

## INTRODUCTION

The work presented here in modern edition for the first time has puzzled scholars for some three decades. Its composer, Antonio Biffi (1666/7-1733), was Maestro di capella of San Marco in Venice from February of 1702 until his death, and most of his extant compositions are preserved in the collections of the cathedral. This work, however, appeared to have been included only as an anomalous afterthought in a volume otherwise devoted to motets by Jean-Baptiste Lully, now housed at the Bibliothèque Nationale de France in Paris.<sup>1</sup> The volume forms part of the “Toulouse-Philidor collection,” an extensive library of musical manuscripts assembled by a workshop of copyists under Louis XIV’s music librarian, André Danican Philidor l’aîné. These volumes were copied at the request of Louis-Alexandre de Bourbon, comte de Toulouse (1678-1737), an illegitimate son of Louis XIV.<sup>2</sup> Although the Toulouse-Philidor collection contains a considerable quantity of Italian music—demonstrating the keen interest in the *ultramontain* among younger members of the royal family—it has been unclear how or why this work by a Venetian composer who was otherwise unknown in France came to be part of a volume of motets by the famous Lully.

The reason probably is to be found in the circumstances of the work’s commission. According to the journal of the marquis de Dangeau, a *Miserere* “by the music master of Saint Mark’s” was performed during a Tenebrae service at the Chapelle royale of Versailles on Maundy Thursday, 20 March 1704:

At Tenebrae, a *Miserere* was sung that M. le duc d’Orléans arranged to have composed in Venice by the master of music at Saint-Mark’s, which was very well performed and was found very beautiful.<sup>3</sup>

The “M. le duc d’Orléans” mentioned as the commissioner of the work was Philippe II d’Orléans (1674-1723), the future Regent under Louis XV and one of the most important

---

<sup>1</sup> Another *Miserere* by Biffi, dated 1732, exists (I-Vnm 832), but the editor was not able to access it to determine whether it has any connection with the work in this edition. Its instrumentation (TTB+org) makes it unlikely to be the same work.

<sup>2</sup> Catherine Massip, “La collection musicale Toulouse-Philidor à la Bibliothèque nationale.” *Fontes Artis Musicae* 30 (1983): 184-207.

<sup>3</sup> Philippe de Courcillon, marquis de Dangeau, *Journal du Marquis de Dangeau avec les additions inédites du Duc de Saint-Simon*, ed. Eudore Soulié, et. al. (Paris, 1856), entry for Jeudi-Saint (20 March) 1704, at Versailles: “Le roi fit la cérémonie de laver les pieds aux pauvres et assista avec toute la maison royal à toutes les dévotions de la journée. On chanta à ténèbres un *Miserere* que M. le duc d’Orléans a fait faire à Venise par le maître de la musique de Saint-Marc, qui fut très-bien exécuté et qui fut trouvé fort beau. Le roi, après son souper, retourna encore à la chapelle adorer le saint-sacrement.”

patrons of Italian and Italianate music in France.<sup>4</sup> While the details of the commission are as yet unknown, the work is undoubtedly the same *Miserere* found in the Toulouse-Philidor collection. The comte de Toulouse was an avid musical amateur and participant in the musical activities of the group of courtiers around Louis XIV's son, the Grand Dauphin, which were often organized by Philippe d'Orléans.<sup>5</sup> Like many members of the Dauphin's circle, the comte had an interest in Italian music, and he almost certainly heard Biffi's *Miserere* during its performance at the Chapelle royale, where the services for Tenebrae, Dangeau reported, were attended by "the entire royal household." This event very likely prompted the comte to request a copy of the work, and the copyists of Philidor's *atelier* evidently made room for it in a collection of Lully's motets they were already assembling.

Although performed in 1704, the *Miserere* could have been written anytime after February 1702, when Biffi became chapel master at San Marco. This was a period in which Philippe was engaging Italian musicians (including the cellist Jean-Baptiste Stuck, and two castrati from Rome, Pasqualino Betti and Pasqualino Tiepoli), organizing performances of Italian music, and encouraging composition in a mixed Italo-French style.<sup>6</sup> In fact, the *durezza e ligature* counterpoint of the "Averte faciem" was directly imitated by Philippe in his opera *Penthée*, the first known performance of which occurred in April of 1703. Thus the *Miserere* was probably composed sometime shortly after Biffi's tenure as *Maestro di capella* began.

