

# JOHANN JOSEPH FUX

(um 1660–1741)

Laetare turba

E 80

Critical Commentary

Edition: Ramona Hocker

after CZ-Kb K I 137, D-MEIr Ed 126t and a source in private hands

Fux concertato no. 3

Austrian Centre for Digital Humanities and Cultural Heritage

Austrian Academy of Sciences

2020

[www.fux-online.at](http://www.fux-online.at)

[https://doi.org/10.1553/fux\\_concertato\\_03](https://doi.org/10.1553/fux_concertato_03)

 CC-BY-NC 4.0 de

 CONCERTATO



## CRITICAL COMMENTARY

### Johann Joseph Fux, “Laetare turba” (E 80 / FuxWV IV.4.59)

#### The Edition

The present publication is a new edition of Johann Joseph Fux’ motet “Laetare turba” (E 80 / FuxWV IV.4.59)<sup>1</sup>. It is decidedly intended for practical performance. Hellmut Federhofer presented a scholarly edition in 1961;<sup>2</sup> for the edition presented here, the sources have been collated and assessed anew. In addition, it was possible to include a privately-owned source, unknown to Federhofer, in the source study and edition, and to expand the list of sources with a further lost manuscript.<sup>3</sup>

This edition consists of a complete score for the conductor, vocal soloist and organist, separate parts for violins, violoncello and violone are also provided. In the parts for the bass strings (violoncello, violone), the vocal line for the recitatives is included in small print for better orientation. The score should enable the leaders of the ensemble to see variants in the source and, where desired, to reach their own interpretation. For reasons of clarity, editorial additions and typographical distinction of secondary sources are largely absent from the parts.

The tenor clef (c4), no longer current in modern scores, has been replaced with the usual octave-transposing g2-clef. The key signatures are in accordance to the main source. Modern rules apply for accidentals, and their use has been silently exercised: Accidentals are valid for the remainder of their bar instead of for a single note, and a # or ♭ used in the sense of a natural is replaced by ♮. Occasionally, accidentals are also used as warnings or reminders, in accordance with their appearance in the sources. The beaming generally is as in the original, but is sometimes unified when there are variants in the sources for no apparent reason. Slurs follow the source. Dots beyond a bar line are represented by tied notes, ties at staff breaks can be rewritten in longer note values. For dynamics, the modern abbreviations are used (**f**, **p**, **pp** instead of *for.*, *pia.*, *pianopiano*). Expression marks on individual notes are faithful to the edition’s source (standardized where applicable). Trills indicated in the source by “t.” are shown in the edition as “**tr**”; their execution follows according to baroque practice.

The continuo figures in the source are retained in principle, and no attempt has been made to fill in missing figures. Normalizations that are not noted involve notations no longer in use, such as ♭ or # in places where a ♮ would otherwise appear. Bracketed additions by the editor are limited to corrections and necessary adjustments (major/minor, unified treatment of parallel cases).

As indications of dynamics one finds forte, piano, and pianissimo (*pianissimo*). In the contemporary material these are noted only in the strings. Explicit dynamics are connected to the scoring: The strings always play softly when accompanying the singer, while forte is found only in instrumental interludes. The edition adds dynamics to the continuo parts. General directions for a volume of sound are not always present at the beginning of movements; rather, a kind of “basic volume” can be assumed, from which deviations are indicated in places. Sometimes these levels hold only for the section marked, not until the next indication.

---

1 The previous catalogue number E 80 comes from Hellmut Federhofer “Unbekannte Kirchenmusik von Johann Joseph Fux”, in *Kirchenmusikalisches Jahrbuch* 43 (1959), Köln 1960, pp. 25 and 31; additions to the source findings are listed in Hellmut Federhofer and Friedrich Wilhelm Riedel, “Quellenkundliche Beiträge zur Johann Joseph Fux-Forschung”, in *Archiv für Musikwissenschaft* 21 (1964), pp. 111–140, here p. 130. – Because the second volume of the new Fux catalogue raisonné has not yet been published, the FuxWV number is only provisional. I thank Thomas Hochradner, Salzburg, for the information provided. On the new systematic of Fux’s works, see Hochradner, *Thematisches Verzeichnis der Werke von Johann Joseph Fux (? 1660–1741). Völlig überarbeitete Neufassung des Verzeichnisses von Ludwig Ritter von Köchel (1872)*, vol. 1, Vienna: Hollitzer, 2016 (= FuxWV).

2 Johann Joseph Fux, *Motetten und Antiphonen für Sopran mit Instrumentalbegleitung*, ed. Hellmut Federhofer (Johann Joseph Fux. Sämtliche Werke III/1), Graz: ADEVA, 1961, pp. 176–186 [hereinafter: *Fux-GA* III/1].

3 I would like to thank Thomas Hochradner, Salzburg, very much for his remarks concerning the privately owned source. The owner has kindly and accommodatingly provided reproductions of the manuscript and thus made a re-evaluation of the source inventory possible in the first place. I would like to express my special thanks to him for his help.

## Sources

At the present time, there are five sources for the motet “Laetare turba”; three of these are preserved, the other two are only traceable from inventories. These sources will be described as far as possible in the following section and assessed in view of this edition.

**Source A: CZ-Kb 137** (archive of the castle Český Krumlov, Zámecká knihovna); copies of parts.

Parts: Tenore solo. (c4); Violino Primo. (g2); Violino 2:<sup>do</sup>. (g2); Violoncello. (f4); Violone. (f4); Organo (f4).

Original wrapper with title: “Motetto. | De uno Sancto. | à | Tenore Solo. | 2. Violini. | [on the left:] Parti. 6. [on the right:] Del Sig: Giov: Gios: | Fux, Maestro di | Cap:<sup>la</sup> di S:C: e C: M:”, watermark: “MD” “N<sup>o</sup> 38” is written at the top right with pencil, overwritten with ink: “Nr<sup>o</sup> 137”. Beneath with pencil: “354 | [another handwriting:] K I”.

