



Title: “Shall the dead arise and praise you?” : Revisions to the Missa pro defunctis in Italian printed graduals, 1591–1621

Author(s): Marianne C. E. Gillion

Source: *Creatio ex unisono : Einstimmige Musik im 15. und 16. Jahrhundert*, ed. by Nicole Schwindt; Dresden, musiconn.publish 2020, (= troja. Jahrbuch für Renaissancemusik 13), p. 59–80.

DOI: <https://doi.org/10.25371/troja.v20142583>



Creative Commons license: CC BY-SA

Vorliegende Publikation wird unter obengenannter CC-Lizenz durch musiconn.publish im Open Access bereitgestellt.

musiconn.publish dient der kostenfreien elektronischen Publikation, dem Nachweis und der langfristigen Archivierung von musikwissenschaftlicher Fachliteratur. Auch Arbeiten aus der Musikpädagogik und der Künstlerischen Forschung mit Musikbezug sind willkommen. Außerdem bietet musiconn.publish die Möglichkeit zur digitalen Publikation von wissenschaftlichen Noteneditionen.

musiconn.publish ist ein Service des Fachinformationsdienstes Musikwissenschaft (musiconn – für vernetzte Musikwissenschaft), der von der Deutschen Forschungsgemeinschaft gefördert und gemeinschaftlich von der Sächsischen Landesbibliothek – Staats- und Universitätsbibliothek Dresden und der Bayerischen Staatsbibliothek München betrieben wird.

Weitere Informationen zu musiconn.publish finden Sie hier: <https://musiconn.qucosa.de/>

Eine Übersicht zu allen Services von musiconn finden Sie hier: <https://www.musiconn.de/>



Sächsische Landesbibliothek –

Staats- und Universitätsbibliothek Dresden

Zellescher Weg 18

01069 Dresden

www.slub-dresden.de

Marianne C. E. Gillion

“Shall the dead arise and praise you?” – Revisions to the *Missa pro defunctis* in Italian printed graduals, 1591–1621

At the end of the sixteenth century the revision of plainchant in Italian printed graduals, which had been occurring in a moderate fashion throughout the previous decades, took a rather dramatic turn.¹ The major publishers of liturgical books began issuing volumes containing melodies that had been heavily “corrected”. Industrious, often anonymous, editors had undertaken the task of reshaping a large, stylistically diverse, and well-known corpus of music. The motivations and methods guiding their work are often difficult to trace, and given the relative lack of written evidence both must be sought in the modified chants themselves.² An exploration of the mass proper of an important liturgical celebration, the *Missa pro defunctis*, provides a panorama of the approaches to and processes of chant revision in influential printed sources. Whilst editors were united in the overarching aims guiding their work, the importance assigned to any particular aim could vary based upon individual aesthetic goals. Similarly, the techniques of chant revision were also shared, but employed differently in accordance with personal plans and priorities.³ All of the editors, to greater or lesser degrees, evinced an awareness of the larger contexts: where a chant stood in the often interrelated corpus of melodies, and where their source stood in the often intertwined printed plainchant traditions. The revisions to plainchant that occur from the late sixteenth century onwards, though far-reaching, thus do not

1 This is an expanded and revised version of a paper I delivered at the Royal Musical Association Study Day *Music in the Seicento*, held at the University of York on 20 October 2012, and later at the *Explorations in Music Theology: History, Theory and Practice* Postgraduate Study Day held at Durham University on 12 March 2013. It also draws upon my doctoral thesis “*Diligentissime emendatum, atque correctum*”? *The transmission and revision of plainchant in Italian printed graduals, 1499–1653*, PhD diss. University of Manchester, 2015.

2 The most detailed investigation of plainchant in printed sources from the late sixteenth century onwards is Theodore Karp, *An Introduction to the Post-Tridentine Mass Proper*, 2 vols. (Middletown, WI, 2005).

3 *Ibid.*, vol. 1, pp. 3, 203–204.

represent a massive break with the past but rather a carefully considered and decisive move into the future.

A new phase of plainchant revision

In 1587 the Venetian music printing firm of Gardano issued a short *Graduale, et Antiphonarium omnium dierum festorum ordinis minorum*, wherein the chant melodies had been systematically shortened and recast by the editor Ludovico Balbi.⁴ Four years later, Angelo Gardano published a full *Graduale Romanum*.⁵ In the preface Gardano claims that the chants contained in the volume have been amended according to “ancient customs”, with correct orthography, accurate text underlay, and properly placed divisions. This work had been carried out by three editors who worked both individually and as a team: Andrea Gabrieli, Ludovico Balbi, and Orazio Vecchi.⁶ Whilst the contention that the plainchant in the volume reflected ancient use is debatable, the musical contents of the volume had been altered even more extensively than in the earlier print.⁷ In 1596, the influential firm of Giunta issued its own newly revised gradual, with an amended version ten years later. The melodies from the 1606 edition would form the basis of interrelated printed chant traditions in subsequent graduals issued by the Venetian publishers Giunta, Ciera, and Baba throughout the first

4 Richard Agee, “Ideological Clashes in a Cinquecento Edition of Plainchant”, *Music, Dance and Society: Medieval and Renaissance Studies in Memory of Ingrid G. Brainard*, ed. Ann Buckley and Cynthia J. Cyrus (Kalamazoo, 2011), pp. 143–158: pp. 146–154.

5 Ibid. For a bibliographical description of the *Graduale Romanum* (Venice: Gardano, 1591) see Marco Gozzi, *Le Fonti Liturgiche a Stampa della Biblioteca Musicale L. Feininger*. Patrimonio storico e artistico del Trentino 17 (Trent, 1994), pp. 452–453. For an examination of the musical contents, see Annarita Indino, “Il Graduale stampato da Angelo Gardano (1591)”, *Il canto piano nell’era della stampa: atti del Convegno internazionale di studi sul canto liturgico nei secoli XV–XVIII [...] 1998*, ed. Giulio Cattin, Danilo Curti, and Marco Gozzi (Trent, 1999), pp. 207–221.

