3-1-1971

Michael Praetorius Creuzbergensis-The Man, the Musician, the Theologian: An Introduction

David Susan
Concordia Seminary, St. Louis, davidjsusan45@gmail.com

MICHAEL PRAETORIUS CREUZBERGENSIS-
THE MAN, THE MUSICIAN, THE THEOLOGIAN:
AN INTRODUCTION

A Research Paper Presented to the Faculty
of Concordia Seminary, St. Louis,
in partial fulfillment of the
requirements for elective
P-200

---

by

David J. Susan

March 1971

Robert Bergt

Advisor

TABLE OF CONTENTS

CHAPTER I

INTRODUCTION

The history of the study of Michael Praetorius Creuzbergensis is possibly as enigmatic as the man himself. No other composer of his stature has suffered as much neglect; even in Germany, few of his works are performed, and only a handful of musicologists have made him or his work the subject of their studies. His works are voluminous, the great majority published during his lifetime. The complete edition of his music,[1] edited in this century by Friedrich Blume, runs to twenty thick volumes; his three volume Syntagma Musicum[2] is the authoritative work about the music of his era. He is a pivotal figure for the beginnings of the Baroque in Germany: a pioneer in the use of the figured bass and Venetian concertato technique for choirs and instruments, a skilled composer whose works are the prototypes for the church cantata and the chorale prelude. Yet, in most studies and commentaries on early 17th century German music, he is mentioned only incidentally (usually in connection with his Syntagma) in favor of his contemporaries Hassler, Scheidt, Schein and Schuëtz.

There are enigmas likewise in the life of Praetorius. Little is known, for example, about so basic an area as his musical training; where, when and with whom he studied music

are matters only of conjecture. Gaps appear in his biography, about which all the primary sources are silent. There are questions about his personality: the dynamic that powered his great output and even greater plans to the point of ruining his health; his oft-repeated regrets about not becoming a pastor; his manifest faith and generosity contradicted by strange references in his funeral sermon[3] to his great sinfulness.

One particular focus of this paper will be Praetorius' theology of music, woven of the thread of concio et cantio, sermon and song, that runs through the prefaces and dedicatory letters to many of his works.

The overall purpose of this paper is to make available in English an introduction to the music and thought of Praetorius, since most of the primary sources and much of the secondary literature are not translated. Material quoted in the text from German and Latin sources has been translated into English, and a translation of one important primary source, his Funeral Sermon, is appended at the end.

February 15, 1971 marks the 400th anniversary of Michael Praetorius' birth, and the 350th anniversary of his death; the time is ripe both for the study of the man and his music, and for festival performances of his works.

FOOTNOTES TO CHAPTER I

[1] *Gesamtausgabe der Musikalischen Werke von Michael Praetorius* (Wolfenbuttel: Kallmeyer, 1928-1940).

[2] *Syntagma Musicum* (Wolfenbuttel: Holwein and Wittenberg: Richter, 1615-1619) 3 volumes. Facsimile reprints: Wilibald Gurlitt, ed., (Basel: Barenreiter, 1958-59).

[3] "Leichenpredigt des Ehrnvesten Achtbaren und Kunstreichen Herrn Michaelis Praetorii, etc." from "Leichensermone auf Musiker des 17. Jahrhunderts," *Monatshefte fur Musikgeschichte*, VII (No. 12, 1875), 177-178. See the APPENDIX of this paper, p. 60.

CHAPTER II

THE MAN PRAETORIUS

1571-1621, the years of Michael Praetorius Creuzbergensis' life,[1] were restless ones in Germany. He was born in a period of religious conflict and intolerance both between Protestants and Roman Catholics and between Lutherans and fellow Lutherans; he died on the eve of the catastrophic Thirty Years War.

His father, Michael Schultheiss, was a devout Lutheran pastor, educated under Luther and Melanchthon at Wittenberg.[2] Born in Bunzlau in Silesia, Schultheiss was a colleague of Johann Walter, Luther's friend and musical adviser, on the faculty of the Latin school at Torgau. Following Luther's death, Schultheiss became deeply enmeshed in the intra-Lutheran doctrinal controversies that led up to the Formula of Concord, and he was forced to move often from parish to parish.

It was during his second stay (1569-1573) at Creuzberg, near Eisenach, that his third son, Michael Praetorius Creuzbergensis[3] was born. Praetorius himself substantiates this in the dedication to his Eulogodia Sionia.[4] From Creuzberg the family moved to Torgau, where Praetorius attended the Latin school. A report by a classmate[5] indicates that Cantor Michael Voigt, a pupil of Johann Walter and

professor at the Torgau school at this time, instilled in his students a great interest in music.

In the summer of 1583, Michael went to Frankfurt on the Oder, at the invitation of his brother Andreas who was a pastor and professor there. Exactly when Praetorius began his studies at the university at Frankfurt is not certain. Robert Eitner writes:

> His name is entered in the register at Frankfurt on the Oder in 1583, but he would have been much too young to be admitted. It was often the custom that registration at universities was given as a gift, perhaps by a friend of the family, and actual attendance then followed later.[6]

Noting that he was too young to begin at the university at age twelve, both Arno Forchert[7] and Friedrich Blume[8] state that he attended the Gymnasium in the town of Zerbst, where two of his sisters lived, and that he returned to Frankfurt in 1585, sometime before the death there of his other brother Johannes, also a pastor.[9] Thus in 1585, at age fourteen, Michael Praetorius began studies in philosophy and theology at the university at Frankfurt on the Oder. Eitner erroneously states that Praetorius mentions his university training in the dedication to his Eulogodia; the actual source of this information is the dedication to the Missodia Sionia,[10] which Eitner mentions later:

> When [Praetorius] dedicated the Eulogodia in 1610 . . . he wrote that after finishing his early schooling and while still very young, he attended the university at Frankfurt on the Oder for three years and studied philosophy; however, during the time he was there, his brother who was supporting him died, so he took on a position as organist to enable him to complete his

> studies. There is a later report in the dedication to the Missodia Sionia of 1611, which he inscribed to the Elector Johann Sigismund of Brandenburg . . . .[11]

Praetorius' brother Andreas died on December 20, 1586. Left without support, Michael took a position in 1587 as organist at St. Mary's Church in Frankfurt. He was apparently self-taught; he notes in the dedication to the Missodia that he became an organist "more through natural inclination than through having received instruction."[12] Elsewhere, in the preface to Volume II of his Syntagma Musicum, he writes that he was "one who first was occupied with the liberal arts and who only quite late arrived at the practice of music."[13] Because he took the position of organist specifically to continue his theological and philosophical studies for three more years, Blume interprets "the practice of music" here to mean the beginning of his career as a composer and Capellmeister some fifteen years later.[14]

It is instructive at this point to note the comments which are made in Praetorius' Funeral Sermon regarding his vocational choice. In that sermon, Magister Petrus Tuckermann states:

> This Capellmeister who has died in God is the descendant of blessed parents and forbears, because his father and grandfather were preachers who served the church a long time; likewise his brothers and relatives, many of whom followed the same calling. He himself also showed a great inclination toward it, and often regretted that he never dedicated his own life to the ministry.[15]

Since the tone of this sermon is decidedly negative, Praetorius' sense of regret may be overemphasized here;

nevertheless, his devotion to theology is clearly seen in his prefaces and dedications, and certainly also in his music. This theme will be treated in greater detail in Chapter Four of this paper.

Praetorius left Frankfurt in 1589 or 1590. Questions arise, however, about where he lived or if he studied during the intervening years until 1592 or 1593, the time which later testimony indicates he came to Wolfenbüttel.[16] His occupation during his first years there is also unknown, since he apparently did not begin his service to Duke Heinrich Julius until at least two years after he came. Twice he names the time of his appointment as organist to the Duke as about 1595: once in the dedication to the Motectae et Psalmi of 1605, where he indicates that he has been the Duke's organist for ten years;[17] and later in the preface to Polyhymnia Caduceatrix, where he says he was appointed at age twenty-five.[18] Gurlitt,[19] Blume,[20] and Forchert[21] all indicate the possibility, however, that Praetorius was appointed organist of the castle church at Gröningen already in 1589 while Heinrich Julius was still Bishop of Halberstadt, and then moved with him to Wolfenbüttel when he became Duke Heinrich Julius of Brunswick and Lüneberg in 1594. It is certain that by 1596 he was the Duke's organist, for in the fall of that year he was one of many prominent organists who gathered at Gröningen for the dedication of the new organ at the castle church, built by

David Beck of Halberstadt for Heinrich Julius. Andreas Werckmeister, in his Organum Gruningense redivivum of 1704, mentions Michael Praetorius as one of this group; others included Compenius from Nordhausen, Hieronymus Praetorius from Hamburg and Hans Leo Hassler from Augsburg.[22]

Although Praetorius traveled much in succeeding years, Wolfenbüttel remained his real home for the remainder of his life. At Christmas, 1601, he journeyed to Regensburg; the purpose of the trip is not certain. At the end of 1602 we find him in Scharnebeck, near Lüneberg.

Friedrich Blume conjectures that he may have spent some time at Prague on his Regensburg trip;[23] Duke Heinrich also made many trips to Prague, especially towards the end of his reign, and his Capellmeister doubtless accompanied him on one or more of these. Prague at this time was an important Roman Catholic musical center, especially for the new concertato techniques of Giovanni Gabrieli and others in Italy. Praetorius' silence about his training in composition motivates Blume's desire to connect him with Prague, since his later music shows the influence of the new Italian style, but it is known that he never visited Italy.[24] It is clear from references in his writings that Praetorius did indeed visit Prague and could have studied there as well. In the second volume of his Syntagma Musicum, he says that at Prague, he has seen a unique clavicymbal from Vienna in the possession of Karel Luyton, a composer who experimented

with chromatic modulation. This keyboard instrument had two half-steps between each whole step, to allow, for example, both a pure C# as well as a pure Db.[25] Elsewhere he says that "he is much in favor of the distinction made at Prague . . . between choral pitch and chamber pitch."[26] In his Syntagma Musicum, volume three, Praetorius mentions another Prague composer, Lambert de Sayve, ranking him with Gabrieli.[27] Coming from a Netherlands family, de Sayve was in the service of Archduke Matthias, the King of Bohemia, who held court at Prague.[28] His polyphonic technique is related to that of the Venetians, and Blume thinks that he may have introduced Praetorius to the use of multiple choirs.[29] It is known also that Praetorius re-published de Sayve's Teutsche Liedlein in 1611.[30]

On September 5, 1603, at age thirty-two, Michael Praetorius married Anna Lakemacher from Halberstadt. The following year, their first son Michael was born, and in 1606, a second son Ernst.[31]

Following the retirement in 1604 of Thomas Mancinus, Capellmeister at Wolfenbüttel, Duke Heinrich Julius renewed Praetorius' appointment as organist at Gröningen, and on December 7, 1604 made him Capellmeister at Wolfenbüttel.[32] Robert Eitner notes that in addition to the duties of organist and Capellmeister, "he instructed the choir boys and gave daily musical instruction to the princes and princesses."[33] During the following year his compositions first appeared in print beginning with Musae Sionae I[34] and con-

tinuing in uninterrupted series until 1613. These were quiet years of hard work; though associated with the courts at Buckeburg, Kassel and Dresden, he spent most of his time at Wolfenbuttel, and even bought a house there in 1612. Forchert writes of this period:

