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Source: Basel, Universitätsbibliothek, KK III 23a, fol. A3r
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1.9 Peter Schöffer the Younger. Cantiones quinque vocum selectissimae (Strasbourg, 1539), vdm 44
Source: Munich, Bayerische Staatsbibliothek, Mus.pr. 48, tenor, Aa2v

2.1 Oxford, The Bodleian Libraries, Tenbury MS 389, p. 63: quarto music paper printed by the ‘integral-staff’ method, as issued under the terms of the Tallis-Byrd licence of 1575–1596
Reproduced by permission of The Bodleian Libraries, Oxford
2.2 Blank staves printed using the cast-type method, as found in Thomas Tallis and William Byrd, *Cantiones quae ab argumento sacrae vocantur* (London: Thomas Vautrollier, 1575; RISM 15753), Bassus, sig. H1v; reproduced from Oxford, Christ Church, Mus. 983 Reproduced by permission of the Dean and Chapter of Christ Church, Oxford

2.3 Tenor of anon., *O mater nostra* Source: Munich, Bayerische Staatsbibliothek, Mus. MS 1503b, no. 15, Tenor partbook, fol. 14

2.4 A page of Paper X Source: Munich, Bayerische Staatsbibliothek, Mus. MS 1508, Cantus partbook, fol. 47

2.5 Paper Z2 Source: Munich, Bayerische Staatsbibliothek, Mus. MS 1508, Quinta Pars partbook, fol. 23

2.6 Quintus liber mottetorum ad quinque et sex et septem vocum (Lyons: Jacques Moderne, RISM 15423), Altus partbook, p. 26

2.7 *Le cincquesme livre contenant trente et deux chansons a cinq et a six parties* (Antwerp: Tylman Susato, RISM 154413), Contratenor partbook, fol. 6

3.1 *Ordnung des Herren Nachtmal* (Strasbourg: Johann Schwan, 1525), vdm 247, fol. A7

3.2 *Psalter: das seindt alle Psalmen Davids* (Strasbourg: Wolfgang Köpfel, 1538), vdm 457, fol. [α]1

4.1 Konrad Celtis and Petrus Tritonius, *Melopoiae* (Augsburg: Erhard Oeglin, 1507), vdm 55, fol. 1

4.2 Konrad Celtis and Petrus Tritonius, *Melopoiae* (Augsburg: Erhard Oeglin, 1507), vdm 55, fol. 9

4.3 Konrad Celtis and Petrus Tritonius, *Melopoiae* (Augsburg: Erhard Oeglin, 1507), vdm 55, fol. 2

4.4 Konrad Celtis and Petrus Tritonius, *Melopoiae* (Augsburg: Erhard Oeglin, 1507), vdm 55, fol. 3

4.5 Konrad Celtis and Petrus Tritonius, *Melopoiae* (Augsburg: Erhard Oeglin, 1507), vdm 55, fol. 4

4.6 Konrad Celtis and Petrus Tritonius, *Melopoiae* (Augsburg: Erhard Oeglin, 1507), vdm 55, fol. 2
5.1 Title page of discantus partbook from Rhau’s *Symphoniae iucundae atque adeo breves* (vdm 40)
Source: Munich, Bayerische Staatsbibliothek, Mus.pr. 12

5.2 Title page of tenor partbook from Rhau’s *Sacrorum hymnorum liber primus* (vdm 1024)
Source: Munich, Bayerische Staatsbibliothek, Mus.pr. 9590

5.3 Title page of tenor partbook from Rhau’s *Magnificat octo modorum* (vdm 1028)
Source: Munich, Bayerische Staatsbibliothek, 4 Mus.pr. 175#Beibd.1

5.4 Title page of tenor partbook from Rhau’s *Officiorum de Nativitate* (vdm 1035)
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6.1 Comparison between Josquin, *Basiés-moy* in *Canti B*, fol. 38r and Petrus Roselli, *Missa Baisez-moy* in Rhau 1541: Sanctus, discantus (fol. 197v) and tenor parts (fol. 147r)
Sources: Paris, Bibliothèque nationale de France, Rés 539 (Canti B); Kassel, Landesbibliothek und Murhardsche Bibliothek der Stadt, 4° Mus. 63/1 (Rhau 1541)

6.2 Kyrie, discantus, from Petrus Roselli, *Missa Baisez-moy* in Antico 1516, fol. 140r (left) and Rhau 1541, fol. 195r (detail, right)
Sources: London, British Library K.9.a.12 (Antico 1516); Kassel, Landesbibliothek und Murhardsche Bibliothek der Stadt, 4° Mus. 63/1 (Rhau 1541)

6.3 Gloria, discantus, from Petrus Roselli, *Missa Baisez moy* in Antico 1516, fol. 141r (left) and Rhau 1541, fol. 195r (right)
Sources: London, British Library K.9.a.12 (Antico 1516); Kassel, Landesbibliothek und Murhardsche Bibliothek der Stadt, 4° Mus. 63/1 (Rhau 1541)

6.4 Kyrie, discantus, from Petrus Roselli, *Missa Baisez moy* in Rhau 1541, fol. 195r–v (left) and Gotha A.98, fol. 288v, with framed out variant at the end of Kyrie II
Sources: Kassel, Landesbibliothek und Murhardsche Bibliothek der Stadt, 4° Mus. 63/1 (Rhau 1541); Gotha, Forschungsbibliothek Gotha, Schloss Friedenstein, Chart. A.98 (Gotha A.98)

6.5 Et expecto, bassus, from Petrus Roselli, *Missa Baisez moy* in Antico 1516, fol. 145r (left) and Rhau 1541, fol. 186r, with framed out ligature variant
Sources: London, British Library, K.9.a.12 (Antico 1516); Kassel, Landesbibliothek und Murhardsche Bibliothek der Stadt, 4° Mus. 63/1 (Rhau 1541)
6.6 Crucifixus (detail), discantus, from Antoine Brumel, Credo of the *Missa De beata virgine* replacing the Credo of Adam Rener, *Missa Dominicalis* in Rhau 1541, fol. 212v (left) and the same place in Antico 1516, fol. 12v (right).
Sources: Kassel, Landesbibliothek und Murhardsche Bibliothek der Stadt, 4° Mus. 63/1 (Rhau 1541); London, British Library, K.9.a.12 (Antico 1516).

6.7 Crucifixus (detail), tenor, from Antoine Brumel, Credo of the *Missa De beata virgine* replacing the Credo of Adam Rener, *Missa Dominicalis* in Rhau 1541, fol. 202v (left) and the same place in Capp. Sist. 16, fol. 14v (right).
Sources: Kassel, Landesbibliothek und Murhardsche Bibliothek der Stadt, 4° Mus. 63/1 (Rhau 1541); Rome, Biblioteca Apostolica Vaticana, MS Cappella Sistina 16 (Capp. Sist. 16).

6.8 Kyrie (detail), discantus, from Ludwig Senfl, *Missa Nisi Dominus* in Rhau 1541, fol. 176v (left) and Gotha A.98, fol. 302v.
Sources: Kassel, Landesbibliothek und Murhardsche Bibliothek der Stadt, 4° Mus. 63/1 (Rhau 1541); Gotha, Forschungsbibliothek Gotha, Schloss Friedenstein, Chart. A.98 (Gotha A.98).

7.1 Examples of title pages
(a) A(i) 1553: *Liber quintus ecclesiasticarum cantionum quinque vocum … Quinta Pars* (Antwerp: Susato, 1553).
Source: Universitätsbibliothek Kassel, Landesbibliothek und Murhardsche Bibliothek der Stadt Kassel, 4° Mus. 107[2]
(b) B(i) 1555: *Liber undecimus ecclesiasticarum cantionum quinque vocum … Superior* (Antwerp: Susato, 1555).
Source: Universitätsbibliothek Kassel, Landesbibliothek und Murhardsche Bibliothek der Stadt Kassel, 4° Mus. 107[1]
(c) B(ii) 1557: *Liber quintus ecclesiasticarum cantionum quinque vocum … Quinta Pars* (Antwerp: Susato, ’1553’ [actually 1557]).
Source: Universitätsbibliothek Kassel, Landesbibliothek und Murhardsche Bibliothek der Stadt Kassel, 4° Mus. 107[5]
(d) C 1558: *Liber decimus ecclesiasticarum cantionum quinque vocum … Quinta Pars* (Antwerp: Susato, ’1555’ [actually 1558]).
Source: Universitätsbibliothek Kassel, Landesbibliothek und Murhardsche Bibliothek der Stadt Kassel, 4° Mus. 107[5]

7.2 Comparison of dates in *EC* 10: *Liber decimus ecclesiasticarum cantionum quinque vocum* (Antwerp: Susato, 1555)
(a) contratenor [actually 1553].
Source: Universitätsbibliothek Kassel, Landesbibliothek und Murhardsche Bibliothek der Stadt Kassel, 4° Mus. 107[2]
(b) other voices except quinta pars (superior illustrated).
Source: Universitätsbibliothek Kassel, Landesbibliothek und Murhardsche Bibliothek der Stadt Kassel, 4° Mus. 107[1].

7.3 Index of *EC* 14, quinta pars, showing pasted slip correction in Susato’s fount: *Liber XIII ecclesiasticarum cantionum quinque vocum … Quinta Pars* (Antwerp: Susato, 1553), A1v.
Source: Uppsala University Library, Utl.vok.mus. i tr. 535–538.
7.4 Indexes of EC 5: *Liber quintus ecclesiasticarum cantionum quinque vocum ... Quinta Pars* (Antwerp: Susato, 1553)
Source: Universitätsbibliothek Kassel, Landesbibliothek und Murhardsche Bibliothek der Stadt Kassel, 4° Mus. 107[2]
(a) A(i) contratenor.
Source: Universitätsbibliothek Kassel, Landesbibliothek und Murhardsche Bibliothek der Stadt Kassel, 4° Mus. 107[2]
(b) A(ii) other voices except quinta pars (bassus illustrated).

7.5 Example of type transferred from EC 3δ to EC 14γ: *Liber XIII ecclesiasticarum cantionum quinque vocum ... Superior* (Antwerp: Susato, 1553), A1r
Source: Uppsala University Library, Utl.vok.mus. i tr. 535–538

7.6 Wear on ornamental initials
Source: Munich, Bayerische Staatsbibliothek, 4 Mus.pr. 201
Ai. TS 11: *L’unziesme livre contenant vingt & neuf chansons amoureuses à quatre parties* (Antwerp: Susato, 1549), tenor, B3r.
Aii. TS 2β: *Le second livre des chansons à quatre parties* (Antwerp: Susato, ‘1544’ [actually c. 1553]), superius, B3r.
Aiii. TS 2β: *Le second livre des chansons à quatre parties* (Antwerp: Susato, ‘1544’ [actually c. 1553]), bassus, B3r.
Bi. TS 11: *L’unziesme livre contenant vingt & neuf Chansons amoureuses à quatre parties* (Antwerp: Susato, 1549), superius, A4r.

7.7 Title page of TS 3β showing the extensive use of pica italic: *Le tiers livre de chansons a quatre parties* (Antwerp: Susato, ‘1544’ [actually c. 1553]), superius, A1r
Source: Munich, Bayerische Staatsbibliothek, 4 Mus.pr. 201

7.8 Comparison of ornamental initials between TS 4β and TS 14 of 1555
(a) TS 4β: *Le quatriesme livre des chansons à quatre parties* (Antwerp: Susato, ‘1544’ [actually c. 1555]), tenor, A2r.
Source: Munich, Bayerische Staatsbibliothek, 4 Mus.pr. 201
(b) TS 14: *Le quatroirsiesme livre à quatre parties* (Antwerp: Susato, 1555), tenor, A2r.
Source: Munich, Bayerische Staatsbibliothek, 4 Mus.pr. 135

8.1 Editions printed by Heirs of Phalèse in Antwerp, 1629–1675

9.1 Draft of imperial privilege to Philipp de Ohr for Latin motets of Hieronymus Praetorius, 20 August 1603, amended for subsequent privilege to Georg Frobenius
Source: Vienna, Haus-, Hof- und Staatsarchiv, RHR, Impressoria, 21-32, fol. 231r
9.2  General imperial privilege to Adam Berg as printed in Orlande de Lassus, *Patrocinium musices* (Munich: Adam Berg, 1573)  
Source: Munich, Bayerische Staatsbibliothek, 2 Mus.pr. 11–1

Source: Hanover, Gottfried Wilhelm Leibniz Bibliothek, K-A 7050

Source: Hanover, Gottfried Wilhelm Leibniz Bibliothek, K-A 7050

Source: Hanover, Gottfried Wilhelm Leibniz Bibliothek, K-A 7050

12.1  Total sales by destination for all choirbooks published by the Officina Plantiniana, 1578–1600  
12.2  Sales by destination of La Hèle’s *Octo missae*, 1578–1600  
12.3  Total sales by destination for all partbooks published by the Officina Plantiniana, 1578–1600  
12.4  Customers for Plantin’s choirbook publications, 1578–1600  
12.5  Profession of customers for Plantin’s partbook publications, 1578–1600  
12.6  Plantin’s partbook publications sales by year, 1578–1600  
12.7  Plantin’s choirbook publications sales by year, 1578–1600  
12.8  Destination of non-Officina Plantiniana music publications, 1578–1600  
12.9  Origin of Plantin’s purchases of music publications not published by the Officina Plantiniana, 1578–1600

13.1  *Processionarium ordinis fratrum praedicatorum* (Seville: Ungut and Polonus, 1494), fol. d1r  
Source: Madrid, Biblioteca Nacional de España. Inc/1268

13.2  Juan Bermudo, *Comiença el libro llamada declaración de instrumentos musicales* (Osuna: Juan de León, 1555), fol. lxxxiiijv  
Source: New York, Hispanic Society of America (no shelfmark)

13.3  Miguel de Fuenllana, *Libro de musica para vihuela, intitulado Orphenica lyra* (Seville: Martín de Montesdoca, 1554), fol. xxv  
Source: Wien, Österreichische Nationalbibliothek, SA.76.A.56

13.4  Francisco Guerrero, *Sacrae cantiones, vulgo moteta nuncupate quinque vocum* (Seville: Martín de Montesdoca, 1555), Tenor, fol. 1v  
Source: New York, Hispanic Society of America (no shelfmark)

13.5  Juan Vásquez, *Villancicos i canciones* (Osuna: Juan de León, 1551), Baxo, colophon  
Source: Palma de Mallorca, Biblioteca Bartolomé March, B88-A-25
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5.1  Beginning of Walter’s setting of Psalm 119, from *Johann Walter, Sämtliche Werke*, vol. 5, edited by Max Schneider (Kassel: Bärenreiter, 1961), 3
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Details, details

We begin with an asterisk. Sit down at your computer, open a window in your web browser and go to www.vdm.sbg.ac.at, the Verzeichnis deutscher Musikfrühdrucke database. Now type in a search term. Given my current scholarly interests in the geographical reach of the French chanson, my first search on the vdm database was for Clément Janequin. Joy! Up popped three anthologies in which Janequin’s name appears:

- Sigmund Salminger, ed., Selectissimae necnon familiarissimae cantiones (Augsburg: Melchior Kriegstein, 1540)
- Trium vocum cantiones centum (Nuremberg: Johann Petreius, 1541)

Drilling down into the details of the Selectissimae necnon familiarissimae cantiones brought up the page shown in Figure I.1, and near the end of the entry, following identifications of the typographic materials, a bibliographic description, list of composers and information about the book design, with accompanying illustrations to the right, stands a list of surviving copies, each linked to individual descriptions that contain further details of provenance, bindings and – where relevant – other items bound with the title in tract volumes.

Here are the asterisks, small and discreet, easy to miss if you rush onward into the pages with detailed descriptions of each surviving copy: *A-Wn, *D-Mbs, *D-Ngm, *D-W. These stars merit our attention, for each represents the work of a scholar who examined a copy of the Selectissimae necnon familiarissimae cantiones. Creating this entry involved consulting books in Vienna, Munich, Nuremberg and Wolfenbüttel to refine the rudimentary information available in RISM. Globally, the results are significant: the vdm adds almost hundred new editions to our knowledge of music printing before 1550, and adds many exemplars to those cited in RISM.

Like footnotes, endnotes, stars and daggers, these asterisks reference a backstory: bibliographers verified the status of every known copy of the Selectissimae necnon familiarissimae cantiones, selected one, A-Wn SA.78.F.32, as the ‘autopsy’ copy, and described it with forensic precision. This insistence on providing detailed descriptions of individual book copies represents a sea change by comparison with RISM, one that merits pausing for reflection, for it marks a radically new attitude towards descriptive bibliography itself. Back when RISM was launched in the 1950s, the library sigla that accompanied each entry were a blunt tool that allowed scholars to know where to request a microfilm or how to
plan a summer research trip. They mapped potential research trajectories in a most practical way, and I certainly remember following their leads back in the day to the British Museum, Bibliothèque nationale de France or the Museo Civico di Bologna, where I spent warm hours in unclimatised reading rooms scoring up chansons.

But the impression given by RISM, and precisely what the vdm so effectively dispels, is that individual book copies are largely the same. From the vdm, hidden editions emerge, new titles are discoverable in tract volumes, and the connectedness of surviving books to one another can be charted with astonishing results. Patterns of dissemination, ownership and survival come into focus, and the material histories of printed books begin to reveal their individuality. We need to only click down into the wealth of details and onward to the digital facsimiles linked to the vdm database.

The essays in this volume chart the research trajectories that emerge from next-generation resources like the vdm and the extraordinary digitisation projects that are giving scholars direct access to high-resolution scans of music books. Their critical approaches privilege strains of material history more familiar to musicologists from manuscript studies, and the results bring into focus a number of falsehoods about early printed books that originated in historiographic oppositions between manuscript and printed production, which characterised manuscripts as singular and unique and printed books as mass produced and
standardised. By subjecting surviving copies of printed music books to the same detailed scrutiny traditionally reserved for music manuscripts, these essays reveal some startling corrections that — taken together — suggest that musicologists have underestimated numbers of reeditions, overestimated the scope of distribution and misjudged the extent to which printing standardised musical repertories. These essays consistently draw attention to the fragility of music printing in ways that depend on a deep appreciation of the physical labour of the print shop; the intractability of lead, paper, vellum, leather and wood; and the profound dialectics of value and valuation that can be recovered from sustained consideration of reprints, survival rates, privileges, capital investment and readers. In sum, they put descriptive bibliography into dialogue with philosophies, ideologies and myths of printing and print culture.

