

MARC DESMET

IHRIM Saint-Etienne, CNRS UMR 5317

GALLUS AS A POLYPHONIC MASS COMPOSER: A BUNCH OF COMPLEMENTARY REMARKS ON HIS FIRST PRINTED COLLECTION FROM 1580

IZVLEČEK: Leta 1580 je v Pragi izšla zbirka maš Jacobusa Handla - Gallusa, kar je prvi pomemben tisk tega skladatelja. Članek obravnava, zakaj lahko to zbirko obravnavamo kot *unicum* v zgodovini tiskanja polifonih maš v poznem 16. stoletju, in se osredotoča na kompozicijske značilnosti, ki kažejo, da so te maše že značilne za skladateljev zreli slog.

KLJUČNE BESEDE: polifona maša, Jacobus Handl - Gallus, Praga, Jiří Nigrin

ABSTRACT: A collection of Masses by Jacobus Handl-Gallus was published in Prague in 1580. It constitutes the first print of importance devoted to the composer. This article examines how the collection can be considered as a *unicum* in the history of polyphonic Mass printing in the late sixteenth century, focusing on the compositional features that show these Masses to be already typical of the composer's mature style.

KEYWORDS: Polyphonic Mass, Jacobus Handl-Gallus, Prague, Jiří Nigrin

THE polyphonic Masses composed by Jacobus Handl-Gallus, printed in Prague in 1580 by Jiří Nigrin,¹ are the first compositions to have appeared with the composer's name, but they are also the last compositions of his to have been rediscovered during the nineteenth century.² Only briefly mentioned by Fétis³ and later on by Eitner,⁴ they were not known

¹ RISMA/I H 1976 to H 1979, with supplements HH 1976 to HH 1979. These Masses are published in four books distinguished by the number of parts (8 and 7 parts, 6 parts, 5 parts, 4 parts).

² In Becker, *Die Tonwerke*, 8.

³ Fétis curiously created two separate entries on Gallus for each of the two editions of his *Biographie universelle des Musiciens* – one devoted to “Gallus (Jacques)”, the other to “Hændl (Jacques), en latin Gallus” – without explaining that the two accounts refer to the same person. For both entries, Masses are mentioned only in the second, 1874, edition (3:392–393 for “Gallus” and 4:193 for “Hændel”).

⁴ Eitner, “Handl (Händl, Gallus), Jakob”.

to the first Slovenian writers on music active during the 1880s,⁵ and although Josip Mantuani initially intended to study them in detail,⁶ they form the subject of only two brief articles within this scholar's production,⁷ of essentially informative content. Paul Amadeus Pisk, responsible for the first modern edition of these Masses in the series *Denkmäler der Tonkunst in Österreich* (DTÖ), devoted to them no fewer than four volumes extending over a considerable period of time (1935–1969).⁸ However, the doctoral thesis of this scholar, devoted to a study of the Masses (1917),⁹ was never published, thereby leaving open the question of their critical evaluation within the history of the Mass during the sixteenth century. Such an appreciation had taken its first step in a rather substantial chapter included by Peter Wagner in his seminal *Geschichte der Messe* (1913),¹⁰ but Wagner's detailed remarks on Gallus's compositions do not seem to have been followed by any other study of importance. By the end of the twentieth century Edo Škulj's critical edition for the *Monumenta artis musicae Sloveniae* (MAMS) series¹¹ offered new possibilities for insight into these Masses, without altering the landscape fundamentally: if a renewed, more practical and convenient access to the music was made possible (in comparison with the previous DTÖ edition), the number of studies devoted to the Masses nevertheless still remained far lower than for any other aspect of Gallus's compositions, even within Škulj's own output.¹² Leaving aside the printed Masses, two notable contributions in recent musicology have been devoted to Gallus's Masses preserved in manuscript copies. Škulj's critical edition of certain works by Handl

⁵ In a substantial article published in 1888 Josip Lavtižar expressed, for example, a regret that “we do not possess any Latin Mass by Gallus, but only motets”. Lavtižar, “Jacobus Gallus”; see Škulj, *Gallusov zbornik*, 20.

⁶ As can be inferred from his correspondence with the editor-in-chief of the series *Denkmäler der Tonkunst in Österreich* (DTÖ), Guido Adler. In February 1910, Mantuani declared to Adler that he had already scored up six Masses by Gallus, which he could not yet retrieve, these scores being still in his boxes. In December 1912 he stated that he had scores of the Masses *Undique flammatis*, *Casta novenarum*, *Elisabeth Zachariae*, *Im Mayen*, *Ung gay bergier* and *Ob ich schon arm*. The incipits of these Masses were then sent to Adler in January 1913, but Mantuani was still unable to retrieve the scores themselves from his personal archive. Adler then gave Mantuani two weeks to send him the scores; otherwise, he would have to make someone else put them into score. In March, Mantuani, having been unable to find the time necessary for this task, asked Adler to give it to someone else. This seems to have been the initial impulse behind Paul Amadeus Pisk's dedication to this task within the DTÖ series. See Hilscher, “Josef Mantuani und Guido Adler”.

⁷ Mantuani, “Über die Messenthemen des Jakob Handl”; Josip Mantuani, “Naš Gallus na bobnu” [Our Gallus at an auction sale], *Slovenec*, 19 May 1929, 16. The first article deals with the identification of motifs in the initial movement (Kyrie) of each Mass. The second one mentions an auction held in Berlin, where original prints of the Masses and the motets were offered for sale.

⁸ Published in the DTÖ, these volumes have the respective numbers 78 (1935), 94–95 (1959), 117 (1967), 119 (1969).

⁹ Pisk, *Die Messen von Jacobus Gallus*.

¹⁰ Wagner, *Geschichte der Messe*, 330–341. Wagner also devoted an article to Gallus's Masses in the same year: “Über die Messen”.

¹¹ Published in 1991, this edition in four volumes follows the distribution of the original prints in four bibliographical categories, the volumes bearing the numbers 12, 14, 16 and 17 within the MAMS series.

