements of the conductor’s score study are, accordingly, founded upon the intuitive elements, which are fundamentally the ‘unreasoned’ creative and imaginative insights into music (Durrant 1998, p 307).

These comments are made specifically in relation to the conductor’s score. However, in the case of most modern editions of Renaissance polyphony, this is the same score used by the chorister. Insofar as PNS endeavours to intuitively address the five identified issues contra-indicated by Renaissance training methods, as indicated in Chapter one, it (PNS) is designed as a constant reminder of these particular issues. The success or otherwise of PNS can be judged by the reaction of choristers and audience members to performances using PNS. These reactions will be addressed in Chapter five.

In her 2014 paper, ‘Leaders,’ ‘followers’ and collective group support in learning ‘art music’, in an amateur composer-oriented Bach Choir’ Sigurn Lilja Einarsdottir states that:

choral singing as a learning environment has some of the characteristics of a formal setting (student-teacher), based on the structured leadership of the educator and thus provides structured leadership for choir members in order to engage in the music they are learning, in a structured way. Therefore, the conductor is responsible for the progress of the choir as a whole and, therefore, the musical development and active learning of choral members (Einarsdottir 2014, pp.281-296).

This approach to conducting as an educator is also at the core of two volumes published by GIA Publications, entitled Teaching Music through Performance in Choir. The fly sheet of volume one describes the book as a ‘resource that enables
conductors and educators to move beyond the printed matter toward full musical awareness’ (Buchanan and Mehaffey 2005). Embedded in the title of these volumes is the concept of learning through performance, a core element of my educator philosophy.

In terms of Renaissance choral music, the degree to which research and education is necessary is highlighted by an extract from Directing The Choral Music Program, by Kenneth H. Phillips, where he speaks in relation to a shift from duple to triple pulse in Renaissance polyphony.

> When the basic metric pattern moved from two to three beats per measure the indication was to conduct three notes in the new section in the space of two in the previous section, which caused the music to move faster in the triple section (Phillips 2004, p.318).

Phillips has been a teacher of conducting for many years and has lectured and written extensively on the topic. However, in this particular quotation, he is describing sesquialtera and determines that this is the way a duple/triple metre relationship should be handled in Renaissance music. He makes no reference to the tripla possibility or to the other metre relationship possibilities referred to by Ruth DeFord, which will be dealt with in Chapter three.

The extent to which performance of Renaissance polyphony requires careful preparation is further evidenced by the 1996 unpublished doctoral dissertation by Ronald D. Oliver, entitled An Anthology of Renaissance Vocal Literature Suitable for High School Choirs. Oliver’s interest is in

> exploring historical and stylistic considerations, discussing the editorial process and providing a practical performing edition to provide the high school choral director with a viable, efficient source for understanding and performing exciting works from the Renaissance period (Oliver 1996, pp. vi-vii).

The inference here is that editions available at the time of his writing in 1996 did not provide such understanding. In an effort to establish the extent to which this inference has been or is currently valid, it is necessary to look at a number of editorial styles that have been applied to commercially available publications of Renaissance material.
The research of Colin Durrant points to the importance of knowledge of the music and the ability to transmit this knowledge and enthusiasm to the choir as important features of a good conductor. A good conductor is not controlling but engenders a sense of freedom within the singers. Durrant further indicates that his research in Sweden shows that ‘singers appear to have an expectation of feeling important in their context for the sake of the sound and the musical interpretation’ (Durrant 2005, p.93). In addition to Durrant’s research regarding the freedom of the singers, some of the choristers he interviewed were very specific regarding the role of the conductor; ‘The conductor had to ‘inspire musically, to teach and have passion for the music’, in addition to ‘taking overall responsibility for the musical outcomes’ (Durrant 2005, p. 95).

It can therefore be summarised that a good conductor needs to teach without appearing to teach; to inspire without being the sole source of inspiration; to promote a confident sense of importance amongst the singers without ever being the most important member of the ensemble but always having overall responsibility.

By providing an edition which seeks to minimise performance traits contra-indicated by Renaissance training methods, conductors are facilitating choristers’ learning rather than merely teaching ‘the students’. In the process, they are addressing unsatisfactory performances such as that which gave rise to my initial questions back in 1984.

2.2 Authenticity, Historically Informed Performance or something else?

In chapter one, I wrote that PNS is designed to address issues contra-indicated by the training provided to Renaissance choristers. Such a cumbersome definition of purpose calls for a more recognised term under which it could be categorised. The search for such a category inevitably involves looking at terms such as ‘authenticity’ or ‘historically informed performance’ and requires an examination of the difficulties associated with these labels and the literature which has attempted to address these issues.

If there is a red flag in musicology these days, it is the word ‘authenticity’. Wars have raged over the term for ten years now, and show no signs of abating. On one side are many of those professionally engaged in the study and performance of early music in all its forms, striving to reconstruct as nearly as
possible the soundscape of the past. Their names are legion, and need no introduction here. On the other side, armed with articles by Richard Taruskin and Laurence Dreyfus from the early 1984s and occupying a substantial part of the 1988 volume *Authenticity and Early Music*, a different consensus seems to have formed. In the latter group, uniting scholars and commentators who can probably agree on very little else, this consensus stands for the belief that the quest for so-called ‘authenticity’ is about as likely to succeed as that of Jason for the Golden Fleece, or Diogenes with his lantern lit in broad daylight looking for an honest man (Lockwood 1991, p.501).

This quotation comes from Lewis Lockwood’s journal paper ‘Performance and Authenticity’ and it brings into sharp relief the difference of opinion regarding authenticity in terms of performance. Kivy defines ‘historically authentic performance’ as

> performance of a musical work in strict compliance with the way that the work would have been performed in its own historical period and no other or, if it did not come to the same thing, in strict compliance with the performing intentions of the composer (Kivy 2002, p.128).

However, it is not unreasonable to ask if such a performance is even possible. One of the main protagonists in this discussion is Richard Taruskin, who is very clear where he stands on the issue - ‘Only complete and certain knowledge [may be considered to be] knowledge at all’ (Taruskin 1995, p.203). It would be interesting, therefore, to see how Taruskin would approach a piece of music which exists in several manifestations, all of which were used by the composer himself?

A good example exists in the aria *But who may abide* from Handel’s *Messiah*. In considering this issue of authenticity, I am not dealing with any stylistic, instrumental, or decorative issues or indeed elements not overtly included in the historic musical score but purely the historically documented performance alternatives. The 1998 Clifford Bartlett edition of *Messiah* published by Oxford University Press presents five options (a-e) for the performance of this aria. The critical commentary informs us that option (a) was written in 1750, eight years after the first performance, for the alto castrato Guadagni. Option (b) provides us with the aria as it was written for Bass voice. Option (c) is a setting of the text in recitative format as was used in the original Dublin performance. Options (d) and (e) provide settings for soprano in G minor and A minor and relate to performances in the 1750s (Bartlett 1998). Given that Handel
created and used all these options, all could be considered to be authentic. Andrew Parrott quotes a contemporary of Handel’s (J.A. Scheibe), ‘how can a piece of music have the effect its author has sought to achieve if it is not also set up and performed in accordance with the wishes of the same and in conformity with his intentions’ (Parrott 2013, p.37). In light of five performance options for one aria, it is not possible to establish the composer’s preferred intentions. This question alone may be considered sufficient to ask, as Phillips did:

whether Early Music performers were really being authentic at all in their practices, since it is impossible to know what the composer’s intentions were, and Early Music performance was really about how modern performers wanted [sic] their chosen repertoire to sound (Phillips 2014, p. 95).

Another approach to authenticity may be to attempt to create in today’s audience a reaction similar to that experienced by the original audience. Kivy’s comments on this approach:

When I say that I want to produce musical sounds as close as possible to those produced by a performance contemporary with the work, do I mean the musical sounds as perturbations of the air or the sounds as heard by a contemporary audience? If I mean the latter, it might well be achieved by not doing the former. To take the simplest of examples, a performing force that might have seemed massive to Bach’s audience seems intimate chamber music to our Wagnarian ears, which means that we might need twice or more the number of performers used, each to produce the same effect on us that his forces produced on his contemporaries (Kivy 2002, p.134).

Clearly any performance with doubled forces cannot be said to be authentic with respect to the forces used.

If true authenticity is not a universally acceptable term, the phrase ‘historically informed performance’ may not be any better: ‘Historically authentic has come to sound dogmatic and inflexible, whereas “historically informed” sounds much more pliable, less dogmatic, and more open to alternatives’ (Kivy 2002, p.139). In the article from which this quotation is taken, ‘On the Historically Informed Performance’, Kivy defines his understanding of the term historically informed:

A historically informed performance can simply be defined as a performance by a historically informed performer. The problem this definition immediately
raised was that a performer might well be historically informed and her performance completely uninfluenced by that knowledge. One could be as historically informed as you like, but completely rejecting of that historical knowledge as a guide to performance. But surely this would be a *reductio ad absurdum* of what historically informed performance is supposed to be and, in order to avoid this *reductio*, some kind of stipulation must be made to the effect that the performer not only be historically informed, but that her performance be influenced by that knowledge in some appropriate way (Kivy 2002, p.132).

Given that Kivy was defining the term ‘historically informed performance’ within a defence of his 1995 publication *Authenticities*, it could be argued that his definitions were designed to suit his defence. However, his comment that ‘the notation does not fully determine the sound occurrence, which is the performance, and it is the performer’s task to fill this gap’ (Kivy 2002, p.136) can hardly be denied. On the basis of ‘filling the gap’ rests much of his argument in that, in reality, there is no discernible difference between ‘authenticity’ and ‘historically informed performance’.

It is also reasonable to ask at what point a performance informed by historical research becomes a ‘historically informed performance’. Bach’s Brandenburg Concerto No.2 has a violin, oboe, recorder, and trumpet as solo instruments. In performances using modern instruments, it is almost impossible for the trumpet not to dominate any time it is playing. Performances using original instruments (or modern replicas) create a very different balance, with the trumpet being far less dominant. Is merely using these ‘period’ instruments enough to make this a ‘historically informed performance’? Is making any adjustment, however small, to a group’s standard performance, where that adjustment can be justified as bringing the performance more into line with known features of historic performance, sufficient to bear the ‘historically informed’ title? If not, then at what level is the bar to be set to be able to claim such a title? This is essentially the question being put by Kivy.

If we make the historically informed performance too liberal, then it becomes a trivial notion; it embodies no principle that would be rejected by any sensible performer. All it says is that, if a historically informed performance seems better to the performer than the alternatives in regard to any musical feature, then the performer should adopt it. No one would quarrel with that. However, it fails to capture the historicist spirit of the historically authentic performance project. On the other hand, if we adopt the strong historicist premise, that the historically informed performance is always the best then the historically informed performance collapses into the historically authentic performance.
There ceases to be any discernible difference between them, either in practice or in principle (Kivy 2002, pp.143-144).

This view is supported by Burgess in his comment:

Attacks on authenticity jargon from Richard Taruskin and others may have redefined sales tactics, but ultimately had little impact on the EM [Early Music] practice. Was the substitution of “Historically Informed Performance” more than politically correct window dressing? As much as John Eliot Gardiner has protested that any performance is authentic in itself, so the HIP [Historically Informed Performance] label is just as vacuous. HIP neither defines the nature of the historical information nor how the performer works with it (Burgess 2015, p.2).

Notwithstanding the various arguments about terminology, we still need to be able to discuss issues regarding the performance of early music. According to Tomlinson:

the meaning of a work is not the meaning that its creators and first audiences invested in it, but rather, the meaning that we, in the course of interpretive historical acts of various sorts, come to believe its creators and first audience invested in it (Tomlinson 1988, p.115).

This is a view supported by Peter Phillips in his Nicholas Kenyon quotation on the occasion of the 25th anniversary of the Lufthansa Festival of Baroque Music in 2009:

for me [Kenyon] as a listener it wasn’t because of the historical evidence that I liked these performances, it was because – to adapt Thomas Beecham – I loved the noise they made’. This was the desirable end result of all those years of debate and experiment (Phillips 2014, p. 93).

This ‘loving the noise’ is one that resonates with me as it brings to the fore the concept of personal engagement with the material being performed. Following rehearsals for Performance 1, I noted in my journal how I was reminded of my response to a recording of Messiah. As a teenager, and in my early twenties, I had played in the orchestra for three performances of Messiah. For two of these performances, I played French horn in an expanded orchestration and for the other I played trumpet. In all cases, the chorus was large and comprised amateur singers. Based on these three performances, I could not understand why anyone would like Messiah. My experience of it was of laboured choruses and solo arias that were sung in a Romantic operatic style. By my mid-thirties, I had determined that it must be me that had the problem
rather than the performers of Handel’s work. I decided to get to know Messiah and purchased a CD and score. I did no research whatever into the particular recording before the purchase. I merely purchased what was on the shelf. In what was a revelatory moment, as soon as the music began, my impression of what Messiah could be changed. The singing was light and vibrant. The soloists understood what they were singing and with clear diction passed that understanding to the listener. The balance within the orchestra was wonderful. On reading the sleeve notes, I discovered that the choir consisted of fourteen singers, accompanied by 15 instrumentalists\textsuperscript{37}, forces that were influenced by the numbers used by Handel - though the Artistic Director of the recording made no claims regarding authenticity or the definitiveness of their recording.\textsuperscript{38} The reason the performance had such an impact on me was not because there were a particular number of singers or instrumentalists, nor was it because the recording used several rarely heard settings of particular arias. It was because, for the first time, I heard what sounded right to me. It made sense. Rightly or wrongly, I felt as if I finally understood what the composer was getting at. I just loved ‘the noise they made’, to again cite Thomas Beecham.

When we look for historical evidence to justify decisions made regarding the performance of Renaissance polyphony, there is no guarantee that we will actually find what we are looking for. This point is attested to by Peter Phillips in his article ‘Hip Replacements’

\begin{quote}
One of the reasons why the revolution in choral sound of the last 30 years has been so much slower to be accepted and appreciated for what it is, is just that it didn’t have such a good story-line to sell it. We were \textit{obviously [sic]} making it up. We couldn’t fall back on historical evidence to boost our credentials (Phillips 2014, p. 99)
\end{quote}

Notwithstanding the lack of historical evidence for many performance decisions, there is a lot to be learned from the study of primary source materials. In a review of Peter Walls’ book \textit{History, Imagination and the Performance of Music}, Stowell makes a relevant comment:

\begin{quote}
He [Walls] demonstrates the benefits of studying primary source materials such as instrumental treatises, which can enrich understanding of the music
\end{quote}

\textsuperscript{37} Instrumentalists used either original baroque instruments or copies.

\textsuperscript{38} The recording was that of the Scholars Baroque Ensemble published by Naxos, ref. 8.550667-668
and stimulate the imagination, but recognizes [sic] that musicianship, imagination and judgement are essential ingredients in performance and that interpretations cannot be determined solely by rules, as if painting by numbers (Stowell 2005, p.345).

One of those elements which can enrich the performance of Renaissance polyphony is an awareness of the training of choristers of that time. Chapter one provided some details regarding such training, though the impact on performance of a comprehensive understanding and fluency in Latin was not fully explored. According to Haberlen, such a familiarity with Latin and its impact on performance is necessary to bring the conductor’s score preparation and understanding to a more sophisticated level.

When preparing a Renaissance composition for performance, most choral conductors begin by studying the flowing melodies, the formal structure, the modal harmonies and dissonances: by considering the text and its musical relationships: and by attempting to establish a proper tempo. These are, of course, desirable steps to be taken in the first stages of preparation, but there are also, more sophisticated levels of study which demand consideration: for example, *musica ficta* and ornamentation must be considered; note value ratios must be taken into account in determining internal tempo correlations; and the rhythmic subtleties which animate the composition must be discovered (Haberlen 1972, p.11).

Lockwood similarly draws a distinction between the forces or instruments to be used and the ability of the conductor to transform the notation into a special performance.

The question of which instruments are being used is secondary when compared with the performer’s ability to translate for his listeners not merely the outer shell of sonority of a given work but its inner structure, its deeper qualities – in short, not only its text but the complexities of musical thought and expression that the composer built into it’ (Lockwood 1991, p.502)

The rhythmic subtleties within the text referred to by Haberlen have remained fairly constant over time ‘as the clergy were educated in the episcopal schools and were, therefore, provided with a good knowledge of Latin, the ecclesiastical pronunciation did not change much through the centuries’ (Haberlen 1972, p.11). Another element which did not change significantly until recent decades, was the clergy’s familiarity with plainchant. Facilitating an increase of modern choristers’ familiarity with both
Latin and plainchant is strongly advocated by Haberlen. In doing so, choristers become aware of the rhythms embedded within the Latin words and this goes a long way towards delineating the individuality of lines within polyphony.

Renaissance performers were, first of all, totally immersed in plainsong. Most of them, as has been said, spent most of their musical lives in the church, singing daily at the various liturgical functions. Many of the older musicians went so far as to take religious orders. Their constant association with plainsong gave them an awareness of the “free interlacing of binary and ternary groupings,” and their long experience with Latin made it easy for them to perceive the text related stresses which play a large role in determining the irregular rhythmic patterns in polyphonic music (Haberlen 1972, p.13).

These text related stresses are independent of the overall metrical stress of the music as a whole and are referred to as microrhythms.

Similar to Jeppesen’s theory, but more succinctly stated, is that of H.K. Andrews who defines a double system of accentuation in sixteenth-century polyphony. He refers to “(a) the metrical (Quantity) rhythm which applies to the composition as a whole and particularly to its vertical organization [sic] and (b) the stress rhythm which belongs to the individual strand.” Andrews calls the metrical rhythm a touchstone against which stress rhythms (Jeppesen’s “microrhythms”) of the individual strands may be measured and made coherent (Haberlen 1972, p.12).

Haberlen provides a list of five factors which influence the placement of agogie accents and thus establish microrhythms within the music.

1. Notes of longer duration usually have more accessional value.
2. Notes of higher pitch require more tension in their production and are therefore more prominent.
3. Notes approached by leap from below should be regarded as self-contained accents. “The more arresting the interval, the more the note is stressed”.
4. Harmonic tension within the prevailing mode or within a specific harmony may result in stress.
5. Text accent will normally coincide with musical accent.

(Haberlen 1972, pp.13-14)
Knowing about microrhythms and delivering them in performance are two different things. The edition being used in performance may, according to Haberlen, play a significant role.

With respect to microrhythms, a good modern edition of Renaissance music will be one in which the rhythmic patterns are readily exposed to the singers or, at the very least, one in which the rhythmic patterns are not obscured by relentless barring in accordance with the metrical signature (Haberlen 1972, p.13).

2.3 Performance Practice and Modern Editions

The definition of what is a ‘good’ modern edition is one that will change depending on the requirements of the end user and their knowledge of the repertoire and its performance norms. In 1996, Oxford University Press released a commercial publication of church music, entitled *European Sacred Music*. This publication contained 54 separate pieces by a wide variety of composers and from a wide variety of European countries. Of these 54 pieces, half were written by composers who were born before 1600, the date traditionally considered to mark the decline of the Renaissance music era and the emergence of the Baroque era. In the preface, editor John Rutter makes a number of points relating to the use of the book and the rationale behind editorial decisions. He states that the book is intended ‘as much for church choirs as for concert choirs’ (Rutter 1996, p.iv). He also states that the editorial practice adopted has, as its aim, ‘first and foremost to serve the practical needs of non-specialist choirs, keeping the music pages clean and uncluttered as possible though not neglecting the interests of the scholar’ (Rutter 1996, p.v). Rutter details various elements such as pitch, note values etc., that have been updated and comments that the barring is shown in the modern, standard way. He describes how the notation has been updated from the original notation, with a view to facilitating the performer. What is not mentioned is the music, the sound of the music, the phrasing of the music, or how the sound of the music might be altered by its translation into modern music notation. A discussion on the impact of the inclusion of dynamic marks and bar-lines or the rationale for metronome marks is also omitted. The implication of the editorial comment is that the performer is the editor’s focus, not necessarily the sound of the music.
In contrast, the Editor’s Note written by Simon Carrington in the GIA published *Evoking Sound Choral Series* indicates that the purpose of that edition is to help ensembles and their directors build on the composer’s techniques, which though they might have been obvious to singers of the time thanks to their extensive training in rhetoric (the art of being persuasive), need some reinforcing nowadays (Carrington 2013).

The implication here is that the chorister is being prompted into a style of performance which is rooted in the training of Renaissance choristers.

In my book, *Choral Conducting – A handbook for Irish choir trainers and conductors*, I argue that ‘music performance, in my opinion, is about giving life to the sounds imagined by the composer’ (O’Carroll 2012, p.30). This approach is reinforced by Thomas Kelly when he writes in *Capturing Music – The Story of Notation* that ‘Music - like speech or really any sound – exists in a sense only when it is happening’ (Kelly 2015, p.26). In other words, music is about sound, not about notation.

According to Haberlen

For polyphonic music, the most widely used device for exposing cross-rhythms has been the *mensurstrich*. … A more recent innovation is the “varia-bar system” created by Dr. James McKelvey of the Mark Foster Music Press. This involves placing bar-lines at various points in the individual voice lines, seldom concurrently in all the voices. Neither the *mensurstrich* nor the “varia-bar system” attempts to dictate specific rhythmic interpretations; they simply expose the microrhythmic patterns for individual interpretation by the conductor and his singers (Haberlen 1972, p.13).

Grove Music Online defines *mensurstrich* as ‘a vertical line drawn between (not through) the staves to show the metrical division in editions of early music’. In Example 2.2 below it can be seen that *mensurstrich* also retains the original note durations. The benefits or otherwise of *mensurstrich* will be discussed in greater detail below.

---

39 As the varia-bar system has not enjoyed widespread use in Ireland, it is not discussed in detail in this dissertation. The most obvious difficulty in using this system is the lack of consensus regarding bar-lines. This difficulty makes orientation a real challenge in the early stages of learning.
2.3.1 Features of sample editions in general use in Ireland

The creation of a new edition is not generally undertaken as an end in itself. It may be undertaken because of new research discoveries thereby leading to a new scholarly edition or possibly to generate a performance edition where previously only scholarly editions or Urtext editions existed. In the case of this particular research project, it is the chorister or choral director who is not a specialist in the area of Renaissance polyphony, and how that lack of specialisation impacts on performance, that is of main concern. In the paragraphs which follow, the observations made regarding the editorial styles in current use are made from this perspective. It is acknowledged that many fine performances and recordings have been made using some of these editions. However, it is the purpose here to examine editions insofar as they do or do not support and promote a style of performance suggested by the training methods employed by Renaissance choristers.

Given that all Renaissance musical compositions must undergo a translation into some form of modern music notation to be understood by those not schooled in the practice of reading from original part-books, it will be of interest to examine a variety of editorial styles which have been used over the last one hundred years. The use of a 2/2 time signature by R.R. Terry in the early twentieth century was replaced by what I, as a practitioner, have found to be as a less successful 4/4 time signature in Simon Carrington’s work in the twenty-first century. In contrast, Terry’s less than helpful use of bar-lines was comprehensively addressed by Carrington’s quarter bar-lines a century later. Other approaches, such as the mensurstrich of Besseler in the 1930s or the dotted bar-lines of the Mapa Mundi publishing house, are indicative of the extent to which bar-lines are perceived to be a significant barrier in the independent linear phrasing required in performance. Looking at how various editions have addressed issues such as bar-lines, accidentals, breath marks, text, time signatures, and transposition gives us an indication of the extent to which editors can interpret and translate similar sources very differently.  

40 The use of bar-lines was identified as a significant obstacle in the performance of Renaissance polyphony by all experts interviewed as part of this research.
41 In the following chapters, these issues will be examined in a) how they have been dealt with to date b) how these dealings have influenced PNS and c) how the issues are actually implemented in the final PNS edition.
What follows is an examination of five editorial styles that enjoyed widespread use in Ireland over the last hundred years or so. Each of the extracts is examined in relation to its treatment of accidentals, bar-lines, breath marks, dynamics, ligatures, metre changes, note value reduction, treatment of text (translation, pronunciation and underlay), tempo indications, time signatures and transposition. The pieces from which extracts are taken are:


### 2.3.2 Accidentals

As a general rule, accidentals appear in modern scores of Renaissance music for one of two reasons: a) the accidental is specified in the original source or b) the accidental is inserted editorially on foot of the convention known as *musica ficta*. Grove Music Online states that ‘the term *musica ficta* is often loosely applied to all unnotated inflections inferred from the context, for editorial or ‘performers’ accidentals rather than notated ones (whether properly *recta* or *ficta*).’ Much has been written on the topic of *musica ficta*, thus it is not intended to address the issue itself here. What will be addressed is the issue of how the accidentals are presented to the singer. For reasons which will become clear, it is necessary that the performer can see and understand the difference between accidentals which have been specified by the composer and those that have been inserted by an editor. Such a comment implies that the editor’s decision regarding accidentals may be called into question. Such questioning is easier to understand when the difficulties relating to such editorial decisions are understood. James Grier’s comments ‘the user [singer] needs a clear convention that indicates which notes are chromatically inflected in the source, and which ones the editor feels should be so inflected in practice, but are not in the source’ (Grier 1996, p.163). Adding to the uncertainty of when accidentals should and should not be used, Karol Berger writes:
the theorists explain why some accidental inflections were notated while others were not. Since some inflections were implied, as a matter of convention, by the musical context, composers could rely on singers to make them in performance regardless of whether the accidentals were written (Berger 1989, p.107).

Alexander Blachly is obviously not content with accepting the editor’s choices at face value as he suggests that:

the performer will do well to remember that merely because an editorial decision has appeared in print does not confer upon it automatic legitimacy. A performer should know that it is his or her right and obligation\textsuperscript{42} to try and find solutions better than the printed ones (Blachly 1994, p.20).

Given that some accidentals are open to question and others are not, it is necessary that choral directors and singers be able to easily distinguish between the two.

In the various editing styles adopted over the last one hundred years, this distinction has not always been in evidence.

\textbf{Example 2.1. Viadana: Missa L’Hora Passa – Agnus Dei extract}

\textsuperscript{42} Original italics.
In Example 2.1 above from R.R. Terry’s edition of Viadana’s *Missa L’Hora Passa – Agnus Dei*, we are shown a # placed above the staff in the second bar of the alto line. We are provided no information, either as a footnote or as part of the introductory notes, as to whether this F# is editorial or not, though common usage of this placement above the staff in editions since 1905 certainly points us in that direction. However, looking at this example with the hindsight of subsequent research and education cannot equate to seeing an unexplained raised pitch for those reading the score in 1905.

In a similar manner, the following extract from Giovanni Gabrielli’s *O Domine Jesu Christe* edited by Heinrich Besseler in 1931 (Example 2.2), presented in the mensurstrich notation system, provides no specific information regarding the source of the accidental in the second and third bar. It is reasonable to think that the # placed above the staff in the third bar merely maintains the raised C from the previous bar, given that both notes are part of the same cadence.

Example 2.2. Gabrielli, G: *O Domine Jesu Christe* extract

This interpretation is reinforced by a similar situation which occurs in the tenor line in the fifth bar of the same example. What is less obvious to the untutored chorister is why the F in the bass line in the second bar has a natural sign placed over it. Does this
mean that the natural sign is optional? Is an F# a possibility to be explored? Why does a similar natural sign occur over the stave two bars later? Without the provision of explanatory notes, these ‘courtesy accidentals’ are open to interpretation in the same manner as could be applied to the R.R. Terry editions produced twenty-six years earlier.

Henry Washington’s editions of 1953 (Example 2.3) leave the chorister in no doubt regarding what is and what is not editorial, at least in terms of accidentals.

Original accidentals are printed in the normal position, i.e. to the left of the note affected. Other accidentals added by the editor in pursuance of the theory of musica ficta appear in small type above the note and are confined for the most part to a naturalizing of B flat under the usual conditions.

Example 2.3. Palestrina: Missa Aeterna Christi Munera – Kyrie extract

The natural sign in bar six is placed over the staff and a clear explanation, as to why, is provided in the introduction.

In the 1996 publication, European Sacred Music, edited by John Rutter, a slightly different approach is taken. In the preface, we are told:
in pre-1700 pieces, full size accidentals are those which appear in the original source; they are silently omitted when made unnecessary by a modern key signature, and also omitted for immediate repetitions of the same note in the same bar. Small accidentals are editorial. Cautionary accidentals are shown full size in round brackets. Cancelling accidentals customary in modern notation but absent in the source are shown full size in round brackets; in pieces where they are frequently needed, they are shown small without brackets, to avoid a cluttered appearance (Rutter 1996, p vi).

Though this is all very clear, there is a case to be made that having so many classifications may actually confuse the issue rather than clarify it. Some accidentals are described as editorial but there is no indication as to why the accidentals were added. It is not unreasonable to ask if they are open to interpretation, as suggested earlier by Blachly. Rutter himself informs us that

editorial markings are to be taken as tentative suggestions and not as prescriptions. Conductors should be encouraged to find their own interpretations, drawn out of the music and its text as they understand them, never arbitrarily imposed (Rutter 1996, p.vi).

In tracking the development of editorial styles in these editions from 1905 to 1996, it might be reasonable to assume that over the century a standard approach across all publishing houses had evolved. However, the 2013 publication of William Byrd’s Sacerdotes Domini, edited by Simon Carrington (Example 2.4) flies in the face of such an assumption.

The Editor’s Note by Carrington makes no reference to accidentals of any kind. We are given no indication as to which accidentals are original and which are editorial. There are examples of accidentals within round brackets but these only appear before notes which had been raised immediately prior to the naturalisation. In other words, they appear to be courtesy accidentals only. One other feature regarding accidentals as portrayed in Carrington’s edition is that the accidentals appear to impact an entire bar, even though the editor has gone to great lengths to make the ‘bar’ almost invisible. This means that when accidentals arise the chorister must reawaken his/her perception of the bar-line in order to ascertain the extent to which any accidental applies.
Example 2.4. Byrd: *Sacerdotes Domini* extract

The issue of accidentals and how they are presented is an important element in how Renaissance polyphony is presented to modern non-specialist singers. Choristers and untrained choral directors have no reason to doubt the accuracy of the editions presented to them. However, this brief examination of just one element of the editing process indicates the scope that exists for re-interpreting at least some of the accidentals appearing in these editions.

2.3.3 Bar-lines

Renaissance polyphony was, by and large, written without bar-lines. The bar-lines which are present in Renaissance sources frequently indicate significant cadence points or signal the end of a section. They do not mark off regular pulses or imply regular stresses as modern bar-lines do. Writing independently in a linear style for each voice part is a feature of polyphony. There is rarely a rigid structure within which
specific beats receive greater or lesser stress. What do exist, in addition to the overall general pulse of the music, are microrhythms created by the text. Central to these microrhythms is the pronunciation of the text, as explained by Haberlen earlier in this chapter. Allowing each individual line to phrase and stress the text as it falls for them ensures that the music remains vibrant within all lines and does not promote a situation where lines are subservient to a perceived single melody line.

The extent to which the inclusion of bar-lines interferes with the natural flow of the music varies according to the writing itself. The text *Sicut cervus desiderat ad fontes aquarum* (As the hart yearns for the springs of water) is generally pronounced with stresses on particular syllables as follows: *Sicut cervus desiderat ad fontes aquarum*. In order to establish a stress on the appropriate syllable, it is necessary to adopt a certain rhythm for the un-stressed syllables. Leaving aside the initial word in the text, it can be seen in Example 2.5 that the modern bar-lines shown in the soprano line support this stress pattern. A look at the other lines shows the inappropriateness of bar-line stresses. Like the soprano line, the bass line (again ignoring the initial word in the text) has a stress pattern within the barred structure that agrees with the stress pattern dictated by the pronunciation of the text itself. For both the tenor line and the alto lines, however, the stress patterns imposed by the barring militate against appropriate pronunciation.
Example 2.5. Palestrina: *Sicut cervus* extract

The impact of bar-lines is not restricted to faster moving pieces. The *Agnus Dei I* from Palestrina’s *Aeterna Christi Munera* (Example 2.6, overleaf) is a case in point.
Example 2.6. Palestrina: Agnus Dei I - Missa Aeterna Christi Munera

Once more, an appreciation of the pronunciation of the text is essential. In this case, the stressed syllable is the first syllable in each of the first two words - Agnus Dei. Whereas the stressed syllables of the opening statement in the alto line are supported by the bar-lines, the barring of the second statement of the word agnus is not sympathetic to the pronunciation. Similarly, the opening of the bass line places the two stressed syllables on the weak beats within the barred structure. An examination of the remainder of the extract reveals many examples of stressed syllables being
denied their appropriate stress while the conventions of the barred structure promotes the accented pronunciation of unstressed syllables in inappropriate places.

An awareness of the impact of bar-lines on Renaissance polyphony is not new. In the 1930s, musicologist, Heinrich Besseler edited a number of choral works using a new music notation system known as *mensurstrich*\(^\text{43}\), a system referred to in the earlier quotation from Haberlen\(^\text{44}\). The key feature of Besseler’s system was the displacement of the bar-line to the space between the staves. Thus, the music notation was relieved of the regular visual disturbance of the bar-line. In addition, the absence of the bar-line in its familiar place meant that the original duration of notes could be maintained, thus allowing the singer to phrase the line appropriately.

Though this was a new approach, it was not without its drawbacks. Drawing on my own experience of singing from music notated in *mensurstrich*, there are several aspects of the notation which caused problems for me. Insofar as I found *mensurstrich* difficult to work with, it is reasonable to question why this was the case. It is also reasonable to identify what can be learned, positive or negative, from taking such a novel approach.

The first problem for me in singing from *mensurstrich* was the position of the bar-lines. Given that the bar-lines were displaced between the various staves, their presence was, for me, heightened rather than diminished. Having sung Renaissance polyphony from standard modern notation for many years, I had become accustomed to the need to diminish the impact of bar-lines. Yet, in this notation system, I found the bar-lines were harder to ignore. Thus, the anticipated altered impact of displacing the bar-lines was not, at least in my case, realised.

A second issue also related to the position of the bar-lines but this time the impact was on the text rather than the metre. By breaking the text into a series of individual words or syllables, I found it much more difficult to see an entire sentence. For me, the bar-lines became an obstruction to understanding the text.

A third issue stemmed from the retention of original note values. If these greater note values had been subject to the standard practice of the same number of beats in each

\(^{43}\) Though Besseler was a lecturer at Heidelberg University at the time, I have failed to locate any writings by him on this revolutionary approach to the notation of Renaissance polyphony.

\(^{44}\) An example of *mensurstrich* can be seen in Example 2.7 on p.65.
bar, I may not have had problems, once I became accustomed to the overall presentation. After all, I never had a problem reading standard white notation\footnote{White notation is the term given to choral music which is presented with the basic unit as a minim. This style presents as rather white when compared with the same piece of music presented with the crotchet used as the modern standard unit.} where the standard pulse is a minim. Here, however, the standard pulse was a semibreve. With mensurstrich, the practice is to maintain note values as per the original, even where these note values over-run a bar-line.

In Example 2.7 below\footnote{Example 2.7 is a fuller extract of Extract 2.2 on p.56.}, it can be seen that the second bar of the soprano line does not appear to have the expected four minims in the bar, while the following bar appears to have no less than five minims. In the standard modern barring system, the presence of a bar-line (though displaced) when viewed in conjunction with a time signature suggests to the singer that four minims should be expected in each bar. When the number of minims in a bar was not constant, I found I was continuously distracted in an effort to ensure that I was in the correct place. Given that notes did not necessarily line up due to the lack of regular metre, I found it very difficult to establish my position vis-à-vis the other lines\footnote{It was this lack of ease of checking my position that prompted me to use tied notes across an invisible bar-line when designing the PNS system.}.

That is not to say that others have not found the mensurstrich system appropriate and useable. For those for whom it works, they are lucky to have found a solution to the problems associated with how Renaissance polyphony is notated.
Example 2.7. Gabrielli, G: O Domine Jesu Christe extract

The creation of mensurstrich did not mean that the search for a solution to the imperfections caused by the addition of bar-lines ceased or that this system was
adopted by all publishers. In the 1950s, Henry Washington created editions of Renaissance masses for Chester music. In stark contrast to the earlier practice of confining bar-lines to the space between the staves, Washington drew the bar-lines straight through all vocal lines. In so doing, he radically reinforced the presence of the bar-lines. However, in what was another novel approach, he sought to lessen the impact of the lines through his use of a short vertical stroke over or under specific notes in the music. In his general introduction to all of the masses, he includes the following on the topic:

a short vertical stroke placed above or below a note, is freely used in this edition with the two-fold object of defending verbal rhythm against the accentual power associated with the modern bar-line and of defining the true agogic rhythm where an original long note has been replaced by two tied notes of shorter duration’ (Palestrina 1953, p.4).

The short stroke he refers to can be seen in bar 6 of the *cantus* line in Example 2.8, below.

Despite Washington’s awareness of the issues associated with the bar-lines, the convention of drawing the bar-line through all choral parts does much to counteract the benefits of the short stroke aid to agogic stresses. Given the number of excellent recordings which have been created using this edition, it is clear that for some choirs the difficulties to which I refer can be overcome. However, for the non-specialist, the appearance of the score is one that is dominated by the presence of the bar-lines.
In 2013, Simon Carrington addressed the bar-line problem in yet another way in his editions of Renaissance polyphony for GIA Publications (see Example 2.9 overleaf). Here Carrington reduced the bar-line to a mere fraction of its usual size. In doing so, he drastically reduced the impact of the bar-line and allowed the music to flow visually in an almost uninterrupted manner. Unlike mensurstrich, he did not retain the notes at their original full value (with or without note value reduction). Instead, he used the modern practice of tying notes across the ‘bar-line’ to provide the desired duration of note.

Whilst this linear outlook is very effective in terms of appearance, Carrington seems to contradict this stylistic preference when he employs a modern 4/4 time signature and shows the tempo in terms of a crotchet pulse. Seeing this instruction brings me back to the 1984 performance which began my research project – the performance of Palestrina’s Sicut Cervus, in which every crotchet was heard and which was devoid of the fluid phrases associated with a good performance of Renaissance polyphony. From his many years’ experience in singing this material when he was a member of the renowned King’s Singers group, there is no doubt that Carrington is acutely aware...
of the fluid movement of which I speak. His performance experience makes his editorial indication of a crotchet pulse all the more puzzling.

Example 2.9. Byrd: Sacerdotes Domini extract

In his defence, Carrington does state in the Editor’s Note that ‘the motet can be “conducted” in a mixture of quarter- and half-note beats and certainly never with a strict pattern’ (Byrd 2013, p.2). It may well be that those with the ability to correctly interpret Carrington’s words do not need such instruction, whereas those who are not familiar with microrhythms, described by Haberlen as ‘among the chief characteristics of sixteenth-century polyphony’ (Haberlin 1972, p.14), will follow what they see in the music – 4/4 time and a crotchet pulse.
2.3.4 Breath Marks

As has been previously stated, this research comes out of my experience and my practice. Part of that experience involves working with many different choirs. A problem I have found to be prevalent amongst non-professional singers (and sometimes also professional singers) relates to the points at which they breathe. Unless specifically directed, singers will sometimes breathe as needed rather than as the musical phrase or text might suggest. This can result in breaths being taken in the middle of words or in the middle of a phrase. Musically appropriate breath points can also be ignored if the singer does not need a breath but fails to recognise the musical phrase. This practice is even more prevalent when the language being sung is one with which they are not familiar. When singing a foreign language, choristers do not always recognise full words, and may only see syllables. Any assistance that can be provided by an editor in addressing this issue will be welcomed by the choral director.

In terms of the five editorial styles being examined here, three make no mention of breathing or breath points whatever. It is not possible to state if this is a deliberate omission or an oversight. It may well be that the editors had full confidence in the choral directors to be able to instruct their singers appropriately. The two editions which do refer to breathing are the 1953 Washington edition and the 2013 Carrington edition.

Washington’s reference is confined to the Preface. He says

For the sake of clarity, no attempt has been made to distinguish the original text-indications from the complete distribution of the words undertaken by the present editor. In this task he has been guided by the rules formulated in Palestrina’s lifetime by Zarlino and Vincentino. The breathing requirements of average singers have also been taken into account and it is intended that breathing points should be governed by the natural punctuation of the text (Palestrina 1953, p. 4).

Placing instruction regarding breath points within a preface runs the risk that choral directors may not read the preface and will, therefore, be unaware of the recommendation of the editor.

In contrast to his approach of referring to issues regarding time signatures and conducting patterns in the Editor’s Note, Carrington makes no mention of breath points in his introductory remarks. Instead, he uses a sign (✓) to indicate a breath
point, as shown in Example 2.10. Carrington is not consistent in where this mark is placed; at times placing it above the staff and at other times placing it over the text.

Example 2.10. Byrd: Sacerdotes Domini extract

The logic for placing the mark in different places is not explained. A close examination of the score has also failed to discover an explanation as to why breath marks placed within the text in one instance are placed above the staff in other similar situations.

2.3.5 Dynamics

The general issue of dynamics in Renaissance polyphony is one that is discussed at greater length elsewhere in this dissertation. Leaving that general discussion aside for the moment, our attention is focused on how over the years the various editors have dealt with the topic. Neither Terry nor Besseler refer to dynamics. The examination therefore starts with the edition created by Henry Washington, where he introduces the topic in the Preface.
The music text is set out unencumbered with arbitrary marks of expression. The needs of inexperienced choirs have been met by incorporating a suggested scheme in the *reduction partitutae* (Palestrina 1953, p.4).

This approach can be seen in Example 2.11.

![Example 2.11. Palestrina: Missa Aeterna Christi Munera – Credo extract](image)

The introduction by Washington makes clear that what is suggested in the reduced score is just that – a suggestion. However, applied rigidly as they might be, by an inexperienced choirmaster for whom it is intended, this set of dynamic recommendations could result in a rather romantic interpretation with printed crescendos being overlaid on the natural crescendo embedded in the music through the gradual inclusion of all four voice parts. An increase in dynamic from pianissimo to mezzo forte in the space of four or six bars may take on a rather romantic style crescendo if each voice line were to follow the instruction literally. Dynamic marks, as shown in the excerpt, do not encourage independence of dynamics between voice lines. Such independence is a feature of Renaissance polyphony and is therefore something to be encouraged rather than camouflaged through general dynamic expressions.