This introduction takes the disciplinary exchanges between descriptive bibliography and histories of ‘print culture’ as a point of orientation. In doing so, my aim has been to show how this volume both contributes to broader debates and moves beyond them. Certainly the fields of descriptive bibliography and cultural history have been intertwined since the emergence of book history and studies of ‘print culture’ in the 1980s: Donald F. McKenzie’s field-defining Bibliography and the Sociology of Texts (1985) worked to show how ‘the material form of books, the non-verbal elements of the typographic notations within them, [and] the very disposition of space itself’ have an expressive function in conveying meaning that cannot be set aside by textual critics and literary historians.1 In 1994, Roger Chartier famously followed up with the daring proclamation that ‘There is no text apart from the physical support that offers it for reading (or hearing)’.2 In these studies and those that took up their calls, descriptive bibliography and histories of print and printing were mobilised in new, more densely social and cultural accounts of objects and oeuvres. At the same time, some bibliographers resisted the claims of book historians, seeing in them the same celebratory rhetoric that had surrounded printing from its very inception.

These broad debates continue to polarise scholarship, and I address them in two steps. In the following section, I explore the ‘Myths of Mass Communication’ cited by critics of book history, and elucidate the ways this volume characterises the new readerships generated by the commercial production of printed music. What emerges from the studies collected here is a fine-grained appreciation of the factors that conjoined to limit production and dissemination. Our authors reveal the extent to which music printing was local and relatively small in scale, something addressed in the section on ‘Materialities’, which considers the immobility of printed matter and physical obstacles to cultural transfer. This is not to say, however, that printing had no effect at all on repertorial circulation and consumption. A third and final section, ‘Mobilities’, zooms back out to consider with fresh eyes the cultural reach of printed music and its distinctiveness as a driver of changing tastes. What becomes clear from this overview is the deftness with which the contributions to Early Printed Music and Material Culture in Central and Western Europe build on musicology’s strengths in source studies even as they stake out new histories that move beyond the polarities evident in other fields between descriptive bibliography and cultural histories of the book.

Myths of mass communication

Printing has long been taken as a prime medium of cultural transmission, a technology perfectly designed to circulate knowledge, beliefs and cultural forms like literature and music. The Renaissance recovery of classical texts, the Reformation and the Scientific Revolution: no discussion of these movements is complete without some account of printing.
Sociologies of print like the ‘communications circuit’ first modelled by Robert Darnton and subsequently enhanced by Thomas Adams and Nicolas Barker worked to capture the dynamics of accelerating cycles of production and consumption with strong implications for increasing literacy, readerships and territorial expansion, and a generation of scholars has avidly followed these methodological leads.3

The corollary, often asserted rather than argued, is that print was a ‘mass medium’ and international in scale. Even credible scholars quickly fall victim to startling claims that printed books allowed for transparent communication across time, space and cultures, cohering communities of faceless masses into publics and nations.4 In *The Gutenberg Galaxy: The Making of Typographic Man* (1962), Marshall McLuhan famously proclaimed that print staged the rise of modern nationalism by centralising the use of language.5 Inspired by McLuhan’s media theories, Elizabeth Eisenstein subsequently described what she called a ‘communications shift’ ‘encompassing the entire world’ in her landmark study *The Printing Press as an Agent of Change: Communications and Cultural Transformations in Early Modern Europe* (1979).6

Fact can swiftly be left behind when the subject turns to the cultures that coalesced around print: in *Imagined Communities: Reflections on the Origin and Spread of Nationalism* (1985), Benedict Anderson depicted printing as international and presses operating on a ‘colossal scale’ that ‘saturated’ European publics with books and newspapers: the ‘spread’ of his title depended on print.7 Yet studies like *Imagined Communities* hardly theorise the mobility on which their explanations depend. Production and distribution are a free-for-all, in which printed sheets fly like magic carpets transmitting knowledge and culture unimpeded to all corners of the globe. Or to use a more modern metaphor, print is likened to broadcast television, beamed directly into households, cafés and bars with the flick of a switch. These triumphant narratives are gratifying to repeat, but they have the pernicious effect of naturalising the relationship between printing and cultural mobility, obscuring the fragility of the new technology and the limits of its cultural reach.

Intoxicating as they are, histories like Anderson’s are difficult to square with the evidence of source materials. Those who dirty their hands working with early books rarely buy into such bold rhetoric, and outside of musicology, bibliographers – who specialise in the particular – have proved staunch critics of big media theories. In his scathing book, *The Myth of Print Culture: Essays on Evidence, Textuality, and Bibliographic Method* (2003), Joseph Dane argued that Lucien Febvre and Henri-Jean Martin grossly overestimated print-runs and numbers of editions in *L’apparition du livre*, thereby inciting generations of hyperbolic claims of a print revolution that swept Europe.8

As musicologists well know, printing made no sense for entire genres such as opera and orchestral repertoire, even into the era of lithography. The partbooks examined by John Milsom in his chapter on printed music papers vividly illustrate the persistence of manuscript production in the letterpress era, and their mongrel form – part manuscript, part print – attests to the convenience of copying music in numerous circumstances. The slow pace at which polyphonic music printing evolved, lagging half a century beyond Gutenberg’s invention, shows the resistance of polyphonic repertoire to popularisation before around 1540, when the market for all sorts of printed recreational materials finally began to gain ground.9 Even so, in the chapter that closes this volume, Iain Fenlon elucidates the economic, social and geographic pressures that prevented music printing from succeeding in sixteenth-century Seville, where printers struggled to survive crises like paper shortages and printing errors in the books witness the stressful circumstances of their production.
Negative histories such as Fenlon’s set important boundaries, forcing into view the localness of printed production and the limits of dissemination in ways that contradict the astronomical rhetoric that made McLuhan’s galactic characterisation of Gutenberg’s invention such a bestseller in the age of Sputnik and the Apollo space programme. Numerous studies in this volume effectively restrict the claims that can be made for the cultural reach of print even as they stake it out: Moritz Kelber’s study of Georg Rhau’s presses in Wittenberg shows Rhau authorising his books as explicitly Lutheran by including prefaces by Martin Luther and Philipp Melanchthon, emblazoning them with Electoral Saxon devices, and – after 1542 – decorating the title pages with emblems of the reformers. Unlike southerly printers in Augsburg and Nuremberg, who served mixed audiences of Catholics and Protestants, Rhau laid claim to the special status of Wittenberg even as he limited the market for his books, despite the cross-confessional nature of the repertoire. In her chapter on distribution of music printed by the Officina Plantiniana in Antwerp, Louisa Hunter-Bradley provides a stark, data-rich analysis of the musical output of Christophe Plantin’s press that reveals just how few book copies entered distribution networks designed to reach distant markets. For Plantin’s super-sized choirbooks, such as the Octo Missae (1578) of George de La Hèle, initial sales might be quite feeble: just three dozen for the Octo Missae, and this despite the glorious typography, with newly cut fonts, and heavy marketing with printed posters advertising the publication sent to Paris to boost sales. Booksellers near Plantin’s press tended to take just two or three copies of even the most marketable sets of partbooks for resale in their shops, and major shipments went directly to Frankfurt for the book fair. Mapping the data title per title can account for a significant share of book copies in ways that contradict claims of mass dissemination to avid consumers across Europe and the world.

Outside of musicology, analogous studies rooted in descriptive bibliography, archival research and economic history have been used to shut down cultural histories of the book, but we should be wary of pitting bibliography against the cultural studies it can support. Indeed, critiques objecting to cultural studies of print have been advanced virtually as long as the studies they decry: Elizabeth Eisenstein’s Agent of Change received repeated drubbings, even recently, and Joseph Dane followed up on The Myth of Print Culture with further salvos in his Blind Impressions: Methods and Mythologies in Book History (2013). There he argues that book history is entirely self-referential and even egotistical:

As bibliographers or book historians, we perform our work by changing the function of the objects we study. We rarely pick up an Aldine edition to read one of the classical texts it contains. No one reads the Bible in Gutenberg’s version [...] and no one learns Latin by reading Donatus. Print culture, under this notion, is not a medium for writing or thought but a historical object of study; our bibliographical field, our own concoction, becomes the true referent of the objects we define as its foundation.

[...] The privileged beings in these histories are not those who produced the textual and bibliographical material (book-makers and writers), the privileged beings are bibliographers, particularly contemporary ones, and most specifically ourselves. Book history? It is us.

The oppositional and quasi-personal tone of such attacks may, in themselves, explain much about musicology’s relative disengagement from these debates, which are ageing quickly and invite more judicious interventions of the sort collected here, which employ methodologies adopted liberally from an array of fields, depending on the books and book cultures under consideration.
Dane, we should note, writes from a position of disciplinary privilege rarely enjoyed by music bibliographers. He might be ‘picking up’ an Aldine edition, Gutenberg Bible or a Shakespeare folio (another of his examples), but musicologists are often lucky just to find one complete set of flimsy sixteenth-century partbooks remaining from an entire edition. If anything, the survival rates for printed books of music align sooner with riff-raff books of lyric poetry and chivalric romances than they do with the collectable tomes Dane considers natural examples for his arguments about scholarly self-absorption.

For instance, the Aldine press printed 1,030 copies of Baldassare Castiglione’s *Cortegiano* in royal folio, of which 147 copies survive, and recent censuses register 228 extant copies of the Shakespeare first folio of 1623 to survive from a print-run of 750.13 The survival rates for those editions are 14% and 31% respectively. Yet compare these figures to the dismal survival rate of Andrea Antico’s royal-sized folio choirbook, the *Liber quindecim missarum* (Rome, 1516), which was issued in 1,008 copies. According to RISM, only seventeen survive complete. That gives a survival rate of 1.6%. And, as Royston Gustavson shows in his chapter, such comparatively buoyant rates of survival diminish rapidly once the books become smaller, both in terms of page size and number of leaves. My own estimates for chansonniers place survival rates well below 1%, and Tim Carter estimates that for the Italian secular music he studies, 15%–20% of titles are now lost entirely.14 In our field, the discovery – thanks to the *vdm* – of several unknown copies of music books represents far more than an infinitesimal statistical shift in census numbers: the locations of missing Tenor partbooks to Christian Egenolff’s *Cantiones vocum quatuor* [1536] and *Cantiones vocum trium* [1536] are major finds of precious unica.15 Partbooks like the one shown in Figure I.2, roughly printed in sextodecimo, are precisely those that tended to suffer the most destruction. But they were likewise the most affordable formats and most representative of the broad reach of songs like these chansons. As performance parts, music books were used hard by singers and players and used up quickly.

It is against the background of performance that the editions discovered by Martin Ham should be read. His study of the output of Tylman Susato’s press reveals second and third editions of Susato’s motet series that survive in such fragmentary states they eluded Ute

![Figure I.2](https://example.com/cantiones-vocum-quatuor-frankfurt-christian-egenolff-1536-vdm-25-discantus-fol-hh8v-source-paris-bibliothèque-nationale-de-france-res-vm7-504-1-source-gallica.bnf.fr)
Meissner’s detection when she catalogued Susato’s output. Even given his extraordinary sleuthing based on analysis of typographic materials, Ham concludes that he may still be underestimating Susato’s productivity in the 1550s, when reprints accounted for much of Susato’s activity. Maria Schildt’s study of the Phalèse press from 1629 to 1675 identifies seventy-five ghost editions, over one-third of the output now known to us today.

The trio of *Libri missarum* studied by Carlo Bosi, printed by Johann Petreius (Nuremberg, 1539), Hieronymus Formschneider (Nuremberg, 1539) and Georg Rhau (Wittenberg, 1541), all survive in fair numbers, by contrast, at least by comparison with the cases just cited. Hans Ott, who edited and published the masses printed by Formschneider, stated in his dedication that by reprinting these musical ‘monuments’, he aspired to preserve and disseminate them for posterity. The sense of urgency might have been palpable, given the date of the music: Petreius relied on a copy of a Petrucci edition from the turn of the century for some of his material, while Georg Rhau apparently had a copy of Antico’s *Liber quindecim missarum* to hand.

The upshot is that in musical repertoires, the very absence of books can point to their success: Royston Gustavson shows in his analysis of a precious Montanus & Neuber catalogue from 1560 that the correlation between the size of a book and the survival of copies is direct, with larger formats and thicker volumes that required sturdier bindings faring better than smaller books and partbooks, some of which could easily have been left in paper covers. Moreover, he posits that attrition for books in duodecimo and smaller formats was swift, beginning shortly after publication, all of which positions musicological scholarship very much on the broader side of cultural history and the new histories of reading aloud that are working to see books in action. At the most ephemeral end of the scale are occasional works like the motet celebrating the Saxon city of Annaberg discovered by Moritz Kelber, who posits that the printing of single works of polyphony in half-sheet pamphlets or on broadsides may have been more common than we realise. Calculations of cultural value in these repertoires thus need to account for the inverse relations linking survival rates to pricing, sales and consumption, even as some specific editions, like the *Melopoiae* (Augsburg, 1507) studied by Elisabeth Giselbrecht, defy generalisations.

Dane objects to the abstractions book historians often make from individual book-copies in the move from descriptive bibliography to studies of ‘print culture’, but scholars of songs like the one depicted in Figure I.2, Ninot le Petit’s *Mon amnant*, cannot justifiably ignore the critical tools cultural histories of the book can bring to the table. For vernacular genres, printed partbooks are often the only substantial material evidence that survives, fragile though it may be. Musicologists are not busy deliberating whether to read the Bible in Gutenberg’s edition or one from another press: musicologists are still working to score up any legible edition whatsoever. In musicology, primary research in descriptive bibliography has always overlapped with repertorial study and cultural history. Perhaps it is because music historians so often trek to libraries in search of that missing partbook, perhaps because music notation is such a graphic art and needs to be seen or perhaps because musicology is at a different point on the curve from literary studies when it comes to bibliographic control and editing repertoire: for whatever reason, it remains the case that scholars of early music are often de facto book historians.

One credo of the cultural histories emerging from bibliography is that books are loaded with social information, and this might be especially true for music books, given the communal performances they script and the prevalence of tract volumes that can reveal the collecting strategies of early owners. Decades ago, Natalie Zemon Davis encouraged scholars to ‘consider a printed book … a carrier of relationships’, and one study in this volume that
responds to that challenge is Elisabeth Giselbrecht’s *Rezeptionsgeschichte of the Melopoiae* (Augsburg, 1507). Taking advantage of its extraordinarily flush rate of survival – twenty-five copies in all – she elucidates what can be discerned about its publics by identifying its early owners and their interests, which ranged from collectors like Hartmann Schedel, whose copy was part of a massive library of universal subject matter, to lesser-known individuals who used their copies as a place to stash other ode settings and lyric poetry. Equally textured is Beat Föllmi’s characterisation of Strasbourg editions from the beginning of the Reformation to the end of the Interim in 1555, a period that witnessed fifty editions of sacred songbooks, many initiated by enterprising preachers. Föllmi stresses the diversity of these editions, which include German hymnbooks, rhyming French psalters and hymns of the Bohemian Brethren, the last commissioned by Katharina Zell, wife of Münster preacher Matthäus Zell. By reading their contents against local (shifting) liturgies and their target audiences, Föllmi recovers a resonant soundscape of musical devotion, evangelical preaching and spiritual singing in the city’s homes and workplaces.

**Materialities**

Investigations like the aforementioned, which tangle with questions of audience, public, marketing, pricing and reception through the optic of specific editions, local cultures and individual print houses, consistently knock up against the material pressures that constrained the establishment of presses and distribution of printed matter. When charted through critical bibliography, studies of printed matter clarify the extent to which books are rooted in the particular, deeply cultural (in the original sense of ‘culture’ as derived from the cultivation of plants) and far less of a media revolution than McLuhan would have it.

Printing is heavy business, and presses are immobile by design. Projects that map the location of printing presses with animated timelines, such as *The Atlas of Early Printing* at the University of Iowa, produce the superficial impression that printing quickly spread across Europe from its origins in Strasbourg and Mainz and its first large footholds in Cologne, Basel, Nuremberg, Augsburg, Venice, Rome, Naples and Paris, as though presses themselves were on the go. Yet the dazzling data can also be read differently, as evidence of inadequate distribution networks and the localness of production. Even the raw materials of book manufacture could not be had just anywhere in Europe. High-quality paper made from linen rags could only be produced in places with running water to power the hammers that pounded the rags into mulch, clean water to wash the mulch, and quantities of discarded clothing, preferably fine white linens. Thus, paper mills were initially concentrated in Southern climes, where linen clothing was more common (as opposed to the woollen clothing worn in Northern Europe), and likewise near large urban areas. In the sixteenth century, Venetian printers imported paper from Padua, Treviso and Friuli; most of the paper for Christophe Plantin’s presses in Antwerp came from French mills, many in Normandy and Champagne, since the paper manufactured in the Low Countries was of inferior quality (it probably contained a large proportion of hemp); and when a press was set up in Mexico City in 1540, all the raw materials came from Europe: paper, type, machines and ink. The Sevillano printers studied by Iain Fenlon imported their paper from Italy.

Type foundries, too, were fewer in number than presses, and tended to be concentrated in centres of printing, since lead type was extremely heavy, and foundries melted down broken and worn type for recasting. Even large enterprises like Plantin’s used type cast by local foundries. Some of these suppliers specialised in type design, cutting the steel
punches that were used to make the type matrices. Prominent foundries also stocked matrices of typefaces cut by others, thereby enlarging the range of types they sold. Matrices could be used for decades and were bought and sold on an international scale that is traceable through the production of individual presses. Laurent Guillo has shown, for instance, how a type first used by Petreius in Nuremberg came to be employed by music printers in Paris, Venice, Augsburg, Kraków and elsewhere in Europe. It was still being used in Stockholm as late as 1733, 200 years and 15,000 km from its point of origin. Highly coveted for its beauty, legibility and adaptability to a variety of uses, this font was used by Parisian printers for their larger oblong quarto partbooks and for the landmark publication of the Balet comique de la Royne (Paris: Le Roy & Ballard, 1582). The Le Bé type foundry in Paris, which supplied this type, persisted for centuries. One of the largest German foundries, the Egenolff-Berner-Luther type foundry in Frankfurt, was still offering sixteenth-century italics cut by the French type designer Robert Granjon in their specimen catalogue of 1745. That foundry, begun around 1555, capitalised on the success of Christian Egenolff, who expanded his printing business into a vast enterprise geared towards profit and control, including ownership of a paper mill and a strong presence at the Frankfurt book fair, which was likewise a trading post for matrices.