> Under the protection of his artistically inclined prince and supported by a productive chapel choir, Praetorius established his reputation during these years as the leading Capellmeister and composer in all of Protestant Germany.[35]

It may have also been during these years that he supplemented his apparently meager income by brewing beer and selling it around Wolfenbuttel, as Walter E. Buszin notes without naming his source but certainly not without adding a smile.[36] Chrysander states that Praetorius' income in 1604 was set at 100 Thaler, 10 Thaler Holzgeld, free board and two suits of clothes annually.[37] More than likely a living stipend accompanied his honorary appointment in 1614 as Prior of the Benedictine monastery at Ringelheim, near Goslar; the Duke also bequeathed 2000 Thaler to him, but he never received all of it and his children had to request the remainder after Praetorius' death.[38] He printed much of his music at his own expense, as he indicates in the preface to volume two of the Syntagma Musicum;[39] Buszin mentions further that he often gave away his music to choirs.[40] In many cases he undoubtedly received some payment, however; an extant letter from him to the city fathers of Muhlhausen in April, 1610, is marked "zehn Gulden 'zum Honorario'" on the outside.[41]

The sudden death of Duke Heinrich Julius on July 20, 1613, brought an end to this relatively tranquil period of Praetorius' life. The customary year of mourning followed, during which all musical activity ceased.[42] Almost immediately, however, Elector Johann Georg of Saxony asked Heinrich's son and successor, Friedrich Ulrich, to release Praetorius into his service during the Trauerjahr. This request granted, Praetorius moved to Dresden in the fall of 1613, where he was Capellmeister "von Hause aus" (away from home) until early in 1616.[43] This marked the beginning of a hectic but very productive period for him. In March, 1614, he conducted for a festival at Naumburg, and soon after served in a similar capacity for the Administrator of the Diocese of Magdeburg, Christian Wilhelm, in a performance of festival music. While in Dresden, he first came into contact with Heinrich Schütz, who had been in the service of the Elector there since the fall of 1614. Some commentators feel that Praetorius actually spent very little time in Dresden. In this connection, Blume comments:

> Praetorius' own important and unequivocal testimony stands in opposition to [the opinion that Praetorius was at Dresden from time to time only for festivals] when he says that he had been Capellmeister at the court of Elector of Saxony at Dresden "for the past two years" ("superiori biennio dum Dresdae in aula Electorali Saxonica Musico choro praefui"). The Latin preface to Syntagma Musicum I [Folio A.I], in which this sentence is found, first appeared in 1615, resulting in the new insight that Praetorius had actually had his position in Dresden since Heinrich Julius' death and until Heinrich Schütz's preliminary acceptance of the position, and did not only occasionally fulfill his position there. It should also

> be noted that the dedicatory letter to the second part of Syntagma Musicum I is dated from Dresden on February 5, 1615, and that Praetorius designated the contents of his Polyhymnia Caduceatrix which appeared in 1619, as a collection of compositions performed over the past five years in Dresden, Naumburg, Halle, Wolfenbüttel, Brunswick and Halberstadt for his patron princes Elector Johann Georg from Saxony, the Administrator of Magdeburg Christian Wilhelm, and Duke Friedrich Ulrich of Brunswick, son and successor of Duke Heinrich Julius.[44]

He then draws this conclusion, important for the question of Praetorius' training and his change as a composer from a motet style to the Venetian concertato style:

> If these assumptions are correct, then the change in style of composition and the new total plan [that Praetorius envisioned] are connected with the robust Italian flavor and the exacting practice of music at the court in Dresden.[45]

Despite this stimulating musical atmosphere, Praetorius sought to return to Wolfenbüttel and resume his regular duties following the year of mourning. However, when his proposals for the re-organization of Friedrich Ulrich's chapel choir were turned down in October, 1614, he remained in Dresden, but still continued to travel, living the restless life of an itinerant musical consultant and organizer.[46] Easter, 1616 finds him in Halle; early in 1617 he re-organized the chapel choir for the Count of Schwarzburg. He was involved in a Concertgesang for baptismal festivities at the court in Kassel on June 26, 1617. Together with Samuel Scheidt and Heinrich Schütz, he received a commission to prepare Concertmusik for the Cathedral at Magdeburg in 1618. In the fall of 1619 he stayed for awhile in Leipzig and Nürnberg.[47] The effect of this kind of life on his health and mental state,

he witnesses in the preface to the second volume of his Syntagma Musicum, published in 1618:

> . . . my musical works, [were] written by the grace of God within a period of sixteen years and partly printed at my own expense, partly withheld for revision. And since because of infirmity, continual travelling and many other difficulties, it was not possible to set down everything quite elaborately and perfect in every detail, I pray that I will be forgiven out of Christian charity; and if I have not succeeded at all, still my intentions were earnest.[48]

During this time, the choir at the court in Wolfenbüttel had been deteriorating; nevertheless, when Praetorius, already plagued by illness for several years, finally returned to Wolfenbüttel during Trinity, 1620, his appointment as Capellmeister was not renewed; he retained, however, the position of Prior of the monastery at Ringelheim.

Anticipating his death and his "farewell to self" (selbsten zum Valete), he composed a setting of Psalm 116 for Burckhardt Grossmann's collection Angst der Hellen und Friede der Seelen.[49] It is a Psalm expressive of his situation; selected verses follow:

> I love the LORD, because he has heard my voice and my supplications . . .
> The snares of death encompassed me; the pangs of Sheol laid hold on me; I suffered distress and anguish.
> Then I called on the name of the LORD: "O LORD, I beseech thee, save my life!" . . .
> Return, O my soul, to your rest; for the LORD has dealt bountifully with you.
> For thou hast delivered my soul from death, my eyes from tears, my feet from stumbling;
> I walk before the LORD in the land of the living.
> I kept my faith, even when I said, "I am greatly afflicted":
> I said in my consternation, "Men are all a vain hope."
> . . . Precious in the sight of the LORD is the death of his saints. . . .

> I will pay my vows to the LORD in the presence
> of all his people,
> in the courts of the house of LORD, in your
> midst, O Jerusalem.
> Praise the LORD![50]

He died February 15, 1621 at Wolfenbüttel, and was buried eight days later in the Heinrichstadt church.[51] "When he died," Forchert writes, "he left the greater part of a considerable fortune to establish a foundation for the poor, a beautiful testimony to the selflessness and good will he had demonstrated for a lifetime."[52]

His funeral sermon, preached by Magister Petrus Tuckermann, speaks of his career in general terms:

> The deceased was very industrious in his occupation, letting neither fervor, indifference nor sleep deter him from striving toward his goal: he desired to elevate music and to instruct many in it, because a man is known by his work. For that reason he was not isolated at his own court in this special grace, but was also at other places with Kings, Electors and Gentlemen, as everyone is aware.[53]

It continues, however, in a most uncomplimentary way:

> He often experienced great and difficult vexations, which he many times lamented and bemoaned, saying that these came upon him and he deserved them because he lived an evil youth; hence he had brought upon himself the great shortcomings and infirmities. Surely he was a sinful man and no angel, but his sins nevertheless brought sorrow to his heart. Many crosses and misfortunes beat him down, so that he was truly a tormented man.[54]

Buszin, possibly depending on Kümmerle,[55] softens the words to say that "a man who had acquired so much learning, knowledge and skill in the days of his youth could not have had time left for sinful frivolity."[56] Blume, however, comments that "the use of inflated language for contrition

was in vogue at the time, and has a somewhat affected and fashionable aftertaste."[57] An unknown editor appended this remark to the sermon: "This Capellmeister must have been considered quite evil spiritually, to be discredited with such a memorial address."[58] The actual meaning remains enigmatic.

Harold Blumenfeld offers an evaluation of Praetorius in describing his literary style:

> Praetorius' writing is marked by a universality of approach revealing a cultured mind with a markedly academic bent, and a fervent religiousness, manifested in passages which go far beyond the ordinary religious formulas proper to the written style of his time. The curiousness of his style, reflecting a certain willfulness, quaint pedantry and a characteristically Saxonian retractiveness of spirit [makes interesting reading] . . .[59]

Buszin characterizes him primarily as an industrious craftsman:

> . . . according to all indications, M. Praetorius was not endowed with a very brilliant mind; he was rather a faithful and steady workman who had acquired his knowledge and mastered his craft through hard work and persistent effort.[60]

The most fitting tribute, however, is also one of the shortest:

> To the pious departed
> Michael Praetorius
> Creuzbergensis . . .
> Advocate, Honorer, Pillar
> of sacred music,
> now at the age of forty-nine years on February 15
> in the year of Christ 1621
> his pious life ended by a pious death.[61]

FOOTNOTES FOR CHAPTER II

[1]There is some question about his year of birth. According to Johann Walther, Musikalisches Lexikon (Leipzig, 1732), Facsimile reprint: Richard Schaal, ed., (Kassel und Basel: Bärenreiter, 1953), it was 1571. 1571 is also the testimony of the inscription on a woodcut of Praetorius in Musae Sionae, 1605, which notes his age in that year as 35. According to the Latin poem by Hildebrand following Praetorius' Funeral Sermon (see the APPENDIX, p. 60) he was 49 years old when he died; this would make 1572 or even 1573 possible years of birth.

[2]Wilibald Gurlitt, Michael Praetorius Creuzbergensis: Sein Leben und Werke (Wiesbaden: Breitkopf und Härtel, 1968), p. 20.

[3]"Praetorius" is the Latinized form of Schultheiss, adopted from the Lüneberg branch of the family; Christoph Praetorius of Lüneberg was a brother of Michael Schultheiss. "Creuzbergensis" designates Michael Praetorius' birthplace, to distinguish him from other Praetorii; hence his oft-used monogram "MPC." This information and the basic outline for this biographical chapter are from: Arno Forchert, "Michael Praetorius," in Die Musik in Geschichte und Gegenwart (Kassel und Basel: Bärenreiter, 1949-1951), X, cols. 1560-1572. Hereafter this edition referred to as MGG.

[4](Wolfenbüttel, 1611). Modern edition, Friedrich Blume, ed., Gesamtausgabe der Musikalischen Werke von Michael Praetorius (Wolfenbüttel: Kallmeyer, 1928-1940), XIII, vi. A collection of harmonized Latin chants (e.g., "Benedicamus domino," "Salve regina," "Laetemur in Christo").

[5]The classmate was J. Bornitz. Noted in Forchert, "Praetorius," MGG X, col. 1560.

[6]"Michael Praetorius," Biographisch-Bibliographisches Quellen-Lexicon der Musiker und Musikgelehrten der Christlichen Zeitrechnung bis zur Mitte des neunzehnten Jahrhunderts (New York: Musurgia, n.d.), VIII, 46. Translation my own.

[7]Forchert, "Praetorius," MGG X, col. 1561.

[8]"Das Werk Michael Praetorius," Syntagma Musicologicum: Gesammelte Reden und Schriften (Kassel: Barenreiter, 1963), p. 244.

[9]He died October 25, 1585. Forchert, "Praetorius," MGG X, col. 1561.

[10](Wolfenbüttel, 1611). Blume, ed., Gesamtausgabe, XI, viii. A collection of Latin music for the Mass (e.g. Kyrie, Gloria in Excelsis etc.).