The extent to which editor John Rutter is cognisant of these issues is evident from his comments in the Preface to *European Sacred Music*, an extract of which is seen in Example 2.12. Though long, his comments are worth reproducing in full:
Not everyone will agree on the desirability of including editorial suggestions of tempo and dynamics in such a book as this one. To some choir directors, they are an imposition and an irritation; to others, they are a lifeline. As a compromise solution, pre-1700 pieces include editorial suggestions in the keyboard reduction only, so they are available for those who want them but they are easy to ignore for those who do not. These general markings cannot, of course, take account of the differing rises and falls of each voice part in a polyphonic texture. Moreover, music of the past is inevitably viewed through the spectacles tinted by one’s own era, musical experience and personality. Ideas on the performance of ‘old’ music are constantly changing: there can never be a single right way to perform Josquin, or Monteverdi, or even Stravinsky. For these reasons, my editorial markings are to be taken as tentative suggestions and not as prescriptions. Conductors should be encouraged to find their own interpretations, drawn out of the music and its text as they understand them, even arbitrarily imposed. Editorial metronome markings are given where I feel there may be a need for them (Rutter 1996, p.vi).

Example 2.12. Palestrina: Sicut cervus extract

Notwithstanding the caveats and qualifications contained within the preface, Rutter’s approach to the dynamic marks means that they are susceptible to incorrect interpretations in a similar way to the Washington edition mentioned above. An awareness of the issues discussed by Rutter is also dependant on actually reading the four pages of close text which constitutes the preface.

In stark contrast, Simon Carrington’s approach to dynamic expression is comprehensive, detailed to a fault. In an effort to promote the microrhythms of the
text referred to above, Carrington has introduced a hand-written angled stress mark over syllables which are to be stressed. In addition to these stress marks, he has also used a series of double hairpin expression marks which he explains as follows: ‘these suggestions of slight *messa di voce* imply a leaning into and away from the suspensions. The tension and relaxation created by the suspensions add greatly to the expressive possibilities in each line’ (Byrd 2013, p.2).

One cannot argue with Carrington’s appreciation of the necessity to stress and de-stress suspensions but the sheer quantity of these marks, if observed, would result in a constant significant increase and decrease in volume in all but the most sensitive hands. By using these crescendo and diminuendo marks for suspensions, it becomes rather confusing when the same mark is used for a general increase in volume required due to the nature of the text. Carrington hasn’t managed to differentiate between the crescendo associated with suspensions and the crescendo associated with the flow of the melodic line. An awareness of both suspension and line are certainly constituent elements of polyphonic performance but the degree of crescendo is not necessarily uniform in each situation.

One further additional mark used by Carrington is what looks like a handwritten tenuto mark. His explanation is that these notes are important expressive notes and thus warrant extra attention. Example 2.13 overleaf shows several of these hand written stress marks. Some are placed during a crescendo whilst others are placed just after a crescendo. It is difficult to see how these two sets of instructions can sit happily side by side without over-impacting on the sound of the performance.
Example 2.13. Byrd: *Sacerdotes Domini* extract

In his eagerness to provide the performer with all possible supports, Carrington has created an edition which Rutter would not describe as ‘clean and uncluttered’. There are so many instructions included in Carrington’s score that the singer is at risk of instruction overload. That said, it is hard to argue with Carrington’s approach, coming as it does from someone who was at the forefront of performance of the genre for many years. I must also acknowledge that the brevity of Carrington’s introductory notes is such that reading them in full is not perceived as a significant challenge as might be the case with the far more detailed preface in Rutter’s *European Sacred Music* publication.

2.3.6 Ligatures

Willi Apel describes ligatures as ‘symbols which represent combinations of two or more tones’ (Apel 1953, p.88). He continues:

> In the earliest stages of polyphonic music, the ligatures are used abundantly… In later times they lose more and more of their original importance… In the sixteenth century they gradually disappear and only a few of the simplest forms survive until the middle of the seventeenth century (Apel 1953, p.88).

In simple terms, in the sixteenth century, the impact of a ligature on choral music was to ensure that multiple notes were applied to a single syllable of text, with that syllable
being pronounced on the first of the notes joined by the ligature. For modern editors working from source material, the ligature permits no equivocation regarding the text underlay. To this end, it is a welcome sign. Of the five editors whose work is examined in this section, only two refer to ligatures. Their comments are very brief and to the point. Rutter states that ‘indications of ligature and coloration are omitted, though care has been taken with editorial [text] underlay never to move a new syllable in the middle of a ligature’ (Rutter 1996, p.vi). Henry Washington’s comment is even shorter: ‘The slur is used exclusively to denote a ligature’ (Palestrina 1953, p.4). In neither case is it explained what a ligature is for or, indeed, why it may be omitted. In reality, the precise nature of modern text underlay means that for practical purposes the reason for the ligature has been superseded by technology and practice of notation.

2.3.7 Note Value Reduction

Note value reduction\footnote{Note value reduction is sometimes referred to as ‘diminution’, a term which can also refer to the creation of ‘smaller notes’, in other words, a tempo change, decoration or embellishment in the context of Renaissance music.} refers to the practice of altering the standard unit note values in the original sources to the modern standard unit of the crotchet. In practice, this frequently means a halving or quartering of the original note values. Early twentieth-century editions used what is often referred to as white notation, where the standard unit used was the minim. This gave a very white look to the music, hence the white notation moniker. For many non-specialist performers, this resulted is rather slow performances, a practice referred to by John Rutter in our interview:

Christopher Robinson was talking to me about this because he was recently editing for Kairos who are saying no, they want to go back to the original note values. Well he’s going along with it but he says he remembers as a young boy they sang off these editions in very long note values. Once it became customary to put crotchets as the more basic unit of beat he said it didn’t half cheer up sixteenth-century music.\footnote{John Rutter interview, 13/10/2015.}

Though in his preface Rutter refers to the reduction of the note values to give a crotchet pulse, no further explanation or reference is made on the topic. Henry Washington, on the other hand, provides a somewhat more helpful explanation

Sixteenth-century note values have been halved to conform to present-day acceptance of the crotchet as the normal unit of time. The quick ternary...
measure in the *Credo* at the words *Et in Spiritum Sanctum Dominum* is indicated in the original by use of black notation’ (Palestrina 1953, p.4)

None of the other editors included in this review make any reference to an alteration to the printed duration in the source material.

2.3.8 Text

The topic of text and its treatment in modern editions of Renaissance polyphony is one which could be a dissertation topic in its own right. The importance of the text, text underlay, pronunciation, meaning, literal translation, and poetic translation cannot be overemphasised. As choristers, we should not merely sing words or syllables, we must sing meaning. To be able to sing the meaning of the text, we need to clearly understand that which we are singing.

The 1905 edition of Viadana’s *Missa L’Hora Passa* created by R.R. Terry provides no translation, literal or poetic and no aid to pronunciation whatever. In contrast, Besseler’s edition of Gabrielli’s motet *Hodie Completi Sunt* published in 1931 (Example 2.14) contains a German translation. It should be noted, however, that this translation is an alternative performance text rather than a literal or poetic translation of the original Latin text. The first word *Hodie* is translated not as *Heute* (Today) but as *Freuet euch* (Rejoice). Such a translation was necessary in order to adhere to the musical setting of a three-syllable word in Latin.

In Washington’s 1953 edition of the *Missa Aeterna Chirsts Munera*, there is once again no translation. Given that this is a mass setting, it could be argued that a translation may not have been required, as at the time of publication choristers would have been very familiar with the text. Such familiarity continues to this day amongst older choristers but in my own work I have found a marked difference in choristers’ familiarity with the text of a *Sanctus* or *Agnus Dei* and that of a *Gloria* or, more particularly, a *Credo*. 


Example 2.14. Gabrielli: *Hodie Completi Sunt* extract

What Washington does attempt to do is to clarify the situation regarding pronunciation. Through the provision of a small mark over some syllables (a mark which resembles a miniature French accent), he encourages a stress on appropriate syllables. An instance of this can be seen in Example 2.15 overleaf. Further, he clarifies the situation in the *Kyrie* where some of the final syllables of the word are elided so as to sound ‘*Kyri*’. He achieves this by placing the syllable to be elided in italics.

Though such an approach is indicative of careful thought, the alteration to italics is not in itself suggestive that the syllable should not be sounded. The technique is not one to which a singer responds intuitively. Looking at the excerpt printed below, the first two bars of the Altus part show a stress on the initial ‘*Ky*’, an elision of the final syllable in that word, followed by a further stress on the second syllable of the word
eleison. Though all of the information is there, it is presented in a very subtle manner and this subtlety is its very undoing.

Example 2.15. Palestrina: *Missa Aeterna Christi Munera – Kyrie extract*

Rutter’s 1996 edition of Palestrina’s *Sicut cervus* treats the translation of the text in an interesting and different way. Where possible, Rutter provides a performance translation which very closely adheres to the actual meaning of the Latin texts. However, his justification for providing an alternative performance text has more to do with satisfying the needs of rigid doctrinal requirements of the end users rather than the aesthetics of translation. In the preface, Rutter states

many, perhaps most, of the choirs using this book will never need to make use of the singing translations provided. Others – including, for example, those serving the largest Christian denomination in the United States – have little choice but to sing in English. I do not think it right that they, and their listeners, should be denied the experience of so much of the best choral literature for lack of an English text (Rutter 1996, p.v).\(^{50}\)

\(^{50}\) It is worth noting that Rutter is not prepared to accept translations at any price. In his own composition, *Requiem*, where he has been unable to come up with a sufficiently successful translation of the Latin text, he has provided alternative text in English which, though sympathetic to the music and the emotion of the piece, in no way attempts to be a translation of the original Latin.
A sample of this approach is shown in Example 2.16.

Example 2.16 Palestrina: *Sicut cervus* extract

I have already referred to the presence of hand-written stress marks to aid pronunciation in the Carrington edition of Byrd’s *Sacerdotes Domini*. Carrington has also provided a semi-literal translation which is ‘designed to help expression and tone color [sic]’ (Byrd 2013, p.2).
2.3.9 Time Signature

Apart from the bar-lines, the symbol that firmly roots a piece of music in a regular pulse with predetermined stresses is the time signature. Of the five editions examined, all have used modern time signatures but only one makes reference to the metre indication in the original manuscript. That edition is the OUP publication edited by John Rutter. Though the cut common symbol is shown in the incipit, there is no explanation as to the significance of the symbol or the manner in which interpretation of the symbol may differ from our modern concept of 2/2 time (Example 2.17). Any benefit that might accrue from showing a duple metre indication in the incipit is countered by a modern time signature, indicating four beats in every bar.

Example 2.17. Palestrina: *Sicut cervus* extract (Rutter edition)

2.3.10 Transposition

In addition to showing the original metre indication, Example 2.17 also shows us that the piece has been transposed. Though the piece is presented to us in the key of G Major, we can see from the incipit that the original was what we today interpret as the key of F Major.
The only other editor who makes reference to an alteration of pitch is Henry Washington. His approach to setting the key, and encouraging transposition where necessary, is worth quoting in full:

*Missa Aeterna Christis Munera* is written in the transposed Ionian mode. It is here reproduced as it stands in the original, a convenient pitch for performance by S.A.T.B. as the voice-lines are set close together the work will nevertheless bear considerable transposition and choirmasters should not hesitate to vary the pitch in accordance with the vocal resources at their disposal. For example, it may be sung a whole tone lower by S.C-T.T.B., a minor third lower by A.T.Bar.B. and even a fourth lower by T.T.B.B (Palestrina 1953, p.4).

Though the five editorial approaches dealt with here do not represent a comprehensive survey of all editions available over the last one hundred years, they do represent a cross section of the commercial publications which were used widely by non-specialist choirs in Ireland and the United Kingdom. All have been used by me in my practice over many years. A summary of the various approaches taken by the editors is contained in Table 2.1 overleaf.
Table 2.1 Summary of selected editorial approaches 1905 - 2013

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Editor Year</th>
<th>Accidental Placement</th>
<th>Barlines</th>
<th>Breath Marks</th>
<th>Dynamics</th>
<th>Ligatures</th>
<th>Metre Changes</th>
<th>Note Value Reduction</th>
<th>Text</th>
<th>Tempo</th>
<th>Time Signature</th>
<th>Transposition</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>R.R. Terry 1905</td>
<td>No distinction between original and editorial</td>
<td>Yes</td>
<td>No</td>
<td>Yes</td>
<td>No indications</td>
<td>No alteration of pulse</td>
<td>No reference to Note Value Reduction</td>
<td>No translation, pronunciation or text underlay reference</td>
<td>Specific indications with M.M. marks</td>
<td>Modern symbol no reference to original</td>
<td>No information</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Besseler 1931</td>
<td>No specific information but editorial changes appear to be over the stave</td>
<td>Between staves</td>
<td>No</td>
<td>No</td>
<td>No indications</td>
<td>Note value equivalents</td>
<td>No reference to Note Value Reduction</td>
<td>No pronunciation or text underlay reference</td>
<td>No tempo marks</td>
<td>Modern symbol no reference to original</td>
<td>No information</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Washington 1953</td>
<td>Editorial accidentals placed above stave</td>
<td>Yes</td>
<td>No</td>
<td>In piano score</td>
<td>Indicated by slurs</td>
<td>Note value equivalents</td>
<td>Note values halved</td>
<td>No translation. Aid to pronunciation. Text underlay referred to.</td>
<td>Indicated on piano reduction</td>
<td>Modern symbol no reference to original</td>
<td>Transposition discussed</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Rutter 1996</td>
<td>Editorial accidentals in smaller font</td>
<td>Yes</td>
<td>No</td>
<td>In piano score</td>
<td>No indications</td>
<td>Note value equivalents</td>
<td>Note values reduced to crotchet pulse</td>
<td>Translation provided - justification included</td>
<td>Tempo is suggested</td>
<td>Modern symbols with reference to originals</td>
<td>Raised 1 tone</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Editor Year</td>
<td>Accidentals</td>
<td>Bar-lines</td>
<td>Breath Marks</td>
<td>Dynamics</td>
<td>Ligatures</td>
<td>Metre Changes</td>
<td>Note Value Reduction</td>
<td>Text</td>
<td>Tempo</td>
<td>Time Signature</td>
<td>Transposition</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>-------------</td>
<td>-------------</td>
<td>-----------</td>
<td>--------------</td>
<td>----------</td>
<td>-----------</td>
<td>---------------</td>
<td>---------------------</td>
<td>------</td>
<td>-------</td>
<td>----------------</td>
<td>----------------</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Carrington 2013</td>
<td>No distinction between original and editorial</td>
<td>Quarter bar-lines</td>
<td>Yes</td>
<td>Yes</td>
<td>No indications</td>
<td>None</td>
<td>No reference to Note Value Reduction</td>
<td>Semi literal translation - justification included</td>
<td>M.M provided with <em>circa</em> qualification</td>
<td>Modern symbols with no reference to originals</td>
<td>No information</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
2.4 A Specialist Publishing House – Mapa Mundi

Having looked at how a number of commercial publishing houses have approached the editing of Renaissance polyphony over the last one hundred years, it is appropriate that a similar examination of the output of a specialist publishing house also be carried out. Using the same criteria under which the commercial publications were examined, I now look at the output of the specialist publisher, Mapa Mundi. According to its website ‘Mapa Mundi was founded in 1977 by Bruno Turner and Martyn Imrie, to edit and publish chiefly Hispanic church music of the Renaissance period in practical performing editions. Our thorough, scholarly, and professional editions, finely printed and affordable to buy, are simply to serve and encourage performance’. 51

Four texts published between 1978 and 2000 are examined for similarities and differences of approach. A development of the editors’ understanding of the needs of the end user is clear to see as they work at addressing the challenges faced by editors working with the source material of Renaissance music. What is particularly interesting is, not only the manner in which the house style of Mapa Mundi develops, but the differences in the editorial style between two pieces edited by Bruno Turner, one from 1978 and one from 2000.

The four extracts examined are:

2. Lugebat David Absalon – Anon. (? Gombert) – Editor John Milsom – 1979

2.4.1 Accidentals

The changes in how accidentals are dealt with by Mapa Mundi between 1978 and 2000 is interesting. Turner’s 1978 edition contains examples of accidentals presented over the stave. However, no information whatever is provided as to why these accidentals are so placed or indeed why the accidentals occur in the first place. The placement of

51 http://www.mapamundimusic.com/mapamundi.html
these accidentals directly in line with the text, as shown in Example 2.18, is also unfortunate, in that it interferes with the easy comprehension of the text.

Example 2.18. Ockeghem: *Missa pro Defunctis* extract

In the 1979 publication, we are told that the *musica ficta* sharps are primarily taken from one 1552 source. However, the editor goes on to state that ‘the modern conductor should feel free to add or remove *ficta* at his own discretion’, an instruction which assumes that conductors are privy to such information as would make them sufficiently familiar with *ficta* as to be informed to take such decisions. The editor directs the reader towards a paper by Howard Mayer Brown for a ‘lucid discussion’ on the topic. 52

The topic of accidentals is treated rather more extensively in the 1983 publication. Here, the editor discusses individual examples of accidentals. Also discussed are explanations as to why the editor has made certain decisions regarding *musica ficta*. A further paragraph is included on the relationship of the chanson *Mille regretz* with its parody mass and how this relationship impacts on the appropriateness or otherwise of major endings through the mass.

Having thus moved from no information on accidentals being provided in 1978 to several paragraphs dealing with the topic in 1983, there is a row back in the 2000 publication on this more informative approach. Here, we are given two short sentences

indicating that original signs are retained in front of the notes and that editorial additions and reminders are shown above the notes affected. Could it be that in the seventeen years between the 1983 and 2000 publications access to basic information regarding *musica ficta* etc. - through access to the internet - meant that extensive notes on the presence of editorial accidentals were no longer needed? Or could it be that the comprehensive discussions on the earlier publication were seen to be ineffective, as people didn’t read the material? Questions such as these were put to the publishers but responses were not forthcoming.

**2.4.2 Bar-lines**

The manner in which bar-lines have been treated differently in all four publications speaks to the ongoing search for a suitable solution to the problem of bar-lines in Renaissance polyphony in modern editions. The 1978 publication (Example 2.19) uses *mensurstrich*, which we have seen already in Besseler’s own publications. In a manner reminiscent of John Rutter’s approach used in *European Sacred Music* discussed earlier, the incipit shows the metre sign from the source publication but a modern 4/4 time signature is shown also.

![Example 2.19. Ockeghem: Missa pro Defunctis extract](image)

In what could be interpreted as a retrograde step, the 1979 publication uses full bar-lines placed within the stave as normal. Where the duration of the beats allocated to any one note results in the necessity to create a tie across a bar-line, then the bar-line...
is altered to two small marks either side of the stave. Examples of this can be seen in the bass 2 part (bar 17/18) and in the bass 3 part (bars 19/20) in Example 2.20. Though this approach facilitates note durations presented in a manner that would have been shown in the original (subject to note value reduction), it does nothing to address the impact of the accented note at the start of the bar, a classic example of which occurs in the Alto 1 line (bar 20). Here, the word *pius* has the second syllable placed as the first note in the bar, with the resultant accent almost reinforced by the nature of the writing.

![Example 2.20. Anon (Gombert?): Lugebat David Absalon extract](image)

Though using a similar approach, the 1983 publication does not appear to completely follow the logic of the 1979 one. Example 2.21 overleaf shows the first page of the *Kyrie*. In the fifth bar, the tenor 1 part shows a tie across the bar-line into bar six. In bars 11 and 12, we see the *mensurstrich* style grouping of notes in the soprano 2 part.

As a performer using this edition, I am rather confused as to why similar situations are dealt with so differently. Unfortunately, as there is no reference to any of these issues in the preface, the chorister or conductor is left wondering if they are missing something.
Example 2.2116. Des Prez: *Missa ‘Mille Regretz’* extract

The 2000 publication takes the concepts used in the 1983 work and moves it on one degree further. In this case, though the quarter bar-lines are present on occasion, the regular bar-lines are not solid but are dotted. This approach does seem to reduce the visual impact of the bar-lines, though they are ever-present.

Once more, the manner of presentation shown in Example 2.21 prompts a question as to why some notes are tied across a dotted bar-line while in other cases the bar-line is eliminated and the duration of the note provided in full.
Example 2.22. Lobo: *Lamentationes Ieremiae Prophetae* extract

An example of this can be seen in the first two bars of Example 2.22 comparing the S1 part with the A1 part. Once again, no reference is made in the preface as to why these different methods of presentation are employed.

Whatever shortcomings there may be, in terms of explaining variants of bar presentation, it is clear that from 1978 to 2000 no firm solution was found to fully satisfy the requirements of the publishers when it came to the issue of bar-lines. It is also clear that they were rather inventive in choosing dotted bar-lines, solid bar-lines that disappeared on occasion, or the quarter bar-lines, both over and under the staff.

**2.4.3 Breath Marks**

None of the four Mapa Munid publications being discussed make any reference to breath points. Where breath marks are not specified, it has always been my practice to instruct choristers to breathe in a place that makes sense in terms of the text. In the case of the Mapa Mundi publications, no translation is provided. The editors have, therefore, provided no direction on breath points for non-specialist singers, or those without a detailed knowledge of Latin. Two of the publications are masses and it could be argued that choristers may be familiar with the Latin text of the mass given the extent to which mass settings form a part of the canon of choral music. The same cannot be argued for the other two pieces (*Lugebat David Absalon* and *Lamentationes Ieremiae Prophetae*). These two pieces contain a Latin text not frequently encountered
by choristers. It is reasonable, therefore, to expect some assistance in terms of phrasing, breathing points or a translation of the text being sung.

2.4.4 Dynamics

In a similar manner to breath marks, no mention is made of dynamics whatever in the Mapa Mundi publications. There are no indications within the sheet music and no mention is made of any dynamic variation in the preface or notes. We will see in chapter three that dynamic variation was not an unknown concept to Renaissance choristers and, to avoid a dynamically sterile performance, some reference to dynamics might be expected.

2.4.5 Ligatures

The issue of ligatures is one that appears to have been re-considered over the period being examined. In the 1978 publication, ligatures are liberally indicated.

Example 2.23. Ockeghem: Missa pro Defunctis extract

Example 2.23 shows just one system where the closeness of the three staves, the presence of word extensions, the inclusion of several editorial accidentals and the presence of ligature indications combine to create a rather busy look.

It may well have been because of sections such as shown in Example 2.22 that all of the later publications being examined dispense with the inclusion of ligature indications. Advances in music notation technology may also have had something to do with the dispensing of ligature indications. This technology allows us to carefully place syllables within the sheet music so that there is little confusion regarding when to sustain a syllable for more than one note – the instruction provided by the original ligature sign in the Renaissance source.
2.4.6 Time Signature and Metre Changes

Given that bar-lines are present in some guise in all four publications, it is hardly surprising that modern time signatures are present in all four scores. In addition to the modern time signature, the original metre indication is also shown in the incipit, though there is no explanation of the various signs that would be unfamiliar to a non-specialist chorister. The 1978 score shows a 4/4 time signature and has a metronome mark indicated in crotchets. This suggests to the chorister a four-in-a-bar ‘feel’. The editor’s note does include reference to Ockeghem’s original metre marks and in particular, to how metronome marks are included to ensure the altered tempi within diminutio sections are observed\(^{53}\). No further explanation of these symbols or diminutio are provided. It may be that the publishing house, being a specialist in Renaissance polyphony, expects choristers using this sheet music to be aware of such matters. Within the non-specialist world of community choirs, this level of awareness is, in my experience, largely absent.

Example 2.24 overleaf shows an extract from the Ockeghem work where the metre changes from triple to quadruple in the third line. Any doubt regarding the relationship between the triple and the quadruple sections is dealt with by clarification that the minim pulse remains constant. What is curious is that, whereas for a change of metre in the middle of a piece, a single digit is considered sufficient, such an approach is not considered sufficient at the commencement of a piece.

\(^{53}\) Diminutio here refers to an alteration of the metre indication within Ockeghem’s original notation.
Example 2.24. Ockeghem: Missa pro Defunctis extract

The 1979 edition, in contrast, uses a 2/2 signature and a metronome mark shown in minims as opposed to the 1978 publication, which uses a 4/4 signature and a metronome mark shown in crotchets. This is an interesting development given that the actual tempo for both pieces is broadly similar – crotchet = 80-88 and minim = ca.46.

The 1983 mass setting and the Lamentationes of 2000 appear to row back somewhat on the earlier development. Though the duple metre movements are shown with a cut common mark, no metronome marks appear anywhere in the score.\(^{54}\) An even more curious development in the mass setting is that the only triple metre section in the entire mass (Osanna – Example 2.25) is shown, not in a 3/2 minim pulse as one might expect, but in a 6/4 crotchet based metre. Modern music notation does not have the

\(^{54}\) The Lamentationes does have a note in the introduction indicating that the cut C does not imply a ‘jolly two-in-a-bar, but simply duple mensuration’.
facility to portray a ‘two dotted minims in a bar’ time signature without expressing it in terms of crotchets. It must be acknowledged that, in terms of understanding the change in pulse from the earlier duple pulse, the editor has shown that the previous minim is equal to the new dotted minim. This is as close as he can get to instructing the singers to sing in a ‘two dotted minims in a bar’ manner, which differs significantly from a six crotchets in a bar.

It would be easy to argue that this section could be written in a number of different time signatures, as the composer has created a confusion of metre within the music, with some lines appearing as a three minim pulse, while others sing in a definite two dotted minims pulse. The question must be asked of whether the absence of bar-lines and time signatures would do anything to reduce the level of confusion here.

![Example 2.25. Des Prez: Missa ‘Mille Regrezez’ extract](image)

The issue of how to present a time signature or a metre indicator can be fraught with difficulties and criticising one choice over another may be unreasonable when the challenges facing editors are understood. An excellent example of these difficulties exists in the Ockeghem Missa Pro Defunctis published by Mapa Mundi in 1978. Example 2.26 overleaf shows the start of the Offertorium. In the incipit, we can see the metre signs which appear in the source material. We can also see that three different metre signs are used. Superius shows O2, Tenor shows cut C, Bar. shows O and Bass shows O2. The solution provided by the editors is to use a 3/2 time signature.
This appears to work well for all, except the tenor line, whose metre indicates that he is working in a duple pulse with divisions of 2.

It is not the purpose of this dissertation to discuss the merits or demerits of editorial choices or devise solutions to those specific situations. It is its purpose to investigate the choices made and to use the data gathered to inform the design of a notation system for use by non-specialist choristers.

Example 2.26. Ockeghem: *Missa pro Defunctis* extract

### 2.4.7 Text

The extent to which a publishing house style in Mapa Mundi appears to have been subject to change is further shown in the approach to the text. No translation whatever is provided for the 1978 publication. This could be because the publication is a mass, albeit a mass for the dead. As such, it might be expected that choristers would be familiar with the text and its meaning. For non-specialists, this may not be reasonable expectation, given that parts of a mass for the dead would be less familiar.

The Des Prez mass published in 1983 is a parody mass and the chanson on which it is based is presented before the mass itself. The chanson is provided with a translation. The editor is therefore aware of the necessity for the chorister to understand that which is being sung. Notwithstanding this awareness, the mass itself is presented without
translation. Again, this may not be surprising, as the mass is a standard liturgical setting.

Both the *Lugebat* and the *Lamentationes* editions, from 1979 and 2008, respectively, have English translations presented at the start of the piece.

The information above regarding the Mapa Mundi publications are summarised in the chart below. From the changes in approaches taken by Mapa Mundi, it is clear that many of the issues of concern to editors in the transcription of Renaissance polyphony continue to be grappled with. The creation of yet another editorial style (PNS) merely continues the search for an appropriate visual medium for this genre of music.

A summary of the various approaches taken by Mapa Mundi over the years covered in this examination is contained in the Table 2.2 overleaf.
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Editor Year</th>
<th>Accidental Approaches</th>
<th>Bar-lines</th>
<th>Breath Marks</th>
<th>Dynamics</th>
<th>Ligatures</th>
<th>Metre Changes</th>
<th>Note Value Reduction</th>
<th>Text</th>
<th>Tempo</th>
<th>Time Signature</th>
<th>Transposition</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Turner 1978</td>
<td>No specific information but editorial changes appear to be over the stave</td>
<td>Mensurstrich is used</td>
<td>No breath marks indicated</td>
<td>None indicated</td>
<td>Indicated through use of square brackets</td>
<td>Single 2,3 or 4 used</td>
<td>Halved</td>
<td>No translation. No indication of editor’s text underlay</td>
<td>A range of M.M. marks provided</td>
<td>Modern English translation provided at the start</td>
<td>No information provided</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Milsom 1979</td>
<td>Editorial accidentals placed over the stave</td>
<td>A Mensurstrich approach though using full bar-lines also</td>
<td>No breath marks indicated</td>
<td>None indicated</td>
<td>No ligatures indicated</td>
<td>No metre changes in this piece</td>
<td>No comment regarding note value reduction</td>
<td>Standard English translation provided at the start</td>
<td>A M.M. mark with circa</td>
<td>Modern English translation provided at the start</td>
<td>No information provided</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Imrie 1983</td>
<td>Editorial accidentals placed over the stave</td>
<td>A Mensurstrich approach though using full bar-lines also</td>
<td>No breath marks indicated</td>
<td>None indicated</td>
<td>No ligatures indicated</td>
<td>Note value equivalents are used</td>
<td>No comment regarding note value reduction</td>
<td>Standard English translation provided at the start</td>
<td>No tempo indication</td>
<td>Modern English translation provided at the start</td>
<td>No information provided</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Turner 2000</td>
<td>Editorial accidentals placed over the stave</td>
<td>A Mensurstrich approach though using dotted bar-lines also</td>
<td>No breath marks indicated</td>
<td>None indicated</td>
<td>No ligatures indicated</td>
<td>A single digit 6 is used</td>
<td>Halved</td>
<td>Standard English translation provided at the start</td>
<td>No tempo indication</td>
<td>Original has been retained</td>
<td>1 tone up from original</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
2.5 How is a new edition informed by the old?

In terms of creating an editorial style which seeks to guide non-specialist choristers, the practices of the past will inform the practices of the future. In conversation, John Rutter paraphrased Thurstan Dart:

> Fundamentally he said you’ve just got to not compromise; you don’t want to stick mock Tudor oak beams on a modern house. If you’re going to be reading a manuscript now, a piece of music, you want to put it in modern notation. Don’t compromise with that but the golden rule is, if you add anything or if you change anything then tell the reader what you’ve added or what you’ve changed so that the reader can see whether the accidentals you’ve added or the phrase marks you might have put in or the changes you’ve made where you’re fairly sure there’s a mistake they always ought to be distinguishable from what is there.\(^\text{55}\)

Initial thoughts as to how the editorial practices of the past influence PNS are listed here under the same categories as when examining modern editions. The more detailed manner in which these practices are applied in the context of PNS will be dealt with in Chapter four.

2.5.1 Accidentals

Accidentals which appear in the original manuscript should appear within the staff in any modern edition. Where necessary, courtesy accidentals should be provided, though no explanation would seem necessary in what is essentially a performing edition rather than a scholarly one. In my experience, choristers rarely query the reason for editorial accidentals. Editorial decisions regarding *musica ficta* which result in accidentals should be shown in a consistent manner, either through being placed in brackets or by being placed over the notes to which they apply.

2.5.2 Bar-lines

The most successful approach to the elimination of bar-lines appears to be that of Simon Carrington. Operating in the absence of any bar-line whatsoever, while a valid proposition, may create additional challenges regarding rehearsal techniques. The

\(^{55}\) John Rutter Interview, 13/10/2015
provision of quarter bar-lines has minimal impact on the obstruction of a fluid line and still provides all the necessary requirements for ease of orientation.

2.5.3 Breath Marks

In many instances, texts breath marks are not deemed necessary. Where long phrases exist or where breath points are less obvious, the presence of breath marks go a long way towards ensuring the meaning of the text is not obscured by the breath. It is possible, however, that the presence of phrase marks may achieve the same end result while at the same time providing direction regarding the flow and focus of any given phrase.

2.5.4 Dynamics

The publications examined displayed a variety of approaches with mixed benefits. The provision of extensive dynamic instruction may result in an over-romanticisation of interpretation. At the same time, the absence of any dynamic guidance may lead to a rather sterile performance. Including the dynamic recommendations within the keyboard reduction score is of broad assistance, though such inclusion can in no way cater for the independence of line associated with this genre of choral writing. The nature of polyphonic writing is such that individual lines frequently differ in the dynamic levels and the direction in which those dynamics are moving. To display all such indications on a keyboard reduction score would result in a score far too ‘busy’ to be of any practical use.

The primary driver of the dynamic approach is likely to be a comprehensive understanding of the text, with additional variation being written into the work by the composer as the number of choral parts is increased and decreased. The provision of a literal text translation is likely to go some way towards ensuring comprehensive understanding of dynamic interpretation. Further subtle guidance can be given within the keyboard reduction score, if required. If these instructions are presented in brackets, they will be more readily seen as optional interpretations, which, of course, they are.
2.5.5 Ligatures

Ligatures in the original manuscript indicate a requirement not to alter the syllable being sung across the notes joined by the ligature. Insofar as this instruction is obeyed in any new edition, the inclusion of a square bracket or other device to show such ligatures would appear to be unnecessary. Though this approach may well be frowned upon by scholars, the purpose of a new edition is the creation of a performance edition (rather than a purely scholarly one) for use by non-specialist choristers for whom the presence or absence of ligatures is little more than a curiosity of historic notation. The inclusion of square brackets, given that there are so many other visual elements presented to a singer, is likely to do little other than create additional ‘visual noise’. The modern conventions of inserting an extended dotted line between syllables where multiple notes are sung to the same syllable or a word extension line (where appropriate) achieves the same end. Therefore, the inclusion of ligature reminders is seen as unnecessary.

2.5.6 Metre Changes

Movement from a duple to triple metre can cause confusion. This is not helped by the fact that, in some cases, modern notation has no way to describe two dotted minim beats without reverting to the use of crotchets in any such description. Providing C as a metre signature is only useful insofar as it indicates a duple pulse with divisions of two. It is, however, likely to be interpreted by non-specialists as the same as 2/2 time. A more appropriate approach might be to use the digit 2 at the start of the piece and detail the tempo in metronomic terms, using the modifying *circa* as appropriate. This gives a clear instruction regarding pulse and tempo. As the metre alters, the inclusion of the digit 3 indicates a move to a triple metre, while the use of a metronome mark specifies the relationship between the two sections. Such an approach would cater for all situations *Tripla*, *Sesquialtera*, and also those situations where neither of these two options work in practice.

---

56 *Tripla* – 3 notes in the duration of the previous 1.
57 *Sesquialtera* – 3 notes in the duration of the previous 2.
58 A fuller discussion on Duple/Triple relationships and their difficulties can be found in Chapter Three.
2.5.7 Note Value Reduction

In most cases, note value reduction\textsuperscript{59} has been applied to the publications examined in this exercise. I see no reason to deviate from this practice, as long as steps are taken to ensure that the crotchet is not seen as the default pulse. In reality, the minim is far more likely to the appropriate pulse. To reinforce this pulse, metronome marks will be shown in relation to minims rather than crotchets.

2.5.8 Text

A variety of approaches to text are displayed in the publications examined above. In some cases, no comment has been made regarding text underlay or its completion. In other cases, comments have been made which imply that conductors should feel free to change things as they see fit. Again, looking to the non-specialist end user, it is more helpful to provide a worked out solution rather than leaving options to be completed. To avoid situations where singers may be confused by different text underlay in different editions, it is worth stating in an introductory note that parts of the text have been completed by the editor but greater detail than that is unnecessary for all but the specialist scholar.

2.5.9 Tempo Marks

An appropriate tempo is vital for performance. However, due care and attention must also be paid to the size of ensemble and the acoustics of the performance space. The use of terms such as allegro or moderato are not deemed helpful, given the very wide interpretations of such instructions. The provision of a range of metronome marks (minim = 60 – 64) or the use of an approximate (minim = \textit{circa} 62) would seem the easiest solution. Using such a system, the tempo relationships in any move from duple to triple or vice versa can be clearly detailed without confusion. What is important in any move between metres is not necessarily the actual tempo before and after the metre change but rather the relationship between the two tempi.

\textsuperscript{59} This refers to a reduction by half or a quarter of the original note values. For more detailed information on the impact of note values and diminution see \textit{Tactus, Mensuration and Rhythm in Renaissance Music}, Ruth DeFord (2015)
2.5.10 *Time Signature*

The use of a standard, modern notation time signature creates the wrong impression from the start, even where it cannot be said to be totally misleading, as in the case of $\frac{4}{4}$. Where ‘bars’ are used exclusively for ease of navigation during rehearsal, it may be sufficient to indicate that the metre is either duple or triple. The use of a 2 or 3 at the start of the appropriate section is sufficient. In more complicated music, phrases such as ‘Duple time with divisions of 3’ could be used if any doubt existed as to the appropriate performance style.

2.5.11 *Transposition*

The scholar may well want to have the detail regarding transposition outlined and this can be done in the introduction or preface. However, much of this choral music exists in modern editions in a variety of voicings and therefore appears in many different keys. Discussions regarding transpositions up or down a minor third are of little interest to non-specialist choristers who merely want to be provided with music that falls within the range of a standard community choir. Compositions in PNS notation should therefore be presented at a pitch suitable for a community choir.

2.6 *Summary*

Throughout this exploration of how early choral music is displayed in modern notation, we have seen the extent to which editors have altered their approach to the presentation of Renaissance polyphony. In the case of the specialist publishing house, it is interesting to note that, notwithstanding their specialisation, they continue to experiment with presentation issues. Such changes cannot merely be down to personal preference but are far more likely to be on foot of a dissatisfaction with the approaches adopted, to date. Decisions should not be taken purely on the basis of what the source notation displays but rather on the basis of the sound that would have been created by that notation. In other words, editors must not be content with translating just the means of communication rather than the actual sonic message contained in that communication.

---

60 A fuller discussion on the appropriateness, or otherwise, of transposition appears in Chapter Three.
By creating a notation system which contains elements which support the chorister in terms of avoidance of performance aspects contra-indicated by historically verifiable Renaissance training, it can be argued that PNS is working to improve the performance of Renaissance polyphony. Is this sufficient to label PNS as contributing to a historically informed performance, if not an authentic one? Insofar as PNS goes some way to address the issues that gave rise to the unsatisfactory sound I heard back in 1984, the precise categorisation as ‘authentic’ or ‘informed’ or something else is of little consequence.
Chapter Three: Approaches to the key elements of Edition Creation

In the previous chapter, I examined how various editions dealt with the issues of bar-lines, breath marks, dynamics, ligatures, note value reduction, time signature, and transposition. In this chapter, I will discuss how the past treatment of these elements influenced their treatment in the phrased notation system. This discussion is informed, not only by the review of other editions, but also by interviews with other conductors and by my personal experience.

Notwithstanding my assertion that this research emanates from my own practice and is designed for my practice, the issues raised by me in 1984 were also commented on as issues of concern by several internationally established conductors. The fact that these issues are of concern to other choral directors may suggest that solutions potentially offered by PNS may have a wider audience than that of my personal practice. The thoughts of these other conductors were recorded in a series of interviews carried out between February and October in 2015.

3.1 The Interviews

Of these nine interviews, seven were conducted through Skype and video recorded using the computer programme ‘Pamela’. A list of questions was drawn up to be used as a general guide in what would be semi-structured interviews. However, in an effort to encourage personal opinion based on their own experience, interviewees were free to include any additional material they thought might be relevant to my research or, where they felt it appropriate, to deviate from the specifics of the question asked. The interviewees were advised that the interviews would take no more than twenty minutes, though in many cases interviewees were more than happy to extend this time. The longest interview lasted almost forty-five minutes. The interviews with Simon Carrington and Stephen Cleobury were conducted through email. In these two cases, the same list of questions, which were used in the live interviews, were provided to

---

61 These issues are: the presence of bar-lines and associated accents, the lack of phrasing in both music and text, inappropriate breathing points, a lack of understanding of text and inappropriate pronunciation of text.

62 ‘Pamela’ is a computer programme used in conjunction with Skype in which audio and video of both interviewer and interviewee is recorded.

63 The list of questions can be found in Appendix II.
the respondents, who replied in their own time. In one case, the responses to the questions were very short, with little or no expansion on single sentence answers. In the other case, fuller responses were received, although these answers were necessarily less comprehensive than the responses received in the live interviews.

A consent form was provided and signed by all participants in advance of the interviews. In the consent form the interviewees confirmed receipt of an information letter that informed them about the nature of the study and their role within it. They were given the opportunity to ask questions before agreeing to participate. The nature of their participation was explained and they were provided with full knowledge of how the information collected would be used. They were made aware that their participation in this study would be recorded and if they felt uncomfortable the recording equipment would be switched off. In addition, they were informed that they were entitled to a copy of the recording and that this would be available once the study had been completed. They were further informed that they would be named as part of this study and that there was no obligation on them to participate. All interviewees were given a period of ten days from the date of their recording in which they could withdraw their participation without giving any reason or being required to explain their change of mind.

All interviews were subsequently transcribed and both recordings and transcriptions have been retained by the writer subject to the restrictions of the University of Limerick Ethics Committee. The quotations included in this dissertation are an accurate record of the interviewees original contribution to my research.

In each case, the interview began by me outlining the nature of my research. In most cases, the interviewees were rather intrigued by my proposals. Time and again, my proposed solutions to issues such as bar-lines, phrasing, and pronunciation were seen as uncomplicated yet potentially effective. Though such affirmation was personally rewarding, it did pose a problem for me as a researcher. This was reflected in my personal journal writing:
It’s great that so many of these conductors think my ideas are good solutions to the identified problems but if everyone is in agreement then how do I challenge my own work through criticism? Hopefully someone will find an issue with my work soon.64

3.1.1 Bar-lines and accents

The data gathered from the interviews was examined from the perspective of addressing the five issues referred to earlier and it was notable that the issue most referred to by interviewees was that of modern bar-lines and their attendant accents. This common thread through all interviews was particularly interesting, as my list of questions included no specific reference to bar-lines. Simon Carrington responded that the greatest challenges of singing Renaissance polyphony included ‘persuading the singers (and the conductors) to forget the bar lines and sing to the word stress and the tension and relaxation of the phrases usually provided by the suspensions and dissonances’65 This reference to the approach of conductors was reinforced by Jeremy Summerly in rather strong terms:

The singers don’t stand a chance if the person standing in front of them is flapping around with a crotchet mentality. If somebody is flapping around with a crotchet mentality it doesn’t matter how intelligent or experienced your singers are, that’s where it’s going to stay, it’s absolutely going to stick there.66

Peter Broadbent’s focus was more on the avoidance of metrical stress. He related his comments to modern editions in general: ‘The danger, whatever edition you are using, is that you have to work hard right from the beginning that they [the singers] don’t become too metrical in terms of the stress’.67 Broadbent’s focus stems from his firm belief that the style of singing Renaissance polyphony comes from plainchant:

With polyphony it’s so very close to original plainsong, and sometimes it’s worth it, I’ve done it, is just to take a line, get them all to sing the line without any measurement but just the text and the shape before tackling it as its written.