There is no record of the work having been performed by Philippe's musicians, but given the duke's curiosity about Italian music, it seems likely that he would have "tested it out" in private before having it performed before the court at the Chapelle royale. One other sign of the connection between the *Miserere* and the circle around Philippe d'Orléans is the unusual use of an inverted time signature, 4/3, in the "Quoniam si voluises," a notational characteristic found in Philippe's operas and in the motets of Charles-Hubert Gervais, his *Intendant [Maître] de la musique*.<sup>7</sup> It is unclear whether the inverted signature derives from Biffi or was added when Orléans's musicians copied the piece.

---

<sup>4</sup> See Don Fader, "Musical thought and patronage of the Italian style at the court of Philippe II, duc d'Orléans (1674-1723)" (Ph.D. Dissertation, Stanford University, 2000).

<sup>5</sup> Massip, "La collection musicale Toulouse-Philidor"; Fader, "The 'Cabale du Dauphin,' Campra and Italian comedy: The courtly politics of French musical patronage around 1700," *Music and letters* 86 (2005), 380-413.

<sup>6</sup> Fader, "Philippe II d'Orléans's 'chanteurs italiens,' the Italian cantata, and the *Goûts-réunis* under Louis XIV." *Early Music* 35 (2007): 237-249.

<sup>7</sup> Jean-Paul Claude Montagnier, "The church music of Charles-Hubert Gervais (1671-1744), Sous-Maître de Musique at the Chapelle royale" (Ph.D. Dissertation, Duke University, 1994), 382-85. Inverted time signatures were also described by Etienne Loulié, who had a number of links with the Orléans circle; see Albert Cohen, 'Loulie, Proportional Signs, and La Stravaganza,' *Music in Performance and Society: Essays in Honor of Roland Jackson*, ed. M. Cole and J. Koegel (Warren, MI: Harmonie Park Press, 1997), 195-203; Patricia M. Ranum: 'Etienne Loulié (1654-1702): Musicien de Mademoiselle de Guise, pédagogue et théoricien', *Recherches sur la musique française classique* 25 (1987): 26-75; 26 (1988-90): 5-49.

## Sources

The work is preserved in two different manuscripts found in the Toulouse-Philidor collection at the Music Department of the Bibliothèque Nationale de France: a set of parts and a score. This pairing of a full score with parts is typical feature of this collection.

*Parts*: F-Pn Rés F 1714, each of whose printed title pages reads: “MOTETS / A DEUX CHŒURS, / POUR LA CHAPELLE DU ROY.... Copiez par Ordre exprés de son Altesse Serenissime Monseigneur le COMTE DE TOULOUZE, / par M. Philidor l’aîné, Ordinaire de la Musique du Roy, & Garde de toute sa Bibliotheque / de Musique, & par son fils aîné, l’An 1704” [“Double choir motets for the Royal Chapel.... copied by the express order of His Most Serene Highness Monseigneur the comte de Toulouse, by M. Philidor the elder ... and by his oldest son in the year 1704”]. These part books contain music for motets by Lully, followed by Biffi’s *Miserere*, which is titled “Motet [or Miserere] del Signor Antonio Biffi Maître di Capella di Sancto Marco.” There are part books for five voices (“premier dessus de récit,” “second dessus de voix,” “haute-contre de récit,” “taille et basse-taille de récit”), two violins (“premier dessus de violon” and “second dessus de violon”), and continuo (“première basse continue”). A second *basse continue* part book can be found under the call number Rés 697bis. This arrangement of parts reflects the standard set copied by the Philidor *atelier* for the collection of the comte de Toulouse.<sup>8</sup> The parts are all in the hand of André Danican Philidor himself, but seem not to have been used for performance, as there are a number of serious copying errors, including missing measures, which show no signs of correction.<sup>9</sup>

*Score*: F-Pn Rés Vma ms 1215 (5), pp. 55-134. Despite the clear attribution to Biffi in the parts, the copyist seems—at least initially—not to have realized that the work was composed by someone other than Lully, as the title page of the score was rewritten from “Notus In Judea /Et /Miserere Mei Deus / De Mr de lully” to read “Notus In Judea *De Mr de lully* /Et /Miserere Mei Deus *Italien/ De Mr de lully*.” A modern hand then added “A. Biffi.” In addition to the instruments indicated in the parts, the score includes a line for viola. The score is written in the hand of Massip’s copiste I (Herlin’s Ph10), or perhaps copiste C, and can be consulted via *Gallica*, the digital collections of the Bibliothèque Nationale: <http://www.gallica.bnf.fr/>.

<sup>8</sup> Massip, “La collection musicale Toulouse-Philidor,” 189.