¹² Škulj, “Gallusovo obravnavanje mašnega ordinarija”. In the meantime, Dragotin Cvetko had discussed the Masses in some detail in his three monographs devoted to Gallus, mostly focusing on the principles of parody and the structure of the different books.

in manuscript, published in the MAMS series (1996),¹³ included the scores of four Masses previously discovered by Mantuani and included in his 1905 bibliography for the DTÖ,¹⁴ but up till then unavailable in a modern edition. Meanwhile, the important milestone in Gallus studies at the beginning of the twenty-first century, namely Marko Motnik's *Jacob Handl-Gallus*,¹⁵ brought forth a thematic catalogue that clarified in a significant way the question of sources for these newly edited manuscript Masses. Their attribution to Gallus remains, however, subject to some hesitation. These Masses appear for the most part to follow stylistic trends distinct enough from the composer's usage to call their authorship into question.¹⁶ To these factual data – and back again to the printed Masses of 1580 – can be added the remark that these compositions do not receive mention within the inventory of the music books possessed by Gallus, established shortly after the composer's decease; conversely, mention is made of all other printed music books bearing the composer's name.¹⁷ Further, the fact that the Masses occupied the position of "earliest-printed production" within Gallus's oeuvre also contributed in no small way towards fuelling an impression that they did not represent the composer's inspiration in its full-bloom (a point of view expressed by Peter Wagner as well as Paul Amadeus Pisk), not being "ripe" enough in their conception (as the composer himself puts it in his forewords).¹⁸

With three exceptions, all Gallus's Masses belong to the genre of the so-called parody Mass, more recently given the better name of imitation Mass,¹⁹ defined by the use of a polyphonic model as the basis for the construction of musical development in all five movements of the Ordinary. Although the notion of parody Mass has generated a considerable quantity of scholarly articles since the 1950s,²⁰ a comprehensive and detailed study of all the material examined in these different articles and researches remains something not yet undertaken. Reasons

¹³ Gallus, *Compositions Preserved in Manuscript*.

¹⁴ Mantuani, "Bibliographie der Werke von Gallus".

¹⁵ Motnik, *Jacob Handl-Gallus*.

¹⁶ Paul Amadeus Pisk had already questioned the authorship of *Missa Levavi oculos meos* on stylistic criteria, this Mass being conceived, with its *cantus firmus* in long note values, in the style of Josquin and the early 1500s rather than in that of Gallus. See Pisk, *Die Messen von Jacobus Gallus*, 3.

¹⁷ With the exception of the "occasional" *Epicedion harmonicum* published in 1589. The inventory, preserved in Prague City Archive (Archiv Hlavního Města Prahy, "Liber inventariorum", Ms. 1173, fols. 217v–218), is studied in detail by Edo Škulj in *Gallusovi predgovori*, with further identifications made by Marc Desmet in "Jacobus Handl Gallus' Inventory". Marko Motnik suggests that the printed copies of the Masses were either all sold out at the moment this inventory was established (July 1591), or that the number of copies was itself low. See Motnik, *Jacob Handl-Gallus*, 34.

¹⁸ Foreword to Book III (five-part Masses), dedicated to Caspar Schönauer, abbot of Zábřovice: "quae si fortè (quod valdè metuo) crudior videbitur, oro ne continuò respuas, sed ut tibi quidem addictissimae at nondum satis excoctae adolescentiae primos fructus liba" (if it [this volume of compositions] by chance happens to appear greener (which I fear most), I beseech you not to reject it, but to enjoy in it the first fruits of a youth that has been most obliged to you, if not yet ripe enough). Handl, *Selectiores quaedam missae*, vol. 3, fol. 1v.

¹⁹ See Franke, "Borrowing Procedures".

²⁰ A glance at listings on the subject of parody Masses in the Répertoire International de Littérature Musicale (RILM) yields a large selection of available studies on the treatment of this genre by specific composers, or within specific contexts. On the general debate over the meaning of parody, see Franke, "Borrowing Procedures".

for this delay are easy to understand, since such a study entails, among other possible tasks, investigation of the complex relationship between the polyphonic model and its re-elaboration in the Mass, possibly leading in very different directions, such as towards the nature of quotation, its role in the Mass and the stylistic association of (or discrepancy between) the model(s) and the new work.²¹

As a result, studies of parody Masses generally limit themselves to the work of a single author or even to a detailed examination of single examples.²² The fact that the Masses published in 1580 are already absolutely typical products of Gallus's inspiration, ones providing a serviceable introduction to their author's compositional fundamentals, consequently renders any attempt to establish a chronology of their dates of composition difficult. Unlike similar compositions by Giovanni Pierluigi da Palestrina, Orlando di Lasso and Philippe de Monte, they do not display a large variety of parody techniques and avoid any alternative basis for construction, except for three compositions identified either by a modal attribution (*Dorium, Mixolydium*) or by a compositional device (*Canonica*). Moreover, half of them rely on models following one of the most modern trends of polyphony during the late 1570s, where harmonic inventiveness starts to govern not only global form, but also the shaping of individual lines, the association of parts in different blocks and even the rhythmic tension of cadence-writing. The remarks presented below have been conceived for the purpose of underlining the aspects that make the 1580 printed Masses by Gallus somewhat exceptional in terms of both their context and also their formation into a collection.

THE MATERIAL ASPECT

The launching of a new author on to the market of printed music, and this by a four volume collection of no fewer than sixteen Masses, could hardly have appeared other than surprising to the potential customers of musical prints in Central-European bookshops or book fairs in 1580. But the claims to novelty of this Nigrin publication far exceed the question of the repertory and its author. A quick glance at the prints issuing from the Nigrin workshop before the Gallus Masses soon convinces us that nothing of such importance had ever been attempted before by

²¹ As Barbara Eichner puts it in an article about Lasso's parody Masses: "Considering that the so-called parody mass was the most popular form of the polyphonic mass ordinary in the sixteenth century, surprisingly little is known about the composers' strategies when adapting a model to a mass, but also about the reasons behind the selection of models". This article can serve as an excellent introduction to the problematic of parody Mass in that it embraces all aspects dealing with the choice of the model, the treatment of the quotations and the symbolic dimension they acquire when associated with the words of the Ordinary. See Eichner, "Woman at the Well".

²² For instance, an example of extreme distance between the model and the Mass is analysed by Klemen Grabnar in "*Je ne menge point de porc*". To the same scholar we owe one of the rare studies on the evolution of parody Masses during a limited chronological period of time and within a coherent complex of sources: see Grabnar, "Parodične maše". For a similarly chronological insight into the evolution of parody techniques within the corpus of Palestrina's Masses, see Franke, "Palestrina's Imitation Mass Settings".

this Prague printer.²³ In 1580, Nigrin was not yet the magnificent and multi-faceted printer he would quickly become a few years later, and as far as music is concerned, only monodic Czech canticle collections²⁴ and a book of humanistic *bicinia* in Latin and Czech by Jevičský²⁵ had previously left his workshop. This meant that the Gallus Masses certainly possessed the characteristics of an exceptional turning point in the printer's career at the moment they were issued, and they probably benefited from important external funding in order to cover the cost of the whole process.