Beneath “2. Violini” is a pencil-written note “10 listů” [= 10 leaves, in accordance with the present amount of leaves]

Midway above each part: “Nr. 137” in brown ink (possibly thinner quill); round red archive stamp on the tenor part.

Contemporary cover consisting of 1 folded leaf, which has probably the same paper as the parts, and badly torn in the fold, ca. 46 x 28 cm. The paper is darkened on right and lower edges of front page.

Six parts in vertical format, ca. 23 x 27.8 cm, lined in ten staves, edges brownish and somewhat worn. Relatively thick, high quality beige paper, ink slightly bled through. Watermark poorly recognizable, heart with letters FKC. Cover with watermark LM (ND?).<sup>4</sup>

T, vlne, vc, org: one folded leaf each; vl I and II: single page each.

Scribe: from the Vienna court chapel, probably scribe C in Johannes Prominczel’s systematology.<sup>5</sup>

No information on performances, no date. No notes and only a few corrections (bars 134.5+14, 135.1): all ♯ before *b*-flat in the carefully prepared parts. On the first page of the organ part, remains of pencil entries are to be found, which were subsequently retraced in ink; however, there is no significant difference in ink color compared with the rest of the notation. The textless tenor line is added to the recitative on the second page of the parts for cello, violone and organ. The da capo in the second aria is not written out.

**Source B: D-MEIr Ed 126t (Max-Reger-Archiv Meiningen), fol. 1–7v, 1727; score copy**

Scoring: s, vl I-II, bc

First piece in a volume bound together from six Fux motets, containing besides E 80 the works E 97, E 57, E 98, E 99 and E 100. Original leather binding, probably made in Vienna. Endpaper with initials and year “A.V.D.S. | 1727” [Anton Ulrich Dux Saxoniae], on the left shelfmark Ed/126 t. Blue stamp “Staatliche Museen Meiningen, Inv.-Nr. XI 4722/V NHs 64”. A total of 84 leaves numbered in pencil. No signs of wear.<sup>6</sup> Original title: “Motetto. | à | Canto Solo. | con | 2 Violini e | Contrabasso. | Del Sig<sup>te</sup> Giov: Giuseppe Fux. M[ae]stro di | Cap:<sup>la</sup> di S:M:C: e Catt:”. On its right is an oval stamp “Hof Capell zu Meiningen”, which is crossed out with ink (X). At the lower left is the later shelfmark “F. N<sup>o</sup> 6”.

Date of the source’s origin: 1726–1727, as a result of Duke Anton Ulrich’s stay in Vienna; the date on the flyleaf is supported by the duke’s diary and copyists’ bills.<sup>7</sup>

<sup>4</sup> See Federhofer, in: *Fux-GA* III/1, p. 191.

<sup>5</sup> Johannes Prominczel, “Die Hofkapisten der Hofkapelle von Kaiser Karl VI.”, unpublished paper read at the conference *Werkstatt und Label. Kompositorische Produktionsprozesse in der Frühen Neuzeit*, Marburg, October 9, 2014, kindly provided by the author.

<sup>6</sup> Dimensions, description of the watermark, rendition of the inscriptions on the cover page and provenance according to Federhofer, *Fux-GA* III/1, p. 191 and RISM (ID 201009322), see <https://opac.rism.info/search?id=201009322> (visited on November 10, 2017) and Rudolf Walter, in *Johann Joseph Fux, Offertoriumsmotetten für vier und fünf Vokalstimmen und Instrumentalbegleitung* (Fux-GA III/4), Graz: ADEVA, 1996, p. 273.

<sup>7</sup> Dating according to the endpaper, probably referring to a diary entry of the duke (“Vor/Motetten/von Fux u. andern meistern”: “For motets by Fux and other masters”) on the bundle ED 126t. See Lawrence Bennett, “A little-known Collection of early-eighteenth-century Vocal Music at Schloss Elisabethenburg, Meiningen”, in *Fontes Artis Musicae* 48, No. 3 (July–September 2001), pp. 250–302, here p. 260.

Provenance: castle library of Duke Anton Ulrich of Saxe-Coburg-Meiningen (1687–1763), Meiningen; from 1831, library of the court chapel; under Duke Georg II of Saxe-Meiningen (1826–1914), public castle library Meiningen; after 1945, Landestheater Meiningen; since 1958, Max-Reger-Archiv Meiningen. Yellowish, high quality paper; watermark: a section of a heart-shape and ornate letters “I P M”;<sup>8</sup> horizontal format, ca. 30.5 x 23.0 cm, lined with ten staves. Foliation in pencil on the upper right corners of the recto pages; the motet E 80 is found on folios 1r–7v. Staves and notation in dark brown ink.

Scribe: from the Vienna court chapel, probably scribe P in the systematology of Prominczel.<sup>9</sup> Score (or parts put into score), four staves per accolade, 5th and 10th staves empty in the outer movements; all staves used for the recitative and continuo aria (“Hodie splendens – Mortales plaudite”) on folio 4r–v. No explicit indication for scoring [vl I, vl II, s, bc], clefs: g2, g2, c1, f4. The unison bass lines are combined on one staff.

Carefully written score without further entries; but there are a few scribal errors that the copyist corrected himself:

bar 42.2 bc revised from *c*

bar 62.2 bc erased

bar 64.1 bc after the first note erased

bar 71–76 s erased (wrongly bar 63–68)

bar 92.1+3 vc continuo figures 6/4 – 5/3 (instead bar 92.5+7) erased

bar 127.2–3 vl II erased whole rest

bar 128.2–132 vl II erased (wrongly notated bars 131–135; overlooked rests)

bar 136–137 vl II erased (wrongly notated bars T. 137–138 first half, false counting due to the double counting of the bars?)

bar 141.7 s inserted accidental ♭

The incorrect rest values in bar 126, vl II resulting from the erasure remained uncorrected.

It should also be noted that bars 101, 104 and 105 are not synoptically notated; i.e., simultaneously sounding notes in s and bc are shifted horizontally vis-à-vis each other.