6 “Quod quidem Graduale Romanum à multis praestantibus, et primarijs Italiae viris, musica praeditis, in cantibus ipsis planis eruditissimis, revisum fuit: et in primis à R.D. Andrea Gabriele in Ecclesia Divi Marci Venetiarum Organico; à R. Magistro Ludovico Balbio, in Ecclesia Divi Antonij Patavini Musices moderatore et à R.D. Horatio de Vecchijs Mutinensi Canonico Corrigenti; à quibus omnibus coniunctim, et separatim summo studio, ac diligentia correctum fuit, et emendatum: ut ei non desit illa praestantissima correctio, qua tanti ponderis opus indiguisset, tam in Musica, quàm in litteris iustè positis, sub suis (ut vocant) notis, seu signis, ubi debent cantari, cum suis pulcherrimis divisionibus; veram orthographiam, et ipsorum cantuum planorum usum antiquum observando.” *Graduale Romanum* (Venice: Gardano, 1591), fol. 2r. The extent of Gabrieli’s work on the volume is unclear, especially given the fact that he died in 1585. Agee argues that this means that “editorial activity” must have taken place before his death. R. Agee, *Ideological Clashes* (cf. fn. 4), p. 146.

7 Ibid., pp. 148–154.

half of the seventeenth century.⁸ Between 1614 and 1615 the Medicean press in Rome issued a two-volume *Graduale Romanum*, edited mainly by Francesco Soriano and Felice Anerio.⁹ The “Medicean Edition” was the culmination of a 20-year project instigated by the printer Giovanni Battista Raimondi.¹⁰ The work had been granted a 15-year privilege by Pope Paul V in 1608, but he withdrew his support prior to printing. Although the privilege remained, the universal church was never bound to use the gradual. The influence of the Medicean Edition upon later printed graduals is minimal; however, references to its melodic readings can be traced in the *Graduale Romanum* issued by Ciera in 1621.¹¹ The plainchant in these sources issued between 1591 and 1621 has been changed dramatically when compared to that in earlier prints, featuring brief, reshaped melodies that sometimes seem to maintain only a faint connection to their musical antecedents.

The impetus behind this new phase of chant revision is unclear. Although given the epithet of “Post-Tridentine”,¹² the alterations to plainchant cannot be linked directly to the reforms of the Council of Trent (1545–1563). As Craig Monson has observed, the Council’s decrees concerning music, as opposed to the detailed preliminary discussions, were vague.¹³ “Lascivious elements” sometimes introduced in singing or organ playing were banned by the “decree concerning things to be observed and avoided in the celebration of the Mass” from the 22nd session of September 1562.¹⁴ The 24th session, held in November 1563, referred any decisions concerning “the appropriate style of singing and chant-

8 Th. Karp, Introduction (cf. fn. 2), vol. 1, pp. 8, 201. These editions include: *Graduale Romanum* (Venice: Giunta, 1611, 1618, 1647; Venice: Ciera, 1610, 1618, 1629; Venice: Baba, 1653). Karp notes that some variants between the chant melodies can be observed.

9 David Hiley, *Western Plainchant: A Handbook* (Oxford, 1993), pp. 615–618. The editorial work on the gradual was begun by a six-man committee, but the panel eventually dwindled to only two members, Anerio and Soriano.

10 Robert F. Hayburn, *Papal Legislation on Sacred Music 95 A.D. to 1977 A.D.* (Collegeville, MN, 1979), pp. 44–64.

11 Th. Karp, Introduction (cf. fn. 2), vol. 1, pp. 8, 86, 202.

12 This label appears to have been instigated by Raphael Molitor in his seminal work *Die nachtridentinische Choral-Reform zu Rom. Ein Beitrag zur Musikgeschichte des XVI. und XVII. Jahrhunderts* (Leipzig, 1901–1902). It was subsequently used by Karp in his influential study (cf. fn. 2).

13 Craig A. Monson, “The Council of Trent Revisited”, *Journal of the American Musicological Society* 55 (2002), pp. 1–37: pp. 2–3.

14 “Ab ecclesiis vero musicas eas, ubi sive organo sive cantu lascivum aut impurum aliquid miscetur, item saeculares omnes actiones, vana atque adeo profana colloquia, deambulationes, strepitus, clamores arceant, ut domus Dei vere domus orationis esse videatur ac dici possit”: *Decrees of the Ecumenical Councils*, ed. Norman P. Tanner (London, 1990), vol. 2, p. 737.

ing” to the local level.¹⁵ More consequential for plainchant was a decree from the 25th session recommending that a revision of liturgical books, including the missal and the breviary, be undertaken.¹⁶ The “restored” *Missale Romanum* was published in 1570 with a bull mandating its universal adoption, unless an institution or a region could demonstrate the use of a different rite for over 200 years.¹⁷ Alterations to the liturgy found in the missal were incorporated into subsequently issued printed graduals, and did impact the texts and melodies of certain chants.¹⁸ However, the act of bringing the sung celebrations into conformity with the textual amendments of the revised *Missale Romanum* did not appear to inspire more wide-ranging alterations to the music of the Mass by the editors employed by the Italian publishing firms.¹⁹

Yet it is possible that a different approach towards chant revision came from Rome, although in a more indirect manner. In 1577, Pope Gregory XIII commissioned the composers Giovanni Pierluigi da Palestrina and Annibale Zoilo to revise the contents of the gradual, antiphoner, and psalter, bemoaning the “barbarisms, obscurities, contrarities, and superfluties” that filled the volumes.²⁰ The precise nature of the problems listed by the pope is somewhat unclear, but Molitor argues that they include imprecise text underlay, inaccurate prosody, melodic variants, terminal melismas, and material made redundant by the revised *Missale Romanum*.²¹ A report on “the Gradual of Palestrina”, sheds light

15 “Cetera, quae ad debitum in divinis officiis regimen spectant, deque congrua in his canendi seu modulandi ratione, de certa lege in choro conveniendi et permanendi, simulque de omnibus ecclesiae ministris, quae necessaria erunt, et si qua huiusmodi: synodus provincialis pro cuiusque provinciae utilitate et moribus certam cuique formulam praescribet. Interea vero episcopus, non minus quam cum duobus canonicis, quorum unus ab episcopo, alter a capitulo eligatur, in his, quae expedire videbuntur, poterit providere”: *ibid.*, vol. 2, p. 767. See also C. Monson, Council (cf. fn. 13), pp. 12–19.

16 4 December 1563: “Super indice librorum, catechism, breviario et missali”, N. Tanner, Decrees (cf. fn. 14), vol. 2, p. 797.

17 John W. O’Malley, *Trent: What Happened at the Council* (Cambridge, MA, 2013), p. 269.

18 Marianne C.E. Gillion, “‘Cantate domino canticum novum’? A re-examination of ‘Post-Tridentine chant revision in Italian printed graduals’”, *The Council of Trent: Reform and Controversy in Europe and Beyond (1545–1700)*, ed. Violet Soen and Wim François, vol. 3 (Göttingen, forthcoming).