[11]Quellen-Lexicon, VIII, 45-46. Translation my own.

[12]Gesamtausgabe, XI, viii. Quoted in Blume, Syntagma Musicologicum, p. 244: ". . . tradito Organistae officio, ad quod me potius naturae inclinatio, quam unquam eo suscepta instituo trahebat . . . ."

[13]Preface, folio 11v. Quoted in Blume, Syntagma Musicologicum, p. 243: "'. . . im Anfang coeteris artibus liberalibus obgelegen' und sei erst 'sehr spät zum exercitio musices gelanget.'"

[14]Ibid., p. 244-245.

[15]See the APPENDIX, p. 60.

[16]In his will, written in May, 1619, Praetorius is said to have lived in Wolfenbüttel for 27 years. Quoted in Forchert, "Praetorius," MGG X, col. 1561.

[17]Blume, ed., Gesamtausgabe, X, vii. ". . . iam ultra decennium fuerim . . . ."

[18]Blume, ed., Gesamtausgabe, XVII, xi. "Ich in das fünff unnd [sic] zwantzigste Jahr; anfangs vor einen Organisten . . . ."

[19]Nachwort to the facsimile edition of Syntagma Musicum I (Basel: Bärenreiter, 1959), p. 1.

[20]Syntagma Musicologicum, p. 233.

[21]"Praetorius," MGG X, col. 1561.

[22]Quoted in Gurlitt, Nachwort to the facsimile edition of Syntagma Musicum II (Basel: Bärenreiter, 1958), p. 1.

[23]Syntagma Musicologicum, p. 246.

[24]Ibid.

[25]Part I, section xl.

[26]Syntagma Musicum II, trans. Harold Blumenfeld (New Haven, Conn.: Chinese Printing Office-Yale U., 1949), p. 15.

[27]pp. 9, 22, and 67.

[28]John Weissmann, "Lambert de Sayve," Groves Dictionary of Music and Musicians (Fifth edition; London: Macmillan, 1954), VII, 436.

[29]Syntagma Musicologicum, p. 248.

[30]Weissmann, "de Sayve," Groves, VII, 436.

[31]Forchert, "Praetorius," MGG X, col. 1562.

[32]Ibid.

[33]Quellen-Lexicon, VIII, 46.

[34](Wolfenbüttel, 1605). Blume, ed., Gesamtausgabe, I. Eight-part motets in German, based on chorales.

[35]"Praetorius," MGG X, col. 1562.

[36]"Lutheran Church Music in the Age of Classic Lutheran Theology - Hans Leo Hassler and Michael Praetorius," The Symposium on Seventeenth Century Lutheranism: Selected Papers, edited by A. C. Piepkorn and others (St. Louis: n.p., 1962), I, 68.

[37]"Geschichte der Braunschw-Wolfenbüttelschen Kapelle und Oper vom 16. bis zum 18. Jahrh.," Jahrbuch für Musikwissenschaft, I (1863), 150. Quoted in Eitner, Quellen-Lexicon, p. 46.

[38]Ibid.

[39]Folio 11; In the translation by Harold Blumenfeld, pp. v-w.

[40]"H.S.M.": Unpublished class notes from Robert Bergt, p. 48.

[41]Philip Spitta, ed., "Zwei Briefe von Michael Praetorius," Monatshefte für Musikgeschichte, II (No. 4, 1870), 68-69.

[42]Gurlitt, Nachwort to facsimile edition of Syntagma Musicum I, p. 1.

[43]Forchert, "Praetorius," MGG X, col. 1563.

[44]Syntagma Musicologicum, p. 238. Translation my own.

[45]Ibid.

[46]Forchert, "Praetorius," MGG X, col. 1563.

[47]Ibid.

[48]Folio 11; In the translation by Harold Blumenfeld, pp. v-w.

[49]Forchert, "Praetorius," MGG X, col. 1563.

[50]Holy Bible, Revised Standard Version.

[51]"Leichenpredigt," Monatshefte für Musikgeschiehte, VII (No. 12, 1875), 177. See the APPENDIX, p. 60.

[52]"Praetorius," MGG X, col. 1563.

[53]"Leichenpredigt," MFM, VII (No. 12, 1875), 177. Translation my own.

[54]Ibid.

[55]"Michael Praetorius," Encycklopädie der evangelischer Kirchenmusik (Gütersloh: Bertelsmann, 1890), II, 730.

[56]"Lutheran Church Music in the Age of Classic Lutheran Theology," Symposium on Seventeenth Century Lutheranism, I, 71.

[57]Syntagma Musicologicum, p. 245.

[58]"Leichenpredigt," MFM, VII (No. 12, 1875), 178. Translation my own.

[59]Preface to his translation of Syntagma Musicum II, p. v.

[60]"Lutheran Church Music in the Age of Classic Lutheran Theology," Symposium, I, 71.

[61]Magister Friedrich Hildebrand of Blankenburg,"Piis Manibus S. Michael Praetorius etc." Epitaph appended to "Leichenpredigt," MFM, VII (No. 12, 1875), 178. Translation my own.

CHAPTER III

BEGINNINGS OF GERMAN BAROQUE AND ENCYCLOPEDIC VISION: PRAETORIUS AS MUSICIAN

The career and works of Michael Praetorius demonstrate a unique confluence of musical and cultural traditions. Disregarding for the moment the questions about his training mentioned in Chapter II, it is nevertheless clear from his music that he brought to his work as a composer the solid theological and musical foundation of the sixteenth-century Lutheran chorale. From his early works it is especially clear that he was skilled in the note against note Renaissance motet style of the sixteenth century. His later works with figured bass and two, three or four choirs of singers and instruments display an Italian influence. The secular dances of his Terpsichore[1] are French in style. As Paul Lang has written:

> Praetorius knew the Venetians as well as the Romans, and he even tried his solemn spirit on the lilting grace of French dances. His inquisitive mind explored every form and technique of his times and shuffled and melted them, with imposing thoroughness, patience and skill, into the musical world of the Protestant chorale; in this he was one of the chief founders of German baroque music.[2]

This chapter will survey the confluence of styles in Praetorius, as well as two related issues briefly mentioned in Chapter II: his prolific musical output, and his tireless zeal for the advancement of music, particularly church

music--a zeal which worked itself out in a great encyclopedic plan, of which the many works he actually completed constitute less than half.

The late years of the sixteenth century and the early seventeenth century were marked by the transition from Renaissance to baroque in many sectors of life. One manifestation of this transition was the Christianization of Greek and Roman authors as an outgrowth of Renaissance humanism. Hans Joachim Moser sees a manifestation of this in the title Musae Sionae which Michael Praetorius chose for nine volumes of his published works. Moser writes:

> [Praetorius] himself elucidates it in the foreword to the seventh part of this work: "In order, however that the author may not be viewed by devout hearts as having profaned and misused in heathen poems these spiritual things which belong to the honor of God and service of His church, he desired to name his Muses and Graces, not according to Pindus and Parnassus but according to the holy and glorious Mt. Zion on which the eternal, great and highest God is praised and honored in many ways with fresh and joyful spirit by his dear angels, who then are the true, rightful and wisest Muses and Graces."[3]

Not only is society at large affected by this transition, but the world of music in particular is also changing stylistically at this time, and nowhere is this shift more apparent than in the works of Michael Praetorius. Harold Blumenfeld makes this observation:

> Praetorius lived at a time of transition crucial for the development of German music. His period was one during which the cultural focal point in Europe was beginning to shift away from the objective and worldly orientation of the Italian Renaissance and towards the North, where the rising tide of mysticism and subjectivity was to arrive at

> its height of expression later in the High Baroque of Germany. The changing temper of the early seventeenth century is manifested in music by a growing emphasis on the spectacular and colorful and in a striving towards more direct expressiveness and a greater overt emotional effect. The changing approach to sonority which these new criteria imply find [sic] expression in the use of contrasting and opposed masses of sound and spatial-acoustical effect, practices stemming from Italy. In German music, the first stage in the development of the new Baroque trend completes itself in the works of Praetorius, in which the new practices from the South are introduced into Germany and are absorbed into the persisting Lutheran musical tradition.[4]

The style of the sixteenth century which characterizes Praetorius' early works is known as modal counterpoint; that is, in the words of Lincoln Spiess, "a style largely diatonic, unaccompanied, imitative and modal."[5] It is typical of madrigals and motets, where the harmony is determined by the counterpoint. The music of this period uses a variety of modal scales, the restriction to major and minor scales being a later development. Composers whose works represent this style include Orlandus Lassus, Thomas Luis de Victoria and Luca Marenzio--all of whom Praetorius mentions by name in the preface to Musae Sionae IX.[6]

Exactly when or where Praetorius' came under the influence of the new Venetian music is not certain; that he came under its influence is apparent in his later music. Spiess writes:

> There is, first of all, more emphasis on harmony, both in the use of more purely homophonic passages and in a more harmonically conceived counterpoint. In this second period there is also a remarkable use of instruments both in accompanying the choral writing and in independent instrumental passages.[7]

Foremost exponent of these innovations was Giovanni Gabrieli; Lambert de Sayve, whom Praetorius knew at Prague, was another.[8]

Two additional characteristics of this Venetian music, the basso continuo (figured bass) and the use of multiple choirs also known as concertato style, were also taken over by Praetorius. Harold Samuel comments:

> Of the important innovations occuring around 1600 in Italian music, the German Lutheran composers quickly adopted basso continuo and concertato style, both of which, along with the already traditional close relation of music and text (musica poetica), dominated Lutheran music throughout the seventeenth century.[9]

He further states:

> It is a combination of the concertato style in the works of Giovanni Gabrieli, its further development after his death, and innovations added by Praetorius that is described by the latter in Syntagma Musicum. Concerto per choros, the first of the two species of concertato style, is a contrast, a rivalry, an alternation between choirs. Three types of choirs are set in opposition to each other: a choir of solo voices (coro favorito), a choir consisting of several voices to a part (chorus pro capella), and a choir of instruments (chorus instrumentalis).[10]

The other type of concertato style is "solo concertato style," which Samuel describes as "compositions for one or more solo voices with basso continuo accompaniment."[11] Both of these types resulted in a later genre of music in the Baroque: the concerto per choros, in the cantata; the solo concerto, in the solo cantata. In particular, the instrumental symphonias used in the concerto per choros contributed to the development of the Baroque instrumental ensemble.[12]

Because Praetorius' works were for the most part published in the order they were composed, it is not difficult to date his stylistic change. Spiess makes the following analysis:

> Praetorius' first period we can easily fix as being through the publications of the year 1607. (This period also should include the Latin motets and masses of 1611, which probably were written much earlier than the date of publication). The second, or later period includes the publications of the years between 1613-1621. The published music of the years between 1607 and 1613 varies in style, some works showing close alliance to the sixteenth century and some showing tendencies toward the baroque. It is clearly a period of transition in his stylistic development. . . .[13]

Buszin comments that Praetorius became captivated by the new innovations, to the point that he regretted having written in his former style.[14] This certainly is possible; however the primary sources neither support nor deny it.