<sup>9</sup> The identification of the copyists’ hands in the Philidor *atelier* began under Catherine Massip, who reported her findings in *Livres de musique du comte de Toulouse: Cantates, Motets, Opéras, Ballets* (Paris: Drouot Rive Gauche, 1978). The hands have also been studied by Denis Herlin, as part of his work on the *Catalogue du fonds musical de la Bibliothèque de Versailles* (Paris: Klincksieck, 1995).

---

## Editorial Principles

The edition is based principally on the score, but readings from the parts were adopted in doubtful cases, or where they provide missing information, especially concerning instrumentation, ornamentation, and movement divisions (see the Critical Notes).

Another reason for conflating these two sets of sources is the considerable evidence that they have been compiled from a now lost score (see the Commentary below). Readings from the parts were particularly necessary in cases where the score has multiple copying errors (missing accidentals, notes placed on the wrong lines or spaces, etc.), especially in the “Sacrificium.” Frequent indications of accidentals, articulation, or other markings present in the parts but not the score have been included (as noted in the Critical Notes).

The original clefs for the vocal parts (C<sub>1</sub>, C<sub>1</sub>, C<sub>3</sub>, C<sub>4</sub>, and F<sub>4</sub>) have been altered to those in common modern usage for ease of reading, including those used to designate *basso seguente* (indicated both in the score and in the continuo parts), where the changing clefs correspond to the vocal parts being doubled by the bass. The continuo parts are not figured in any of the sources, a common characteristic not only of the Toulouse-Philidor collection, but also of many Italian compositions of the period. The only ornament symbol is a cross (+), which usually indicates a trill. Ornaments are indicated haphazardly; the parts, especially for the instruments, tend to be more highly ornamented than the score. Ornaments indicated either in the score or the parts have been included in the edition, but all ornaments incorporated from the parts have been indicated in square brackets []. Performers should certainly use their own discretion in ornamenting, as they would have at the time. No attempt has been made to coordinate ornaments between doubled voices and instruments in the choral movements, and there are many cases in which ornaments are indicated in one but not the other. In performing the piece, such coordination would certainly be desirable.

Slurs are given only sporadically in the sources. They are generally used as warning indications that a syllable continues across beats where a singer (or copyist?) might be tempted to place the next syllable. These have been left as they are in the sources, unless they involve an obvious error.

The sources’ usage of accidentals is practical, if inconsistent. In general, the score and parts follow the modern bar-line convention whereby an accidental remains in force throughout a bar unless cancelled. In a number of cases, however, notes repeated later in a measure receive a second (cautionary) accidental, or an accidental is added where the key signature makes it redundant. The sources also frequently treat accidentals as continuing to be in force on repeated notes of the same pitch, even across bar-lines. This practice sets up potential confusion in contexts of chromaticism (see, for example, soprano I, mm. 578-9). The edition thus follows the sources in using the modern bar-line convention, adding editorial accidentals in the cases where the sources leave them out on repeated notes (as in m. 578), and tacitly removing cautionary accidentals, except in cases where chromatic motion or cross-relations might confuse the reader (as in m. 579). In these cases, warning accidentals have been either left (if they are present in the sources), or added in parenthesis (), as indications of editorial additions. All other accidentals added by the editor are indicated in parenthesis.

## Commentary

Given that the original copy (or copies) of the work were owned by Philippe d'Orléans, it is not surprising that the sources in the Toulouse-Philidor collection demonstrate several signs of having been copied from a now lost original. In particular, there are errors, both large and small, that are shared between score and parts, but also errors unique to one source or the other. The lost source was probably a score—rather than parts—because a number of these errors involve copying notes from another vocal or instrumental line (especially alto and tenor), particularly in choral movements where a score has many musical lines. See the Critical Notes for mm. 12-14, 27-31, and 420-21.

As in several large works in the Toulouse-Philidor collection, the number of part books belies the complexity of the scoring. The vocal ensemble called for by the *Miserere* is an SSATB group, which, interestingly, corresponds to the usual part book assignment of the Toulouse-Philidor collection. The parts and the score both distinguish between solo and choral movements, although the parts, especially the continuo parts, tend to be much more informative regarding scoring. Each part book contains music both for “choral” sections (indicated variously “choro,” “chœur” or “tous”) and solo movements (indicated by “récit,” “solo,” “duo,” or “trio”). The parts also differentiate introductions or ritornelli (usually by “prélude” or “violons”) from vocal accompaniment, indicated in the accompanying parts by a short text incipit where the voices begin. Adding to the complexity of the score is one indication of solo performance within an otherwise *tutti* movement (sop II, m. 581), which does not appear in the part.