Egenolff’s music books certainly fell to the smallest end of the scale: editions like the Cantiones vocum quatuor depicted in Figure I.2, a rough sextodecimo reprint of chansons from Petrucci’s Canti B, were designed for quick production, swift sale and maximum profit. Unsurprisingly, Egenolff’s music fonts were not embraced by other printers: the long stems and other elements that extended beyond the rectangular body of the type were susceptible to buckling and breaking, and the staff lines were badly misaligned. Punch-cutting required true artistry and exactitude, much like gold work and jewellery-making. (It took several hours to cut a punch, and several hours more to justify the matrices to make sure that the resulting types were well aligned, and it was especially difficult to design and cut small fonts and highly inclined italics and civility types with flamboyant kerns.) The most renowned punch-cutters often had highly international careers: Robert Granjon worked in Paris, Lyons, Antwerp and finally Rome. One gets the sense that punch-cutting, which flourished around 1550, was an industry with a brief arc, and that successful artisans moved on after they exhausted opportunities in place after place. Foundries guarded their punches like original works of art, which they are, and as is evident from the selection of typefaces available on Adobe and other typesetting software, the designs of Granjon, Claude Garamond and other sixteenth-century artists have retained their place as paragons of typography even into the digital age.

Studies of music typography are gradually revealing the extraordinary mobility and longevity of some fonts, and more investigation will repay the scholars who undertake it. Iain Fenlon observes in his chapter that even major presses in Spain did not possess punches and that printers regularly shared typographical materials. These collaborative relationships among printers made special sense in the case of music printing, which was a niche endeavour; thus, it comes as a surprise that Andrea Lindmayr-Brandl failed to find evidence of such practical exchanges in her study of multiple-impression printing in German-speaking lands. Despite the concentration of music presses in cities like Augsburg, the pioneers of polyphonic music printing there worked independently, sometimes using newly created fonts for but a single edition before shelving music projects entirely. Overall, initial production was spotty and uneven in quality.

Even after music printing took firm root, obstacles continued to pertain. Leendert van der Miesen shows that even in a printing capital like Paris, which by the turn of the seventeenth
century had a venerable legacy of music printing, few options might be available to those who wished to bring music to light. The music theorist Marin Mersenne described the printing of the *Harmonie universelle* as three years of ‘very hard work’, lambasted Parisian booksellers as ‘petty tyrants’ and lamented that manuscript publication might have produced a better result. At the root of Mersenne’s problems was the royal monopoly held by the firm of Robert II Ballard (Mersenne had no other choices), yet such complaints also stand as a reminder that despite its commercial viability, single-impression typography remained relatively unsuccessful from a graphic standpoint, marred as it was by broken staff lines. For this reason, multiple-impression printing and xylography persisted throughout the sixteenth century, even after the development of copperplate engraving, which once and for all solved the problem of graphic continuity essential to music notation, but at a price.28

This overview of paper-making, punch-cutting, type foundries and design problems illustrates the production challenges faced by music printers even as it charts the international scale of the solutions required to overcome the restricted availability of paper, typographic materials and skilled craftsmen. Further weight could be added to this material history with analyses of how printers sourced vermilion to make red ink (it was dealt by spice merchants), and where foundries procured lead, tin and antimony for the casting of type, but the point should be amply clear: both local and global forces were at play in the economies of the print shop.

Material history, by paying due to the very intractability of matter, also calls attention to the ambition of those artists, pressmen and entrepreneurs who developed the new industry, the men and women whose hard work sublimated linen, metals and oily ink into printed sheets. Printing required manual, intellectual and capital investments that might take years to return a profit. These financial factors led some printers and publishers to seek privileges to protect their ventures, a subject investigated by Grantley McDonald and Stephen Rose. McDonald and Rose clarify the legal origins of printing privileges, the history of book privileges in the pre-print era and the likeness of printing privileges to patents, which were granted for new techniques for processing silk, manufacturing glassware, harnessing waterpower to operate machinery and so forth. For instance, the very first privileges awarded to music printers – those accorded to Ottaviano Petrucci and Andrea Antico by Pope Leo X – covered contrasting technologies: double-impression typography and xylography, respectively. In both of those originary cases, proprietary claims of ‘authorship’ indisputably went to those who made the books in the most literal sense, for it was the printers who sank capital, ingenuity and long labour into their manufacture, to paraphrase Antico’s own description of the effort expended in bringing the *Liber quindecim missarum* to light.29

Eventually privileges were accorded directly to composers (Orlando di Lasso is a case in point), but these were exceptions, and undue focus on them has confused the nature of privileges with more modern forms of ownership such as copyright, intellectual property and artistic product.30 Perhaps the most striking conclusion of McDonald and Rose’s chapter is that prior to 1550, printers in German-speaking lands rarely sought privileges, which were costly to obtain for their already unique goods: less than 0.5% of the editions in the *vdm* carried privileges, which should caution historians against reading much value into them in the first decades of commercial music printing.

**Mobilities**

Having begun with an asterisk, let us end with a subject usually relegated to a footnote or consigned to the obligatory list of ‘other sources’ in modern editions: the reprint. Across the
studies in this volume, the prominence of reprints is so striking as to stake out a prime area for future research: the masses of Josquin des Prez are reprinted decades after his death, arrangements of Italian madrigals are printed in Seville, and Peter Schöffer the Younger was granted a special privilege to protect the *Cantiones quinque vocum selectissimae* (Strasbourg, 1539), a book of motets he had gone to great lengths to source in Italy. Such a list, which could be multiplied, is thought-provoking in its denial of geographic and chronological boundaries. Indeed, my own search of the *vdm*, with which we began, turned up French chansons of Janequin reprinted in Augsburg and Nuremberg. Music printed at some remove from a composer’s activities has long been relegated to secondary status by editors in search of authoritative readings, and in some cases, the late appearance of a work in print has pitched it over into the ‘dubious’ column of works lists. About a third of Josquin’s chansons have been discredited for their late appearance in surviving sources, for instance, which has significantly quashed scholarship on these songs, elegant though they may be.

Repertorial studies that begin from the perspective of reprints can help us reset critical agendas: instantly, they reorient research towards reception and consumption, neatly circumventing author-centric historiography and foregrounding a considerable number of sources that newfound bibliographic control is bringing into view. Maria Schildt’s contribution to this volume exemplifies the explanatory power that can be leveraged from the second-hand stratum of derivative, knock-off and pirated repertoires. Perhaps not coincidentally, her study also brings female entrepreneurs into view, women with extensive careers like Katharina Gerlach, and others like the wife of Pierre Attaingnant, Marie Lescaloppier, who took the helm of major presses as widows. Schildt examines the output of Madeleine and Marie Phalèse (1629–1675), daughters of Pierre II Phalèse, who inherited the music printing firm from their father and ran it for forty-five years under the imprint ‘Heirs of Phalèse’. What can we make of the fact that almost half of the editions issued by the Phalèse sisters contain music by Italian composers? They are full of madrigals, canzoni amorosi, villanelle and balletti like Giovanni Giacomo Gastoldi’s best-selling collections for three (1594) and five voices (1591), which proved so popular that after reprinting them multiple times, the Phalèse sisters brought out an edition of the three-voice *Balletti* with Dutch translations of the lyrics.

The mobility of Italian repertoires and their marketability in Antwerp can help us refract generalisations about the circulation of music into valuable specifics. Read against the backdrop of what we now know about the localness of production, these apparently marginal sources bring within hearing underexplored communities of music-making: immigrants must be accounted for, resident foreigners like the Florentine, Genoese, Lombard and Luccan ‘nations’ in international centres of trade like Antwerp, and Flemish or Francophone singers who liked a madrigal or two. Soundscapes emerge as polyglot, culture as mixed. Songs allow us to listen in to the spoken environment of early modern cities, revealing the mobility of people, languages and trade. This is to say, the publics anticipated in the choices of printers were not distant and unbounded, but known and proximate.

*Repertorial mobility brings us back to the social and cultural issues with which we began, showing how musicology contributes to both sides of the debates over mass media and how printing did (or did not) internationalise communication. On the one hand, acknowledging the roots and routes of printed material confronts us with the complexity of local cultures and the movement of people, goods and song from place to place along trade*
routes, on military campaigns, to university, and in pilgrimage to holy shrines. Yet careful studies of reprinted repertoires also dial back globalisms – can we really continue to use blanket terms like ‘pan-European polyphony’? – and replace them with the pointed analyses musicologists regularly essay in the study of manuscripts, their provenance and recipients. As we dig into the pages of printed music books, we can begin to hear echoes of spoken environments elsewhere silenced in print by the rise of national languages and regulatory agencies like the Accademia della Crusca, founded in Florence in 1583, or the Académie française, founded by royal patent in 1635. In this respect, McLuhan had it right – the linguistic ideologies prompted by reactions to printing did indeed support the uniform centralising forces of modern nationalism. Likewise, the nationalistic arguments of Benedict Anderson’s *Imagined Communities* begin to take on validity when squared with Romantic ideologies of folk music and the myths of ethnic purity so foundational to modern nation-states. The studies in this volume in no way endorse the inflated rhetoric of global (or galactic) communication and top-down cultural policy trumpeted by early media theorists like McLuhan and Anderson. Rather, they represent an important new history ‘from below’, one that leverages the documentary evidence of printed music books to move beyond production-end histories of composition and deepen our understanding of the people who sang, played, heard and danced to the music coming off presses in Central and Western Europe.

Notes

4 For one recent celebration of printing as stimulating early modern readers to ‘think nationally, internationally, and transnationally while leading decidedly local lives’, see the introduction to McElligott and Patten, *The Perils of Print Culture*, 2–3.
9 On the commercialisation of recreational books, including music, see Pettegree, *The Book in the Renaissance*, 151–176.
13 See, respectively, Fahy, ‘Royal Paper Copies of Aldine Editions’, and Rasmussen and West, *The Shakespeare First Folios*. The appearance of three further copies of the First Folio since Rasmussen and West’s catalogue was published in 2012 brings the total of known copies to 235.
16 For the standard catalogue of Susato’s output, see Meissner, *Der Antwerpener Notendrucker Tylman Susato*. 
17 The vdm shows: Petreius 15 (2), Formschneider 14 (2) and Rhau 2 (2) (with numbers of incomplete sets in parentheses). The typography of the Petreius and Rhau editions is particularly beautiful, with striking two-colour printing on the title-page of the Rhau and large woodblock initials throughout both editions.

18 See, most recently, the essays in Richards and Wistreich, Voicing Texts, 1500–1800.

19 This chanson is given as ‘Mon ami’ in Canti C (Venice: Petrucci, 1504). On the contents of this volume, see Bridgman, ‘Christian Egenolff’.

20 Davis, Society and Culture, 192.

21 See The Atlas of Early Printing, accessed 17 June 2018, which is based on information compiled from ISTC. See also the mapping tool for early German printed music on the homepage of vdm (https://ispacesvm38.researchstudio.at/vdm/).

22 Pettigree, The Book in the Renaissance, 17. For a map of paper mills in Europe to 1500, see The Atlas of Early Printing, and for an excellent account of the manufacturing process before 1800, see Barrett, ‘European Papermaking Techniques, 1300–1800’, also hosted by the University of Iowa (accessed 17 June 2018).

23 On Venice, see Bernstein, Print Culture and Music in Sixteenth-Century Venice, 34–35; on Plantin, see Voet, Golden Compasses, 2: 22–32, and on Mexico City see Pettigree, The Book in the Renaissance, 266.

24 Guillo, “‘Made in Germany’”, type 4.


27 See Kmetz, ‘The Music Books of Christian Egenolff’, which analyses Egenolff’s output from the financial perspective. Also see Stallybrass, ‘Little Jobs’, which argues that the lucrative printing of pamphlets and broadsides enabled presses to produce costly editions such as Plantin’s polyglot Bible.

28 For some mid-century examples of double-impression music printing and the continued use of woodblocks, particularly in psalters, see van Orden, ‘Robert Granjon and Music’, 31 note 24.

29 See van Orden, Music, Authorship, and the Book, 30–38, with these lines from Antico’s preface at 34.


31 See, respectively, the studies in this volume by Carlo Bosi, Iain Fenlon and Grantley McDonald and Stephen Rose.
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Part I

Type
Soon after Ottaviano Petrucci started producing polyphonic music books by using a multiple-impression technique, some German printers attempted to seize a share of the same market. Music printing was still an exciting new enterprise with a yet uncertain expectation of success, and only a handful of printers took the risk of producing fonts for mensural notation. They began this new line of their business in the awareness that this product required a higher degree of technical effort and workers knowledgeable about music. In this chapter I will introduce these men, discuss the kinds of repertoire and sources they published, and describe and compare their music fonts. As a contribution to cultural material studies, I offer a type repertory of early German music fonts for printing mensural notation through multiple impression, as Mary Kay Duggan did for music incunabula and Donald W. Krummel for the single-impression technique in the same area.1

Background and overview
When German printers first used a multiple-impression process to print mensural music in 1507, the technique had already been known in German-speaking territories for decades. Starting with the Gutenberg workshop, printers produced many books with pages set in at least two colours. At this early stage, this printing practice concerned mainly liturgical books, such as missals, breviaries, psalters or agendas. Colour was used for initials, for important words on the title page and in continuous text, and for long instructional sections (rubrics), to embellish and to structure the book. Some printers even specialised in printing illustrations in many colours.2 The challenge for the pressmen was to place the paper on the tympan in such a way that the second impression in the other colour was perfectly aligned (‘in register’) with the first. The difficulty of this process is indicated by the survival of misprinted pages that were not discarded but incorporated into a book.3 It was only a small step to printing chant melodies in double-impression technique: instead of letter types, notational shapes were cast and composed like words, not in a single line but within a two-dimensional space. Black text and black notes were printed together, and in a second impression the staff in red ink and red text and initials were added (or the other way round). This was no different from the regular process for printing liturgical books, but required extra types, a careful typesetter and a knowledgeable editor or proofreader.4 In rare cases the name of the editor is indicated in the colophon.5

Nevertheless, it took about twenty years after the invention of letter-printing before the appearance of the first edition with printed chant notation in double impression, the so-called ‘Constance Gradual’.6 It took another thirty years until this technique was applied to polyphonic music in mensural notation. Before this time, we know of seventy-eight...
liturgical books printed in several cities within the German-speaking lands. Leading the list is Augsburg (26 editions, all by Erhard Ratdolt), followed by Nuremberg (10 editions), Basel (9 editions), Würzburg (6), Strasbourg and Bamberg (4), Leipzig and Speyer (3), Vienna and Lübeck (2). It is remarkable that Mainz, the cradle of printing, is not represented in this list. Obviously music printing was not part of the agenda of the workshops of this town.

Although one might expect that the development of polyphonic music printing should have started in workshops experienced in printing chant notation, this was not the case. Figure 1.1 provides an overview of all seven printers who pioneered this new business, arranged chronologically by the date of their first polyphonic edition, from Mewes to Ruff. Their output within the period 1507–1539 is indicated on a horizontal time axis, with the places of printing added on the right or within the bar. Also here Augsburg is dominant, but Nuremberg does not appear at all. Mainz, however, is very present.

The visualisation of the production exemplifies that two groups of printers can be distinguished: ‘one-shot printers’, and those who were active over a longer period of time, namely, Erhard Oeglin, who printed five known editions between 1507 and about 1512/1513; and Peter Schöffer the Younger, who produced sixteen known editions between 1512 and 1539. Within thirty-three years, only twenty-six editions with mensural notation were produced in German-speaking lands, or – perhaps better – have survived from this area. We must remember that further editions have disappeared without trace. But even if we assume a 50% rate of loss, the number of musical editions is still quite small for this time span. However, these books cover a broad range of repertoire: masses, motets, Magnificat settings, songs, hymns and polyphonic ode settings, in many cases arranged in partbooks, but also in choirbook layout, some humanist books, a pamphlet and two broadsheets (see Appendix 1.2).

The individual printers

A start in Basel: Gregor Mewes

One of the first men who experimented with techniques to print polyphonic music was Gregor Mewes, a printer from northern Germany who worked in Basel, from 1504 at the latest, and who died in late 1516 or after. At this time, Basel was a centre of book
production, and workshops here had been printing chant in double impression since the early 1480s. As Birgit Lodes has shown, Mewes was an apprentice in the workshop of Jacob Wolff von Pforzheim, who was also active in music printing. Until then, Wolff had only printed music from woodcuts. Mewes might have profited from the fact that the networks between the Basel printers were aware of experiments with the technical challenges of production. Nevertheless, Mewes must have been an extraordinary personality, who put everything into exploring a new field and taking great financial risks when he published his only known music book in the first half of the year 1507. Mewes’ output was a set of four partbooks containing four masses by Jacob Obrecht. The books reveal little about their circumstances of origin, since they lack a colophon and a dedication.

Figure 1.2 shows one page from this book, displaying its neat music fonts, including ligatures and careful layout. In the lowest staff of the example, Mewes even extended the stem of the longa with breve rests so that it would match the length of the other note stems. A letter to the readers informs us that Mewes has worked on this exceptional work ‘summa lucubratione’, during the night (if we take his words literally). This common expression from Cicero means that the reader cannot blame the author (or, in this case, the printer) if the book is not perfect, since it is merely the product of one’s leisure hours, however diligent. Also the fact that the author of the letter mentions the printer not by his regular name – Mewes is not a surname but a northern German nickname for Bartholomäus or Matthäus (Mäus → Mewes) – indicates that it was a personal enterprise. A few years later, Mewes would have his own print shop, where he printed under his proper name Gregorius Bartholomäus. Birgit Lodes, who deduced the identity of Mewes and the date of the publication, has demonstrated that he had had no models for this experiment, neither Petrucci nor any other sources.

Furthermore, neither he nor any other printer in Basel produced any known edition of polyphony. It looks to me like a masterstroke, a personal satisfaction for the printer who

Figure 1.2 Gregor Mewes. *Concentus harmonici quattuor missarum* (Basel, [1507]), vdm 630, Tenor partbook.
Source: Basel, Universitätsbibliothek, KK III 23a, fol. A3r.
was able to succeed technically. But it also could have been a financial failure, since we do not know if there was a ready market for a collection of demanding polyphonic music in the area, and Mewes might have stopped printing music for this reason. In any case, it had no consequences for the development of a new line of business in the city.