Perhaps the best way to illustrate the change is to compare and contrast two of Praetorius' works, one from each period. In each case, Philip Nicholai's chorale Wachet auf, ruft uns die Stimme is treated: first, in Musae Sionae V (1607),[15] second, in Polyhymnia Caduceatrix (1619).[16]

Three unaccompanied settings of Wachet auf appear together in Musae Sionae V. The first is for two equal voices, in the manner of a canon. Both voices imitate one another throughout, though one more consistently states the entire cantus firmus, while the other uses phrases from the cantus firmus in counterpoint with the first. This device is an innovation of Praetorius which he used in his music of both

periods. Arno Forchert sees in this device a great new freedom of interpretation for the content of the chorale text. He writes:

> The chorale appears here simultaneously in two musical and textual levels: on the one hand as the continuous cantus firmus, bound to the contents of the entire chorale text; on the other hand, as a contrapuntal chorale motif with the brief fragment of the text that belongs to it, which makes the affirmation of the text crystal clear. By doing this, he combines musical experimentation with the Reformation mandate to let the Word come alive.[17]

The second setting of Wachet auf in Musae Sionae V is apparently written for congregational singing; it is a four part (soprano, alto, tenor, bass) note against note harmonization.

Two choirs are required for the third setting: one, for three voices; the other, for four voices. As the other two settings, it is unaccompanied. The choirs do not really oppose one another, as in the later concertato style. It is imitative in a way similar to the first.

By contrast with these simple settings in Musae Sionae, the setting of Wachet auf in Polyhymnia Caduceatrix has nearly all the characteristics of the chorale cantatas of J. S. Bach one hundred years later. Scored for a total of 19 voices in four choirs, it has figured bass throughout and requires at various times a string ensemble, a brass ensemble and two virtuoso cornetti in Echo which imitate one another in running eighth and sixteenth notes throughout the first movement. Preceded by an instrumental sinfonia which leads

directly into the first movement, it is divided into three parts, each one based on a stanza of the chorale. There is a good deal of imitation, but the choirs also often oppose one another in true concertato style.

Particularly noteworthy is the musical treatment of the phrase mit Harfen und mit Zimbeln schon in stanza three. Creating an onomatapoietic effect of the Zimbelstern on the organ, the sopranos and altos of one choir sing the phrase in eighth note values, und mit Zim- Zim- Zim-beln, Zim- Zim- Zim-beln schon, with a moving accompaniment of sixteenth notes in the violins. Spiess writes concerning this work:

> The chorale melody is treated freely and imaginatively, and in some ways even more freely than is true of the Bach cantatas. Certainly the Wachet auf and all Praetorius' later comparable works are true cantatas in all but name.[18]

For its sheer volume, the music of Michael Praetorius from both periods is overwhelming, not to mention his works about music. Lang writes:

> The number of his compositions is fantastic, the collection entitled Musae Sionae alone containing 1244 settings of the chorales for ensembles, ranging from bicinia or "two-part songs" to quadruple choirs. His Syntagma Musicum (Musical Treatise) is, with Mersenne's Harmonie Universelle, our most important source for seventeenth century musical history.[19]

A brief survey of his published works bears witness to his prolific output.

Musae Sionae I - IV (1605-1607)[20] contain German motets for choir in the older style. Musae Sionae V - VIII (1607-1610)[21] include various settings of chorales, probably involving the congregation (as in Wachet auf, Musae Sionae V,

mentioned above). Buszin indicates that Musae Sionae IX (1610),[22] with its bicinia and tricinia, two and three part settings of chorales, may have been intended for the home.[23]

Volume Ten of the Gesamtausgabe is titled Motectae et Psalmi Musarum Sionarum and dates from 1607; stylistically it also represents that early period. Likewise, Volumes Eleven through Thirteen, though published in 1611, were probably written in 1607 or earlier since they fit that period stylistically.[24] These include the four volumes under the general title Leiturgodia Sionia Latina[25] with the individual titles Hymnodia Sionia, Missodia Siona, Eulogodia Sionia and Megalynodia Sionia. The Terpsichore (1612) referred to earlier is a collection of more than three hundred secular French dances.[26]

With the Urania of 1613[27] the first signs of the new style appear. This collection contains twenty-eight polychoral settings of nineteen German chorales. Spiess points out the explicit connection with the Italian style by noting Praetorius' preface to this collection:

> Praetorius has been speaking about the problem of keeping the two or more choirs together when separated at some distance. He mentions the practice in Italy of using a basso continuo to keep the choirs together and goes on to say that this practice is to be seen in the "previously unheard" concerti and motets of the "splendid composer and organist Giovanni Gabrieli." (Vol. 16, p. xiv)[28]

In the Polyhymnia Caduceatrix (1619),[29] Polyhymnia Exercitatrix (1620)[30] and Puercinium (1621)[31] we see the full flowering of the baroque style in Praetorius, as the Wachet

auf "cantata" discussed above indicates. Volume Twenty of the Gesamtausgabe contains miscellaneous shorter works, including the setting of Psalm 116 mentioned in Chapter II, which Forchert thinks is a late work,[32] in contrast to Spiess who regards it as early.[33]

Praetorius' contribution to the development of organ literature cannot be overlooked; Gurlitt, in addition sees his entire musical career as a composer built on the foundation of his organ playing.[34] His extant organ works are included in Volumes Seven and Twelve of Blume's Gesamtausgabe, and comprise large treatments of the German chorales Ein feste Burg ist unser Gott, Wir glauben all an einen Gott, and Christ unser Herr, zum Jordan kam, a set of variations on Nun lob, mein Seel, den Herren, and six Latin organ hymns. Both Buszin[35] and Spiess[36] mention Praetorius' projected plans in the preface to Musae Sionae VII (1609) to publish "toccatas, fugues, fantasies, organ hymns or psalms" should he live longer; he did live for another twelve years, but these plans never came about.

Buszin speaks quite highly of Praetorius' German chorale preludes, particularly his Ein feste Burg:

> M. Praetorius wrote chorale fantasies for organ which are prototypes of the great chorale fantasies written for organ by J. S. Bach and other composers of note. His fantasy based on Ein feste Burg ist unser Gott is perhaps the greatest organ composition extant which is based on this great hymn; in majesty and grandeur, and even in contrapuntal skill, it surpasses the preludes based on Ein feste Burg by Dietrich Buxtehude, J. S. Bach and a veritable host of other eminent composers of organ history.[37]

Both Buszin[38] and Spiess[39] agree that, since these works precede by fifteen years the chorale preludes of Samuel Scheidt's Tabulatura nova of 1624, Praetorius rather than Scheidt is the father of the chorale preludes of the Lutheran church.

Apart from his compositions, Praetorius has received considerable musicological notoriety for his three volume Syntagma Musicum. Since the end of the 1950's, a facsimile edition by Wilibald Gurlitt of the Syntagma[40] has made it accessible in its entirety, with the exception of the fourth volume, which, while Praetorius completed it in his lifetime, was never published and is now lost.[41]

W. S. Rockstro provides a careful listing of the contents of Syntagma I:

> Vol. I . . . written chiefly in Latin, but with frequent interpolations in German, is arranged in two principal parts, each subdivided into innumerable minor sections. Part i is entirely devoted to the consideration of ecclesiastical music, and its four sections treat, respectively, (1) of choral music and psalmody, as practised in the Jewish, Egyptian, Asiatic, Greek and Latin churches; (2) of the music of the Mass; (3) of the music of the antiphons, psalms, tones, responsoria, hymns and canticles, as sung at Matins and Vespers, and the greater and lesser Litanies; and (4) of instrumental music, as used in the Jewish and early Christian churches, including a detailed description of all the musical instruments mentioned either in the Old or the New Testament. Part ii treats of the secular music of the ancients . . .[42]

Perhaps the best known of all his works is Volume Two of Praetorius' Syntagma, De Organographia. Buszin writes:

> Musicologists today regard M. Praetorius' volume as one of the most important tomes ever written on the organ and its music; it approaches the problems of organ history and organ construction from a highly scientific point of view. . . . Every reputable organ

> builder of our day must acquaint himself intimately with what M. Praetorius has to say about organ building if he desires to excel as a builder of classical organs.[43]

Of special value in this volume is the Theatrum instrumentorum seu sciagraphia appended at the end, consisting of forty-two woodcuts of the instruments described previously in the text.[44]

Volume Three considers early seventeenth century Italian, French, English and German secular composition, technical matters such as notation, rhythm, management of multi-choral music and the like, and explanation of Italian technical terms. Praetorius wrote "from the practice for the practice," writes Harold Samuel:

> His description of concertato style was intended as an aid for the establishment of this practice in the German churches and courts. The description was so thorough, and the practice in the seventeenth century was so fixed, that it was unnecessary for later German writers to be concerned with the subject.[45]

In his Syntagma III, Praetorius also provided a listing of both his completed and his proposed works; it is this list which provides us with deepened insight into the zeal for music which drove this man to contemplate plans that were physically impossible but which he saw as indispensable for an encyclopedic treatment of all aspects of music.

It is Friedrich Blume who first made this observation. He writes:

> The dimension of universality in the thought of the Middle Ages found a new stimulus in the great geniuses of the Baroque. Their proneness to see all the arts and sciences as one great unity, and to fashion a system with unified points of view, encom-

> passed music as well, whether it is seen together with mathematics as brother and sister in the quadrivium, or as the ethical dimension in the domain of the civitas dei.[46]

Blume sees Michael Praetorius as the epitome of this kind of vision. He continues:

> In Michael Praetorius, German learning and thoroughness, German inclination to meditation and speculation, German pedagogy and pedantry are joined with untiring creativity, truly comprehensive knowledge and ability, with conservative obstinacy and a zeal for systematizing that accounts for every detail; but also with passionate devotion to new insight, with the pompous display of the charming ego but at the same time, genuine German readiness to pour out the entire individual person and the whole of an individual lifetime for one great undertaking.[47]

One can only look incredulously at the twenty volume Gesamtausgabe and imagine that this is less than half of Praetorius' vision. Yet, says Blume, it is true that what Praetorius' actually completed is only the torso of a monumental undertaking that wants to encompass nothing less than the total scope of music in all its parts and build a complete system: history and theory, practice and technique, secular and spiritual, organization, construction of instruments, choral and instrumental instruction, dance and dramatic music.

Blume sees this plan developing in five stages: (1) Praetorius' Musae Sionae and Urania encompass sacred and secular songs; (2) his Terpsichore, the reprint of Lambert de Sayve's German secular music and Musae Aoniae take in secular instrumental and vocal music; (3) the four volumes of Latin chant: the Hymnodia, Missodia, Eulogodia, and Megalynodia

encompass Lutheran liturgical music; (4) his Syntagma I and the Leiturgodia Sionia Latina form the basis for his theoretical and historical writing; (5) the final phase draws all the preceding together in the Syntagma II, III and IV and announces in the Syntagma III of his proposed fifteen volumes of Polyhymnia.[48]

Five large volumes were also contemplated of Musae Aoniae, covering all phases of German secular music;[49] nevertheless, we will pass over listing them here and list instead the almost incredible plan for the Polyhymnia: Polyhymnia Heroica and Caesarea, settings of various Latin texts; Polyhymnia Caduceatrix, Puercinium and Exercitatrix, the three which actually appeared; Jubilaea, Polyhymnia VII (no special name) and Miscellanea, settings of various Latin texts; Leiturgica, masses and Magnificats; four volumes of Polyhymnia continens Motetas divided into two parts, namely Collectanea and Eulogodiaca, settings of other liturgical texts; Polyhymnia Melpomene or Instrumentalis, instrumental works for church use; and, Polyhymnia Aglaia, more Latin texts. In addition, he contemplated a series of written doctrinal and meditative pieces, titled, Regnum Coelorum; these will be dealt with in Chapter IV.[50]

We have seen the stylistic change and the beginnings of German baroque in Praetorius' music, surveyed his complete works and caught a glimpse of his encyclopedic vision. Robert Eitner had far less to go on, but what he said of Praetorius still bears repeating: "Through his works in

music literature, his compositions and his collected works, he has left an imperishable memorial."[51]

FOOTNOTES TO CHAPTER III

[1](Wolfenbüttel, 1612). Modern edition, Friedrich Blume, ed., Gesamtausgabe der Musikalischen Werke von Michael Praetorius (Wolfenbüttel: Kallmeyer, 1928-1940), Vol. XV. Hereafter referred to as GA.