However, another level of novelty has to be taken into account in order to take full measure of the event, this time with respect to the genre of the polyphonic Mass itself. It has seldom been remarked that although this genre already boasted a considerable printed heritage in 1580, this relied almost exclusively on prints originating from Venice, Rome, Paris and Antwerp. This fact meant that, for a Prague printer, the "burden" of publishing a voluminous collection such as Gallus's was indeed something of a technical and commercial adventure. Even as observed within the wide expanse of the Imperial lands in general, it remains a unique occurrence, since printed publications of polyphonic Ordinaries never seemed to develop into any of the music printers' specialities in Central Europe. After producing three pioneering anthologies at the turn of the 1540s,²⁶ German printers issued Masses in individual prints of only modest importance,²⁷ among which the Lasso volume of the *Patrocinium musices* devoted to Masses in 1574, which was printed by Adam Berg in Munich, appears to be the only exception before 1580.²⁸ The polyphonic Mass is probably the genre in which specialization within European printers' production is most obviously observable. In the German lands polyphony for the Mass was more oriented towards polyphonic Propers,²⁹ and had a circulation widely reliant on the provision of manuscript copies in the case of Ordinaries.³⁰ As a matter of fact, and even taking into account the formidable strength of music printing in centres such as Nürnberg or Munich, printed Ordinaries or volumes grouping several Masses by different composers remained the exception, while they were far more common in Italy, France and the Low Countries. It is therefore not surprising to observe that, again with the exception of Lasso, all important composers in imperial service had

²³ On the Nigrin publications, see Daněk, "Nototiskařská činnost"; Jakoubková, "Typografie hudebních tisků".

²⁴ *Pisnický duchovníj; Škorně z Frymburgku, Knjzka Pjsnj.*

²⁵ Jevičský, *Bicinia nova.*

²⁶ *Liber quindecim missarum; Missae tredecim; Opus decem missarum.*

²⁷ A six-part Mass, *Non auferetur sceptrum*, by Andreas Crappius printed in 1572 and 1573 by Schwertel in Wittenberg, the three Masses by Utendal issued in 1573 by Dietrich Gerlach in Nürnberg and the first book of Masses by Teodoro Riccio published in Königsberg in 1579 by Georg Osterberger are among the rare exceptions that appeared before 1580.

²⁸ Lasso, *Patrocinium musices.*

²⁹ And richly exemplified at the very start by Heinrich Isaac's *Choralis Constantinus.*

³⁰ Such as the many polyphonic Masses copied in the choirbooks originating from the basilica St Afra in Augsburg, for the most part currently accessible through digitized versions at the Bayerische Staatsbibliothek in Munich.

their Masses printed most often in Venice (like Monte and Jacobus de Kerle), a situation that had not fundamentally altered by the end of the century.³¹

As a matter of fact, the Gallus publication by Nigrin had few, if any, predecessors. With the exception of the Lasso case and of the three anthologies of the 1540s already mentioned, only a handful of prints can be identified before 1580, among which the three Masses by Alexander Utendal printed in Nürnberg by Dietrich Gerlach were probably the closest precedent Nigrin could follow, as can be judged from a title page already very close to that of the Gallus publication seven years later.

A CAREFUL PLANNING OF CHOICE: CONSIDERING MODELS AS SAMPLES?

The sixteen Masses contained in the 1580 publication can be listed as follows, with a mention of their respective models:

Table 1 | Masses in Gallus's 1580 publication (with their models)

| BOOK | TITLE | NO. OF VOICES | MODEL* | DATE | RISM |
|------|--|---------------|--|------|-------------------|
| I | (1) <i>Undique flammatis</i> | 7 | Gallus, own motet, lost | 1579 | lost [†] |
| | (2) <i>Pater noster</i> | 8 | Gallus, own motet, in <i>Opus musicum</i> , vol. 1 (Prague), no. 69 | 1586 | H 1980 |
| | (3) <i>Elisabethae impletum est tempus</i> | 8 | Gallus, own motet, in <i>Opus musicum</i> , vol. 4 (Prague), no. 20 | 1590 | H 1985 |
| | (4) <i>Casta novenarum</i> | 8 | Christian Hollander, in <i>Novi atque catholici Thesauri musici</i> , vol. 5, ed. by Pietro Giovannelli (Venice) | 1568 | B/1 1568 6 |
| II | (5) <i>Dorium</i> | 6 | No known model | | |
| | (6) <i>Elisabeth Zachariae</i> | 6 | Gallus, own motet, in <i>Opus musicum</i> , vol. 4 (Prague), no. 53 | 1590 | H 1985 |
| | (7) <i>Locutus est Dominus</i> | 6 | Gallus, own motet, in <i>Opus musicum</i> , vol. 1 (Prague), no. 80 | 1586 | H 1980 |
| | (8) <i>Sancta Maria</i> | 6 | Philippe Verdelot, in <i>Motteti del fiore, tertius liber [...] ad quinque et sex voces</i> (Lyon) | 1538 | B/1 1538 2 |

³¹ With the exception of an anthology of five Masses, *Missae quinque*, published by Catharina Gerlach in 1590 and the *Missae quaternis* of Hans Leo Hassler published by Kauffmann in 1599, the market remains dominated by a few items devoted to a single author (Lasso, *Liber missarum* (Gerlach, 1581); Lechner, *Liber missarum* (Gerlach, 1584); Amon, *Missae quatuor vocibus* (Apfl, 1588); Amon, *Patrocinium musices* (Berg, 1591); Sales, *Patrocinium musices* (Berg, 1589); Sartorius, *Missae tres* (Berg, 1600); Grothusius, *Missa cum adjuncto Patrem* (Lucius, 1588); Custrovius, *Missa quinque vocum* (Lucius, 1595); Castro, *Missae tres* (Grevenbuch, 1599)), none of which created a specialization more significant than a “niche repertory” within their respective publishers’ production.

| BOOK | TITLE | NO. OF VOICES | MODEL* | DATE | RISM |
|------|---|---------------|--|------------------|-------------------------------------|
| III | (9) <i>Adesto dolori meo</i> | 5 | Clemens non Papa, in <i>Liber sextus ecclesiasticarum cantionum</i> (Antwerp); repr. in <i>Evangelia dominicorum</i> , vol. 5 (Nürnberg) | 1553, repr. 1556 | B/1 1553 ¹ (no. 3) |
| | (10) <i>Transeunte Domino</i> | 5 | Giaches de Wert, in <i>Novi atque catholici thesauri musici</i> , ed. by Pietro Giovanelli (Venice) | 1568 | B/1 1568 ⁶ |
| | (11) <i>Im Mayen hört man die Hahnen krayen</i> | 5 | Orlando di Lasso, in <i>Neue Teütsche Liedlein</i> (Munich) | 1567 | L 814 |
| | (12) <i>Ich stund an einem Morgen</i> | 5 | Ivo de Vento, in <i>Neue Teutsche Liedlein</i> (Munich) | 1569 | V 1119 |
| IV | (13) <i>Ob ich schon arm und elend bin</i> | 4 | Jobst vom Brandt, in <i>Der fünffte Theil</i> [...] <i>teutscher Liedlein</i> , ed. by Georg Forster (Nürnberg) | 1556 | B/1 1556 ² (no. 9) |
| | (14) <i>Mixolydium</i> | 4 | No known model | | |
| | (15) <i>Un gay bergir</i> | 4 | Thomas Crecquillon, in <i>Premier livre des chansons à quatre parties</i> (Antwerp) | 1543 | B/1 1543 ¹ (no. 6) |
| | (16) <i>Canonica</i> | 4 or 8 | No known model | | |