This initially ‘free’ approach is one that was similarly advocated by Paul Spicer:

---

64 Personal journal entry, 31/03/2015.
65 Carrington interview, 11/04/2015.
66 Summerly interview, 16/07/2015.
67 Broadbent interview, 27/02/2015.
One of the things which I try to get students to do is, when I am doing this sort of period of music, is to get them to do their own editions. We talk a lot about it and simply say ‘Just ignore, just take the notes off the page and work with the text and the notes and see what you come up with. Find where the natural rhythms lie.  

Though most of the conductors interviewed continue to use standard modern notation, they were not unfamiliar with the other options available. Speaking of mensurstrich, Simon Halsey said, ‘I think that’s a very good idea in theory. But having been brought up with the bar-lines in the music and so on, I actually found it purely confusing and irritating’. Jeremy Summerly’s comments were a little more considered and he referenced the impact mensurstrich may have on less experienced singers:

The only thing that worries me about devising a notation system that gets away from the modern system of barring and stuff like that - which is, frankly unhelpful as we know – is that if people can no longer align themselves easily to some kind of verticality then it might be self-defeating. In order for them to do that they’ve got to be able to listen as well as sing off stuff that’s not barred and I think you have to be of a certain standard to make that achievable. My experiments, even with mensurstrich - as soon as things go wrong it’s nice to be able to have some point at which you breathe altogether. If there’s a way of showing that properly, unequivocally in a new type of notation but which doesn’t put a bar-line in there, I’d be very interested to see that.

Though Summerly is aware of the problems caused by the use of standard modern notation, he deals with it in a slightly different way. Responding to the question as to whether or not he ever uses white notation, Summerly responded:

Most amateur choirs I give white notation to just because it’s the defamiliarisation of the notation in front of them which means they concentrate on the hierarchy that you [the conductor] want rather than thinking about the hegemony of the crotchet. As soon as people start thinking 4/4 the game’s up – over!  

Though the interviewees had their own way of dealing with the ‘bar-line issue’, all were curious as to how a new approach might work. This curiosity was summed up in Paul Spicer’s comment:

We are a long way down the line in terms of music education and experience of a lifetime that gets you completely into the bar line habit and it’s very difficult to break that. If you see something which looks just endless melody with no bar lines you think ‘Oh my God. How do I read this?’ It takes quite a

68 Spicer interview, 02/03/2015.
69 Summerly interview, 16/07/2015.
70 Summerly interview, 16/07/2015.
leap of faith to be able to really start to think completely freshly about a new way of approaching this music. It’s exciting.  

3.1.2 Phrasing and pronunciation

Dealing with the presence of bar-lines in the music is only part of the issue of phrasing Renaissance polyphony. In a previous comment, Peter Broadbent referred to polyphony being a development of plainchant. This point was reiterated by Andrew Parrott who said ‘if you don’t understand how chant can be fluid and beautiful you have no right to sing most of this sixteenth-century polyphony. It should spring from chant’. Parrott continued:

What people who understand chant - or really understand chant - get is the flexibility even within a strict rhythm that words give; sentences, grammatical units within the sentence and the character and shade of every single word with its cluster of consonants or its long vowels.

Summerly expressed a similar awareness of pronunciation. He said that ‘one of the first challenges in singing Renaissance polyphony is to identify the stress within the Latin text. I underline the important syllable of every word’. 

3.1.3 Understanding the text

In addition to the importance of the pronunciation of the text, interviewees also stressed the necessity for a clear understanding of the text. Paul Spicer was very strong when he said:

Text comes first in my book and that is what I teach my students. The text did come first and the text should come first. We can only understand what the composer [intended], why he wrote as he did (or she) through the setting of the words. So the words do come first. It is important to understand every word because a number of different languages have their word order in a totally different order from the way English is structured.

John Rutter was equally strong on the issue of an understanding of each word in the text.

---

71 Spicer interview, 02/03/2015.
72 Parrott interview, 27/02/2015.
73 Summerly interview, 16/07/2015.
74 Spicer interview, 02/03/2015.
You need that because often the way the composer sets an individual Latin word is because of what that individual word means. So they [the choristers] don’t need to know a vague poetic idea. They need to know what that exact word means.75

Simon Halsey stated that understanding was so important that he makes his own editions ‘and all the translations are written in and, wherever possible, they are not poetic translations but they are literally word for word’.76

Of all of the conductors interviewed, Peter Broadbent works more with amateurs than any of the others. It is not surprising, therefore, that he provided a very clear summary of the challenges facing the non-specialist singer and the editor creating editions for their use. Broadbent stated:

The most specific challenge is for all the singers, every individual singer, to really understand the rhythmic shape of the phrase which comes from the text and to combine that with listening to the other singers’ phrases without losing the individual quality of their particular line. With the less experienced amateur singers what they see is what they give and it’s very difficult to get away from that. Anything that leads them to immediately understand, or move towards an understanding of the way things come together in a different way is to be welcomed. Notation therefore, psychologically, plays an important part.77

This declaration by Broadbent, regarding the impact of notation, supports the thought expressed by me in the USA of how notation can affect performance. His assertion, that a notation system that promotes intuitive understanding of ‘how things come together … is to be welcomed’, is also reassuring. A further reassurance that PNS may play a worthwhile role in the performance of Renaissance polyphony by non-specialist choristers comes from the fact that the five issues detailed in chapter one were referred to as issues of common concern by the interviewees.

However, these interviewees have not written specifically on the impact of modern notation on the performance of Renaissance polyphony.

75 Rutter interview, 13/10/2015.
76 Halsey interview, 31/03/2015.
77 Broadbent interview, 27/02/2015.
3.2 Published Discourse concerning Renaissance Music and Modern Notation

The important role played by notation in the performance of Renaissance polyphony is referred to in Bernard Thomas’s article ‘Renaissance Music in Modern Notation’, from 1977. In that article, Thomas writes:

The exaggerated respect that the average performer feels for the printed notes increases the editor’s dilemma about how far to go in any particular direction, whether it be in adding accidentals, or whatever (Thomas 1977, p.5)

Thomas proceeds to look at six areas which impact upon how the music is presented. These are note values, barring, musica ficta, pitch, scoring/performing medium (which Thomas says is related to pitch), and underlay of text. With regard to this last area, underlay of text, Thomas writes that the intentions of the composers become more explicit as we progress through the sixteenth-century. He continues, noting that ‘for much late 16th-century music, there are quite explicit rules that have come down from the theorists of the time’ (Thomas 1977, p.11). Thus, the repertoire being transcribed as part of this research is generally clear regarding text underlay. The issue of pitch is dealt with later in this chapter and musica ficta is addressed in Chapter four. It is, however, appropriate to look in more detail at the first two categories mentioned by Thomas – note values and barring.

3.2.1 Note values

Thomas states that ‘the most drastic change in Renaissance or medieval music is that of reducing original note values’ (Thomas 1977, p.5). Whilst I do not agree with Thomas that note value reduction is the most dramatic change, a term I reserve for the imposition of bar-lines, Thomas certainly does have a point that note value reduction can present difficulties for an editor as to how to present the music. According to Thomas, the rhythm \[ \frac{1}{4} \text{ quarter notes} \] is unambiguously in 3/4 time and excludes the possibility of a 6/8 option. Presenting the same rhythm in minims and crotchets (half the value of the original note values rather than a quarter) would, according to Thomas, create sufficient ambiguity to facilitate multiple rhythmic interpretations in performance. Presenting the argument in such stark terms is not entirely fair, however. No allowance is made for the impact of the text on the rhythm. Nor, where
appropriate, is the possibility of presenting separate quavers suggested. This latter option is frequently encountered in modern editions of vocal music, though less so in choral music. Another possibility not explored is the option of varying the time signature for the relevant bars, either globally or for the particular voice line displaying a 6/8-style rhythm. Underpinning this entire argument, however, is a belief that a time signature must be used.

3.2.2 **Barring**

Thomas begins his section on barring by stating: ‘Having decided on what note values to use, the next problem is where to put the bar-lines (if any)’ (Thomas 1977, p.6). He then presents four options: 1.) no bar-lines at all, 2.) mensurstrich, 3.) conventional bar-lines simply as a means of marking off beats, rather than implying an accent, and 4.) the use of bar-lines, with more or less their modern meaning of implying accent. The argument for no bar-lines is made on foot of its elegant simplicity; however, according to Thomas, ‘for those other than professionals or particularly experienced amateurs the drawbacks are considerable’. He continues:

> An important objection is that those performers who can cope with the difficulties would be quite capable of reading from the original notation, and in this age of litho- printing the simplest and cheapest way of publishing early music is to print direct from the original. (Thomas 1977, p.6)

What Thomas does not mention is that in reading from original sources is a challenge is commented on by members of the specialist choral group ‘The Sixteen’ in the 2015 BBC documentary, *Monteverdi in Mantua – the Genius of the Vespers*, presented by Simon Russel Beale.

---

78 The extent to which reading from original sources is a challenge is commented on by members of the specialist choral group ‘The Sixteen’ in the 2015 BBC documentary, *Monteverdi in Mantua – the Genius of the Vespers*, presented by Simon Russel Beale.
the difficulties of which can be overcome quite easily, given enough practice. My personal experience, echoed by that of Simon Halsey and Jeremy Summerly, leads me to a contrary conclusion.

The use of conventional bar-lines, simply as a means of marking off beats, rather than implying an accent, calls for constant awareness and understanding from the performer. Given that the target audience for PNS is the non-specialist (and generally amateur) chorister, I am reminded of Peter Broadbent’s comment above: ‘With the less experienced amateur singers what they see is what they give and it’s very difficult to get away from that’. If, as Thomas suggests, it was a relatively straightforward process for a chorister to re-educate him/herself as to the meaning and impact of the bar-line, it is highly unlikely that all of the interviewees would have remarked on the presence of the bar-line as being the single biggest inhibitor in the performance of Renaissance polyphony.

The final option offered by Thomas is the use of bar-lines with more or less their modern meaning. Where such an approach may be well suited to some dance music, the comments above from interviewees indicate the extent to which this option does not work successfully with non-specialist choristers singing Renaissance polyphony.

Having provided the various options for barring the music, Thomas determines that the problem is not so much one for the editor but rather the performer: ‘The onus is really on the reader to work out for himself what the bar-lines actually mean in any edition he comes across’ (Thomas 1977, p.6). In an environment where non-specialist performers do not have the scholarship to make such determinations, this is hardly a realistic possibility. There are occasions where even users with the necessary scholarship would prefer to be told what to do. Simon Halsey stated:

I do want people to make decisions about which pitch things are going to be sung at and so on. Because … I don’t have time to be working out whether the pitch is up a minor third or down a minor third or whatever it is. So I want someone to make all those decisions for me but I want them to have been made clear, in a very, very clear well-written edition.79

---

79 Interview with Simon Halsey, 31/03/2015.
Casting the responsibility of interpreting the notation back on the singer has little chance of real success based on Thomas’s own words: ‘I strongly suspect that the majority of performers really have no idea to what extent they are being influenced by the many apparently trivial decisions taken by the editor (or the publisher) before the music reaches its public’ (Thomas 1997, p.4). On the basis of decades of performance experience working with amateur choirs, I have found nothing to contradict this suspicion.

In the preface to his book, Editing Early Music, John Caldwell writes that ‘the requirements of performers and scholars are - or should be - identical’ (Caldwell 1995, p.v). In the words of Simon Halsey, the objective of the editor should be to create an edition ‘which allows singers and the conductor to understand the music most readily’. The music Halsey speaks of is not the dots, lines, and circles on a page but rather the sound of the combined voices singing.

3.3 Understanding the text

Writing in the foreword to The Oxford Book of Italian Madrigals, Alec Harman states:

The growing importance of the text was fundamental to the development of the Italian Madrigal, for it was increasingly the text that caused composers to decide on what mode, metre, and voices they would use for a particular madrigal and, for a particular word or phrase. It is therefore essential when performing an Italian madrigal to understand the poem as a whole, as well as certain words and phrases that receive special musical treatment (Harman 1983, p.viii).

This approach is reinforced by Alexander Blachly (1994), writing in A Performer’s Guide to Renaissance Music, he states:

The most useful aspect of the translation is its conveyance of the general meaning of the text. Nearly as important, however, is that the translation make clear the meaning of each individual word of the original, since the singers will be pronouncing each of the words, even if they are conveying overall meaning. For the singer, after all, the task is to breathe musical life into the original words themselves, not into their translation (Blachly 1994, p.17).

80 Interview with Simon Halsey, 31/03/2015.
In answer to the same question as to the importance of a comprehensive understanding of the meaning and function of each word in the text, interviewees associated with this research left no room for doubt, as their responses detailed above attest. The one dissenting voice was that of Stephen Cleobury. Cleobury allowed for a little leeway in his response that ‘[understanding the text is] very important, but an understanding of the key words may suffice’.

The elevation of the text to a position of the highest importance is further attested to in the writings of English madrigalist Thomas Morley (1558-1603). In his *A Plaine and Easie Introdvction to Practicall Mvsicke*, Morley comments that a composer who composed ‘a mighty musical fury’ was ‘moved to do so by the words of his text’ (Morley 1597, p.60). He goes on to be very specific in what is required in setting text:

> You must then when you would express any word signifying hardness, cruelty, bitterness or other such like make the harmony like unto it, that is somewhat harsh and hard, but yet so that it offend not’ (Morley 1597, p.290).

Morley does not confine his comments to the composers alone, however. Singers also come in for some harsh criticism: ‘Though a song be never so well made and never so aptly applied to the words yet shall you hardly find singers to express it as it ought to be’ (Morley 1597, p.293). In other words, singers need to interpret the music according to the text.

A similar point is made by Alexander Blachly:

> Singers must understand the meaning of the words they are singing and they must sing the words with untempered sincerity. Singing with a clear projection of the sound and sense of the text is the easiest, most natural, and most obvious way to begin the process of interpreting a piece of vocal music. Yet, it is the one most often overlooked, especially by amateurs (Blachly 1994, p16).

Alejandro Planchart echoes this point:

> Translations of the texts – as literal as possible – should be handed out the same day as the music, and the singers should be encouraged to begin thinking
not only about the meaning of each word they sing but also about the rhetoric and syntax of the different languages (Planchart 1994, p.31).

James (2012), presenting notes for the ACDA-CA\textsuperscript{82} Summer Conference 2012, published online, also reinforce this approach to the primacy of the text – ‘Text is the most important element of the music’:

Given the level of consensus on the importance of a comprehensive understanding not only of the general sentiment of the text but also an understanding of each word in the text, it is curious that editors continue to provide alternative performance texts in translation rather than a literal translation with which to assist singers to imbue their performance with a comprehensive understanding of that which is being sung. The extent to which an understanding of each word is important can be illustrated by presenting a Latin text, a vernacular English translation, and a literal English translation. Given the penchant of Renaissance composers for word painting, as referred to in the earlier quote from Morley, the extent to which this technique loses its impact can be seen when a literal translation and a poetic translation are placed in close proximity, as shown in Table 3.1 overleaf.

\textsuperscript{82} American Choral Directors Association - California
Table 3.1 Latin / Literal / Poetic translation

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Latin</th>
<th>Pange lingua gloriosi</th>
<th>Corporis mysterium, Sanguinisque pretiosi,</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>Literal Translation</strong></td>
<td>Sing tongue of glorious</td>
<td>Body mystery, and of blood precious,</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Poetic Translation</strong></td>
<td>Sing, O tongue,</td>
<td>the mystery of the glorious Body, and of the precious blood,</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Latin</strong></td>
<td>Quem in mundi pretium</td>
<td>Fructus ventris generosi, Rex effudit gentium.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Literal Translation</strong></td>
<td>Which as of world price</td>
<td>fruit of womb noble, King poured forth of nations.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Poetic Translation</strong></td>
<td>Which the king of all nations,</td>
<td>The fruit of a noble womb, Poured forth as the ransom for the world.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

In the final line, the words ‘poured forth’ have been placed in the poetic translation at a location previously occupied by the word ‘Rex’ (King). Given the majestic attitude suggested by the word ‘Rex’ and the florid moving elements suggested by the word ‘effudit’ (poured forth), a setting which uses this standard English translation may reduce the potential impact of any word painting employed by the composer. Even without word painting, the performance of the word ‘Rex’ should be imbued with a very different attitude than the word which translates as ‘poured out’. To fail to do so would be to sing mere syllables without an understanding of the text or communication of its meaning to the listener.

Singing in the vernacular may well facilitate better general understanding of the text by the singers but the provision of a literal translation will achieve the same end while, at the same time, facilitating performance in the original language, as intended by the composer. A literal text provided in the score may well appear as pigeon English (or any given vernacular) but those fluent in English will have no problem extracting the precise meaning of the sentence by combining the meanings of the individual words.

---

It is for this reason that a literal translation will be included as an integral part of the Phrased Notation system.

### 3.4 Pitch

Discussions regarding the precise pitch at which pieces were originally sung will, no doubt, occupy musicologists for many years to come. Questions regarding performance pitch, though not at all irrelevant, are not within the scope of this research. It is certainly interesting that, with the provision of a basso continuo\(^{84}\) in the 1625 publication being examined as part of this research project, Viadana was allowing for the possibility of his masses being accompanied by an instrument or instruments. In the event that such accompaniment was provided by organ, the following table clearly demonstrates the very wide range of pitches which could result.

No determined effort was made to standardise pitch until 1834, at which point the recommended A\(_4\) = 440 Hz was suggested in Germany, though many regions continued with their own preferred pitch right up to the twentieth century.

The following table (Table 3.2) details information on the variety of pitches sounded by the note A\(_4\) on organs from 1495 to 1789. In modern pitch, it should be noted that G\(_4\) is 388 Hz and B\(_4\) is 480 Hz. Thus, the difference in pitch of A\(_4\) on the organs included in this table was up to a major third.\(^{85}\) In practice, the difference could have been even greater as in each case it is the average pitch that is listed, with no indication of the precise range of pitches included in each category. Given the variety of pitches listed, the extent to which a non-contentious decision on pitch is impossible is self-evident.

---

84 What Viadana has called Basso Continuo in this publication is in actuality Basso Seguente – which merely duplicates the lowest sounding vocal part at any given time.

85 Within the brass band world standardisation of pitch A = 440 Hz only occurred in the 1960s. Black Dyke Mills band being the first UK band to convert from the previously known ‘high pitch’ in 1965; Newsome, R. (2006) *The Modern Brass Band. From the 1930s to the New Millennium*, Aldershot: Ashgate.
In the absence of certainty, what is necessary is to produce an edition which takes into account the realities of life in modern choral groups that wish to perform this music. A shift of a major third in one direction or the other will, in many cases, mean a composition will cease to be performable for a given choir. In creating a PNS edition of the Viadana mass collection, *Missarum Quatuor Vocum. Cum Basso Continuo ad Organum, Liber Primus. Item Missa pro Defunctis Clementis non Papae*, I have decided to maintain the pitch as displayed in the original part books, given that performance of the material at the pitch shown in the source is within the scope of most community choirs. In only one case within the collection of masses being transcribed has it been found that retaining the original notation pitch may cause strain for a competent amateur ensemble. The tessitura of the tenor line in the *Missa Audi Filia* is rather high and the pitch has therefore been lowered by one tone.

A further indicator of the inappropriateness of detailed discussions of the precise original pitch comes from Richard Sherr’s 1987 article ‘Performance practice in the Papal Chapel during the 16th century’. Citing a sixteenth-century memorandum, he states:

---

When they performed in the Sistine Chapel, the papal choir sang without the accompaniment of instruments. There was thus no way of giving pitch to the choir (through an instrument toccata for instance), and the solution seems to have been to allow whoever began to choose the pitch level. This is implied also by a decision recorded after an apostolic visitation of the choir in 1630: *When the choir begins, everyone will allow the oldest singer [of his voice part] to begin, and if he does not intone well, he should be severely fined.*\(^7\) (Sherr 1987, pp. 453-455).

Caldwell reinforces comments about the difficulties referred to above when he writes: ‘The transcription of Renaissance music is a minefield.’ Caldwell continues:

> It is also fallacious to suppose that there is any objective incorrectness in transposition to remote keys… The real objection to transposition to remote keys is a psychological one: there is a danger that it may inculcate a romantic style of performance by creating facetious resemblances to inappropriate parallels (Caldwell 1995, pp. 54-55).

### 3.5 Phrasing/ Breaths

An element closely associated with the text and essential to the clear communication of the meaning of the text is the manner in which the text is phrased. Given the linear nature of the writing and the independence of the various voice parts, an understanding of how to phrase musical sentences is a necessary skill in the performance of Renaissance polyphony. Various interviewees have spoken of the necessity of knowing where the phrase comes from and to where it is going. There is much more to this comment than merely the start and finish of the musical phrase. In speaking of any text, we stress certain syllables while ensuring other syllables are not stressed. However, we do this with an understanding of the tempo of the spoken words. There are words we skip over and words which we pronounce more slowly in order to ensure our message is accurately communicated. Renaissance composers were trained in the skills of oratory, as noted in previous extracts from *Young Choristers 650-1700* (Boynton & Rice 2008) and they built these techniques into their music. In the potential absence of an understanding of the Latin text by modern choristers or the correct pronunciation of individual words, in addition to a lack of training in musical

\(^7\) Author’s italics.
phrasing, this area is addressed in Phrased Notation through the use of two different techniques.

The first of these techniques is the use of phrase marks. These extended slurs indicate the individual phrases and are also indicators of breath points. The inclusion of these phrase marks on each individual line provides a visual reminder of, not only how that line should be phrased, but also highlights the independence of lines. This independence becomes very obvious as the various phrase marks vary in their placement and do not fall into any predictable pattern. This addresses the problem outlined by Alexander Blachly:

> The problem facing the director of a chorus singing Lassus (or Byrd or Willaert) is not so much in getting the singers of an individual line to phrase musically in isolation from the other parts, but in training them to maintain their independence – especially when the line calls for a falling off (decrescendo)- at a point where other lines are singing other motives or other words (Blachly 1994, p.18).

The second technique is the use of bold type for stressed syllables. Words with more than one syllable generally have at least one stressed syllable. By stressing the correct syllable, the rhythm of the word is more clearly enunciated. The word miserere (have mercy) is included in the text of the Agnus Dei from the Ordinary of the mass. As such, it is frequently sung by choristers. It is possible to sing this word without stresses of any kind. However, by pronouncing the word with a stress on the third syllable (mise-re-re), a totally different sound is created. The inclusion of the stress facilitates a 'pleading' attitude appropriate to its meaning. By ensuring such words are thus properly enunciated, the phrasing of the sentence is significantly altered.

According to Compton, Graves and Hall, writing in the National Federation of Music Societies (NFMS) publication Choral Latin:

> Latin, though described as a dead language, has been in continuous use in Europe for between two and three thousand years. It has, therefore, inevitably been pronounced differently at different times in the same place, differently in different places at the same time and still more differently when places and times are leagues and centuries apart. There is therefore no one correct or authentic pronunciation to which modern users of the language, be they

---

88 See Example 3.1 on p.122.
89 Author’s own emphasis.
classical scholars, ecclesiastics, lawyers or choral singers, can appeal as a final authority (Compton et al. 1983, p.1).

The pronunciations employed throughout these Phrased Notation System editions are based on the Latin pronunciations learned by me as a student of Latin for six years as a schoolboy, and as a singer of liturgical Latin for over fifty years. I have found these pronunciations to be, by and large, consistent here in Ireland, the United Kingdom, and the United States. I am aware, however, that different pronunciations of the Latin of the Roman Catholic mass exist in Italy, Austria, and France. These differences are referred to in the NFMS publication mentioned above.90

The provision of breath marks, where needed, is initially considered on the basis of the punctuation of the text. Where additional breaths are required, full consideration is given to the completion of the musical phrase. As a last resort, breath marks are provided where the inclusion of a breath will cause minimal disturbance to the musical line.

3.6 Dynamics

As a general rule, Renaissance composers did not indicate dynamics. However, there is little doubt that a range of dynamics was used. Quoted in Readings in the History of Music in Performance, Michael Praetorious, writing in Syntagma musicum (1619), was very specific that motets and concertos ‘are given a particular charm’, with the ‘raising of voices and then with a very quiet sound, done with all care and attention’ (MacClintock 1979, p.150).

Dynamics are impacted by at least three performance elements:

1. The inclusion or exclusion of voice parts
2. The nature of the text being performed
3. The nature of the melodic line being sung

90 Additional comments regarding the pronunciation of Latin can be found in Chapter Five – The Masses Transcribed.
The ebb and flow of voice parts, as they enter or leave the ensemble, will automatically alter the overall dynamic of the piece being performed. If all parts singing maintained a steady dynamic level throughout the performance, there would still be significant variation in the overall dynamic of the performance, as the number of people singing increases or decreases in line with the writing of the composition.

It is doubtful that a competent performer would advocate that an *Agnus Dei* should be performed in the same manner as the start of a *Gloria*. To do so would to entirely disregard the meaning of the text. Similarly, within a *Credo*, there are a wide variety of sentiments expressed in the text – from the proclamation of glory to the prayer of the supplicant for mercy. A performance without dynamic adjustment in sympathy with the changing sentiment would reduce the impact of the text’s meaning.

Closely allied to the nature of the text is the manner in which the text is set. Words with more than one syllable will frequently have one syllable stressed and one not. Renaissance composers exploited this reality and built the impact of such pronunciation into their writing. In the excerpt from *Ascendit Deus* (Example 3.1) given overleaf, it will be noted that the text *in voce tubae* (with the voice of trumpets) is repeated by four of the five voice parts. The imitative nature of the writing is heightened by the inherent crescendo and diminuendo contained in the three short words. The rhythmic setting of the stressed syllable ‘*vo*’ and the stressed and extended syllable ‘*tu*’ create a variety of dynamic irrespective of the overall dynamic in performance. By ensuring that these variations in dynamic do not occur at the same time in any of the four moving lines, the composer facilitates the prominence of each line in quick succession. The effect in performance, therefore, is akin to a series of trumpets, each entry being clearly heard due to the skill of the writing. This is a classic example of word-painting, so loved by Renaissance composers.
The third element which affects dynamics is the nature of the writing itself. It would be virtually impossible to sing the opening phrase of the above Gallus piece without automatically creating a crescendo within each of the parts. From the excerpt shown overleaf in Example 3.2, it can be seen that as Cantus part reaches the zenith of the phrase as the Bass II starts his phrase, with the Cantus voice falling silent almost immediately. This alteration in dynamics is achieved by the careful management of the presence and absence of the individual parts.

The range and nature of the writing can also affect the dynamic structure. In the opening phrase of Example 3.2, the Cantus has a range of a 10th, Altus and Tenor both have a range of an octave, Bassus I has a range of a sixth, while the Bassus II has the range of a fifth. In other words, the composer has actually written a greater or lesser crescendo into the music (depending on the line) without ever specifically dictating anything in that regard.

Example 3.1. Jacobus Gallus (Handl): *Ascendit Deus* extract

---

91 The Altus opening phrase is not shown in full in Example 3.2.
Example 3.2. Jacobus Gallus (Handl): *Ascendit Deus* extract

The provision of a printed *crescendo* instruction in this opening phrase would run the risk of promoting an overstatement of the increase in dynamic. What is required from each part is a warming and cooling of the sound rather than a forced crescendo and diminuendo. Using the less specific graphic of hairpin crescendo and *diminuendo* marks runs the risk of creating excessive *messa di voce*, which would likewise spoil the effect.

Though Praetorius did advocate the use of dynamic variation in performance, he also indicated that not everyone shared his opinion, as we are told once again in the *Readings in the History of Music in Performance*: ‘Some people do not wish to allow a mixture of motet and madrigal styles in a single composition’ (MacClintock 1979, p.150). Yet it is clear that dynamic variation must have existed even without specific instruction. It is the extent of the dynamic variation that is at risk by overt instruction in this regard.
The solution provided by the Phrased Notation System is threefold:

1. Provision of phrase marks to indicate the contour of the phrase.
2. Provision of a literal translation so that the exact meaning of the text is clearly understood.
3. The use of bold typeface for stressed syllables.

The combined impact of these three measures promotes an accurate portrayal of the text while facilitating an automatic increase and decrease in overall dynamic intensity without the necessity for overt instruction.

3.7 Bar-lines

One of the most difficult issues with which modern choristers have to cope when singing Renaissance polyphony is that of bar-lines. Without exception, all interviewees commented on the bar-line as an inhibitor to good performance practice. In his interview, Paul Spicer refers to the ‘prison cell of the bar-line’.92 Simon Carrington commented that the greatest challenge in singing Renaissance polyphony was persuading the singers (and conductors) to forget the bar-lines.93 Jeremy Summerly’s interview response to the topic of bar-lines was: ‘As soon as people start thinking in 4/4 the game’s up, over!’94 The problem regarding bar-lines and their attendant accents is not a new discovery but has been known since the 1930s, as mentioned earlier in relation to Heinrich Besseler’s system, mensurstrich. Unfortunately, searches have failed to uncover any writings by Bessler on this topic, though other papers published by him on other topics are extant. Caldwell discusses mensurstrich and comments that ‘the advantage of mensurstrich is that the rhythmic independence of the individual voice parts is preserved – but – the metrical structure of the music leaps less clearly to the eye and singers tend to get lost when counting longer values’ (Caldwell 1995, p.49).

92 Spicer interview, 02/03/2015.
93 Carrington interview, 11/04/2015.
94 Summerly interview, 16/07/2015.
This propensity to lose one’s place, in addition to other problems to which I have referred previously, means that many people find mensurstrich less than successful and so experimentation has continued.

However subtle the indication of a bar-line, any indication of its presence is an inhibitor to a fluid performance. Blachly maintains that a choir ‘can be taught in a relatively short time that the words are the proper guides to stress patterns’ (Blachly 1994, p.19). Were this universally the case, then the conductors interviewed as part of this research would have had little reason to assert that the single greatest inhibitor to good performance practice of Renaissance polyphony is bar-lines. Neither would there have been so much experimentation in the use of mensurstrich, dotted bar-lines and quarter bar-lines as shown in the analysis of editions through the twentieth century in Chapter two. The unanimity of the interviewees on the topic of bar-lines makes a very clear statement.

In what appears to be a separation of performance and musicology, Christopher Reynolds in his chapter, ‘Sacred Polyphony’ in Performance Practice, Music before 1600’ makes light of the bar-line ‘issue’. He refers to discussions around the topic as ‘pedantic quibbles’ (Reynolds 1989, p.185). Having thus dismissed the practical experience of experts, he continues in the next sentence to state that ‘the options for editors today are too rigidly split between scholarly and practical considerations’.

My own experience of working with non-specialist ensembles is very much in line with the opinion of the interviewees, rather than those of Blachly or Reynolds. Modern amateur choristers do not have access to the extensive training of Renaissance choristers and thus some assistance in performance is required. To this end, the Phrased Notation System abolishes bar-lines for all parts except the keyboard rehearsal part, unless bar-lines are present in the original manuscript. The retention of bar-lines in the keyboard part assists rehearsal orientation but is designed to have little or no impact on the actual performance of the individual choral lines. Another aid to rehearsal orientation are the rehearsal numbers on the Soprano part. These rehearsal numbers correspond to the bar numbers in the keyboard reduction part.
3.8 Tempo

The performance tempo of many forms of choral music varies depending on, among other things, the ability of the choir, the context in which the performance takes place and, the performance space. Renaissance polyphony is no different. It is therefore not appropriate to be prescriptive regarding the performance tempo of any given piece. Suggestions or recommendations of approximate metronome marks are about as far as an editor can go. Support for this approach comes from Alexander Blachly. His comments are worth restating in full:

What evidence is there against a ‘subjective’ interpretation of tempo that responds to the words and the music, in favour of an interpretation in which the beat remains unvaried from the first note to last? It must suffice here to note that the explicit injunctions for the tactus to remain constant throughout a piece are found only in some primers by German schoolmasters of the early sixteenth century and in treatises by their followers. All of the more sophisticated commentaries on musical practice, such as Gaffurius’s Practica musiceae, Glarean’s Dodecachordon or Zarlino’s Isttitione harmoniche, carefully avoid rigid generalisations about tempo (Blachly 1994, p.23).

3.9 Metre Signature

Modern music notation uses time signatures to inform the performer how many beats are in a bar and also what type of note gets one beat. In music without bars or bar-lines, such a signature becomes meaningless. What is necessary is that we are informed as to what metre, duple or triple, should be used. Dealing with this point, Caldwell is very firm. The choice of signature should ‘follow sensible modern convention, taking care to express the pulse of the music properly (e.g. not confusing 3/2 with 6/4)’ (Caldwell 1995, pp. 49-50). While Caldwell makes a valid point regarding such a selection, modern notation systems do not facilitate a tactus of dotted minim or dotted crotchet duration, expressing all such situations in terms of smaller duration (e.g. two dotted minims in a bar is shown as 6/4 and two dotted crotchets in a bar are shown as 6/8). Thus, any duple metre with divisions of three are compromised by modern time signature conventions.

Caldwell is especially explicit in dictating that such things as ‘2’ should be avoided. This is unfortunate, in that theorists much closer to Renaissance times have expressed the view that such a symbol would be more than appropriate. Marin Mersenne, writing
in his *Harmonie universelle* in 1636, and quoted in *Readings in the History of Music in Performance*, writes:

It seems to me that it would suffice to put the number ‘2’ at the beginning of the staffs, or in any other place that one would wish, before the notes that are to be sung in binary measure, just as one is content with the number ‘3’ to mark the ternary, in order to avoid the multitude of signs and to facilitate the practice of music (MacClintock 1979, p.153).

Given the absence of bar-lines within the phrased notation system, I am happy to use metre signatures such as ‘2’ or ‘3’ and am reassured in this stance by theoreticians much closer to the original composers and Renaissance conventions than modern writers on Renaissance editions.

### 3.10 Ligatures/Coloration

Ligatures exist in Renaissance sources to indicate that a syllable should be held through a series of notes, in much the same way as a slur or a word extension would indicate in modern notation. Similarly, coloration in the original source indicates an alteration from an expected rhythm. On the topic of ligatures, John Caldwell is explicit. He advocates for their retention. He argues that ‘the omission of ligatures deprives performers of important negative evidence as to the word-underlay and articulation, and is to be deprecated’ (Caldwell 1995, pp. 60-61). However, if the instruction contained in the ligature is properly realised within the modern text underlay then presenting a ligature on the sheet music is notational tautology. A similar argument can be made for indications of coloration. If the coloration has been properly realised in an appropriate rhythm by the editor, then we should have no need for additional information. It may well be that such additional information will call a non-specialist chorister to question more than is appropriate. Rigid adherence to the printed matter of the original manuscript is to become bound by the messenger of the script rather than the actual message of the music. The presence of a ligature in source material being to prevent a changing of syllable between two or more notes must be seen as a necessary addition at a time when text underlay was rather uncertain and where choristers were at liberty to allocate syllables as they thought fit. This is not
the case in modern editions and thus the inclusion of a ligature could be considered anachronistic in a modern publication.

3.11 Duple/Triple relationships

A confusing issue for non-specialist choral directors and their singers when singing late Renaissance polyphony is the shift from duple time to triple time (or vice versa). Different editors take different approaches to dealing with this issue. One of the most common methods is to indicate that the dotted minim of triple time is equal to the duration of the preceding minim or vice versa. Sometimes, however, adopting this relationship results in an unsatisfactory tempo for one or other of the two sections. The extent to which Renaissance theorists wrote critically about composers who did not adhere to the norms of the day is indicative of the fact that such norms were not universal and that the norms of notation were being altered in line with the innovative writing of composers. Even today’s expert practitioners do not see eye to eye on this topic. In reviewing a recording of the Western Wynde Mass in The Early Music Journal in 1993, David Mateer comments that Harry Christophers establishes an equivalence between duple and triple metre sections, ‘a solution which despite its lack of theoretical justification works well in practice’ (Mateer 1993, p.138). Thus, Christophers is interested in what works in practice rather than what works in theory. In contrast, Jeremy Summerly commented in interview that he wants a precise and measurable relationship between the two sections.95 A lack of consensus in modern times is not surprising, given the obvious lack of consensus in the late fifteenth century. In her article, ‘On Diminution and proportion in Fifteenth-Century Music Theory’, Ruth DeFord comments that the writings of Tinctoris (Proportionale musices, 1472-75 and Liber de arte contrapuncti, 1477) ‘was not so much to describe the notational practices as to reform them’ (DeFord 2005, p.1). In that same article, DeFord references the writing of Anna Maria Busse Berger, who wrote that ‘on the issue of relationships among mensurations, Tinctoris and Gaffurio “certainly do not represent the mainstream, and often give the impression of

95 Summerly interview, 16/07/2015.
wanting to reform an untidy system rather than describe contemporary theory and practice”’.

To provide the reader with a simple illustration of the nature of the complexities involved, DeFord writes the following:

Diminution affects note values, which may be defined in relation to any of three different standards: absolute time, relative time and numbers of counting units. A statement that notes lose half their “value” in diminution might therefore mean (a) the notes lose half their duration in relation to an absolute standard (analogous to a modern metronome mark); (b) the notes lose half their duration in relation to other notes of the same piece; (c) the notes are measured with half the number of counts; or (d) any combination of the above (DeFord 2005, p.2)

If these changes in tempo are the options available without any alteration from duple to triple metre, it is easy to see the complexity of the issue in practice when such alterations do occur. The situation became rather easier after circa 1520 when ternary passages within a binary signature were notated either as *sesquialtera* or *tripla* proportions (DeFord 1995). The fact that this is a difficult issue does not allow us to ignore it, however, and a workable solution must be found if guidance is to be given to non-specialist performers. As previously stated, a variety of solutions are possible though only one is likely to prove workable in performance.

As it is not the purpose of this research to investigate in detail the particular issue of changes in metre, I do not propose to labour the topic but refer the reader to DeFord’s article ‘Tempo Relationships between Duple and Triple Time in the Sixteenth Century’ (DeFord 1995). I will, however, summarise the issue insofar as it explains some tempo relationship decisions taken in this project.

---

96 An example of the extent to which theorists of the era could indulge in the development of proportions beyond practical application is given in Apel, W. (1953) *The Notation of Polyphonic Music 900-1600*, Cambridge, Massachusetts: The Mediaeval Academy of America Apel, 145; where we are told Gafarius explained the proportions calling for a diminution in the ratio of 9:23.

97 Diminution in this context refers to the alteration of metre signature in the original source so as to impact the tempo of the performance.

98 A relationship of 3:2 where three notes are performed in the duration of two notes of the same type. (see note 56)

99 A relationship of 3:1 where three notes are performed in the duration of one note of the same type. (see note 55)
In her 1995 paper, ‘Tempo Relationships between Duple and Triple Time in the Sixteenth Century’, Ruth DeFord states that proportions notated with signs of major *sesquialtera* could be performed either as written, with three semibreves equivalent to two of the preceding sign, or twice as fast, with three semibreves equivalent to one, and that latter option became increasingly common throughout the [sixteenth] century (DeFord 1995, p.26).

According to DeFord, ‘although this account satisfactorily explains many examples, it is almost certainly not complete’ (DeFord 1995, p.26). It is in the performance of the passages concerned that the appropriateness or otherwise of these two options is revealed. In the case of the masses of Viadana, neither one option nor the other proves to be fully successful in every case. It is therefore necessary to explore other options as suggested by DeFord. From a performer’s perspective, she is correct when she states that ‘ternary passages do not fall neatly into two categories, one suggesting a *sesquialtera* relationship and the other a triple relationship, but often seem to require a tempo somewhere between these extremes’ (DeFord 1995, p.39). She continues:

> There is one tempo relationship between the binary signs and their ternary proportions that preserves the identity of a time unit between them and solves some of the problems discussed above: the semibreve or minim of the proportion may be equated, respectively, with the minim or semiminim of the preceding mensuration, creating a duple proportion between the ternary sign and the binary one (DeFord 1995, pp.39-43)

![Diagram of musical notation](image)

This tempo refers directly to the *tactus*,\(^{100}\) *which* is also referred to by the various theorists when discussing the concept of tempo and tempo relationships. The *tactus* of major *sesquialtera* of \(\text{C}\) is then one and a half times as long as a semibreve (or three quarters as long as a breve) of \(\text{C}\) and the *tactus* of minor *sesquialtera* of \(\text{C}\) is three

\(^{100}\) Literally ‘touch’ but referring to the beat – the falling and rising motion of the hand to demonstrate the tempo.
quarters as long as a semibreve of \( \text{C} \). Translated into arbitrary metronome marks, the relationship is as follows:

\[
\begin{align*}
\text{C} & \quad = \quad 90 & \text{C} & \quad = \quad 60 \\
\text{} & \downarrow = \quad 180 & \text{} & \downarrow = \quad 240 \\
\text{C\textsuperscript{3/4}} & \quad = \quad 180 & \text{C\textsuperscript{3/2}} & \quad = \quad 240 \\
\text{\textsuperscript{1/3}C} & \quad = \quad 60 & \text{\textsuperscript{1/2}C} & \quad = \quad 80
\end{align*}
\]

(DeFord 1995, p.43)

While DeFord admits that the theoretical support for her position is weak, she does cite a composition by Ingegneri where her theory is the only one which satisfies the requirements imposed by the writing for double choir. In terms of performance, she counsels that

if a literal reading of any sign or an interpretation of major \( \text{sesquialtera} \) as triple proportion seems appropriate, it should probably be preferred to other alternatives that are less widely documented. If a strictly proportional tempo seems too slow or too fast, a slightly different one that is close enough to preserve a feeling of proportionality may work well. If none of these options produces a musically satisfactory result, the possibility of a duple or intermediate relationship may also be considered (DeFord 1995, p.49).

A final quote from DeFord is relevant here:

The search for reliable formulas to solve the problem of tempo relationships between different mensuration and proportion signs is nothing new. It occupied many of the best thinkers about music in the fifteenth and sixteenth centuries and has been a challenge to modern scholars for well over a century, but no consensus has ever been reached on the issues involved. Musical reality was too complex and diverse to be reducible to such formulas, and no amount of classifying or theorising about symbols can eliminate the need for musical judgement in interpreting them (DeFord 1995, p.51).