The soprano and alto roles are particularly complex. The two part books for soprano (“Premier dessus de récit” and “second dessus de voix”) both contain music for all of the solo movements (with the exception of the “Cor mundum,” which is absent from the *second dessus* part), but while the *premier dessus* part contains the music of both soprano lines in choral movements, the *second dessus* contains only its line. This organization evidently was intended to allow singers the flexibility to fill different roles according to the needs of the occasion and the individual singer. The alto [*haute-contre*] part book includes both lines for the duo for two altos in the “asperges me.” The score renders the roles of the *hautes-contres* yet more complex by providing an extra alto line for the “Libera me,” which, although largely doubling its companion, includes an extra short phrase (mm. 582-3, which duets with the sop II, marked “seul”), as well as a few imitative entrances of its own. The score’s reading at the end of the movement, however, where Alto II essentially doubles the pitches of Alto I but with different rhythms and text syllables (mm. 597-600), seems to be an error. Since the *haute-contre* part reflects only the score’s Alto I, leaving out the duet with Soprano II in mm. 582-83 and extra thematic entrances at mm. 589-90 and 597 indicated in the score, it does not by itself provide a complete alternative solution. Without other sources to consult it is impossible be certain what was intended. The edition presents the alto parts as they are in the score so that readers or performers can make up their own minds about what the altos should sing. One possible solution might be to choose to sing only the Alto II line in mm. 597-600, as it contains a thematic entrance missing in Alto I.

The SSATB scoring indicates that the *Miserere* could have been conceived for the choir of San Marco, which, in 1708, consisted of 13 sopranos, 4 contraltos, 11 tenors, 1

baritone, and 6 basses.<sup>10</sup> This scoring corresponds to the Chapelle royale's small group of soloists, the *petit chœur*, rather than the multi-voice *grand chœur* (divided into *dessus*, *haute-contre*, *taille*, *basse-taille*, and *basse*). Exactly how the forces of the Chapelle would have been adjusted to sing this motet is not certain. The score requires a minimum of one soloist each for the soprano, tenor and bass parts, but two alto soloists for the "Asperges me." The score's one indication of "seul" (in the soprano II part, mm. 581-2) intimates that there may have been other sections for solo voices within "choral" movements. Aside from the answer by the alto in mm. 582-3, one likely place for such a passage would be the first six measures of the piece, where the soprano sings the words "Miserere mei, Deus," followed by a homophonic varied repetition from all five voice parts. Such a solo vs. choral exchange was a very common practice for the openings of *grands motets* by Du Mont and Lully.

The score indicates an Italian-style 4-part orchestra: 1st and 2nd violin, viola, and continuo. How this scoring would have been adapted to the standard six-part string ensemble of the Chapelle royale (2 violin and 3 viola parts with continuo) is not entirely clear. Movements for solo singers were accompanied by one instrument per part, as indications of "solo" or "violino" in the string parts of such movements make clear. In the "choral" movements, the instruments generally double the voices in the fashion of Lully's *grands motets* (which make up the rest of the volume in which the Biffi was inserted).<sup>11</sup> Although the viola typically doubles the alto, the 1st violin often doubles the 2nd soprano at an octave above, while the 2nd violin doubles Soprano I at the unison. This creates an unusual registral inversion in which an inner voice is heard above the top vocal line. The instrumental doubling also occasionally switches between voices, particularly where the texture thins.

The four-part string band called for in the score has implications for the balance in choral movements. While the two soprano and alto voice parts are doubled by the violins and viola, and the bass is doubled by the continuo, the tenor part is rarely doubled (except in some instances by the viola). This creates a sonic imbalance, particularly in the fugal movements. Whether this reflects the original scoring, that of the performance at the Chapelle royale, or the exigencies of copying for the Toulouse-Philidor format is not clear. It certainly would have been possible to double the tenor line with the Chapelle's multiple violas. One possible reflection of such an adaptation to the forces of the Chapelle royale occurs in the "Ne projicias me," where the score has two instrumental lines notated in soprano and alto clefs, neither of which appears in the violin parts. Thus, these lines were apparently intended for two violas. This is an unorthodox setting, since the Italians typically deployed violins to accompany solo singing, although the unusual combination of lower voices—alto and tenor—may have suggested the use of the lower

<sup>10</sup> Francesco Caffi, *Storia della musica sacra nella già cappella ducale di San Marco in Venezia dal 1318 al 1797* (Venice, 1854–5); ed. E. Surian (Florence, 1987), 2: 44-45, amplified with additional documents in Michael Talbot, *Benedetto Vinaccesi: A Musician in Brescia and Venice in the Age of Corelli* (Oxford: Clarendon Press, 1994).