* With reference to the first known printed source of the model

† Publication today lost, supposedly printed by Nigrin

From this table the variety of models is apparent even at first glance:

(a) nine of them are motets, which include:

- five motets composed by Gallus himself. *Undique flammatis*, celebrating the election of Pavlovský as bishop of Olomouc, was published the previous year while four others were published in *Opus musicum*, vol. 1 (1586) or vol. 4 (1590): that is, well after the Masses.³²
- four other motets, in contrast, come from composers of the Low Countries belonging to two different generations: (1) two recent compositions by Christian Hollander and Giaches de Wert are taken out from a single source, the *Novus Thesaurus Musicus* (1568); (2) two other motets are selected from older sources and the previous generation of Franco-Flemish composers: Philippe Verdelot (1538) and Jacobus Clemens non Papa (1553);

(b) four secular songs complete the list of models. They include:

³² Readers should be reminded at this point that the “natural” supposition that these motets were already in circulation at the time the Masses to which they were related were published can sometimes be debatable. For example, David Crawford has shown that three Masses published by Jacques Moderne were composed before the motets to which they are related. It remains to ascertain whether, at least in some instances, this might also be true for these four Gallus Masses. See Crawford, “Reflections on Some Masses”, 89.

- three German *Lieder* by different composers and from different dates: Jobst von Brandt (1556), Orlando di Lasso (1567) and Ivo de Vento (1569);
- one French chanson by the Franco-Flemish composer Thomas Crecquillon, who belonged to the same generation as Verdelot and Clemens.

Considered simply as a list of titles, these models do not reveal what appears only through a careful examination of their musical profile. It is a striking dimension of their grouping in the 1580 publication that none of them, within this choice, seems to adhere to the same aesthetic as its companions within the given category. This is most clearly observable in the three German *Lieder*: while Brandt provides an elegant example of the classic, post-Senfl conception of the German *Lied*, with the main melody situated in the Tenor part, Lasso conceives *Im Mayen* in exactly the same style as his French chansons; in contrast, Vento's *Ich stund* benefits from a brilliance of sonority closer to the Italian *villanella*, which is characteristic of the *Lied* genre in its late development, and for which, precisely, this composer became famous. A similar observation could be made about the motets: Wert and Hollander follow the new trend of Franco-Flemish inspiration, being as distinct as possible from one another, just as their treatment, in turn, is different from that displayed in the two motets by Verdelot and Clemens; these, in contrast, recapture the classical inspiration of the previous generation, marked, among other features, by its use of pervasive imitation. As for Gallus's own compositions, it can similarly be noted that while *Pater noster* and *Elisabethae impletum est tempus* distribute the eight parts among two choirs following different approaches (lengthy contrasted sections in *Pater noster* and quickfire responsorial effects in *Elisabethae*), the six-part motets *Elisabeth Zachariae* and *Locutus est Dominus* themselves construct a similar kind of opposition along similar lines. In this case, however, the dialogue is between two "virtual" choirs within a six-part texture: *Locutus est* features large sections of dialogue between the two sub-choirs, while in *Elisabeth Zachariae* the texture and part groupings vary all the way through the motet. These seemingly careful details cause one to speculate whether an overall plan for the whole collection was perhaps purposefully worked out, conferring on each model the status of a sample: that is, a type of musical inspiration that by design appears only once.

UNITY OF STYLE

A closer examination of the models borrowed from other composers also deserves mention, but this time in terms of style. Few commentators, if any, have previously remarked that most of the models display stylistic features often strikingly similar to these of Gallus himself, ensuring, as a result, a perfect homogeneity of development between elaboration of the model and passages lacking such quotation. Whether this means that Gallus elaborated his own musical gestures to match what he found in these pieces, or that he simply chose the models because he could distinguish in them similarities to his own approach is a question that would far exceed the limits of this article. Suffice it to say that this observation is at least partly dissonant with the one previ-

ously made in that it underlines the unity of style within the collection, whereas the compositional features on display in the models are well varied. The most obvious examples of this occur in the two modern motets taken from the *Novus Thesaurus musicus* published in Venice by Gardano in 1568. In *Casta novenarum* by Hollander – on a text that Gallus, too, would come to set to music in his *Harmoniae morales*³³ – we find what would become almost a “signature” of the first-named composer: namely, the cadential movement II–I, producing an augmented fourth (see Music example 1).

Music example 1 | Christian Hollander, *Casta novenarum*, from *Novus Thesaurus musicus*, bb. 26–34

The image shows a musical score for 'Casta novenarum' by Christian Hollander, measures 26-34. The score is in G minor (one flat) and 4/4 time. It features seven staves: C (Soprano), 5 (2) (Alto), A (Tenor), 5 (Soprano), T (Tenor), 6 (Alto), and B (Bass). A vertical box highlights measures 28-30, where a cadential II-I movement is shown, resulting in an augmented fourth interval between the second and first voices in measure 29.

In the Wert motet, *Transeunte Domino*, instances of stepwise parallel motion involving three voices are also a familiar feature of Gallus own style (see Music example 2).

³³ Handl, *Harmoniae morales*, no. 5.

Music example 2 | Giaches de Wert, *Transeunte Domino*, from *Novus Thesaurus musicus*, bb. 46–50

But these two examples are not isolated, and one could also argue that, after all, the section in triple metre closing Wert’s motet could just as well have been written by Gallus himself!³⁴ On the other hand, the two motets chosen from the older generation of Franco-Flemish composers both start with a similar device (a descending tetrachord in the G-Dorian mode), and they both contain as well allusions to some of Gallus favourite compositional gestures:

- the parallel motion already found in Wert (Clemens, bb. 47–50, in a passage which also appears in the *secunda pars* in the same bars);
- a conclusion built around the figure of a *congeries*:³⁵ that is, a sequential contrapuntal progression (Verdelot, bb. 73–82, section repeated up to the end of the motet).

This same profile of similar features between the chosen models and Gallus’s own distinctive language can in fact be extended to other models:

- *Im Mayen* alludes to the rooster with an onomatopoeic *stretto* conclusion of a type that will reappear in the *Harmoniae morales*;³⁶
- the *congeries* figure is also present at the end of Crecquillon’s *Ung gay bergier*;

³⁴ Gallus seems, indeed, to have appreciated the music of Giaches de Wert. A volume of motets by Wert – *Modulationum sacrarum*, printed in 1583 in Nürnberg – is mentioned in the inventory of the music books in his possession established in 1591.

³⁵ Burmeister, *Musica poetica*, 65: “Congeries [sunatrismos] est coacervatio specierum concordantium tam Perfectarum, quam Imperfectarum, quarum par motus est concessus.” (Congeries is an accumulation of consonances, perfect as well as imperfect, whose parallel motion is allowed to stand.)