[2]Music in Western Civilization (New York: Norton, 1941), p. 394.

[3]Heinrich Schütz, His Life and Work, translated by Carl Pfatteicher (St. Louis: Concordia Publishing House, 1959), p. 12.

[4]Syntagma Musicum of Michael Praetorius, Vol. II, De Organographia, First and Second Parts. Translated by Harold Blumenfeld (New Haven, Conn.: Chinese Printing Office, Yale University, 1949), Preface, p. i-ii.

[5]"Michael Praetorius Creuzbergensis, Church Musician and Scholar," The Musical Heritage of the Lutheran Church, edited by Theodore Hoelty-Nickel (St. Louis: Concordia Publishing House, 1959), V, 68.

[6](Wolfenbüttel, 1610). Modern edition: Blume, ed. GA, IX, ix.

[7]"Praetorius," Musical Heritage, V, 69.

[8]See Chapter II, p. 9.

[9]Michael Praetorius on Concertato Style," Cantors at the Crossroads, Essays on Church Music in honor of Walter E. Buszin, edited by Johannes Riedel (St. Louis: Concordia Publishing House, 1967), p. 95.

[10]Ibid., p. 97.

[11]Ibid., p. 102.

[12]Spiess, "Praetorius," Musical Heritage, V, 71-72.

[13]Ibid., p. 69.

[14]"H.S.M." 49: Unpublished class notes by Robert Bergt.

[15]Blume, ed. GA V, 192-199.

[16]Blume, ed. GA XVII, 192-228.

[17]"Michael Praetorius," in Musik in Geschichte und Gegenwart, edited by Friedrich Blume (Kassel: Bärenreiter, 1949-1951), X, col. 1565. Hereafter this edition referred to as MGG. Translation my own.

[18]"Praetorius," Musical Heritage, V, 76.

[19]Music in Western Civilization, p. 394.

[20]Blume, ed. GA, I-IV.

[21]Ibid., V-VIII.

[22]Ibid., IX.

[23]"H.S.M." 49.

[24]Spiess, "Praetorius," Musical Heritage, V, 75.

[25](Wolfenbüttel, 1612). Praetorius' general introduction to his Latin liturgical works.

[26]See Footnote 1, above.

[27]Blume, ed., GA, XVI.

[28]"Praetorius," Musical Heritage, V, 75.

[29]Blume, ed. GA, XVII.

[30]Ibid., XVIII.

[31]Ibid., XIX.

[32]"Praetorius," MGG X, col. 1563.

[33]"Praetorius," Musical Heritage, V, 77.

[34]Michael Praetorius Creuzbergensis: Sein Leben und Werke (Wiesbaden: Breitkopf und Härtel, 1968), p. 119.

[35]"Lutheran Church Music in the Age of Classic Lutheran Theology - Hans Leo Hassler and Michael Praetorius," The Symposium on Seventeenth Century Lutheranism, edited by A. C. Piepkorn and others (St. Louis: n.p., 1962), I, 73.

[36]"Praetorius," Musical Heritage, V, 71.

[37]"Lutheran Church Music," Symposium, I, 73-74.

[38]Ibid.

[39]"Praetorius," Musical Heritage, V, 72.

[40]Michael Praetorius, Syntagma Musicum (Wolfenbüttel: Holwein, and Wittenberg: Richter, 1615-1619), 3 vols. Facsimile edition by Wilibald Gurlitt (Basel: Bärenreiter, 1958-1959).

[41]Friedrich Blume, "Das Werk Michael Praetorius," Syntagma Musicologicum: Gesammelte Reden und Schriften (Kassel: Bärenreiter, 1963), pp. 239-240.

[42]"Michael Praetorius," Groves Dictionary of Music and Musicians, edited by Eric Blom (London: Macmillan, 1954), VI, 905-906.

[43]"Lutheran Church Music." Symposium, I, 73.

[44]Rockstro, "Praetorius," Groves, VI, 906.

[45]"Praetorius on Concertato Style." Cantors, p. 95.

[46]"Das Werk Michael Praetorius," Syntagma Musicologicum, p. 229. Translation my own.

[47]Ibid., pp. 229-230. Translation my own.

[48]Ibid., pp. 230-231.

[49]Ibid., p. 235.

[50]Ibid., p. 239. Syntagma Musicum III, p. 159 ff.

[51]"Michael Praetorius," Biographisch-Bibliographisches Quellen-Lexicon der Musiker und Musikgelehrten der Christlichen Zeitrechnung bis zur Mitte des neunzehnten Jahrhunderts (New York: Musurgia, n.d.), VIII, 46.

CHAPTER IV

CONCIO ET CANTIO: PRAETORIUS AS THEOLOGIAN

The composition of music was an intensely theological activity for Micahel Praetorius; what is more, he has written down much of his theology. Few other composers have systematized their theological approach to music quite so explicitly as he does, particularly in the Dedication to Volume One of his Syntagma Musicum[1] and in the Dedication to the Polyhymnia Caduceatrix.[2]

A hint of the role of theology in his life is given by his unfulfilled aspirations to follow his father and his brothers into the Lutheran ministry. One of his unfulfilled plans, furthermore, was a series of six devotional and didactic writings titled The Kingdom of Heaven.[3] Yet, his cardinal theological principle, the union of concio et cantio--Sermon and Song--in the worship of God's redeemed people, marks his career as Capellmeister as a kind of ministry in its own right. Hans Joachim Moser has written:

> Where the Gospel rings out twice, once from the mouth of the preacher in the reading and again from the choir in motet form, what happens is not a mere twofold repetition, but a clear division of the task. The reading presents the text primarily in its rational elements, whereas the musical setting stresses its more emotive, jarring portions, and by means of stimulating images, harmonic illumination, rhythmic accent, repetition of words and so forth, instantly gives an excellent commentary on the sermon, conveys to the congregation an "understanding that moves unhindered" from ear to heart, whose forcefulness addresses other spiritual needs,

> as they attend to making the word of the homiletical exegesis accessible; so that the correctness of a statement by Michael Praetorius consists in this, that cantio and contio [alternative spelling] (Song and Sermon) constitute an indispensable fulfillment of one another.[4]

This chapter will survey both Praetorius' theology of music and its antecedents, both Lutheran and Platonic.

The first major source is Praetorius' Dedication to Syntagma Musicum I.[5] Written in Latin with occasional Greek, Hebrew or German words, the first half is particularly pertinent. After a flattering address formula typical of that age, he begins, "Two exercises . . . are required for the total and absolute perfection of the divine liturgy administered in the Church's public gatherings, namely, concio (Sermon) and cantio (Song)."[6] The remainder of the dedication seeks to support this assertion, first philosophically, then by allegory from the Scriptures, and finally from noted ecclesiastical and political leaders of the past.

Philosophically, Praetorius writes:

> The highest and greatest purpose, which man himself has in common with the blessed angels, destines and devotes him to the genuine practice of divine worship. For if we consider action, man's purpose is twofold: namely, the inquiry for and recognition of truth, and the selection of virtue. But when the highest truth becomes the conception of God, and the highest virtue becomes the celebration of God by true worship, it follows that the purpose of man becomes conception of God and celebration of Him. The former of these is received and returned in the Church especially through sacred Sermons, the latter, through Songs.[7]

Man was created, redeemed and will be raised up to fulfill this twofold purpose, so that, "in every state of his divinely communicated goodness, he might be nothing other

than the temple of God." God has made this clear to man through the Scriptures in three ways: "the symbolic mysteries of paradisal worship, Levitical ceremony and prophetic vision."[8]

> For the primal Church, made up of Adam and Eve in paradise, the sacrament of two trees was proposed and set down for liturgical worship. One was for testing, namely the Tree of the Knowledge of Good and Evil, under (the symbol of) which must have been instituted theory and meditation on the distinction, implanted by the Creator, between desiring good and fleeing evil. The other was the Tree of Life, under (the symbol of) which must have been fostered for man, not (yet) having fallen into error, the practical celebration of immortality, and of singing in a terrestrial and celestial paradise forever with the angels. Genesis 2.[9]

Needless to say, the two trees correspond to Sermon and Song.

The main Biblical proof for him, however, is the second symbolic mystery, that of Levitical ceremony; its explication takes up many pages, of which the following is the beginning:

> . . . Among the other Levitical ceremonies and ornaments of the priest, the pectoral ephod of the High Priest illustrated the two offices of the liturgy; which (ephod) was marked and distinguished not only by the gold and jewels for the number of the tribes, but also by two brilliant distinguishing marks: Urim and Thumim, which the Septuagint translators interpret deilosin kai aletheian, clarity and truth. Chaldaeus has provided this interpretation: in Hebrew, Urim, light or clarity; Thumim, perfection or integrity; Luther translates Das Liecht uund Das Recht. Exodus 28.
>
> For just as clear speech, illuminated for the minds of the listeners in the recognition of the mysteries, corresponds with Sermon, so the truest confession of praise owed to God certainly agrees with Song, leaning for the perfection of faith on none other except God, Who, giving Himself to everyone on account of righteousness, for Himself alone claims and from the Church demands His special honor of invocation and of the action

> of the means of grace. Where reason, logos o eso, first will have been illuminated by Sermon through the light of the indwelling Holy Spirit, afterward a prayer of Song, logos o exo, puts forth and diffuses an image of rays in the public sanctuary.[10]

Thus interpreted, every instance of Urim and Thumim in the Old Testament becomes the occasion for a lesson on Sermon and Song. They are always together and dare not be separated; they warn of "the deceit of infidels and heretics" as they warned David of the deceit of the men of Keilah in I Samuel 23; they encourage the Church to be aggressive in the face of enemies despite its small size, as David was encouraged to pursue the Amalekites with only 600 men in I Samuel 30. They are means by which God communicates His will to man and he responds; on the other hand, as God turned away from Saul's use of Urim and Thumim because of His displeasure, I Samuel 28, so He condemns faithless and hypocritical worship.[11]

The two pillars erected in the temple of Solomon, I Kings 7, II Chronicles 3, also correspond to Sermon and Song:

> Further, when Sermon and Song are one in faith by orthodox agreement and harmony, the same confession of the doctrine of Christ, that through His blood propitiation has been made, is preached and celebrated; thus, it is not unsuitable that these two pillars of the Church's liturgy be foreshadowed by the two bronze columns erected in the portico of Solomon's temple.[12]