### 3.12 Conclusion

For the vast majority of non-specialist choristers, most of the academic scholarship referred to in this chapter is of little interest. Choristers working with me on this project have commented that they simply love Renaissance polyphony and enjoy
singing it. They are oblivious to the fact that editors argue over note value reduction or *musica ficta*. They have never heard of *sesquialtera*, and coloration or ligatures are not terms they will regularly come across in their musical lives. They merely want a notation system which helps them sing this repertoire. This is not to decry scholarship but rather to promote a translation of that scholarship into a different medium, one which can be understood intuitively; one which presents the singer with what they need to know, given their non-specialist status, and one which promotes a better understanding of the music and its performance.
Chapter Four: The Masses Transcribed

The creation of Phrased Notation System (PNS) for use with Renaissance polyphony is not merely a technical exercise. It is part of an arts practice research project whose research methods includes the performance of sixteenth-century music using the new notation system. In order to ensure that the performance avoids the influence of existing publications, which may have been familiar to choristers and which employ standard modern music notation styles, it was necessary to use material not currently commercially available in either print or audio recorded formats. I became aware of the music of Ludovico Grossi da Viadana as a teenager and was fascinated by the skilled manipulation of the various voices and the juxtaposition of different metres in what was, to my young mind, intellectual music – music that made me think rather than music which engaged me on an emotional level. This music made me wonder about how it had been put together. It made me question how best one might sing it. It offered many possibilities for interpretation. This in turn may have had a subconscious influence on selecting Viadana as the composer whose works would assist me in thinking about the sound the composer may have expected to hear. A very rare collection of the masses of Ludovico Grossi da Viadana is held by Marsh’s Library, Dublin. This collection includes four masses by Viadana, a mass for the dead by Clemens non Papa, and a mass by Gregorii Zuchini.

The collection was the subject of an M.Litt thesis in 2000 by Louise Dukes for University College Dublin. In her thesis, Dukes informs us that the book Missarum Quatuor Vocum. Cum Basso Continuo ad Organum, Liber Primus. Item Missa pro Defunctis Clementis non Papae was printed in Antwerp in 1625 (Dukes 2000, p.65). It was one of 25 books presented to the library by Christopher Ussher in 1727. At some point, all of the part-books associated with the publication were bound together and so the publication has survived intact and complete. The research carried out by Dukes indicates that the Marsh’s Library copy is the only known complete 1625 edition. She does confirm that a copy resides in the British Library but two of the part-books are missing. One other distinguishing feature of the collection, according to Dukes, is the fact that the Missa Audi Filia exists in no other collection and is therefore the only surviving copy. Dukes was unable to locate any eighteenth- or nineteenth-
century edition of the mass and there are no commercial recordings in existence. These facts made Missa Audi Filia the perfect source material for my research.

4.1 The Composers

Of the composers whose works are contained in the collection Missarum cum Quatuor Vocum. Cum Basso Continuo ad Organum, Liber Primus (1625), the best researched is Clemens non Papa. His biographical entry in Grove Music Online contains thirty-eight sources, whereas Viadana’s has eighteen and Zuchini’s a mere four. The inclusion of the masses by Clemens non Papa and Zuchini in this collection are somewhat of a mystery, as Dukes (2000) informs us that these masses were not included in earlier editions of the Missarum cum Quatuor Vocum. Cum Basso Continuo ad Organum, Liber Primus of 1596.

4.1.1 Jacobus Clemens non Papa

Clemens non Papa was born c.1510 and died in either 1555 or 1556. His place of birth is disputed with one source from 1575 referring to him as being from ‘Belgica terra’, whereas Sweertius, writing in 1626, lists ‘Batavus’ as his place of birth, which could refer to Batavia, part of the Dutch province of Zeeland. There are a number of theories regarding the soubriquet ‘non Papa’, which is first found in a 1542 reference. One theory was that it was added to his given name (Jacob Clement) as a joke in order to distinguish him from Pope Clemens VII, whilst a second theory is that it was added to prevent confusion with the poet Jacobus Papa. He was succentor (under-singer) at Bruges Cathedral from 1544 to 1545. There are few proven details of his appointments after this date, though ‘s-Hertogenbosh and Ypres are offered as places of work. He is buried at Dixmuiden, near Ypres. His writings include 15 masses and 233 motets, in addition to over 100 secular works.

4.1.2 Gregorio Zucchini (Zuchini)

Little is known for definite about Zuchini. Grove Music Online offers Brescia as a possible place of birth and 1540 or 1560 as two possible dates of birth. Even the date of his death is not certain, being listed as ‘after 1615’. He was a Benedictine monk at

---

101 Details of the lives of the composers discussed here are summarised from Grove Music Online. [accessed 04/07/2017]
the monastery of S Giorgio Maggiore in Venice. That monastery granted permission to him to spend time in the Roman monastery of S Paolo fuori le Mura, where he composed masses and motets. He seems to have been very interested in polychoral works, in that he composed a four-choir mass, a sixteen-voice motet *Laudate Dominum*, and a twenty-voice motet *Sanctificati sunt*. In these poly-choral works, he was probably influenced by Giovanni Gabrielli, who became organist in St Marks, Venice in 1585, 15 years before Zuchini left for Rome.

4.1.3 Ludovico Grossi da Viadana

Like so many composers of the era, Ludovico Grossi is known to us by a name taken from the place of his birth around 1560. He died aged sixty-seven in Gualtiere, near Parma. He was a member of the order of Minor Observants and maestro di cappella in Mantua cathedral from 1994 until 1597. He also spent time in a similar role at Cremona, Concordia, and Fano. His 1602 publication *Concerti Ecclesiastici* is the first publication of sacred music to include a basso continuo.

4.2 The Conversion Process

Simply referring to the transcription process as a conversion or translation from the 1625 script to PNS is to understate the extent of work required over and above a transcription into standard modern notation. In order to ensure that PNS transcriptions are consistent in their format and content, I developed a step by step guide to assist me with the process.102

4.2.1 Step 1 – Initial conversion

Having selected a piece to be transcribed into PNS, the first step is to convert the piece into a familiar format modern score complete with bar-lines, time signatures etc. Although the finished sheet music will not use these bar-lines or time signatures, they are very helpful in the initial stages in determining the position of the notation graphics on the score. They act like a plotting system, facilitating pin point accuracy as you move from score to manuscript and back again. Bar numbers are created for the

---

102 This step by step guide is included in Appendix I.
Cantus line and also for the keyboard reduction line. These numbers will remain even when the bar-lines have been removed but will subsequently be referred to as rehearsal numbers.

Many decisions which will impact on the look of the finished produce need to be made at this early stage. These decisions include note value reduction, text underlay, and musica ficta.

4.2.1.1 Note Value Reduction

Note Value Reduction is the term given to the reduction of time values from those shown in the source document. Modern notation systems use the crotchet as the standard time value. However, older music used minims or semibreves as the basic value. In Editing Early Music, John Caldwell writes:

The reduction of time values is still a major issue for music of this period (the Renaissance). Modern practices vary widely. The old collected editions of Obrecht and Josquin employed original note values with little if any impediment to legibility; but English music of the same period has normally been edited in quartered values, a practice extended by some editors to music written as late as c. 1555; and indeed some editors of Giovanni Gabrielli and Monteverdi quarter their values even in triple time (Caldwell 1995 p. 45).

Caldwell’s asserts that original notes are not necessarily an impediment to legibility but there are those who would argue that these larger note values could lead to rather ponderous performances. In our interview, John Rutter stated:

I don’t really like very prescriptive editions but I do like modern note values. Simply because you see an ‘eggy’ note, a semibreve, and for any of us that means long note. Christopher Robinson was talking about this with me because he was recently editing for Kairos who are saying no, they do want to go back to original note values. Well, he’s going along with it but he says he remembers as a young boy they sang off these editions in very long note values. Once it became more customary to put crotchets as the more basic unit of beat he said it didn’t half cheer up the sixteenth century music. It developed more momentum. You can go too far the other way. But in a way I would say make the notation modern.

Note value reduction is sometimes termed diminution. As ‘diminution’ is also used in reference to changes in metre indicated in the source and also to ornamentation (the creation of smaller notes) I have used the term note value reduction in order to avoid confusion.

Rutter interview, 13/10/2015.
In transcribing the masses contained in the Viadana collection, the note values are generally halved, though triple metre sections are sometimes quartered. However, the relationship between these various metres is made clear through the use of metronome marks.

Not all of the masses in the collection have note values altered in the PNS edition. The mass by Gregorii Zuchini has note values retained as in the source. This was as a direct result of the copious use of quavers in the source document, as seen in Example 4.1. There seemed to be little value in substituting semiquavers for quavers. The approach taken in the Zuchini mass would be approved of by Caldwell, as he asserts ‘there is little merit in substituting modern hemidemisemiquavers for Renaissance demisemiquavers’ (Caldwell 1995, p. 45).

Example 4.1. Zuchini: Missa extract

4.2.1.2 Text

A variety of issues arise when we consider the subject of text and text underlay. Issues such as capitalisation, punctuation, or spelling are, by and large, straightforward. All that is required is to take a decision on the preferred style and then ensure that this approach is applied consistently. However, there are other issues that are not so straightforward. In some cases, text may be omitted altogether. In other cases, a text repeat may be indicated using a symbol as in the Zuchini example above (marked with

---

105 In early drafts of the transcription of this mass, the note values in the source were halved. This note value reduction made the music more difficult to read and so was abandoned.
a yellow arrow). It is also possible to have text inserted with few indications, if any, regarding how the syllables should be allocated to the text.

Example 4.2 shows an extract where the words *aeternam*, *Domine* and *luceat* have multiple syllables but nothing present on the manuscript to guide the singers as to how these syllables should be allocated to the large number of notes available. The options seem almost limitless and thus it is up to the editor to make a firm decision.

![Example 4.2. Clemens non Papa: Missa defunctorum extract](image)

Apel tells us that an original manuscript frequently leaves considerable room for doubt and speculation as to the ‘correct’ placing of the words. In cases in which the placement of the syllables is unambiguous, the result is frequently contradictory to the modern principles of ‘good’ accentuation. In general, it can be said that modern editors and interpreters are frequently misled and biased in this matter by ideas which
actually did not prevail until the middle of the sixteenth century (Apel 1953, p.118).

Writing on this topic Caldwell states: ‘It is not sufficient to supply the text exactly as it stands in the manuscript. A facsimile will do that better’ (Caldwell 1995, p.44). Such a comment is hardly appropriate in a situation where choristers require a modern edition, as they are incapable of reading from the original manuscript in the first place. Caldwell goes on to describe how variants might be supplied to the performer, drawing their attention through the use of foot notes or special signs in the score which guide them to the editorial notes. Once more, I am reminded of Simon Halsey’s comment that he does not want to have to make those decisions. He wants the editor to do that for him. The example shown in Example 4.2 from the Missa Defunctorum by Clemens non Papa is so full of possible variants that any attempt to discuss all the options would require a publication separate from the music score itself.

In the final analysis, decisions regarding text underlay must be taken by the editor. In terms of the phrased notation system, these decisions are taken, having sung each individual line and testing out the most likely options before taking a firm decision. This decision is taken in the full knowledge that a different editor will have a different opinion.

4.2.1.3 Musica Ficta

A search for the term Musica Ficta on Google generates approximately 123,000 results. This is indicative of the degree of discussion, disagreement, and writing on the topic. Musica ficta can be defined as accidentals omitted from original printed sources but which may have been observed in performance. Grove Music Online notes:

Most scholars accept that notated polyphony of this period required performers to interpret under-prescriptive notation in accordance with their training (by contrapuntal and melodic criteria about which scholars disagree), ensuring the perfection of consonances, and approaching cadences correctly.

Such is the complexity of the issue of ficta that even Apel concedes in his book, The Notation of Polyphonic Music 900-1600, that a thorough discussion of musica ficta ‘would far exceed the limitations of this book’ (Apel 1953, p.16).
In the case of the music in the Viadana collection, most occurrences of *musica ficta* relate to the avoidance of tri-tones and cross relations or sharpening melodic leading tones.

4.2.1.4 Other considerations

To the three considerations mentioned above must be added the difficulty of determining what are errors in the original manuscript. Sometimes it can be difficult to determine whether a mark is a stray dot of ink or a rest. All of this detective work forms part of that simple initial phrase – Convert the original document into standard modern notation.

Modern choristers are accustomed to working from a full score rather than part-books. Therefore, the notes and text of each part-book must be transcribed onto a prepared full score template which has the desired number of vocal lines. Using the Finale music notation programme, isolating mistakes and errors of transcription becomes much easier, as playing back the various lines, either together or in various combinations, quickly establishes where questions need to be asked regarding the pitch of the notes, their duration, or the duration of rests. This playback process is where performance experience plays a key role. An ear attuned to the norms of Renaissance polyphony will very quickly select passages which need further investigation. Such investigation will include *musica ficta* issues, which are highlighted either through unusual intervals (most of which should have been resolved in the initial input stage) or harmonic clashes within lines.

4.2.2 Step 2 – Keyboard part for rehearsal

Having input all notes and ensured the accuracy of same, the next step is to create a keyboard reduction part. This is a relatively straightforward exercise using the ‘Mass Mover’ tool within the Finale software programme. The Viadana collection includes the part-book ‘Basso Continuo’.

In order that this part can be easily determined from within the keyboard reduction part, this line is retained at 100% size while all other lines in the keyboard part are reduced to 80%. This reduction in size approach

---

106 The ‘Basso Continuo’ in this case is in reality a Basso Seguente, which merely tracks the lowest vocal line at any given point.
supports the fact that the keyboard part is for rehearsal purposes only. Example 4.3 shows the opening of the Missa Audi Filia, with the Basso Continuo shown in the larger size.

Example 4.3. Viadana: Missa Audi Filia – Kyrie extract

Though all vocal parts are, by now, transcribed onto the keyboard part, the look of that part is not necessarily finished, as vocal lines crossing, voice parts working in thirds or sixths do not necessarily convert to a familiar looking keyboard format. The keyboard part, therefore, needs examination to ensure that it is presented in a manner and style familiar to keyboard players.

107 For more detail on Viadana’s approach to the use of Basso continuo see page p.116.
108 It will be noted that within rehearsal mark two, the Altus part includes four quavers while the Basso Continuo shows a single minim. This was one of the few times in the source publication when the continuo part differed from the lowest vocal line. In the circumstances, it was decided to provide clarity regarding the Basso Continuo part-book.
4.2.3 Step 3 – Address text issues

Having completed steps 1 and 2, all text should be in place, with issues such as text omitted from the manuscript, text not assigned to particular notes, or indications to repeat text (where such instruction is not specific as to the text underlay) all resolved. It is now that the text is brought into standard modern format. Capitalisation, spelling, and punctuation are all added in accordance with the format used in the Liber Usualis. In addition, the entire text is examined and syllables which are stressed when spoken are inserted in bold print. Original Latin texts are set at 14 point.\textsuperscript{109}

A literal translation sourced from Jeffers (1988) is inserted in the score in a location normally utilised for the lyrics of verse 2. This translation text is set at 10 point so as to be as unobtrusive as possible but at the same time to be sufficiently legible as to be of assistance in determining the meaning of the phrase or sentence being sung.

The modern score is now compared with the various part-books in turn to ensure that all editorial text completion is indicated in \textit{italics} as in the alto part in Example 4.4 overleaf.

\textsuperscript{109} Initially the standard 12 point was used. However, during early rehearsals with choristers it was indicated that with smaller font size it was not always easy to determine the shorter syllables which were in bold print. This increase in the point size addressed the issue to the satisfaction of the singers.
Example 4.4. Viadana: *Missa Audi Filia – Kyrie* extract

4.2.4 Step 4 – Creation of phrase marks

The step by step guide suggests that at this point one should ‘insert phrase marks in accordance with good singing, breathing, phrasing practice’. This step involves examining each vocal part in turn and singing it to determine the most appropriate points for inserting the phrase mark. Singing the part rather than merely executing a visual examination will determine how feasible it is to expect non-professional singers to sing the phrases. In some cases, the phrases will be very long indeed. A decision must then be taken regarding the preference of maintaining the long phrase (with the singers required to stagger their breaths) or if it is possible and justifiable to break the long single phrase into two or more shorter phrases. It is the experience of singing this genre of music that informs these decisions.

It will be noted that the Tenor line is allocated three syllables in the word *Ky-ri-e* while all other lines are allocated two syllables *Ky-rie*. This is precisely as indicated in the source publication. Similar discrepancies occur in the score with the word *eleison* being shown variously as being of three or four syllables.
In all cases, phrase marks are placed over the stave so as to avoid clashes with printed lyrics. There is a case to be made that not every piece of Renaissance choral music benefits from a legato approach implied by the inclusion of phrase marks. A madrigal such as *Though Philomela lost her* love by Thomas Morley is one such example. In cases where a legato performance is not preferred or appropriate, the phrase marks can be inserted as dotted phrase marks rather than using a solid line.\textsuperscript{111}

4.2.5 Step 5 – Remove bar-lines and time signatures

The next step is to remove the bar-lines from the choral parts. The Finale software programme facilitates this action, as it is possible to remove bar-lines from individual parts while retaining the lines in the keyboard part. Once again, the original manuscript is checked to ensure that any bar-lines in the original manuscript are retained. It should be noted that although the bar-lines have been removed, they are in reality merely invisible and the software programme still behaves as if the lines were still in situ.

Removing the time signature is a similarly easy process. Within the software programme, space is allowed on the printed page for a time signature. With the time signature removed, the software automatically redistributes any additional space now available. This would not be a problem but for the fact that the time signature must be replaced with a ‘2’ or ‘3’, indicating a duple or triple metre. Despite much effort, I have not yet succeeded in creating a ‘metre signature’ mark within the software package which can be used in the place of the standard time signature while maintaining the positional properties of same. It appears some software development may be required to address this issue. Discussions have been had with the programme developers in this regard but, to date, no viable option has been identified.

In the absence of a solution within Finale’s Time Signature tool, the method for inserting these digits uses the Expression Tool facility. This tool allows the user to create signs or symbols which can be attached to any note. In order to place the metre signature in the space ordinarily occupied by the time signature, it is necessary to manually space the beats in each ‘bar’. The software, knowing that the time signature

---

\textsuperscript{111} This option is included on foot of an observation made by choristers of the University of Louisiana who facilitated an independent trial of PNS.
is not in place, regularly adjusts the spacing automatically causing the metre signature to be super-imposed on the clef. This is an ongoing problem and again will require a modification of the software. Metre signatures are included at a fixed size (24 point).

4.2.6 Step 6 – Create individual part-books

Before beginning the process which will dictate the final look of the score, it is necessary once again to check that all elements on the full score agree with the source material. The easiest way to do this is to extract the individual parts and compare them with the original part-books.

Printing out these extracted parts is tantamount to creating modern part-books which facilitates easy comparison with the original while allowing for immediate correction in the full score of any problems noted. Typical issues identified during this process are the requirement of additional courtesy accidentals in order to avoid potential confusion, as shown in Example 4.5:

Example 4.5. Viadana: Missa Audi Filia – Kyrie extract Cantus part

It is at this point that issues regarding a possible transposition are clarified and decisions taken in that regard. Transposition on the Finale programme is a very simple process and adjusts all parts at once. Having visually compared the extracted part-

112 An interesting post-doctoral line of enquiry might be a comparison of singers’ experience using these PNS part books and their experience using the PNS full score.
book with the original manuscript, the extracted part is used to sing each individual line in turn. Singing is done while the computer plays the other choral parts. In so doing, a further check is carried out on all aspects of the vocal line being examined.

It is also during this process that decisions are taken regarding tempo recommendations. These tempi recommendations are entered on to the full score with the modifying *circa* mark.

### 4.2.7 Step 7 – Working towards a final document

As all individual choral lines will have been adjusted as part of step 5 or 6, any further processes should relate to general layout on the full score only. The distance between the various lines are adjusted on a page by page basis. This is done to ensure that no page appears cluttered and that each line is clear and legible. Each page is adjusted individually as the requirements change as vocal lines go to the extremes of their range. A very low alto line can encroach on a high tenor part, for instance, requiring additional space to be created between the two staves.

All pages are now reduced to 85% so as to give the finished product a clean, professional look. With the various adjustments and resizing that have gone on, it is necessary to check, yet again, for placement of phrase marks, word extensions etc. This is especially the case in the literal translation where the presence of word extensions can create a rather cluttered look. Another impact of the literal translation is that the music spacing can be rather stretched in order to accommodate a situation where the translation takes more space than the original Latin text. This automatic spacing is a feature of the software and without specific software modifications all such cases need a manual adjustment.

The final task is to create a title page and editorial notes which are inserted before the start of the first movement of the mass. Once this has been completed, a PDF of the finished document can be created for printing.

### 4.2.8 Editorial notes

Editorial notes are presented in order to inform performers of what has and what has not been altered from the source. These notes also indicate the various elements of the Phrased Notation System and their specific purpose. Below is a copy of these
editorial notes to which I have added a fuller commentary with illustrative musical examples where appropriate.\textsuperscript{113}

All of the examples shown below come from the Missa Audi Filia by Viadana.\textsuperscript{114}

**Accidentals** – Accidentals which appear in the original publication are retained. These accidentals are placed before the notes to which they refer, in accordance with modern convention. Courtesy accidentals are provided as appropriate and are shown in brackets over the note to which they refer. These accidentals may be necessary due to the cancellation of a preceding raised pitch, on foot of Musica Ficta or merely for clarification.

In the example shown below in Example 4.6, the second line of the manuscript contains two incidences of a C\# accidental. The third note following the second C\# is yet another C but there is no indication as to whether this C is to be sharpened or not. Having considered the issue, the editorial decision is that this C should not be sharpened. A courtesy accidental has therefore been placed over the note concerned, while the \# signs shown in the original material are included in the modern score in a conventional manner, as shown in Example 4.7 overleaf.

\textbf{Example 4.6. Viadana: Missa Audi Filia – Kyrie extract Cantus part}

\textsuperscript{113} These editorial notes use many of the headings used when examining the various existing editorial styles. The headings were also used when deciding the elements for inclusion in PNS.

\textsuperscript{114} The text of the Editorial Notes as they appear in the finished copy are presented here in italics; additional information is presented in standard script.
Another example of an accidental (Bb) can be seen in the bass part in 4.7. In this case, the subsequent B is retained as a Bb, though this is not specifically indicated in the original score. Failure to maintain this accidental would result in a semitone clash with the Alto line which also has a Bb at the same time.

Example 4.7. Viadana: Missa Audi Filia – Kyrie extract

Accompaniment – Though a keyboard reduction is provided, it is not suggested that the music should always be accompanied (see Basso Continuo).

Bar-lines – In general, the original score does not use bar-lines. Where bar-lines do appear in the original, they are present within the choral parts in this edition.

As can be seen from Example 4.1 (see p.137), a double bar-line is provided at the end of this Kyrie eleison section. In the original part-book for Basso Continuo, there are far more bar-lines included, as shown in Example 4.8.\(^{115}\)

\(^{115}\) The bar-lines in the Basso Continuo part may well be a vestige of the rules of perfection and imperfection, a system which was well in decline by the time of Viadana. However, it is not within the scope of this dissertation to examine the topic in detail. For more information on perfection and imperfection see Kelly, T.F. (2015) Capturing Music, The Story of Notation, New York: W.W. Norton & Company, Inc.
Example 4.8. Viadana: *Missa Audi Filia* – *Kyrie* extract Basso Continuo part

Regular modern bar-lines are provided within the PNS keyboard reduction score and are presented as an aid to rehearsal. These bar-lines do not imply additional accents as in modern convention. The bar numbers placed over the keyboard score correspond to the rehearsal numbers placed over the soprano line.

**Basso Continuo** - A basso continuo [sic] is contained in the original publication. The part is, in reality, a basso seguente in that it merely tracks the lowest vocal part at any given time. We are informed in Viadana’s writings that he included a ‘basso continuo’ to facilitate performance of his works when there were too few choristers or where a voice part was missing. It can be assumed that the basso continuo presented here should function in the same way.

Example 4.8 above shows the start of the basso continuo part book. When this is compared with the full score for the same section (Example 4.9 overleaf), it can be seen that the alto line commences as the lowest line. The only difference between the alto line and the continuo part is that the four beamed quavers in the alto part at rehearsal mark 2 are represented as a minim in the basso continuo part. This is followed at rehearsal mark 3 by the tenor part and finally the bass part enters at rehearsal mark 5.
Example 4.9. Viadana: *Missa Audi Filia – Kyrie* extract

**Dynamics** – The music is presented without overt dynamic marks as no such marks exist in the original publication. However, dynamic variation should be inferred from:

1. The inclusion or exclusion of vocal lines
2. The meaning of the text
3. The nature of the musical writing

Providing detailed dynamic instruction for each individual vocal line would result in a cluttered, not to mention confusing, looking score. It is thought, therefore, that by providing information on the factors that influence dynamics singers will take direct responsibility for dynamic variation.

The topic of dynamics within the performance of Renaissance polyphony is dealt with in Chapter three.

**Grouping of Notes** – In an effort to ensure clear alignment and easy analysis of the profile of each line vis-a-vis the other choral lines, notes are grouped according to beats rather than the modern convention of syllabic separation.
In Example 4.9 above, the alto line shows four beamed quavers within rehearsal mark 2. In the original part-book, these quavers are shown as separate (Example 4.10).

Example 4.10. Viadana: Missa Audi Filia – Kyrie extract Altus part

By grouping these quavers according to the modern rules pertaining to the grouping of notes, the relationship between these quavers and the notes of the other choral lines is more easily established.

**Metronome Marks** – Metronome marks (M.M) are provided at the start of each movement or when the metre changes. These M.M. values should be seen as indicators of an appropriate tempo and not necessarily strictly followed. Where a change of metre is involved, the new M.M. establishes a relationship between the two metres. This relationship should be maintained even where the M.M. is not observed due to performance demands or personal interpretation.

All metronome marks are shown with a *circa* qualification, as many factors may impact on the tempo of a piece. These factors include the size of the performing ensemble and the acoustics in which the music is to be performed. In his interview, Jeremy Summerly contrasted performing in St Paul’s Cathedral, London, where there is a seven-second reverberation, with St. Aloysius Church nearby, where there is no reverberation whatever. He commented that ‘only an idiot’ would perform at the same
tempo in the two locations – but he maintains that some people do.\textsuperscript{116} The M.M. marks are included as a suggested medium, determined by the nature of the writing and the content of the text.

**Note Values** – Note values have been halved from those in the original publication. Occasionally, for the sake of clear vertical alignment note values have been further divided and a tie inserted to ensure that a note of the correct duration is sung.

More has been written elsewhere in this dissertation on the topic of note value reduction, so I will not rehearse the arguments here.\textsuperscript{117} It is, however, appropriate to show examples of how note values have been modified. Some musical examples are reproduced a second time here for the sake of side-by-side comparison.

From the following examples, it will be seen that (allowing for a note value reduction by half in the modern edition) the first note in the Altus part is represented by a dotted minim. Though the Cantus part could have been represented by a modern minim, this note has been divided into two crotchets joined by a tie. In this way, the relationship between the Cantus and Altus parts is more clearly seen than would have been the case had the Cantus part shown a minim.\textsuperscript{118}

![Example 4.6 (2) Viadana: Missa Audi Filia – Kyrie extract Cantus part](image)

\textsuperscript{116} Summerly interview, 16/07/2015.
\textsuperscript{117} See page 75.
\textsuperscript{118} Examples 4.6, 4.9 and 4.10 are reproduced here side by side for ease of comparison.
Example 4.10 (2) Viadana: Missa Audi Filia – Kyrie extract Altus part

Example 4.9 (2) Viadana: Missa Audi Filia – Kyrie extract

Phrase Marks – Phrase marks are included as an essential part of the PNS system. The phrase mark indicates the musical phrases as appropriate for each individual voice part. The phrase marks are also indicative of appropriate breath points.

There are no indications within the original part-books as to when breaths should be taken. However, the part-books are generally good regarding the inclusion of text punctuation. Given the requirement to sing in an intelligent manner, it stands to reason that (where possible) breaths should coincide with punctuation. Thus, it is that the
phrase marks frequently mirror the punctuation. Allowance is made for repetition or imitation, where appropriate.

One of the elements most referred to by performers using PNS is the extent to which they are made increasingly aware of the independence of the various voice parts due to the non-alignment of phrase marks. The first page of the Sanctus (Example 4.11) is an excellent example in this regard. On that page, there is only one instance where two parts finish a phrase and commence the next phrase at the same time. In all other cases, the voice parts are phrased totally independently.
Example 4.11. Viadana: *Missa Audi Filia* – *Sanctus* extract

**Pitch** – Whereas the pitch for most of the masses in this collection is found to be within the range considered acceptable by modern choirs, the tessitura of the Tenor line in Missa Audi Filia is rather high. The pitch in the associated PNS edition has therefore been lowered from the original publication by a tone.
For the purposes of easy comparison, the extracts form the Missa Audi Filia used in this chapter are presented in the original key.

**Rehearsal Numbers** – Rehearsal marks are provided on the Cantus/Soprano stave throughout. These rehearsal marks coincide with the bar numbers as shown on the keyboard reduction score.

**Text Presentation** – The text is presented with modern capitalisation, spelling, and punctuation as laid out in the Liber Usualis. Where the text underlay has not been completed or a simple indication of a repeat of text is shown in the original publication, it is presented in italics in this edition.

![Example 4.6 (3) Viadana: Missa Audi Filia – Kyrie extract Cantus part](image)

The extract shown in Example 4.6\(^{119}\) provides examples of some of the issues that require to be dealt with. The first word, Kyrie, can be pronounced in a number of different ways. It could be as three separate syllables (Ky-ri-e), as two syllables where the final ‘e’ is elided and blended with the initial letter of eleison. A third option is to move swiftly through the second syllable and onto the third syllable so that the ‘i’ is barely discernible. Singing through these options, it becomes clear that the broader vowel ‘e’ is a more suitable one for singing the extended melisma. The question

\(^{119}\) Example 4.6 is reproduced here for ease of reference.
therefore is whether we enunciate the middle syllable or not. In this case, the first note is repeated and therefore provides an ideal opportunity to sing the middle syllable, thus making the full word more easily discernible as was required following the Council of Trent. An extract from the Council of Trent writings which explains this requirement is provided by Gustave Reese in *Music in the Renaissance*:

> The whole plan of singing in the musical modes should be constituted not to give empty pleasure to the ear, but in such a way that the words may be clearly understood by all, and thus the hearts of the listeners be drawn to the desire of heavenly harmonies, in the contemplation of the joy of the blessed (Reese 1954, p.449)


My solution here is to sing all three syllables (Example 4.12), separating out the middle syllable in the text, something which is not specified in the original manuscript.

Line two of Example 4.6 (3) shows a second issue. It will be seen that this line commences with a symbol ://: which instructs the singer to repeat the text. What is
not specified is exactly how much of the previous text should be repeated. Should one repeat both *kyrie* and *eleison* or merely *eleison*.

Example 4.7 (2) Viadana: *Missa Audi Filia – Kyrie* extract

The solution provided restates both words even though repeating merely the second word would provide a satisfactory result (Example 4.7 [2]). The reason for this decision was to facilitate imitation between the *Cantus* and *Altus* part at rehearsal mark 7. This decision is reinforced by a similar imitation between *Altus* and *Cantus* at rehearsal mark 9.

At first glance, it might be expected that a similar approach should have been taken when the tenor line has a repeated word indicated in line two of Example 4.13. However, the presence of a ligature at this point in the original part-book makes it difficult to achieve a comfortable fit of syllables while observing the ligature instruction not to change syllable between the two notes comprising the ligature. The resultant repeat of the word *eleison* matches the soprano and alto vowels at that time, as can be seen in Example 4.14.
Example 4.13. Viadana: Missa Audi Filia – Kyrie extract Tenor part


As in so many editorial decisions, other editors may take different decisions when presented with the same issues. What is important is not that all editors provide similar solutions but rather that any solutions they do provide can be justified by the original manuscript or by the context in which the text is to be sung.

Text Pronunciation – As an aid to pronunciation, stressed syllables are presented in **bold** type face. Observation of these stressed syllables is essential in promoting the micro metres contained within the music.
The topic of the pronunciation of Latin is a discussion which is nearly as hotly debated as that of *musica ficta*. As such, any editor wanting to determine a pronunciation must take a decision regarding his/her preferred pronunciation of the language and thereafter adhere to that pronunciation. In their pamphlet, *Choral Latin*, Compton, Graves and Hall list six options for the pronunciation of Latin – (a) the old Erasmian pronunciation, (b) the new Ciceronian pronunciation, (c) the modern Italianate pronunciation, (d) compromises between (a) and (c), (e) German pronunciation, and (f) French pronunciation (Compton *et al.* 1983, p.2). By and large the Roman Catholic Church has adopted the modern Italianate pronunciation and therefore the stressed syllables advocated in the text through the use of bold print stem from this pronunciation. It should be said, however, that in terms of the use of consonants, Italianate consonants tend not to be as sharp and crisp as those used in English. Given that their pamphlet was aimed at an English audience, Compton, Graves and Hall conclude that:

> the most satisfactory pronunciation, therefore, for general use is the compromise based on continental vowels (which are, in fact, common to Ciceronian and Italianate Latin) and English consonants. This pronunciation avoids affectation, has been proved in practice and is at once intelligible and euphonious (Compton *et al.* 1983, p3).

My own experience of learning Latin pronunciation as a secondary school student rarely conflicts with the Latin pronunciations heard in liturgical settings or in the very many recordings in that language. The main exceptions here are recordings by either French or German choirs. However, as has already been noted, the pronunciation of Latin in both these countries differs significantly from Italianate or Ciceronian pronunciations.

**Time Signatures** – *Time signatures are not used in this edition, as such signs are inappropriate for use with un-barred music. A digit 2 or 3 is inserted as an indicator of duple or triple metre as appropriate.*

This approach is taken, not only in an effort to maintain consistency of presentation, but also to discourage interpretation of familiar looking signs as a modern ‘two in a bar’. Such a sign occurs at the start of the *Sanctus* (Example 4.15) and thus there is an argument for its inclusion in a modern edition. Apart from the fact that it is not
possible to have ‘two in a bar’ when there is no bar, such an approach would suggest accents and stresses in what would be rather inappropriate places, such as in the middle of a quaver running passage.

Example 4.15. Viadana: Missa Audi Filia – Sanctus extract cantus part

When a change of metre is required, as at the start of the Hosanna, as shown in Example 4.16 overleaf, there is little in the modern notation system to guide the conductor in either the metre or its relationship with the preceding metre. It could be argued that the presence of the 3/2 symbol could imply a triple time. However, this would be to misunderstand the symbol. It is the circle with the line through it that indicates the metre. The digits indicate the relationship to the previous metre. It is these changes in the meaning of signs and symbols which makes reading from facsimile publications so confusing and difficult for non-specialist choristers.
Example 4.16. Viadana: *Missa Audi Filia* – *Sanctus* extract cantus part

By providing non-specialists with new symbols and specific relationship instructions via metronome marks, the problems associated with changes of metre are all but eliminated.

**Translation** – A literal translation is provided under each word as an aid to understanding, not only the text, but also the relationship between the text and the music. Such an understanding plays a vital role in the subtle dynamic variation and musical phrasing within the composition.

A more detailed discussion on the topic of translation is contained in Chapter three.

**To the Conductor** – Conductors should note that, unlike standard modern music notation, the tactus or beat should in general indicate a minim within duple sections. In the triple-metre sections, the tactus should indicate the dotted minim. Correct relationships between duple and triple metres are an essential characteristic of Renaissance music and so careful attention should be paid to the metronome marks (see comments on metronome marks above). Though allowance is made for a slight variation in tempo due to acoustics or a variation in the size of the performing group, it is essential that the proportional relationships indicated by the M.M are maintained when the metre changes.

*It should also be noted that the style of conducting should not be a didactic, heavily pointed beat but rather a gentler, less articulated one. Such a tactus will promote*
fewer ‘first beat in the bar’ type accents and encourage a more fluid line, as is appropriate.

This approach to a conducting style is nicely reinforced by a memory of John Rutter, which he recounted in our interview:

I always remember in Cambridge Dr George Guest at St. John’s College with all kinds of music but certainly whenever we did anything from the Renaissance period he just conducted in a circle where you didn’t see any particular beat anywhere. What he was really saying was listen to each other folks, keep together, shape your individual lines. If you do a lot of shaping it may suit what the sopranos are doing but it may not be in the least what the tenors are doing.120

One final comment on the issue of tactus stems from Ruth DeFord’s writing on the topic in her book, Tactus, Mensuration and Rhythm in Renaissance Music. Here she has an entire chapter devoted to the definitions and description of tactus (DeFord 2015, pp.51-81). The author informs us that tactus is the Latin word for ‘touch’. DeFord includes an image by Jorg Breu the Elder on the small organ shutters for the Fugger Chapel in the Church of Santa Anna in Augsburg. Alongside the image, she has a quotation from Stephano Vanneo’s Recanetum de musica aurea of 1533:

this mensura is a beat or kind of light tap, which is usually made by musicians with the hand or foot or any other instrument held in the hand. And it may also be made silently, that is, without any overt or audible striking of any instrument … but observed in the mind (DeFord 2015, pp.61-62)

The image referred to appears to show a maestro equipped with a staff or rod with which he can tap the music lectern. More interestingly, in view of the Vanneo comments, it also shows the hands of adults placed on the shoulders of the younger choristers. DeFord suggests that these adults are literally providing the tactus or touch to the youngsters thus ensuring a common understanding of the pulse of the piece throughout the choir. The common pulse being ‘observed in each chorister’s mind’ is, of course, the ideal rather than the imposition of a metrical pulse by the conductor.

---

120 Rutter interview, 1/10/2015.
Chapter Five - The Chorister’s Response

The previous chapter finished by suggesting that the common understanding among choristers of the pulse of a piece without overt external expression is an ideal in performance. Another ideal is where choristers automatically shape a musical phrase in a manner sympathetic to the genre of the music and the meaning of the text without prompting through editorial marks. Scholarly editions provide evidence of the scholarly research that contribute to the edition. They contain details of the variants between sources and possibly contain details on the performance practice in vogue at the time of the composition. Performance editions, though they may be well informed by scholarly research, are not always explicit in detailing the research but focus more on performance elements.

As editor, I can design my edition in the hope that it will do certain things or to create certain responses from the singers using my edition. Whether a singer actually responds in this manner is a totally different matter. The response of the choristers to an edition is a major factor in determining the success or otherwise of the edition.

5.1 Initial Trials

The first exploration of what was to become the Phrased Notation System took place in Texas Tech University in 2007. At that time, I had no plans to proceed towards a PhD and the exercise was therefore one in which I satisfied my curiosity and little else past that. One of the singers on that day, Alexa Vogelzang, was a post-graduate colleague and singing Renaissance polyphony using the early form of PNS was, for her, a ‘light-bulb’ experience.

In an interview carried out with Vogelzang in 2015, she recalled several aspects of that first interaction with the new notation system.

What really got me interested in the whole idea was the experience in the little workshop that you did with the choral conducting students at the university when you were here [in Texas]. It was instantly different. You were so low key about it. When we were walking down the hall to the opera lab you said ‘Ah, it’s just a little something I’m going to do.’ It was just so casual and for me, that changed everything for the next several years in terms of my work. It was just remarkable to me. I had never heard anything like that before and it
got me very excited about the possibilities and I thought it would be so interesting to follow through in a bigger way and to see if other people had the same kind of response that I did. Because it was a very visceral, immediate thing just hearing it. It was immediately different.\footnote{Vogelzang interview, 02/10/2015.}

Vogelzang spent the next few years working on a DMA in which she would compare performances of Renaissance polyphony using traditional notation and performances using my notation. Due to a serious illness, she never completed the research.

Given that Vogelzang had spent two years thinking about the notation system, I was keen to establish exactly what it was about the notation system that made the difference for her. Was it the absence of the bar-lines that made the difference or was it the inclusion of phrase marks? Vogelzang confirmed that it was neither. Rather, it was both elements together.

The absence of bar-lines in isolation would have been, for her, helpful up to a point. However, it would have meant looking at a series of notes rather than musical sentences. The insertion of phrase marks alone would likewise have helped but there would still have been a visual blockage in the form of the bar-lines. It was the combination of the two elements that made all the difference.

This was not the first time Vogelzang had tried different styles of notation.

In the past when conductors I was singing for had chosen one of these alternative things, \textit{[modified form of notation]} looking at it that …it’s like … well how are you supposed to sing this? It made no sense, some of the things that other people were doing. Then when I researched what they were trying to achieve, it kept coming back to ‘yeah, but when I try to sing that it didn’t work for me’ and this \textit{[PNS]} did. Immediately.\footnote{Vogelzang interview, 02/10/2015.}

Vogelzang’s response was hugely positive. Her vivid memories of her experiences of eight years earlier may have been influenced by conversations we had had following the short trial. I was therefore very interested to see what differences would emerge when the four professional singers involved in Performance 1 began to discuss the notation system during the rehearsals leading to the performance.
5.2 Performance 1

Within an arts practice research project, performances are much more than performing pieces in concert mode. The rehearsals and performances are, in themselves, research. In the case of this research, Performance 1 was prepared in six rehearsals. These rehearsals would provide the first real feedback on the efficacy or otherwise of PNS. Though the PNS system is aimed at non-specialist and generally amateur choristers, it was necessary to ensure that the first choristers to fully engage with the system were sufficiently musically educated to be able to provide informed feedback. I had previously worked with a professional ensemble, Vocalis, and asked four singers from this group to assist me in my research, which they were pleased to do. It was agreed that all rehearsals would be video recorded and the quartet was requested to provide honest feedback on the notation system. All responses, comments, queries were captured on video and thus provided a real-time record of the singers’ development and acceptance or criticism of PNS.

5.2.1 The Quartet

The four singers involved in Performance 1 are all trained singers, having worked both as soloists and as members of a professional choral group. Below, is a brief resumé of their qualifications and experience.

- Soprano: Roisín Dempsey from Enniscorthy is an honours music graduate from NUI Maynooth, specialising in performance. She has recorded and toured internationally with Anúna, Riverdance, Liam Lawton, and Celtic Woman. As a soloist, she moves between classical and crossover repertoire recording two albums, "Spirit of an Irish Christmas" and "Surrounded", both of which have been met with critical acclaim and has led to many engagements, including Gothenburg, Sweden, and Nashville, Tennessee. Her Oratorio experience ranges from Bach's' St Matthew's Passion', to Fauré's "Requeim". Roísín is now a secondary school music teacher.
- Alto: Sandra Wickham studied at the Royal Northern College of Music in Manchester, after which she moved to Dublin, to study with Mary Brennan at Dublin Institute of Technology, where she achieved a Diploma in Vocal Teaching. She sang with the National Chamber Choir of Ireland for many
years and toured with them both nationally and internationally. She has performed as a soloist with Opera Ireland and Lyric Opera. She qualified as a primary teacher in 2009 and is now working as a principal of a special needs school in County Kilkenny.