³⁶ In *Gallus amat Venerem* (Handl, *Harmoniae morales*, no. 6) and *Quam gallina suum parit ovum* (ibid., no. 7). On the ingenious conception of Lasso’s *Lied*, see Cœurdevey, *Roland de Lassus*, 519.

- *Ich stund* contains triadic melodic writing, with lively cadences opposing two sub-choirs – exactly of the kind that characterizes many secular pieces by Gallus.

Considering, then, that the choice of models reveals many personal features characteristic of Gallus's own style, but also that each model seems to have been carefully selected in order to achieve an obvious and apparent variety, a question therefore arises about the compositional processes to which the models are subjected: does Gallus emphasize their closeness to his own style, or does he try, on the contrary, to showcase their specific traits? Bearing this question in mind allows the 1580 collection to bring to light another distinctively original trait when observed within the context of the polyphonic Mass in the late sixteenth century.

HOW DOES GALLUS ELABORATE THE MODELS?

The answer to this question does not require a lengthy investigation, since most of the Masses discussed here evolve at some distance from their models, when they do not simply ignore them in detail. Nearly all of them, it will be noted, refer back to motets. The reasons for this are not only due to the harmonic rather than motivic structure of most of the models, which causes difficulty in making out the borderline between an actual quotation and a mere variation of a harmonic or cadential frame. They also stem from the fact that Gallus frequently plans for entirely free sections that do not depend on the model at all. An extreme case in point would be the Mass *Elisabethae impletum est tempus*, almost conceived in its entirety at some distance from its model.³⁷ But even in a Mass such as *Undique flammatis*, which purposefully evokes the model without quoting from it literally,³⁸ the presence of the original motet gradually seems to fade as the Mass progresses.³⁹ Two exceptions are discernible within this scheme: the Mass *Locutus est Dominus*, built on a motet, relies on its model very insistently. In contrast, the Mass *Ob ich schon arm*, built on a *Lied*, does not, adding many episodes foreign to it in at least eight sections of the Mass, including half of the Kyrie, Sanctus and Agnus Dei, a third of the Gloria, and at least a quarter of the Credo.

Unlike this group where the Masses evoke their models with clarity only occasionally, the Masses built on secular songs do indeed rely on their sources in a much more perceptible way. This is the case with *Im Mayen*, *Ich stund* and *Ung gay bergier* plus, as we have just seen, a Mass on the motet *Locutus est Dominus*. Since it has often been remarked that late imitation Masses of the sixteenth century are less bound to their models than Masses from the mid-century or the 1560s, one might infer that this difference of treatment revealed an earlier date of composition.

³⁷ Should we infer from this distance that the motet was indeed composed after the Mass, seeing that this sometimes happens elsewhere in the Mass literature of the sixteenth century? See note 32 above.

³⁸ The motet on which this Mass is built being a celebration of the election of Bishop Pavlovský, into whose service Gallus had just entered, and to whom the first two books of the collection are dedicated.

³⁹ And this even in the movement incipits, up to a point where Sanctus and Agnus Dei preserve at best only a shadowy memory of the motet.

But other considerations could well have played a role as well, such as, for example, the factor of musical rhetoric.

It is, for instance, a striking feature that the *Dorium* and *Mixolydium* Masses, built on modal scales without reference to a known model, are completely opposed to one another in compositional style. *Mixolydium*, in Book IV, with its mostly syllabic development and non-sectionalized Credo,⁴⁰ conforms to the rhetoric of brevity and the *genus humile* exemplified by all the Masses built on secular models in the collection. *Dorium* in Book II, in contrast, includes generously proportioned periods of dense counterpoint and lengthy developments (with a 112-bar Sanctus!) characteristic of Masses built on motets and observing a more “Ciceronian” musical rhetoric comparable to the *genus sublime* of Latin prose.⁴¹ The division between these two categories is confirmed by the fact that the longest Mass in the *brevis* category, *Ung gay bergier* (316 bars), is still 120 bars shorter than the shortest Mass in the *sublime* category, which is actually the *Dorium* itself (435 bars). This also helps us to figure out how the models were treated: first by reference to a general framework (brief or elaborated), then by a schedule of quotations with some sections completely independent from it, these independent sections becoming increasingly important as the work progresses. Both these conceptions appear interrelated, in that the models tend to be less audibly present in Masses conceived in the “high” style or *genus sublime*, while they are more perceptible in *missae breves*, with two exceptions, as we have already seen: *Locutus est Dominus* (high style, with a high presence of the model), *Ob ich schon arm* (*genus humile*, with a low presence of the model).

IS THERE EVIDENCE OF A STYLISTIC EVOLUTION?

The preceding remarks already make it clear that the search for a chronological order of compositions within the 1580 collection is bound to encounter many obstacles. These Masses are generally brief and presented in Nigrin’s typography in a very compact way; each has an exceptionally short Agnus Dei lacking repetition signs, and in nine cases⁴² even without a *Dona nobis pacem* section or an *ut supra* instruction.⁴³ If we are to accept the idea of a carefully planned selection of Masses, as the title *Selectiores quaedam missae* itself suggests, then we should be wary of clues presenting themselves too obviously.

The first of these “too obvious” clues is suggested by the forewords themselves. Books I and II are dedicated to Pavlovský, Gallus new patron since 1579 – that is, almost coinciding with

⁴⁰ Of which it is the only example in the whole collection, all the other Credo movements being divided into several sections.

⁴¹ To borrow here (as in the further developments) the two extreme terms of the Ciceronian distinction between three *dicendi genera*: that is the *genus humile* and its opposite, the *genus sublime*.

⁴² Out of sixteen Masses, that constitutes little more than half of the collection.

⁴³ The presence of a *Dona nobis pacem* section does not seem to be related to the overall length or density of the Masses: rather unexpectedly, this concluding section is more frequent in Books III and IV than in Books I and II.

the publication. Book III is dedicated to abbot Schönauer, with whom Gallus was in close contact during the years he spent in the Zábřdovice Praemonstratensian monastery. Book IV is dedicated to abbot Rueff in Zwettl, whom Gallus had previously met when both were in Melk, which is generally held to be Gallus first place of residence as a composer. The forewords tend to present the works of each Book as related to the period when Gallus interacted personally with the dedicatees, thereby implying an inverted chronology from Book I to Book IV, the Masses of Books I and II being the latest, these of Book IV the oldest. As has already been shown, this scheme can be accepted only with great reluctance:

- The eight Masses contained in Books I and II are probably too numerous to be related to Pavlovský alone and to Gallus’s most recently acquired position.
- The time spent by Gallus in Silesia is not evoked in the forewords, whereas this period seems to have been fruitful enough, judging from both the number of sources originating from Breslau and other Silesian cities⁴⁴ and that of Gallus’s own Silesian acquaintances.⁴⁵ The reason for not mentioning the Silesian episode is probably based on ideological grounds, as has been shown in an earlier article,⁴⁶ since this environment was mostly dominated by Lutherans, hence unwise to mention in forewords dedicated to a bishop engaged in Counter-Reformation measures in Moravia.
- Finally, there is something odd about imagining Gallus composing Masses for four parts in Melk, then for five in Zábřdovice, then for six and eight parts later.