The two cherubim whose wings touch over the mercy seat, Exodus 25, "refer to the affinity of liturgy and to the harmony of all the hierarchies won over to Christ by (His)

service and grace . . . ."[13] The two trumpets which God commanded Moses to make to call an assembly of the people, Numbers 10, correspond to "Sermon and Song sounding together with harmony and faultless sincerity."[14]

Following a brief mention of the New Testament, which apparently does not lend itself nearly so well to allegorization on this topic, he devotes the remainder of the Dedication to quotations and some discussion of both Church fathers and political rulers, which will not be taken up here.[15]

Praetorius wrote prefaces and dedications for most of his musical works; one of the longest and most valuable for his thought is the Dedication to the Polyhymnia Caduceatrix et Panegyrica,[16] written in German sprinkled with Latin, Hebrew and Greek. Inscribed in 1619 to his patrons John George, Duke of Saxony, Christian Wilhelm, Administrator of the Bishopric of Magdeburg and Friedrich Ulrich, Duke of Brunswick and Lüneberg, its general theme is the responsibility of Christian rulers to see to it that their subjects are provided with good music. He writes:

> It is a praiseworthy and salutary arrangement, when with Christian government, the following are inseparably and immovably joined:
>
> Sceptrum (Scepter) and
> Plectrum (pluck)
> Regio (reigh) and
> Religio (religion)
> Politeia (politics) and
> Ecclesia (church)
> Cura Fori (care for the state) and
> Cura Chori (care for the choir)
> Cura Soli (care for one) and
> Cura Poli (care for all)

[in short] Civil Government and Divine Worship.

> Inasmuch as the Holy Spirit Himself calls kings caretakers, and singles out rulers and princes as nurses of the church (Isaiah 49:23), the Holy Spirit would by these beautiful and winsome names indicate the measure of love, diligence and care with which the rulers of this earth should be concerned about the Christian church and the right and proper worship of God (just as a wet nurse would adopt the child entrusted to her care.[17]

This care includes both provision of "the necessary food for the soul by means of pure doctrine of the Holy Gospel and the blessed Sacraments," and also "the proper care and attention, nurture and protection; yes, that they may possess all that is essential to the correct and complete worship of God in a most elegant and proper form. "Accordingly," he continues,

> it is essential to the highest ideals of church government, as well as to a corporate worship service that there be not only concio, a good sermon, but also cantio, good music and singing.[18]

This disposition on the part of rulers is a gift of God's Holy Spirit, for which he gives this philological analysis:

> For this very reason the Holy Spirit in Psalm 51 is called a "freely giving, a "princely" Spirit. Such a spirit is becoming to princes, that it might spur them to be liberal in promoting and preserving churches. This thought is suggested by the origin of the epithet given to the Holy Spirit, since it is derived from the Hebrew root nadab, to make willing and benevolent, and since it is related to nadaph, which signifies that a liberal man is prompted by his spirit to be benevolent.
>
> By transposing letters we get the Greek word dapanao, to spend, to lay out money; and if we drop the initial Hebrew letter "n" and affix "r," we have the German word tapfer [brave]. In like manner, the Hebrew word nadib does not merely denote one who is liberal and munificent, but also means prince, because liberality in maintaining large churches becomes everyone, but

> especially princes and sovereigns. Whenever therefore the Hebrew nadib occurs in the Psalms, the Septuagint translators rendered it rulers or princes . . .[19]

In the following paragraphs he traces references to this "princely" Spirit in the Scriptures and also in church history. He mentions Theodosius and Constantine, for example, and "many Christian emperors, kings and rulers, princes and potentates who with similar zeal and love for corporate worship proved by their actions that the "Princely" Spirit dwelt in them . . . .[11] Concerning others who have opposed music and this Princely Spirit, he writes that they

> . . . are instead saddled down with an evil frivolous spirit, pretending to foolish wisdom . . . for such contempt of this "Princely" music they must hear in the fiery chapel of hell the eternal neighing of proud horses and the endless howling of envious dogs, who amidst gnashing of teeth will produce most wretched and awful music.[20]

The paragraph which follows that condemnation, in which he describes the role of music in heaven, has great import for his theology of music:

> Therefore I hear it said in jest, and yet not altogether untruthfully, "Whoever does not desire to be a musician and cares not for music, what does such a one hope to do in heaven?" For in heaven, when all government will have come to an end, and all external distinctions will cease, when there will be no more princes and princely offices, and when God will be all in all, then we will all, master and servant alike join with all who have been enlightened by the Holy Spirit, [all who have] loved and fostered Christian music, then, I say, we will all as heavenly princes, together with the holy angels and all the elect, patriarchs, kings, prophets and apostles, stand before the throne of the Lamb and participate in the unending, continuing Kantorei and with seraphim

> and cherubim intone the threefold Sanctus mentioned in Isaiah 6:3, and in Revelation 4:8, "Holy, Holy, Holy is the Lord of Hosts, etc." Then it will really become true that "Heaven and earth are full of Thy glory."[21]

Further on, he writes:

> Although participation in the heavenly Kantorei will not come as a rich compensation for any preparation we might have made here below, yet it has been aptly said, "Illumined by the Holy Spirit we ought to begin to do here, however imperfectly, what we hope to do perfectly in heaven." For St. Paul writes in I Corinthians 13 that through illumination of the Holy Spirit, we ought to gain a partial knowledge of that which we hope to master in heaven. Anyone who hopes to use his voice in praising God when he gets to heaven, ought to find joy and delight in praising God to the best of his ability while still here below . . . .[22]

He continues by citing and discussing many of the Biblical references in which men are exhorted to praise God in song, including also a list of all the verses from the Psalms which speak to that point.[23] He commends Christian rulers who have fostered music, appealing to his patrons to follow their example:

> And as David, Solomon, Theodosius and Constantine were moved by the "Princely" Spirit to show a warm interest in good Christian court and church music, I appeal to your princely kindness and liberality to advance and support the same with your influence and patronage, to give it strong protection as faithful promoters and nursing mothers of the church.[24]

For these patrons, he says, he has selected some of his compositions which were presented at their court chapels during his travels between 1615 and 1619, and now offers these works to those "who were kind and gracious enough to favor them with discerning auditions, and from whom in my capacity as a composer I have received much favor and many

deeds of kindness . . . ."[25] In closing, he adds this wish:

> . . . that my worthy lords may, by God's grace, be blessed with continuous good health, a successful reign favored by good fortune, and a government favorable to the protection of the Christian church for the preservation of the true and pure religion and worship of the Lutheran church, and that the distinguished and honorable ruling families of Saxony, Brandenburg and Brunswick, continue united as an amicable, threefold inseparable, ever more stable and prosperous.
>
> In the Name of the eternal, inseparable Holy Trinity, God the Father, Son and Holy Ghost, exalted above all the shields of earth.[26]

Based primarily on these sources and some other fleeting references in his writings, some basic principles of Praetorius' theology of music can be formulated.

Of primary importance for his thought is that the essence of redeemed life on earth and especially in heaven is singing; this is the eternal occupation of the angels in the heavenly Kantorei. Singing is the form of perfect praise to God, the angels are our examples, and the Biblical canticles such as the Sanctus, Gloria in excelsis and Dignus est Agnus are the perfect songs of praise. This is apparent in the sources quoted above, as well as in the preface to his Syntagma Musicum II.[27] There, he also writes that the festal music of heavenly Kantorei is sung" . . . with alternating choruses celebrating the joyous marriage of Our Holy Groom, Jesus Christ . . .";[28] according to the Polyhymnia dedication, they also use "harps and cymbals" and the Psalms commend the use of "trumpets and cornet."[29] What this undoubtedly means for Praetorius is that this perfect music

of heaven is most closely resembled on earth by the polychoral instrumental and vocal style of the Venetian school, which he may have adopted precisely for that reason. It is interesting in this connection to observe the woodcut in the front of the Polyhymnia, which portrays antiphonal choirs of singers and instruments here on earth, and the same configuration of angels above them in heaven singing their praises to Yahweh.[30]

It follows that if the very nature of heavenly, perfected life is song, then participation in music and song here on earth give man a preview of what heaven is like, yes, even allows him to participate already in some of its glory, though in a tainted way. Recall the statement quoted above: "Whoever does not desire to be a musician and cares not for music, what does such a one hope to do in heaven?"; or further on:

> Illumined by the Holy Spirit, we ought to begin to do here, however imperfectly, what we hope to do perfectly in heaven . . . Anyone who hopes to use his voice in praising God when he gets to heaven, ought to find joy and delight in praising God to the best of his ability while still here below.[31]

It is thus important that music be written well and performed well in order best to reflect the perfect heavenly music and to worship God aright.

Several corollaries follow from this for Praetorius. One is that all music must of necessity be Trinitarian, since Father, Son and Holy Spirit are the only true God. Another is, that if heaven is the best, music, then hell must be

the most raucous music possible. As quoted above, despisers of music on earth receive a kind of double punishment in hell: they must listen to music for eternity, and it is grunting scraping cacophony besides. An additional corollary is that Satan, the Archfiend, opposes music and does all he can to frustrate it and to draw mortals to do likewise.

The second foundation for his theology of music is that it is not Song alone that is God-pleasing, but Sermon and Song, concio et cantio. Sermon and Song are mutually complementary; they are two different forms for the same content. That content is the "doctrine of Christ, that through His blood propitiation has been made,"[32] or that "our penalty has been paid by the blood of Christ,"[33] or elsewhere, "the harmony of all the hierarchies won over to Christ by His service and grace."[34] Sermon corresponds with the theoria of the conception or knowledge of God; Song corresponds with the praxis of celebrating Him. Sermon, by the Holy Spirit's power, speaks to reason, logos o eso, "the Word within," to illuminate a person in the mysteries of God; Song, logos o exo, "the Word outside," is the resulting public confession of praise to Him. Sermon and Song are the supporting pillars of the Church; they belong together, and leaders in the Church are to be trusted as long as they maintain both in the Church's worship. Christian rulers should also see to it that Sermon and Song are maintained for the sake of their subjects.

Sermon and Song are, in fact, the fulfillment of man's very destiny and purpose as man. As noted earlier, Praetorius writes:

> When the highest truth becomes the conception of God, and the highest virtue becomes to celebrate God by true worship, it follows that the purpose of man becomes conception of God and celebration of God. The former of these is received and returned in the Church especially through sacred Sermons, the latter, through Songs.[35]

Likewise in the Polyhymnia dedication, he quotes approvingly:

> No ruler can govern land and people well, nor can anyone in any other calling accomplish anything worthwhile if he does not possess a measure of musical interest.[36]

To mention one additional sidelight, Praetorius probably still subscribed to the Greek doctrine of ethos or moral character of the modes, since while speaking against organists who sometimes transpose music to different keys, he says, "This alters the way in which the modes move the affections and creates chaos among the singers and players of the ensemble . . . ." Such activity is prepetrated by the Archfiend, Satan.[37]

As a whole, Praetorius' theology of music displays a markedly Platonic character. To see this, a brief survey of Plato and those who follow in his footsteps is necessary.