19 *Ibid.*

20 Oliver Strunk and Leo Treitler, *Source Readings in Music History*, rev. ed. (New York, 1998), p. 375. For the full translation, see pp. 375–76. The Latin text is found in R. Molitor, Nach-tridentinische (cf. fn. 12), vol. 1, pp. 297–98. See also Th. Karp, Introduction (cf. fn. 2), vol. 1, p. 2.

21 R. Molitor, Nach-tridentinische (cf. fn. 12), vol. 1, p. 94. In his consideration of the brief, Karp includes lack of modal centrality as one of the possible areas targeted for modification. Th. Karp, Introduction (cf. fn. 2), vol. 1, p. 2. For a discussion of the term “barbarism” in six-

on Palestrina and Zoilo's interpretation of the papal brief. According to this document, their revisions focused on eliminating melismas on single syllables, rectifying textual accentuation, and correctly notating *mi* and *fa*.²² The composers probably completed their task in 1578; however, partly due to pressure from Philipp II of Spain Gregory withdrew his support the same year, and the project was never brought to completion.²³

Any potential influence that this abandoned attempt at plainchant revision could have had on future publications is a matter of debate. In his attempt to revive a Roman series of chant books Raimondi attempted to obtain the results of the work from Palestrina in 1593. The composer explained that he only possessed the *Dominicale*, as the *Sanctorale* had been Zoilo's purview, but promised to work on the latter and to provide it in three to four months' time. Upon Palestrina's death in 1594 the manuscripts became the property of his son Iginio, who then sold them to Raimondi. When examined by an expert panel the *Sanctorale* was discovered to be a forgery. After years of legal intrigue, the documents were sold to a pawnshop and have never been recovered.²⁴ However, Richard Agee recently proposed a theory that the reforms of Palestrina might have traveled northwards to Venice, at least in spirit.²⁵ He uncovered documents which state that in 1582, Angelo Gardano's Roman agent was sent to negotiate a contract with Palestrina. In 1583, the publisher applied for a printing privilege in Vienna covering chant books edited by Zoilo and Palestrina.²⁶ Agee notes that it is impossible to determine to what extent – if any – the reforms of the two composers influenced the chant revision in Gardano's later publications.²⁷ Nevertheless, the possible connection between Gardano and Palestrina might explain the new efforts towards chant revision that arose in Venice in the final decades of the sixteenth century.

The amendments to plainchant found in printed graduals from 1587 onwards, although more expansive than those seen previously, were still rooted in a

teenth-century music criticism, see Don Harrán, "Elegance as a Concept in Sixteenth-Century Music Criticism", *Renaissance Quarterly* 41 (1988), pp. 413–438: pp. 420–426.

22 The text of the report is found in R. Molitor, *Nach-tridentinische* (cf. fn. 12), vol. 1, p. 305. He states that the report is held by the Archivio di Stato di Firenze (Doc. d. stamp. orientale). For an English translation of the text, see R.F. Hayburn, *Papal Legislation* (cf. fn. 10), p. 42.

23 R.F. Hayburn, *Papal Legislation* (cf. fn. 10), pp. 38–43; R. Molitor, *Nach-tridentinische* (cf. fn. 12), vol. 1: pp. 296–297.

24 R.F. Hayburn, *Papal Legislation* (cf. fn. 10), pp. 46–47.

25 R. Agee, *Ideological Clashes* (cf. fn. 4), pp. 143–146.

26 Agee states that these documents are found in "the Venetian State Archive and the Imperial Chancellery in Vienna", but he does not provide shelfmarks; *ibid.*, p. 145.

27 *Ibid.*, p. 146.

tradition of chant revision that extended back to the first gradual printed in the Italian peninsula. Luc'Antonio Giunta's two-volume *Graduale Romanum* (Venice, 1499/1500) was edited by the Franciscan friar Francis of Bruges. In his efforts to restore the chant from a state of "deprived corruption" ("deprevatam corruptionem"), he claimed to have removed errors, properly placed the pause lines, and correctly notated necessary accidentals.²⁸ The musical readings found in the gradual would be appropriated and adapted by the printing firms of Liechtenstein, Porris, Porris and Dossene, and Varisco, and thus served as the foundation of a series of interrelated printed chant traditions.²⁹ The alterations made to chant during this period were often modest. However, more significant changes could occur, such as the excision of portions of melismas seen in Porris and Dossene's 1524 *Graduale Romanum* (Turin), and in the abbreviated gradu-als issued by Giunta in 1546 and 1560.³⁰ The later editors of plainchant would expand and add to these techniques of chant revision: removing and adding notes, repositioning the text underlay, notating accidentals, amending the prosody, shifting the placement of pause lines, and adapting notational forms.³¹

28 "Primum namque est quod errores tollere summopere studuimus qui partim ex scriptorium inscitia seu si quid artis norunt in scribendo negligentia, partim ex ingeniorum diversitate omnia propemodum gradualia repleverunt. Volentibus etenim diversa diversis, ac proinde quibusdam addentibus quibusdam vero tollentibus, in usqueadeo depravatam corruptionem omnium ferme cantionum eventum est ut impossibile sit eas ad originales pristinasse redigere neumas. Secundum vero est quod pausationes necessaria annotavimus plurimasque pessime prius appositae delevimus: veluti fuisse necessarium nosce poteritis ex his que in captibus huius compendii de distinctionibus et de progressionibus asseruimus. Sed in hac nostra errorum summotione pausarumque congrua annotatione hoc non ignoretis quod cunctum id quod supportari potuit absque artis et regularum eius contradictione totum prorsus intactum dimisimus, id solummodo subtrahentes quod vitiatum fuisse manifesta artis impatientia perspicuum est. Tertium est quod ubicumque suspicati sumus quempiam posse in incertum incidere an molliter canendum sit an dure, seu ad evitandum tritonum vel ad generandam meliorem consonantiam an 'mi' aut 'fa' debeat per ordinem qui accidentalis nuncupatur cantari, rite omnia signavimus": Giuseppe Massera, *La 'Mano musicale perfetta' di Francesco de Brugis delle prefazioni a corali di L.A. Giunta. Venezia, 1499-1504* (Florence, 1963), p. 72. For discussions of Francis' chant revision, see *ibid.* See also Marianne C.E. Gillion, *Accidental Chant Revision: A case study of accidental use in the Giunta Graduale (1499-1500) edited by Francis of Bruges* (MA diss. Bangor University, 2011).

29 Richard J. Agee, "The Printed Dissemination of the Roman Gradual in Italy During the Early Modern Period", *Notes* 64 (2007), pp. 9-42; M. Gillion, *Cantate* (cf. fn. 18).