The score for the entire opening movement (folios 1v–3v) was originally laid out for five staves (clefs: g2, g2, c1, c3, f4); the clef was altered in each fourth staff (c3 → f4) and obliterated in the fifth;<sup>10</sup> in addition, the curved brace for the accolade was shortened at the bottom.

The da capo is not written out in the second aria.

### Source C: private collection, Germany; copies of parts

Seven parts in vertical format on brownish paper, notated in black ink, no pagination:

Tenore Solo. (6 pages; c4); Violino Imo (2 pages; g2); Violino 2do. (2 pages; g2); Violoncello. (4 pages; f4); Violone. (4 pages; f4); M:D:C. (4 pages; f4); Organo. (4 pages; f4).

The edges of the original sleeve are torn off and in shreds. Title: “Laetare Turba. | â 3. | Tenore Solo | 2 Violin Con | Organo.” Inscription on the bottom right: “Del Sig<sup>re</sup>: | Gio Giuseppe Fux | Maestro di Cap<sup>la</sup> | di : S: M: C:.” No date, no performance notes and no indications of ownership or shelfmarks.

Scribe: unknown, not a recognizable copyist from the Vienna court chapel; clearly a case of a well-practiced but non-professional music scribe, who at times made errors that remained uncorrected. The parts show no further annotations.

Provenance: uncertain. With no indications of ownership and the titles being divergent, it cannot be assumed that this source is the lost Herzogenburg manuscript (source D).

In the recitative, only the organ and MdC parts contain the tenor line with its text. The da capo in the second aria is written out in all parts, whereby small differences – probably as a result of scribal error – can be observed. The organ part may have served as model for the violoncello and MdC for the violone. Unless the parts were all copied from models where the errors were already present, the variants in pitch

<sup>8</sup> Watermark according to Walter, *Fux-GA* III/4, p. 273; Federhofer, *Fux-GA* III/1, specifies only “P” for the letters.

<sup>9</sup> See Prominczel, “Die Hofkopisten”.

<sup>10</sup> At the beginning of the line, clefs, accidentals and system brackets are notated. The more in-system position of the clef suggests a c3 clef, but the placement of the ♭-sign would suggest a c4 clef.

found in bar 41.2 of precisely these pairs (*G* versus *F*) could point to such a procedure having been followed.

#### Source D: [A-H lost] (Stift Herzogenburg); copies of parts

The source, which was prepared before 1750, is lost, and known only from two inventories compiled in the mid-18th century.<sup>11</sup>

Besides a four-bar incipit from the organ part (with the indication “Allegro”), the first catalogue lists the following title on p. 230 under Nr. 19: “Motteta de o[m]ni S[an]cto | ò Sancta | Tenor Solo | 2 Violini | 1 Violon, 1 Violoncello 1 Fagotto con | Organo | parti 7. | Del Maestro Fux”. In the other catalogue, fol. 95v, no. 14, the title is slightly modified: “Motteta de o[mni] Sancto v[el] S[an]cta | â | Tenore Solo | 2 Violini | Organo, Violone, Violoncello | ê Fagotto parti 7. | Del Sig.<sup>re</sup> Maestro Fux.”<sup>12</sup>

#### Source E: [provenance B-Bg, lost] (Cathedralis SS. Michaelis et Gudulae, Brussels); copies of parts

The manuscript from the 18th century has not been located at the present time. Edmond van der Straeten cites the catalogue of Jean-François Libau, a priest active at the Cathedral of St. Michael and St. Gudula at Brussels, which lists both the music Libau purchased and what he composed himself. According to the present state of research, the catalogue is unlikely to have been preserved; van der Straeten<sup>13</sup> gives no further information as to its whereabouts, and it is not listed among the holdings of the Bibliothèque royale de Belgique.<sup>14</sup>

Van der Straeten’s transcription<sup>15</sup> of the catalogue entry reads as follows: “Laetare turba, tenore solo et instr., de Joan. Jos. Fux. | Ouvrage non cité par M. Fétis.”<sup>16</sup> Besides “Laetare turba”, the catalogue contains entries regarding at least five more sacred works by Fux.<sup>17</sup>

Hardly anything is known about Libau; the only information that has come down to the present is found in the *ex libris* of his collection of preludes and versets of 1764, and a mention in a list of persons living at St. Gudula from the 1770s to the 1790s.<sup>18</sup> He seems to have been active in the second half of the

11 The two catalogues have the same title: CATALOGUS Selectiorum Musicalium chori Ducumburgensis [...]; one of the catalogues was created in 1751, while the other one is not dated; the year 1774 at its end refers probably to the appendix. See Hellmut Federhofer, *Unbekannte Kirchenmusik von Johann Joseph Fux*, special print of *KmJb* 43, 1959, p. 4 note 25. Hug includes only preserved works in his repertoire lists, therefore, E 80 is not mentioned. See Raimund Hug, *Georg Donberger (1709–1768) und die Musikpflege im Augustiner-Chorherrenstift Herzogenburg*, Teil 1: Text (Kirchenmusikalische Studien 5), Sinzig: studio verlag 2007, pp. 142–154 and 216–244.

12 Specifications according to Federhofer, *Fux-GA III/1*, p. 191, note 5.

13 Robert Eitner, *Biographisch-Bibliographisches Quellen-Lexikon der Musiker und Musikgelehrten [...]*, vol. 6, Leipzig: Breitkopf & Haertel, 1902, p. 163 refers to the main work of the author, Edmond Vander [Van der] Straeten, *La Musique aux Pays-Bas avant le XIXe siècle. Documents inédits et annotés [...]*, vol. 1, Brussels 1867, p. 85, which should be used with caution (“mit Vorsicht zu gebrauchen”, Eitner vol. 1, Leipzig: Breitkopf & Haertel 1900, p. 13) – However, this is a reprint of works that have already been published several times (p. X): they first appeared in the years 1863–1867 as successive articles in the *Messenger des Sciences historiques ou Archives des Arts et de la Bibliographie de Belgique*, the catalogue of Libau is printed in the 1864 published series in course of the entry concerning Joseph Van Helmont (pp. 219–224). The history of music was also released with the title *Curiosités de L’Histoire Musicale des Anciens Pays-Bas [...]*, Paris and Brussels 1867 (the catalogue of Libau is now on pp. 85–89). There is no detailed archival information on the sources consulted by Van der Straeten or the shelfmarks.

