

FOOTNOTES

¹ The principal arguments of Mr. Collins's dissertation may be consulted in two articles: "The performance of sesquialtera and hemiola in the 16th century", *JAMS* 17:5-28 (Spring 1964), and "The performance of triplets in the 17th and 18th centuries", *JAMS* 19:281-328 (Fall 1966).

² These theorists include Finck, 1556; Quitschreiber, 1607; Vulpius, 1608; Beringer, 1610; Elsmann, 1619; Gengenbach, 1626; Hase, 1657; and Trümper, 1668.

REPLY TO ARTHUR HILLS

Michael Collins

Mr. Hills's main criticism of my work is aimed at my "failure to fashion an adequate method". It seems to me that there is a great deal of talk about method lately; but certainly no matter how airtight the researcher's method, it is no substitute for his having investigated all sources, finally choosing those relevant to the subject. This has been my "method", and the virtually complete list of 16th-, 17th-, and 18th-century theorists consulted can really not be listed. I chose those who seemed to be talking about real practice rather than abstract mathematical theory. Mr. Hills has turned up no new sources to contradict my theory; instead, he has attacked it on the rather dubious grounds of national styles.

We shall for the moment leave aside the 17th-century German theorists of the conservative camp who so clearly call for resolutions of three black minims (↓ ↓ ↓) into binary figures (↓ ↓ ↓). In the 16th century there were no national styles in the sense that Mr. Hills claims. There were different genres, such as madrigal, mass, motet, and chanson, and there was an *international* style—that of the Netherlanders. They developed the polyphonic style about which the Italians discourse; they brought it to Italy and they were employed there to write and perform this music in the great churches and courts of Italy. The Italian theorists I quote are speaking of the notation and the music of these Netherlanders. Aron cites Obrecht, Josquin, and Isaac as his masters and acquaintances in Florence; Zarlino cites Willaert, his teacher, Ockeghem, Josquin, de Rore, and Mouton. Tigrini is beholden, as are they all, to Gafurio, whose treatise is not about Italian music, and to Tinctoris, Aron, and Lusitano (a Portuguese theorist); he cites Josquin as well as Palestrina. Zacconi cites the theorists Zarlino and Heyden among others, and most of his examples are drawn from Ockeghem, Obrecht, Isaac, Josquin, and Mouton.

Now the first theorists to write out resolutions of sesquialtera and hemiola were Agricola (1532) and Bourgeois (1550), both of them perhaps somewhat removed from the center of musical culture. The former, however, quotes Gafurio, the latter Heyden, Frosch, and Listenius. They do not make reference to tactus in regard to their resolutions. The later 17th-century German theorists, perhaps stemming from the great influence of the Netherlander

Lassus, do refer to tactus. They all say the same thing. Beringer (1610), who is perhaps the clearest, says: “. . . in this case [three black minims against two white ones] the notes are counted as three-part, but measured off as only two-part. Thus the first two are worth a half tactus, and the third by itself is also worth a half tactus”.

I maintain that this is exactly what the Italians were saying since 1553. It is futile to argue that Zarlino distinguished between “della” and “nella”; he might also have used “alla”, as we shall see in the following quotations describing the relation of the three notes of sesquialtera (or hemiola) to an equal tactus:

- Lusitano (1553): “le due si metterano nella prima testa, & una nella seconda”
 Zarlino (1558): “due si pongono della Positione & uno nella Levatione”
 Tigrini (1588): “due si metteranno nella positione, & una nella levatione”
 Pisa (1611): “due si metteranno nel descendere & una nell’ascendere”
 “due vanno nell’abbassare della mano, & una nel levare”
 Picerli (1630): “dando similmente due note alla prima, un’altr’alla seconda parte della battuta”
 Lorente (1672): “dos Semibreves al dar del compas y uno al alçar”

While none of these writers illustrates a resolution as do Agricola (1532), Quitschreiber (1607), Vulpius (1608), Beringer (1610), Elsmann (1619), Gengenbach (1626), Hase (1657), and Trümper (1668), it is quite obvious that the Italians agree with the Germans. Had one of the Italians written “la terza nel mezzo della seconda” or something similar, then there would be something to argue about. When we add to these theorists Bourgeois (1550) and the Portuguese Lorente (1672), whose examples and explanations are all about 16th-century *prima prattica*, then the practice of resolving sesquialtera and hemiola appears to be international. Therefore, I conclude that I am not dealing with a well-defined national school, and I would further say that the mainstream is not Italian but rather Netherlandish.