30 Giunta issued another abbreviated gradual in 1580. There are no extant copies, so it is uncertain how this print related to the editions preceding it.

31 Karp notes that the editors of printed gradu-als revised the chants in accordance with their own theoretical and aesthetic standards. He contrasts this with the source comparison and "best reading" method he states was starting to be used by "secular scholars". Th. Karp, *Introduction* (cf. fn. 2), vol. 1, p. 3. However, Brian Richardson, in his study of the editing and printing of vernacular texts in early modern Italy, observes that careful and consistent recourse to the source during this period was an editorial exception rather than the norm. Brian Richardson, *Print*

These amendments fulfill the aims of increased brevity and improved prosody, combined with a readiness to alter the melodic line, that Karp argues guided chant revision from the late sixteenth century onwards.³² In addition, the alterations to pause lines also demonstrate a concern with recasting the textual-musical syntax of the chants. Although the methods and priorities of plainchant revision were broadly shared individual editorial implementations varied, and could thus result in rather differently reformed chants.

Revisions to the Requiem

The aims of and approaches to chant revision by editors of early modern Italian printed graduals can be explored through the modifications made to one of the most important liturgical celebrations: the *Missa pro defunctis*. Death was omnipresent, and the importance of dying well (*ars moriendi*) and properly carrying out the rituals for the dead prescribed by the church not only had important salvific consequences, but also served to comfort the living.³³ In the seventeenth and eighteenth centuries the focus on continual preparation for death increased, and this, combined with a belief in the immediate divine judgment of the dead, led to an emphasis on the days directly following death.³⁴ The Requiem Mass, a votive Mass for the dead, was an integral part of the Catholic rituals surrounding death. It could be sung on the day of the burial, on specified dates after the interment, and on subsequent anniversaries.³⁵ Whilst its history stretches back to as early as the second century, the earliest musical sources date only from the tenth. From then there was a significant increase in the repertory, although as Karp notes, two-thirds of the chant represent local practice. Both the variety of the chants and the frequency of Requiem use were limited by church law.³⁶

Culture in Renaissance Italy: The Editor and the Vernacular Text 1470–1600 (Cambridge, 1996), pp. 20–23.

32 Th. Karp, Introduction (cf. fn. 2), vol. 1, pp. 203–204.

33 Mia Korpiola and Anu Lahtinen, “Cultures of Death and Dying in Medieval and Early Modern Europe: An Introduction”, *Cultures of Death and Dying in Early Modern Europe*, ed. Mia Korpiola and Anu Lahtinen, *COLLeGIUM: Studies across Disciplines in the Humanities and Social Sciences* 18 (2015), pp. 1–31: pp. 1–2, accessible online: <http://tinyurl.com/Korpiola>.

34 Alexandra Bamji, “The Catholic Life Cycle”, *The Ashgate Research Companion to the Counter-Reformation*, ed. Alexandra Bamji, Geert H. Janssen, and Mary Laven (Farnham, 2013), pp. 183–201: pp. 197–198.

35 Theodore Karp, Fabrice Fitch, and Basil Smallman, “Requiem Mass”, *Grove Music Online. Oxford Music Online* (accessed 01/07/2016).

36 *Ibid.* In addition, as Bamji notes, the changing ideas concerning death and judgment appear to have played a role in the decline of perpetual masses for the dead. A. Bamji, *Catholic Life* (cf. fn. 34), p. 198.

GIU 1499/1500
e - is

GAR 1591
e - is

GIU 1596
e - - - is

CIE 1610
e - - - is

MED 1614/15
e - - - - - is

CIE 1621
e - - - - - is

Example 1: Introit, “*Requiem aeternam*”: “eis”

Graduals published in the Italian peninsula between 1499 and 1653 transmit what in the late nineteenth and twentieth centuries would become known as the “normative formula”: the introit “*Requiem aeternam*”; a gradual of the same name; the tract “*Absolve Domine*”; the sequence “*Dies irae*”; the offertory “*Domine Iesu Christe*”; and the communion “*Lux aeterna*”.³⁷ A survey of the main chants of the proper³⁸ in editions of the *Graduale Romanum* issued by Giunta (Venice, 1499/1500,³⁹ 1596), Gardano (Venice, 1591), Ciera (Venice, 1610, 1621), and Medici (Rome, 1614/15) will highlight the methods, aims, and results of chant revision in key sources printed in Italy during the early modern period.⁴⁰

The relatively short chants that open and close the Mass, with their sparse textures and few melismatic passages, were often revised relatively lightly by chant editors. This is the case in both the introit and the communion of the *Missa pro defunctis*. Few notes are excised or added, so the melodic profiles of the chants in the later graduals remain quite similar to those in Giunta 1499/1500.

37 Th. Karp, F. Fitch, and B. Smallman, *Requiem Mass* (cf. fn. 35).

38 The sequence will not be examined, as its syllabic texture prompted relatively few revisions. Anerio and Soriano made the most extensive alterations to “*Dies irae*”, some of which are transmitted in Ciera 1621. Alterations to syllabic chants are addressed in the discussion of introits and communions.

39 The melodies found in Giunta 1499/1500, as the foundation of the printed chant tradition in the Italian peninsula, will be used as a baseline but not otherwise analysed.

40 These sources are selected because of the individuality of their revisions and/or the influence of their melodic readings on later editions of the *Graduale Romanum* printed in the Italian peninsula.

The image shows a musical score for the Introit "Requiem aeternam" with the text "domine". It consists of six staves, each representing a different source. The text is written below the notes, with hyphens indicating syllable boundaries. The sources and their corresponding text are:

- GIU 1499/1500: do - mi - - - - - ne
- GAR 1591: Do - mi - - - - - ne
- GIU 1596: do - - - - - mi - - - - - ne
- CIE 1610: Do - - - - - mi - - - - - ne
- MED 1614/15: Do - - - - - mi - ne
- CIE 1621: Do - - - - - mi - ne

Example 2: Introit, “*Requiem aeternam*”: “domine”

The main alterations concern the repositioning of the text underlay, which in some cases appears to have been shifted so that the musical accent of the word (defined by the number of notes per syllable) coincides with the prosodic accent of the text.⁴¹ However, not all of the editors evince the same level of concern for positive syllable-accent correlation. The introit “*Requiem aeternam*” has eight polysyllabic words.⁴² In the musical reading transmitted in Giunta 1499/1500, four words have positive syllable-accent correlation, one has neutral (“perpetua”) and three have negative (the first “eis”, “domine”, and “luceat”). On “eis” (see Example 1), which has a lengthy terminal melisma, the editor of Giunta 1596 moves the second syllable forward by several notes so that the accent is divided almost equally between the syllables; however, it is still technically “faulty”. In Medici 1614/15 Anerio and Soriano shift the final syllable so that it falls on the final note, amending the ungrammatical accent. This change is also transmitted in Ciera 1621. In contrast to the revisions in the other sources, the editorial team