<sup>11</sup> Jean Duron, "Le rapport chœur-orchestre dans les grands motets de Lully," *Jean-Baptiste Lully; Actes du colloque/Kongressbericht, Saint-Germain-en Laye, Heidelberg, 1987* (Laaber: Laaber-Verlag, 1990), 99-144.

strings. For the sake of simplicity, these two lines are assigned in this edition to violin II and viola, whose ranges they fit.

The sources indicate a number of adaptations of Italian to French practice, which also present further indications that the parts were copied from a score. One clear adaptation is the clef changes from the score to the parts. The score gives the two violin parts in G<sub>2</sub> clef, but the parts present them in French violin (G<sub>1</sub>) clef, presumably to accommodate French violinists accustomed to playing in this clef. Similarly, in the “Quoniam si voluises,” the assignment of the parts differs somewhat from the score. The score indicates that “Le 2<sup>e</sup> dessus jouë la basse seule” [the second *dessus* {*de violon*} plays the bass alone], assigns it an alto clef, and positions it under the voice part rather than its usual position above. This line appears not in the 2nd violin part, but in the continuo part, with the annotation “violino secundo B.C.” Presumably, the copyists viewed this movement as an instance of what Deborah Kaufman has termed “violons en basse.”<sup>12</sup> The problem with this reading, aside from the absence of music in the second violin part and the clef assignment, is that the part goes down to F below middle-C, that is, below the range of a violin. Thus, the part was probably played on viola doubled by chordal continuo instruments. A final problem apparently arising from the copying is apparent attempts to adopt Italian genre terms that occasionally miss the mark. The “Docebo,” for example, is marked “Recitativo solo” in both score and parts. Since the movement is not in Italian recitative style, this marking was evidently an unsuccessful attempt to Italianize the French term “récit” (solo).

### Acknowledgements

Permission to publish a modern edition of Biffi’s *Miserere* was granted by the Bibliothèque Nationale de France and is gratefully acknowledged by the editor. I wish to thank Alexander Silbiger, Bruce Gustafson, and John Hajdu Heyer for their generous assistance and advice. I also thank the Editorial Board of WLSCM for their willingness to include this project as part of a “long seventeenth century,” however difficult it might be to define chronologically, stylistically, or culturally.

Don Fader  
University of Alabama  
October 2009

[Critical Notes follow on the next page]

---

<sup>12</sup> Deborah Kaufman, “Violons en basse as Musical Allegory,” *Journal of Musicology* 23 (2006): 153–185.

## CRITICAL NOTES

*Notes are listed by measure number, instrument/voice, and beat.*

### Miserere

8, tenor, b. 1 and 3: both score and part read D.

9-11, vn I: score has slur from A to G in m. 11, b. 1-2; part has tie between the G m. 10, b. 2 and the G in m. 11, b. 1, but missing tie between the two As in m. 9, b. 2 and m. 10 beat 1 that is present in the doubled alto part.

11, bass voice: reads B $\flat$  instead of doubling the D of the BC

12-14 tenor: score has temporary change to alto clef; part has no change of clef, but the pitches are those of the alto voice.

17, tenor, b. 1:  $\flat$  in part but not score

25, alto, b. 1: both score and part read middle C. Edited to A, to conform to the doubling vn I part.

27, vn II: both score and part read E $\flat$ ; this contradicts the E $\sharp$  in doubled sop I in both score and part. A diminished, rather than an augmented-6<sup>th</sup>, sonority is more contrapuntally logical in this context, thus the  $\flat$  is evidently a copying error for  $\sharp$ .

27, alto and tenor, b. 4: ties to m. 28, b. 1 in both score and parts, do not accord with the text.

27-31: the score has an additional line notated in tenor clef, which contains the notes in the same position on the staff as the alto line. These notes appear in the tenor part. They have been tacitly removed.

30, sop I, b. 1: warning  $\flat$  in part but not score.

### Et secundum multitudinem [m. 32]

38-9, vla, b. 4-b. 1: tie added to match vn II

44, vla, b. 1: 2<sup>nd</sup> eighth-note reads D

48, BC, b. 2: score and part both read A

### Amplius lava me [m. 62]

71, alto: part and score read  $\downarrow$   $\circ$ , which contradict scansion and the rhythm in sop I.