- **Tenor: Dermot Doyle** holds a BA in Music and Higher Diploma in Education. He sang with the National Chamber Choir of Ireland from 1996 -2002 and represented Ireland in the World Youth Choir. He has sung with Opera Ireland and Garsington Opera UK.

- **Bass: Eoin Power** studied singing at The Royal Irish Academy of Music, Dublin. He works as a primary school teacher in Tramore and is actively involved in music locally and further afield, both as a chorister and as a soloist. His professional solo engagements include Dvorak *Te Deum*, Duruflé’s *Requiem*, and many debut performances of Eric Sweeney’s music, including *Hymn to Gaia*.

In contrast to my very casual approach to the 2007 trial of PNS, the system would be under close scrutiny by me and the quartet through the rehearsals for Performance 1. The first rehearsal was held on February 14, 2016. My personal journal notes from that day show that I was very nervous. As a regular performer, I do not, as a rule, suffer from nervousness but on this occasion it was very different:

Nerves! Me? How can this be? I don’t do nerves! This time I do. My ‘baby’ is about to be revealed to the world – well, four people anyway – and they will think what they will think. Good or bad, positive or negative. The amount of myself I have invested in this project is about to be revealed. Am I ready for the answer? Can I take the criticism? But of course the system is just that, a system. It will not be perfect. It must have shortcomings. It can only be improved through constructive criticism. The four singers Roisín, Sandra, Dermot and Eoin are all good musicians and will have opinions that warrant a hearing. In a very real way they will be working with the notation in a way that I won’t be. That makes them better assessors of the system than me. Then again, I will be working with the system in a way I had not envisaged either! How will I manage working with it? If the system doesn’t do what I need it to do … It will – it does- at least it did in the USA. Will it travel? Questions, questions, questions and doubts. I suppose they had to come at some point.

The thoughts and doubts, which I noted at the time, were indicative of my confidence in the system, together with my doubts about my ability to convert an imagined sound
into visual cues for the chorister. It also indicated, however, my willingness to accept that the system as conceived may not have been an ideal solution to the issues I was trying to address. It showed my willingness to accept criticism and/or suggestions for improvement.

In the fullness of time, this willingness to be open to critical analysis would mean improvements to the system, especially in relation to the counting of rests and the size of the text font.

All rehearsals were video recorded so that all the reactions, responses and comments were captured for future analysis. I made sure not to hand out the music before the video was recording. Thus, I was able to capture the initial reactions:

Ehhh- no bar-lines!’ and ‘Bar-lines! Am I allowed draw them in?’ ‘I wasn’t panicking at not seeing them (bar-lines) but now that they’re there (in the keyboard reduction part) it’s like … phew!’

Though these reactions were amusing, they also highlighted the extent to which bar-lines are used as a crutch in music reading. There followed a short but interesting conversation, where Sandra indicated that she saw the logic behind not having bar-lines, but Eoin commented that the bar-lines added structure. Roisín’s contribution was that singers were likely to listen to each other more. Dermot’s opening comment showed that he intuitively understood what was suggested by the notation ‘What I’m looking at and I never looked at before (in this genre of music) was the start to finish of a phrase’. The interchanges continued for some time as the quartet discussed what they were seeing.

The singers worked their way through the benefits and drawbacks of the notation before they sang at all. They looked for ways to cheat by looking at the keyboard part before deciding that it would not really help over a long period – okay in an emergency but not for regular use. They noted the ‘2’ indicating duple time and also the absence of dynamics. They also noted that some of the text was in bold type. Instinctively, they realised that they should stress the syllables in bold type. Though bold type was not a feature of the 2007 trial, it was rewarding to see that the singers’ instincts immediately understood the message contained in the bold text.

---

123 Video of rehearsal, 1 14/02/2016.
124 Video of rehearsal, 1 14/02/2016.
Having examined the scores in detail, the initial fright appeared to dissolve and comments indicated that, overall, the notation had a rather familiar look and ‘feel’. Dermot went even further, in his comments:

Something just struck me. It’s all on the page! It’s all there. I actually don’t need to worry about the conductor, what his version of it is going to be like. You usually sit down and go, ‘What way is he going to approach this now?’ Then they’re going to start messing around. You don’t know until they come in and put their stamp on it. Maybe it sounds a bit cheeky to say, I don’t care what you’re going to do with it. It’s all on the page!  

As the rehearsal progressed, other comments were made which showed that the singers were not taking the notation totally for granted. Eoin gave his assessment:

It certainly places the emphasis on phrasing. I have to say I am nervous doing it and trying to count and I am constantly afraid I’ll lose my place. But it does favour phrasing which is good.

Counting and potentially losing his place was a real issue for Eoin. It then struck me that the rests he was trying to count were mostly semibreve rests, whereas the pulse was a minim. For the next rehearsal, I prepared a score in which all rests were of a minim duration (or shorter where appropriate). In this way, the singer could count the rests as a number of beats. This appeared to resolve the issue for Eoin. A further tweak on this element was the addition of a numbering of the rests when the count went above three.

Well into the rehearsal, Sandra made an interesting comment when she remarked that she was no longer thinking in ‘bricks’. By this, she meant that heretofore the music was compiled of bricks – each one a bar, and where the ‘bricks’ from the various voice lines were stacked one on top of the other to create the harmonies. Later in the rehearsal, Sandra wondered if I had anything in my bag from the genre which did contain bar-lines. I produced the Oxford Book of English Madrigals. Her amusing reaction was as much a positive comment regarding PNS as it was a negative one.

125 Video of rehearsal, 1 14/02/2016.
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regarding standard modern notation - ‘That looks like Lego! It does, it looks like blocky Lego!’

It was obvious from that point onwards that the quartet were convinced of the efficacy of PNS in the performance of Renaissance polyphony and were supportive of its use.

5.2.2 Focus Group 1

Performance 1 took place on April 6th 2016 and was a musically illustrated presentation of the research completed to that date. The music performed was the Missa Audi Filia by Viadana. The performance was followed by a focus group discussion in which members of the audience were invited to ask questions. The focus group discussions were recorded and transcribed. University of Limerick ethics rules dictate that no audience members participating in the focus group can be identified. Questions were not only directed at me but also at the members of the quartet. Quartet members’ responses were very informative, given that, by that time, they had been working with PNS for several weeks.

One question asked about the ease with which the singers had picked up the system and how easy they found it to deliver what I, as the conductor, wanted. Sandra’s response was that initially she was reticent about the system but within about twenty minutes she was very comfortable with it. She recounted how she had looked at the barred music and termed it as ‘Lego’. These responses during the focus group discussions were a very accurate summary of the videoed responses of the first rehearsal. Similarly, Roisin’s response to this focus group question re-affirmed that for her she felt prompted to sing in a more musical way from the outset, during the note-learning phase. This contrasted to her more traditional approach, which was to ‘learn the notes and be musical afterwards’. According to Eoin, within this additionally supportive editorial style was a familiarity which meant that there was a minimal ‘learning’ of a new notation style.

127 Video of rehearsal 1 14/02/2016.
128 A DVD of Performance 1 is attached to the back of Volume 1 as Appendix IV.
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Contributors to the focus group discussion were not only asking questions, but were also making observations on what they had seen while looking at extracts of the music projected on a screen. One such observation was the extent to which the successive points of imitation are brought into high relief through the use of PNS. It was noted that the observance of these successive waves of imitation (either through performance by the singers or observance by the audience) is the secret to unlocking this music. This clear identification of the phrase within the sheet music was seen by Eoin as a major boon, in that you were always aware of where the music was going. On a lighter note, Dermot commented that the omnipresent phrase mark also inflicted a degree of guilt on the singer that needed to break the phrase in order to take a breath.132

Another observation by a focus group member was the extent to which the sense of the music was highlighted at the expense of the ‘maths’ of the counting and the rigidity of the bars. It was felt that PNS resulted in more musical performance rather than mathematical one. Such an observation is, of course, very much down to the individual and how they experience and interact with sheet music and is heavily influenced by the degree of music literacy of the individual.133

A question was posed by a focus group member regarding the extent to which the singers had to be aware of the other singers’ lines when using PNS, compared to standard notation. I was rather surprised that Roisin was very quick to respond that she felt she had to be less aware of accommodating other singers. As she was thinking in a linear fashion, she was less aware of vertical chords. This response re-affirmed a previous comment she had made that chords were a by-product of the linear performance rather than the essence of the performance.

Another point raised by a focus group member related to the rise and fall of the musical phrase. The phrase marks, as currently presented, show the start and finish of the phrase but the apex of the printed arc of the phrase mark did not necessarily correspond to the apex of the musical phrase. This is an issue of which I am aware, but for which I have, as yet, not found a solution. One possibility is that the density or thickness of the phrase mark might be increased to show the apex of the phrase. This would be

132 This, it should be noted, was an observation where the performance forces used were one singer to a part; breath management is not likely be such an issue when performing with a larger group.
133 The topic of how choristers who are less musically literate interact with PNS will be addressed later in this chapter when discussing the responses of the larger choir preparing for Performance 2.
analogous to having the stressed syllables in bold print, as happens with the printed text of the piece to be sung. Thus far, I have been unable to find a way to achieve this within the notation programme and, according to the Finale programme developers, it will require some development and refinement of the notation software.

Some discussion also surrounded the role of the conductor and the impact of the conducting style. The propensity for conductors to deliver very precise and defined ‘downbeat’ was commented on as an element which would work against the aims of PNS. This observation raised the question regarding the training of conductors in the direction of PNS. In reality, this question of training conductors is much bigger than merely working with PNS. In Ireland, it is more a question of training conductors in the first instance and then making them aware of the styles and characteristics of various genres. If a conductor is aware of the stylistic elements of Renaissance polyphony, then s/he will be cognisant of the danger of interfering too much in the music-making.

The extent to which a conductor directs or guides a performance of Renaissance polyphony in performance was one of the questions posed by me to the interviewee conductors and there were two distinct approaches here. Most of the interviewees commented that the size of the performance group would have an impact on the role of the conductor but that, when working with a chamber group, a conductor’s involvement should be minimal. Simon Halsey’s view was that, by the time it comes to performance, the conductor’s work should already be done; the conductor should melt into the background.134 Paul Spicer suggested that the conductor should ‘step aside and let them [the choir] do it as chamber music’.135 Simon Carrington’s response was a little more comprehensive:

> With inexperienced singers he is an essential guide in the learning stage. Once the piece is understood he/she is just a guide to the tactus and a reminder of interpretation points already discussed.136

The exception to promoting this light touch approach to conducting Renaissance polyphony was Jeremy Summerly, who was rather forceful in his response:

---

134 Halsey interview, 31/03/2015.
135 Spicer interview, 02/03/2015.
136 Carrington interview, 11/04/2015.
You’ve got to keep people directing towards the cadences, you’ve got to make sure that you are interacting with all of the polyphonic voices simultaneously, that they’re all feeling looked after and that you don’t give them any chance to let up. Because at the first opportunity the amateurs will get frightened and go to a default mush and the pros will get bored and think it doesn’t matter.\textsuperscript{137}

It is not unreasonable to comment that the impact of a conductor on a performance will be felt, or not, irrespective of the notation being used by the choristers. Insofar as the conductor does take a light touch approach, then any additional support offered by an edition will be welcomed by choristers.

Additional questions which were not directly related to the creation of PNS and its use with Renaissance polyphony were also posed by members of the audience as part of the focus group discussion. One such question related to the compositional methodology of the composer, given that a full score original does not exist. Whereas this is an interesting question in its own right, it is not considered as materially contributing to the creation of the PNS system, therefore it is not dealt with here.

Another question posed by a composer in attendance at Performance 1 related to the potential use of PNS by contemporary composers. Again, this is an intriguing question and one that had been previously raised by Andrew Parrott during my interview with him. An exploration of how modern composers might be able to exploit the opportunities offered by PNS could be added to the list of post-doctoral investigations facilitated by the creation of PNS.

\textbf{5.3 Performance 2}

It will be remembered from Chapter one that my initial question was sparked by a performance by an experienced amateur choir in 1984, which I found to be less than satisfactory. While feedback from the Performance 1 quartet was hugely informative, the real test of PNS would be its operation in a similar situation to that of the 1984 performance. To this end, I brought together a choir of twenty-one choristers who, while enthusiastic and experienced amateurs, were not Renaissance polyphony

\textsuperscript{137} Summerly interview, 16/07/2015.
specialists. All were current, or until recently, members of community choirs.  

Three of the Performance 1 quartet were keen to remain singing with the project and thus the total number in the choir was twenty-four. A working title of *Vox Humana* was used for the group.  

Though I was encouraged by the continued involvement of the singers, Roisín, Sandra, and Eoin, it was necessary to assess the success or otherwise of the Phrased Notation System, as used exclusively by non-professional choristers. Therefore, these three professionals were excluded from six of the twelve works to be sung as part of Performance 2. Additional questions were posed by this exclusion. Would the system achieve its goals with non-professionals in the same way it had with professionals? Would working with non-professionals reveal shortcomings within the PNS system that would need to be addressed?  

In addition to a change in personnel for Performance 2, there was also a change in repertoire. Whereas Performance 1 consisted of a single composition for which there was no modern edition, Performance 2 included many smaller works which are part of the standard repertoire for community choirs, be they church choirs or secular choirs. The compositions included liturgical pieces such as *Sicut Cervus* by Palestrina and *Pater Noster* by Viadana. They also included works in English such as *If ye love me* by Tallis and the madrigal *How merrily we live* by Michael Este. The thinking behind selections such as these was that, if PNS could modify the performance of works which were already familiar to most of the choristers, this would represent a significant argument for its efficacy. I also decided to include pieces exclusively for female voices and for male voices. I would even include a piece to be sung without a conductor. In reality, I was seeking to see how far PNS could be stretched before it would lose its impact. I was trying to ‘break the system’ in order to reveal its weaknesses. All of the pieces included in Performance 2 had to be transcribed into

---

138 *Madrigallery* and *Ad Hoc Chorale* are both mixed voice community chamber choirs. *Voci* is a female voice community choir. All three choirs are Waterford based.  

139 Members of *Vox Humana* were not interviewed individually though their individual contributions to discussions at rehearsal was recorded. Choristers were assured that their contributions would be anonymised. The three exceptions to this were the three members of the quartet from Performance 1 who joined *Vox Humana* for Performance 2.  

140 A DVD of Performance 2 is attached to the back of Volume 1 as Appendix V.  

141 Repertoire for Performance 2 can be found in Appendix III
the PNS format.\textsuperscript{142} The principles of PNS were, in effect, retro-fitted to modern editions.\textsuperscript{143}

Performance 2 also included extracts from the \textit{Missa Defunctorum} by Clemens Non Papa. Though this work is available commercially, none of the currently available editions mention Marsh’s Library’s Viadana collection of masses as a source. When comparing the Marsh’s Library edition with other published editions, it became clear that there were significant differences both in pitches and in text underlay. In order to give voice to this rare edition, I decided to transcribe the \textit{Missa Defunctorum} exactly as it was presented in the Marsh’s Library collection without trying to resolve any inconsistencies with other editions.\textsuperscript{144}

\textit{Vox Humana} operated in an identical way to regular community choirs and absenteeism due to illness or holidays during the six Summer rehearsals was sufficiently significant to require an additional three rehearsals in September and October. It was not possible to gather all of the group together for any of these additional rehearsals. This was in no way indicative of a lack of interest but was down to prior individual commitments or illness.

The vocal training, choral experience, and music literacy levels of all twenty-four singers involved in Performance 2 varied significantly. Omitting the three professionals, Table 5.1 (overleaf) displays the mix of skills and skill levels within the group.

\textsuperscript{142} As I did not have access to the original publications for this repertoire, I chose material from the collection \textit{European Sacred Music} edited by John Rutter.

\textsuperscript{143} This ‘retro-fitting’ meant that I had no role to play in interpreting the original notation, text underlay or \textit{musica ficta}. These decisions were taken by the editors of Oxford University Press. John Rutter who was principal editor of the \textit{European Sacred} Music publication confirmed to me in interview that he had had access to the original manuscripts for these Renaissance pieces.

\textsuperscript{144} Given that I was working with a mass for the dead, I leaned towards avoidance of many \textit{tierce de Picardie} options an editor might ordinarily choose. I was also less inclined to opt for the raised third when options of \textit{musica ficta} presented themselves. In my avoidance of these sharpened options, I was careful to adhere to the rules of \textit{ficta} and the pitches were raised where appropriate.
Table 5.1 Levels of vocal training amongst members of *Vox Humana*

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>No Vocal Training</th>
<th>Little Vocal Training</th>
<th>Extensive Vocal Training</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>17</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>No Choral Experience</td>
<td>Little Choral Experience</td>
<td>Extensive Choral Experience</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>0</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>17</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Music Literacy Level - Low</td>
<td>Music Literacy Level - Medium</td>
<td>Music Literacy Level - High</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>11</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

As had been the case with Performance 1, no prior notification, training, or explanations were provided before the first rehearsal, though several of the membership of the choir had attended Performance 1 as audience members and would therefore have been aware of the issues I was trying to address and the techniques I was employing. Again, as had been done for Performance 1, all rehearsals were recorded for analysis.

The techniques I used in rehearsal with this larger choir were identical to the techniques I have used with choral groups over the last forty years. This was a very deliberate approach so as to ensure that the sheet music was the only unusual feature of the rehearsal experience. These rehearsal techniques included clarifying pronunciations, running over individual lines, rehearsing lines in pairs, clarifying rhythms etc. However, from the first rehearsal, there was a particular emphasis on pronunciation of the text and, in particular, on the stressed syllables within each word.

The extent to which the reactions of the singers of *Vox Humana* mirrored those of the Performance 1 quartet, in their first encounter with PNS, was remarkable. Comments were made about the lack of bar-lines, the presence of phrase marks, and the bold type used on some syllables. Curiously, there was no mention of the large 2 or 3 at the start of each piece. These numbers are indicators of the metre and are placed in the same space, as would normally be occupied by time signatures. The similarity in the responses of the members of the quartet and the members of *Vox Humana* suggested that each group saw and understood the notation in a similar way. This was important,
as for a notation system to be described as prompting an intuitive response, it is necessary that the system prompt a similar response in all singers. A notation which prompts a variety of responses is not likely to be successful in supporting a singularity of approach to performance.

The first notable query from a chorister related to some confusion regarding a rhythm. Had there been a bar-line in place, the chorister felt it would have been much easier to clarify the issue for herself. Her observation resonated with a similar comment Eoin had made during the early rehearsals for Performance 1. Indeed, the solution Eoin devised for himself was to use the facility of the keyboard reduction score for a few moments in order to clarify the rhythm. Once this clarification had been made, Eoin found he no longer needed the additional support of the bar-line. This same approach was adopted by the Performance 2 chorister with a similar outcome, in that once the ‘mathematical issue’ had been dealt with, the keyboard reduction score was no longer required. This brief discussion did give rise to some observations regarding choristers with limited music literacy skills and these issues will be discussed later. The discussion brought some very interesting comments from choristers who were engaging with the system for the first time. Comments included, ‘You seem to take more notice of the phrase mark (because of the absence of the bar-line)’ or ‘The phrase mark is your bar-line’. Both these comments demonstrate the extent to which the choristers understood the nature of the problem being addressed.

Whereas for the majority of the choir for Performance 2, this was their first exposure to PNS; for three of the group, this was their second time interacting with the system. It is therefore worth noting the reaction of these singers, the second time around.

In the seven months between Performance 1 and Performance 2, each of the three singers, Roisín, Sandra, and Eoin, had worked on different projects in a variety of musical genres, all of which had used standard modern notation. Each of the three singers were positive in their comments regarding reacquainting themselves with PNS: ‘It was like I was never away’ (Roisín); ‘It’s easy to come back to, it’s not difficult’ (Eoin); ‘It’s not difficult, it’s not like the initial “agh” there’s no bar-lines!’ (Sandra).

---

145 This observation indicates that there was ‘recovery time’ in which the challenges and peculiarities of the PNS system could have been forgotten, thus lessening their influence on performance.
Notwithstanding the choristers’ awareness, it was necessary through the various rehearsals to regularly remind all singers of the necessity to phrase the music according to the marks on the score. Similarly, it was necessary to remind singers of the importance of the pronunciation, as indicated by the normal and bold typefaces. Though this need to remind the singers is noted for the sake of completeness, similar regular prompts are required within any non-professional choir regarding breathing in the correct place, unanimity of vowel sounds etc. I saw this reminding as part and parcel of normal choral rehearsal activity and not as a new requirement due to the use of PNS.

Not everyone in *Vox Humana* found the PNS system to be a significant improvement, however. Those who identify themselves as not being fluent music readers were not so impressed by the differences between standard notation and PNS. These individuals had no problem whatever in understanding the issues being addressed or the logic of how these issues were addressed. The comment was that, in the normal course of events, these individuals learn their music more through their ears than through their eyes. Insofar as they could hear what was being phrased, stressed etc. they could easily replicate the sound, irrespective of how it was written down. The presence or absence of bar-lines was, to them, largely irrelevant, as they claimed to be unaware of the subtle differences in accents or stresses within a barred phrase. Notwithstanding the irrelevance of the bar-lines in such cases, the presence of the phrase marks and the inclusion of bold print to assist with pronunciation was seen by these choristers as an aid to performance. These observations might suggest that the effectiveness of elements of the PNS system may depend on the music literacy skills of the choristers. In some respects, this is not surprising, as it is those who are musically literate that respond automatically to the impositions of the bar-lines. The extent to which this is a correct analysis of the situation may be explored in post-doctoral studies.

### 5.4 An Independent Trial

Through rehearsals for both Performance 1 and Performance 2, I was a constant presence. Though this meant I was at all times aware of singers’ responses and was thus in a position to make any necessary adjustments or take on board any comments,
it also meant that I may have, unwittingly, added additional direction to that offered exclusively by the notation system. Through a mutual acquaintance, I approached a group of singers, with whom I had no prior connection, to oblige me by carrying out an independent trial of the Phrased Notation System. Though they agreed to undertake this trial, they laid down certain restrictions regarding how the resulting material was to be presented. What follows is a summary of the information gleaned from the trial.146

5.4.1 Background to the Independent Trial

Following a brief meeting with a group of post-graduate conducting students from the University of Louisiana, it was agreed that they would carry out an independent trial of PNS and provide a video recording of their subsequent discussions. I would have no input into how the trial was structured or carried out and I would have no right of reply. Their decision was to sing through Palestrina’s Sicut Cervus using standard modern notation before replacing the sheet music with a PNS edition and then sing the piece once again. The PNS edition had not been seen by the choristers in advance of this trial. In addition, no information regarding the reason for the inclusion of various elements was provided. The performance using PNS was, in effect, sight unseen. There then followed a discussion on the experience. This process was video recorded and the video was sent to me.

Concern was expressed by the group regarding how the video of their performance and subsequent discussion would be used and how their discussion would be cited. In order to allay these concerns, it was agreed that my summary of the video would be sent to the convener of the group for final permission to use the material contained therein. It was further agreed that individuals would not be identified.147 I was happy to agree to these restrictions so as to be able to use the very valuable data gathered as part of this independent trial.

146 The convener of the trial has verified this summary as a true assessment of the discussions of the independent trial group.
147 Given that I had only met a few of the students once before, identification would not have been possible even if it were allowed.
5.4.2 A Summary of the Independent Trial

Positive observations on their performance using PNS included a lack of accenting pulses perceived as ‘down beats’ when singing. This in turn led to facilitation of singing more lyrically and sustaining phrases intuitively. Though the singers had not seen this edition before, they very quickly assimilated much of what the edition was attempting to do. On closer examination, it was perceived that there was rhythmic ambiguity through the use of ties. This perception was quickly altered when it was noticed that the presence of tied notes ensured that a duple look and feel were retained. This comment echoes the comments of choristers in both Performance 1 and Performance 2.

In a similar vein, by using PNS it was seen as easier to sing a phrase, as it could be easily seen where the phrase was coming from and going to. This is another way of saying, as Alexa Vogelzang did when referring to the initial 2007 trials, ‘I think the differences had to do with visually seeing on the page it not being cut off … There’s no punctuation, if you will, in every so many notes. I could really just sing the line that I saw and then go on and do the next grouping and I think that was the biggest difference’. 148

The impact on individuals and their personal engagement with the music was interesting, with some commenting that it was easier to locate oneself vertically, given the absence of bar-lines. A further comment referred to an increased ability to perform as an individual. It was possibly this perception of increased personal responsibility that led one chorister to positively state that she preferred the PNS edition.

There was one observer (the convener) in attendance at the performance and it was interesting that he perceived a change in the timbre of the performance. Whereas when singing from standard notation he perceived a standard ‘choir voice’, this was replaced by a more independent sound when the PNS edition was used. In an additional comment he noted that ‘it sounded as if you were perceiving it as earlier music!’ Of all of the positive comments, this is perhaps the most promising, as it implies a shift in perception of the music as something different, something which is not subjected to the norms of standard notation and all of the attendant conventions. In the same way
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as I find that singing plainchant from four stave notation looks and feel different to singing from five stave notation, this comment implies a similar shift in perception. On the other hand, the conductor of the group (a post-graduate conducting student) commented that he was not aware of any significant difference in the overall sound. The video suggests that the group were of such a quality that they were in a position to provide a laudable performance of *Sicut Cervus* from any edition. Several had sung it many times before, though for at least one chorister this was his first experience with the piece.

As one would expect in any experiment, not everything was positively received. In a similar way to the initial rehearsals for Irish based Performance 1, comments were made on the requirement to keep an internal pulse, at which point the conductor was of less assistance.\(^{149}\)

The absence of bar-lines made it difficult to be on auto-pilot, according to another chorister. A not unreasonable response would be that working through the PNS edition one or two more times might prompt a review of this approach. It is always easier to relax into something which looks familiar. Increased time spent with PNS goes a long way in this regard, as was clearly noted in the quotation from Performance 1 singer, Sandra Wickham, following two hours working with PNS and then reverting to standard notation – ‘It looks like Lego! It’s all blocky.’

As had been commented on in rehearsals for Performance 1, and in contrast to the observation made earlier, some choristers commented that they found it difficult to check out where they were, vertically, and that the absence of bar-lines made it more difficult to ‘get back in’ if you missed an entry or lost your place. The experience with the community choir for Performance 2 suggests that using PNS through rehearsals informs your ear rather than your eye and that establishing a re-entry point becomes easier as familiarity with the geography of the piece increases. It must be stated that having lost one’s place in the middle of a piece of Renaissance polyphony, it can be difficult to re-join the piece, irrespective of the presence or otherwise of bar-lines.

\(^{149}\) This resembles Dermot Doyle’s comment at the first rehearsal for Performance 1 when he stated that there was little need for a conductor given that there was so much information on the page (Rehearsal video 14/02/2016)
One of the ways in which Performance 1 singer, Eoin Power, re-located himself in the early stages of learning a piece using the PNS edition was to glance at the keyboard reduction score. This was something which some of the University of Louisiana choristers also admitted to doing. It is curious that in both American and Irish cases it was the bass singers that glanced at the keyboard reduction part to clarify their position. The proximity of the bass part to that of the keyboard part may have facilitated such activity. No soprano, alto, or tenor suggested that they had been tempted to use the additional information offered by the keyboard part.

Another observation was that PNS encouraged a focus on the individual rather than on the ensemble. Insofar as this is an indication that each individual is required to concentrate on their own performance, this is not necessarily a bad thing, as ensemble is established through ongoing rehearsal rather than any single read through of a piece.

A final observation concerned the sustaining of long notes. It was correctly observed that performance-practice dictates that longer value notes should have an element of decay but that the extended phrase mark contradicted that practice and encouraged a sustaining of the sound for the full value of the note. The suggestion was that an element of *messa di voce* be introduced. The nature of this observation indicated an awareness of performance practice, which is above a level one would expect from a non-specialist community chorister. Simon Carrington’s GIA editions do contain such indications and a fuller discussion regarding their use is contained in Chapter three. In response to the *messa di voce* comment, it was suggested by another chorister that, in the same way as standard notation requires rehearsal to lessen the impact of bar-lines, similar rehearsal might be required to attend to this fine detail of performance.

Related to the previous comment was another which asked if all music from this era should be performed in a legato fashion. The consensus was that it should not. In such cases, it was posited, that a phrase mark/slur would be an inappropriate indication. Though this topic had not been raised previously by either myself or the other choristers who had used PNS, it is a reasonable argument. My suggestion for addressing this issue would be to use a dotted phrase mark, where appropriate, rather than the solid phrase mark in general use. The Finale computer programme used for creating the PNS edition does facilitate such a mark and so would be easy to implement.
In addition to straight positive or negative comments regarding PNS, there were also a number of other comments which were worthy of note.

One such comment referred to the presence of bold print for some of the syllables. Only one individual noticed these bold syllables and stated that he slightly accented these syllables, as he thought that that must be the intention. Such an intuitive response indicates that bold print is capable of achieving its expressed intention. Others had not noticed the bold print and thought it may have been helpful if they had been made aware of it. It was suggested that the font size could be greater or that the bold print be capitalised. Both of these suggestions have indeed been considered and the font size used in PNS has subsequently been increased.

Doubt was expressed regarding the facility of reading new material from PNS. Though most of the choristers declared familiarity with *Sicut Cervus*, there were some who had never seen it before. One chorister who was less familiar with the piece did not appear to be particularly comfortable with the music being presented in an unfamiliar manner. Another commented that he found it easier to establish his position within the ensemble due to the lack of bar-lines. With two diametrically opposed responses, it is not possible to offer categorical assurance that one notation system is any easier to read than another. However, no public performance would ever take place after just one reading of a piece. Whether with standard notation or a PNS edition, all choristers would expect to be very familiar with a piece before performing it in public.

A question was raised concerning the size of the group for whom this notation would be suitable. It is probably a more pertinent question to ask the size of group for whom this genre of music is appropriate. It was suggested that presenting a PNS edition to a large choir could result in a less than successful result. However, this music was, by and large, written for a number of singers which in today’s terms would be considered a chamber choir. Thus, the challenges of working a Renaissance polyphonic piece with a one hundred-piece choir are significantly increased when compared with working the same piece with a chamber group of sixteen voices, irrespective of the editorial style of the sheet music.

One comment made begs a series of questions which can never be answered. The comment was that it may have been a different experiment had the barred version not
been sung first. This is a totally valid observation but the converse would also be true.
If a second reading of the piece, using standard notation, had followed the PNS reading
would the second reading not feel more comfortable given its familiarity? In truth, we
can never devise a true clinical experiment, as every chorister has a different musical
history which informs their views and performance. Having seen standard notation,
we cannot un-see it. We will inevitably bring this experience to bear on any notation
system we encounter. Having previously sung *Sicut Cervus*, we cannot un-sing it.
These singings are part of our musical experience we bring to bear on every
performance of every piece of music.

The question was asked as to whether there is a half-way stage between having and
not having bar-lines, rather than having the bar-line interrupt the sound. The answer
is yes, there is. Several options have been experimented with: *Mensurstrich*, dotted
bar-lines, quarter bar-lines (ticks); the merits and de-merits of each is addressed in
Chapter two of this dissertation.

A question was posed regarding how many people actually read a score vertically and
in such cases why not sing from a part book? This is, yet again, an interesting question,
though probably not relevant to non-specialist choristers for whom PNS is created.
Having sung from choral scores where no prompt is provided as to the
accompaniment, such as in the choral score of Duruflé’s *Requiem*, there are real
challenges in singing from such editions. Singing from modern equivalents of part-
books would certainly be something promoted by those interested in scores that most
closely resemble the original material. However, where would such scores draw the
line? Would they be facsimiles of the original? If so, far more training would be
required for every chorister to be able to read such material. Would the historic
conventions (*musica ficta* etc.) be fully and correctly realised in such editions? Would
such part-books contain cue lines when voices were *tacet*? Would the part-books not
be more in the realm of the specialist chorister than the non-specialist for whom PNS
was designed? PNS certainly has the potential to be used in a part-book scenario and
this may well form part of a special edition appropriate for more advanced choral
groups.

In the discussion, no reference was made to the presence of a literal translation in the
edition and whether the availability of such a translation impacted on the choristers’
understanding of the text. Others, who have rehearsed with PNS, comment on the additional understanding of the independence of individual lines prompted by seeing phrase marks not aligning between parts. Given the American group’s general lack of awareness of the bold print syllables, the additional impact of the microrhythms resulting from the observation of these syllables could not be observed. Additionally, the fact that the choristers in this case were all (to the best of my knowledge) post-graduate choral conducting students certainly resulted in a detailed discussion one would not expect in an amateur choir.

As previously stated, the PNS edition of *Sicut Cervus* was performed, sight unseen, by post-graduate conducting students of Louisiana State University, to whom I am most grateful. Had they had an opportunity to see the score in advance or to read the introductory notes, additional comments may well have been forthcoming regarding PNS. Against this, having time to consider the minutiae of PNS may have resulted in fewer automatic responses to the actual notation and may have contributed an element of expectation regarding the performance prompted by the notation. The responses to PNS might then have been influenced by individual’s expectations of the system rather than by their actual experience, which in terms of this research is particularly valuable.

In summary, it could be said that many of the positive elements experienced by the choristers in this independent trial were echoed by the experiences of the professional choristers of Performance 1 and of community performers in Performance 2. Many of the reservations expressed in the University of Louisiana discussions had been previously expressed by their Irish counterparts. However, in the case of the Irish singers, they were in a position to re-engage with the PNS system through repeated rehearsal in preparation for performances. Through the process of these rehearsals, many of the expressed reservations were dealt with and issues resolved.

### 5.5 Conclusion

There is little doubt that Renaissance polyphony is a treasured resource within the canon of choral repertoire. There is also little doubt that enthusiastic non-specialists will seek to perform this music in an appropriate manner – insofar as that can be identified. That, of course, is where the trouble begins. We cannot be sure how the
music of the Renaissance sounded. However, we can be sure of certain elements that would not have been part of their performance practice. It is, in the main, these non-sympathetic elements, those contra-indicated by the historically verifiable training received by Renaissance choristers that PNS seeks to address.

On the basis of my own practice and the experience of professional interviewees, the three most significant elements in performing Renaissance polyphony are text, phrasing, and understanding, whilst the element of modern notation that inhibits appropriate performance more than any other is the bar-line.

For decades, performers and musicologists have searched for a solution to the ‘prison cell’ of the bar-line, as described by Paul Spicer150. From Besseler in the 1930’s to Carrington in modern times, editors have tried many different options – mensurstrich, dotted bar-lines, quarter bar-lines – all have their advocates and their detractors. Yet, to date, no sufficiently satisfactory solution on which all editors can agree has been identified. I believe that the approach taken as part of PNS to the bar-line problem provides a workable solution, straddling the need for clarity of alignment with lack of interference in the musical phrase. Merging the barred rehearsal keyboard part with the un-barred choral parts provides the benefits of both systems without compromising either.

Experts agree that communication of the meaning of the text is an essential element for good communication of any choral piece. Provision of a literal translation on a word by word basis facilitates the detailed understanding required for such communication. The intuitive nature of the responses of choristers in both Performance 1 and Performance 2 to the bold print syllables suggests that the microrhythms inherent in the text are supported by this feature through reinforcement of pronunciation stresses.

By far the most positive responses to PNS, which have come from both performances and from the independent trial, are in relation to the use of the phrase marks – that feature which gives the system its name. This feature facilitates the structuring of a phrase in concert with the meaning of the text. It also plays a major role in ensuring choristers treat their individual line as vital, not only as part of the overall sound, but
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as an individual entity in its own right. The phrase marks do this whilst at the same
time increasing an awareness of how their line interacts with and yet remains
independent of the other lines. This level of awareness is not based on a vertical
assessment of any given chord but rather on a higher ‘helicopter’ view which portrays
the overall shape of the independent writing of lines by Renaissance composers.

The extent to which PNS addresses issues raised appear, initially, to be more readily
interpreted by those with more than a basic awareness of music literacy. However,
even those with limited literacy skills speak to the additional understanding of
phrasing and pronunciation offered by the new style of editing as shown earlier in this
chapter. At what level of literacy the full impact of PNS is felt may form part of other
post-doctoral studies.

Other opportunities to continue research may also be offered by presenting PNS
editions of part-books for groups who, whilst eager to explore the additional
challenges of part-books, are not in a position deal with the additional challenges faced
by facsimiles of original sources.

Nor are the possibilities offered by PNS restricted to music of the Renaissance. In his
March 2015 interview, conducting teacher, Paul Spicer, commented on the potential
use of the system by modern composers. I am tempted to consider how the works
of John Tavener, Gorecki or Arvo Pärt might be portrayed in PNS.

As stated previously, some performers have already found an editorial style, which,
for them, addresses the issues raised by Renaissance polyphony. Others such as Simon
Carrington, through his innovative editions for the publishing house GIA, continue the
search for an edition that unlocks the beauty of this genre. I do not claim that PNS
addresses all of the questions, or indeed is necessarily appropriate for all music of the
Renaissance; more research using the compositions of DuFay or Ockeghem will
explore the extent to which PNS aids performance practice for this earlier material.

This journey through notation and its impact on performance began with a question
back in 1984, ‘Why does it sound lumpy?’ I don’t pretend to have provided all of the
answers or even identified all of the potential questions stemming from that
performance. What I have done is create a notation system which resonates with

151 Spicer interview, 02/03/2015.
choristers in a manner which results in a performance that shows evidence of increased understanding and appropriate phrasing. To paraphrase the convener of the independent trial, this system appears to create in singers an awareness of an earlier form of music. For some, this system may have little impact on how they perform. However, those who have used and worked with PNS as part of this research project have acknowledged publicly through the post-performance focus groups that they have been influenced by the notational supports offered by the Phrased Notation System.
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Appendix I - Detailed instruction for the use of Phrased Notation

1. Convert original document to standard notation on full score completing all text underlay as required.
2. Create a Piano reduction score with 80% sized notes for all elements except where a basso continuo has been provided in the original. In such a case the B.C. notes are retained at 100%
3. Address text issues:
   a. Complete capitalisation and punctuation in accordance with Liber Usualis.
   b. Create bold type for stressed syllables.
   c. Original text to be at 14 point.
   d. Literal translation to be included at 10 point. Translations taken from purple book
   e. Make sure ‘repeat text indications’ are in italics
4. Insert phrase marks in accordance with good singing/breathing/phrasing practice.
5. All phrase marks to be placed over the stave in order to avoid clashes with text.
6. Bar-lines to be removed from voice parts. Retain any bar-lines shown in original score.
7. Extract parts and sing each part with computer making alterations as necessary.
8. Ensure courtesy accidentals are properly noted.
9. Full bar-line to be provided for Group staves (piano reduction).
10. Bar numbers to be included.
11. Ensure all rests match the tactus.
12. Number multiple rests.
13. Time signatures to be removed and replaced by ‘2’ or ‘3’ with fixed size of ’24 point.’
14. Metronome marks to be inserted with ‘circa’ qualification.
15. Present on page layout
16. Alter distance between staves as follows:
   a. Cantus/Altus 1.2
   b. Altus/ Tenor 1.2
   c. Tenor/Bass 1.3
   d. Bass/Piano Reduction 1.2
   e. Piano Reduction/Basso Continuo 1.2
17. Reduce page to 85%
18. Adjust Phrase marks.
19. Edit word extensions where necessary.
20. Edit beat positions within bars eliminating any impact of English text.
21. Ensure secure placement of two systems per page.
22. Insert title page.
   a. Title 48 point
   b. Composer 36 point
   c. Edited and transcribed into Phrased Notation 14 point
   d. Kevin O’Carroll 18 point
   e. from Missarum Quator Vocum cum Basso Continuo ad Organum Part Books held in Marsh's Library, Dublin - Accessed 11 April 2014 10 point
23. Titles of each movement to be included at 24 point.
24. Reset Page Numbers
25. Create a PDF to be printed.
Appendix II – Questions for Specialist Interviewees

1. Do you work exclusively with professional or amateur singers, or both?

2. What are the biggest differences between working with amateur and professional singers?

3. What are the specific challenges in singing Renaissance polyphony?

4. What, in your opinion, are the greatest differences between specialist and non-specialist (including amateur) performances of Renaissance polyphony?

5. Do you sing from white notation? Why or why not?

6. What are the advantages/disadvantages of singing from original Renaissance manuscripts?

7. What do you perceive to be the drawbacks of singing Renaissance polyphony from modern notation?

8. What techniques do you use to address issues raised by modern notation in the singing of Renaissance polyphony?

9. How important is a comprehensive understanding of the meaning and function of each word in the text of polyphony?

10. How successful can a performance be if the singers do not understand the meaning and function of each word in a text?

11. How great a role does the conductor play in the performance (as opposed to the rehearsal) of Renaissance polyphony.

12. When you present professional singers with a piece of Renaissance polyphony what do you expect to hear from them that differs from say a classical or romantic piece?

13. Could these differences be portrayed through notation which would support non-specialists in producing a more appropriate performance?
Appendix III – Repertoire included in Performance 2

This appendix includes all the music used in Performance 2 with the exception of Missa Defunctorum by Clemens Non Papa which is included in Volume 2 of this dissertation as part of the Marsh’s Library transcriptions.
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Missa Audi Filia

Ludovico Grossi da Viadana

from Missarum Quator Vocum cum Basso Continuo ad Organum
Part Books held in Marsh's Library, Dublin - Accessed 11 April 2014

Edited and transcribed into the Phrased Notation System by

Kevin O’Carroll
The Phrased Notation System (PNS) is a modified form of music notation which aims to guide non-specialist choirs towards improved performance of Renaissance polyphony. This is, therefore, designed to be a practical edition rather than a scholarly edition. This edition has used as its source a single publication, the 1625 Pierre Phalèse edition of *Missarum Quatuor Vocum. Cum Basso Continuo ad Organum, Liber Primus. Item Missa pro Defunctis Clementis non Papae* which was printed in Antwerp and is held by Marsh’s Library, Dublin. As Marsh’s hold the only complete surviving copy, its presentation here provides an opportunity for comparison of several of the masses contained therein with other sources of the same material. Two of the masses, *Missa Audi Filia* by Viadana and the mass by Gregorii Zuchini appear in no other publication and are therefore considered as important discoveries.

There are many elements to be considered when transcribing polyphonic Renaissance material from the original part books. An explanation of the approach taken to each of these elements is provided below.

**Accidentals** – Accidentals which appear in the original publication are retained. These accidentals are placed before the notes to which they refer, in accordance with modern convention. Courtesy accidentals are provided as appropriate and are shown in brackets over the note to which they refer. These accidentals may be necessary due to the cancellation of a preceding raised pitch, on foot of *Musica Ficta* or merely for clarification.