To grasp Plato's thought on music, it is first of all essential to understand his notion of the perfect forms and ideas. For everything that is, there is an ideal exemplar. Thus, for example, an object is a music stand because it possesses certain characteristics of the ideal music stand

which exists in the realm of perfect ideas in the mind of God. It is nevertheless only an imperfect copy or shadow of the ideal music stand, for no music stand in this world can attain the complete perfection of ideal "musicstandness."

It must also be understood that there is a relationship between the way the universe is ordered and the way man's life is ordered; man, in other words, is a microcosm of the universe. R. C. Lodge writes:

> As man and the cosmos are smaller and larger portions of one and the same natural system, and exhibit in other respects the operation of the same fundamental laws, it is to be expected that the musical intervals which are natural to man will correspond to musical intervals which are natural to the cosmic organism. . . . It follows, then, that true music--music which is not just playing with tones and rhythms--should be a representation in melodies, scales and rhythm-forms which can be appreciated by the sensuous nature of man, of the mathematically intelligible dance of the stars in their courses, courses which are a visible copy of the invisible and purely intelligible laws of the absolute ideal universe created by God and understood directly only by a mixture of human logic and divine inspiration.[38]

As Lodge has indicated, perception of the ideals is important for a life in tune with the universe; for this perception process to be understood, the distinction between theory (<u>theoria</u>) and practice (<u>praxis</u>) must be seen in Plato's thought. In brief, theory is contemplation of the ideal; practice involves doing and action in the ethical realm. The theoretical is apprehended by reason and seeks the universal and necessary nature of a thing; the practical is pursued by the will and seeks the relation of the thing to human aims and aspiration. John Wild notes:

> A thing must first be, before it can perfect any aspiration, even its own. Thus the theoretical order of truth (the relation of being to the knowing faculty) is absolutely prior to the practical order of goodness (the relation of our being to our striving faculty).[39]

He sums up several pages later by saying, "Theory directs all proper practice, but it is proper practice alone which can give theory its final integration."[40]

It is the philosopher who is best suited to apprehend the ideals by contemplation; it is the musician, however, who is trained in music and is therefore most capable of composing good music that approaches the ideal music of the universe. Which of the two is best qualified to write the music that will serve best to put men's lives in tune with the universe? R. C. Lodge answers the question this way:

> Faced, then, with this acknowledged contrast between creative art and philosophic insight, platonism draws the only possible conclusion; viz., that the creation of music in the ideal community is to be a matter of cooperation. The artist creates what he can, but is compelled to submit his creations to the censorship of the dialectician. The dialection, in consultation with experts, lays down certain norms or standards, in the way of scales, rhythms and melodic patterns adapted to induce in the citizens who play and hear such music, courage, temperance, piety, justice and a feeling for the beauty of wisdom. . . . In this cooperative effort, both artist and philosopher are guided throughout by the principle of the mean. . . . It is because the principle of the mean is also the principle of order, not only in the actual cosmos, but also in each member of the ideal realm of which the actual cosmos is a sense-perceivable image, that the art of music acquires . . .a significance which is not merely physical, and not merely human, but is metaphysical and divine in meaning and function.[41]

Music thus written is capable of bringing man's soul into harmony with the universe. Egon Wellesz comments as

follows, in connection with Plato's Timaeus:

> As the ratios of the circles in our souls correspond to the melodic intervals, music, as far as it uses audible sound, was bestowed upon mankind as a gift from heaven for the sake of harmony. "And harmony, whose motions are akin to the revolutions of the soul within, has been given by the Muses to him whose commerce with them is guided by intelligence, not for the sake of irrational pleasure (which is now thought to be its utility) but as an ally against the inward discord that has come into the revolution of the soul, to bring it into order and consonance with itself."[42]

Further, the different modes in music each possess a certain ethos or character, which makes some more suitable than others for regulating the harmony of the soul.[43] Some are soothing, some depressing, some exciting, some downright perverse; care must be exercised in the use of the modes.

Christian Neo-platonists picked up many of these ideas and amplified them somewhat, but much of the basis remains the same. For example, Pseudo-Dionysius the Areopagite, writing in fifth century A.D., assumes the Platonic realm of ideals and musical theory. For Pseudo-Dionysius, the hierarchy of the church here on earth is an imperfect reflection of the perfect sequence and arrangement of the angelic hierarchy. Thus, all that the church does reflects imperfectly what is done perfectly by the angels, particularly the hymns. Dom Denys Rutledge, commenting on the Ecclesiastical Hierarchy of Pseudo-Dionysius, writes:

> The hymns and canticles of the Church are the reflections of the spiritual chants, transmitted from the celestial hierarchy to mankind and made audible to human ears in the form of Psalms. When the singing of hymns (Hymnologia) has brought

> our souls "into harmony with the ritual that is to follow" and has brought our heart "into accord with the divine, with ourselves and with one another," the poetic imagery of the Psalms is further explained by the reading of the divine lessons.[44]

On a later page, Rutledge notes:

> The purpose of these sacred chants is, in fact, "to celebrate all the words and works of God, to recount all that the men of God have said of God and all they have done in His service. Thus they form "a complete historical poem of all the divine mysteries, giving to all who sing them reverently the right dispositions for receiving and distributing the mysteries of the hierarchy."[45]

The redemption through Christ, for Pseudo-Dionysius, took place when by His incarnation, Christ

> . . . bypassed the celestial hierarchy, becoming not just an abstraction, humanity, but all men in all their manifold external manifestations. By his ascension he has taken back into the hierarchy man and his world in indestructible form. . .[46]

Pseudo-Dionysius wrote the Ecclesiastical Hierarchy, says Rutledge,

> . . . to demonstrate that all that was, that is, in Christ flows still into this world down through the stages of the ecclesiastical hierarcy, made really present in the Holy Eucharist with its clothing of ritual, words and actions.[47]

There is much correlation between the Platonists and Praetorius, particularly in the notion that our earthly music is an imperfect replica of heavenly music but that such earthly music still operates to put man in tune with God and the universe. He likewise maintains the distinction between theoria and praxis, using those precise words and identifying them with concio et cantio. These two,

says Praetorius, must work in conjunction, much the same way the Platonists talk about the philosopher and musician working together towards the end goal of helping man achieve his purpose; Praetorius also seems to hold to the doctrine of ethos. In language reminiscent of Pseudo-Dionysius, Praetorius speaks of the redemption of the hierarchies, and speaks of the great Biblical canticles as the perfect archetypal hymns which the angels sing and to which men aspire.

It is not difficult to ascertain Praetorius' acquaintance with Greek music theory. His facility with the Greek language and the Greek thought world is apparent in his works. His German and Latin prose is liberally sprinkled with Greek words. He quotes widely from Greek authors (though not always in the Greek language), including Pseudo-Dionysius and a rather large number of quotes from Plato, particularly in the history of secular music section of Volume One of the Syntagma Musicum.[48] His university training in philosophy[49] undoubtedly included studies in Plato. The curious combination Muses of Zion (Musae Sionae) is an indication of the influence of Greek musical ideas on his thinking. Likewise, the titles of many of his other collection are the names of various Greek muses; for example, Terpsichore (Volume Fifteen) is the name of the Muse of Dance; Polyhymnia Caduceatrix et Panegyrica (Volume Seventeen) means "Muse and Heraldess of Many Hymns Fit for a Public Festival." The names of others of the nine muses

were included as titles for volumes in his projected Musae Aoniae.[50]

From his works, there is of course no doubt that Michael Praetorius stood firmly in the Lutheran tradition. The very first volume of Musae Sionae in 1605 begins with a preface by Martin Luther, which he originally wrote in 1538 for Georg Rhau's Symphoniae iucundae. This particular document contains Luther's oft-quoted statement that "Next to the Word of God, music deserves the highest praise."[51] Among the works he never completed, but reported in his Syntagma Musicum III,[52] is a six-part devotional and didactic series called Regnum Coelorum, The Kingdom of Heaven. It is a compilation of prayers from the fathers, comforting words from the Scriptures, prayers for the sick, troubled and dying, articles of faith (for example, on the Lord's Supper), and even a brief explication of Luther's Small Catechism.

Michael Praetorius was a man of broad learning, and a man who committed that learning to a great purpose. Friedrich Blume offers this all-inclusive assessment of the man, his music and his theology:

> With this colossal will to all-encompassing system-building and to a restless accomplishment according to the "insignificant talent" alloted to him, Michael Praetorius was in conformity with all the great geniuses of baroque human will, turbulent splendor and grandiose extravagance, which attained its greatest influence in Germany and here more than among other peoples puts its stamp on the picture of the time. It puts into that age a struggle after the unending and the superhuman, a metaphysical drive, which can find satisfaction only in the most all-encompassing plans without concern about the possibility of reali-

zation, and which pushes forward in its way toward the "heavenly choir," which the master so often in his lifetime undertook to imitate. It puts forth a good portion of self-conscious humanity, that throws the entire personality with all its strengths and abilities into the will to the pronouncement, to the discussion, to the urgency of cantio and contio, brutally exacting for the individual self in the depths of the mind, full of fervent self-sacrifice in the conscious mind and complete surrender of the individual existence to gain the highest level for community, people and fatherland.[53]

FOOTNOTES TO CHAPTER IV

[1](Wolfenbüttel: Holwein, 1615). Facsimile reprint by Wilibald Gurlitt, (Basel: Bärenreiter, 1959), unpaginated folios, a3-A3,3. Unpublished translation by David Susan and Ronald Jones.

[2](Wolfenbüttel, 1619). Modern edition edited by Friedrich Blume, Gesamtausgabe der musikalischen Werke von Michael Praetorius (Wolfenbüttel: Kallmeyer, 1928-1940), XVII, vi-xi. Unpublished translation by Martin Bangert and A. C. Hardt. Hereafter Gesamtausgabe referred to as GA.

[3]Michael Praetorius, Syntagma Musicum III, Facsimile reprint by Wilibald Gurlitt (Basel: Bärenreiter, 1959), pp. 225-227.

[4]Die evangelische Kirchenmusik in Deutschland (Berlin and Darmstadt; Merseburger, 1954), p. 112. Translation my own.

[5]Facsimile reprint by Gurlitt, unpublished translation by D. Susan and R. Jones.

[6]Ibid., unpaginated first page.

[7]Ibid., Folio a3.

[8]Ibid.

[9]Ibid.

[10]Ibid., Folio â3, 1.

[11]Ibid., Folios â3,1 - Folio b.

[12]Ibid., Folio b.

[13]Ibid., Folios b-b,1.

[14]Ibid., Folio b,1.

[15]Ibid., Folio b2 ff.

[16]Blume, ed., GA, XVII, vi-xi. Unpublished translation by Martin Bangert and A. C. Hardt.

[17]Ibid., pp. vi-vii.

[18]Ibid., p. vii.

[19]Ibid.

[20]Ibid., p. viii.

[21]Ibid.

[22]Ibid., p. ix.

[23]Ibid.

[24]Ibid., p. x.

[25]Ibid., pp. x-xi.

[26]Ibid., p. xi.

[27]Facsimile edition edited by Gurlitt (Basel: Bärenreiter, 1958), p. 11. Translated from an earlier ed. by Harold Blumenfeld (New Haven, Conn.: Chinese Printing Office, Yale U., 1949), page w.

[28]Ibid.