41 There is debate surrounding the nature of the accent in plainchant: whether it is tonic (height of pitch), stress (number of notes per syllable), or conveyed by the occurrence of structural notes. It appears that sixteenth-century theorists conceived of the accent in terms of stress, and as such this definition is used in the following analyses. For a summary of the main views on the topic, see Willi Apel, *Gregorian Chant* (Bloomington, 1958), pp. 279–297; John Stevens, *Words and Music in the Middle Ages: Song, Narrative, Dance and Drama, 1050–1350* (Cambridge, 1986), pp. 277–283; Don Harrán, *Word-Tone Relations in Musical Thought: From Antiquity to the 17th century*. *Musicological studies and documents* 40 (Neuhausen-Stuttgart, 1986), pp. 10–16.

42 The psalm verse of the introit, due to its almost entirely syllabic text setting, is not considered here.

The image shows six staves of musical notation for the Communion "Lux aeterna". Each staff is labeled with an edition name and a date. The lyrics are "e - ter - - na" for the first two staves and "ac - ter - - na" for the last four. The syllables are connected by horizontal lines, and some have a dash underneath, indicating accents. The notation includes a treble clef, a key signature of one flat, and a common time signature.

Edition	Lyrics
GIU 1499/1500	e - ter - - na
GAR 1591	e - ter - - na
GIU 1596	ac - ter - - na
CIE 1610	ac - ter - - na
MED 1614/15	ac - ter - - na
CIE 1621	ac - ter - - na

Example 3: Communion, "*Lux aeterna*": "aeterna"

of Gardano 1591 leaves the text underlay unchanged. This pattern is repeated on the word "domine" (see Example 2), with positive syllable-accent correlation created in Medici 1614/15 and Ciera 1621, and the negative syllable-accent correlation retained in Gardano 1591. In this instance, the editor of Giunta 1596 has created slightly more emphasis on the stressed syllable of "domine", but by an almost imperceptible margin (4–3–2).⁴³ These tendencies towards repositioning the text underlay are also observable in the communion "*Lux aeterna*", as seen on the words "aeterna" (see Example 3) and "domine" (see Example 4). It thus appears that of the editors, Anerio and Soriano were the most concerned with conveying proper prosodic accent, and the editorial team of Gardano 1591 the least. The anonymous editor of Giunta 1596, whose revisions form the basis of those followed in most of the Cieran prints, displayed a variable approach to altering the text underlay. Although he sometimes repositioned the text he was often content, especially in chants where little else was altered, to leave it unchanged. Surprisingly, despite drawing largely from the Cieran tradition, the editor of the print from 1621 sometimes seems to draw upon readings from the Medicean Edition, creating "hybrid" chants.⁴⁴

43 The final instance of negative syllable-accent correlation, on "luceat", is not amended by any of the editors.

44 The editor of Ciera 1621 also seems to have drawn upon readings from Giunta 1596, as opposed to the re-revised melodies from Giunta 1606 that were used as the basis of Ciera 1610. Thus the chants in Ciera 1621 are a most likely a conflation of at least three sources. M. Gillion, *Diligentissime* (cf. fn. 1).

The image shows a musical score for the Communion, "Lux aeterna": "domine". It consists of six staves, each representing a different source. The sources are: GIU 1499/1500, GAR 1591, GIU 1596, CIE 1610, MED 1614/15, and CIE 1621. Each staff shows a melodic line with notes and lyrics. The lyrics are "do - - - mi - - - ne". The notes are connected by a slur, indicating a melisma. The sources show variations in the number of notes and the placement of the lyrics.

Example 4: Communion, "*Lux aeterna*": "domine"

One of the defining characteristics of revised plainchant in Italian printed graduals from the late sixteenth and early seventeenth centuries is its brevity. The gradual "*Requiem aeternam*" contains the most drastic excisions of melodic material from the proper chants of the *Missa pro defunctis*. If the reading in Giunta 1499/1500 is taken as a guide, then the cuts made in the case study graduals total between approximately 44–49% of the notes.⁴⁵ The size and the location of the excisions are dependent upon various factors, including the melodic density of the passage, the surrounding musical context, and the editors' overarching plan for the revised chant. When these are taken into consideration, the cuts can be classified into three types. The first is the removal of between one to four notes.⁴⁶ In these later sources, this type of melodic excision normally occurs in passages with sparser textures. An example of this can be seen in Giunta 1596 and the prints that draw upon it on the word "eis", near the opening of "*Requiem aeternum*" (see Example 5). The editor has cut the first three notes, *a* / *a*-*G*, so that the word begins on *b*-flat. This removes a three-fold repetition of the note *a*

⁴⁵ Gardano 1591: 46%; Giunta 1596 and Ciera 1610: 44%; Medici 1614/15: 48%; Ciera 1621: 49%. These figures do not include few added notes in Gardano 1591 and in Medici 1614/15.

⁴⁶ These numbers are tied to the concept of melismatic density: whether a setting is syllabic (between one to three notes per syllable), neumatic (approximately three to six notes per syllable), or melismatic (above seven notes per syllable). As four notes straddles a relative midway point between the different categories of melismatic density, it was chosen as the cut-off for the first type of melodic excision. For a discussion of melismatic density, including the preceding definitions, see Emma Hornby and Rebecca Maloy, *Music and Meaning in Old Hispanic Lenten Chants: Psalmi, Threni and Easter Vigil Canticles* (Woodbridge, 2013), p. 15.

GIU 1499/1500
do - - - na e - is

GIU 1596
do - - - na e - is

CIE 1610
do - - - na e - is

CIE 1621
do - - - na e - is

Example 5: Gradual, “*Requiem aeternum*”: “dona eis”

between the words “dona” and “eis”, and allows the line to move briefly down to *G*. The second type of melodic excision is the removal of multiple contiguous notes from a passage. This type of cut is often used when editors wish to retain the structurally important opening and closing notes of a phrase. The editorial team of Gardano 1591 and that of Medici 1614/15 use this technique identically on the word “iustus” (see Example 6). They retain the first five notes of the melisma, a decorated oscillation between *e* and *c*. After this, they cut a swathe of reiterative melodic material before they “reconnect” the melody at its end, a brief three-note close to *a*.