14 The collections of St. Gudula and Michel are largely held in the Bibliothèque royale in Brussels; none of the relevant catalogs mention Libau’s inventory or his estate. It is therefore to be assumed that Libau’s estate was not taken over by St. Gudula, but was probably scattered or lost. See Paul de Ridder, *Inventaris van het oud archief van de kapittelkerk van Sint-Michiël en Sint-Goedele te Brussel*, 3 vols., Brussels 1987 and Robert Wangermée, *Les Maîtres de Chant des XVIIe et XVIIIe siècles à la collégiale des SS. Michel et Gudule à Bruxelles* (Académie Royale de Belgique, Classe des Beaux-Arts. Mémoires, Collection in-8°. Deuxième série, Tome VI), Brussels 1950. I am grateful to Dr. Marie Cornaz at the Bibliothèque royale in Brussels for her confirmation that there are no other known sources indicating Libau and his estate.

15 The transcription is non-diplomatic and the form of the catalogue title (“Liste de musique d’église appartenant à J.-F. Libau, prêtre de Sainte-Gudule, achetée”) is almost certainly by Van der Straeten. It is not certain whether the catalogue still contained incipits.

16 Van der Straeten, in *Messenger*, p. 223. The frequent references to Fétis, which Van der Straeten accuses of numerous errors in the introduction, refer to the first edition of François-Joseph Fétis, *Biographie universelle des musiciens et bibliographie générale de la musique*, vol. 4, Brussels 1837, here pp. 220–224 on Fux.

17 Therefore, six works have the name “Fux”, and it is unclear whether some of the directly following entries also refer to Fux.

18 Cited for the first time in Van der Straeten, in *Messenger*, p. 217: “Ex libris Joannis Francisci Libau, sacerdotis necnon capellani ecclesiae collegialis DD. Michaelis et Gudulae Bruxellis, collegii minoris Sancti Spiritus Lovanii alumni. Anno 1764”. See also *Den Grooten Brugschen Comptoir-Almanach voor het Jaer MDCC. LXXXV.*, p. 101 “Hr. Joannes Franciscus Libau.” (in the section

18th century and probably acquired the six Fux manuscripts in his catalogue (or had them copied) in this period. It is not clear what happened to Libau's collection of music after his death. It is certain that he did not leave it to St. Michael and St. Gudula; if he had, it would have been preserved and passed in 1929, along with the rest of the church's music, to the Conservatoire Royal in Brussels.<sup>19</sup> Of the five sacred works by Fux kept there, two – the motets E 56 and E 57 – are in fact from St. Michael and St. Gudula. At some time between the 1850s and the early 1860s, the catalogue must in any case have been available, in order for Van der Straeten (1826–1895) to have made his transcription. Whatever the situation may have been, he made no mention of where the music listed there was to be found.<sup>20</sup>

E 80's text is free poetry, which makes confusion with another work very unlikely. Judging by the text incipit, along with the reliability of the ascriptions to Fux in the catalogue and the scoring, it can be assumed that E 80 was indeed part of Libau's collection. As long as provenance and scribe of source C cannot be determined with certainty, and the history of Libau's lost manuscripts remains uncertain, the possibility that the Brussels manuscript is in fact source C (preserved as a single source after the collection was dispersed), cannot be excluded.

### Source Comparison

The composition cannot be traced in the collections of the Vienna court chapel, and only the copy from the library of Duke Anton Ulrich of Saxe-Meiningen is dated (1727). The preserved sources do not permit a reconstruction of its commission or the occasion of its first performance.

Comparisons of handwriting show that sources A and B are of Viennese provenance; the origin of sources C, D and E cannot be determined on the basis of present research.

None of the three sources is completely error-free (see the detailed proofs). As might be expected, the manuscripts by Viennese copyists offer a clean and, with the exception of a few details, reliable text. The erasures in the Meiningen source could indicate that its model presented a different picture, and that the copyist might have been putting separate parts into score. It is, in any case, odd that such mistakes occur especially at rests of multiple bars, whereas places where errors might be expected, such as repeats, sequences and analogous passages, are correct. Source C has the most uncorrected mistakes. The missing notes in bar 100.1–4 of the tenor, because of which the next are shifted forward by a quarter note, are particularly remarkable. Generally speaking, differences in pitch, bowing and continuo figures are to be found between the A section of an aria and its written-out da capo.

Source B is the only one in score form; the fascicle containing six motets by Fux was not intended for performance, but as an enrichment of the ducal music library in Meiningen. Anton Ulrich of Saxe-Meiningen was in Vienna 1725–1728, where he commissioned transcriptions of operas, oratorios and smaller sacred works from copyists working for the court chapel.<sup>21</sup> None of the six motets contained in D-MEIr Ed 126t are known from sources in Vienna; moreover, four (E 97, E 98, E 99, E 100) are unique to this manuscript. With no performance intended, it is unlikely that any changes dictated by differing circumstances, e.g. in available forces, were undertaken. It can rather be assumed that the copyist faithfully transcribed his models note for note.

The sources exhibit characteristic differences in scoring, tempo, text, key signatures in the recitative, use of indications for dynamics, and continuo figures. The most striking are the divergences in scoring: Source B has a soprano soloist, in all the others the voice is a tenor. This change and its concomitant octave transposition has no influence on the composition in general or the other parts. The continuo

---

“Residerende Capellaenem der voorzegde Kerke. [= “Parochiale Kerke van den HH. Michaël en Gudula”]) and identical in the *Comptoir-Almanach* [...] MDCC. XC., p. 96 and *Comptoir-Almanach* [...] MDCC. XCII., p. 96.