**Another start in Augsburg: Erhard Oeglin**

Mewes might have been the first to print polyphonic music in German-speaking countries, but Erhard Oeglin (c. 1470–1520) claimed the credit. He, too, learnt his craft in Basel, but then moved to Augsburg, where he established a small printing workshop on his own in 1502. This imperial city was another centre of printing. Although it was not the seat of a university, it had an active intellectual and cultural life, based on the clergy and mercantile and banking families, prominently the Fuggers and Welsers, who benefited from the frequent residences and the ambitious enterprises of Emperor Maximilian I. The Augsburg printers focussed on books with woodcut illustrations and on books in the vernacular. Oeglin’s use of Hebrew type indicates his readiness to undertake capital expenditure and experimentation.18

Oeglin’s first musical edition, the *Melopoiae*, was a selection of homophonic settings of odes, mainly by Horace, set to music by Petrus Tritonius.19 It appeared in the same year as Mewes’ mass collection, 1507. The circumstances of its origin are much clearer. The edition emerged from the humanist circle around the poet Konrad Celtis and the Augsburg town clerk Conrad Peutinger, who was also a counsellor to Maximilian. This *sodalitas litteraria*, as such associations were called, supported the printers mainly by supplying reliable texts, producing paratexts – poems and letters – and correcting the proofs. The fact that the publication of the *Melopoiae* was funded by Johannes Rynmann, a successful publisher and bookseller based in Augsburg, should remind us that printing was already a business with frequently shared responsibilities, even if this was not explicitly mentioned.20 In this case the colophon pays tribute to both men: to Oeglin for his practical ingenuity and diligence, and to Rynmann for his funding. In the passage following the colophon, Oeglin is also praised as the first German who used metal types for printing (polyphonic) music:

**Impressum Augusta uindelicorum ingenio & industria Erhardi Oglin**

**Expensis Ioannis Riman alias de canna et Oringen**

Ad Erhardum Oglin impressorem

Inter germanos nostros fuit Oglin Erhardus

Qui primus intidas [sc. nitidas] pressit in æris notas

Primus et hic lyricas expressit carmine musas

Quatuor et docuit uocibus ære cani21

[poem:] To the printer Erhard Oeglin: Among us Germans it was Erhard Oeglin who first pressed shimmering notes in metal. He was also the first to print lyric poems in song and to teach us to sing in four voices from a printed book.

The layout of the book is adopted from a sacred choirbook, but in a small folio format, with all four parts arranged on one opening (see Figure 1.3, first opening of the music section). Compared with the regular sacred repertoire that is usually allocated on the two pages, the ode settings are quite short. As a consequence, the parts of two or three settings are placed
underneath each other so that the impression is a bit confusing. One might think that one was reading a composition for double choir with two (or three) parts for each voice.\textsuperscript{22}

Presumably as a reaction against such an unsatisfactory mise-en-page, Oeglin changed the format when he published a second and corrected edition in the same year. Here he used quarto format and placed one setting on each opening, which made more sense to users. When he printed two collections with German songs in sexto and octavo five years later, he reduced the size of the book again. (The repertoire of the two song books in vernacular language fit well into the general Augsburg printing programme.) The print in the small pocket size is in octavo oblong format and splits the voices into individual partbooks (see Figure 1.4, p. 24). As a consequence of this shrinking of format, the music notation, which was originally designed for a book in folio format, appears rather oversized for a songbook, especially for the book printed in oblong octavo format, in which the pages are quite tightly packed.

Besides the \textit{Melopoiae}, \textit{Harmonie} and the two songbooks, the only other surviving edition from Oeglin’s press is a broadsheet with a hymn melody. Oeglin might have planned to print even more polyphonic books to make the most of the specially produced font, but he soon had problems with the court: in 1513 he lost his title as an imperial printer when he was banished from the city. The reasons are unclear, but judging from the unusually harsh sentence, we can speculate that he might have misused the emperor’s heraldic arms to advertise his products. It was presumably through Peutinger’s intervention that Oeglin was soon allowed to return to Augsburg, but he never obtained another imperial order. Oeglin was again cautioned for printing invective works in 1520 and died shortly afterwards. The
letter types were passed on to Philipp Ulhart the Elder, another Augsburg printer, but the music types disappeared.23

More Augsburg printers: Johann Miller, Grimm and Wyrsung, Simprecht Ruff

In contrast to Mewes, Oeglin left a legacy as music printer in the city. Three other printers followed in his footsteps, all closely affiliated with the humanist network of Augsburg. Johann Miller (c. 1475–1528), who came from a rich patrician family, studied Greek and Latin at Ingolstadt and inherited a fortune from his father, may have collaborated with Oeglin for a while. His only musical edition in double impression is the humanistic treatise *Quadratum sapientiae* by Johannes Foeniseca, published in 1515. Besides the medieval ‘seven liberal arts’ (*septem artes liberales*), it contains additional chapters, covering geography, medicine, metaphysics and an introduction to Hebrew grammar. Here Foeniseca indicates the pronunciation and prosody of the language with breves and semibreves on two staff lines. Since Hebrew reads from right to left, the music also runs in this direction; the clef is located on the right end of the system, but is not mirrored. If one did that it would no longer resemble the letter F and thus lose its meaning (see Figure 1.5). Although the notation is quite simple, it involves a double-impression technique with a reduced number of types (only breves, semibreves, f-clefs and staff lines in blocks 18 mm long). That the music notes were not identical with Oeglin’s font becomes explicit when measuring them: Miller’s breves are 3.5 mm high, Oeglin’s breves 5 mm; furthermore, the clef is different (see Appendix 1.1). It seems that the music fonts were cast specifically for this edition, since they were not used in another edition which Miller printed the following year. The treatise *Musica rudimenta* by Nicolaus Faber (vdm 448) contains mensural music notation only on the title page. The short monophonic ode setting could have easily been printed from the types used for Foeniseca’s book by adding longs and fermatas. However, the music is cut in wood, while the text underlay is set in type. The page also contains an illustrative title woodcut. One might wonder why Miller, who was also active as a merchant, did not invest in enlarging his stock of music types. Was the market not yet ready for it? It may be that
he simply could not afford the investment. In 1520 he had to shut down his workshop for financial reasons, and declared bankruptcy in 1523.24

In the same year, in 1520, a much more ambitious printing project was realised. The Liber selectarum cantionum, a selection of twenty-four motets, has been studied intensively in the last ten years.25 It seems that the intellectual forces of the town were bundled into this book as an exceptional bibliophilic enterprise: Peutinger wrote a letter to the readers, Ludwig Senfl collected and edited the music, and the humanist printers Grimm and Wyrsung wrote a learned preface with a dedication to Matthäus Lang, Archbishop of Salzburg.26 Both printers also owned a pharmacy in the city. Grimm was also a municipal physician, with an interest in alchemical experiments. To print a book such as the Liber selectarum, containing more than 250 pages of music in folio, a rich font of types had to be produced: not only all musical notes, from maxima to fusa (some in two different shapes, some also in a coloured version), but also ligatures in composite and oblique forms, clefs, rests, custodes, fermatas, mensuration signs and accidentals. They were presumably cast in Grimm’s own type foundry. The size of the font is enormous: the staves are 24.5 mm high (Oeglin’s staves measure 15 mm), and a minim is 25.5 mm high (Oeglin’s is only 12 mm). Remarkable is also the great care that was taken in the proofreading, not only in correcting notes but also in the mise-en-page. The sample in Figure 1.6 shows the same page in two different copies. On the right side (b), the typesetting of the forme has been improved by spelling out Isaac’s
first name in full, by prolonging the third staff, and by placing the tacet part exactly in the middle of the page. Furthermore, several syllables in the text underlay in the lower voice have been adjusted to the music. Many such stop-press corrections occur throughout the book. The enormous effort with which this edition was produced is almost unbelievable, and it is not surprising that this workshop also went bankrupt only a few years later. The music fonts were not used again for several decades.\(^27\)

During the process of dissolving this workshop Simprecht Ruff came into play. Neither Grimm nor Wyrsung were familiar with the practical part of book production, and employed Ruff (active as printer 1517–1526) as head of the workshop. At first Ruff only gave his name in the colophons to keep the output of the press from the creditors, but from 1526 onwards he was the real owner of the workshop. In the same year, he printed a Latin grammar book, *De partium orationis inflexionibus compendium* (vdm 137) by Theobald Billianus, which includes twenty-one ode settings. This humanistic publication is assigned to Ruff on the basis of the text font and the initials. It seems to draw on Oeglin’s first editions, although the format was even smaller – *De partium orationis* is in upright octavo – and instead of breves and semibreves, semibreves and minims are used to indicate long and short syllables. The four voices, however, are also in a choirbook layout, with newly cast music fonts (see Figure 1.7). In size they correspond to Oeglin’s types; the ‘swan-neck’ custos and the g-clef also resemble those of Oeglin. However, the minim is half a space
longer, and the c-clef, open on the right side, is clearly related to that in the Liber selectarum, in which Ruff must have been involved.\textsuperscript{28}

Experimenting in Vienna: Hieronymus Vietor

East of Augsburg, the printer Hieronymus Vietor (c. 1480–1531) operated workshops in Kraków and Vienna. Vietor, born in Silesia, learnt the printing business in Kraków, transferring to Vienna in 1510, where he worked with Johann Winterburger and Johann Singriener. The former was active in liturgical music printing in double-impression technique, while the latter printed works of music theory and lute tablatures with music examples in woodblock.\textsuperscript{29} With the publication of the Cathemerinon in 1515, Vietor introduced mensural music printing in double impression to Vienna. The humanistic book in upright quarto format contains twelve hymns according to the times of the day, authored by Prudentius, a Christian poet from late antiquity. Four of the hymns are accompanied by melodies, which are displayed in two different styles: three with breves and semibreves, like Oeglin’s ode publications; and one with semibreves and minims, according to Ruff’s collection (see Figure 1.8, p. 28). The hymns were set to music by Wolfgang Grefinger, organist at St Stephan in Vienna, at the request of the Viennese humanist circle, led by Joachim Vadianus.\textsuperscript{30}

The inconsistent notational representation of the hymn settings is matched by an unconventional and unsystematic musical layout. While the voice parts are always notated in one line each, as in a modern score, their designations differ from example to example. In two cases the voice designations are placed at the beginning of the music, above the line
with the uncommon abbreviations ‘Dis’, ‘Te’, ‘Alt’, ‘Ba’, or fully written out to the left of the staff lines. In two other cases they follow the music in the right margin; once they are written out, once indicated with the initials ‘D’, ‘T’, ‘A’, ‘B’ (see Figure 1.8). The printing of the notation looks quite uneven: the shape of the f-clef of the Bassus is very simple, some final longas are crooked, and several final double bars are slightly skewed. Moreover, the staff lines are composed of shorter sections, reinforcing the unsettled character. In the heavily annotated copy from the Russian National Library at St Petersburg, the notation looks tiny. Indeed, it is much smaller than the music fonts we have seen so far: the height of the staff is only 10 mm. By contrast, Oeglin’s staff is 14 mm high, Ruff’s 15 mm, Grimm and Wyrsung’s 24 mm.

All in all, the printed music in the Cathemerinon seems somewhat experimental and unprofessional, and Vietor seems not to have followed up on this endeavour. He returned to
set up another workshop at Kraków in 1518. His brother maintained his book shop at the old Fleischmarkt, and Singriener, who had a share in the same shop, took over his typographical materials. The music font, however, was not used again.33

A third start at Mainz: Peter Schöffer the Younger

While Vietor was a geographical outlier, our last printer comes from the very centre of German book printing, from Mainz. Peter Schöffer the Younger (c. 1480–1547) was born into a family of printers. His father Peter the Elder was involved in the production of the legendary 1452 Bible from Gutenberg’s workshop, and took over the firm when Gutenberg failed. While the older brother Johann inherited the workshop, Peter Schöffer the Younger worked as a type cutter and founder until he opened his own printing shop, where he experimented with music printing. In 1512 he started his production with a tablature book named Tabulaturen etlicher Lobgesang und Lidlein uff die Orgel, und Lauten. For this collection, which also contains pieces for lute and voices, he had to cast type for early German keyboard and lute tablature, as well as for mensural notation. Schöffer was clearly aware of the high quality of the polyphonic music books from Italy and imitated Petrucci’s fonts. I have shown elsewhere that the shapes of the musical signs and their dimensions were modelled 1:1 on the products of the Italian paragon.34 Schöffer’s second publication, the songbook Quinquagena carminum (1513), was even a reprint of Petrucci’s Canti B.35

The comparably rich output over the next twenty-seven years comprises a broad repertoire: after lute and keyboard tablatures, German and French song books, polyphonic German song and hymns, a work on music theory, motets, a lament and a Magnificat collection were in his programme. Schöffer also printed Lutheran music, including three editions of the polyphonic hymn book by Johann Walter (see Appendix 1.2). The example in Figure 1.9 is a page from his last music book, a collection of motets for five voices,
including a repertoire from the cathedral of Milan. With its balance, its diligence, its perfect proportions and fine technical execution it is a magnificent example of Schöffer’s high aesthetic standards.

Moreover, Peter Schöffer the Younger seems to be the only polyphonic music printer also interested in producing liturgical music. While his brother Johann printed only empty staff lines in some of his psalters, missals and agendas, Peter was involved in printing at least three liturgical books in the second decade of the century, when his first mensural notated music books and the tablature were already out. It is unclear if these editions were printed on commission, or if they represent a second line of his business which however did not gain momentum.36

Nevertheless, there is no doubt that Peter Schöffer the Younger was the most significant music printer of his time north of the Alps. He combined the rich tradition of German printing with the new technical advances in polyphonic music printing transmitted from Venice. Like other early printers, Schöffer did not stay in one place. His sympathies for the new religious movement forced him to leave the Roman Catholic city of Mainz, settling first at Worms, and in 1529 at Strasbourg, one of the centres of the Reformation. Schöffer did not adopt the new single-impression technique for printing polyphonic music, introduced by Christian Egenolff in 1532. Consequently, his last musical editions until 1539 seem like monuments from the past, sustaining the highest quality of double impression. He sold his fonts to a printer from the Low Countries who used it for the so called ‘Kampen Songbook’ (c. 1535).37 When Schöffer finally moved to Basel – Mewes’ workplace and Oeglin’s training centre – in the early 1540s, the circle was complete and the first period of polyphonic music printing in German-speaking lands was over.

Music types and fonts

For printers who were already involved in printing literary texts, and who possessed a stock of fonts in different sizes and styles, printing musical notation in multiple impression involved an additional investment. In principle, the production of a music font and additional musical signs followed the same technical process as producing letters: the individual notational signs had to be designed, cut on a punch, stamped in a matrix, cast and justified.38 The staff lines were printed either from a series of shorter blocks containing five lines, or set from individual metal strips. Both techniques were used in printing chant in liturgical books.

Measurements and formats

The range of dimensions and aesthetics of the music types that emerged in the German-speaking area during the first three decades is striking, as shown in Table 1.1. Before we go into detail, we should discuss the problem of the measurement. Even if an electronic caliper is used to measure individual elements, certain parameters make accurate measurement difficult. First of all there are material reasons: the ink is not absorbed evenly by the moistened paper, so that staff lines or note stems are not of the same thickness throughout. Furthermore, the printed paper shrinks slightly when drying, which means that the same characters can shrink to different degrees, even if only to the extent of tenths of a millimetre. And finally, the human eye must be sharp enough to determine boundaries in the micro range with the measuring instrument. To counteract these difficulties, in the vdm project we measure the staff from the middle of the lowest line to the middle of the highest line and round all our measurements up or down to half a millimetre.
Determinative criteria for the identification of music types are the height of the staff, the length of the stems and their relationship to each other. In the chronologically arranged Table 1.1, three different basic sizes of staves can be identified. The first printers, Mewes and Oeglin, opted for a medium-sized staff, between 14 and 15 mm. While the music in the oblong quarto format of Mewes’ publication seems rather crowded, the notes for the folio format of Oeglin’s first edition, as mentioned above, are actually too small for the page (cf. Figures 1.2–1.4). Even the latest printer, Simprecht Ruff, uses a staff of 15 mm on average, but now for a work in octavo format, in which the notes appear oversized in relation to the text beneath (see Figure 1.7).

Peter Schöffer the Younger and Hieronymus Vietor preferred a medium staff size of 10 mm, which was adopted from Petrucci’s publications. As with the Italian model, both pioneers printed in quarto format for the first time. Later in his career, Schöffer preferred the somewhat smaller, almost square sexto format that Oeglin introduced with his songbook *Aus sonderer künstlicher Art* in 1512.39 Only three of Schöffer’s songbooks are in octavo format, while the two editions of Johannes Frosch’s theoretical treatise were presumably both in folio format.40

The printed works of Miller and the Grimm and Wyrsung partnership are exceptions in various respects. While Miller only needs two staff lines to depict the Hebrew melody, Grimm and Wyrsung’s collection of motets in the large choirbook format shows by far the largest dimensions of staff systems and staves. As with manuscripts of the time, in this case the page size corresponds perfectly to the staff height. The flexible arrangement of the staves and the extremely accurate typeface more closely resemble a hand-written book than most other printed ones from the time.41

In order to determine the dimension of the notational signs, the height of the minima is measured and this number is compared to the staff height. This can either be expressed numerically or determined by the naked eye by specifying the number of spaces into which the note stems are inserted. In the standardised notation pattern in use today, the stem of a note in the first interspace ends exactly with the top staff line. The types of Schöffer (and Petrucci) correspond relatively precisely to this ideal. In mathematical terms, this relation would be 1.0. The fact that Schöffer’s ratio is slightly lower (0.90) is due to the rhombic shape of the note head, which protrudes slightly above the line. Grimm and Wyrsung are

---

**Table 1.1 Measurement (height) formats in chronological order (broadsheets are not included)**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Printer</th>
<th>Measurements</th>
<th>Formats</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Staff</td>
<td>Minim</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Mewes</td>
<td>14</td>
<td>11</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Oeglin</td>
<td>15</td>
<td>12</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Schöffer</td>
<td>10</td>
<td>11</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Vietor</td>
<td>10</td>
<td>9a</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Miller</td>
<td>(3.5)b</td>
<td>–c</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Grimm &amp; Wyrung</td>
<td>24.5</td>
<td>25.5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Ruff</td>
<td>15</td>
<td>13</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

a The number is calculated in relation to the staff since the inspected copy PL-WRzno is missing the page with the ode notated in semibreves.
bHeight of two staff lines.
cBreve: 3.5 mm high.
closest to this ideal (0.96). In Vietor’s font, the stem of the note ends shortly before the top line (1.11). The stems of the notes in Ruff’s font occupy two and a half spaces (1.15). In those of Oeglin and Mewes they are only two spaces high. With the dimensions 1.25 and 1.27, they deviate the most from the current standard.