83, alto, b. 3: syllable “a” misplaced in score to m. 84, b. 1; part reading adopted.

92, alto: score reads  $\downarrow$   $\downarrow$   $\downarrow$ ; part reads  $\downarrow$   $\downarrow$   $\downarrow$ ; part reading adopted; slur in part but not score

102, alto: both score and part have only one syllable (“me”) for the two notes in this bar; scansion fits repeat of “munda”

### Quoniam iniquitatem [m. 122]

128-129, alto: tie missing in both score and part

130, alto, b. 1: flat on the A in part but not score

134, alto: both score and part read G – F – E $\flat$ , which clashes with the other voices; replaced with A $\flat$  – G – F

140, vn I: score reads  $\gamma$   $\downarrow$   $\downarrow$   $\downarrow$   $\downarrow$ ; part reads  $\gamma$   $\downarrow$   $\downarrow$   $\downarrow$

160, vn I, b. 1:  $\downarrow$   $\downarrow$  altered to  $\downarrow$   $\downarrow$  to match vn II



**Tibi soli** [m. 161]

164-5, vn II: tie added to match doubled voice part

170, vla, b. 2: score reads E $\flat$ ; corrected to F to match doubled alto and BC

178, tenor: score sets “-ci” to quarter note; part sets it to dotted half

179, vn II, b. 3: score and part read F; corrected to D (reading in doubled sop I part)

179, sop II, b. 2: score reads A $\flat$ ; part reads A

184-5, vn II: doubling of sop I missing in both score and part

185, vn I: doubling of sop II missing in both score and part

189, alto, b. 1:  $\flat$  in part but not score

192-193, sop I, b. 1: both score and part have a tie to a half-note D in 193 from the whole-note D in the previous measure, but place the syllable “vin” on the D half-note. The editor chose the rhythm in the doubling vn II line, which matches the scansion perfectly.

195, bass voice: missing syllable “-is” and slur to b. 196

197-201, sop I: tie added

**Ecce enim ex hoc** [m. 203]

208, tenor: rhythm reads  $\downarrow\downarrow$ ; altered to  $\downarrow\downarrow$  in order to match alto and continuo.

212, bass: rhythm reads  $\downarrow\downarrow$ ; altered to  $\downarrow\downarrow$  in order to match alto and continuo.

215-218, alto: text setting in score and part disagrees. Both are missing syllable “et” in the phrase beginning in measure 218, and neither cadence with the other parts on “sum.”

Both are thus presumed to be the result of copying errors, and the text setting in these bars was adjusted to conform to the other parts.

227, alto: slur in part but not in score

**Ecce enim delexisti** [m. 243]

255-269: signature changes to B $\flat$  only [E $\flat$  discontinued]

**Asperges me** [m. 270]

There is most probably a missing measure in the sources for this movement (m. 273), as the pattern in the continuo varies from its next appearance (m. 279) and in the ending ritornello (m. 304) where there is a whole bar of C minor between bars in G minor and F major. The measure is presented in brackets, indicating that it is an editorial addition.

280, alto I b.1:  $\flat$  in part but not score

281, alto I b.1:  $\flat$  in part but not score

281, alto II: both part and score read two B $\flat$ 's; corrected to As

281-3, alto I: all Es corrected to E $\flat$ , the reading in the part

284, alto I: rhythm in score reads  $\downarrow\downarrow\circ$ ; part reading chosen for consistency of rhythm.

286, BC: score missing  $\flat$  on both Es; present in parts

286, alto II: part and score read  $\downarrow\circ$ , which contradict scansion in b. 289

288, alto I: part and score read  $\downarrow\circ$ , which contradict scansion in b. 289

302, alto I, b. 2-3: tie present in part, but not score.

**Auditui meo** [m. 310]

Final notes of cadences are variously notated as half notes (generally in the first half of the movement, e.g. m. 343) or quarter notes (in the second half) in both score and parts.

They have been left as they are in the sources, except mm. 343 and 373.