**Accompaniment** – Though a keyboard reduction is provided it is not necessarily suggested that the music should be accompanied (see Basso Continuo).

**Bar Lines** – In general, the original score does not use bar lines. Where bar lines do appear in the original, they are present within the choral parts in this edition. Bar lines are provided within the keyboard reduction score and are presented as an aid within rehearsal. These barlines do not imply additional accents as in modern convention.

**Basso Continuo** - A basso continuo [sic] is contained in the original publication. The part, is in reality a basso seguente in that it merely tracks the lowest vocal part at any given time. We are informed in Viadana’s writing that he included a ‘basso continuo’ to facilitate performance of his works when there were too few choristers or where a voice part was missing. It can be assumed that the basso continuo presented here should function in a similar manner.

**Dynamics** – The music is presented without obvious dynamic marks as no such marks exist in the original publication. However, dynamic variation should be inferred from:

1. The inclusion or exclusion of vocal lines
2. The meaning of the text
3. The nature of the musical writing
Providing detailed dynamic instruction for each individual vocal line would result in a cluttered, not to mention confusing, looking score. It is thought, therefore, that by providing information on the factors that influence dynamics singers will better able to take direct responsibility for dynamic variation.

Grouping of Notes – In an effort to ensure clear alignment and easy analysis of the geography of each line vis-a-vis the other choral lines, notes are grouped according to beats rather than the modern convention of syllabic separation.

Metronome Marks – Metronome marks (M.M) are provided at the start of each movement or when the meter changes. These M.M. values should be seen as indicators of an appropriate tempo and not necessarily slavishly followed. Where a change of meter is involved the M.M. establishes a relationship between the two meters. This relationship should be maintained even where the initial M.M. is not observed due to performance demands or personal interpretation.

Note Values – Note values have been halved from those in the original publication. Occasionally for the sake of clear vertical alignment note values have been further divided and a tie inserted to ensure that a note of the correct duration is sung.

Phrase Marks – Phrase marks are included as an essential part of the PNS system. The phrase mark indicates the musical phrases as appropriate for each individual voice part. The phrase marks are also indicative of appropriate breath points.

Pitch – Whereas the pitch for most of the masses in this collection is found to be within the range considered acceptable to modern choirs, the tessitura of the Tenor line in Missa Audi Filia is rather high. The pitch has therefore been lowered from the original publication by a tone.

Rehearsal Numbers – Rehearsal numbers are provided on the Cantus/Soprano stave throughout. These rehearsal numbers coincide with the bar numbers as shown on the keyboard reduction score.

Text Presentation – The text is presented with modern capitalisation, spelling and punctuation as laid out in the Liber Usualis. Where the text underlay has not been completed or a simple indication of a repeat of text is shown in the original publication it is presented in italics in this edition.

Text Pronunciation – As an aid to pronunciation, stressed syllables are presented in bold type face. Observation of these stressed syllables is essential in promoting the micro meters contained within the music.

Text Underlay – Text underlay is generally well presented in the original publication. Where the original publication indicates that the text should be repeated, this repeated text has been printed in full with due regard to the rhythm of the music. Where text has been added editorially it appears in italics. Such additions only occur where the music strongly suggests that the omission of the text in the original publication was in error.

Time Signatures – Time signatures are not used in this edition as such signs are inappropriate for use with unmensured music. A digit 2 or 3 is inserted as an indicator of duple or triple meter as appropriate.
Translation — A literal translation is provided under each word as an aid to understanding not only the text but also the relationship between the text and the music. Such an understanding plays a vital role in the subtle dynamic variation and musical phrasing within the composition.

To the Conductor — Conductors should note that unlike standard modern music notation the tactus or beat should in general indicate a minim within duple sections. In the triple meter sections, the tactus should indicate the dotted minim. The relationship between duple and triple meters are an essential characteristic of Renaissance music and so careful attention should be paid to the metronome marks as the metre changes. Though allowance is made for variation in tempo due to acoustics or a variation in the size of the performing group it is essential that the proportional relationships indicated by the M.M changes are maintained between meters.

It should also be noted that the style of conducting should not be a didactic, heavily pointed beat but rather a gentler, less articulated one. Such a tactus will promote fewer ‘first beat in the bar’ type accents and encourage a more fluid line, as is appropriate.
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Kyrie

Cantus

Altus

Tenor

Bassus

For rehearsal only

Basso Continuo

Lord

have mercy,

Lord

have mercy,

Lord

have mercy,

Lord

have mercy,

Lord

have mercy,

Lord

have mercy,

Lord

have mercy,

have mercy,
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41

rie e - lei - son, Ky - rie e - lei - son, Ky -

have mercy, Lord have mercy, Lord

42

rie e - lei - son, Ky - rie e - lei - son, Ky-rie e -

have mercy, Lord have mercy, Lord
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son, Ky - rie e - lei - son, Ky-rie e -

son, Ky-rie e - lei - son, Ky-rie e -

44

rie e - lei - son.

have mercy.
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son.

46

son.

47

son.

48

son.
Gloria

Et in terrā pax hominibus bonae voluntatis,
And on earth peace to men of good will.

Et in terrā pax hominibus bonae voluntatis,
And on earth peace to men of good will,
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no - bis. Quo ni-am tu so-lus san c - tus.
on us. For thou alone holy.
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C

A

T

B

B.C.
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Tu so - lus Al-tis si-mus, Je-su Chri - ste.
Thou alone most high Jesus Christ.
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nus. Tu so-lus Al-tis si-mus, Je-su Chri-ste.
Thou alone most high Jesus Christ.
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nus. Tu so-lus Al-tis si-mus, Je-su Chri - ste.
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Cum Sancto Spiritu, in gloria Dei Patrius.

With Holy Spirit in glory of God Father.

Amen.
Father almighty,

fac-tor-rem cae-li et ter-

maker of heaven and of earth,

fac-tor-rem cae-li et ter-

Father almighty,

Patrem omnipo-

tem,

Patrem omnipo-

tem,

fac-tor-rem cae-

li et ter-

maker of heaven and of earth,

Patrem omnipo-

tem,

Patrem omnipo-

tem,

Patrem omnipo-

tem,

Patrem omnipo-

tem,

Patrem omnipo-

tem,

Patrem omnipo-

tem,

Patrem omnipo-

tem,

Patrem omnipo-

tem,

Patrem omnipo-

tem,

Patrem omnipo-

tem,

Patrem omnipo-

tem,

Patrem omnipo-

tem,

Patrem omnipo-

tem,

Patrem omnipo-

tem,

Patrem omnipo-

tem,

Patrem omnipo-

tem,

Patrem omnipo-

tem,

Patrem omnipo-

tem,

Patrem omnipo-

tem,

Patrem omnipo-

tem,

Patrem omnipo-

tem,

Patrem omnipo-

tem,

Patrem omnipo-

tem,
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139

Et in unum Dominum le sum Christum, Filium Dei
And in one Lord Jesus Christ, Son of God

140

141

142

143

144

145

146

147

148

Only begotten. Et ex Patre natum ante omnia
Only begotten. And of Father born before all

Et in unum Dominum le sum Christum, Filium Dei
And in one Lord Jesus Christ, Son of God

Only begotten. Et ex Patre natum ante omnia
Only begotten. And of Father born before all

And in one Lord Jesus Christ, Son of God
Missae Audi Filia

Veni sancte Spiritus

In fine
tri: per quem om-ni-a fac-ta sunt. Qui pro-pter nos ho-mi-
nes, et pro-pter nos-tram sa-lu-tem de-sce-n-dit
nes, et pro-pter nos-tram sa-lu-tem de-sce-n-dit de
nes, et pro-pter nos-tram sa-lu-tem de-sce-n-dit de
nes, et pro-pter nos-tram sa-lu-tem de-sce-n-dit de
nes, et pro-pter nos-tram sa-lu-tem de-sce-n-dit de
de caelis. Et incarnatus est de Spiritu Sancto ex Maria Virgine.

from heavens. And made flesh was of Spirit Holy of Mary Virgin.

caelis. Et incarnatus est de Spiritu Sancto ex Maria Virgine.

heavens. And made flesh was of Spirit Holy of Mary Virgin.

decaelis. Et incarnatus est de Spiritu Sancto ex Maria Virgine.

from heavens. And made flesh was of Spirit Holy of Mary Virgin.

caelis. Et incarnatus est de Spiritu Sancto ex Maria Virgine.

heavens. And made flesh was of Spirit Holy of Mary Virgin.

ET HOMO FACTUS EST. Crucifixus est etiam pro nobis.

And man was. Crucified also for us.

ET HOMO FACTUS EST. Crucifixus est etiam pro nobis.

And man was. Crucified also for us.

ET HOMO FACTUS EST. Crucifixus est etiam pro nobis.

And man was. Crucified also for us.

ET HOMO FACTUS EST. Crucifixus est etiam pro nobis.

And man was. Crucified also for us.
V

am pro nobis, etiam pro nobis sub Pontio Pilate.

Crucifixus etiam pro nobis sub Pontio Pilate

Crucified also for us under Pontius Pilate,

no bis, etiam pro nobis sub Pontio Pilate

us, also for us under Pontius Pilate,

Crucifixus etiam pro nobis

Crucified also for us under Pontius Pilate,

Cru to: passus, et

C to: sub Pontio Pilate

C to: sub Pontio Pilate

C to: sub Pontio Pilate

pas sus, et

pas sus, et

pas sus, et

pas sus, et

suffered, and

sus, et

sus, et

sus, et

suffered, and

suffered, and

suffered, and

suffered, and
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se - pul - tus est. Et re - sur - rex - it ter - ti - a
buried was. And he rose third

di - e, se - cun - dum Scrip - tu - ras. Et a - scen - dit in cae -
day, according to Scriptures. And he ascended into

Et resur - rex - it ter - ti - a
And he rose third

Et a - scen - dit in cae -
And he ascended into

Et resur - rex - it ter - ti - a
And he rose third

And he ascended into
Missa Audi Filia

C.

\[
\text{se-det ad dexte-rum Patris, se-det ad dexte-rum Patris,}
\]

he sits at right hand of Father, he sits at right hand of Father.

A.

\[
\text{se-det ad dexte-rum Patris, se-det ad dexte-rum Patris.}
\]

he sits at right hand, he sits at right hand.

T.

\[
\text{se-det ad dexte-rum Patris, se-det ad dexte-rum Patris.}
\]

he sits at right hand, he sits at right hand.

B.

\[
\text{se-det ad dexte-rum Patris, se-det ad dexte-rum Patris.}
\]

he sits at right hand, he sits at right hand.

B.C.

\[
\text{se-det ad dexte-rum Patris, se-det ad dexte-rum Patris.}
\]

he sits at right hand, he sits at right hand.

---

\[
\text{Et i-te-rum ven-tu-rus est cum glo-ri-}
\]

And again going to come he is with glory.

\[
\text{Et i-te-rum ven-tu-rus est cum glo-ri-}
\]

And again going to come he is with glory.

\[
\text{Et i-te-rum ven-tu-rus est cum glo-ri-}
\]

And again going to come he is with glory.

\[
\text{Et i-te-rum ven-tu-rus est cum glo-ri-}
\]

And again going to come he is with glory.

\[
\text{Et i-te-rum ven-tu-rus est cum glo-ri-}
\]

And again going to come he is with glory.
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210 vi-vos et mor-tu-os, vi-
211 living and dead, living

212 glo-ri-a iu-di-ca-re vi-vos et mor-
213 tu-os, vi-vos et mor-
214 tu-os, vi-vos et mor-

215 tu-os:

216 vi-vos et mor-
217 tu-os:

218 cu-ius

219 of whose

220 os, vi-vos et mor-
221 tu-os:

222 cu-ius

223 of whose

224 os, vi-vos et mor-
225 tu-os:

226 cu-ius reg-ni non e-
227 rit,

228 of whose kingdom not will there be,

229 et mor-
230 tu-os:

231 cu-ius reg-
232 ni non e-

233 rit,

234 of whose kingdom not will there be
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re-gni non e-rit fi-nis. Et in Spi-ri-tum Sanc-tum Do-mi-num, et vi-

reg-ni non e-rit fi-nis. Et in Spi-ri-tum Sanc-tum Do-mi-num, et vi-

non e-rit fi-nis. Et in Spi-ri-tum Sanc-tum Do-mi-num, et vi-

vii-fi-can-tem: qui ex Pa-tre, Fi-li-o-que pro-ce-

vi-fi-can-tem: qui ex Pa-tre, Fi-li-o-que pro-ce-

vi-fi-can-tem: qui ex Pa-tre, Fi-li-o-que pro-ce-

vi-fi-can-tem: qui ex Pa-tre, Fi-li-o-que pro-ce-

not will there be end. And in Spirit Holy Lord, and life giver

not will there be end. And in Spirit Holy Lord, and life giver

not will there be end. And in Spirit Holy Lord, and life giver

not will there be end. And in Spirit Holy Lord, and life giver

who from Father and Son proceeds.

who from Father and Son proceeds.

who from Father and Son proceeds.

who from Father and Son proceeds.
dit. Qui cum Patre, et Fili o simul adoratur, et con-
Who with Father and Son together is adored and glorified,
glorificatur: qui locutus est per Prophets.
and glorified, who spoke through Prophets.
con-glorificatur: qui locutus est per Prophets.
glorified, who spoke through Prophets.
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am. Con-fi-te-or in re-mis-si-o-nem pec-ca-

am. Con-fi-te-or u-num bap-tis-ma in re-mis-si-o-nem pec-ca-

am. Con-fi-te-or for remission of sins.

Con-fi-te-or u-num bap-tis-ma for remission of sins.

Con-fi-te-or

I confess

For remission of sins.

Con-fi-te-or

I confess

For remission of sins.

To-rum. Et ex-pecto re-sur-rec-ti-o-nem, re-sur-rec-ti-

To-rum. Et ex-pecto re-sur-rec-ti-o-nem, re-sur-rec-ti-

To-rum. Et ex-pecto

And I expect resurrection,

To-rum. Et ex-pecto

And I expect resurrection,

To-rum. Et ex-pecto

And I expect resurrection,

To-rum. Et ex-pecto

And I expect resurrection,
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V o n e m m o r - t u - o r u m. E t v i - t a v e n - t u - r i,
of dead. And life to come,

r e c - t i - o - n e m m o r - t u - o - r u m. E t v i - t a m v e n - t u -
of dead. And life to come,

o - n e m m o r - t u - o - r u m. E t v i - t a m v e n - t u -
of dead. And life to come,

v e n - t u - r i s a e - c u - l i. A - m e n.
to come of age. Amen.

r i s a e - c u - l i. A - m e n.
of age. Amen.

r i, v e n - t u - r i s a e - c u - l i. A - m e n.
to come of age. Amen.

B.C.
Missa Audi Filia

Sanctus
Missa Audi Filia

Veni, Sancte Spiritus, veni aeterni Deus, veni Dei unum patris, veni Domine, veni Spiritus Sanctus, veni Domine Deus, veni Spiritus Sanctus.

Domine Deus, veni; veni Domine Deus, veni Spiritus Sanctus, veni Domine Deus, veni Spiritus Sanctus.

Veni, Sancte Spiritus, veni aeterni Deus, veni Dei unum patris, veni Domine, veni Spiritus Sanctus, veni Domine Deus, veni Spiritus Sanctus.

Veni, Sancte Spiritus, veni aeterni Deus, veni Dei unum patris, veni Domine, veni Spiritus Sanctus, veni Domine Deus, veni Spiritus Sanctus.
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\(J = \text{circa } 50\)

\(\text{tu-tu-a.} \quad \text{Hosanna in ex-cel-}
\)

\(\text{thy.}
\)

\(\text{a tu-a.} \quad \text{Hosanna in ex-}
\)

\(\text{thy.}
\)

\(\text{a, glo-ri-a tu-a.} \quad \text{Hosanna in}
\)

\(\text{thy.}
\)

\(\text{glo-ri-a tu-a.} \quad \text{Hosanna in highest,}
\)

\(\text{of glory}
\)

\(\text{sis, in ex-cel-sis.} \quad \text{Hosanna in}
\)

\(\text{in highest.}
\)

\(\text{cel-sis, in ex-cel-sis.} \quad \text{Hosanna in}
\)

\(\text{in highest.}
\)

\(\text{Ho-san-na in ex-cel-sis, in ex-cel-sis.} \quad \text{Hosanna in}
\)

\(\text{in highest, in highest.}
\)

\(\text{Ho-san-na in ex-cel-sis.} \quad \text{Hosanna in}
\)

\(\text{in highest.}
\)

\(\text{Ho-san-na in ex-cel-sis.} \quad \text{Hosanna in}
\)

\(\text{in highest.}
\)
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Agnus Dei

\( j = \text{circa} 42 \)

C

\[ \text{Agnus Dei, qui tollis pec-cta mun-di: misere-re, misere-re} \]

Lamb of God, who take away sins of world,

A

\[ \text{Agnus Dei, qui tollis pec-ca ta mun-di: misere-re, misere-re} \]

Lamb of God, who take away sins of world,

T

\[ \text{Agnus Dei, qui tollis pec-ca ta mun-di: misere-re, misere-re} \]

Lamb of God, who take away sins of world,

B

\[ \text{Agnus Dei, qui tollis pec-ca ta mun-di: misere-re, misere-re} \]

Lamb of God, who take away sins of world,

B.C.

\[ \text{Agnus Dei, qui tollis pec-ca ta mun-di: misere-re, misere-re} \]

Lamb of God, who take away sins of world,
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C

re, mi- se - re - re no - bis.

A

re - re no - bis, mi - se - re - re no - bis.

T

mi - se - re - re no - bis.

B

re - re, mi - se - re - re no - bis.

B.C.
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Ludovico Grossi da Viadana

from Missarum Quator Vocum cum Basso Continuo ad Organum

Part Books held in Marsh's Library, Dublin - Accessed 11 April 2014

Edited and transcribed into the Phrased Notation System by

Kevin O’Carroll
The Phrased Notation System (PNS) is a modified form of music notation which aims to guide non-specialist choirs towards improved performance of Renaissance polyphony. This is, therefore, designed to be a practical edition rather than a scholarly edition. This edition has used as its source a single publication, the 1625 Pierre Phalèse edition of Missarum Quatuor Vocum. Cum Basso Continuo ad Organum, Liber Primus. Item Missa pro Defunctis Clementis non Papae which was printed in Antwerp and is held by Marsh’s Library, Dublin. As Marsh’s hold the only complete surviving copy, its presentation here provides an opportunity for comparison of several of the masses contained therein with other sources of the same material. Two of the masses, Missa Audi Filia by Viadana and the mass by Gregorii Zuchini appear in no other publication and are therefore considered as important discoveries.

There are many elements to be considered when transcribing polyphonic Renaissance material from the original part books. An explanation of the approach taken to each of these elements is provided below.

**Accidentals** – Accidentals which appear in the original publication are retained. These accidentals are placed before the notes to which they refer, in accordance with modern convention. Courtesy accidentals are provided as appropriate and are shown in brackets over the note to which they refer. These accidentals may be necessary due to the cancellation of a preceding raised pitch, on foot of Musica Ficta or merely for clarification.

**Accompaniment** – Though a keyboard reduction is provided it is not necessarily suggested that the music should be accompanied (see Basso Continuo).

**Bar Lines** – In general, the original score does not use bar lines. Where bar lines do appear in the original, they are present within the choral parts in this edition. Bar lines are provided within the keyboard reduction score and are presented as an aid within rehearsal. These barlines do not imply additional accents as in modern convention.

**Basso Continuo** - A basso continuo [sic] is contained in the original publication. The part, is in reality a basso seguente in that it merely tracks the lowest vocal part at any given time. We are informed in Viadana’s writing that he included a ‘basso continuo’ to facilitate performance of his works when there were too few choristers or where a voice part was missing. It can be assumed that the basso continuo presented here should function in a similar manner.

**Dynamics** – The music is presented without obvious dynamic marks as no such marks exist in the original publication. However, dynamic variation should be inferred from:

1. The inclusion or exclusion of vocal lines
2. The meaning of the text
3. The nature of the musical writing
Providing detailed dynamic instruction for each individual vocal line would result in a cluttered, not to mention confusing, looking score. It is thought, therefore, that by providing information on the factors that influence dynamics singers will better able to take direct responsibility for dynamic variation.

**Grouping of Notes** – In an effort to ensure clear alignment and easy analysis of the geography of each line vis-a-vis the other choral lines, notes are grouped according to beats rather than the modern convention of syllabic separation.

**Metronome Marks** – Metronome marks (M.M) are provided at the start of each movement or when the meter changes. These M.M. values should be seen as indicators of an appropriate tempo and not necessarily slavishly followed. Where a change of meter is involved the M.M. establishes a relationship between the two meters. This relationship should be maintained even where the initial M.M. is not observed due to performance demands or personal interpretation.

**Note Values** – Note values have been halved from those in the original publication. Occasionally for the sake of clear vertical alignment note values have been further divided and a tie inserted to ensure that a note of the correct duration is sung.

**Phrase Marks** – Phrase marks are included as an essential part of the PNS system. The phrase mark indicates the musical phrases as appropriate for each individual voice part. The phrase marks are also indicative of appropriate breath points.

**Pitch** - No adjustment has been made regarding pitch has been made as the pitch presented in the original publication is within the range considered acceptable to modern choirs.

**Rehearsal Numbers** – Rehearsal numbers are provided on the Cantus/Soprano stave throughout. These rehearsal numbers coincide with the bar numbers as shown on the keyboard reduction score.

**Text Presentation** – The text is presented with modern capitalisation, spelling and punctuation as laid out in the Liber Usualis. Where the text underlay has not been completed or a simple indication of a repeat of text is shown in the original publication it is presented in italics in this edition.

**Text Pronunciation** – As an aid to pronunciation, stressed syllables are presented in **bold** type face. Observation of these stressed syllables is essential in promoting the micro meters contained within the music.

**Text Underlay** – Text underlay is generally well presented in the original publication. Where the original publication indicates that the text should be repeated, this repeated text has been printed in full with due regard to the rhythm of the music. Where text has been added editorially it appears in *italics*. Such additions only occur where the music strongly suggests that the omission of the text in the original publication was in error.

**Time Signatures** – Time signatures are not used in this edition as such signs are inappropriate for use with unmensured music. A digit 2 or 3 is inserted as an indicator of duple or triple meter as appropriate.
Translation – A literal translation is provided under each word as an aid to understanding not only the text but also the relationship between the text and the music. Such an understanding plays a vital role in the subtle dynamic variation and musical phrasing within the composition.

To the Conductor – Conductors should note that unlike standard modern music notation the tactus or beat should in general indicate a minim within duple sections. In the triple meter sections, the tactus should indicate the dotted minim. The relationship between duple and triple meters are an essential characteristic of Renaissance music and so careful attention should be paid to the metronome marks as the metre changes. Though allowance is made for variation in tempo due to acoustics or a variation in the size of the performing group it is essential that the proportional relationships indicated by the M.M changes are maintained between meters.

It should also be noted that the style of conducting should not be a didactic, heavily pointed beat but rather a gentler, less articulated one. Such a tactus will promote fewer ‘first beat in the bar’ type accents and encourage a more fluid line, as is appropriate.


Missa Cantabo Domino

   have mercy, Lord have mercy.

11. e - lei - son.
   have mercy.

12. e - lei - son.
   have mercy.

13. e - lei - son.
   have mercy.

14. e - lei - son.
   have mercy.

   have mercy, have mercy.

   have mercy, have mercy.

   have mercy.

   have mercy.

   have mercy.
Voleuntatis.

Laudamus thee. We praise thee. We bless thee. We adore thee.

B.C.

Missa Cantabo Domino
Missa Cantabo Domino

*C* This G corrects an erroneous A in the source.
Missa Cantabo Domino

Qui tol - lis pec - ca - ta mun - di, of Father.

Qui tol - lis pec - ca - ta mun - di, of Father.

Qui tol - lis pec - ca - ta mun - di, of Father.

Qui tol - lis pec - ca - ta mun - di, of Father.

Qui tol - lis pec - ca - ta mun - di, of Father.

Qui tol - lis pec - ca - ta mun - di, of Father.

Qui tol - lis pec - ca - ta mun - di, of Father.

Qui tol - lis pec - ca - ta mun - di, of Father.

Qui tol - lis pec - ca - ta mun - di, of Father.
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83

C
-

- di, su - sci - pe de - pre - ca - ti - o - nem no -
receive supposition

84

A
-

- mun - di, su - sci - pe de - pre - ca - ti - o - nem no -
receive supposition

85

T
-

- di, su - sci - pe de - pre - ca - ti - o - nem no -
receive supposition

86

B
-

- di, su - sci - pe de - pre - ca - ti - o - nem no -
receive supposition

B.C.

88

C
-

- stram. Qui se - des ad dex - te - ram Pa - tris, mi - se -
Who sit at right hand of Father, have mercy

89

A
-

- stram. Qui se - des ad dex - te - ram Pa - tris, mi - se -
Who sit at right hand of Father, have mercy

90

T
-

- stram. Qui se - des ad dex - te - ram Pa - tris, mi - se -
Who sit at right hand of Father, have mercy

91

B
-

- stram. Qui se - des ad dex - te - ram Pa - tris, mi - se -
Who sit at right hand of Father, have mercy

B.C.
Amen, in gloria Dei Patris. Amen.
li et ter rae, visibi li um omnium, et in vi-
li et ter rae, visibi li um omnium, et in vi-
li et ter rae, visibi li um omnium, et in vi-
li et ter rae, visibi li um omnium, et in vi-
li et ter rae, visibi li um omnium, et in vi-
li et ter rae, visibi li um omnium, et in vi-
i visibi li um. Et in unum Dominum Jesum Chri-
i visibi li um. Et in unum Dominum Jesum Chri-
i visibi li um. Et in unum Dominum Jesum Chri-
i visibi li um. Et in unum Dominum Jesum Chri-
i visibi li um. Et in unum Dominum Jesum Chri-
i visibi li um. Et in unum Dominum Jesum Chri-
Vatum, Filium Dei unigenitum. Et ex Patre nato, of God only begotten. And of Father born.
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lumen, Deus verum de Deo vero.

lumen, Deus verum de Deo vero. Geni-

lumen, Deus verum de Deo vero. Geni-

con-substantiam Patribus: per quem omni-

tum, non factum, per quem omni-

con-substantiam Patribus: per quem omni-

tum, non factum, per quem omni-

C

A

T

B

B.C.

C

A

T

B

B.C.
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\[ \begin{align*}
&\text{B.C.} \\
&\text{C} \\
&\text{A} \\
&\text{T} \\
&\text{B}
\end{align*} \]

\[ \begin{align*}
&\text{154} \\
&\text{155} \\
&\text{156} \\
&\text{157} \\
&\text{158}
\end{align*} \]

\[ \begin{align*}
a \quad &\text{made} \\
\text{et} &\text{and}
\end{align*} \]

\[ \begin{align*}
&\text{A} \\
&\text{T} \\
&\text{B}
\end{align*} \]

\[ \begin{align*}
&\text{154} \\
&\text{155} \\
&\text{156} \\
&\text{157} \\
&\text{158}
\end{align*} \]

\[ \begin{align*}
&\text{prop-ter nos homi-nes, et} \\
&\text{Qui} \\
&\text{for us men, and}
\end{align*} \]

\[ \begin{align*}
&\text{154} \\
&\text{155} \\
&\text{156} \\
&\text{157} \\
&\text{158}
\end{align*} \]

\[ \begin{align*}
&\text{prop-ter nos homi-nes,} \\
&\text{Qui} \\
&\text{for us men,}
\end{align*} \]

\[ \begin{align*}
&\text{154} \\
&\text{155} \\
&\text{156} \\
&\text{157} \\
&\text{158}
\end{align*} \]

\[ \begin{align*}
&\text{prop-ter nos homi-nes, et} \\
&\text{Qui} \\
&\text{for us men, and}
\end{align*} \]

\[ \begin{align*}
&\text{154} \\
&\text{155} \\
&\text{156} \\
&\text{157} \\
&\text{158}
\end{align*} \]

\[ \begin{align*}
&\text{prop-ter nos homi-nes,} \\
&\text{Qui} \\
&\text{for us men,}
\end{align*} \]

\[ \begin{align*}
&\text{154} \\
&\text{155} \\
&\text{156} \\
&\text{157} \\
&\text{158}
\end{align*} \]

\[ \begin{align*}
&\text{prop-ter nos homi-nes, et} \\
&\text{Qui} \\
&\text{for us men, and}
\end{align*} \]

\[ \begin{align*}
&\text{154} \\
&\text{155} \\
&\text{156} \\
&\text{157} \\
&\text{158}
\end{align*} \]

\[ \begin{align*}
&\text{prop-ter nos homi-nes,} \\
&\text{Qui} \\
&\text{for us men,}
\end{align*} \]
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no - bis sub Pon - ti - o Pi - la - to:

bis, pro no - bis sub Pon - ti - o Pi - la - to: pas - sus,

e - ti-am pro no - bis sub Pon - ti - o Pi - la - to: pas - sus,

died.

pas - sus, et se - pul - tus est. Et re - sur - rex - it, et re - sur - rex -

et se - pul - tus est. Et re - sur - rex - it, et re - sur - rex -
et se - pul - tus est. Et re - sur - rex - it, et re - sur - rex -

and buried was. And he rose, and he rose and buried was. And he rose, and he rose and buried was. And he rose, and he rose

Missus Cantabo Domino
Et ascendit in caelum: sedet ad dextram, ad dextram

And he ascended into heaven, he sits at right hand at right hand

B.

Missa Cantabo Domino
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C

dex - te - ram Pa - tris. Et i - te - rum ven - tu - rus est cum glo - ri-
right hand of Father. And again going to come he is with glory

A

Pa - tris. Et i - te - rum ven - tu - rus est cum glo - ri-
of Father. And again going to come he is with glory

T

Pa - tris. Et i - te - rum ven - tu - rus est cum glo - ri-
of Father. And again going to come he is with glory

B

Pa - tris.
of Father.

B.C.

a iu - di - ca - re vi - vos et mor - tu - os: cu - ius reg -
to judge living and dead; of whose kingdom

A

a iu - di - ca - re vi - vos et mor - tu - os: cu - ius reg -ni
to judge living and dead; of whose kingdom

T

a iu - di - ca - re vi - vos et mor - tu - os: cu - ius reg -
to judge living and dead; of whose kingdom

B

a iu - di - ca - re vi - vos et mor - tu - os: cu - ius reg -
to judge living and dead; of whose kingdom

B.C.
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C

\[J = \text{circa 50}\]

ni non e - rit fi - nis, non e - rit fi - nis. Et in

A

ni non e - rit fi - nis, non e - rit fi - nis. Et in

T

ni non e - rit fi - nis, non e - rit fi - nis. Et in

B

\(`J = \text{circa 50}\)`

B.C.

not will there be end, not will there be end. And in

not will there be end, not will there be end. And in

not will there be end, not will there be end. And in

not will there be end, not will there be end. And in

\(\text{C} = \text{circa 50}\)

Spiri - tum Sanctum Domi - num, et vi - vi - fi - can - tem: qui ex

A

Spi - ri - tum Sanctum Domi - num, et vi - vi - fi - can - tem: qui ex

T

Spi - ri - tum Sanctum Domi - num, et vi - vi - fi - can - tem: qui ex

B

Spi - ri - tum Sanctum Domi - num, et vi - vi - fi - can - tem: qui ex

B.C.

Spirit Holy Lord, and life giver who from

Spirit Holy Lord, and life giver who from

Spirit Holy Lord, and life giver who from

Spirit Holy Lord, and life giver who from

\(\text{C} = \text{circa 50}\)

\(\text{C} = \text{circa 50}\)

\(\text{C} = \text{circa 50}\)

\(\text{C} = \text{circa 50}\)

\(\text{C} = \text{circa 50}\)
Pa - tre, Fi - li - o - que pro - ce - dit.
Father, and Son proceeds.

Father, Fi - li - o - que pro - ce - dit. Qui cum Pa - tre, et
and proceeds. Who with Father and

Father, Fi - li - o - que pro - ce - dit. Qui cum Pa - tre, et
and proceeds. Who with Father and

Fi - li - o si - mul a - do - ra - tur, et con - glo - ri - fi -
together is adored and glorified,

Fi - li - o si - mul a - do - ra - tur, et con - glo - ri - fi -
together is adored and glorified,

Fi - li - o si - mul a - do - ra - tur, et con - glo - ri - fi -
together is adored and glorified,
Missa Cantabo Domino

catur: qui locutus est per Prophetas.
catur: qui locutus est per Prophetas.
catur: qui locutus est per Prophetas. Et

catur: qui locutus est per Prophetas. Et

et Apostolicam Ecclesiam. Confess

et Apostolicam Ecclesiam. Confess

u nam, sanctam, catholic

sanc tam, catholic

sanc tam, catholic

C 237 238 239 240 241 242

A 237 238 239 240 241 242

T 237 238 239 240 241 242

B 237 238 239 240 241 242

B.C. 237 238 239 240 241 242

C 243 244 245 246 247

A 243 244 245 246 247

T 243 244 245 246 247

B 243 244 245 246 247

B.C. 243 244 245 246 247
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C

\begin{align*}
\text{fite-or unum baptism} & \text{ma in remissi-o-nem pec-ca-toto} \\
\text{for remission of sins.}
\end{align*}

A

\begin{align*}
\text{fite-or unum baptism} & \text{ma in remissi-o-nem pec-c} \\
\text{for remission of sins.}
\end{align*}

T

\begin{align*}
\text{fite-or unum baptism} & \text{ma in remissi-o-nem pec-ca} \\
\text{for remission of sins.}
\end{align*}

B

\begin{align*}
\text{fite-or unum baptism} & \text{ma in remissi-o-nem pec-ca} \\
\text{for remission of sins.}
\end{align*}

B.C.

\begin{align*}
\text{fite-or unum baptism} & \text{ma in remissi-o-nem pec-ca} \\
\text{for remission of sins.}
\end{align*}

\begin{align*}
\text{-} & \text{rum. Et expec-to et expec-to resur-rec-ti-o-nem} \\
\text{Et expec-to resur-rec-ti-o-nem mor-tu-o-} & \text{to} \\
\text{Et expec-to resur-rec-ti-o-nem mor-tu-o-} & \text{to} \\
\text{Et expec-to resur-rec-ti-o-nem mor-tu-o-} & \text{to} \\
\text{Et expec-to resur-rec-ti-o-nem mor-tu-o-} & \text{to}
\end{align*}

\begin{align*}
\text{Et expec-to resur-rec-ti-o-nem mor-tu-o-} & \text{to} \\
\text{Et expec-to resur-rec-ti-o-nem mor-tu-o-} & \text{to} \\
\text{Et expec-to resur-rec-ti-o-nem mor-tu-o-} & \text{to}
\end{align*}

\begin{align*}
\text{Et expec-to resur-rec-ti-o-nem mor-tu-o-} & \text{to} \\
\text{Et expec-to resur-rec-ti-o-nem mor-tu-o-} & \text{to}
\end{align*}
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mor-tu-o-rum. Et vi-tam ven-tu-ri sae-cu-li, ven-tu-ri sae-

rum. Et vi-tam ven-tu-ri sae-cu-li, Et vi-tam ven-tu-ri sae-

rum.

And life to come of age. And life to come of age.

Et vi-tam ven-tu-ri sae-cu-li, Et vi-tam ven-tu-ri sae-

rum.

And life to come of age. And life to come of age.

Et vi-tam ven-tu-ri, ven-tu-ri sae-

rum.

Et vi-tam ven-tu-ri, ven-tu-ri sae-

rum.

Amen.
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Sanctus

\( d = \text{circa } 50 \)

\( \sum_2 \)

Sanctus, Sanctus, Sanctus, Sanctus

Sanctus, Sanctus, Sanctus, Sanctus

Sanctus, Sanctus, Sanctus, Sanctus

Sanctus, Sanctus, Sanctus, Sanctus
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281

ctus Do - mi - nus De - us Sa - ba - oth, Do - mi - nus De - us Sa -

A

ctus Do - mi - nus De - us Sa - ba - oth, Do - mi - nus De - us

T

ctus Do - mi - nus De - us Sa - ba - oth, Do - mi - nus De - us

B

ctus

B.C.

281

- ba - oth. Ple - ni sunt cae - li et ter - ra glo - ri - a

A

- ba - oth. Ple - ni sunt cae - li et ter - ra glo - ri - a

T

- ba - oth. Ple - ni sunt cae - li et ter - ra glo - ri - a

B

- ba - oth. Ple - ni sunt cae - li et ter - ra glo - ri - a

B.C.
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291

292

293

294

295

296

297

298

299

300

301

thy, glo - ri - a thy.

thy, glo - ri - a thy.

thy, glo - ri - a thy.

thy, glo - ri - a thy.

thy, glo - ri - a thy.

thy, glo - ri - a thy.

thy, glo - ri - a thy.

thy, glo - ri - a thy.

thy, glo - ri - a thy.

thy, glo - ri - a thy.

thy, glo - ri - a thy.

thy, glo - ri - a thy.

thy, glo - ri - a thy.

thy, glo - ri - a thy.

thy, glo - ri - a thy.

thy, glo - ri - a thy.

thy, glo - ri - a thy.

thy, glo - ri - a thy.

thy, glo - ri - a thy.

thy, glo - ri - a thy.

thy, glo - ri - a thy.

thy, glo - ri - a thy.

thy, glo - ri - a thy.

thy, glo - ri - a thy.

thy, glo - ri - a thy.

thy, glo - ri - a thy.

thy, glo - ri - a thy.

thy, glo - ri - a thy.

thy, glo - ri - a thy.

thy, glo - ri - a thy.

thy, glo - ri - a thy.

thy, glo - ri - a thy.

thy, glo - ri - a thy.
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\[ \text{Agnus Dei} \]

\[ j = \text{circa 42} \]
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\[\text{ag - nus De - i, ag - nus De - i, qui tol -} \]

\[\text{Lamb of God, Lamb of God, who take away} \]

\[\text{i, ag - nus De - i, qui tol - lis pec-ca - ta mun - di,} \]

\[\text{Lamb of God, who take away sins of world,} \]

\[\text{i, qui tol - lis pec-ca -} \]

\[\text{qui tol - lis pec-ca -} \]

\[\text{lis pec-ca - ta mun - di, qui tol - lis pec-ca - ta mun - di:} \]

\[\text{of world, who take away sins of world,} \]

\[\text{qui tol - lis pec-ca - ta, pec-ca - ta mun -} \]

\[\text{who take away sins of world,} \]

\[\text{ta mun - di, qui tol - lis pec-ca - ta mun -} \]

\[\text{ca - ta mun - di, qui tol - lis pec-ca - ta mun -} \]

\[\text{of world, who take away sins of world,} \]

\[\text{ca - ta mun - di, qui tol - lis pec-ca - ta mun -} \]

\[\text{of world, who take away sins of world,} \]
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346 - 350

C

A

T

B

B.C.

351 - 355

C

A

T

B

B.C.

mi-se-re-re

have mercy

on us,

mi-se-re-re

have mercy

di: mi-se-re-re

have mercy

on us,

mi-se-re-re

have mercy

mi-se-re-re

on us,

mi-se-re-re

on us,

mi-se-re-re

no-bis,

mi-se-re-re

no-bis,

mi-se-re-re

no-bis,

mi-se-re-re

no-bis.

mi-se-re-re

no-bis.

mi-se-re-re

no-bis.

mi-se-re-re

no-bis.

mi-se-re-re

no-bis.

mi-se-re-re

no-bis.

mi-se-re-re

no-bis.

mi-se-re-re

no-bis.

mi-se-re-re

no-bis.

mi-se-re-re

no-bis.

mi-se-re-re

no-bis.

mi-se-re-re

no-bis.

mi-se-re-re

no-bis.

mi-se-re-re

no-bis.

mi-se-re-re

no-bis.

mi-se-re-re

no-bis.

mi-se-re-re

no-bis.

mi-se-re-re

no-bis.

mi-se-re-re

no-bis.

mi-se-re-re

no-bis.

mi-se-re-re

no-bis.
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Ludovico Grossi da Viadana

from Missarum Quator Vocum cum Basso Continuo ad Organum
Part Books held in Marsh's Library, Dublin - Accessed 11 April 2014

Edited and transcribed into the Phrased Notation System by

Kevin O’Carroll
The Phrased Notation System (PNS) is a modified form of music notation which aims to
guide non-specialist choirs towards improved performance of Renaissance polyphony. This
is, therefore, designed to be a practical edition rather than a scholarly edition. This edition
has used as its source a single publication, the 1625 Pierre Phalèse edition of *Missarum
Quatuor Vocum. Cum Basso Continuo ad Organum. Liber Primus. Item Missa pro Defunctis
Clementis non Papae* which was printed in Antwerp and is held by Marsh’s Library, Dublin.
As Marsh’s holds the only complete surviving copy, its presentation here provides an
opportunity for comparison of several of the masses contained therein with other sources of
the same material. Two of the masses, *Missa Audi Filia* by Viadana and the mass by
Gregorii Zuchini appear in no other publication and are therefore considered as important
discoveries.

There are many elements to be considered when transcribing polyphonic Renaissance
material from the original part books. An explanation of the approach taken to each of these
elements is provided below.

**Accidentals** – Accidentals which appear in the original publication are retained. These
accidentals are placed before the notes to which they refer, in accordance with modern
convention. Courtesy accidentals are provided as appropriate and are shown in brackets over
the note to which they refer. These accidentals may be necessary due to the cancellation of a
preceding raised pitch, on foot of *Musica Ficta* or merely for clarification. **Accompaniment**
– Though a keyboard reduction is provided it is not necessarily suggested that the music
should be accompanied (see Basso Continuo).

**Bar Lines** – In general, the original score does not use bar lines. Where bar lines do appear
in the original, they are present within the choral parts in this edition. Bar lines are provided
within the keyboard reduction score and are presented as an aid within rehearsal. These
barlines do not imply additional accents as in modern convention.

**Basso Continuo** - A basso continuo [sic] is contained in the original publication. The part, is
in reality a basso seguente in that it merely tracks the lowest vocal part at any given time. We
are informed in Viadana’s writing that he included a ‘basso continuo’ to facilitate
performance of his works when there were too few choristers or where a voice part was
missing. It can be assumed that the basso continuo presented here should function in a
similar manner.

**Dynamics** – The music is presented without obvious dynamic marks as no such marks exist
in the original publication. However, dynamic variation should be inferred from:

1. The inclusion or exclusion of vocal lines
2. The meaning of the text
3. The nature of the musical writing
Providing detailed dynamic instruction for each individual vocal line would result in a cluttered, not to mention confusing, looking score. It is thought, therefore, that by providing information on the factors that influence dynamics singers will be better able to take direct responsibility for dynamic variation.