The only solid clues available are limited in scope: alone the Mass *Undique flammatis*, linked to a motet celebrating the election of Pavlovský, can be dated with certainty as the latest of all, coincident with its publication. On the other hand, *Ung gay bergier* seems to adopt a similar vein as Lasso in his Masses based on French chansons. Lasso’s Mass *Le berger et la bergère* published in the *Patrocinium musices* could well have served as an inspiration for *Ung gay bergier*. The publication of this Mass in 1574 can therefore perhaps be considered as a *terminus a quo* for *Ung gay bergier*.

Among other available clues, the matter of word repetitions can also bring forth some interesting observations. A clear compositional choice seems to establish a distinction between Masses displaying many repetitions of words or of textual fragments, whereas in other Masses priority seems to be given to a simple utterance of the text without repetitions. Contrary to what one might think, this distinction does not completely map on to that existing between the rhetoric of high and *brevis* styles respectively, already discussed. Within the *brevis* category one observes that *Ung gay bergier*, *Mixolydium* and *Ich stund* are full of word repetitions, while *Pater*

⁴⁴ See Jež, “Twórczość Jacoba Handla”, 43–48, as well as Motnik, *Jacob Handl-Gallus*, 69–75.

⁴⁵ The poet Salomon Frenzel, the baron Wilhelm von Oppersdorff and the physician Abraham Schwalb were among Gallus’s acquaintances – and in the case of Frenzel became an enduring friend. See Desmet, “Jacob Handl Gallus i Śląsk”, especially 44–46. On Salomon Frenzel, see also Leitmeir, “Words for Music”.

⁴⁶ See Desmet, “Establishing a Chronology”, 168.

noster and *Elisabeth Zachariae*, which belong to the high category, are not particularly wedded to this device.

Among these repeated words, there is one in particular, situated in the Credo, which could add a decisive semantic dimension: “et in unam sanctam **catholicam** et apostolicam ecclesiam”. As has already been remarked in a previous article,⁴⁷ there is no need to insist on what the repetition of the word “catholicam” could mean in a Counter-Reformation context, but one may add here that this repetition is sharply emphasized in Gallus’s Masses whenever it is present: “catholicam” is repeated in this way twice in *Locutus est Dominus, Transeunte Domino* and *Im Mayen*, but three times in *Undique flammatis* and *Pater noster*, four times in *Casta novenarum* and *Ich stund*, five times in *Ung gay bergier* and a full six (!) times in *Mixolydium*, making it clear that the repetition in question was by no means a simple allusion but was deliberately intended as a *punctum* of special salience. Different from this group are, however, six Masses where the word “catholicam” is not repeated: *Elisabethae impletum est tempus, Elisabeth Zachariae, Dorium, Sancta Maria, Adesto dolori meo* and *Ob ich schon arm*.

As can be inferred from this distribution, the opposition between *Mixolydium* and *Dorium* already noted in terms of musical rhetoric, is here again confirmed. A rough draft of the contextual distribution of the Masses within the 1580 collection can probably be deduced from these differences: if Masses without the repeated “catholicam” could have been sung in all contexts, it is most probable, in contrast, that those where this repetition occurs were not directed towards the Silesian localities open to the Lutheran Reformation. On the basis of this general evaluation, one may hypothesize a distribution that, without being completely chronological, perhaps furnishes a basis for further reflection on, and elucidation of, possible contexts of composition:

- Recent Masses linked with Stanislav Pavlovský, or the “Counter-Reformation” Masses by Gallus – “catholicam” is repeated, rhetoric is in high style, while frequent syllabic word-relivity ensures perfect grasp of the sung text: *Undique flammatis, Pater noster, Casta novenarum*.
- Recent Masses but conceived before entering Pavlovský’s service or adopting the high style of the later period – possibly composed and performed in Silesia, with florid counterpoint and no repetition of “catholicam”: *Elisabethae impletum est tempus, Elisabeth Zachariae, Dorium*.
- Two Masses in the high style, alternating between florid counterpoint and syllabic declamation, with repeated catholicam – Zábřdovice period?: *Transeunte Domino, Locutus est Dominus*.
- Within the remaining Masses, two Masses built on similar motives and using models from the 1540s, with no repetition of “catholicam” and a high density of imitative counterpoint, seem to have a similar origin: *Adesto dolori meo, Sancta Maria*.
- Within the remaining Masses, all of which are built on secular models, one may probably associate *Ob ich schon arm* with a Silesian context. Not only because Jobst vom Brandt, the

⁴⁷ Ibid., 165–166.

author of the *Lied*, was a firm Lutheran, but also because of the varied style exhibiting beautiful craftsmanship that radiates from this Mass. The fact that the model is neither constantly present, nor deeply imprinted within the texture, could also point towards a late date of composition.

The other four Masses are more difficult to distinguish stylistically, and it will be left to further investigation to ascertain whether they are linked with the Melk or the Zábřdovice periods. One notes, however, that both the *Ung gay bergier* and *Ich stund* Masses display a maturity of style combined with a quasi-instrumental sense of counterpoint, perhaps reminding us that Gallus was also an organist. They can perhaps be more plausibly associated with Zábřdovice, since Gallus insisted in his foreword of his *Epicedion harmonicum* (1589), devoted to the memory of the recently deceased Schönauer, abbot of Zábřdovice and a long-standing friend and supporter, how much the abbot cared about restoring the organs of the monastery to their full splendour. If Lasso's Mass *Le berger et la bergère* published in 1574 can be identified as a model for Gallus's *Ung gay bergier*, as previously suggested, then this *terminus a quo* is also a good fit for a composition originating from the Zábřdovice period. In contrast, *Mixolydium* and *Im Mayen* could perhaps be earlier in conception. Rueff, to whom Book IV is dedicated is the only dedicatee to whom Gallus speaks in familiar terms, nick-naming himself "your rooster". This could be a hint that the Mass *Im Mayen* came about in this context.

CONCLUSION

The collection of Masses by Jacobus Handl-Gallus, *Selectiores quaedam missae*, published in 1580, gathers compositions conceived over a decade (1570–1580) in different contexts, as four forewords dedicated to three ecclesiastical dignitaries of different ranks remind us objectively. The diversity of these compositions also reminds us of the flexibility required from musicians of the sixteenth century,⁴⁸ all the more so from an itinerant composer such as Gallus was until 1580, a year coinciding both with his first official position and with the publication of this collection. This diversity is all the greater for the fact that Gallus had also wandered amidst Silesian society (something not mentioned in the forewords), which was for the most part dominated by the Lutheran faith and towards which Catholic hierarchy of the Breslau episcopal see maintained a conciliatory attitude.