Now, with reference to 17th- and 18th-century instrumental music, I do not conclude on the basis of quotations from Mattheson and Printz that resolutions also apply in the Baroque period. I merely add them to the aforementioned theorists in order to construct a hypothesis for Baroque practice. Since no theorists before 1750 actually mention dotted figures or pairs of eighth-notes in conjunction with eighth-note triplets, I have examined the music in the light of my hypothesis. Briefly, the hypothesis is that the 16th-century rules for the resolution of sesquialtera, hemiola, and coloration are to be applied to lower note levels in the 17th and 18th centuries. I was greatly encouraged by the fact that the subtraction of one-fourth and one-half respectively in the resolution of the trochaic figure (♩, ♩ = ♩, ♩), advocated by virtually all 16th-century theorists, exactly conforms to the difference between the trochaic triplet and the dotted figure (♩³ = ♩). Variants found even in one and the same autograph further supported the hypothesis that triplets were occasionally resolved into binary figures.

Mr. Hills has given us a completely unsupported hypothesis as a statement of fact when he asserts that the “‘Italian style’ is real triplets against duplets”. In the light of common sense and Marpurg, would anyone claim this for the giges of Corelli? To this I must add that the only writer I know ever

to have expressly forbidden the use in composition of triplets against duplets was the Italian Giannantonio Banner, Maestro di Cappella in Padova, in his *Compendio musico* of 1745.

The real reason for rewriting the piece by Zannetti seems to have been overlooked by Mr. Hills. It has nothing to do with Brossard or Walther, but with the nature of the piece itself. It is labelled a Corrente, and one might expect it would be in triplet meter like other correntes, but it is duple on every level. Yet it bears in every part the sign 3 of triple meter. I conclude, therefore, that the sign is an indication that the piece is actually ternary.

I heartily agree with Mr. Hills that the definitive work on performing 17th-century triplets is still to be written. I submit that it is not a refinement of method that is needed, but more information, from treatises or from the music itself. Should anyone be able to supply me with such evidence, I shall be more than happy to refine my present conclusions.

University of Rochester

Donald M. Mintz—*The sketches and drafts of three of
Felix Mendelssohn's major works*

Ann Arbor; University Microfilms (UM order no. 61-16),
1960. (Vol. I, 497 pp. text; Vol. II, 151 pp. music, Cornell
University diss.)

Arnold Salop

As the title indicates, this dissertation consists of a study of early drafts of three well-known works by Felix Mendelssohn: *Elijah*, the D Minor Trio, Op. 49, and the A Major Symphony, Op. 90. Thanks to a Fulbright, Dr. Mintz was given the opportunity to visit the Deutsche Staatsbibliothek in Berlin and examine the volumes of the Mendelssohn Nachlass containing these drafts. His findings are reported here.

Dr. Mintz goes about his task by first discussing any matters of background that seem relevant to the work or movement in question, then describing in more or less detail the published versions of the various movements—i.e. those of the Breitkopf & Härtel Gesamtausgabe (GA), and finally drawing comparisons with the versions found in draft form (MS). In doing this, Professor Mintz demonstrates complete familiarity with the pertinent literature, with the versions of these works contained in the GA, and also presumably with those of the MS—I say presumably because only isolated passages of the early drafts are presented as musical examples. Indeed, he has demonstrated something more than mere familiarity; he has gone into these works in their various versions with a fine-toothed comb. He has studied what makes them tick motivically, thematically, harmonically, and dramatically, and has applied this knowledge, and that gained from comparing the versions, to the