19 On the music collection, see Charles Van den Borren, “Le Fonds de Musique ancienne de la Collégiale SS. Michel et Gudule, à Bruxelles”, in *Annuaire du Conservatoire Royal de Musique de Bruxelles*, 52e Année, 1928–1929, pp. 127–135; René Lenaerts, “The ‘Fonds Ste Gudule’ in Brussels: an important collection of eighteenth century Church Music”, in *Acta Musicologica* 29, Fasc. 4, Okt.–Dez. 1957, pp. 120–125.

20 Eitner, *Quellen-Lexikon*, vol. 6, p. 163, notes that the place where the catalogue was found is missing, and he also could not locate the music in Brussels (“Wo die Werke selbst hingekommen sind, ist unbekannt; in Brüssel liegen sie nicht.”: Where the works themselves have gone is unknown; they are not located in Brussels.) He does not include the Fux works mentioned by Van der Straeten in his own article on Fux.

21 See Bennett, “A little known collection”, pp. 254f. and 265–283.

parts are variously disposed: Only source C provides a part for the Maestro di Cappella directing from his keyboard instrument, while the catalogue entry in source D adds a bassoon. In source B the basses are reduced to a single line with no further indication of instrumentation. It can be assumed that the bassoon – as is the case with other solo motets by Fux, e.g. “Plaudite, sonat tuba” (K 165) – would strengthen the bass line only in the instrumental tutti, but would have been silent in the recitative, the continuo aria, and in sung passages where the instruments participate.<sup>22</sup>

Music of the baroque was not usually conceived for a definite number of performers, and so its practical realization is subject to a certain degree of flexibility. This principle is reflected by the sources for the present work.

Source B differs further from the other preserved ones in the matter of text; here alone we find the specific name “Aloysius” in bar 80 of the recitative, the only clue to a possible performance context (see in this connection the introduction to the edition). It is highly unlikely that this score of the work, having been prepared for the Protestant court of Meiningen, was ever used for a performance; it would therefore seem that the model was exactly copied. In sources A and C the letter “N” appears as a placeholder, where the name of any saint could be inserted according to the occasion at hand. The inscription on the title page of source A (“De uno Sancto”) also points to the recyclability of the work. There are, however, no signs of any noted name – which might have been expected as memory aids for a singer – and so it is not possible to reconstruct the saint’s days that saw performances of the piece. A placeholder can be suspected for the lost copy from Herzogenburg, as the title found in the inventory (“Motetta de omni Sancto o Sancta”) also leaves its place in the liturgical year open. Nothing can be said regarding the Brussels source, the catalogue transcription having no indication of the motet’s purpose.

If one were to assume that the use of a soprano and the name Aloysius do not represent Fux’ original intentions, then these modifications go back to one of the Jesuits’ celebrations of Aloysius’ canonization in 1727. On the other hand, Federhofer thinks that the “Aloysius” variant is the original, and that in the other sources which were known to him (A, D), the placeholder was substituted for the name. However, a closer look at the spot raises doubts about Federhofer’s theory, because the text “Aloysius” can only be squeezed with difficulty into the notated rhythm (♩ ♪♪). It is questionable whether Fux, who in the *Gradus* demands a tight orientation of the music upon the text,<sup>23</sup> would have set the recitative’s central name so clumsily. For that reason the reverse argument should be considered, namely a modification of the text in the model for source B. The preserved sources allow no definitive statement regarding Fux’ autograph. If the composition was ordered from Fux for a specific occasion, then the corresponding saint’s name might have been included in the score and parts made after it; the dotted rhythm could point to a certain name (for example, Michael, or Aloysius’ “twin” Stanislaus). In the further course of events, the name was replaced (source B) or completely eliminated (sources A, C, D). But the possibility that, in spite of the pronounced rhythm, there was a placeholder in Fux’ original, cannot be completely disallowed.<sup>24</sup>

The Meiningen score as well as source C show another textual variant: “aethera” (in the place of “coelum”) at the end of the recitative. In addition, the text of the Alleluja-melisma in the final movement is divided differently at one point in source B (bars 150–154). Another remarkable difference is the “Lydian” key signature of one ♭ for the recitative in sources B and C.

The time signatures are consistent in all sources except for the first movement. It is of interest that source C has the time signature “3”, while the notation follows the 3/4 time of source A. Source B is the opposite case: The time signature is 3/4, but the measures as written are twice as long.

22 Because the bassoon part is not preserved in any of the surviving sources, this edition, unlike Federhofer’s, does not include a reconstruction. The instrumentation of the bass group is variable and can be adapted to the particular performance conditions as room dimensions, strength of the solo voice and scoring of the string parts. The aim is to achieve a tonal balance in a way similar to the operas performed at the Viennese court. On this aspect see Dagmar Glüxam, *Anmerkungen zu den Besetzungspraktiken in den Opern von Johann Joseph Fux und seinen Zeitgenossen* (Jahresgabe der Johann-Joseph-Fux-Gesellschaft 29), Graz: J. J. Fux-Gesellschaft, 2006, p. 2.

23 Johann Joseph Fux, *Gradus ad Parnassum*, Vienna: J. P. van Ghelen, 1725, p. 274: “In recitativo sermone quotidiano finitimo, Musica voce aliquantum remissa instruenda est.” Although the second part of the sentence is concerned with the melody, the rhythm is also to be subsumed under “proper pronunciation”.

24 The motet E 100, also delivered in the Meiningen bundle, contains such a placeholder: “O Sancte N; lumen ecclesiae [...]”.



Then again, B and C are in agreement regarding tempo indications; instead of the differentiated tempi in source A (Andante – [recitative] – Un poco Allegro – Presto), all the arias are marked “Allegro”.