**Grouping of Notes** – In an effort to ensure clear alignment and easy analysis of the geography of each line vis-a-vis the other choral lines, notes are grouped according to beats rather than the modern convention of syllabic separation.

**Metronome Marks** – Metronome marks (M.M) are provided at the start of each movement or when the meter changes. These M.M. values should be seen as indicators of an appropriate tempo and not necessarily slavishly followed. Where a change of meter is involved the M.M. establishes a relationship between the two meters. This relationship should be maintained even where the initial M.M. is not observed due to performance demands or personal interpretation.

**Note Values** – Note values have been halved from those in the original publication. Occasionally for the sake of clear vertical alignment note values have been further divided and a tie inserted to ensure that a note of the correct duration is sung.

**Phrase Marks** – Phrase marks are included as an essential part of the PNS system. The phrase mark indicates the musical phrases as appropriate for each individual voice part. The phrase marks are also indicative of appropriate breath points.

**Pitch** - No adjustment has been made regarding pitch as the pitch presented in the original publication is within the range considered acceptable to modern choirs.

**Rehearsal Numbers** – Rehearsal numbers are provided on the Cantus/Soprano stave throughout. These rehearsal numbers coincide with the bar numbers as shown on the keyboard reduction score.

**Text Presentation** – The text is presented with modern capitalisation, spelling and punctuation as laid out in the Liber Usualis. Where the text underlay has not been completed or a simple indication of a repeat of text is shown in the original publication it is presented in *italics* in this edition.

**Text Pronunciation** – As an aid to pronunciation, stressed syllables are presented in **bold** type face. Observation of these stressed syllables is essential in promoting the micro meters contained within the music.

**Text Underlay** – Text underlay is generally well presented in the original publication. Where the original publication indicates that the text should be repeated this repeated text has been printed in full with due regard to the rhythm of the music. Where text has been added editorially it appears in *italics*. Such additions only occur where the music strongly suggests that the omission of the text in the original publication was in error.

**Time Signatures** – Time signatures are not used in this edition as such signs are inappropriate for use with unmensured music. A digit 2 or 3 is inserted as an indicator of duple or triple meter as appropriate.

**Translation** – A literal translation is provided under each word as an aid to understanding not only the text but also the relationship between the text and the music. Such an
understanding plays a vital role in the subtle dynamic variation and musical phrasing within the composition.

**To the Conductor** – Conductors should note that unlike standard modern music notation the tactus or beat should in general indicate a minim within duple sections. In the triple meter sections, the tactus should indicate the dotted minim. The relationship between duple and triple meters are an essential characteristic of Renaissance music and so careful attention should be paid to the metronome marks as the metre changes. Though allowance is made for variation in tempo due to acoustics or a variation in the size of the performing group it is essential that the proportional relationships indicated by the M.M changes are maintained between meters.

It should also be noted that the style of conducting should not be a didactic, heavily pointed beat but rather a gentler, less articulated one. Such a tactus will promote fewer ‘first beat in the bar’ type accents and encourage a more fluid line, as is appropriate.
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Kyrie

Ludovico Viadana

\( \text{Cantus} \)

\( \text{Alto} \)

\( \text{Tenor} \)

\( \text{Bass} \)

\( \text{For \ rehearsal \ only} \)

\( \text{Basso Continuo} \)
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Gloria

Et in ter-ra pax ho-mi-ni-bus bo-nae vo-lun-ta-tis.
And on earth peace to men of good will.

We bless thee.
We glorify thee. Thanks

We adore thee.
Thanks

Gloria
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- ti-as a-gi-mus ti-bi prop-ter ma-gnam glo-ri-am tu-am. Do-

- ti-as a-gi-mus ti-bi prop-ter ma-nam glo-ri-am tu-am. Do-

- ti-as a-gi-mus ti-bi prop-ter ma-gnam glo-ri-am tu-am. Do-

- ti-as a-gi-mus ti-bi prop-ter ma-nam glo-ri-am tu-am. Do-

- mi-ne De-us, Rex cae-le-stis, De-us Pa-ter om-ni-po-

- mi-ne De-us, Rex cae-le-stis, De-us Pa-ter om-ni-po-

- mi-ne De-us, Rex cae-le-stis, De-us Pa-ter om-ni-po-

- mi-ne De-us, Rex cae-le-stis, De-us Pa-ter om-ni-po-
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41 tens. Do mi-ne Fi-li u-ni-ge - ni-te, le-su
Lord Son only begotten, Jesus

42 Lord Son only begotten, Jesus

43 Do mi-ne Fi-li u-ni-ge - ni-te, le-su

44 Lord Son only begotten, Jesus

45 le-su Chi

B.C.

46 Chri-ste.
Christ

47 Chri-ste.
Christ

48 A - gnus De - i,
Lamb of God, Lamb of God,

49 De - i,
De - i,

50 De - i,
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\(\text{C}\)  
\(\text{Filius Patris. Son of Father.} \)
\(\text{Qui tolouis pecata mun}\)

\(\text{A}\)  
\(\text{Filius Patris. Son of Father.} \)
\(\text{Qui tolouis pecata mun}\)

\(\text{T}\)  
\(\text{Filius Patris. Son of Father.} \)
\(\text{Qui tolouis pecata mun}\)

\(\text{B}\)  
\(\text{Filius Patris. Son of Father.} \)
\(\text{Qui tolouis pecata mun}\)

\(\text{B.C.}\)  
\(\text{Filius Patris. Son of Father.} \)
\(\text{Qui tolouis pecata mun}\)

\(\text{di, misere no-bis. Qui tolouis pecata mun-di, su}\)

\(\text{A}\)  
\(\text{di, misere no-bis. Qui tolouis pecata mun-di, su}\)

\(\text{T}\)  
\(\text{di, misere no-bis. Qui tolouis pecata mun-di, su}\)

\(\text{B}\)  
\(\text{di, misere no-bis. Qui tolouis pecata mun-di, su}\)

\(\text{B.C.}\)  
\(\text{di, misere no-bis. Qui tolouis pecata mun-di, su}\)

\(\text{\(\text{j = circa 52}\)}\)
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\( \text{C} \)

\( \text{A} \)

\( \text{T} \)

\( \text{B} \)

\( \text{B.C.} \)

\( \text{tris, misere-re nobis. Quo-ni-am tu so-lus sanct-us. Tu} \)

\( \text{tris, misere-re nobis. Quo-ni-am tu so-lus sanct-us. Tu} \)

\( \text{tris, misere-re nobis. Quo-ni-am tu so-lus sanct-us. Tu} \)

\( \text{tris, misere-re nobis. Quo-ni-am tu so-lus sanct-us. Tu} \)
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C

\( \text{so - lus Do - mi-nus.} \)
\( \text{Tu so - lus Al - tis - si-mus, le - su} \)

A

\( \text{so - lus Do - mi-nus.} \)
\( \text{Tu so - lus Al - tis - si-mus, le - su} \)

T

\( \text{Tu so - lus Al - tis - si-mus, le - su} \)

B

\( \text{Tu so - lus Al - tis - si-mus, le - su} \)

B.C.

\( \text{Tu so - lus Al - tis - si-mus, le - su} \)

---

C

\( \text{Chri - ste. Cum Sanc-to Spi - ri-tu, in glo - ri-a De - i} \)

A

\( \text{Chri - ste. Cum Sanc-to Spi - ri-tu, in glo - ri-a} \)

T

\( \text{Chri - ste. Cum Sanc-to Spi - ri-tu, in} \)

B

\( \text{Chri - ste. Cum Sanc-to} \)

B.C.

\( \text{Chri - ste. Cum Sanc-to} \)
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C

\[ \text{Patris, in gloria Dei Patris. Amen.} \]

A

\[ \text{a, in gloria Dei Patris. Amen.} \]

T

\[ \text{gloria, in gloria Dei Patris. Amen.} \]

B

\[ \text{Spiritu, in gloria Dei Patris. Amen.} \]

B.C.

\[ \text{Credo} \]

\[ \text{Patrem omnipotentem, fac torem caelestem,} \]

C

\[ \text{Father, almighty, maker of heaven} \]

A

\[ \text{Patrem omnipotentem, fac torem caelestem} \]

T

\[ \text{Patrem omnipotentem, fac torem caelestem} \]

B

\[ \text{Patrem omnipotentem, fac torem caelestem} \]

B.C.

\[ \text{Credo} \]

\[ \text{Father, almighty, maker of heaven} \]
et terae, visibi- li-ui m ни в и m и и visible of all things, and invisible.

li et terae, visibi- li-ui m ни в и m и и visible of all things, and invisible.

li et terae, visibi- li-ui m ни в и m и и visible of all things, and invisible.

li et terae, visibi- li-ui m ни в и m и и visible of all things, and invisible.

li et terae, visibi- li-ui m ни в и m и и visible of all things, and invisible.

li et terae, visibi- li-ui m ни в и m и и visible of all things, and invisible.

li et terae, visibi- li-ui m ни в и m и и visible of all things, and invisible.

li et terae, visibi- li-ui m ни в и m и и visible of all things, and invisible.

li et terae, visibi- li-ui m ни в и m и и visible of all things, and invisible.

li et terae, visibi- li-ui m ни в и m и и visible of all things, and invisible.

li et terae, visibi- li-ui m ни в и m и и visible of all things, and invisible.

li et terae, visibi- li-ui m ни в и m и и visible of all things, and invisible.

li et terae, visibi- li-ui m ни в и m и и visible of all things, and invisible.

li et terae, visibi- li-ui m ни в и m и и visible of all things, and invisible.

li et terae, visibi- li-ui m ни в и m и и visible of all things, and invisible.

li et terae, visibi- li-ui m ни в и m и и visible of all things, and invisible.

li et terae, visibi- li-ui m ни в и m и и visible of all things, and invisible.

vi-si- bi-li-ui m

in-visible.

vi-si- bi-li-ui m

in-visible.

vi-si- bi-li-ui m

in-visible.

vi-si- bi-li-ui m

in-visible.

vi-si- bi-li-ui m

in-visible.

vi-si- bi-li-ui m

in-visible.

vi-si- bi-li-ui m

in-visible.

vi-si- bi-li-ui m

in-visible.

vi-si- bi-li-ui m

in-visible.

vi-si- bi-li-ui m

in-visible.

vi-si- bi-li-ui m

in-visible.

vi-si- bi-li-ui m

in-visible.

vi-si- bi-li-ui m

in-visible.

vi-si- bi-li-ui m

in-visible.

vi-si- bi-li-ui m

in-visible.

vi-si- bi-li-ui m

in-visible.

vi-si- bi-li-ui m

in-visible.

vi-si- bi-li-ui m

in-visible.

vi-si- bi-li-ui m

in-visible.

vi-si- bi-li-ui m

in-visible.

vi-si- bi-li-ui m

in-visible.

vi-si- bi-li-ui m

in-visible.

vi-si- bi-li-ui m

in-visible.

vi-si- bi-li-ui m

in-visible.

vi-si- bi-li-ui m

in-visible.

vi-si- bi-li-ui m

in-visible.

vi-si- bi-li-ui m

in-visible.

vi-si- bi-li-ui m

in-visible.

vi-si- bi-li-ui m

in-visible.

vi-si- bi-li-ui m

in-visible.

vi-si- bi-li-ui m

in-visible.

vi-si- bi-li-ui m

in-visible.

vi-si- bi-li-ui m

in-visible.

vi-si- bi-li-ui m

in-visible.

vi-si- bi-li-ui m

in-visible.

vi-si- bi-li-ui m

in-visible.

vi-si- bi-li-ui m

in-visible.

vi-si- bi-li-ui m

in-visible.

vi-si- bi-li-ui m

in-visible.

vi-si- bi-li-ui m

in-visible.

vi-si- bi-li-ui m

in-visible.

vi-si- bi-li-ui m

in-visible.

vi-si- bi-li-ui m

in-visible.

vi-si- bi-li-ui m

in-visible.

vi-si- bi-li-ui m

in-visible.

vi-si- bi-li-ui m

in-visible.

vi-si- bi-li-ui m

in-visible.

vi-si- bi-li-ui m

in-visible.

vi-si- bi-li-ui m

in-visible.

vi-si- bi-li-ui m

in-visible.

vi-si- bi-li-ui m

in-visible.

vi-si- bi-li-ui m

in-visible.

vi-si- bi-li-ui m

in-visible.

vi-si- bi-li-ui m

in-visible.

vi-si- bi-li-ui m

in-visible.

vi-si- bi-li-ui m

in-visible.

vi-si- bi-li-ui m

in-visible.

vi-si- bi-li-ui m

in-visible.

vi-si- bi-li-ui m

in-visible.

vi-si- bi-li-ui m

in-visible.

vi-si- bi-li-ui m

in-visible.

vi-si- bi-li-ui m

in-visible.

vi-si- bi-li-ui m

in-visible.

vi-si- bi-li-ui m

in-visible.

vi-si- bi-li-ui m

in-visible.

vi-si- bi-li-ui m

in-visible.

vi-si- bi-li-ui m

in-visible.

vi-si- bi-li-ui m

in-visible.

vi-si- bi-li-ui m

in-visible.

vi-si- bi-li-ui m

in-visible.

vi-si- bi-li-ui m

in-visible.

vi-si- bi-li-ui m

in-visible.

vi-si- bi-li-ui m

in-visible.

vi-si- bi-li-ui m

in-visible.

vi-si- bi-li-ui m

in-visible.

vi-si- bi-li-ui m

in-visible.

vi-si- bi-li-ui m

in-visible.

vi-si- bi-li-ui m

in-visible.

vi-si- bi-li-ui m

in-visible.

vi-si- bi-li-ui m

in-visible.

vi-si- bi-li-ui m

in-visible.

vi-si- bi-li-ui m

in-visible.

vi-si- bi-li-ui m

in-visible.
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C

stum, Fili-um De-i u-ni ge-ni-tum. Et ex Pa-bre

A

stum, Fili-um De-i u-ni ge-ni-tum. Et ex Pa-bre

T

stum,

B

stum,

B.C.

stum,

C

na-tum an-te om-ni-a sae-cu-la. De-um de De-o, lu-men de

A

na-tum an-te om-ni-a sae-cu-la. De-um de De-o, lu-men de

T

na-tum an-te om-ni-a sae-cu-la.

B
	nat-an-te om-ni-a sae-cu-la. De-um de De-o, lu-men de

B.C.

na-tum an-te om-ni-a sae-cu-la. De-um de De-o, lu-men de
Missa L'Hora Passa

light, God true

light, God true

made, of one substance

made, of one substance

made, of one substance
Missa L'Hora Passa

\[\text{prop-ter nos homi-nes, et prop-ter nostram salu-tem de-}\]

\[\text{for us men, and for our salvation descended}\]

\[\text{prop-ter nos homi-nes, et prop-ter nostram salu-tem}\]

\[\text{for us men, and for our salvation}\]

\[\text{prop-ter nos homi-nes, et prop-ter nostram salu-tem de-}\]

\[\text{for us men, and for our salvation descended}\]

\[\text{prop-ter nos homi-nes, et prop-ter nostram salu-tem}\]

\[\text{for us men, and for our salvation}\]

\[\text{prop-ter nos homi-nes, et prop-ter nostram salu-tem de-}\]

\[\text{for us men, and for our salvation descended}\]

\[\text{scen-dit de cae-lis. Et in-car-na-tus est}\]

\[\text{from heavens. And was}\]

\[\text{de-scen-dit de cae-lis. Et in-car-na-tus est de}\]

\[\text{descended from heavens. And was of}\]

\[\text{scen-dit de cae-lis. Et in-car-na-tus est}\]

\[\text{from heavens. And was}\]

\[\text{scen-dit de cae-lis. Et in-car-na-tus est}\]

\[\text{from heavens. And was}\]
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131

de Spiritu Sancto ex Maria Virgi-ne.

132

of Spirit Holy of Mary Virgin.

133

of Spirit Holy of Mary Virgin.

134

of Spirit Holy of Mary Virgin.

135

of Spirit Holy of Mary Virgin.

136

ET HOMO FACTUS EST.

137

And man was.

138

And man was.

139

And man was.
Cru - ci - fix - us e - ti - am pro no - bis sub Pon - ti - o Pi - laten: pas - sus, et se - pul - tus est. Et re - sur - rex - us.

Miss L'Hora Passa
it tertii die, secundum Scripturas. Et ascendit ter
terti ad die, secundum Scripturas. Et ascendit ter
it tertii die, secundum Scripturas. Et ascendit ter
it tertii die, secundum Scripturas. Et ascendit ter
it tertii die, secundum Scripturas. Et ascendit ter

dit in caelum: sedet ad dexteram Patris. Et ite
dit in caelum: sedet ad dexteram Patris. Et ite
dit in caelum: sedet ad dexteram Patris. Et ite
dit in caelum: sedet ad dexteram Patris. Et ite

B.C.
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rum ven-turus est cum glori-a iu-di-ca-re vi-vos et mor-tu-

os: cu-ius reg-ni non e-rit fi-nis, non e-rit

B.C.
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- nis. Et in Spi-ri-tum Sanc-tum Do-mi-num, et vi-vi-fi-can-
end. Et in Spi-ri-tum Sanc-tum Do-mi-num, et vi-vi-fi-can-
fi-nis. Et in Spi-ri-tum Sanc-tum Do-mi-num, et vi-vi-fi-can-
end. Et in Spi-ri-tum Sanc-tum Do-mi-num, et vi-vi-fi-can-

Qui cum Pa-tre, et Qui cum Pa-

tem:

tem:
Qui ex Pa-tre, Fi-li-o-que pro-ce-dit.

qui ex Pa-tre, Fi-li-o-que pro-ce-dit.
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or one baptism for remission of sins. And I expect

I confess

I expect
pec - to re - sur-rec-ti-onem mor-tu-o-rum. Et vi - tam ven-tu-ri sae-cu-lii,

resurrection of dead. And life to come of age,

pec - to re - sur-rec-ti-onem mor-tu-o-rum. Et vi - tam ven-tu-ri sae-

resurrection of dead. And life to come of age,

pec - to re - sur-rec-ti-onem mor-tu-o-rum. Et vi - tam ven-tu-ri

of age,

Amen, Amen.

of age, Amen, Amen.
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C

Ple - ni sunt cae - li et ter - ra glo - ri - a tu - a. Ho -

A

Ple - ni sunt cae - li et ter - ra glo - ri - a tu - a. Ho -

T


B


B.C.

oth. Full are heaven and earth of glory thy. Hosanna.

oth. Full are heaven and earth of glory thy. Hosanna.

oth. Full are heaven and earth of glory thy. Hosanna.

oth. Full are heaven and earth of glory thy. Hosanna.

C

san - na in ex - cel - sis. Be - ne - di - tus qui

A

san - na in ex - cel - sis. Be - ne - di - tus qui

T

san - na in ex - cel - sis. Be - ne - di - tus qui

B

san - na in ex - cel - sis. Be - ne - di - tus qui

B.C.

san - na in ex - cel - sis. Be - ne - di - tus qui

Hosanna in highest. Blessed qui is who.

Hosanna in highest. Blessed qui is who.

Hosanna in highest. Blessed qui is who.

Hosanna in highest. Blessed qui is who.
Agnus Dei

who take away, sins

who take away, sins

who take away, sins

have mercy

have mercy

have mercy

have mercy
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\[ \text{C, A, T, B} \]

\[ \text{254, 255, 256, 257, 258, 259} \]

\[ \text{re - re no - bis, mi - se - re - re no - bis.} \]

\[ \text{on us, have mercy on us.} \]

\[ \text{se - re - re no - bis, mi - se - re - re no - bis.} \]

\[ \text{on us, have mercy on us.} \]

\[ \text{re - re no-bis, mi - se-re-re no-bis, mi - se-re-re no-bis.} \]

\[ \text{on us, have mercy on us, have mercy on us.} \]

\[ \text{re - re no-bis, mi - se - re - re no-bis.} \]

\[ \text{on us, have mercy on us.} \]
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Ludovico Grossi da Viadana

from Missarum Quator Vocum cum Basso Continuo ad Organum

Part Books held in Marsh's Library, Dublin - Accessed 11 April 2014

Edited and transcribed into the Phrased Notation System by

Kevin O’Carroll
The Phrased Notation System (PNS) is a modified form of music notation which aims to guide non-specialist choirs towards improved performance of Renaissance polyphony. This is, therefore, designed to be a practical edition rather than a scholarly edition. This edition has used as its source a single publication, the 1625 Pierre Phalèse edition of *Missarum Quatuor Vocum. Cum Basso Continuo ad Organum, Liber Primus*. *Item Missa pro Defunctis Clementis non Papae* which was printed in Antwerp and is held by Marsh’s Library, Dublin. As Marsh’s hold the only complete surviving copy, its presentation here provides an opportunity for comparison of several of the masses contained therein with other sources of the same material. Two of the masses, *Missa Audi Filia* by Viadana and the mass by Gregorii Zuchini appear in no other publication and are therefore considered as important discoveries.

There are many elements to be considered when transcribing polyphonic Renaissance material from the original part books. An explanation of the approach taken to each of these elements is provided below.

**Accidentals** – Accidentals which appear in the original publication are retained. These accidentals are placed before the notes to which they refer, in accordance with modern convention. Courtesy accidentals are provided as appropriate and are shown in brackets over the note to which they refer. These accidentals may be necessary due to the cancellation of a preceding raised pitch, on foot of *Musica Ficta* or merely for clarification.

**Accompaniment** – Though a keyboard reduction is provided it is not necessarily suggested that the music should be accompanied (see Basso Continuo).

**Bar Lines** – In general, the original score does not use bar lines. Where bar lines do appear in the original, they are present within the choral parts in this edition. Bar lines are provided within the keyboard reduction score and are presented as an aid within rehearsal. These barlines do not imply additional accents as in modern convention.

**Basso Continuo** - A basso continuo [sic] is contained in the original publication. The part, is in reality a basso seguente in that it merely tracks the lowest vocal part at any given time. We are informed in Viadana’s writing that he included a ‘basso continuo’ to facilitate performance of his works when there were too few choristers or where a voice part was missing. It can be assumed that the basso continuo presented here should function in a similar manner.

**Dynamics** – The music is presented without obvious dynamic marks as no such marks exist in the original publication. However, dynamic variation should be inferred from:

1. The inclusion or exclusion of vocal lines
2. The meaning of the text
3. The nature of the musical writing
Providing detailed dynamic instruction for each individual vocal line would result in a cluttered, not to mention confusing, looking score. It is thought, therefore, that by providing information on the factors that influence dynamics, singers will better able to take direct responsibility for dynamic variation.

**Grouping of Notes** – In an effort to ensure clear alignment and easy analysis of the geography of each line vis-a-vis the other choral lines, notes are grouped according to beats rather than the modern convention of syllabic separation.

**Metronome Marks** – Metronome marks (M.M) are provided at the start of each movement or when the meter changes. These M.M. values should be seen as indicators of an appropriate tempo and not necessarily slavishly followed. Where a change of meter is involved the M.M. establishes a relationship between the two meters. This relationship should be maintained even where the initial M.M. is not observed due to performance demands or personal interpretation.

**Note Values** – Note values have been halved from those in the original publication. Occasionally for the sake of clear vertical alignment note values have been further divided and a tie inserted to ensure that a note of the correct duration is sung.

**Phrase Marks** – Phrase marks are included as an essential part of the PNS system. The phrase mark indicates the musical phrases as appropriate for each individual voice part. The phrase marks are also indicative of appropriate breath points.

**Pitch** - No adjustment has been made regarding pitch as the pitch presented in the original publication is within the range considered acceptable to modern choirs.

**Rehearsal Numbers** – Rehearsal numbers are provided on the Cantus/Soprano stave throughout. These rehearsal numbers coincide with the bar numbers as shown on the keyboard reduction score.

**Text Presentation** – The text is presented with modern capitalisation, spelling and punctuation as laid out in the Liber Usualis. Where the text underlay has not been completed or a simple indication of a repeat of text is shown in the original publication it is presented in *italics* in this edition.

**Text Pronunciation** – As an aid to pronunciation, stressed syllables are presented in **bold** type face. Observation of these stressed syllables is essential in promoting the micro meters contained within the music.

**Text Underlay** – Text underlay is generally well presented in the original publication. Where the original publication indicates that the text should be repeated this repeated text has been printed in full with due regard to the rhythm of the music. Where text has been added editorially it appears in *italics*. Such additions only occur where the music strongly suggests that the omission of the text in the original publication was in error.

**Time Signatures** – Time signatures are not used in this edition as such signs are inappropriate for use with unmensured music. A digit 2 or 3 is inserted as an indicator of duple or triple meter as appropriate.
Translation – A literal translation is provided under each word as an aid to understanding not only the text but also the relationship between the text and the music. Such an understanding plays a vital role in the subtle dynamic variation and musical phrasing within the composition.

To the Conductor – Conductors should note that unlike standard modern music notation the tactus or beat should in general indicate a minim within duple sections. In the triple meter sections, the tactus should indicate the dotted minim. The relationship between duple and triple meters are an essential characteristic of Renaissance music and so careful attention should be paid to the metronome marks as the metre changes. Though allowance is made for variation in tempo due to acoustics or a variation in the size of the performing group it is essential that the proportional relationships indicated by the M.M changes are maintained between meters.

It should also be noted that the style of conducting should not be a didactic, heavily pointed beat but rather a gentler, less articulated one. Such a tactus will promote fewer ‘first beat in the bar’ type accents and encourage a more fluid line, as is appropriate.
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Kyrie

Ludovico Grossi da Viadana

\[ \begin{array}{c}
\text{Cantus} \\
\text{Altus} \\
\text{Tenor} \\
\text{Bass} \\
\text{For rehearsal only} \\
\text{Basso Continuo}
\end{array} \]

\[ \begin{align*}
\text{Kyrieelee} & \quad \text{Lord have mercy,} \\
\text{Kyrieelee} & \quad \text{Lord have mercy} \\
\text{Kyrieelee} & \quad \text{Lord have mercy} \\
\text{Kyrieelee} & \quad \text{Lord have mercy}
\end{align*} \]
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A - do - ra - mus te. Glo - ri - fi - ca - mus te. Gra - ti - as a -

We worship thee. We glorify thee. Thanks we give

tе. Ad - o - ra - mus te. Glo - ri - fi - ca - mus te. Gra - ti - as a -

We worship thee. We glorify thee. Thanks we give

tе. Ad - o - ra - mus te. Gra - ti - as a -

We worship thee. Thanks we give

tе. Glo - ri - fi - ca - mus te. Gra - ti - as a -

We glorify thee. Thanks we give

tе.

We give

We give

We give

We give

Glo - ri - fi - ca - mus te. Gra - ti - as a -

We glorify thee. Thanks we give

Glorify thee.

We give

We give

Glorify thee.

We give

Glorify thee.

We give

Glorify thee.

We give

Glorify thee.

We give

Glorify thee.

We give

Glorify thee.

We give

Glorify thee.

We give

Glorify thee.

We give

Glorify thee.

We give

Glorify thee.

We give

Glorify thee.

We give

Glorify thee.

We give

Glorify thee.

We give

Glorify thee.

We give

Glorify thee.

We give

Glorify thee.

We give

Glorify thee.

We give

Glorify thee.

We give

Glorify thee.

We give

Glorify thee.

We give

Glorify thee.

We give

Glorify thee.

We give

Glorify thee.

We give

Glorify thee.

We give

Glorify thee.

We give

Glorify thee.

We give

Glorify thee.

We give

Glorify thee.

We give

Glorify thee.

We give

Glorify thee.

We give

Glorify thee.

We give

Glorify thee.

We give

Glorify thee.

We give

Glorify thee.

We give

Glorify thee.

We give

Glorify thee.

We give

Glorify thee.
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Cant.  
-mi-ne De-us, Rex cae-le-stis, De-us Pa-

Alt.  
Do-mi-ne De-us, Rex cae-le-stis,

Ten.  
De-us, Rex cae-le-stis, De-us Pa-ter

Bass  
De-us Pa-

B.C.  
De-us Pa-

Cant.  
-ter om-ni-po-tens. Do-mi-ne Fi-li uni-ge-ni-te, un-

Alt.  
Do-mi-ne Fi-li uni-ge-ni-te, uni-

Ten.  
om-ni-po-tens. Do-mi-ne Fi-li uni-

Bass  
der om-ni-po-tens. Do-mi-ne Fi-li uni-

B.C.  

Missa Sine Nomine

\[ \text{Cant.} \]
\[ \text{Alt.} \]
\[ \text{Ten.} \]
\[ \text{Bass} \]

\[ \text{B.C.} \]
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Cant.  

\[ \text{mun-di, su-sci-pe de-pre-ca-ti-o-nem no-} \]

Alt.  

\[ \text{mun-di, su-sci-pe de-pre-ca-ti-o-nem nos-} \]

Ten.  

\[ \text{mun-di, su-sci-pe de-pre-ca-ti-o-nem no-} \]

Bass  

\[ \text{mun-di, su-sci-pe de-pre-ca-ti-o-nem no-} \]

B.C.  

\[ \text{stram. Qui se-des ad dex-te-ram Pa-} \]

Alt.  

\[ \text{stram. Qui se-des ad dex-te-ram Pa-} \]

Ten.  

\[ \text{stram. Qui se-des ad dex-te-ram Pa-} \]

Bass  

\[ \text{stram. Qui se-des ad dex-te-ram Pa-} \]

B.C.  

\[ \text{stram. Qui se-des ad dex-te-ram Pa-} \]

130
Cant.  
tris, misere re ne bis. Quo ni am tu so lus  
Alt.  
tris, misere re ne bis. Quo ni am tu so lus  
Ten.  
mi se re re no bis. Quo ni am  
Bass  
mi se re re no bis. Quo ni am  
B.C.  

Cant.  
sanctus. Tu so lus Al tis si mus, Ie su 
Alt.  
sanctus. Tu so lus Al tis si mus, Ie su 
Ten.  
Tu so lus Do mi nus. Tu so lus al tis si mus, Ie su 
Bass  
Tu so lus Do mi nus. Tu so lus al tis si mus, Ie su 
B.C.  

97 98 99 100 101 102 103 104 105 106 107
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Missa Sine Nomine

\[ \text{Cant.} \]

um. Et in unum Dominum Jesus Christum, Filium Dei

\[ \text{Alt.} \]

um. Et in unum Dominum Jesus Christum, Filium Dei

\[ \text{Ten.} \]

um. le sum Christum, Filium Dei

\[ \text{Bass} \]

um. le sum Christum, Filium Dei

\[ \text{B.C.} \]

um. le sum Christum, Filium Dei

\[ \text{Cant.} \]

uniogenitum. Et ex Patre natum an-

\[ \text{Alt.} \]

uniogenitum. Et ex Patre natum ante om-

\[ \text{Ten.} \]

uniogenitum. Et ex Patre natum ante om-

\[ \text{Bass} \]

uniogenitum. Et ex Patre natum ante om-

\[ \text{B.C.} \]

uniogenitum. Et ex Patre natum ante om-
Missa Sine Nomine

137 Cant. te om-ni- a sae-cu-la. De-um de De-o, all ages. God from God,

138 Alt. sae-cu-la. De-um de De-o, ages. God from God,

139 Ten. De-um de De-o, light from light,

140 Bass De-um de De-o, light from light,

141 B.C. De-um de De-o, light from light,

142 Cant. lu-men de lu-mi-ne, God true

143 Alt. De-um ve-rum de

144 Ten. De-um ve-rum de

145 Bass De-um ve-rum de

146 B.C. De-um ve-rum de
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Cant.  
\[157\] sunt. Qui propter nos homines, et propter nostram salvation

Alt.  
\[158\] sunt. Qui propter nos homines, et propter nostram salvation

Ten.  
\[159\] sunt. Qui propter nos homines, et propter nostram salvation

Bass  
\[160\] sunt. Qui propter nos homines, et propter nostram salvation

B.C.  
\[161\] sunt. Qui propter nos homines, et propter nostram salvation

Cant.  
\[162\] tem descendit de caelis. Et

Alt.  
\[163\] tem descendit de caelis. Et

Ten.  
\[164\] tem descendit de caelis. Et

Bass  
\[165\] tem descendit de caelis. Et

B.C.  
\[166\] tem descendit de caelis. Et
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Cant.  
FAC - TUS EST.  
made wax.  

177

Alt.  
- - TUS EST.  
Cru-cifix-us e-ti-am pro no - 
Crucified also for us  

178

Ten.  
- - TUS EST.  

Bass  
TUS EST.  
Crucifix-us e-ti-am pro no -  

B.C.  


182

Cant.  
sub Pon-ti-o Pi-la-to: pas-sus, et se-pul - 
under Pontius Pilate, suffered, and buried  

Alt.  


183

Ten.  
sub Pon-ti-o Pi-la-to: pas-sus, et se - 
under Pontius Pilate, suffered, and  

Bass  


184

B.C.  


185


186


139
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Cant.  
Et resur-rexit tertia die, secundus est.  
And he rose, the third day, according to Scriptures.

Alt.  
Et resur-rexit tertia die, secundus est.  
And he rose, the third day, according to Scriptures.

Ten.  
Et resur-rexit tertia die, secundus est.  
And he rose, the third day, according to Scriptures.

Bass  
Et resur-rexit tertia die, secundus est.  
And he rose, the third day, according to Scriptures.

B.C.  
Et resur-rexit tertia die, secundus est.  
And he rose, the third day, according to Scriptures.

Cant.  
Et ascendit in caelum:  
And he ascended into heaven,

Alt.  
Et ascendit in caelum:  
And he ascended into heaven,

Ten.  
Et ascendit in caelum:  
And he ascended into heaven,

Bass  
Et ascendit in caelum:  
And he ascended into heaven,

B.C.  
Et ascendit in caelum:  
And he ascended into heaven,
**Missa Sine Nomine**

**Cant.**

Et interum veniatus est, et
And again coming he is, and

dexter-am, ad dexter-am Patris.
right hand, at right hand of Father.

**Alt.**

Et interum veniatus est cum gloria, cum gloria, iudicabatur.
And again coming he is, with glory, with glory, to judge

**Ten.**

um veniatus est cum gloria, iudicabatur.
going to come he is, with glory, to judge

**Bass**

Et interum veniatus est cum gloria, iudicabatur.
And again coming he is, with glory, to judge

**B.C.**

Again interum veniatus est, et
And again coming he is, and

dexter-am, ad dexter-am Patris.
right hand, at right hand of Father.

Et interum veniatus est cum gloria, cum gloria, iudicabatur.
And again coming he is, with glory, with glory, to judge

um veniatus est cum gloria, iudicabatur.
going to come he is, with glory, to judge

**B.C.**
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Cant. 

207
208
209
210
211

re vi-vos et mor-tu-os: cu-ius reg-ni
living and dead: of whose kingdom

Alt. 

212
213
214
215
216
217

non e-rit fi-nis. Et in Spi-ri-tum Sanc-tum
not will there be end. And in Holy Spirit

Ten. 

218
219
220
221
222
223

e-rit fi-nis. Et in Spi-ri-tum Sanc-tum
will there be end. And in Holy Spirit

Bass 

224
225
226
227
228
229

_ e-rit fi-nis. Et in Spi-ri-tum Sanc-tum
will there be end. And in Holy Spirit

B.C. 

230
231
232
233
234
235

\( \text{c} = \text{circa 54} \)
Lord, and life giver

Qui cum Patre, et Filio simul
Who with Father and Son together

Missa Sine Nomine
Missa Sine Nomine

Cant.  
228 a-do-ra-tur, et con-glo-ri-fi-ca-tur: qui lo-cu-tus est, qui lo-cu-
       is adored and glorified, who spoke, who spoke

Alt.  
229 a-do-ra-tur, et con-glo-ri-fi-ca-tur: qui lo-cu-tus est, qui-
       is adored and glorified, who spoke, who

Ten.  
230 a-do-ra-tur, et con-glo-ri-fi-ca-tur: qui lo-cu-tus est, qui-
       is adored and glorified, who spoke, who

Bass  
231 a-do-ra-tur, et con-glo-ri-fi-ca-tur: qui lo-cu-
       is adored and glorified, who spoke, who

B.C.  
232 a-do-ra-tur, et con-glo-ri-fi-ca-tur: qui lo-
       is adored and glorified, who spoke, who

Cant.  
233 tus est per Pro-phe-tas.  
       through Prophets.

Alt.  
234 lo-cu-tus est per Pro-phe-tas.  
       spoke through Prophets.

Ten.  
235 est, qui lo-cu-tus est per Pro-phe-tas. Et u-nam, san-c-tam, ca-tho-
       who spoke through Prophets. And one holy, catholic

Bass  
236 cu-tus est per Pro-phe-tas. Et u-nam, san-c-tam, ca-tho-
       through Prophets. And one holy, catholic

B.C.  
237 }
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\begin{align*}
\text{Cant.} & : \quad \text{ca-torum. Et } \text{expe-to res-sur-ec-tio-nem mor-tu-o-} \\
\text{Alt.} & : \quad \text{Et expe-to res-sur-rec-tio-nem mor-tu-o-} \\
\text{Ten.} & : \quad \text{Et expe-to res-sur-rec-tio-nem mor-tu-o-} \\
\text{Bass} & : \quad \text{Et expe-to res-sur-rec-tio-nem mor-tu-o-} \\
\text{B.C.} & : \quad \text{Et expe-to res-sur-rec-tio-nem mor-tu-o-}
\end{align*}

\begin{align*}
\text{Cant.} & : \quad \text{rum. Et vi-tam ven-tu-ri sae-cu-li. Amen.} \\
\text{Alt.} & : \quad \text{o-rum. Et vi-tam ven-tu-ri sae-cu-li. Amen.} \\
\text{Ten.} & : \quad \text{o-rum. Et vi-tam ven-tu-ri sae-cu-li. Amen.} \\
\text{Bass} & : \quad \text{rum. Et vi-tam ven-tu-ri sae-cu-li. Amen.} \\
\text{B.C.} & : \quad \text{rum. Et vi-tam ven-tu-ri sae-cu-li. Amen.}
\end{align*}
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Agnus Dei

Lamb of God, you take away sins of world

Lamb of God, (you) who take away sins

Lamb of God, (you) who take away sins

Lamb of God, (you) who take away sins

Lamb of God, (you) who take away sins

Lamb of God, (you) who take away sins

Lamb of God, (you) who take away sins

Lamb of God, (you) who take away sins

Lamb of God, (you) who take away sins

Lamb of God, (you) who take away sins

Lamb of God, (you) who take away sins

Lamb of God, (you) who take away sins

Lamb of God, (you) who take away sins

Lamb of God, (you) who take away sins

Lamb of God, (you) who take away sins

Lamb of God, (you) who take away sins

Lamb of God, (you) who take away sins

Lamb of God, (you) who take away sins

Lamb of God, (you) who take away sins

Lamb of God, (you) who take away sins

Lamb of God, (you) who take away sins

Lamb of God, (you) who take away sins

Lamb of God, (you) who take away sins

Lamb of God, (you) who take away sins

Lamb of God, (you) who take away sins

Lamb of God, (you) who take away sins

Lamb of God, (you) who take away sins

Lamb of God, (you) who take away sins

Lamb of God, (you) who take away sins

Lamb of God, (you) who take away sins

Lamb of God, (you) who take away sins

Lamb of God, (you) who take away sins

Lamb of God, (you) who take away sins

Lamb of God, (you) who take away sins

Lamb of God, (you) who take away sins

Lamb of God, (you) who take away sins

Lamb of God, (you) who take away sins

Lamb of God, (you) who take away sins

Lamb of God, (you) who take away sins

Lamb of God, (you) who take away sins

Lamb of God, (you) who take away sins

Lamb of God, (you) who take away sins

Lamb of God, (you) who take away sins

Lamb of God, (you) who take away sins

Lamb of God, (you) who take away sins

Lamb of God, (you) who take away sins

Lamb of God, (you) who take away sins

Lamb of God, (you) who take away sins

Lamb of God, (you) who take away sins

Lamb of God, (you) who take away sins

Lamb of God, (you) who take away sins

Lamb of God, (you) who take away sins

Lamb of God, (you) who take away sins

Lamb of God, (you) who take away sins

Lamb of God, (you) who take away sins

Lamb of God, (you) who take away sins

Lamb of God, (you) who take away sins

Lamb of God, (you) who take away sins

Lamb of God, (you) who take away sins

Lamb of God, (you) who take away sins

Lamb of God, (you) who take away sins

Lamb of God, (you) who take away sins

Lamb of God, (you) who take away sins

Lamb of God, (you) who take away sins

Lamb of God, (you) who take away sins

Lamb of God, (you) who take away sins

Lamb of God, (you) who take away sins

Lamb of God, (you) who take away sins

Lamb of God, (you) who take away sins

Lamb of God, (you) who take away sins

Lamb of God, (you) who take away sins

Lamb of God, (you) who take away sins

Lamb of God, (you) who take away sins

Lamb of God, (you) who take away sins

Lamb of God, (you) who take away sins

Lamb of God, (you) who take away sins

Lamb of God, (you) who take away sins
Cant.  
\[ \text{Cant.} \]
\[ \text{Missa Sine Nomine} \]
\[ 297 \]
\[ \text{Missa Sine Nomine} \]
\[ 298 \]
\[ \text{Missa Sine Nomine} \]
\[ 299 \]
\[ \text{Missa Sine Nomine} \]
\[ 300 \]
\[ \text{Missa Sine Nomine} \]
\[ 301 \]
\[ \text{Missa Sine Nomine} \]
\[ 302 \]
\[ \text{Missa Sine Nomine} \]
\[ 303 \]
\[ \text{Missa Sine Nomine} \]
\[ 304 \]
\[ \text{Missa Sine Nomine} \]
\[ 305 \]
\[ \text{Missa Sine Nomine} \]
\[ 306 \]
\[ \text{Missa Sine Nomine} \]
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Clementis non Papae

from Missarum Quator Vocum cum Basso Continuo ad Organum

Part Books held in Marsh's Library, Dublin - Accessed 11 April 2014

Edited and transcribed into the Phrased Notation System by

Kevin O’Carroll
The Phrased Notation System (PNS) is a modified form of music notation which aims to
guide non-specialist choirs towards improved performance of Renaissance polyphony. This
is, therefore, designed to be a practical edition rather than a scholarly edition. This edition
has used as its source a single publication, the 1625 Pierre Phalèse edition of Missarum
Quatuor Vocum. Cum Basso Continuo ad Organum, Liber Primus. Item Missa pro Defunctis
Clementis non Papae which was printed in Antwerp and is held by Marsh’s Library, Dublin.
As Marsh’s hold the only complete surviving copy, its presentation here provides an
opportunity for comparison of several of the masses contained therein with other sources of
the same material. Two of the masses, Missa Audi Filia by Viadana and the mass by
Gregorii Zuchini appear in no other publication and are therefore considered as important
discoveries.