**Individual fonts**

In addition to the dimensions, individual note shapes can also characterise a font. In Appendix 1.1, individual staves of the seven fonts are presented in relative proportion to one another, while in Appendix 1.3, selected individual characters are compared in a type repertory. Both representations are arranged chronologically.

In respect of the note heads, we already notice clear differences between the music fonts. For example, the breves of the first four printers, from Oeglin to Vietor, are square and equipped with serifs; Miller’s breve is completely unadorned and Grimm’s breve is wider than it is high. Ruff’s font contains no breves, and longs only as final notes.\(^{42}\) The semibreves of the individual printers are more similar to each other, although this sign is particularly slim for Mewes and particularly oblique for Grimm. More characteristic, on the other hand, are the note stems, shown here as they occur on minimas. With Mewes, Schöffer and Ruff they are equally fine. In Oeglin’s font, the upper end of the neck ends with a small hook, as seen often in woodcuts. The music stems in Grimm and Wyrsung’s font are peculiar in other ways. Since they begin somewhat to the right of the tip of the note head, they give the impression that they have been added separately. In addition, they are not all equally thick, and appear shortened when individual pages are corrected with regard to the text lines above them (cf. Figure 1.6, fourth and fifth minima at the beginning of the second line, first and sixth minima in the third line).\(^{43}\) The differences in the note flags are considerable: in Mewes, Oeglin and Schöffer, the flags form a triangle. In Mewes, however, the triangle does not close at the neck of the note, but passes it with a flourish. Grimm, on the other hand, uses only small flags, as in modern notational convention.

The range of variation between the fonts of the individual printers is greatest in the area of clefs. Only Oeglin, Schöffer and Grimm had c-, f- and g-clefs. Miller and Vietor had only c- and f-clefs in their type repertoire; Ruff had only c- and g-clefs; and Miller had only a simple f-clef to determine the pitch. The c-clef, which consist of two breves with vertical boundary lines, differ mainly in the right boundary line. At Mewes it is bent inwards in a second variant. In Oeglin’s font there is a long and a short variant. With Schöffer the right boundary line is shorter than the left one. With Vietor the line between the two breves is missing. In the fonts of Grimm and Ruff, the c-clefs remain without any boundary line at all; their shape resembles rabbit’s teeth.\(^{44}\) The basis of the g-clef is always the capital letter G, which is provided with additional loops. Here the characteristic shapes of Oeglin and Schöffer form one group and the shapes of Grimm and Ruff form another. In the fonts of Mewes, Oeglin, Schöffer and Grimm, the f-clefs are a combination of notes (long and two semibreves with stems up and down). Grimm also has a second variant, which is based on a symbolised representation of the letter f, corresponding to the f-clef used today. Vietor uses the same character. Miller, on the other hand, has a simple version of the same clef with the capital letter F.

Among the strongest markers of a music notation are the custodes. Here it is above all the continuing line after the zigzag sign that makes the difference. This line is quite straight in the fonts of Schöffer and Grimm, though the angle is somewhat steeper in that of Grimm. The custodes in Mewes’ font are slightly curved. In that of Oeglin, this line is S-shaped and reminiscent of a swan’s neck. Ruff bends this S-line back once again, so that his custos resembles the g-clef of Oeglin or Schöffer.
Other characteristic special characters are fermatas and accidentals. While the fermata sign in the fonts of Mewes and Grimm are quite symmetrical and straight, those of Schöffer and Vietor point slightly to the right. Oeglin’s fermata is small, and that of Ruff is bulbous. Only four printers use slightly different sharp signs; Schöffer had an earlier and a later shape available.

**Other features**

Having trained our eye to recognise the details of each font, we shall now examine how the note appears when set in entire passages and printed pages. Here, the density of a sequence of notes is decisive. Three categories can also be identified here. Mewes and Vietor set their notes very closely, as does Schöffer, an impression reinforced by the long note stems. In Oeglin’s books there seems to be hardly any space between the notes, although density of notes is more irregular. Only in Grimm’s choirbook and the ode collection of Ruff are the notes evenly spaced.

Further criteria for comparison would be indents for initials at the beginning of a voice, the presence and composition of ligatures, the use of repetition signs and ledger lines, various mensural and proportion signs, signa congruentiae and the design of the staves. Without going into more detail, I would like to draw attention to the differences in size of the various fonts. This obviously depends on the printed musical repertoire. Miller could set the Hebrew language melody using only three characters: breve, semibreve and f-clef. Slightly larger fonts, of ten and fourteen characters respectively, were required by Vietor and Ruff for their ode settings. Mewes, Oeglin, Schöffer and Grimm had complete fonts of up to forty characters. Their portfolio included masses, motets and secular songs, whose notation requires many more musical characters.

**Summary**

In contrast to Petrucci, who intended to establish a new market for polyphonic printed music, German printers seemed to print music only as a side line besides their literary books. Although the technique of double impression was already used for music in liturgical books, none of the printers were directly affiliated with those workshops, though they had personal contacts with them.

Augsburg, home to the workshops of Oeglin, Miller, Grimm and Ruff, was an early centre for mensural music printing, promoted by German humanist circles. Vietor was connected to Viennese humanistic circles, closely related to those in Augsburg by virtue of Maximilian’s peripatetic court. Given the close personal networks between printers, it is astonishing that there was no direct exchange of music fonts – only a few borrowings in type design. All these printers had individual fonts, applied for a single edition or just a few. That they did not continue with music printing might be due to their unstable and risky financial background. Like Gutenberg and many other early printers, some even went bankrupt. Only Peter Schöffer the Younger, the master of music printing from Mainz, developed a more extensive programme of musical editions, with a broad repertoire over a longer period of time, yet even his output is not overwhelming. Moreover, his font was the only one that was transferred to another printer outside the German-speaking lands, at a time when multiple-impression technique was already obsolete.

Polyphonic music printing needed a simpler technique and a clearly defined, stable market if it was to succeed. This only happened a few decades later, once the turbulence of the early Reformation had calmed down and the single-impression technique was
introduced. The shift to the new technique also entailed the beginning of mass production. New printers entered business and the centres of music printing moved to other cities. Nuremberg came to dominate the market, with Wittenberg following, while Augsburg fell into third place. As far as we know, the printers of Mainz and Vienna did not take up single-impression music printing at all, and those of Strasbourg started only very late.45

The pioneer printers of mensural notation in German-speaking lands, who used the difficult multiple-impression technique, also began a tradition in the design of music fonts. While Schöffer the Younger found his model in Petrucci’s music books, all other German printers developed their own style. In general, the dimensions of the fonts were orientated on the format and the repertoire to be printed. Staff heights ranged from 10 to almost 25 mm. The aesthetics of the fonts, the proportion of the type measurements, the mise-en-page, the format and the printed area establish the individual character of a given printing workshop, an individuality far from the standard appearance of music notation developed much later. For us, in retrospect, this counts as a rich heritage and a cultural achievement of its own.

Appendix 1.1 Overview of music type fonts with measurements (height of staff and minim in millimetres) and relative proportions

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Font</th>
<th>Measurements</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Mewes</td>
<td>14/11</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Oeglin</td>
<td>15/12</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Schöffer</td>
<td>10/11</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Vietor</td>
<td>10/9</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Miller</td>
<td>–/–</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Grimm</td>
<td>24.5/25</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Ruff</td>
<td>15/13</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
## Appendix 1.2 Chronological list of editions with mensural music printed in double-impression technique

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Year</th>
<th>Author title</th>
<th>Place</th>
<th>Printer</th>
<th>Source type</th>
<th>vdm</th>
</tr>
</thead>
</table>
| [1507] | Jacob Obrecht<br>
*Concentus harmonici quattuor missarum*       | Basel   | Gregor Mewes                 | Polyphonic music book         | 630 |
| 1507   | Petrus Tritonius<br>
*Melopoiae sive harmoniae tetracenticae*         | Augsburg| Erhard Oeglin                | Humanist book                | 55  |
| 1507   | Petrus Tritonius<br>
*Harmoniae super odis Horatii Flacci*            | Augsburg| Erhard Oeglin                | Humanist book                | 108 |
| c. 1510| O Sakrament der Heiligkeit                       | Augsburg| Erhard Oeglin                | Broadsheet                    | 124 |
| 1512   | *Aus sonderer künstlicher Art*                    | Augsburg| Erhard Oeglin                | Polyphonic music book         | 11  |
| 1512   | [Sixty-eight songs]                               | [Augsburg]| [Erhard Oeglin]              | Polyphonic music book         | 14  |
| 1512   | Arnold Schlick<br>
*Tabulaturen etlicher Lobgesang und Liddlein uff die Orgeln und Lauten Quinquagena carminum* | Mainz   | Peter Schöffer the Younger   | Tablature book               | 12  |
| 1513   | [Songs for 3–4 voices]                            | Mainz   | Peter Schöffer the Younger   | Polyphonic music book         | 15  |
| 1515   | Aurelius Prudentius Clemens<br>
*Cathemerinon*                                     | Vienna  | Hieronymus Vietor            | Humanist book                | 84  |
| 1515   | Johannes Foeniseca<br>
*Quadratum sapientiae*                             | Augsburg| Johann Miller                | Theory book/Humanist book    | 436 |
| 1517   | [Thirty-six songs]                                | Mainz   | Peter Schöffer the Younger   | Polyphonic music book         | 16  |
| c. 1518| Hans von Schnore<br>
*Ein newes Lied in Hessen gmacht*                 | [Mainz] | [Peter Schöffer the Younger] | Pamphlet                     | 889 |
| 1520   | Ludwig Senfl (ed.)<br>
*Liber selectarum cantionum quas vulgo mutetas appellant* | Augsburg| Sigmund Grimm & Marx Wyrsung| Polyphonic music book         | 18  |
| 1525   | Johann Walter<br>
*Geystliche Gsangbüchlin*                          | [Worms] | Peter Schöffer the Younger   | Polyphonic music book         | 111 |
| 1526   | [Anarg von Wildenfels]<br>
*O Herre Gott, dein göttlich Wort*                 | [Worms] | [Peter Schöffer the Younger] | Broadsheet                    | 202 |
| 1526   | Theobald Billicanus<br>
*De partium orationis inflexionibus compendium*    | [Augsburg]| [Simprecht Ruff]             | Humanist book                | 137 |
| [1532] | Johannes Frosch<br>
*Rerum musicarum opusculum rarum ac insigne*       | [Strasbourg]| Peter Schöffer the Younger | Theory book                  | 1534|
| 1534   | Sixt Dietrich<br>
*Epicedion Thomae Sporeri musicorum principis*     | Strasbourg| Peter Schöffer the Younger & Matthias Apiarius | Polyphonic music book         | 62  |
| 1534   | Johann Walter<br>
*Wittenbergische Gsangbüchli*                       | Strasbourg| Peter Schöffer the Younger & Matthias Apiarius | Polyphonic music book         | 112 |
| 1535   | Sixt Dietrich<br>
*Magnificat octo tonorum liber primus*             | Strasbourg| Peter Schöffer the Younger & Matthias Apiarius | Polyphonic music book         | 63  |

(Continued)
Appendix 1.2 continued

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Year</th>
<th>Author</th>
<th>Title</th>
<th>Place</th>
<th>Printer</th>
<th>Source type</th>
<th>vdm</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1535</td>
<td>Johannes Frosch</td>
<td>Rerum musicarum opusculum rarum ac insigne (a)/(b)</td>
<td>Strasbourg</td>
<td>Peter Schöffer the Younger &amp; Matthias Apiarius</td>
<td>Theory book</td>
<td>564</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1536</td>
<td></td>
<td>Fünff und sechzig teutscher Lieder, vormals inn Truck nie ussgangen</td>
<td>Strasbourg</td>
<td>Peter Schöffer the Younger &amp; Matthias Apiarius</td>
<td>Polyphonic music book</td>
<td>27</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1537</td>
<td>Sixt Dietrich</td>
<td>Magnificat octo tonorum liber primus</td>
<td>Strasbourg</td>
<td>Peter Schöffer the Younger &amp; Matthias Apiarius</td>
<td>Polyphonic music book</td>
<td>64</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1537</td>
<td>Johann Walter</td>
<td>Wittenbergische Gsangbüchli</td>
<td>Strasbourg</td>
<td>Peter Schöffer the Younger &amp; Matthias Apiarius</td>
<td>Polyphonic music book</td>
<td>113</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1539</td>
<td></td>
<td>Cantiones quinque vocum selectissimae / Mutetorum liber primus</td>
<td>Strasbourg</td>
<td>Peter Schöffer the Younger</td>
<td>Polyphonic music book</td>
<td>44</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Appendix 1.3 Type repertory for multiple-impression music printing (selection, not to scale)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>NOTES</th>
<th>Mewes</th>
<th>Oeglin</th>
<th>Schöffer</th>
<th>Victor</th>
<th>Miller</th>
<th>Grimm</th>
<th>Ruff</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>breves</td>
<td><img src="image1.jpg" alt="Image" /></td>
<td><img src="image2.jpg" alt="Image" /></td>
<td><img src="image3.jpg" alt="Image" /></td>
<td><img src="image4.jpg" alt="Image" /></td>
<td><img src="image5.jpg" alt="Image" /></td>
<td><img src="image6.jpg" alt="Image" /></td>
<td>..</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>semi-breves</td>
<td><img src="image7.jpg" alt="Image" /></td>
<td><img src="image8.jpg" alt="Image" /></td>
<td><img src="image9.jpg" alt="Image" /></td>
<td><img src="image10.jpg" alt="Image" /></td>
<td><img src="image11.jpg" alt="Image" /></td>
<td><img src="image12.jpg" alt="Image" /></td>
<td>..</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>minimae</td>
<td><img src="image13.jpg" alt="Image" /></td>
<td><img src="image14.jpg" alt="Image" /></td>
<td><img src="image15.jpg" alt="Image" /></td>
<td><img src="image16.jpg" alt="Image" /></td>
<td><img src="image17.jpg" alt="Image" /></td>
<td><img src="image18.jpg" alt="Image" /></td>
<td>..</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>fusae (notes with flags)</td>
<td><img src="image19.jpg" alt="Image" /></td>
<td><img src="image20.jpg" alt="Image" /></td>
<td><img src="image21.jpg" alt="Image" /></td>
<td><img src="image22.jpg" alt="Image" /></td>
<td><img src="image23.jpg" alt="Image" /></td>
<td><img src="image24.jpg" alt="Image" /></td>
<td>..</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

CLEFS

| c-clef | ![Image](image25.jpg) | ![Image](image26.jpg) | ![Image](image27.jpg) | ![Image](image28.jpg) | ![Image](image29.jpg) | ![Image](image30.jpg) | .. |
| g-clef | ![Image](image31.jpg) | ![Image](image32.jpg) | ![Image](image33.jpg) | ![Image](image34.jpg) | ![Image](image35.jpg) | ![Image](image36.jpg) | .. |
Notes

1 Duggan, Italian Music Incunabula; Krummel, ‘Early German Partbook Type Faces’.
2 See Stijnman and Savage, Printing Colour 1400–1700.
3 See, for instance, fol. B5’ in the Paris copy (F-Pn Rés.B.1028) of Psalterium ordinis S. Benedicti de observantia Bursfeldensi (Mainz: Johann Schöffer, 1516), vdm 290. Here the staff lines, red text and red initial are about 6 mm too high in relation with the black text, which looks very confusing. This edition has only empty staff lines; the musical notation was to be added by hand.
4 For a more detailed description of the printing process with two colours, see Gaskell, A New Introduction, 137–139; Giselbrecht and Savage, ‘Printing Music’.
5 See, for instance, the Graduale Romanum, printed in Augsburg by Erhard Ratdolt between 1494 and 1498 (vdm 1082). The colophon of this book mentions Sixtus Haug as editor: ‘Hoc opus graduale dicier vulgo solitum: permaximinis & cura & solicitudine Magistri Sixti haugen revisum & castigatum […]’ (fol. 116’).
6 Graduale Romanum ([Constance?], [c. 1470–1473] [vdm 1107]). Only two copies survive: a complete one in the British Library, London; and seven leaves in the University Library of Tübingen, detached from a binding of another book.
7 The numbers are taken from vdm, accessed on 18 January 2019. The list here only includes cities where more than two known editions were printed.
8 The only possible book would be a Missale Moguntinum, printed by Peter Schöffer the Elder in 1493 (vdm 1449). The Eucharistic prefaces in this edition are printed with empty staves, but in the first section there are some intonations for Kyrie, Gloria and Credo with printed notes. Since the shape of the notes is quite irregular, they were presumably produced in woodcut. More research has to be done to clarify the printing technique used here.
9 Between 1534 and 1537, Schöffer worked in partnership with Matthias Apiarius. In 1537, Apiarius moved to Berne, where he established his own workshop (see Reske, Die Buchdrucker, 107). Some of his output contained music printed with woodcut (several editions of Lampadius’ theory book [vdm 572, 573, 1327, 1328]) or in single-impression technique (for example, the pamphlet Ein hüpsch nüw geystlich Lied [vdm 694]).
10 This number is the result of the search ‘Printing technique: multiple impression’ combined with ‘Notation type: Mensural notation’ in vdm, accessed on 23 January 2019. The two variant issues of the music treatise Rerum musicarum opusculum rarum ac insigne by Johannes Frosch (vdm 564 and 637) are counted as one item.
11 The database vdm contains several editions only known from historical catalogues with no copies extant. McDonald and Raninen, ‘The Songbooks of Peter Schöffer’, hypothesise the existence of
at least two lost song books by Peter Schöffer the Younger. See also Royston Gustavson’s chapter in this volume.

12 See also Lodes, ‘Concentus, Melopoiae und Harmonie 1507’; Lodes, ‘Gregor Mewes’ ‘Concentus harmonici’’. I am grateful to Birgit Lodes for supplying me with relevant chapters of her unpublished study.

13 The printers who produced such books were Bernhard Richel and Michael Wenssler (together with Jacob von Kilchen).

14 This concerns two editions of Niger’s Grammatica from 1499 and 1500 (vdm 85 and 131). In two editions of De fide concubinarum in sacerdotes from the beginning of the sixteenth century (vdm 671 and 673) a snippet of chant is integrated into the title woodcut. Jakob Wolff from Pforzheim started to print liturgical books with music in about 1510, and then dominated the Basel market until 1519.