The sources differ from each other in the realm of details in the musical text as well: Sources B and C have nearly identical continuo figures that are less dense than those of source A. The placement of slurs largely lacks interconnection – it is especially notable that in the first aria, the ornamental thirty-second notes in the first violin are slurred only in the Meiningen score. Yet again, dynamics are absent in source B, whereas in the other copies they are almost identical. It would have been rather unusual to have no explicit dynamic markings in an entire motet; in comparable works by Fux they are regularly found, including those in Viennese sources. They serve to calibrate the balance between vocal solo and accompanying instruments: When both are active simultaneously, the strings are reduced in dynamics so as not to cover the voice. Conversely, purely instrumental ritornellos are mostly to be played *forte*.<sup>25</sup> The question now arises as to whether the dynamics in sources A and C are, as Federhofer suspected, later additions; or whether they were not present in the model for source B; or whether the otherwise reliable B copyist simply left them out.

### Source Assessment

To sum up: The results of the source comparison show that the Meiningen score (source B) differs significantly from source A (and as far as can be determined from the inventory, from source D as well) in all important parameters – scoring, written text, key signature in the recitative, dynamic indications. Source C, of unclear provenance, intersects with A and B: it shares some pitch readings with source B (bar 67 bc, bar 114.3 bc, bar 115 accidentals in the vocal part, bar 134 accidentals/figures); the simpler tempo indications, the key signature of the recitative, and the text variant “aethera” are also identical. On the other hand, it shares the designation of the solo voice, the placeholder in the recitative, the dynamics, the missing slurs for the first violin in the opening movement, the rhythm in the first bar of the recitative, and the correct notes in vl I in bar 120 as well as the text underlay (bars 152, 154, 156) in the finale with source A (and as far as the incipit goes, with source D). Source A exhibits the *lectio difficilior* in most of the cases mentioned, and might therefore offer a version less worn down in transmission.<sup>26</sup>

No reliable assessment of the lost sources is possible; nor are lines of transmission to be reconstructed, since the collation must depend not only on the substantial, but also on details and variants in the musical text. Source D, with its scoring and placeholder seems close to A. Source E preserves only very meager indications of scoring (“tenore solo et instr.”) and nothing about the text. Still, in its use of the tenor, it shows a connection with sources A and C. It is nevertheless possible that sources D and E – similarly to C – contain a “mixed version” of A and B.

The source comparison shows that the three fully preserved sources are not directly connected; none of the manuscripts can have served as the model for one of the others. The common features and differences in the sources (see the detailed proofs) are not sufficiently meaningful to allow a determination of dependencies, and a trustworthy stemma cannot be constructed in view of the uncertain provenance of sources A and C.

It is possible that sources A and B represent two different lines of transmission, even though source C makes a clear separation difficult. Thus, more than one set of parts copied from Fux’s score may have existed, which already led to divergent branches in Vienna.

In addition, the material derived from the area of practical performance allows no conclusions to be drawn about Fux’s composition autograph: At least one branch goes back to a copy from pre-existing parts, and it is not clear when which changes from the autograph were undertaken. There is no secure information regarding whether the transmission connected with source A, or that of source B, reflects

<sup>25</sup> In addition to explicit dynamic indications, gradations in volume can also be achieved by an enforced instrumentation; in the present solo piece, however, no *ripieno* parts are intended, but the reference in the Herzogenburg inventory to a bassoon doubling the bass (see above) corresponds to this practice of a sonorous enhancement of the purely instrumental passages.

<sup>26</sup> Federhofer, *Fux-GA* III/1, p. IX, on the other hand, assumes an enrichment in the course of tradition and chooses the Meiningen score as main source for his edition.

the situation found in the presumptive autograph. In any case, changes in performance forces and text brought about by availability of musicians and the demands of a certain occasion were not unusual, especially considering the fact that the modifications seen in the present case do not affect the substance of the piece.

It is clear that, on the basis of the source material as described here, no preference can be determined for either branch, because no definite conclusions can be drawn from one or the other regarding Fux's intentions. Sources A and B offer themselves as possible primary sources; the role of source C is uncertain on the grounds of its ambivalent readings. C also contains more errors, but is nevertheless useful as a source for comparisons. Because this edition is decidedly intended for practical use, A has been chosen as primary source: These parts were produced for performance purposes, in contrast to the Meiningen score. In this respect, the intentions of the modern edition and the main source employed for it are in alignment.

### DETAILED PROOFS

The bar numbering follows the primary source A. For the indications of position within a bar, the notes and rests are counted, but not brackets, accidentals, slurs or dots. Where there is uncertainty, or for an exact positioning of continuo figures, more detailed information calculated from the meter may appear. For a better overview, editorial changes are highlighted in grey.

Orthography and the use of upper and lower case letters are generally in accordance with source A, which is very reliable and consistent where these matters are concerned. Except for the unusual form "condemnite" (instead of "contemnite") the spelling was retained.<sup>27</sup> For better orientation, punctuation has been added to text repetitions.

Insofar as they concern errors and divergences due to scribal habit, findings from sources B and C are documented in the critical notes. Variants from the secondary sources, which affect the structure or the actual sound in performance, as well as additions relevant to performance practice (such as the violin slurs in the first movement) are integrated in the musical text and distinguished by grey print. Sources B and C being largely congruent regarding accidents of detail, no further differentiation in the notes themselves is necessary. All editorial additions are bracketed; obvious errors are corrected without extra marking and documented in the critical notes. Modifications to clefs, beaming and accidentals resulting from discrepancies between contemporary notational practice and a modern edition have been undertaken silently. In the sources, accidentals usually apply only to their note, but occasionally a repeated accidental is omitted in the case of changing notes or within a beamed group. Source C is especially inconsistent in this respect. In places where the context offers a clear solution, the edition dispenses with a detailed listing. Where variants are already included in the musical text, they are listed only when all three sources differ. On the other hand, when sources B and C both have the same contextually meaningful variant from A, it will usually be found printed in grey in the score, without further comment in the detailed proofs.