If some marks of these different contexts and periods can be detected in the collection, all the Masses reveal a composer already distinguished by a very solid sense of form and a plasticity of musical construction: the variability of choice apparent from the models of the Masses seems itself to have been the result of a carefully planned conception: that is, devised at the level of the collection as a whole. These Masses are rendered delightful in their varied expression not only

⁴⁸ As Thomas Christian Leitmeir well describes it: "Musicians, whose aspirations went beyond employment as humble singer or instrumentalist, had to react swiftly and flexibly to the demands of an ever-changing market". See Leitmeir, "Lutheran Propers", 89.

by the constant renewal of inspiration, which is clearly perceptible, but also by a rhythmic spontaneity and an elegance of prosody: two constituents that constantly reappear in the music of Gallus. These general features, reformulated in every Mass and for each type of borrowed model, unquestionably contribute to the unique dimensions of the 1580 collection. Like the *Opus musicum* that was to follow in the years 1586–1590 and the secular Latin *Moralia* from the 1589–1591 period (some of them published posthumously in 1596), this collection of Masses seems not to have generated imitations or followers. It shows us a composer already in full possession of his expressive means as early as the 1570s, in possession of a *modus operandi* that successive collections were sometimes to slightly modify, yet without ever fundamentally altering it. The time when it was possible to qualify these Masses as “inferior” by comparison with the inspiration of the motets seems today to be long gone, but it is also true that, since they belong to the least often performed or recorded of Gallus’s works, one can only wish for a wider diffusion of these masterpieces in the future.

BIBLIOGRAPHY

Sources

- Amon, Blasius. *Missae quatuor vocibus*. Vienna: Michael Apffel, 1588.
- Amon, Blasius. *Patrocinium musices: missae cum breves tum quatuor vocum laudatissimae concinnatae*. Munich: Adam Berg, 1591.
- Burmeister, Joachim. *Musica poetica*. Rostock: Stephan Möllemann [Myliander], 1606.
- Castro, Jean de. *Missae tres, trium vocum*. Cologne: Gerhard Grevenbuch, 1599.
- Crappius, Andreas. *Missa sex vocum. Ad imitationem suavissimae cantionis: Non auferetur sceptrum de Iuda*. Wittenberg: Johannes Schwertel, 1572. RISM A/I C 4399.
- Custrovius, Johannes. *Missa quinque vocum ad imitationem suavissimae cantilenae Concussus est mare*. Helmstedt: Jacob Lucius, 1595.
- Grothuisius, Arnold. *Missa cum adjuncto Patrem &c. ad imitationem [...] motetae Orlandi di Lasso Deus misereatur nostri*. Helmstedt: Jacob Lucius, 1588.
- Handl, Jacobus. *Harmoniae morales*. Prague: Jiří Nigrin, 1589.
- Handl, Jacobus. *Selectiores quaedam missae*. 4 vols. Prague: Jiří Nigrin, 1580.
- Hassler, Hans Leo. *Missae quaternis, V. VI. et VIII. vocibus*. Nürnberg: Paul Kauffmann, 1599.
- Isaac, Heinrich. *Choralis Constantinus*. 3 vols. Nürnberg: Hieronymus Formschneider, 1550–1555. RISM A/II 89, I 90, I 91.
- Jevičský, Ondřej [Andreas Chrysoponus Gevicenus]. *Bicinia nova*. Prague: Jiří Nigrin, 1579. RISM A/I C 2105.
- Lasso, Orlando di. *Liber missarum quatuor et quinque vocum*. Nürnberg: Gerlach, 1581.
- Lasso, Orlando di. *Patrocinium musices [...] missae aliquot quinque vocum. Secunda pars*. Munich: Adam Berg, 1574. RISM A/II L 873.
- Lechner, Leonhard. *Liber missarum sex et quinque vocum*. Nürnberg: Gerlach, 1584.

- Liber quindecim missarum a praestantissimis musicis compositorum.* Nürnberg: Johannes Petreius, 1539. RISM B/I 1539|1.
- Missae quinque quinis vocibus.* Nürnberg: Catharina Gerlach, 1590.
- Missae tredecim, a praestantissimis artificibus compositae.* Nürnberg: Hieronymus Formschneider, 1539. RISM B/I 1539|2.
- Opus decem missarum quatuor vocum.* Wittenberg: Georg Rhau, 1541. RISM B/I 1541|1.
- Pisnický duchovníj.* Prague: Jiří Nigrin, 1574. Knihopis 13522.
- Riccio, Teodoro. *Liber primus missarum quatuor, quinque et sex vocum.* Königsberg: Georg Ostenberger, 1579. RISM A/I R 1287 and RR 1287.
- Sales, Franz. *Patrocinium musices. Missae solemniorum.* Munich: Adam Berg, 1589.
- Sartorius, Paul. *Missae tres octonis vocibus.* Munich: Adam Berg, 1600.
- Škorně z Frymburgku, Jan. *Knjžka Pjsnj, a Chwál Božských.* Prague: Jiří Nigrin, 1575. Knihopis 15920.
- Utendal, Alexander. *Tres missae, quinque et sex vocum [...] item Magnificat, per octo tonos, quatuor vocibus.* Nürnberg: Dietrich Gerlach, 1573. RISM A/I U 122, UU 122.
- Wert, Giaches de. *Modulationum sacrarum quinque et sex vocum libri tres.* Nürnberg: Catharina Gerlach & Johann vom Bergs Erben, 1583. RISM A/I W 853.

Modern Edition

- Gallus, Iacobus. *Compositions Preserved in Manuscript.* Edited by Edo Škulj. Monumenta artis musicae Sloveniae 28. Ljubljana: SAZU, Muzikološki inštitut ZRC SAZU, 1996.

Literature

- Becker, Carl Ferdinand. *Die Tonwerke des XVI. und XVII. Jahrhunderts, oder systematisch-chronologische Zusammenstellung der in diesen zwei Jahrhunderten gedruckten Musikalien.* Leipzig: Ernst Fleischer, 1847.
- Cœurdevey, Annie. *Roland de Lassus.* Paris: Fayard, 2003.
- Crawford, David. "Reflections on Some Masses from the Press of Moderne". *The Musical Quarterly* 58, no.1 (1972): 82–91.
- Daněk, Petr. "Nototiskařská činnost Jiřího Nigrina". *Hudební věda* 24, no. 2 (1987): 121–136.
- Desmet, Marc. "Establishing a Chronology of Jacob Handl's Printed Masses: Evidence and Problems". In *The Musical Heritage of the Jagiellonian Era*, edited by Paweł Gancarczyk and Agnieszka Leszczyńska, 155–168. Warsaw: Instytut Sztuki PAN, 2012.
- Desmet, Marc. "Jacobus Handl Gallus' Inventory: New Suggestions about the Music Books found in the Composer's Belongings". *Hudební Věda* 54, no. 4 (2017): 441–454.
- Desmet, Marc. "Jacob Handl Gallus i Śląsk: między danymi biograficznymi a kwestiami stylowymi". *Muzyka* 53, no. 4 (2008): 39–66.
- Eichner, Barbara. "The Woman at the Well: Divine and Earthly Love in Orlando di Lasso's Parody Masses". *Revue belge de musicologie* 72 (2018): 31–51.