15 I thank my co-editor Grantley McDonald for his expertise.

16 Seibicke, Vornamen, 220.


19 See Lodes, ‘Concentus, Melopoiae und Harmonie 1507’.


22 See also McDonald, ‘Printing Hofhaimer’, and Figure 4.3 of Elisabeth Giselbrecht’s chapter in this book.

23 Reske, Die Buchdrucker, 31.


27 Reske, Die Buchdrucker, 33–34. Printing material and woodcuts went to Philipp Ulhart the Elder and to Heinrich Steiner, who both also printed music, but Ulhart used single-impression technique and woodcuts, and Steiner only woodcuts. As Royston Gustavson recently has shown, Grimm and Wyrsung’s music fonts seem to reappear in seven musical editions in large folio format, each containing a single historical polyphonic mass, produced in the private printing workshop of Count Anton of Isenburg-Büdingen in Ronneburg castle between 1558 and 1560 (Gustavson, Senfl in Print’, 290–297). More research has to be done on this issue.


29 Two editions were produced in collaboration between Singriener and Vietor: the theory book Musicorum libri quattuor by Václav Philomathes in 1512 (vdm 422), and the humanist book Scenaica progymnasmata by Johannes Reuchlin in 1514 (vdm 78).

30 For more on the edition and the music, see McDonald, ‘The Metrical Harmoniae’, 72–83.

31 The crooked longas and the skewed double bars could have been caused by setting the type too loosely in the forme; alternatively, it is possible that Vierot used the technique of stereotyping. In the latter case, this edition would no longer count as an example of multiple-impression printing. More research needs to be done to determine Vierot’s technique.

32 This is also the case in the copy in Wrocław (PL-WRzno XVI.Qu.3272), see Figure 1 at McDonald, ‘The Metrical Harmoniae’, 76, where a full page is depicted.

33 Reske, Die Buchdrucker, 965–966.


35 Although I agree with the argument by McDonald and Raninen (‘The Songbooks’, 52) that the songbook of Arndt von Aich is based on lost songbooks by Schöffer, I cannot follow their derived hypothesis that Schöffer ‘developed his music font in conscious emulation of Oeglin’, particularly the g-clefs, f-clefs and the custodes. The curly g-clef is also close to that of Petrucci, and the f-clef is a standard shape used by other printers (see Appendix 1.3). The shape of the custus of all extant Schöffer editions is totally different from that of Oeglin (but again close to Petrucci’s custus) and I wonder why Schöffer should have commissioned only a new custus after his two early, possibly lost song books were produced, since all other forms are stable. Also the tablature book from 1512 shows already the typical Schöffer/Petrucci custus.
Oddly enough, in all three editions individual music fonts were used: in the *Psalterium Spirense [1515]* (vdm 729), the measurements of the notation are 14.0 / 9.5 mm (height of the staff / height of the virga); in the office *De dulcissimo nomine Jesu*, 1518 (vdm 972), the measurements are 11.5 / 6.0 mm; and in the *Responsoria Moguntina [1518] [vdm 261]* we measured 10.0 / 5.0 mm.

For a discussion of the production of the ‘Kampen Songbook’, see Fallows, ‘The Printed Songbook at Kampen’.

The process of producing music types is described in more detail in Krummel, ‘Early German Partbook Type Faces’, 80.

The one publication by Oeglin and the six publications by Schöffer the Younger are the only titles in this format in *vdm*. The measurements of the printed page vary between 98 x 94 mm (vdm 27) and 125.5 x 101.1 mm (vdm 111). The number of staves on each page is usually four.

The first edition of Frosch’s treatise is only recorded in a historical catalogue, which does not specify the format (see vdm 1534).

Staff heights in manuscripts vary between 7–9 mm in very small books and 27–28 mm in the largest ones (see Schmidt and Leitmeir, *The Production and Reading of Music Sources*, 16).

In Ruff’s font, the longa was probably made by combining a breve and a stem during typesetting, since the stems are of various lengths, set on the right or left of the breve, pointing upwards or downwards. The note heads of these ‘longae’ are extended like the breves in Grimm’s font.

An apparent shortening of the stems might also be caused by the covering of the underlaid text.


Nuremberg counts 75 editions, Wittenberg 36 and Augsburg 17. Strasbourg counts only three editions, all published around 1545. The numbers of editions with mensural notated music until 1550 were extracted from *vdm*, accessed on 7 February 2019.

---

### References


From at least the 1530s onwards, European music manuscripts were sometimes copied on papers printed with staves and tablature grids. The existence of this kind of stationery in an age of widening musical literacy should come as no surprise. Printed music papers bearing staves or tablature grids were cheap and easy to make, they were convenient for users, and they met an obvious and perennial need among amateur and professional musicians alike, whether for assembling personal or local repertories, or for the acts of composing, arranging or transmitting musical works. Printed music papers were available in sixteenth-century Italy, Spain, France, the Low Countries, Germany, England and Sweden; they could probably also be bought elsewhere. The only surprise is that they have been observed so rarely, and are sometimes completely overlooked. Admittedly the inattentive eye can easily miss the presence of printed staves, especially when viewing an item from a surrogate such as a monochrome photograph or microfilm. To an extent, however, printed staves have probably often been passed over in silence because, as matters stand, it can be hard to know what to make of them or say about them, beyond merely noting their existence.

One reason for this general neglect is that printed music papers are not easy to attribute or catalogue. Almost none bears the name or initials of its printer, and they never record either the date of printing or the place of printing. Only through other evidence can they sometimes be located in geographical or chronological context. Moreover, printed music papers are cumbersome to describe because their characteristics need to be defined numerically, by counting or measuring the number of staves or grids per page, the height of the individual staff, the length of the staves, and the total height of the printed area. Watermarks can sometimes add evidence, and a few designs have ornamental borders or frames around the staves. However, most printed music papers are plain, anonymous and frankly inscrutable.

In this study, I point to some ways in which research in this field can be moved forward in an age of rapidly increasing online availability of digital images. Tasks that once required the researcher to visit libraries take careful notes and order bespoke photography can now be done easily and quickly on a computer screen. Moreover, access to digital images encourages new ways of researching and thinking. For instance, a digital copy of a physical object can be dismembered, and its component parts reassembled on the screen to permit comparisons. High-resolution images can be magnified to allow the study of detail. A screen can easily accommodate images of items scattered across the world’s libraries. Questions remain about how best to accumulate, share and interpret the resulting data, but nonetheless the research opportunities are fairly transparent.

This chapter examines two sample groups of printed music papers in order to develop these arguments. Both groups encompass only papers printed with five-line staves for
mensural notation. Tablature grids are omitted here for reasons of space, but the research methods proposed below would be equally applicable to them. The first sample group came into existence under the terms of a royal licence granted in 1575 to two English musicians, Thomas Tallis and William Byrd, which gave them exclusive national rights to print, import and sell ‘ruled paper imprinted’ for a period of twenty-one years, that is, from 1575 to 1596.3 When their printed papers were first identified and described by Iain Fenlon and myself, as part of a report published in 1984, we drew our data direct from the physical books, which we consulted in the libraries where they are kept.4 Most of these same books can now be viewed online in high-resolution digital images, accessible via the Digital Image Archive of Medieval Music (DIAMM). These images make it clear that we overlooked evidence that sheds light not only on Tallis and Byrd’s output of printed papers, but also (and more importantly) on the manuscripts that were made from them. The second sample group, briefly mentioned in our 1984 report but not researched there, is drawn from manuscripts now in the care of the Bayerische Staatsbibliothek, Munich. They date apparently from the 1540s; some, if not all of them, once belonged to the Augsburg bibliophile Hans Heinrich Herwart (1520–1583).5 These items also use printed music papers, and digital images are available for free download from the Staatsbibliothek’s website. The time is therefore ripe to look afresh at them, and ask what more might be learnt about their provenance history.

The methods used to create music paper need a brief introduction.6 In principle, two technologies were available: printing from woodblocks, and printing from metal. For the latter, there were at least three options. The first and commonest, here called the ‘integral-staff’ method, required the printer either to cast whole staves, or to assemble each staff out of five long metal rules, and to bond or fuse those rules together in some way. (No physical examples of such staves are known to survive, so the method of manufacture is unclear, though the subject could probably sustain more research.) The rules themselves may have been made from a variety of metals, including durable brass.7 Most, however, were clearly vulnerable to damage, because over time each staff-line typically acquired small bends, splays and splits.8 The evolving identity of these physical objects makes it possible to research the life-history of an individual staff that was re-used multiple times. The second option was available to any printer who owned a font of so-called ‘nested’ music type, a technology in which each type bearing a music symbol is minimally embedded in staff-lines.9 Here, the compositor had access to a wide selection of short single rules of varying lengths, into which the sorts for musical characters were fitted. These same short rules could also be assembled to create whole blank staves. Music paper made this way uses the ‘nested’ method. A third option for printing staves was the ‘cast-type’ method. When a new music font of standard linear music type was devised, the punchcutter by necessity had to design short segments of blank staff for insertion between symbols, and for filling out the final staff of a composition.10 He would therefore cut punches for staff-segments in a variety of lengths, and create matrices from which the resulting type could be cast. Multiple castings of the longer segments could then be abutted to form whole staves, and in theory these could be used to print music paper.11 Whole blank staves assembled from cast type often feature in books of printed polyphony, sometimes even whole pages of them. However, there is little evidence that this technique was used to print sheets intended solely for separate sale and manuscript use.

At the printing shop, the compositor first had to assemble staves of near-identical height and width, typically twenty or so. He then imposed them as a single forme, which would
serve to print both sides of the sheet. If imposing in folio format, the staves would be arranged in two tall columns separated by a central space. When printed, the sheet would be identical on both its sides, and when folded on its vertical (shorter) axis, it would produce a bifolium (two leaves, four pages). If working in oblong quarto format, the compositor would fill each quarter of the forme with a block of between three and six staves. The finished sheet, again identically printed on both its sides, would be folded twice, first on its horizontal (longer) axis, then on its vertical axis, giving rise to four-leaf (eight-page) gathering. After printing, when the contents of the forme were washed and distributed, the staves might be set aside for re-use. This last action would ease the task of making a new edition, because only minutes were needed to re-impose the staves in the forme and resume printing. In less than a day, many hundreds of sheets could be printed on both sides from a freshly re-imposed forme. If the format were oblong quarto, then 500 sheets would generate 1,000 bifolia (4,000 pages) of printed staves. If the printer supplied stationers as well as selling from his own premises, then demand might be sufficiently high for multiple editions of a stable design to be printed and issued over the course of a year or several years.12

The notion of ‘editions’ of a stable design is also explored here, using the Tallis-Byrd papers in oblong quarto format as an example.13 These sheets were manufactured using the integral-staff method, drawing on more than twenty near-identical metal-rule staves that were reserved after each printing. When a new edition was needed, the staves were set once again in the forme. However, this happened each time in a random new order (each staff being notionally identical), and with the staves inverted at random (each staff being symmetrical). Because most of the staves have characteristic dents and splays, different editions of a stable and repeatable design can easily be distinguished from one another. To an extent, we may even place them in chronological order on the basis of the evolving damage to individual staves. The editions themselves are of course undated, but sometimes they can be assigned approximate dates from the repertory copied into them.

Research into printed music papers therefore needs to proceed at five different levels. The first level addresses production technique, which might be woodblock, integral-staff, nested or cast-staff. The second level identifies the design, determined by the number of staves per page, the height and length of the staff, the total height of the printed area, and possibly indentation of the uppermost staff. The third level seeks to identify different editions of a stable design, if and when they exist. This is done by working at the fourth and most detailed level, which involves identifying individual staves on the basis of their idiosyncrasies and defects. If the same staves were used to create more than one design – for instance, both quarto and folio layouts – then in effect we also face the concept of brand: multiple related products made and issued by the same manufacturer. Production technique is easily described in words, and designs are defined by measurement, but the analysis of brand, editions and staff-characteristics is more challenging. Some suggestions for procedure are offered below.

The Tallis-Byrd quarto papers

Printed music papers were commonly used in England from the 1560s onwards. Trade in this commodity was therefore well established when Tallis and Byrd gained control over it in 1575.14 We know that the two men took advantage of their royal privilege. In 1577, a group of London printers and booksellers objected to the fact that ‘One Byrde a singingman hathe a licence for … the printing of ruled paper’, which implies that at
least one of them resented the monopoly.\textsuperscript{15} In 1582 Christopher Barker, queen’s printer and Upper Warden of the Stationers Company, reported to the queen’s chief counsellor, Lord Burghley, that the Tallis-Byrd printed music papers were, by the standards of the day, moderately profitable, or ‘somewhat beneficial’, as Barker put it.\textsuperscript{16} In London, at least around 1583, the papers were available from the printer-bookseller Henry Bynneman (discussed below), and they could also probably be bought from stationers elsewhere in the country. For instance, an inventory of the stock of the Cambridge bookseller John Denys in 1578 included ‘2 quires [quires] of paper ruled’.\textsuperscript{17} The ‘Sitherne book ruled’ stocked by the Shrewsbury bookseller Roger Ward in 1585 was probably made of printed paper for cittern or gittern tablature.\textsuperscript{18} By law, these papers, if printed rather than hand-ruled, could only have been supplied by Tallis, Byrd, or assigns such as Bynneman, from 1575 until expiry of the licence in 1596.

Three late sixteenth-century sets of partbooks use the Tallis-Byrd quarto paper. Close study reveals that, between them, they were in fact made from no fewer than fifteen different editions of a stable design, each with the staves differently configured in the forme. Since the spacing between the staves remains unchanged, it would seem that, between editions, not only the staves but also the segments of spacing furniture were reserved for re-use when required.\textsuperscript{19} It is not known who actually owned these materials. They may have stayed with the printer, or passed between printers, or may have been the property of Tallis (d. 1585) and Byrd, who handed them over to a printer only when a new edition was needed. Certainly this would have protected them from illicit undeclared editions made by unscrupulous hands.\textsuperscript{20}

The partbook set most securely copied on the Tallis-Byrd quarto paper is GB-Och Mus. 979–983, which was compiled over the course of several decades, probably from the 1570s onwards.\textsuperscript{21} Formerly a set of six volumes but now lacking its Tenor, these important books are the main and often unique source of many Latin-texted compositions by Thomas Tallis, John Sheppard, William Byrd and their contemporaries. They were copied by John Baldwin, a professional church singer and music scribe. Baldwin probably knew Byrd personally. Certainly he had access to rare and unpublished compositions by Byrd, including juvenilia, and he was the copyist of ‘My Ladye Nevells Booke’, a superb and authoritative manuscript copy of Byrd’s keyboard works up to 1591. His partbooks, cited below as Baldwin, use a total of nine different editions of the quarto paper. This shows that Baldwin was repeatedly able to acquire new sheets of a stable design over the course of more than a decade. Baldwin’s proximity to Byrd suggests that he is unlikely to have used an unauthorised product sourced from an underhand dealer. For that reason, his printed papers can confidently be linked with the Tallis-Byrd licence.

Two further partbook sets make use of this design of music paper. One of them, GB-Och Mus. 984–988, is a set of five partbooks copied by Robert Dow (1553–1588), a university-educated lawyer and fellow of All Souls College, Oxford, who was also skilled in calligraphy. This set, designated below as Dow, bears the copying date 1581. Dow uses another edition of the quarto design, this time with the staves printed in red ink.\textsuperscript{22} The third set survives incomplete; only two partbooks now exist of what was once probably a set of six. The Superius is in private ownership (the ‘McGhie MS’, formerly known as the ‘James MS’); the Discantus is GB-Ob MS Tenbury 389.\textsuperscript{23} This set, designated below as McGhie/T389, was compiled by various unidentified copyists during the last quarter of the sixteenth century, and makes use of six different editions of the basic quarto design. One of the editions used in McGhie/T389 also occurs in Baldwin, so the total number of editions present within these three partbook sets is fifteen, not sixteen.
The editions were researched by first identifying individual staves, then watching for their changing placement within the forme in each edition. For ease of reference and to aid memory, each staff was named using a neutral four-letter noun (‘BARD’, ‘HOST’, ‘KING’, etc.), and an image library created, showing each distinctive staff in both its inversions. Using these images and names, each edition was then analysed by charting the placement of individual staves within the forme. Diagrams were drawn of the sheets as printed – four blocks each of five staves, identically printed on both sides of the sheet – and the staves identified by their four-letter names. A decision was made not to number the resulting editions, since numbers might misleadingly imply a chronological relationship. Instead, each edition was named using a neutral and memorable three-letter noun, such as ‘CAT’, ‘ELK’ and ‘OWL’.

Using these methods, a comprehensive overview was made of the fifteen different editions of the Tallis-Byrd quarto paper found in Baldwin, Dow and McGhie/T389. This, in turn, allowed a better understanding of the partbooks themselves. Of them, the most straightforward is Dow. This set, which Dow apparently copied for his personal use, includes pre-planned layers of motets, anthems, consort music, and consort songs for voices and viols. It is a major source of Byrd’s works, especially his songs. Dow acquired his ruled paper as a batch of a single edition. The fact that the staves are printed in red might even imply that the edition was custom-printed for him. Dow seems to have bought exactly 5 quires of this paper, one 24-sheet quire for each partbook. With the sheets folded into quarto, each partbook therefore comprises 24 gatherings, 96 leaves and 192 pages. Dow evidently began copying the partbooks in or around 1581, the date recorded on the first page of each book.

We can estimate how much Dow paid for his printed paper by turning to an inventory of the possessions of the London printer-bookseller Henry Bynneman, who seems to have acted as retail agent for Tallis and Byrd. On his death in 1583, Bynneman held a stock of ‘twenty foure Remes of ruled paper’, valued at £4.16s (= 1152d). An English ream numbered 480 sheets. Bynneman had twenty-four reams in stock, so his holdings were in the region of 11,520 sheets. At a total value of £4.16s (= 1152d), this works out at 0.1d per sheet. It is not known whether the valuations of Bynneman’s stock represent estimates of wholesale or cost prices. Either way, however, these valuations could realistically be quadrupled to achieve retail price, leading to a maximum estimate of 0.4d per sheet. This is less than the price typically asked for ‘broadside’ ballad sheets, which were printed on one side only. In the sixteenth century, such ballad sheets cost between a halfpenny and a penny (0.5d–1d). Using this estimated price of 0.4d per sheet, we can calculate that Dow spent around four shillings on acquiring his ruled paper, assuming that it came from stock. If it was printed with red staves on commission, the price might have been higher. Had Dow returned to Bynneman’s shop two years later to purchase another 120 sheets, he would have found there 11,520 sheets waiting for sale. Assuming that all these sheets were printed in quarto format, this would have been sufficient to make ninety-six partbook sets of the size of Robert Dow’s. Thus for the first time we gain some idea of the economics and sheer scale of printing music papers in late Tudor England. Tallis and Byrd presumably took a share of the profits, so the business must indeed have been ‘somewhat beneficial’ to them.