The third type of melodic excision is the removal of multiple, non-contiguous notes: essentially a combination of the first and second types. When employing this technique, the editors appear to choose notes and gestures from a phrase in order to reshape the melodic line according to their overarching plan for the revised chant. This can be seen quite clearly in the modifications made in Giunta 1596 to three melismas that occur during the course of “*Requiem aeternam*” (see Example 7).⁴⁷ The first is on the word “perpetua”, and here the editor employs the second category of melodic excision. He keeps the first six notes of the passage, which include a prominent rising *c-d-e* gesture, removes the central portion and reconnects the melody to an extended cadence to *F*. The *c-d-e* figure appears to have been of some importance to the editor as it is retained when it occurs in the melismas on the words “eis” and “aeterna”. In order to preserve this feature, he employs the third type of melodic excision. On “eis” he leaves the first two notes, a descent from *c* to *a*, which approximate the *c-b* fall at the beginning of “perpetua”. He then removes the three notes between the *a* and the *c-d-e* figure. After a second, larger cut the melody continues with a decorated

⁴⁷ The readings of these melismas are also transmitted in Ciera 1610 and, with a single-note variant, Ciera 1621.

GIU
1499/1500
iu - - - - - stus

GAR
1591
iu - - - - - stus

MED
1614/15
iu - - - - - stus

Example 6: Gradual, “*Requiem aeternum*”: “iustus”

cadence to *a*. The word “aeterna” begins in a higher tessitura, with an oscillation between *d* and *e*. Again, the editor excises the material between the opening of the melisma and the *c-d-e* gesture, which in this instances encompasses a reiterative fall to *G*. A second cut occurs, eliminating another descent to *G* and a swift ascent to high *f*. The reconstructed melisma ends with a simple two-note close to *d*. The excisions on either side of the *c-d-e* figure both shorten the passage and compress its range from a seventh to a third, which makes the gesture slightly less prominent than in the previous two melismas.

The editors of printed graduals not only reshaped chants through melodic excision, but also through the addition of notes, as can be seen in the offertory “*Domine Iesu Christe*”. The rationale behind the added material is not always clear, but plausible explanations can be arrived at through an examination of the surrounding musical context. The editorial team of Gardano 1591 adds single notes to several words, including “fidelium”, “absorbeat”, the first occurrence of “Abraham”, and “hostias” (see Example 8). In each case the word has a relatively sparse melodic texture. The additional notes occur in conjunction with the repositioning of the syllables and thus create different musical accentuation. However, only on the word “hostias” does the syllable-accent correlation move from negative or neutral to positive.⁴⁸ The editor of Giunta 1596 adds notes to several passages in “*Domine Iesu Christe*”. In the middle of the brief melisma on the first syllable of “ore” he interpolates a *C-D* gesture (see Example 9). The added *C* extends the range of the melisma from a fourth to a fifth, and the following *D* ensures that the melodic motion remains entirely conjunct. Both of the Cieran prints and Medici 1614/15 include the descent to *C*, although the close of the melisma is slightly different in Medici 1614/15 and Ciera 1621. A further instance of added material in Giunta 1596 occurs in the phrase “in lucem sanctam” (see Example 10). Here, at the beginning of “sanctam”, the first interval is modified from a third to a second by means of an added *D*. It is possible that this

⁴⁸ The accentuation of the name “Abraham”, which is borrowed from Hebrew, is debatable.

The image displays a musical score for the Gradual "Requiem aeternum". It consists of three systems of staves, each with two parts: GIU 1499/1500 and GIU 1596. The lyrics are: "per-pe - - - - - tu - a", "e - is", and "e - ter - - - - - na". The melody is written in a single line on a five-line staff with a treble clef and a common time signature. The notes are connected by slurs, indicating a continuous melodic line. The lyrics are placed below the notes, with hyphens indicating that a single note spans multiple syllables.

Example 7: Gradual, “*Requiem aeternum*”: melismas on “perpetua”, “eis”, and “aeterna”

slight alteration is the result of typesetter error; however, it is transmitted in later prints, and thus becomes an accepted reading of the phrase.⁴⁹

Anerio and Soriano’s melodic additions to “*Domine Iesu Christe*”, as in other chants throughout Medici 1614/15, are most often to increase modal centrality. This focus is made clear from the beginning of the offertory (see Example 11). The closing notes of the first two sub-phrases are changed from *C* to the modal final of *D*. Yet “*libera animas omnium*”, which is essentially a slightly decorated recitation on *D*, is altered to end on *F*. This creates a sense of forward motion until the melody briefly cadences on *D* at the end of “*fidelium defunctorum*”. Anerio and Soriano promote modal centrality in a slightly different fashion in the following passage. “*De pœnis inferni*” closes with a descent of a third from the original *D* to an added *A*. The subsequent phrase, “*et de profundo lacu*” is also altered to begin on the co-final. This not only creates parallelism but could also be a rare instance of word painting, with the low notes perhaps indicating the deep pit in which the souls of the dead are languishing. The word “*lacu*” is modified to close on *C* instead of *D*, propelling the textual phrase forward to the next plea for deliverance.

The melodic excisions and additions made in the gradual “*Requiem aeternam*” and the offertory “*Domine Iesu Christe*” demonstrate that the editors of printed graduals employed discretion, forethought, and possessed musical awareness of the chants themselves. Yet their knowledge of the often intricately

⁴⁹ The alteration is transmitted in later Cieran prints with the exception of Ciera 1621, in which the melodic reading of this phrase follows Medici 1614/15.

GIU 1499/1500
fi - de - - - li - um

GAR 1591
fi - de - - - li - um

GIU 1499/1500
ab - sor - be - at

GAR 1591
ab - sor - be - at

GIU 1499/1500
ab - ra - - - e

GAR 1591
A - - - bra - hac

GIU 1499/1500
Ho - sti - - - as

GAR 1591
Ho - - - sti - as

Example 8: Offertory, “*Domine Iesu Christe*”: “fidelium”, “absorbeat”, “Abraham”, “hostias”

interconnected repertoire and their approach(es) to revising it has sometimes been called into question. After surveying a number of formulaic chants Theodore Karp concluded that the editors disregarded relationships between them and proceeded with their work on a chant-by-chant basis, which resulted in increased individuation.⁵⁰ An examination of the revisions made to the eighth-mode tract “*Absolve domine*” tempers this view. The melodic construction of the genre with its close connections between text, structure, and formulaic construction has been the subject of much scholarly discussion.⁵¹ Emma Hornby, in her detailed study on the eighth-mode tracts in Gregorian and Old Roman sources, demonstrates that the eighth-mode tracts are composed of six main phrases

50 Th. Karp, Introduction (cf. fn. 2), vol. 1: pp. 88–93, 113–119, 167–178. In his review of Karp’s work, Richard Sherr proposed that the editors could have been unaware of the formulaic elements, or simply have chosen to ignore them. Richard Sherr, “The life of plainchants: A review of ‘An Introduction to the Post-Tridentine Mass Proper’ by Theodore Karp”, *Early Music*, 35 (2007), pp. 301–302: p. 302.