There are many elements to be considered when transcribing polyphonic Renaissance
material from the original part books. An explanation of the approach taken to each of these
elements is provided below.

**Accidentals** – Accidentals which appear in the original publication are retained. These
accidentals are placed before the notes to which they refer, in accordance with modern
convention. Courtesy accidentals are provided as appropriate and are shown in brackets over
the note to which they refer. These accidentals may be necessary due to the cancellation of a
preceding raised pitch, on foot of Musica Ficta or merely for clarification.

**Accompaniment** – Though a keyboard reduction is provided it is not necessarily suggested
that the music should be accompanied (see Basso Continuo).

**Bar Lines** – In general, the original score does not use bar lines. Where bar lines do appear
in the original, they are present within the choral parts in this edition. Bar lines are provided
within the keyboard reduction score and are presented as an aid within rehearsal. These
barlines do not imply additional accents as in modern convention.

**Basso Continuo** – Unlike the other masses in this collection, no Basso Continuo for this
mass is included in the original publication.

**Dynamics** – The music is presented without obvious dynamic marks as no such marks exist
in the original publication. However, dynamic variation should be inferred from:

1. The inclusion or exclusion of vocal lines
2. The meaning of the text
3. The nature of the musical writing

Providing detailed dynamic instruction for each individual vocal line would result in a
cluttered, not to mention confusing, looking score. It is thought, therefore, that by providing
information on the factors that influence dynamics singers will better able to take direct
responsibility for dynamic variation.
**Grouping of Notes** – In an effort to ensure clear alignment and easy analysis of the geography of each line vis-a-vis the other choral lines, notes are grouped according to beats rather than the modern convention of syllabic separation.

**Metronome Marks** – Metronome marks (M.M) are provided at the start of each movement or when the meter changes. These M.M values should be seen as indicators of an appropriate tempo and not necessarily slavishly followed. Where a change of meter is involved the M.M. establishes a relationship between the two meters. This relationship should be maintained even where the initial M.M. is not observed due to performance demands or personal interpretation.

**Note Values** – Note values have been halved from those in the original publication. Occasionally for the sake of clear vertical alignment note values have been further divided and a tie inserted to ensure that a note of the correct duration is sung.

**Phrase Marks** – Phrase marks are included as an essential part of the PNS system. The phrase mark indicates the musical phrases as appropriate for each individual voice part. The phrase marks are also indicative of appropriate breath points.

**Pitch** – No adjustment has been made regarding pitch as the pitch presented in the original publication is within the range considered acceptable to modern choirs.

**Rehearsal Numbers** – Rehearsal numbers are provided on the Cantus/Soprano stave throughout. These rehearsal numbers coincide with the bar numbers as shown on the keyboard reduction score.

**Rests** – The standard pulse throughout is a minim. Extended rests are therefore shown as multiple minim rests. A count (3,5,7 etc.) is included as an aid where the number of minim rests exceeds 3.

**Text Presentation** – The text is presented with modern capitalisation, spelling and punctuation as laid out in the Liber Usualis. Where the text underlay has not been completed or a simple indication of a repeat of text is shown in the original publication it is presented in italics in this edition.

**Text Pronunciation** – As an aid to pronunciation, stressed syllables are presented in bold type face. Observation of these stressed syllables is essential in promoting the micro meters contained within the music.

**Text Underlay** – Text underlay is not always well presented in the original publication. This has resulted in many situations where editorial decisions regarding the precise allocations of syllables. Where the original publication indicates that the text should be repeated this repeated text has been printed in full with due regard to the rhythm of the music. Where text has been added editorially it appears in italics. Such additions only occur where the music strongly suggests that the omission of the text in the original publication was in error.

**Time Signatures** – Time signatures are not used in this edition as such signs are inappropriate for use with unmensured music. A digit 2 or 3 is inserted as an indicator of duple or triple meter as appropriate.
Translation – A literal translation is provided under each word as an aid to understanding not only the text but also the relationship between the text and the music. Such an understanding plays a vital role in the subtle dynamic variation and musical phrasing within the composition.

To the Conductor – Conductors should note that unlike standard modern music notation the tactus or beat should in general indicate a minim within duple sections. In the triple meter sections, the tactus should indicate the dotted minim. The relationship between duple and triple meters are an essential characteristic of Renaissance music and so careful attention should be paid to the metronome marks as the metre changes. Though allowance is made for variation in tempo due to acoustics or a variation in the size of the performing group it is essential that the proportional relationships indicated by the M.M changes are maintained between meters.

It should also be noted that the style of conducting should not be a didactic, heavily pointed beat but rather a gentler, less articulated one. Such a tactus will promote fewer ‘first beat in the bar’ type accents and encourage a more fluid line, as is appropriate.

Kevin O’Carroll
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Introit

\( \text{Cantus} \)
\( \text{Alto} \)
\( \text{Tenor} \)
\( \text{Bass} \)

For rehearsal only

\( J = \text{circa 30} \)
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C: -ternam dona eis Do-
A: ae-ternam dona eis, Do-
T: -ternam dona eis, dona eis, dona
B: dona eis, dona eis, dona

C: -mine: et lux perpe-
A: -mine: et lux perpe-
T: Do-mine: et lux perpe-
B: eis Do-mine: et lux perpe-

C: Lord; light perpetual
A: Lord; light perpetual
T: Lord; light perpetual
B: Lord; light perpetual

160
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C

in Jerusalem: exaudi Deus orationem meam,

A

in Jerusalem: exaudi Deus orationem meam,

T

in Jerusalem: exaudi Deus orationem meam,

B

in Jerusalem: exaudi Deus orationem meam,

31

in Jerusalem: exaudi Deus orationem meam,

32

in Jerusalem: exaudi Deus orationem meam,

33

in Jerusalem: exaudi Deus orationem meam,

34

in Jerusalem: exaudi Deus orationem meam,

35

in Jerusalem: exaudi Deus orationem meam,

36

in Jerusalem: exaudi Deus orationem meam,

37

in Jerusalem: exaudi Deus orationem meam,

38

in Jerusalem: exaudi Deus orationem meam,

39

in Jerusalem: exaudi Deus orationem meam,

40

in Jerusalem: exaudi Deus orationem meam,

41

in Jerusalem: exaudi Deus orationem meam,

42

in Jerusalem: exaudi Deus orationem meam,
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\(\text{Cordam ab omni vin-culo de-lic-tum ab omni vin-culo de-lic-tum.}\)

\(\text{Et gratia tua, et gratia tua.}\)

\(\text{Et gratia tua, et gratia tua.}\)

\(\text{Et gratia tua, et gratia tua.}\)
by grace to those sustaining,

...
Et lúcis aéternae bea:ti:tu:di:ne

eternal in the happiness
Missa Defunctorum

Offertory

\[ \text{Domine Iesus Christe, Rex} \]

\[ \text{Dies Iræ, Dies Irae, Rex} \]

\[ \text{Deliver souls} \]
Missa Defunctorum

- ni-mas om-ni-um fi-de-li-um de-func-to-rum,

- ni-mas om-ni-um fi-de-li-um de-func-to-rum

- ni-mas om-ni-um fi-de-li-um de-func-to-rum

- ni-mas om-ni-um fi-de-li-um de-func-to-rum

de poe-nis in-fer-

de poe-nis in-fer-

de poe-nis in-fer-

de poe-nis in-fer-

from pains of hell

from pains of hell

from pains of hell

from pains of hell

171
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tar - us
ne ca - dant in ob - scu -

tar - ta - rus,
ne ca - dant in ob - scu -
			
tar - ta - rus,
ne ca - dant in ob - scu -

tar - ta - rus,
ne ca - dant in ob - scu -

ra te - ne - bra - rum lo - ca,
sed sig - ni - fer Sanctus

ra te - ne - bra - rum lo - ca,
sed sig - ni - fer Sanctus

ta - tus
let them fall
into shadowy

ra te - ne - bra - rum lo - ca,
sed sig - ni - fer Sanctus

ra te - ne - bra - rum lo - ca,
sed sig - ni - fer Sanctus

ra te - ne - bra - rum lo - ca,
sed sig - ni - fer Sanctus

ra te - ne - bra - rum lo - ca,
sed sig - ni - fer Sanctus

ra te - ne - bra - rum lo - ca,
sed sig - ni - fer Sanctus

ra te - ne - bra - rum lo - ca,
sed sig - ni - fer Sanctus

ra te - ne - bra - rum lo - ca,
sed sig - ni - fer Sanctus

ra te - ne - bra - rum lo - ca,
sed sig - ni - fer Sanctus

ra te - ne - bra - rum lo - ca,
sed sig - ni - fer Sanctus

ra te - ne - bra - rum lo - ca,
sed sig - ni - fer Sanctus

ra te - ne - bra - rum lo - ca,
sed sig - ni - fer Sanctus

ra te - ne - bra - rum lo - ca,
sed sig - ni - fer Sanctus

ra te - ne - bra - rum lo - ca,
sed sig - ni - fer Sanctus

ra te - ne - bra - rum lo - ca,
sed sig - ni - fer Sanctus

ra te - ne - bra - rum lo - ca,
sed sig - ni - fer Sanctus

ra te - ne - bra - rum lo - ca,
sed sig - ni - fer Sanctus

ra te - ne - bra - rum lo - ca,
sed sig - ni - fer Sanctus

ra te - ne - bra - rum lo - ca,
sed sig - ni - fer Sanctus

ra te - ne - bra - rum lo - ca,
sed sig - ni - fer Sanctus

ra te - ne - bra - rum lo - ca,
sed sig - ni - fer Sanctus

ra te - ne - bra - rum lo - ca,
sed sig - ni - fer Sanctus

ra te - ne - bra - rum lo - ca,
sed sig - ni - fer Sanctus

ra te - ne - bra - rum lo - ca,
sed sig - ni - fer Sanctus

ra te - ne - bra - rum lo - ca,
sed sig - ni - fer Sanctus

ra te - ne - bra - rum lo - ca,
sed sig - ni - fer Sanctus

ra te - ne - bra - rum lo - ca,
sed sig - ni - fer Sanctus

ra te - ne - bra - rum lo - ca,
sed sig - ni - fer Sanctus

ra te - ne - bra - rum lo - ca,
sed sig - ni - fer Sanctus

ra te - ne - bra - rum lo - ca,
sed sig - ni - fer Sanctus

ra te - ne - bra - rum lo - ca,
sed sig - ni - fer Sanctus

ra te - ne - bra - rum lo - ca,
sed sig - ni - fer Sanctus

ra te - ne - bra - rum lo - ca,
sed sig - ni - fer Sanctus

ra te - ne - bra - rum lo - ca,
sed sig - ni - fer Sanctus

ra te - ne - bra - rum lo - ca,
sed sig - ni - fer Sanctus

ra te - ne - bra - rum lo - ca,
sed sig - ni - fer Sanctus

ra te - ne - bra - rum lo - ca,
sed sig - ni - fer Sanctus

ra te - ne - bra - rum lo - ca,
sed sig - ni - fer Sanctus

ra te - ne - bra - rum lo - ca,
sed sig - ni - fer Sanctus

ra te - ne - bra - rum lo - ca,
sed sig - ni - fer Sanctus

ra te - ne - bra - rum lo - ca,
sed sig - ni - fer Sanctus

ra te - ne - bra - rum lo - ca,
sed sig - ni - fer Sanctus

ra te - ne - bra - rum lo - ca,
sed sig - ni - fer Sanctus

ra te - ne - bra - rum lo - ca,
sed sig - ni - fer Sanctus

ra te - ne - bra - rum lo - ca,
sed sig - ni - fer Sanctus

ra te - ne - bra - rum lo - ca,
sed sig - ni - fer Sanctus

ra te - ne - bra - rum lo - ca,
sed sig - ni - fer Sanctus

ra te - ne - bra - rum lo - ca,
sed sig - ni - fer Sanctus

ra te - ne - bra - rum lo - ca,
sed sig - ni - fer Sanctus

ra te - ne - bra - rum lo - ca,
sed sig - ni - fer Sanctus

ra te - ne - bra - rum lo - ca,
sed sig - ni - fer Sanctus

ra te - ne - bra - rum lo - ca,
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Michael representeth them into light holy.

Quam once to Abraham
Missa Defunctorum

A - bra - hae pro - mi - si - sti,
  to Abraham you promised,
  to Abraham you promised,
  to Abraham you promised,

bra - hae pro - mi - si - sti,

bra - hae pro - mi - si - sti,

bra - hae pro - mi - si - sti,

bra - hae pro - mi - si - sti,

bra - hae pro - mi - si - sti,

bra - hae pro - mi - si - sti,

bra - hae pro - mi - si - sti,

bra - hae pro - mi - si - sti,

bra - hae pro - mi - si - sti,

bra - hae pro - mi - si - sti,

bra - hae pro - mi - si - sti,

bra - hae pro - mi - si - sti,

bra - hae pro - mi - si - sti,

bra - hae pro - mi - si - sti,

bra - hae pro - mi - si - sti,

bra - hae pro - mi - si - sti,

bra - hae pro - mi - si - sti,
198 e, quarum hodie me-mo-ri-am fac-imus:

199 whose today, we recall:

200 ho-di-e me-mo-ri-am fac-imus:

201 we recall:

202 e, quarum hodie me-mo-ri-am fac-imus:

203 we recall:

204 fac e-as de mor-te trans-i-re ad vi-tam.

205 Grant to them from death to pass to life.

206 fac e-as de mor-te trans-i-re ad vi-tam. Quam

207 Grant to them from death to pass to life. Which

208 fac e-as de mor-te trans-i-re ad vi-tam. Quam

209 Grant to them from death to pass to life. Which

210 fac e-as de mor-te trans-i-re ad vi-tam. Quam

211 Grant to them from death to pass to life. Which
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Quam olim A bra-hae pro-mi-si-sti,
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\( \text{C} \)

\( \text{A} \)

\( \text{T} \)

\( \text{B} \)

\[ \frac{d}{d} = \text{circa 54} \]

\( \text{Ple} \)ni\( \text{sunt} \) caeli et terra glo\( \text{ri} \) 

\( \text{Ple} \)ni\( \text{sunt} \) caeli et terra glo\( \text{ri} \) 

\( \text{Ple} \)ni\( \text{sunt} \) caeli et terra glo\( \text{ri} \) 

\( \text{Ple} \)ni\( \text{sunt} \) caeli et terra glo\( \text{ri} \) 

\( \text{Full} \)

\( \text{are} \)

\( \text{heaven} \) and \( \text{earth} \)

\( \text{of glory} \)

\( \text{Full} \)

\( \text{are} \)

\( \text{heaven} \) and \( \text{earth} \)

\( \text{of glory} \)

\( \text{Full} \)

\( \text{are} \)

\( \text{heaven} \) and \( \text{earth} \)

\( \text{of glory} \)

\( \text{Full} \)

\( \text{are} \)

\( \text{heaven} \) and \( \text{earth} \)

\( \text{of glory} \)

\( \text{a tu a.} \) 

\( \text{Ho} \)san\( \text{na} \) in ex\( \text{cel} \)sis.

\( \text{a tu a.} \) 

\( \text{Ho} \)san\( \text{na} \) in ex\( \text{cel} \)sis.

\( \text{a tu a.} \) 

\( \text{Ho} \)san\( \text{na} \) in ex\( \text{cel} \)sis.

\( \text{a tu a.} \) 

\( \text{Ho} \)san\( \text{na} \) in ex\( \text{cel} \)sis.

\( \text{thy.} \)

\( \text{Hosanna} \) in highest.

\( \text{thy.} \)

\( \text{Hosanna} \) in highest.

\( \text{thy.} \)

\( \text{Hosanna} \) in highest.

\( \text{thy.} \)

\( \text{Hosanna} \) in highest.
Agnus Dei

Lamb of God, take away sins of world, grant them rest. Agnus Dei, Lamb of God, take away sins of world, grant them rest.
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266 qui tol-lis pec-ca-ta mun-di: do-na e-

267 is re-qui-em. qui tol-lis

268 qui tol-lis pec-ca-ta mun-di: do-na e-

269 is re-qui-em. A-gnus De-i qui tol-lis

270 qui tol-lis pec-ca-ta mun-di: do-na e-

271 is re-qui-em. qui tol-lis

272 qui tol-lis pec-ca-ta mun-di: do-na e-

274 is re-qui-em. qui tol-lis

276 qui tol-lis peculiar to the Missa Defunctorum.
pec - ca - ta mun - di: do - na e -
pec - ca - ta mun - di: do - na e -
pec - ca - ta mun - di: do - na e -
pec - ca - ta mun - di: do - na e -

is re - qui - em sem - pi - ter - nam.
is re - qui - em sem - pi - ter - nam.
is re - qui - em sem - pi - ter - nam.
is re - qui - em sem - pi - ter - nam.
Lux aeterna

let shine on them, Lord,

\[ \sum \]

C

Communion

\( \acute{\eta} \approx 45 \)

\[ \sum \]

B

Cum sanc-tis tu-is in aetern-i

With saints your for eternity,

\[ \sum \]

A

Cum sanc-tis tu-is in aetern-i

With saints your for eternity,

\[ \sum \]

T

Cum sanc-tis tu-is in aetern-i

With saints your for eternity,
num, for eternity, qui-a pi-
num, cum sanc-tis tu-is in ae-ter-num, qui-a pi-
tis tu-is in ae-ter-num, qui-a pi-
um, qui-a pi-us es, qui-a pi-us

us es, qui-a pi-us es, qui-a pi-us

qui-a pi-us es, qui-a pi-us es

qui-a pi-us es, qui-a pi-us es

a pi-us es, qui-a pi-

num, cum sanc-tis tu-is in ae-ter-num, qui-a pi-
tis tu-is in ae-ter-num, qui-a pi-
um, qui-a pi-us es, qui-a pi-us

us es, qui-a pi-us es, qui-a pi-us

qui-a pi-us es, qui-a pi-us es

qui-a pi-us es, qui-a pi-
a pi-us es, qui-a pi-

num, for eternity, for merciful you are, for merciful you are, for merciful you are, for merciful you are, for
Requiem aeternam dona eis Domine, et lux perpetua
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ae-ter-num, qui-a pi-us es, qui-a pi-

for merciful you are, for merciful

tu-is in ae-ter-num, qui-a pi-us es, qui-

your for eternity, for merciful you are, for merciful

us es, qui-a pi-us es, qui-a pi-us es.

you are, for merciful you are, for merciful

qui-a pi-us es, qui-a pi-us es.

for merciful you are, for merciful

es, qui-a pi-us es, qui-a pi-us es.

you are, for merciful you are, for merciful
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from Missarum Quator Vocum cum Basso Continuo ad Organum

Part Books held in Marsh's Library, Dublin - Accessed 11 April 2014

Edited and transcribed into the Phrased Notation System by

Kevin O’Carroll
The Phrased Notation System (PNS) is a modified form of music notation which aims to
guide non-specialist choirs towards improved performance of Renaissance polyphony. This
is, therefore, designed to be a practical edition rather than a scholarly edition. This edition
has used as its source a single publication, the 1625 Pierre Phalèse edition of *Missarum
Quatuor Vocum. Cum Basso Continuo ad Organum, Liber Primus. Item Missa pro Defunctis
Clementis non Papae* which was printed in Antwerp and is held by Marsh’s Library, Dublin.
As Marsh’s hold the only complete surviving copy, its presentation here provides an
opportunity for comparison of several of the masses contained therein with other sources of
the same material. Two of the masses, *Missa Audi Filia* by Viadana and the mass by
Gregorii Zuchini appear in no other publication and are therefore considered as important
discoveries.

There are many elements to be considered when transcribing polyphonic Renaissance
material from the original part books. An explanation of the approach taken to each of these
elements is provided below.

**Accidentals** – Accidentals which appear in the original publication are retained. These
accidentals are placed before the notes to which they refer, in accordance with modern
convention. Courtesy accidentals are provided as appropriate and are shown in brackets over
the note to which they refer. These accidentals may be necessary due to the cancellation of a
preceding raised pitch, on foot of *Musica Ficta* or merely for clarification. **Accompaniment**
– Though a keyboard reduction is provided it is not necessarily suggested that the music
should be accompanied (see Basso Continuo).

**Bar Lines** – In general, the original score does not use bar lines. Where bar lines do appear
in the original they are present within the choral parts in this edition. Bar lines are provided
within the keyboard reduction score and are presented as an aid within rehearsal. These
barlines do not imply additional accents as in modern convention.

**Basso Continuo** – A basso continuo [sic] is contained in the original publication. The part, is
in reality a basso seguente in that it merely tracks the lowest vocal part at any given time.
There is no indication whether this part was included at the composer’s instruction or on foot
of an editor’s decision. We are informed in Viadana’s writing that he (Viadana) included a
‘basso continuo’ to facilitate performance of his works when there were too few choristers or
where a voice part was missing. It can be assumed that the basso continuo presented here
should function in a similar manner.

**Dynamics** – The music is presented without obvious dynamic marks as no such marks exist
in the original publication. However, dynamic variation should be inferred from:

1. The inclusion or exclusion of vocal lines
2. The meaning of the text
3. The nature of the musical writing

Providing detailed dynamic instruction for each individual vocal line would result in a
cluttered, not to mention confusing, looking score. It is thought, therefore, that by
providing information on the factors that influence dynamics singers will better able to
take direct responsibility for dynamic variation.
Grouping of Notes – In an effort to ensure clear alignment and easy analysis of the geography of each line vis-a-vis the other choral lines, notes are grouped according to beats rather than the modern convention of syllabic separation.

Metronome Marks – Metronome marks (M.M) are provided at the start of each movement or when the meter changes. These M.M. values should be seen as indicators of an appropriate tempo and not necessarily slavishly followed. Where a change of meter is involved the M.M. establishes a relationship between the two meters. This relationship should be maintained even where the initial M.M. is not observed due to performance demands or personal interpretation.

Note Values – Note values in duple sections are presented as in the original publication. Note values in the triple sections have been halved.

Phrase Marks – Phrase marks are included as an essential part of the PNS system. The phrase mark indicates the musical phrases as appropriate for each individual voice part. The phrase marks are also indicative of appropriate breath points.

Pitch - No adjustment has been made regarding pitch has been made as the pitch presented in the original publication is within the range considered acceptable to modern choirs.

Rehearsal Numbers – Rehearsal numbers are provided on the Cantus/Soprano stave throughout. These rehearsal numbers coincide with the bar numbers as shown on the keyboard reduction score.

Text Presentation – The text is presented with modern capitalisation, spelling and punctuation as laid out in the Liber Usualis. Where the text underlay has not been completed or a simple indication of a repeat of text is shown in the original publication it is presented in italics in this edition.

Text Pronunciation – As an aid to pronunciation, stressed syllables are presented in bold type face. Observation of these stressed syllables is essential in promoting the micro meters contained within the music.

Text Underlay – Text underlay is generally well presented in the original publication. Where the original publication indicates that the text should be repeated this repeated text has been printed in full with due regard to the rhythm of the music. Where text has been added editorially it appears in italics. Such additions only occur where the music strongly suggests that the omission of the text in the original publication was in error.

Time Signatures – Time signatures are not used in this edition as such signs are inappropriate for use with unmensured music. A digit 2 or 3 is inserted as an indicator of duple or triple meter as appropriate.

Translation – A literal translation is provided under each word as an aid to understanding not only the text but also the relationship between the text and the music. Such an understanding plays a vital role in the subtle dynamic variation and musical phrasing within the composition.
To the Conductor – Conductors should note that unlike standard modern music notation the *tactus* or beat should in general indicate a minim within duple sections. In the triple meter sections, the tactus should indicate the dotted minim. The relationship between duple and triple meters are an essential characteristic of Renaissance music and so careful attention should be paid to the metronome marks as the metre changes. Though allowance is made for variation in tempo due to acoustics or a variation in the size of the performing group it is essential that the proportional relationships indicated by the M.M changes are maintained between meters.

It should also be noted that the style of conducting should not be a didactic, heavily pointed beat but rather a gentler, less articulated one. Such a *tactus* will promote fewer ‘first beat in the bar’ type accents and encourage a more fluid line, as is appropriate.
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Et in terra pax homini-bus bo-nae vol-un-ta-
And on earth peace to men of good will.

C

A

T

B

We praise thee. We bless thee. We worship

We bless thee. We adore

tis. Be-ne-di-ca-mus te. A-do-ra-mus
We bless thee. We adore

We praise thee. We bless thee. We adore

\( \delta = \text{circa 120} \)

\( \delta = \text{circa 60} \)
Lord Deus, Rex coelestis, Deus Patrem omnipotentem.

Deus, Rex coelestis, Deus Patrem omnipotentem.

Deus, Rex coelestis, Deus Patrem omnipotentem.

Deus, Rex coelestis, Deus Patrem omnipotentem.

Deus, Rex coelestis, Deus Patrem omnipotentem.

Deus, Rex coelestis, Deus Patrem omnipotentem.

Deus, Rex coelestis, Deus Patrem omnipotentem.

Deus, Rex coelestis, Deus Patrem omnipotentem.

Deus, Rex coelestis, Deus Patrem omnipotentem.

Deus, Rex coelestis, Deus Patrem omnipotentem.

Deus, Rex coelestis, Deus Patrem omnipotentem.

Deus, Rex coelestis, Deus Patrem omnipotentem.

Deus, Rex coelestis, Deus Patrem omnipotentem.

Deus, Rex coelestis, Deus Patrem omnipotentem.

Deus, Rex coelestis, Deus Patrem omnipotentem.

Deus, Rex coelestis, Deus Patrem omnipotentem.

Deus, Rex coelestis, Deus Patrem omnipotentem.

Deus, Rex coelestis, Deus Patrem omnipotentem.

Deus, Rex coelestis, Deus Patrem omnipotentem.

Deus, Rex coelestis, Deus Patrem omnipotentem.

Deus, Rex coelestis, Deus Patrem omnipotentem.

Deus, Rex coelestis, Deus Patrem omnipotentem.

Deus, Rex coelestis, Deus Patrem omnipotentem.

Deus, Rex coelestis, Deus Patrem omnipotentem.

Deus, Rex coelestis, Deus Patrem omnipotentem.

Deus, Rex coelestis, Deus Patrem omnipotentem.

Deus, Rex coelestis, Deus Patrem omnipotentem.

Deus, Rex coelestis, Deus Patrem omnipotentem.

Deus, Rex coelestis, Deus Patrem omnipotentem.

Deus, Rex coelestis, Deus Patrem omnipotentem.

Deus, Rex coelestis, Deus Patrem omnipotentem.

Deus, Rex coelestis, Deus Patrem omnipotentem.

Deus, Rex coelestis, Deus Patrem omnipotentem.

Deus, Rex coelestis, Deus Patrem omnipotentem.

Deus, Rex coelestis, Deus Patrem omnipotentem.

Deus, Rex coelestis, Deus Patrem omnipotentem.

Deus, Rex coelestis, Deus Patrem omnipotentem.

Deus, Rex coelestis, Deus Patrem omnipotentem.

Deus, Rex coelestis, Deus Patrem omnipotentem.

Deus, Rex coelestis, Deus Patrem omnipotentem.

Deus, Rex coelestis, Deus Patrem omnipotentem.

Deus, Rex coelestis, Deus Patrem omnipotentem.

Deus, Rex coelestis, Deus Patrem omnipotentem.

Deus, Rex coelestis, Deus Patrem omnipotentem.

Deus, Rex coelestis, Deus Patrem omnipotentem.

Deus, Rex coelestis, Deus Patrem omnipotentem.

Deus, Rex coelestis, Deus Patrem omnipotentem.

Deus, Rex coelestis, Deus Patrem omnipotentem.

Deus, Rex coelestis, Deus Patrem omnipotentem.

Deus, Rex coelestis, Deus Patrem omnipotentem.

Deus, Rex coelestis, Deus Patrem omnipotentem.

Deus, Rex coelestis, Deus Patrem omnipotentem.

Deus, Rex coelestis, Deus Patrem omnipotentem.

Deus, Rex coelestis, Deus Patrem omnipotentem.

Deus, Rex coelestis, Deus Patrem omnipotentem.

Deus, Rex coelestis, Deus Patrem omnipotentem.

Deus, Rex coelestis, Deus Patrem omnipotentem.

Deus, Rex coelestis, Deus Patrem omnipotentem.

Deus, Rex coelestis, Deus Patrem omnipotentem.

Deus, Rex coelestis, Deus Patrem omnipotentem.

Deus, Rex coelestis, Deus Patrem omnipotentem.

Deus, Rex coelestis, Deus Patrem omnipotentem.

Deus, Rex coelestis, Deus Patrem omnipotentem.

Deus, Rex coelestis, Deus Patrem omnipotentem.

Deus, Rex coelestis, Deus Patrem omnipotentem.

Deus, Rex coelestis, Deus Patrem omnipotentem.

Deus, Rex coelestis, Deus Patrem omnipotentem.

Deus, Rex coelestis, Deus Patrem omnipotentem.

Deus, Rex coelestis, Deus Patrem omnipotentem.

Deus, Rex coelestis, Deus Patrem omnipotentem.

Deus, Rex coelestis, Deus Patrem omnipotentem.

Deus, Rex coelestis, Deus Patrem omnipotentem.

Deus, Rex coelestis, Deus Patrem omnipotentem.

Deus, Rex coelestis, Deus Patrem omnipotentem.

Deus, Rex coelestis, Deus Patrem omnipotentem.

Deus, Rex coelestis, Deus Patrem omnipotentem.

Deus, Rex coelestis, Deus Patrem omnipotentem.

Deus, Rex coelestis, Deus Patrem omnipotentem.

Deus, Rex coelestis, Deus Patrem omnipotentem.

Deus, Rex coelestis, Deus Patrem omnipotentem.

Deus, Rex coelestis, Deus Patrem omnipotentem.

Deus, Rex coelestis, Deus Patrem omnipotentem.

Deus, Rex coelestis, Deus Patrem omnipotentem.

Deus, Rex coelestis, Deus Patrem omnipotentem.

Deus, Rex coelestis, Deus Patrem omnipotentem.

Deus, Rex coelestis, Deus Patrem omnipotentem.

Deus, Rex coelestis, Deus Patrem omnipotentem.

Deus, Rex coelestis, Deus Patrem omnipotentem.

Deus, Rex coelestis, Deus Patrem omnipotentem.

Deus, Rex coelestis, Deus Patrem omnipotentem.

Deus, Rex coelestis, Deus Patrem omnipotentem.

Deus, Rex coelestis, Deus Patrem omnipotentem.

Deus, Rex coelestis, Deus Patrem omnipotentem.

Deus, Rex coelestis, Deus Patrem omnipotentem.

Deus, Rex coelestis, Deus Patrem omnipotentem.

Deus, Rex coelestis, Deus Patrem omnipotentem.

Deus, Rex coelestis, Deus Patrem omnipotentem.

Deus, Rex coelestis, Deus Patrem omnipotentem.

Deus, Rex coelestis, Deus Patrem omnipotentem.

Deus, Rex coelestis, Deus Patrem omnipotentem.

Deus, Rex coelestis, Deus Patrem omnipotentem.

Deus, Rex coelestis, Deus Patrem omnipotentem.

Deus, Rex coelestis, Deus Patrem omnipotentem.
mi-ne Deus, Agnus Dei, Filius

Domine Deus, Agnus Dei, Filius

Pa-tris. Qui tol-lis pec-ca-

Pa-tris. Qui tol-lis pec-ca-

Pa-tris. Qui tol-lis pec-
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re nobis. Quoniam tu solus sanctus. Tu solus on us.

re nobis. Quoniam tu solus sanctus. Tu solus on us.

re nobis. Quoniam tu solus sanctus. Tu solus on us.

re nobis. Quoniam tu solus sanctus. Tu solus on us.

re nobis. Quoniam tu solus sanctus. Tu solus on us.

re nobis. Quoniam tu solus sanctus. Tu solus on us.

re nobis. Quoniam tu solus sanctus. Tu solus on us.

re nobis. Quoniam tu solus sanctus. Tu solus on us.

re nobis. Quoniam tu solus sanctus. Tu solus on us.

re nobis. Quoniam tu solus sanctus. Tu solus on us.

re nobis. Quoniam tu solus sanctus. Tu solus on us.

re nobis. Quoniam tu solus sanctus. Tu solus on us.

re nobis. Quoniam tu solus sanctus. Tu solus on us.

re nobis. Quoniam tu solus sanctus. Tu solus on us.

re nobis. Quoniam tu solus sanctus. Tu solus on us.

re nobis. Quoniam tu solus sanctus. Tu solus on us.

re nobis. Quoniam tu solus sanctus. Tu solus on us.

re nobis. Quoniam tu solus sanctus. Tu solus on us.

re nobis. Quoniam tu solus sanctus. Tu solus on us.

re nobis. Quoniam tu solus sanctus. Tu solus on us.

re nobis. Quoniam tu solus sanctus. Tu solus on us.

re nobis. Quoniam tu solus sanctus. Tu solus on us.

re nobis. Quoniam tu solus sanctus. Tu solus on us.

re nobis. Quoniam tu solus sanctus. Tu solus on us.

re nobis. Quoniam tu solus sanctus. Tu solus on us.

re nobis. Quoniam tu solus sanctus. Tu solus on us.

re nobis. Quoniam tu solus sanctus. Tu solus on us.

re nobis. Quoniam tu solus sanctus. Tu solus on us.
Credo

Patrem omnipotentem, fac torem coeli, facem facem manum, facem facem f rei et terrae, vi
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C

Et ex Patre natum, et ex Patre natum
And of Father born, and of Father born

A

Et ex Patre natum, et ex Patre natum
And of Father born, and of Father born

T

Et ex Patre natum, et ex Patre natum
And of Father born, and of Father born

B

Et ex Patre natum, et ex Patre natum
And of Father born, and of Father born

---

All ages. God from God, light from light,

---

And of Father born, and of Father born

---

All ages. God from God, light from light,

---

All ages. God from God, light from light,
V

ne, De-um ve-rum de De-o ve-ro. Ge-ni-tum, non fac-

ne, De-um ve-rum de De-o ve-ro. Ge-ni-tum, non fac-

De-um ve-rum de De-o ve-ro. Ge-ni-tum, non fac-

De-um ve-rum de De-o ve-ro. Ge-ni-tum, non fac-

tum, con-sub-stan-ti-a-lem Pa-tri: per quem om-ni-

tum, con-sub-stan-ti-a-lem Pa-tri: per quem om-ni-

tum, con-sub-stan-ti-a-lem Pa-tri: per quem om-ni-

tum, con-sub-stan-ti-a-lem Pa-tri: per quem om-ni-
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B = circa 54
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P = 54
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P = 54
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P = 54

P = 40

P = 54

P = 40

P = 54

P = 40

P = 54

P = 40

P = 54

P = 40

P = 54

P = 40

P = 54

P = 40

P = 54

P = 40

P = 54

P = 40

P = 54

P = 40

P = 54

P = 40

P = 54

P = 40
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P = 40
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P = 40
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P = 40

P = 54

P = 40

P = 54

P = 40
 Qui prop-ter nos homi-nes, et prop-ter nos-tram sa-lu-tant. Who for us men, and for our salvation.

Et in-car-natus est de caelis. And made flesh was of heavens.
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us e-tiam pro nobis sub Pontius Pilate,
also for us under Pontius Pilate,

Pon-ti-o Pi-la-to,
Pontius Pilate,

Pon-ti-o Pi-la-ta, sub Pontius Pilate,

Pon-ti-o Pi-la-to, sub Pontius Pilate,

Pon-ti-o Pi-la-to, sub Pontius Pilate,

Pon-ti-o Pi-la-to,
Pontius Pilate,

Pon-ti-o Pi-la-ta, sub Pontius Pilate,

Pon-ti-o Pi-la-to, sub Pontius Pilate,

Pon-ti-o Pi-la-to,
Pontius Pilate,

Pon-ti-o Pi-la-ta, sub Pontius Pilate,

Pon-ti-o Pi-la-to, sub Pontius Pilate,

Pon-ti-o Pi-la-to,
Pontius Pilate,

Pon-ti-o Pi-la-ta, sub Pontius Pilate,
Et re-sur-rex-it ter-ti-a di-e, se-cun-dum Scrip-tu-res.

And he rose third day, according to Scriptures.

Et re-sur-rex-it ter-ti-a di-e, se-cun-dum Scrip-tu-res.

And he rose third day, according to Scriptures.

Et re-sur-rex-it ter-ti-a di-e, se-cun-dum Scrip-tu-res.

And he rose third day, according to Scriptures.

Et a-sca-n-dit in cae-lum: se-det ad dex-

And he ascended into heaven, he sits at right hand

Et a-sca-n-dit in cae-lum: se-det ad
dex-te-ram, se-det ad

And he ascended into heaven, he sits at

Et a-sca-n-dit in cae-

And he ascended into heaven,

Et a-sca-n-dit in cae-

And he ascended into heaven,
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216...

- te-ram Pa tris. Et i-terum ven-

dex-te-ram Pa tris. Et i-te-rum

dex-te-ram Pa tris. Et i-te-rum

lum: se-det ad dex-te-ram Pa tris. Et i-te-rum

tur- us est cum glo-ri-a iu-di-ca-re

i-ter-um ven- tu-r us est cum glo-ri-a iu-di-

tu-r us est cum glo-ri-a iu-di-ca-re vi-

rum ven-tu-r us est cum glo-ri-a iu-di-ca-re
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living\n
and\n
dead;\n
of whose\n
living\n
and\n
dead;\n
of whose
et vivifi - can - tem: qui ex Pa - tre, Fi - li-o-que pro - ce - dit. Qui cum proceeds. Who with

et vivifi - can - tem: qui ex Pa - tre, Fi - li-o-que pro - ce - dit. Qui cum proceeds. Who with

et vivifi - can - tem: qui ex Pa - tre, Fi - li-o-que pro - ce - dit. Qui cum proceeds. Who with

et vivifi - can - tem: qui ex Pa - tre, Fi - li-o-que pro - ce - dit. Qui cum proceeds. Who with

et vivifi - can - tem: qui ex Pa - tre, Fi - li-o-que pro - ce - dit. Qui cum proceeds. Who with

et vivifi - can - tem: qui ex Pa - tre, Fi - li-o-que pro - ce - dit. Qui cum proceeds. Who with

et vivifi - can - tem: qui ex Pa - tre, Fi - li-o-que pro - ce - dit. Qui cum proceeds. Who with

et vivifi - can - tem: qui ex Pa - tre, Fi - li-o-que pro - ce - dit. Qui cum proceeds. Who with

et vivifi - can - tem: qui ex Pa - tre, Fi - li-o-que pro - ce - dit. Qui cum proceeds. Who with

et vivifi - can - tem: qui ex Pa - tre, Fi - li-o-que pro - ce - dit. Qui cum proceeds. Who with

et vivifi - can - tem: qui ex Pa - tre, Fi - li-o-que pro - ce - dit. Qui cum proceeds. Who with

et vivifi - can - tem: qui ex Pa - tre, Fi - li-o-que pro - ce - dit. Qui cum proceeds. Who with

et vivifi - can - tem: qui ex Pa - tre, Fi - li-o-que pro - ce - dit. Qui cum proceeds. Who with

et vivifi - can - tem: qui ex Pa - tre, Fi - li-o-que pro - ce - dit. Qui cum proceeds. Who with

et vivifi - can - tem: qui ex Pa - tre, Fi - li-o-que pro - ce - dit. Qui cum proceeds. Who with

et vivifi - can - tem: qui ex Pa - tre, Fi - li-o-que pro - ce - dit. Qui cum proceeds. Who with

et vivifi - can - tem: qui ex Pa - tre, Fi - li-o-que pro - ce - dit. Qui cum proceeds. Who with

et vivifi - can - tem: qui ex Pa - tre, Fi - li-o-que pro - ce - dit. Qui cum proceeds. Who with

et vivifi - can - tem: qui ex Pa - tre, Fi - li-o-que pro - ce - dit. Qui cum proceeds. Who with

et vivifi - can - tem: qui ex Pa - tre, Fi - li-o-que pro - ce - dit. Qui cum proceeds. Who with
Et unus, sanctam, catholicam et apostolicam Ecclesiam.

And one, holy, catholic and Apostolic Church.

Qui locutus est per Prophetas.
I confess one baptism for remission of sins.

And I expect resurrection of dead.

Et expecto resurrectionem mortuorum.
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265 coda 266
rum. Et vi-tam ven-tu-ri sae-cu-li, et
vi-tam ven-

267 allegro
rum. And life to come of age, and life to come

268 allegro
rum. And vi-tam ven-tu-ri sae-cu-li, Amen, Amen,

269 allegro
vu-ri sae-cu-li, Amen, Amen.

270 tempo I

271 allegro

272 allegro
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San na in highest.

Benedictus qui venit,

Be - - - - - - - - - -

be - - - - - - - - - -

Blessed who comes,

Blessed who comes,

Benedictus qui venit,

Be - - - - - - - - - -

Be - - - - - - - - - -

who comes,

who comes,
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be ne dic tus qui ve nit
blessed who comes

in no mi ne Do mi ni. Ho san na in ex cel sis.
in name of Lord. Hosanna in highest.

in no mi ne Do mi ni. Ho san na in ex-
in name of Lord. Hosanna in highest.

in no mi ne Do mi ni. Ho san na in ex-
in name of Lord. Hosanna in highest.

in no mi ne Do mi ni. Ho san na
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Agnus Dei, qui tollis pecata mundi:
Lamb of God, who takes away sins of world,

muni di, qui tollis pecata mundi:
who takes away sins of world,

i, qui tollis pecata mundi:
who takes away sins of world,

mi se re re, mi se re re nobis, mi se re re:
have mercy on us, have mercy,

mi se re re nobis, mi se re re:
have mercy on us, have mercy,

mi se re re, mi se re re nobis,
have mercy on us, have mercy,

misere re re nobis, misere re re:
have mercy on us, have mercy,
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re, mi-se-re-re no-bis, mi-se-re-re no-bis, have mercy, have mercy on us, on us,

re-re no-bis, mi-se-re-re no-bis, have mercy on us, have mercy

mi-se-re-re no-bis, mi-se-re-re no-bis, have mercy on us, have mercy

bis, mi-se-re-re, mi-se-re-re, mi-se-re-re no-bis. have mercy, have mercy have mercy on us.

mi-se-re-re, mi-se-re-re no-bis. have mercy, have mercy on us

bis. have mercy, have mercy on us

bis, mi-se-re-re-re re no-bis. have mercy, have mercy on us.