319, vn II, b. 2: score and part read E without a cancelling natural

330, sop I, b. 3: score and part read E<sub>b</sub>

343, sop, b 1: score and sop I part read ♭ ♯ ♯; sop II part reads ♭ ♯

357, bass voice, b. 2: score and part read E without a cancelling natural

361-62, sop: scansion in the score contradicts both parts and parallel passage in m. 371; the only difference between the two parts is the slur, which appears only in sop II; reading taken from the part

362, sop, b. 2: trill in sop II part, but not sop I or score

371, BC, b. 3: score and part read E without a cancelling natural

373, BC, b. 2: score and part read ♭ ♯ ♯; changed to ♭ ♯ to match voices

376, sop I, b. 3; score and sop I part read ♭ ♯, sop II part reads ♭ ♯

381, sop I, b. 2: score and part read B without a cancelling natural

403, vn 2, b. 3: score has warning flat on the B, part has no accidental

408, sop: part and score both read ♭ ♯

**Averte facium** [m. 409]

409, all parts: there is no movement break in the score, but it is present in the parts.

409-17, BC: *basso seguente* indication adopted from the score, with the exception of bar 413:

409, all parts: in the score, there is no double bar or movement break between the previous movement and this one; it is present in all the parts.

413, BC, b. 4: clef change missing in score; tenor entrance continues to be notated in soprano clef, one octave higher than the sounding pitch of the tenor vocal part

420-21, vla: notes from soprano I part copied into vla line without clef change. Corrected so that vla continues to double the alto voice part.

429, sop II, b. 3-4: score has two As; parts read two Gs

431, vn I, b. 3: both score and part read A; corrected to B<sub>b</sub> following doubled sop I

**Cor mundum** [m. 434]

This movement is present only in the *premier* (but not *second*) *dessus* part

440, bass voice, b. 3: upbeat C from bar 441 mistakenly copied into this bar

451, alto, b. 2: eighth note reads C in both part and score; corrected to B<sub>b</sub> to follow parallel thirds with the sop I part.

467, alto, b.2: both part and score read A without a flat.

467, bass voice, b. 1: missing syllable: “sce”

**Ne projicias me** [m. 471]

In the score, the lines for the two string instruments are notated in soprano and alto clefs, and do not appear in the violin parts. They were thus apparently played by two violas. For the sake of simplicity, they are given in this edition to the violin II and viola, whose ranges they fit.

- 473, vla, b. 1-2: score has half-note rest; this introduces unprepared dissonances in the next half bar. Rests replaced by two quarter-note E $\flat$ s.
- 475-79 alto: The first stave is mistakenly notated in tenor clef.
- 481, vn 2 and vla, b. 1: score has whole measure rests; missing cadential notes added
- 484, BC: As missing flat in score; present in both parts
- 489, vla: rhythm notated as even eighth-notes in score, changed to dotted-eighth-sixteenths to match prevailing rhythm
- 491, tenor: in the score, the bar contains two half-note C's setting "auffer" and the next bar has "fer" set to the quarter-note. The part has the same two half-notes, the first set to the syllable "auf," with no syllable on the second. The two half-notes were altered to a whole, to match the alto's previous melody setting this text.

### **Rede mihi** [m. 498]

- 502, vla: score reads D, which clashes with the other voices.

### **Docebo** [m. 557]

- 559, BC, b. 2: score missing flat on the E; present in parts
- 560, BC, b. 2: score reads ♯; parts read ♭
- 567, BC, b. 3 and sop, b. 4: score has fermatas; not present in the parts. These fermatas appear in the middle of both a musical and textual phrase, and seem not to have any identifiable function.
- 568, sop, b. 4: slur begun on C $\sharp$  at the end of the page in the score not continued on the next note. Reading in the edition follows the parts.

### **Libera me** [m. 577]

- In the score, this movement contains an extra alto line (not present in the part), which largely doubles the other, except at a few important points. The score's Alto I reflects the reading of the *haute contre* part, except the "solo" in mm. 582-83 (which is missing).
- 577, BC, b. 2: flat on E in part but not score
- 577, vla, b. 4: rhythm in score reads ♯ instead of the rest of the ensemble's ♯
- 578, sop I: the first E in the bar has no flat, the second has a flat in both part and score.
- 581, vn II, b. 1 and 2: score and parts have two Cs. Corrected to two B $\flat$ s
- 582, alto, b. 1: in both score and part, E has no flat
- 588-600, sop I and II: the score suddenly inverts the two voices, creating a repetition of the entrances on "et exultabit" in sop II instead of an imitative entrance; the reading of the parts was chosen to avoid this problem.
- 592, sop I: score switches to G2 clef (rather than the usual C1); not present in parts
- 595, vn II, b. 3, second ♯ reads E
- 596, vn I, b. 3-4: score and part read D-B $\flat$ -D-E $\flat$  which clashes with the harmony; edited to read B $\flat$ -G-B $\flat$ -E $\flat$ ; copying error by a third assumed.
- 597-600, alto I and II: in the score, the two parts essentially double each other's pitches but with different rhythms and texts syllables. Alto I reflects the reading of the part. One explanation may be that the two lines are alternate versions of a single alto part and are not meant to be sung together. The parts have been left as they are in the score, and the

reader or performer can make up their own mind about what practical solution they choose.