Compared with Dow, the Baldwin set of partbooks is bibliographically complex. Baldwin began his project by making ad hoc gatherings that he may not have meant originally to collect into bound partbooks. As his collection grew, however, Baldwin’s expansions became more organised, and eventually he amalgamated all the layers, so that the contents follow on from one another continuously without breaks. This required him to excise
certain leaves, and to re-copy some pages on fresh paper, actions that contributed to the bibliographical complexity of the finished books. In total, Baldwin drew on nine different editions of the Tallis-Byrd paper, which he acquired over the course of perhaps two decades. The stability of the basic design over such a long period may imply that Tallis and Byrd were sensitive to the needs of a scribe such as Baldwin, who might expect the printed dimensions and page layout to remain stable when he returned to buy new sheets.

In themselves, the nine editions used by Baldwin imply little about their chronology, notwithstanding some evidence of staff deterioration, a subject that awaits further research. However, we learn much about their relationship by watching Baldwin’s evolving notational habits and letter formation. Changes in his script and evolution in the repertory he copied – for instance, the inclusion of motets by Byrd composed during the 1580s – allow us to discern the chronology of the editions. Thus it is now almost certain that Baldwin’s project started with a gathering he finally placed near the centre of the bound partbooks. This layer, copied largely on the paper I designate as ‘FOX’, was written informally, in a cursive secretary hand, and probably at speed, with little concern for elegance. The inclusion of largely obsolete Catholic ritual works by John Sheppard, Thomas Tallis, John Redford and their contemporaries may imply that Baldwin set out to preserve rare repertory that might otherwise be lost to posterity. Another early layer, copied wholly on the paper designated as ‘APE’, was made in each partbook from six sheets folded and nested together to create bulky quires of twenty-four leaves. Later layers, richer in music by William Byrd, are smaller and more regular, being typically made from a quired pair of folded sheets (eight leaves). By this stage, Baldwin’s script has acquired greater elegance and consistency, with a higher proportion of stable italic letter-forms, much more like the work of an organised scribe.

The third partbook set, McGhie/T389, differs from both Dow and Baldwin in its diverse contents, which are variously sacred and secular, texted and untexted, and copied in layers by assorted unknown hands. To a modern reader this collection is frankly a jumble, and hard to comprehend. However, study of the printed papers used in this set of partbooks suggests that it may in fact unite unrelated fascicles made independently by different people for different purposes, and conjoined only at a relatively late stage. Their union would have been enabled by their common use of editions of the Tallis-Byrd quarto paper. The diversity of the fascicles might suggest that the contents were copied and used by a community such as a family, a school, or a professional group such as a company of waits. Whoever they were, the scribes could evidently source fresh batches of their printed music paper over the course of years or even decades. Uniformity of appearance may therefore not have mattered to them, in the way that it probably mattered to Baldwin, and definitely did to Dow. Instead, uniformity in McGhie/T389 may merely reflect the tight regulation of printed music papers during the twenty-one-year span of the Tallis-Byrd monopoly.

From all this, it should be clear that a Tallis-Byrd brand existed, and is ultimately defined by its staves, irrespective of how they might be placed in the forme in any edition of a design, whether quarto or folio. Figure 2.1 shows five of these staves as they occur in a randomly chosen page of McGhie/T389. Can these same staves also be found embedded in English books of printed polyphony? Many sixteenth-century music printers placed blank staves at the foot of pages where the notation does not fill all the available space. They did this partly for aesthetic reasons, partly because, during printing, a well-filled forme stopped the platen from dipping into unsupported areas, causing uneven printing or inking. As it happens, the Tallis-Byrd staves resist such comparative research, because only one book of polyphony was published in
England between 1575 and 1588, and its blank staves were assembled using the ‘cast-staff’ method; see Figure 2.2, which shows a sample page of Tallis and Byrd’s *Cantiones ... sacrae* (London: Thomas Vautrollier, 1575; RISM 1575). Many sixteenth-century printers used segments of cast type to create blank staves in their books of polyphony, presumably because cast-type staves were quick and easy to set, could be adjusted in width to match the polyphony, and ensured consistency of appearance with the music itself. Using these same cast staff-segments, Vautrollier could have printed music paper, though no example has yet come to light. Instead, the printer(s) of the Tallis-Byrd papers, like English printers before and after them, used the integral-staff method. Nonetheless, the theoretical possibility of overlap between printed music papers and printed polyphony exists for printers in continental Europe. Did key figures in sixteenth-century music printing, such as Petrucci, Attaingnant, Gardano and Susato, issue music papers using the integral-staff method? If so, were the identical staves ever used in their books of polyphony? These questions lead to the second case study.

**Quarto music papers in the Bayerische Staatsbibliothek, Munich**

Unlike their English equivalents, sixteenth-century European printed music papers have not been systematically studied. The following discussion therefore locates some of the research opportunities that exist, and also points to challenges facing potential researchers.
in this field. The sample papers discussed here are drawn from the collections of the Bayerische Staatsbibliothek, Munich. They make good subjects for introductory study, partly because important preliminary work has been done on them by Marie Louise Göllner (drawing on earlier research by Julius Joseph Maier) and JoAnn Taricani, partly because digital images can be accessed and freely downloaded from the Staatsbibliothek’s website. In preparation for writing this study, the items mentioned below were inspected at the Staatsbibliothek to verify that their staves were indeed printed, not hand-ruled. Otherwise, all the research described below was done from digital images. In part, this has been made possible by the Staatsbibliothek’s policy of showing a ruler at the end of its digital files, which allows screen images to be enlarged to life size. All measurements cited below have been derived in that way. They should therefore be verified against the original documents before being used for further research.

A good point of entry is the set of five partleaves bearing the anonymous lament _O mater nostra_, catalogued by Göllner as Mus. MS 1503b, no. 15 (fol. 14), and viewable on the Staatsbibliothek’s website as part of Mus.ms. 1503b. This work, unique to these partleaves, commemorates Queen Anna Jagiello, wife of Ferdinand I and sister-in-law to Charles V, who died on 27 January 1547. The piece was presumably written soon after her death. Because of its text, Albert Dunning classified it as a ceremonial motet (Staatsmotette), and floated the idea that it might have been sung at the queen’s funeral in Prague, or at memorial events held in her honour in Vienna in February 1547. Its text is expressed in somewhat awkward Latin as a dialogue between the dead queen, her widowed husband and their three eldest sons, Maximilian (aged nineteen when his mother died), Ferdinand (aged seventeen) and Charles (aged six). In the Munich partleaves, the top two voices, both notated in C1 clef, are headed ‘Pars Caroli’ and ‘Pars nostri principis Ferdinandi’ respectively; the tenor (C3 clef) is ‘Pars Maximiliani’ (Figure 2.3), and the bass (F3 clef) ‘Pars nostri regis Ferdinandi’. The fifth voice (C3 clef), headed ‘Pars reginae Annae’, remains
silent until the words ‘O my wife’ (‘O mea uxor’), where it joins the others in singing ‘O my husband, it is too sad [to live] grieving and singing’ (‘O mi marite, deplorando et cantando nimium grave est’). Most unusually, O mater nostra was copied by five different hands, each supplying one partleaf.

The printed music paper used for these partleaves can be dated c. 1547 on grounds of the lament copied on it. Göllner and Taricani report that the paper itself bears a watermark associated with either Augsburg or nearby Landsberg am Lech.42 They also suspect that these partleaves, together with others now in Munich, once belonged to the Augsburg bibliophile Hans Heinrich Herwart (1520–1583), whose music library survives largely intact within the holdings of the Bayerische Staatsbibliothek. To these facts we can now add a new one: the staves were printed by the ‘nested’ method. In the late 1540s, two Augsburg printers were actively involved in music printing, Melchior Kriesstein and Philipp Ulhart the Elder. When they printed music from type (rather than woodcut), both printers used only founts of nested music type.43

Three further items now in Munich are bibliographically related to these partleaves. All were copied on music papers printed using the nested method, all apparently descend from Herwart’s library, and all share a scribal concordance with O mater nostra. Their copyist, still unidentified, has been designated ‘Scribe J’ by Taricani.44 Scribe J, who copied the ‘Pars Maximiliani’ in O mater nostra (Figure 2.3), copied two further sets of partleaves, each containing a Latin-texted song. He also contributed to a slender set of partbooks containing two motets, one of which is by Johannes (or Christian) Hollander. (On this indeterminacy, see below.) Between them, the four items copied wholly or partly by Scribe J make use of three different designs of ‘nested’ printed music paper. All use papers with watermarks associated with Augsburg or Landsberg. In combination, these details suggest that music papers were printed in Augsburg in the late 1540s.

Scribe J’s music papers are best viewed online, using the Staatsbibliothek’s digital images. From them, it can be seen that the two partleaf sets copied solely by him demonstrably use

Figure 2.3 Tenor of anon., O mater nostra.
Source: Munich, Bayerische Staatsbibliothek, Mus. MS 1503b, no. 15, Tenor partbook, fol. 14v.
paper drawn from a single edition of one design, because the pattern of rule-distribution within their staves is identical. One set, made from bifolia, contains the anonymous four-voice song Non eadem facies anni.45 The second set, made from single leaves, bears what may be the chorus of an unidentified four-voice work, opening with the words Arrentes [arentes?] irrigate fauces.46 These two partleaf sets use paper printed with four staves to the page; staff-height is approximately 13 mm, and the top staff is not indented.47 This design therefore contrasts with the printed paper used for O mater nostra (Figure 2.3), which has a much taller staff-height of 17.5 mm, and an indented top staff. The fourth item by Scribe J (Mus. MS 1505) uses yet another design of printed paper, again with staff-height of 13 mm, but now with five staves to the page, and the top staff indented. Mus. MS 1505 is a set of six partbooks, each made from a single sheet folded into a four-leaf gathering. It features two unascribed motets, copied collaboratively by several hands, including Copyist J.48 The first motet, Tulerunt Dominum (à 6), is otherwise unknown. The second, Benedic Domine domum istam (à 5), has printed concordances, the earliest of which is Susato’s Liber quintus ecclesiasticum cantionum quinque vocum (RISM 155312), where the piece is attributed to ‘Cristianus hollande’ in the index, and to ‘Ioannes de Hollande’ in the music pages.

Several details link Scribe J’s printed music papers to Kriesstein and Ulhart’s printed polyphony. The main link is one of production technique. In their publications, Kriesstein and Ulhart always built their blank staves out of segments of nested rules, and never used the integral-staff method. It follows that they might also have used nested staves for any printed papers they produced. The second link is staff-height. In general, Kriesstein and Ulhart used music fonts with staff-heights of 9 or 11 mm. However, a single extant publication by Ulhart, a broadsheet surviving in a single known copy, uses a larger font with staff-height of 13 mm, exactly matching two of the printed papers used by Scribe J.49 The Ulhart broadsheet, which bears Sixt Dietrich’s puzzle-canon Laudate Dominum omnes gentes (RISM A/1: D 3019; vdm 1176), is dated 1547, and may commemorate the imperial diet held in Augsburg in 1547–1548. We recall that the lament for Queen Anna, O mater nostra, was also dated tentatively to 1547. All these details together suggest strongly that music papers in a variety of designs were being printed in Augsburg by the late 1540s. This enterprise could have been led by Sigmund Salminger, the driving force behind the music printed by Kriesstein and Ulhart.50 Salminger is usually characterised as being a music editor, but it is possible that he was also a publisher, and therefore an entrepreneur.

Sixteenth-century Augsburg was a major trading centre and a distribution hub. Were its printed music papers being exported and used elsewhere? This seemingly straightforward question in fact leads into one of the most severe challenges facing research in this field: no comprehensive list or database exists of sixteenth-century music manuscripts. The nearest we have is the Census-Catalogue. The Illinois project was researched largely from surrogates such as microfilms, so it was not always alert to the presence of printed staves. Its coverage of manuscripts copied from mid-century onwards is highly selective. Having been published in book form, it is not searchable electronically – though its descriptions have now been incorporated into DIAMM, which does have a search facility. Meanwhile, various examples of sixteenth-century printed music paper have been found in manuscripts that were not included in the Census-Catalogue. Ideally, all these examples would be recorded in a dedicated database of early printed music papers, to which researchers could report new information as it comes to light; but no such collaborative database has yet been established. In short, a research opportunity exists here.

What benefits might be had from such a database? Its main uses would be to aid research in provenance history, and to shed light on the full range of music-related printed
products that were available for sale in the sixteenth century. If printers across Europe did indeed issue music papers, and if those printers can be identified by analysing their papers, then useful facts may emerge about the provenance of manuscripts copied on those papers. This point is developed below by looking closely at one last item in the Bayerische Staatsbibliothek.

D-Mbs Mus. MS 1508 is an important source of chansons, copied in the 1540s, and known once to have been owned by Herwart. Its contents are entirely copied on printed music papers. These books’ provenance is disputed: the prevailing view is that they come from either France or the Low Countries, but JoAnn Taricani has argued instead that they were probably copied in Augsburg. None of the music paper in these partbooks bears a watermark. What can study of the printed staves add to the debate?

D-Mbs Mus. MS 1508 was conceived from the start as a six-partbook chansonnier in three layers. It opens with a large collection of works for four voices, proceeds into a much shorter layer of works for five voices, and ends with a still shorter one for six voices. The maker of the partbooks acquired at least seventy-four sheets of music paper in quarto format, with staves printed by the integral-staff method, six staves to a page. In the discussion below, this product is called Paper X. All the sheets belong to a single edition, so probably they were bought as a single batch, in the same way that Robert Dow bought matching sheets to make his partbooks. The copyist, designated Scribe A by Taricani, named the four main partbooks ‘Cantus’, ‘Altus’, ‘Tenor’ and ‘Bassus’, and allocated sixteen sheets to each, but only six sheets to the much smaller ‘Quinta pars’, and a mere four to the ‘Sexta pars’. The sheets were folded into four-leaf gatherings, the gatherings abutted (that is, not quired together), cut at the upper edges, and given signature letters (‘A’, ‘B’, ‘C’, etc.), written in the bottom right-hand corner of the first recto of each gathering. Figure 2.4 shows the first page of Cantus sig. I. Into this structure, Scribe A copied sixty-two chansons for four voices (numbered by a later hand as ‘1–62’), twelve five-voice chansons (‘83–104’) and eleven six-voice chansons (‘111–121’), leaving some pages unused. He or she seems to have copied the contents partly in batches from chansonniers printed in Paris by Attaingnant and in Lyons by Moderne. From that evidence, Taricani argues that the partbooks came into existence ‘sometime about 1542–43’.

The books were then expanded both physically and in terms of repertory by the copyist Taricani calls Scribe B. (Six other hands, Scribes C–H, subsequently added more pieces.) In particular, Scribe B set out to develop the five-voice layer, but needed extra pages to do this. He or she therefore acquired and inserted new gatherings, made from two closely related designs of another printed quarto paper, here called Papers Z1 and Z2. These too have six staves to a page, but otherwise they bear little resemblance to Paper X. Their staff-lines are thicker, the staves are longer, the width of the text-block varies between pages, and the staves are not always carefully justified at left and right. To the casual viewer they do not even look printed, and indeed Taricani thought that they were hand-ruled. In short, Papers Z1 and Z2 do not obviously match the brand of Paper X. They could have been made by a different printer in a different place at a different time.

However, papers Z1 and Z2 can in fact be identified. Their ragged appearance and imperfect justification are reminiscent of music books printed in Lyons by Jacques Moderne. A search through digital images of Moderne’s publications from about 1542, also available at the Bayerische Staatsbibliothek’s website, quickly revealed that the metal-rule staves used to print Papers Z1 and Z2 were also used to fill out pages of Moderne’s Quintus liber motetorum ad quinque et sex et septem vocum (RISM 1542). Figure 2.5 shows a typical page
of Paper Z2 from Mus. MS 1508. It should be compared with Figure 2.6, which shows a page from Moderne’s *Quintus liber mottetorum*. Note that the second and third staves in Figure 2.5 (Mus. MS 1508) are identical to the first and third blank staves of Figure 2.6 (RISM 15425). They were printed using the same metal rules, though in different states of damage. This discovery generates a new research opportunity. If the progressive deterioration in Moderne’s blank staves were to be more closely examined – a task not attempted here – then it might be possible to prove that Paper Z2 was printed after RISM 15425, but before another dated Moderne edition; this would allow us to date Paper Z2 with reasonable confidence.

The identity of the person who printed Paper X, the main design used in Mus. MS 1508, remains unclear. In theory, any firm that had access to the materials needed to print staves could have made this product, or indeed any other printed music paper. In practice, evidence exists to show that music papers were at least sometimes manufactured by (or for) printer-publishers with a known interest in music. This may have been for reasons of retail sale and distribution: a firm that produced, sold and marketed printed music might logically extend its product range to include printed music paper, and indeed become known as a supplier of music stationery. As a working hypothesis, therefore, music printers should be reckoned strong candidates for making and supplying printed music papers.

The quality of Paper X is superior to that used by Moderne; compare Figure 2.4 (Paper X) and Figure 2.5 (Moderne’s Paper Z2). The metal rules used for Paper X are finer, and the staves are carefully justified at both the left- and right-hand margins. By comparison, Moderne’s design looks decidedly rough. There is no reason to suspect that Paper X was manufactured by Moderne’s competitors in Lyons, the Beringen brothers, because
Figure 2.5  Paper Z2. Note the imperfections in staves 2 and 3, and compare them with the first and third blank staves of Figure 2.6, which were printed using the same brass rules. In Mus. MS 1508, all leaves of Paper Z2 have been trimmed at one margin.
Source: Munich, Bayerische Staatsbibliothek, Mus. MS 1508, Quinta Pars partbook, fol. 23v.

Figure 2.6  Quintus liber motettorum ad quinque et sex et septem vocum (Lyons: Jacques Moderne, RISM 1542), Altus partbook, p. 26: Note the imperfections in the first and third blank staves, and compare them with those of Figure 2.5, staves 2 and 3, which were printed using the same brass rules. In this image, curvature of the staves at the right-hand side arises from tightness of binding at the gutter edge.
Source: Munich, Bayerische Staatsbibliothek, 4º Mus. pr. 201, tract 5.
they used only nested music fonts, and therefore assembled blank staves using the nested method. However, Paper X is made by the integral-staff method.