The more complete continuo figuration in source A should also prove useful for present-day practice. Additional figures from the other sources which are not found in A are integrated in the musical text without further notice, insofar as they are sensible and clearly reflect the polyphony of the composition. The many differences between the two source branches A – B/C, which are a result of the latter's less dense figuration, are documented below in a separate table, in order to unburden the detailed proofs regarding the rest of the musical text. Exception is made for places where the edition diverges from the reading in source A.

The following differences between the sources, which have been mentioned above are not included in the detailed proofs: the dynamics that are missing throughout source B, the general tempo designation "Allegro" for all three arias in sources B and C, and the lack of slurs for the first violin, first movement, in sources A and C.<sup>28</sup>

<sup>27</sup> In bars 108.4 and 112.1. However, sources B and C have the spelling "contemnite".

<sup>28</sup> Bars 3.5–6, 4.6–7, 5.6–7, 6.6–6, 7.6–7, 20.5–6, 24.5–6, 35.5–6, 36.6–7, 37.6–7, 59.6–7, 60.6–7, 63.6–7, 64.6–7.

Bar.Sign	Source(s)	Voice(s)	Remark
<b>Laetare turba</b>			
1	C	t, vl I-II	lacks tempo indication
1–76	C	all	meter “3” (instead of $\frac{3}{4}$ )
1–76	B	all	bar lines every two bars (double-bars; one bar contains 6 quarters instead of the indicated $\frac{3}{4}$ )
5.5	C	vl I	lacks trill
6.5, 7.5	A, C	vl I	lacks “t” [trill]
7.1–8.3	A	vc, vlne, org	c4-clef
8.1–2	A	org	lacks continuo figure
11	C	t	lacks text syllable “ta”
20.4	C	vl I	lacks trill
24.4	C	vl I	lacks trill
26.2	C	t	note <i>a</i>
27.3–28.1	B	s	syllable “con” in bar 27.3; bar 27.1–2 with slur and text (“di-em”)
34.1–2	B, C	s / t	lacks slur
35.3	C	vl I	lacks dynamic indication
36.2		vl II	
35.4	C	vl I	lacks trill
36.5	A, C	vl I	lacks trill
37.3	A	vl I	♯ at this position
37.5	C	vl I	lacks trill
41.2	C	vc, org	note <i>G</i>
42.5–6	B, C	s / t	lacks slur
43.1–2	A, C	t	lacks slur
46.1–2	A, B	t / s	lacks slur
46.3–4	B	s	wrong slur and syllable “-rum” in bar 46.3
50.1	B	s	note <i>e</i> ” instead of <i>f</i> ”
58.4, 59.5, 60.5, 61.4, 62.5, 63.5, 64.5	C	vl I	lacks slur
61	C	vl I	inexact position of the dynamic indication
63.1–64.1	B, C	bc / vc, vlne, org, MdC	lacks tie
67.2–3	B, C	bc / vc, vlne, org, MdC	quarter note <i>c</i> -C
70.1	C	vl II	lacks dynamic indication
<b>Recitativo: Hodie splendens</b>			
77–83	A		title “Recit:”
	B, C	s / t, vc, vlne, org	title “Recit:” / “Recit:” key signature 1 <sub>b</sub> , in bars 79.1 (s / t), 81.2 (bc), 82.4+7+12 (s / t) <i>e<sub>b</sub></i> with flat
77	B	s	rhythm
77.1–78.1, 78.1–79.1	C	vc, vlne, org, MdC	lacks ties
80.1–3	B	s	text “Aloysius”

Bar.Sign	Source(s)	Voice(s)	Remark
83.1–2	C	t in org	lacks slur
83	B	s	text “aethera” (rhythm ♩ ♪ ♪), in source C with tie from the first to the second note), while the position of the syllables remains unclear in both sources
	C	t, MdC	
<b>Aria: Mortales plaudite</b>			
85.2–4	A	vc, vlne, org	c4-clef
86.3	C	t	lacks eighth-note rest
91.4	C	vc, vlne, org, MdC	2nd pass: <i>f</i> (instead of <i>g</i> in the 1st pass)
91.8	C	vlne	1st pass: <i>e<sub>b</sub></i> (instead of <i>d</i> )
92.1–2	C	t	lacks slur (also in the D.C.)
92.5+7	A	org	bass figure “4 3”
94.5–6	A	org	bass figure “4 3”
98.1	B	bc	note <i>F</i>
98.3–4	C	vc, vlne, org, MdC	2nd pass: <i>f e<sub>b</sub></i> (instead of <i>e<sub>b</sub> d</i> )
100.1–4	C	t	missing notes in the 1st pass; therefore, the remaining notes of the bar are shifted up a quarter and a compensatory ♯ is added at the end of the bar
102.1–2	C	t vc	lacks slur (also in the D.C.) sign “+” with unclear meaning above the system, see bar 108.1
102.5–6	C	t	1st pass without slur (D.C. with slur)
104.7–8	C	t	lacks slur (also in the D.C.)
105.1–2	B	s	lacks slur
107.3	A	bc	fermata above and under the system; fermata and double bar line in the t. D.C. not notated.
	B	s	fermata above the system; D.C. not notated
107.4–5	C	vc, vlne, org, MdC	2nd pass: quarter-note rest (end of the D.C.)
108.1	C	vc	sign “+” with unclear meaning above the system (without relation to the D.C.; see bar 102.1)
110.1–2, 3–4	B, C	s / t	lack slurs
113.1	B, C	s / t	lacks ♯
114.3	A	vc, vlne, org	lacks ♯ (= <i>e<sub>b</sub></i> )
115.6	B, C	bc / vc, vlne, MdC	lacks ♯
115.15	A	t	with ♯ (= <i>c</i> , or wrong placing of 115.16?)
115.16	A	t	lacks ♯ (= <i>b flat</i> )
116.6	B, C	s / t	lacks ♯ (= <i>e<sub>b</sub></i> )
117.1	C	t	note <i>e<sub>b</sub></i> (because bar 116.6 has no ♯)
117.5	B, C	s / t	with ♯ (instead in 117.1 as in source A)
118	A	t, bc	at the end of the bar: “Aria da capo”; in vc + vlne also “poi segue.” (page change).
	B	above s	“Da Capo al Segno.” and 2 fermatas