- Eitner, Robert. "Handl (Händl, Gallus), Jakob". In *Biographisch-bibliographischen Quellen-Lexikon der Musiker und Musikgelehrten der christlichen Zeitrechnung bis zur Mitte des 19 Jh.*, vol. 5, 13–15. Leipzig: Breitkopf und Härtel, 1901.
- Fétis, François-Joseph. *Biographie universelle des Musiciens*. Paris: Firmin-Didot, 1874.
- Franke, Veronica. "Borrowing Procedures in Late 16th Century Imitation Masses and Their Implications for Our View of *Parody* or *Imitatio*". *Studien zur Musikwissenschaft* 46 (1998): 7–33.
- Franke, Veronica. "Palestrina's Imitation Mass Settings: A Study of Recompositional Procedures". *South African journal of musicology* 14 (1994): 15–34.
- Grabnar, Klemen. "Je ne mange point de porc: Orlando di Lasso's Early Parody Mass". *Studia latina et graeca* 15, no. 1 (2013): 119–130.
- Grabnar, Klemen. "Parodične maše v Hrenovih konih knjigah". PhD diss., University of Ljubljana, 2015.
- Hilscher, Elisabeth T. "Josef Mantuani und Guido Adler: der Briefwechsel in Archiv der Gesellschaft zur Herausgabe von Denkmälern der Tonkunst in Österreich". In *Mantuanijev zbornik*, edited by Edo Škulj, 23–74. Ljubljana: Družina, 1994.
- Jakoubková, Petra. "Typografie hudebních tisků Jiřího Nigrina". MA thesis, Charles University, Prague, 2014.
- Jež, Tomasz. "Twórczość Jacoba Handla w źródłach proveniencji śląskiej" [Compositions of Jacob Handl in Sources of Silesian Provenience]. *Muzyka* 49, no. 4 (2004): 27–62.
- Lavtžar, Josip. "Jacobus Gallus". *Cerkveni glasbenik* 11, nos. 8–9 (1888): 57–61.
- Leitmeir, Christian Thomas. "Lutheran Propers for Wrocław/Breslau: The *Cantus Choralis* (1575) of Johannes Knöfel". In *The Musical Culture of Silesia before 1742: New Contexts – New Perspectives*, edited by Paweł Gancarczyk, Lenka Hlávková-Mráčková and Remigiusz Pośpiech, 89–113. Frankfurt: Peter Lang, 2013.
- Leitmeir, Christian Thomas. "Words for Music, Words about Music: Salomon Frenzel von Friedenthal's Epigrams as Source for Music History". In *Ars Musica and Its Contexts in Medieval and Early Modern Culture*, edited by Paweł Gancarczyk, 367–394. Warsaw: Liber Pro Arte, 2016.
- Mantuani, Josip. "Bibliographie der Werke von Gallus". In *Opus musicum II* by Jacob Handl (Gallus), v–xvii. Denkmäler der Tonkunst in Österreich 24. Vienna: Artaria, 1905.
- Mantuani, Josip. "Über die Messenthemen des Jakob Handl". *Musica Divina* 1, no. 6 (1913): 228–233, 269–274.
- Motnik, Marko. *Jacob Handl-Gallus: Werk – Überlieferung – Rezeption; mit thematischem Katalog*. Wiener Forum für ältere Musikgeschichte 5. Tutzing: Hans Schneider, 2012.
- Pisk, Paul Amadeus. *Die Messen von Jacobus Gallus*. Vienna: Institut für Musikwissenschaft, 1917.
- Škulj, Edo, ed. *Gallusovi predgovori*. Ljubljana: Družina, 1991.
- Škulj, Edo. "Gallusovo obravnavanje mašnega ordinarija". *Glasbeno-pedagoški zbornik Akademije za glasbo v Ljubljani* 5 (2005): 229–248.
- Škulj, Edo, ed. *Gallusov zbornik*. Ljubljana: Družina, 1991.
- Wagner, Peter. *Geschichte der Messe*. Leipzig: Breitkopf und Härtel, 1913.
- Wagner, Peter. "Über die Messen des Jakob Handl". *Musica Divina* 1, no. 3 (1913): 93–99.

Povzetek

GALLUS KOT SKLADATELJ POLIFONIH MAŠ: NEKAJ DODATNIH PRIPOMB K NJEGOVI PRVI TISKANI ZBIRKI IZ LETA 1580

Zbirka z naslovom *Selectiores quaedam missae* iz leta 1580 je prva, ki je bila objavljena pod Gallusovim imenom. Obsega šestnajst polifonih maš, zasnovanih – razen treh izjem – v skladu z načeli tako imenovane parodične maše. Za razliko od motetov zbirke *Opus musicum* ali posvetnih latinskih skladb zbirke *Harmoniae morales* se zdi kritična odmevnost teh maš skromna, tako glede njihovega položaja v zgodovini polifonih maš ob koncu 16. stoletja kot kronologije njihovega nastanka in celo glede mesta v slogovnem razvoju skladatelja. Pregled vsebine vendarle v več ozirih omogoča ponovno ovrednotenje pomena te zbirke. Prvi se nanaša na materialni vidik izdaje in izpostavlja izjemnost tiska, ki ga je v Pragi pripravil Jiří Nigrin in ki nima para v Srednji Evropi, celo v cesarskih deželah nasploh, saj so bile zbirke uglasbitev mašnega ordinarija v tistem času zlasti domena beneških, pariških ali antwerpenskih tiskarjev. Dva vidika se nato nanašata na samo zasnovano zbirke: pomenljiva se zdi Gallusova izbira modelov, na katerih so maše osnovane (pet lastnih motetov, štirje moteti in štiri posvetne skladbe drugih skladateljev), ki se med seboj popolnoma razlikujejo, kakor da bi bila zbirka zamišljena kot prikaz različnih možnih modelov. Po drugi strani pa se zdi, da je skladatelj izbiral tiste modele, ki so bili zelo blizu njegovemu slogu, kar je v mašah omogočalo odlično povezovanje med citati in prostimi odlomki. Pri iskanju možnih indicev za določitev kronologije nastanka maš je treba naposled upoštevati jasno ločnico med mašami, kjer se glasbene fraze nenehno razvijajo in kjer se besede ali fraze pogosto ponavljajo, in mašami, kjer, nasprotno, besedilo skorajda ne vsebuje ponavljanj in kjer se glasbene fraze ne prekrivajo. Naštete razlike in zlasti primer obravnave besede »catholicam« v stavku *Credo* lahko pomagajo pri predvidevanju kronologije nastanka skladb.