51 For a survey of the main literature see Emma Hornby, *Gregorian and Old Roman Eighth-Mode Tracts: A Case Study in the Transmission of Western Chant* (Aldershot, 2002), pp. 10–14. See also Edward Nowacki, “Text Declamation as a Determinant of Melodic Form in the Old Roman Eighth-Mode Tracts”, *Early Music History* 6 (1986), pp. 193–226.

Example 9: Offertory, “*Domine Iesu Christe*”: “de ore”

based upon textual syntax and cadential shapes.⁵² Phrase A begins the tract; E begins verses besides the first; B occurs at the end of a half-verse; C occurs at the start of the second half-verse; D closes all verses except the last; F closes the final verse.⁵³ With the exception of Phrase E, all of the phrases can be split into subgroups, indicated by numbers.⁵⁴ Hornby designates “*Absolve domine*” as a “non-standard” eighth-mode tract. These were not part of the eighth-century Old Roman repertory and were thus composed later. Moreover, in the sources she examined they only occur in manuscripts linked to specific geographic areas.⁵⁵ Despite being “non-standard”, Hornby notes that “*Absolve domine*” is composed in a manner consistent with the main repertory.⁵⁶ The tract is relatively short, with the B2 phrase repeated three times and the C1 phrase twice (see Table 1). The reiteration of formulaic material within such a brief space is both aurally and visually apparent. Thus, it is reasonable to conclude that editors not only were aware of it, but that any retention or rejection of formulaicism was intentional.

The B2 phrase begins with a leap from *G* to *c* followed by a recitation on the latter note, the length of which varies depending upon the number of syllables to be accommodated. The melody then falls briefly to *b* and rises quickly to *e* before an undulating melisma that moves between *c* and *G* and eventually cadences to *F* (see Example 12). All of the editors display a strong degree of con-

52 E. Hornby, *Eighth-Mode Tracts* (cf. fn. 51), p. 9.

53 *Ibid.*, pp. 9, 56.

54 *Ibid.*, pp. 9, 55–127, 271–323.

55 *Ibid.*, pp. 178–179.

56 *Ibid.*, p. 198.

Text	Phrase subgroup	Phrase number
Absolve domine	A1	1
animas omnium fidelium defunctorum ⁵⁷	B2	2
ab omni vinculo delictorum	C1	3
Et gratia tua illis succurrente	B2	4
mereantur evadere iudicium ultionis	C1	5
Et lucis eterne	B2	6
beatitudine perfrui.	F	7

Table 1: Phrase subgroups in “*Absolve domine*”⁵⁸

sistency in their revisions to each occurrence of the phrase.⁵⁹ The editorial team of Gardano 1591 uses the second type of melodic excision in B2₁ and B2₂.⁶⁰ They leave the openings unchanged until the triadic descent from *e*, cut the reiterative *a*–*G* figures, and reconnect the melodies to shortened cadential gestures.⁶¹ Whilst the revisions to these phrases are fairly uniform more material is retained in B2₃, which slightly diminishes the connection between the passages. The editor of Giunta 1596 follows the same pattern of melodic excision in all three iterations of Phrase B2.⁶² He begins each cut after the note *c* and resumes each melody at an *a* in the approach to the cadence. However, there are some minor differences between the revisions. In Phrase B2₂ and B2₃ the closing figures are identical, but in B2₁ the approach to the cadence is two notes longer. Similarly, the opening of the melisma in B2₃ is extended by two notes. As in Giunta 1596, Anerio and Soriano begin their cuts to the melismas after the note *c*, and reconnect the melodies at an *a*.⁶³ Although there is some variance in the cadential figures, this does not negate the similarity that the editors maintain between the passages.

57 This text replaces that given in E. Hornby: “animas eorum”, *ibid.*

58 Adapted from *ibid.*, p. 199.

59 In the following analyses, the different occurrences of the phrase groups will be marked with subscript numbers.

60 A single reiterated *G* is also removed from each cadence.

61 The exemplar used for these transcriptions, I-TRfeinger, FSG 16, is damaged at this point (fol. 204v), and the readings for Phrases B2₂ and B2₃ are incomplete. The omissions are marked with ellipses and square brackets in Example 12. In particular, the third syllable of “succurrente” is missing from the former phrase. Given the consistency of the revisions elsewhere in the gradual, and the editorial team’s preference for the second type of melodic excision, it seems reasonable to assume that the absent passage would have matched that in Phrase B2₁.

62 The reading of “*Absolve domine*” found in Giunta 1596 is followed in Ciera 1610.

63 The reading of “*Absolve domine*” found in Medici 1614/15 is followed in Ciera 1621.

The image shows two staves of Gregorian chant notation. The top staff is labeled 'GIU 1499/1500' and the bottom staff is labeled 'GIU 1596'. Both staves show the melody for the phrase 'in lucem sanctam'. The top staff has a melisma on 'ccm' and 'sanc'. The bottom staff has a melisma on 'sanc' and 'tam'.

Example 10: Offertory, “*Domine Iesu Christe*”: “in lucem sanctam”