[29]GA, XVII, viii - ix.

[30]Ibid. p. v.

[31]Ibid., p. ix.

[32]Preface to Syntagma I, Folio b.

[33]Ibid.

[34]Ibid., Folios b - b,1.

[35]Ibid., Folio a3.

[36]GA, XVII, x.

[37]Syntagma II, p. 8. Translated Blumenfeld, pp. r-s.

[38]Plato's Theory of Ethics (New York: Harcourt, Brace and Co., 1928), p. 451.

[39]Plato's Theory of Man (Cambridge, Mass.: Harvard University Press, 1946), p. 22 ff.

[40]Ibid., p. 30.

[41]Lodge, Ethics, p. 453.

[42]A History of Byzantine Music and Hymnography (Oxford: Clarendon Press, 1961), p. 41.

[43]*Ibid.*, pp. 38, 43-44.

[44]*Cosmic Theology - The Ecclesiastical Hierarchy of Pseudo-Denys: An Introduction* (Staten Island, N.Y.: Alba Hse., 1965), p. 50.

[45]*Ibid.*, p. 97.

[46]*Ibid.*, p. 20.

[47]*Ibid.*, p. 21.

[48]Ps.-Dionysius is quoted on p. 260; Plato on pp. 167, 177, 186-187, 199, 233-234, 278-279, 309.

[49]Arno Forchert, "Michael Praetorius," *MGG*, X, col. 1561. See Chapter II of this paper.

[50]For example, *Calliope*, *Erato*, *Thalia* and others. Friedrich Blume, *Syntagma Musicologicum* (Kassel: Bärenreiter, 1963), p. 235.

[51]Walter E. Buszin, *Luther on Music.* Lutheran Society for Music, Worship and the Arts, Pamphlet No. 3. Edited by Johannes Riedel (St. Paul, Minn.: North Central Publishing Co., 1958), p. 5.

[52]pp. 225-227.

[53]Blume, *Syntagma Musicologicum*, pp. 240-241. Translation my own.

CHAPTER V

SUMMARY

The best postscript to this introduction to Michael Praetorius Creuzbergensis the man, the musician, and the theologian, is one he himself used. Taking his initials M.P.C. as the first letters of three words, he adopted the sentence Mihi Patria Coelum, "my fatherland is heaven," as an alternative way of signing his name. This expresses well the faith by which he lived and died; it points to the God whom he served and to other people whose worship of that same God was and is enriched through his vast musical legacy; it discloses the theological basis for his life's work.

Michael Praetorius deserves more recognition than he has received. There are thousands of his compositions to hear and sing and study. As a brother in the One Holy Catholic and Apostolic Church that spans all the ages, he has much to say to us as we too sing to the Lord.

APPENDIX

Funeral Sermon[1]

of the Honorable Noteworthy and Artistic Gentleman

Michael Praetorius,

Capellmeister to the Prince of Brunswick;

who fell asleep in God on the 15th of February, and on the 23rd of February was buried in the Church of Heinrichstadt,

preached by Magister Petrus Tuckermann.

Printed at Wolfenbüttel by El. Holwein, 1621.

This Capellmeister who has died in God is the descendant of blessed parents and forbears, because his father and grandfather were preachers who served the church a long time; likewise his brothers and relatives, many of whom followed the same calling. He himself also showed a great inclination toward it, and often regretted that he never dedicated his own life to the ministry. The deceased was very industrious in his occupation, letting neither fervor, indifference nor sleep deter him from striving toward his goal: he desired to elevate music and to instruct many in it, because a man is known by his work. For that reason he was not isolated at his own court in this special grace, but was also at other places with Kings, Electors and Gentlemen, as everyone is aware. He often experienced great and difficult vexations, which he many times lamented and bemoaned, saying that these came upon him and he deserved them because he lived an evil

youth; hence he had brought upon himself the great shortcomings and infirmities. Surely he was a sinful man and no angel, but his sins nevertheless brought sorrow to his heart. Many crosses and misfortunes beat him down, so that he was truly a tormented man.

--

Remarks

This Capellmeister must have been considered quite evil spiritually, to be discredited with such a memorial address. Only two burial tributes follow: one, a longer Latin poem by Tobias Herold of Halberstadt, a paraphrase of the above; and a shorter poem by Magister Friedrich Hildebrand of Blankenburg, Headmaster of the school at Wolfenbüttel; he gives the sainted (Praetorius) the following epitaph, which offers more personal details:

To the pious departed
Michael Praetorius
Creuzbergensis:
Prior of the monastery at Ringelheim; in the court of the most splendid Dukes of Brunswick and Luneberg which is at Wolfenbuttel,
Master of Choral Music,
the Director and Master
elsewhere also of the choirs of Kings, Electors and Dukes;
Advocate, Honorer, Pillar

of sacred music,
now at the age of forty-nine years on February 15
in the year of Christ 1621
his pious life ended by a pious death.

FOOTNOTES FOR THE APPENDIX

[1]My own translation from the German and Latin of: "Leichpredigt des Ehrnvesten Achtbaren und Kunstreichen Herrn Michaelis Praetorii, etc." from "Leichensermone auf Musiker des 17. Jahrhunderts," Monatshefte fur Musikgeschichte, VII (No. 12, 1875), 177-178.

BIBLIOGRAPHY

A. Primary Sources

Blume, Friedrich, ed. Gesamtausgabe der Musikalischen Werke von Michael Praetorius. 20 vols. Wolfenbüttel: Kallmeyer, 1928-1940.

"Leichenpredigt des Ehrnvesten Achtbaren und Kunstreichen Herrn Michaelis Praetorii, etc." from "Leichensermone auf Musiker des 17. Jahrhunderts," Monatshefte für Musikgeschichte, VII (No. 12, 1875), 177-178. Unpublished translation by David Susan.

Praetorius, Michael, "Dedicatory Epistle," Syntagma Musicum I (Wolfenbüttel: Holwein, 1615; Facsimile reprint edited by Wilibald Gurlitt - Basel: Bärenreiter, 1959). Unpublished translation from the Latin by David Susan and Ronald Jones (St. Louis, 1971).

Praetorius, Michael, "Preface," Polyhymnia Caduceatrix. Gesamtausgabe der Musikalischen Werke von Michael Praetorius, XVII, edited by Friedrich Blume. Unpublished translation from the German by Martin Bangert and A. C. Hardt (Milwaukee, Wisc.: n.d.).

Praetorius, Michael. Syntagma Musicum. 3 vols. Wolfenbüttel: Holwein, and Wittenberg: Richter, 1615-1619. Facsimile edition edited by Wilibald Gurlitt. Basel: Bärenreiter, 1958-1959.

Praetorius, Michael. Syntagma Musicum, Vol. II, "De Organographia, First and Second Parts." Translated from the German by Harold Blumenfeld. New Haven, Conn.: Chinese Printing Office, Yale U., 1949.

Spitta, Philip, ed., "Zwei Briefe von Michael Praetorius," Monatshefte für Musikgeschichte, II (No. 4, 1870), 67-69.

B. Secondary Sources

Bible, Holy. Revised Standard Version.

Blume, Friedrich, "Das Werk Michael Praetorius," Syntagma Musicologicum: Gesammelte Reden und Schriften. Kassel: Bärenreiter, 1963. Pp. 229-264.

Bukofzer, Manfred F. Music in the Baroque Era. New York: W. W. Norton, 1947.

Buszin, Walter E. "H.S.M." Unpublished class notes by Robert Bergt.

Buszin, Walter E. "Lutheran Church Music in the Age of Classic Lutheran Theology - Hans Leo Hassler and Michael Praetorius." The Symposium on Seventeenth Century Lutheranism Selected Papers, Vol. One. Edited by A. C. Piepkorn, Robert Preus and Erwin Lueker. St. Louis: n.p., 1962. Pp. 62-76.

Buszin, Walter E. Luther on Music. Lutheran Society for Worship, Music and the Arts, Pamphlet Series No. 3. Edited by Johannes Riedel. St. Paul, Minn.: North Central, 1958.

Eitner, Robert, "Michael Praetorius," Biographisch-Bibliographisches Quellen-Lexicon der Musiker und Musikgelehrten der Christlichen Zeitrechnung bis zur Mitte des neunzehnten Jahrhunderts. VIII. New York: Musurgia, n.d. Pp. 45-47.

Forchert, Arno, "Michael Praetorius," Die Musik in Geschichte und Gegenwart. X. Edited by F. Blume. Kassel und Basel: Barenreiter, 1949-1951. Cols. 1560-1572.

Gurlitt, Wilibald. Michael Praetorius (Creuzbergensis)Sein Leben u. Werke. Wiesbaden: Breitkopf und Härtel, 1968. Reproduced from the Leipzig edition of 1915.

Haydon, Glen. Introduction to Musicology. New York: Prentice-Hall, 1941.

Lang, Paul Henry. Music in Western Civilization. New York: Norton, 1941.

Lodge, R. C. Plato's Theory of Ethics. New York: Harcourt, Brace and Co., 1928.

"Michael Praetorius," Encycklopädie der evangelischer Kirchenmusik. II Edited by S. Kümmerle. Gütersloh: Bertelsmann, 1890. Pp. 728-734.

Milne, J. R., "Karel Luython," Groves Dictionary of Music and Musicians. V. Edited by Eric Blom. London: Macmillan, 1954. P. 450.

Moser, Hans Joachim. Die evangelische Kirchenmusik in Deutschland. Berlin-Darmstadt: Merseburger, 1954.

Moser, Hans Joachim. Heinrich Schütz, His Life & Work. Translated from the German edition of 1936 by Carl Pfatteicher. St. Louis: Concordia Publishing House, 1959.

Rockstro, W. S., revised H. S. Shaw, "Michael Praetorius," Groves Dictionary of Music and Musicians. VI. Edited by Eric Blom. London: Macmillan, 1954. Pp. 905-907.

Rutledge, Dom Denys. Cosmic Theology - The Ecclesiastical Hierarchy of Pseudo-Denys: An Introduction. Staten Is., N.Y.: Alba Hse., 1965.

Samuel, Harold E. "Michael Praetorius on Concertato Style," Cantors at the Crossroads, Essaipan Church Music in honor of Walter E. Buszin. Edited by Johannes Riedel. St. Louis: Concordia Publishing House, 1967. Pp. 95-109.

Schlink, Edmund. Zum Theologischen Problem der Musik. Tübingen: J.C.B. Mohr, 1950.

Spiess, Lincoln Bunce, "Michael Praetorius Creuzbergensis, Church Musician & Scholar," The Musical Heritage of the Lutheran Church, Vol. 5. Edited by Theodore Hoetly-Nickel. St. Louis: Concordia Publishing House, 1959. Pp. 68-78.

Walther, J. G. Musikalisches Lexikon. Leipzig, 1732. Facsimile edition edited by Richard Schaal. Kassel und Basel: Bärenreiter, 1953.

Weissmann, John S., "Lambert de Sayve," Groves Dictionary of Music and Musicians, VII. Edited by Eric Blom. London: MacMillan, 1954. P. 436.

Wellesz, Egon. A History of Byzantine Music and Hymnography. Oxford: Clarendon Press, 1961.

Wild, John. Plato's Theory of Man. Cambridge, Mass.: Harvard University Press, 1946.