Bar.Sign	Source(s)	Voice(s)	Remark
<b>Alleluia</b>			
119.2	A	org	lacks bass figures
120.3–4	B	vl I	notes <i>d'' b'</i>
121.5	A	org	bass figure “4”
121.7	B, C	vl II	lacks trill
122.3	A	org	lacks bass figure
126.2	B	vl II	wrong duration of the rest (half note instead of quarter note rest) due to correction / erasure
131.2–3	B, C	s / t	lacks slur
134.5, 134.14, 135.1	A	t	erased ♯-signs
134.5	B	s	with ♯ (= <i>b'</i> , see bc)
134.5	C	t	with ♯ (probably also valid for 134.8)
137.6	A	org	lacks bass figure
140.11	B	vl II	accidental ♯ in the first space ( <i>g'</i> instead of <i>gis'</i> )
142.1	C	vl I-II	lacks dynamic indication
143	A	vl II	“p:” (redundant, as already in bar 142)
143.10	C	vl I	<i>b'</i> instead of <i>g'</i> (see vl II)
146.2	C	vl I-II	lacks dynamic indication
147.2	C	vl I-II	lacks dynamic indication
149.1	C	MdC	wrong note <i>A</i> (instead of <i>G</i> in the other bass parts)
149.5	A	org	wrong bass figure “6”
150.1	C	vl II	wrong note <i>a'</i>
152.6	B	s	new start of the text with “Al-”, the remaining syllables are placed as in bar 154.2–4 of the other sources
153.3	C	vl I	lacks dynamic indication
154.1	A	org	lacks bass figure
154.2–4	B	s	lacks slur
	C	t	lacks slur; the text “Al-[leluja]” begins in bar 154.3, notation of bar 154.1–4 as $\text{♩} \text{♩}$ ; but also the divergent text underlay of the parallel passage in bar 156.4 in accordance with source A
154.3	C	vl II	lacks dynamic indication
155.9	C	vl II	lacks dynamic indication
156.2	A, B	t / s	note <i>g</i>
156.3	B	s	text “Al-” + melisma; the following syllables on 156.8ff as in the other sources 156.8ff
156.11	B, C	vl I	lacks trill
157.2	C	vl I	note <i>e''</i> instead of <i>d''</i>
after 157	B	between s and bc	“Fine.”

## DETAILED PROOFS FOR CONTINUO FIGURES

The following table documents the divergences in the figures between sources A, B and C. In the third column (single part), an entry appears only when, in a given case, not all the existing figured parts are affected. Where a bar number is not followed by a specific position, the entire bar is meant (especially where there is no figure). Source C is less clear than the others regarding the position of figures under a certain note. In addition, at repeated notes or octave leaps in sources B and C, the figures are often crammed together, such that, for example, in bar 4.1 the figures “5 6” are both under the first note.<sup>29</sup>

Bar.Sign	Source(s)	Voice(s)	Remark
<b>Laetare turba</b>			
4.3, 5.3, 6.3, 7.3	B, C		lacks bass figure
8.1–2	A		lacks bass figure
8.3	C		wrong bass figure “6” (instead of “6̣”), see bar 21
9.2	B, C		lacks bass figure
16.2	B, C		lacks bass figure
17.1	B, C		lacks bass figure
20.2	B, C		lacks bass figure
22.1	B, C		lacks bass figure
24.2	B, C		lacks bass figure
26.2	B, C		lacks bass figure
27–28	B, C		lacks bass figure
30.3	B, C		lacks bass figure
32.2	B		unclear placing of the bass figure, “4 3” on 32.2
36.3, 37.3	B, C		lacks bass figure
38.3	B, C		lacks bass figure
39.2	B		lacks bass figure “4̣” (see vl II)
41.1	B, C		lacks bass figure
49.3	B, C		lacks bass figure
57.2–3	B, C		lacks bass figure
<b>Recitativo: Hodie splendens</b>			
77–83	B, C		complete recitative without bass figures
<b>Aria: Mortales plaudite</b>			
92.5+7	A		4 3
	C		2nd pass without bass figures
93.4	C		1st pass without bass figures
94.5–6	A		4 3
	C	org	lacks bass figure
	C	MdC	1st pass: bass figures placed on 94.5
96.7	B, C		lacks bass figure
97.3	B, C		lacks bass figure
98.3	B, C		lacks bass figure
101	B, C		lacks bass figure

<sup>29</sup> Further positions concerned are bars 5.1 (by contrast in MdC correct position in bar 6), 32.1, 36.1, 59.1, 60.1, 94.5, 140.5.

Bar.Sign	Source(s)	Voice(s)	Remark
102	B, C		lacks bass figure
104–105	B, C		lacks bass figure
108.1	B		lacks bass figure
108.2	C		6
	B		lacks bass figure on the second ♪
109.7	B, C		lacks bass figure
110.2	B, C		lacks bass figure
111.6	B, C		lacks bass figure
112.2, 3, 5	B, C		lacks bass figure
113.1, 2	B, C		lacks bass figure
116.1	B, C		lacks bass figure
116.7	C		6 (instead of “♯6”, see t)
116.7+8	B		lacks bass figure
117.1	C		6 (instead of “♯6”, see t)
117.2	B, C		lacks bass figure
118.1, 2	B, C		lacks bass figure
<b>Alleluia</b>			
119.2	A		lacks bass figure
121.5	A		4
122.3	A		lacks bass figure
134.2	B, C		♯ (see s / t)
137.6	A		lacks bass figure
149.5	A		wrong bass figure “6”
154.1	A		lacks bass figure
156.3	C	org	lacks bass figure

## ABBREVIATIONS

bc	basso continuo	t	tenor
MdC	Maestro di Cappella	vl	violin
org	organ	vc	violoncello
s	soprano	vln	violone

Edition and texts: Ramona Hocker, 2018  
 Translation: Glen Wilson, 2020