In a similar fashion to Phrase B2, Phrase C1 can be divided into two parts (see Example 13). The first opens with a triadic ascent from *F* to *c*, followed by a gradual fall to *F* and a reiterative recitation pattern focused on *G* and *a*. In the second part the melody rises from *G* to *c*, followed by a meandering descent that eventually closes on the modal final. The editors of the printed graduals are somewhat less uniform in their revisions to the two occurrences of C1 in “*Absolve domine*”. In C1₁ the editorial team of Gardano 1591 removes melodic material that falls on the second two syllables of “delictorum”, but the cadence is left untouched. Yet in C1₂ this is reversed, and most of the excisions occur at the end of the phrase. The editor of Giunta 1596 also focuses his attention on the material from the latter part of the C1 phrases. As in his modifications to the B2 group, he ensures that the structurally important opening and closing sections of the passages remain. He also begins both cuts after the same note, in this instance *c*, and “restarts” both of the reconstituted melodies on the same note, again on *c*. In C1₁ he makes a fairly substantial cut near the opening of “delictorum”. By contrast he retains nearly all of equivalent material in C1₂, repositioning the text to create a lengthy melisma on the accented syllable of “ultionis”. Anerio and Soriano revise the C1 phrases relatively lightly. They maintain the majority of the melodic material, focusing their excisions on small gestures or repeated notes, and alter the text underlay to create proper prosody. To accomplish this on “iudicium” in C1₂, Anerio and Soriano cut all of the notes originally allocated to it (*G* / *G-a* / *G* / *G*), and shift the text forward to what in Giunta 1499/1500 was the beginning of the following word, “ultionis”. They retain the small five-note melisma for the accented second syllable of “iudicium”, and the word closes simply on two added *c*’s. The text of “ultionis” also begins on *c*, and from there the melody proceeds almost unchanged. When the revisions to the repeated phrase groups B2 and C1 in “*Absolve domine*” are examined all of the editors demonstrate, although to differing degrees, an awareness of the shared material.⁶⁴ Whilst it is possible that some of the uniformity in the modifications

⁶⁴ This impression is strengthened when revisions to other eighth-mode tracts are examined. For a detailed discussion see M. Gillion, *Diligentissime* (cf. fn. 1).

GIU 1499/1500
Do - mi - ne ie - su chri - ste

MED 1614/15
Do - mi - ne Ie - su Chri - - - ste,

GIU 1499/1500
rex glo - - - ri - e

MED 1614/15
rex glo - - - ri - ac,

GIU 1499/1500
li - be - ra a - ni - mas om - ni - um

MED 1614/15
li - be - ra a - ni - mas om - - - ni - um

GIU 1499/1500
fi - de - li - - - um de - func - to - rum

MED 1614/15
fi - de - li - um de - func - to - rum

GIU 1499/1500
de pe - nis in - fer - - - ni et de pro - fun - do la - cu:

MED 1614/15
de pœ - nis in - fer - - - ni, et de pro - fun - do la - cu:

GIU 1499/1500
li - be - ra e - as de o - - - re le - o - - nis

MED 1614/15
li - be - ra e - as de o - - - re le - o - - nis

Example 11: Offertory, “*Domine Iesu Christe*”: opening phrases

stems from a consistent use of particular revision techniques, the phrases remain recognizably related.

Conclusion

The new phase of chant revision apparent in Italian printed graduals from the late sixteenth century onwards was both a continuation and an expansion of preexisting printed chant traditions and revision techniques. An examination of the modifications made to the proper chants of one of the most important liturgical celebrations, the *Missa pro defunctis*, highlights the methods, priorities, and approaches of the editors of key sources from this period. As demonstrated by

GIU 1499/1500 a - ni - mas om - ni - um fi - de - li - um de - func - to - rum

GIU 1499/1500 Et gra - ti - a tu - a il - lis suc - cur - ren - te

GIU 1499/1500 Et lu - cis e - - - - - ter - ne

GAR 1591 a - ni - mas om - ni - um fi - de - li - um de - func - to - - -

GAR 1591 Et gra - ti - a tu - a il - lis suc - cur - [ren]te

GAR 1591 Et lu - cis ae - - - - - ter - [nac]

GIU 1596 a - ni - mas om - ni - um fi - de - li - um de - func - to - - -

GIU 1596 Et gra - ti - a tu - a il - lis suc - cur - ren - - -

GIU 1596 Et lu - cis ae - - - - - ter - - -

MED 1614/15 a - ni - mas om - ni - um fi - de - li - um de - func - to - - -

MED 1614/15 Et gra - ti - a tu - a il - lis suc - cur - ren - - -

MED 1614/15 Et lu - cis ae - - - - - ter - - -

Example 12: Tract, “*Absolve domine*”: revisions to occurrences of Phrase B2 (continued on next page)

Theodore Karp, the guiding aims of the revisers appear to have been greater brevity and improved prosody, which they carried out with a willingness to recast the melodic line.⁶⁵ A variety of techniques were used in pursuit of these aims, the three most common being the repositioning of the text underlay, melodic excision, and the addition of notes. Despite sharing the same overarching goals and methods of revision the editors of printed graduals apparently had different priorities, as is seen in the analyses of the modified chants. The editorial team of Gardano 1591 was relatively unconcerned with the transmission of

65 Th. Karp, Introduction (cf. fn. 2), vol. 1: pp. 203–204.

The image displays a musical score for ten staves. Each staff contains a melodic line with notes and rests. The lyrics are written below the staves, with hyphens indicating syllables that span across multiple notes. The lyrics are: 'rum', 'te', 'ne', 'rum', 'te', 'nac'. The music is written in a single system, with each staff on a new line. The notes are primarily quarter and eighth notes, with some longer notes and rests. The overall style is that of a plainchant or a simple liturgical setting.

Example 12 (continued)

grammatical accentuation, and the anonymous editor of Giunta 1596 was somewhat concerned. In contrast, the communication of proper prosody in Medici 1614/15 was extremely important to Anerio and Soriano, who frequently repositioned the text underlay in order to accomplish this. All of the editors drastically shortened the chants, but not with indiscriminate hands. Rather, they employed different types of melodic excision in response to the texture and context of the passage, combined with their overarching plan for the plainchant in question. The reasoning behind the addition of notes is less clear, but they could be added as an aid to change the accent pattern, to smooth the melodic line, or

GIU 1499/1500
ab om-ni vin - - cu-lo de-li - cto - rum

GIU 1499/1500
me-re-an-tur e - va-de-re iu-di-ci-um ul-ti - o - nis

GAR 1591
ab om-ni vin - - cu-lo de-li - cto - rum

GAR 1591
me-re-an-tur e - va-de-re iu-di-ci-um ul-ti-o - nis

GIU 1596
ab om-ni vin - - cu-lo de-lic - - - to - rum

GIU 1596
me-re-an-tur e - va-de-re iu-di-ci-um ul-ti - o - - - nis

MED 1614/15
ab om - ni vin - cu-lo de - lic - to - - - rum

MED 1614/15
me-re-an - tur e - va-de-re iu - di - ci-um ul-ti-o - nis

Example 13: Tract, “*Absolve domine*”: revisions to occurrences of Phrase C1

to clarify the mode. The editors appear to have taken a fairly systematic approach to their work, and also to have possessed knowledge of the vast corpus of plainchant that they had undertaken to revise. The melodic readings in graduals published by Gardano, Giunta, Ciera, and Medici demonstrate both the inventiveness and the care of the editors as they reshaped the well-known chants and thus allowed them to “arise” and to praise God anew.