### **Domine labia** [m. 601]

623, vn II: score and part read ♯ ♯ ♯; corrected to ♯ ♯ ♯

639, sop I, b. 1: flat in part, but not score

### **Quoniam si voluises** [m. 652]

The score indicates that “Le 2<sup>e</sup> dessus jouë la basse seule” [the second dessus {de violon} plays the bass by itself], but this line appears not in the 2<sup>nd</sup> violin part, but in the BC part, notated in alto clef, with the annotation “violino secundo B.C.”

670, vn II, b. 3: both part and score read F, which clashes with the upper voice; changed to an A to match the parallel passage in m. 693.

679, sop I, b. 1: Both score and parts include a second, alternative part a major third lower (E♭-D). Perhaps this alternative was offered as an alternative for boys who had difficulty negotiating the octave leap to high G, but it is musically less satisfactory, and has been left out of the transcription.

694, vn I, b. 1: score and part missing cadential note: D added

699, sop I, b. 3: score has C♯ that clashes with the violin; ♯ not present in the part

703, vn II/BC, b. 3: both score and part read G.

726, vn II/BC, b. 1-2: score and part read E♭

741, vn I, b. 1: score reads two eighth-note Cs; part reads D C

### **Sacrificium** [m. 762]

763, BC, b. 4: score reads A F; part reads A E. Part reading chosen.

764, vn I, b. 1: score and part read A [clashes with the bass], altered to F

765, vn I, b. 4: score reads C; part reads C♯. Part reading chosen.

766, BC, b. 4: score reads D C; parts read D B♭. Part reading chosen.

767, BC, b. 1: score reads G C; parts read G C♯. Part reading chosen.

768, alto: score reads E D, D G A♭ B; part reads E D, D G A B♭; editorial reading assumes a misplaced flat (from E to D) in both, and takes the part reading on the A and B.

771-2, vn I, b. 3-1: score reads C B♭ A A G; part reads C B♭ A F♯ G. Reading in edition consistent with earlier phrases and with the rules of counterpoint.

772, vn II, b. 1: 2<sup>nd</sup> ♯ is G in score and part.

775, vn II, b. 3-4: ♯ ♯ ♯ ♯ in score and part changed to ♯ ♯ ♯ ♯ to match the rhythm in the other imitated parts

802, vn I, b. 1-2: score reads A F E D; part reads A G F E; Part reading chosen to avoid parallel 2nds.

802, alto, b. 4: ♭ in part but not score

806, vn II, b. 1: ♭ in part but not score

807, vn I, b. 2-3: score reads two As with rhythm ♯ ♯; the part has a tie between the two; modernized to ♯.

**Benigne fac** [m. 810]

813, sop II, b. 1-2: ♭ on the two Es in part but not score

818, vla, b. 1: score reads A (clashes with doubled sop II)

823, alt, b. 1: # in part but not score

824, all parts: The sources differ in how they treat the division between the two sections.

The parts have a final double bar while the score has only a single barline. The editor has chosen to divide the two as sections rather than movements, particularly because, unlike the other movements, these two divide a line of the psalm text, rather than between lines.

830, BC, b. 1: Score and parts have change to bass clef (at page turn) and B<sub>♭</sub>. Edited to G to match tenor, and clef change moved to the middle of the measure to follow the entrances.

845-846, vla: tie added to correspond with doubled alto voice

851-4, bass: missing text “um” in b. 850, “vitulos” is repeated twice, and there is an extra syllable “los.” Solution is consistent with the text setting in other voices.

856, vla, b. 4: sharp misplaced (on G rather than F, as in doubled alto voice)

859-860, b. 2, BC: part continues in bass clef, but doubles tenor. Change of clef added to indicate basso seguente.

862-3, vla: missing tie added to follow doubled alto part

864, bass voice, b. 3-4: score reads 2 quarter-note B<sub>♭</sub>s; changed to Gs to match BC and avoid melodic false interval F<sub>♯</sub>-B<sub>♭</sub>

868-9, sop I: syllable “tu” missing across page turn in score; reads “vi-los.” Part reading chosen.