An obvious candidate as printer of Paper X would be Pierre Attaingnant. He definitely manufactured music papers, though they remain unresearched. Herwart purchased many of Attaingnant’s publications. However, the evidence provided by Paper X may suggest otherwise, on two counts. First, Attaingnant’s four known music fonts have staff-heights variously of 10, 14, and 17.5 mm. By contrast, Paper X has a staff-height of 12 mm. Second, a few quires of printed paper possibly printed by Attaingnant are bound together with some of Attaingnant’s chansonniers of 1535–1536 in F-Pm 30485A. They have a staff-height of 10 mm. This matches the staff-heights of Attaingnant’s two main music fonts, but not Paper X.

Another conjecture worth considering is that Paper X was made by Tylman Susato, music printer in Antwerp from 1543, whose editions Herwart also collected. Susato’s earliest publications use a font of nested type with a staff-height of 12 mm, which exactly matches that of Paper X. Moreover, from the start of his career Susato filled out his pages of polyphony with blank staves made from continuous metal rules, also with a staff-height of 12 mm. He therefore combined two technologies, nested type for the mensural notation, integral staves as filling material; see Figure 2.7, from Susato’s Le cincqiesme livre contenant trente et deux chansons a cinq et a six parties (Antwerp: Tylman Susato, RISM 154413). The metal rules used for the staves of Paper X are uniformly fine, and are carefully left- and right-justified on every page. The same high standards of production are evident in

Figure 2.7 Le cincqiesme livre contenant trente et deux chansons a cinq et a six parties (Antwerp: Tylman Susato, RISM 154413), Contratenor partbook, fol. 6r; The two blank staves at the foot of the page have each been printed from two segments of staff, one long, the second short. Susato’s compositors often used this principle, possibly because it allowed slight flexibility when the staves were justified with the typeset music. The pages of this book are cockled, hence the wavy effect in this image.

Source: Munich, Bayerische Staatsbibliothek, 4° Mus. pr. 201, tract 4.
Susato’s printed polyphony. Susato’s first known publication bears the date of 1543; this aligns perfectly with the earliest possible date for initial music copying in Munich Mus. MS 1508.

However, a bid to link Paper X with Susato runs against some significant obstacles. First, Paper X lacks watermarks, whereas Susato always used watermarked paper in his printed books. Admittedly the paper used for printing staves might have needed to be of a special kind in order to make it suitable for manuscript use, for example, to cope with ink absorption, and therefore differ from Susato’s normal papers; but closer analysis of music papers would be required to test this hypothesis. Second, staff-length in Paper X is 164–166 mm, whereas it is typically 160 mm in Susato’s chansonniers of the 1540s. It would of course have been possible for the printer of Paper X to have reserved those longer staves expressly for repeated printings of music paper, in the same way that Tallis and Byrd or their printer reserved a set of staves for this purpose; but Susato need not have been that printer. Above all, however, any attempt to attribute Paper X to Susato fails for a third reason: the actual staves used to print Paper X do not occur in any polyphonic books printed by Susato in the 1540s. No direct link exists, as it does between Papers Z1–Z2 and Moderne’s publications.

What does seem likely, however, is that the integral-staff method of printing blank staves, as found in Paper X, was in use by French and Flemish music printers by the mid-1540s, but not by their German contemporaries. The case for an Augsburg provenance of D-Mbs Mus. MS 1508 thus does not look strong. None of the paper bears a German watermark; Papers Z1 and Z2 were definitely printed in Lyons by Moderne; the copyists’ scribal habits, to quote David Fallows, ‘are without question those of a born Francophone, with handwriting absolutely characteristic of mid-16th-century French sources’. If anything, Mus. MS 1508 now seems more closely linked to Lyons, where Papers Z1 and Z2 were printed. This makes total sense: branches of the Herwart family resided and did business in that city. As for the dates of compilation, at present Paper X yields no firm information, but Papers Z1 and Z2 do hold promise, because their staves were used multiple times by Moderne, and deteriorated over time. Closer study of them may point to a year of printing; this would provide an approximate date when Scribe B expanded Mus. MS 1508.

Learning from printed staves

The main lesson to be learnt from this study is that printed music papers can yield evidence about their place of origin, their date, and even their printer. For instance, we may learn something by identifying the manufacturing process, whether integral-staff, nested or cast-type, because different printers used different methods. The height of the staff needs to be known, because it may match staff-height in a printer’s font of music type, and therefore point to or imply the printer’s identity. Above all, however, latent evidence exists in every staff that can be visually distinguished from its neighbours, either because of the way it was made, or from damage subsequently done to it. Once we have identified individual staves, we can prove that a design of printed paper passed through more than one edition. When that happens, study of staff-placement allows us to distinguish the editions. Staff-deterioration may imply chronology. If a printer used his set of staves to print not only music paper but also partbooks, then his identity may be revealed by comparing those two categories of product. This has happened with Jacques Moderne, and as a result, we now know not only that he issued music paper, but also what it looked like. An investigation of staff-deterioration across Moderne’s printed output might permit us to establish
relative chronology or approximate dates not only for Papers Z1 and Z2, but also for those of Moderne’s sets of partbooks that were issued without date of publication, such as the enigmatic Musicque de joye (RISM [c. 1550]). Thus staff deterioration now becomes a topic that invites future research.

When two or more discrete items can be linked together through their shared use of the same staves or method of manufacture, then it becomes possible to affirm or propose the concept of brand, and to supply a base on which future research can build. For instance, comparison of papers – based on analysis of the staves and watermarks – now allows us to speak with confidence about a Tallis and Byrd brand, a Moderne brand, and probably an Augsburg brand. Through further research, it may also be possible to identify an Attaingnant brand, working outwards from the printed paper bound into F-Pm 30485A (briefly mentioned above).

Knowledge of brand can contribute to biography. A case in point is Derrick Gerarde, active in the mid-sixteenth century, who made extensive use of printed papers. Gerarde is a shadowy figure, undocumented in archival sources, and known mainly from his compositions. Susato printed a few works attributed to ‘Gerardus’ between 1544 and 1558, but the majority are unique to Gerarde’s six holograph partbook sets, which survive in various states of completeness in The British Library. These books are important because they contain by far the largest known cache of autograph copies of music by any sixteenth-century composer. But they are also mysterious, because so little is known about Gerarde’s life and career. Between them, Gerarde’s partbooks contain at least five different designs of printed music paper. One of them, with a distinctive ornamental border of printer’s flowers, has long been known to have been printed in England. Recently it has been dated more precisely to c. 1567–1572, giving us for the first time firm evidence of Gerarde’s whereabouts at a particular period. An obvious next step would be to research the other printed papers used by Gerarde. They have plainer designs, not otherwise recorded in Tudor sources. It would be worth investigating whether any of them were printed on the European mainland. Gerarde’s partbooks can now be viewed online in high-resolution digital images. A rich research opportunity exists here.

Looking to the future, scope exists for the creation of a collaborative online catalogue of music papers and tablature grids known to have been printed in at least the sixteenth and seventeenth centuries, and possibly later too. Such a catalogue would need to be international in its coverage, because the papers themselves could move across Europe over time, whether in unused state as stationery for sale, or in the hands of the musicians and collectors who owned and used printed-paper products. It would be essential for this catalogue to be image-rich, because the printed staves themselves transmit so much key evidence. The catalogue would need to link with data about sixteenth-century music fonts, and indeed might even intersect with detailed analyses of those fonts. It would need to be searchable by at least four criteria: (1) manufacturing process (integral-staff method, etc.); (2) design (number of staves, indentation of top staff, etc.); (3) measurements (staff-height, staff-width); and (4) watermarks. Items with shared brand characteristics would ideally be grouped together, irrespective of the library locations where those items are now physically kept. Above all, though, it would need to supply users with hypertext links to the ever-expanding world of online digital images, through which intensive research in this field has been made possible in the first place. Such a collaborative catalogue or database might reasonably be hoped to supply relevant data for locating the likely origins of previously obscure sources, and to provide a much broader view of music printing, creation and consumption than has previously been achieved.
Notes

1 I am indebted to Nicolas Bell, Laurent Guillo, Martin Ham and Eric Jas for their comments on a draft text of this study. Existing writings about printed music papers include Fenlon and Milsom, ‘Ruled Paper Imprinted’; Butler, ‘Printed Borders’; and for seventeenth-century France, Guillo, ‘Les papiers à musique’. The present study distinguishes between ‘staff/staves’ and ‘tablature grid’ to signal differences of function: a staff is used to specify pitch, whereas a tablature grid specifies the courses of a plucked instrument.

2 For documentary references to the sale or use of ruled papers in France, Spain and Italy, see Van Orden, Materialities, 44–45 (France), 50 (Spain), and 73 (Italy). For images of two ruled papers printed or used in the Low Countries, see Schreurs, Anthologie van muziekfragmenten, 127 (lower image) and 130–131. For English papers, see Fenlon and Milsom, ‘Ruled Paper Imprinted’. Sanna Raninen (personal communication) kindly alerted me to examples of Swedish manuscripts with printed staves.

3 This licence, which also gave Tallis and Byrd exclusive rights to print music in England and import printed music into England, is discussed most fully in Tallis & Byrd: Cantiones Sacrae 1575, Introduction.

4 Fenlon and Milsom, ‘Ruled Paper Imprinted’.

5 On Herwart’s collection, see Slim, ‘The Music Library’.

6 For discussion of the staves used when printing music by double or multiple impression, see Duggan, Italian Music Incunabula, 49–64, and Boorman, Ottaviano Petrucci, 118–121.

7 According to Moxon, Mechanick Exercises, 26–27, brass rules were made by joiners, and were hardened by planishing or annealing to minimise the risk of bowing. If combined to form staves or tablature grids, the rules may have been set in grooves cut into wooden blocks.

8 In theory, a bend or splay in a metal staff-line could be rectified with pliers. In reality, however, printers of music papers seem to have ignored such blemishes, allowing them not only to survive, but then to be joined by further imperfections – hence the ‘evolving identity’ of each staff. A small dent or break in a metal staff-line might have been harder to remedy.

9 The terms ‘nested’ and ‘linear’ were introduced by Donald Krummel in English Music Printing, 49–50. For discussions of the process of setting nested mensural music type, see especially Forney, ‘Tielman Susato’, 112–117 and 151–154; also McDonald, ‘Printing Hofhaimer’, 70–72.

10 Krummel’s term ‘linear type’ denotes a single-impression music font in which every sort includes a segment of five-line staff. The principle was apparently first used by John Rastell in London in the early 1520s, but was made famous by the Parisian printer Pierre Attaingnant.

11 Cast staves and staff-segments for printing plainchant are discussed in Duggan, Italian Music Incunabula, 55.

12 Peter Stallybrass shrewdly observes that printers have always relied on ‘little jobs’ for cash turnover, and that many such ‘little jobs’ fall into the category of ‘blanks’, that is, single-sheet (or single-leaf) printed works designed to be filled in by hand; Stallybrass ‘Little Jobs’, 340–341. Printed music papers perfectly exemplify those points.

13 I propose use of the term ‘edition’, rather than ‘state’, because the latter bibliographical term implies changes made to the contents of a forme during the course of printing, prior to those contents being broken up and distributed. ‘Edition’, conversely, implies that the forme has been freshly composed, even if using exactly the same staves as in earlier and later editions.

14 For English music papers printed between c. 1530 and c. 1575, see Fenlon and Milsom, ‘Ruled Paper Imprinted’.

15 Arber, A Transcript, 111.

16 Ibid., 144.

17 Leedham-Green, Books in Cambridge Inventories, 1: 337, item 465.

18 Rodger, ‘Roger Ward’s Shrewsbury Stock’, 252, item 102. Other ‘paper booke’ listed in this inventory (items 511–519) might also refer to ruled music paper, but the descriptions are too vague to be sure.

19 Another possibility is that the staves were set permanently into the spacing furniture, and therefore naturally resumed their relative positioning when returned to the forme. I am grateful to Nicolas Bell for this suggestion.

20 Scope exists for watermark evidence to be taken into account. For some preliminary work on this in the Tallis-Byrd quarto music papers, see Butler, ‘Creating a Tudor Musical Miscellany’.
Described with an inventory and summary collation in Bray, ‘The Part-Books’. See also the online description and inventory at the Christ Church Library Music Catalogue website. High-resolution digital images can be accessed at the DIAMM website, and a facsimile edition is in preparation for the series DIAMM Publications.

Facsimile and full discussion in The Dow Partbooks. High-resolution digital images can be accessed at the DIAMM website.

A detailed discussion of these partbooks is forthcoming in Butler, ‘Creating a Tudor Musical Miscellany’.


Eccles, ‘Bynneman’s books’, 87, item 146. An English pound (£) was worth 20 shillings (s), and a shilling worth 12 pence/pennies (d); so £1 = 240d.


Barnard and Bell, ‘The Inventory’, 11–14.

This estimate is supported by a receipt written by William Byrd for payment of two shillings for ‘three quyres of partician [partition] paper’, probably in 1576; see Harley, William Byrd, 47. Assuming that this refers to printed music paper, the value of each sheet was approximately 0.34d.

High-resolution digital images can be accessed at the DIAMM website. A detailed discussion of these partbooks is forthcoming in Butler, ‘Creating a Tudor Musical Miscellany’.

Full details, together with collation diagrams and an inventory, will feature in the forthcoming facsimile edition of Baldwin. The outline analysis of gathering structure shown in Bray, ‘The Part-Books’, 184–188, is largely accurate, but supplies too little information to be useful for detailed research, and was also drawn up before the partbooks were paginated.

An equivalent system operates in our own day: some music publishers sell forms of music stationery that have been available in stable formats for many decades. For instance, the UK firm of Novello has long produced a numbered series of ‘Manuscript Books’ with configurations of staves and quality of paper that never significantly change.

This layer opens with John Sheppard’s responsory [Justi autem] in perpetuum (no. 90). In GB-Och Mus. 979, the layer is made solely from edition FOX; in the other partbooks of the set, FOX is mixed with sheets of editions ELK and HEN. A full analysis of the editions of printed papers used in Baldwin will appear in the introduction to the forthcoming DIAMM facsimile of these partbooks.

This layer opens with Robert Parsons’s O bone Jesu (no. 54). When Baldwin subsequently joined the various fascicles together, he excised the start of this piece, and re-copied its opening at the close of a fascicle made from the later edition CAT. By doing so, he achieved a seamless continuity of contents from CAT into APE; but as a result, Baldwin’s scribal hand changes character during the course of this work. See, for instance, GB-Och Mus. 979, p. 108 (last page of CAT) and facing p. 109 (first page of APE): the right-hand page of the opening (109) shows an earlier state of Baldwin’s hand than the re-copied left-hand page (108).

In both partbooks, the printed staves begin at p. 17, following a layer copied on hand-ruled staves.

This is suggested by the fact that copying of some pieces coincides with the first recto of a fresh edition of printed staves. For instance, Robert Johnson’s Domine in virtute tua was copied at the start of a four-leaf gathering made from a sheet of the edition designated as POT (at McGhie, p. 61, and T389, p. 59). The edition designated BUG, which starts at p. 17 in both partbooks, is also found in Baldwin, commencing at (for instance) GB-Och Mus. 979, p. 149. Baldwin used BUG to extend an earlier layer made from edition APE (commencing at GB-Och Mus. 979, p. 109), in which he had already copied motets by Byrd composed probably in the mid-1580s, such as Tristitia et anxietas. This may imply that edition BUG was itself printed in the mid-1580s. If so, then evidence from Baldwin can be used to point to a possible copying date for one layer of McGhie/T389. However, it should not be assumed that the layers of McGhie/T389 were necessarily copied in the order in which they were eventually bound.

The same image can be viewed online at the DIAMM website, where a ruler is shown, allowing the image to be zoomed to life-size, and its dimensions accurately measured. Magnification also allows every defect to be viewed in minute detail.


Segments of cast four-line staff were also commonly used to print the red staves for plainchant in liturgical books produced by the double-impression method. Presumably this is because the often
complex mise-en-page of liturgical books required staves to be of many different lengths, and this was most easily achieved by using type segments to set the staves.

39 Göllner, Tabulaturen und Stimmbücher; Taricani, ‘A Chansonnier’.

40 Göllner, Tabulaturen und Stimmbücher, 61–62; online reference numbers were accurate at the time of writing (May 2019). For an overview of the phenomenon of partleaves (loose single leaves or bifolia, one for each performer), and discussion of the term ‘partleaf’, see Milsom, ‘The Culture of Partleaves’. The Bayerische Staatsbibliothek holds the largest known cache of sixteenth-century examples.

41 Dunning, Die Staatsmotette, 224–226.

42 Göllner, Tabulaturen und Stimmbücher, 60; Taricani, ‘A Chansonnier’, 110 (watermark E), 115, 117, and 121 fn 35. Digital images of these and other watermarks mentioned below can now be viewed on the Bayerische Staatsbibliothek’s website, accessed under the call-numbers of the items to which they relate.

43 This conclusion was reached by viewing digital images of all the music items known or thought to have been printed by Kriesstein and Ulhart, as catalogued in the vdm database. It is unclear whether Kriesstein and Ulhart both owned fonts of nested type, or shared them with one another, or drew on fonts owned by third parties. For some discussion of this, see Krummel, ‘Early German Partbook Type Faces’, 83–87; also Röder and Wohnhaas, ‘Der Augsburger Musikdruck’, 301–310.


45 D-Mbs Mus. MS 1503b, fols. 12–13, no. 14. Göllner, Tabulaturen und Stimmbücher, 61, which reports that this song also occurs in RISM 15611 and later manuscript sources. Images can be viewed online as part of Mus.ms. 1503 b.

46 D-Mbs Mus. MS 1503b, fol. 5, no. 6. Göllner, Tabulaturen und Stimmbücher, 61–62. Images can be viewed online as part of Mus.ms. 1503 b.

47 It is impossible to be precise about measurements, partly because of inconsistencies in the inking of the staff-lines, which themselves may vary slightly in height and length, partly because of shrinkage of the paper, which may not be consistent within a batch. On measurement, see especially Forney, ‘Tielman Susato’, 109–111; Krummel, ‘Early German Partbook Type Faces’, 97–98; and Guillo, Les éditions musicales, 377–378. On paper shrinkage, see most recently Blayney, ‘A Dry Discourse’, 391.

48 Göllner, Tabulaturen und Stimmbücher, 67–68. This book is viewable online at Mus.ms. 1505.

49 This font is described in Krummel, ‘Early German Partbook Type Faces’, 87, typeface no. 7.


51 Description and inventory in Göllner, Tabulaturen und Stimmbücher, 68–76. Provenance: Slim, ‘The Music Library’, item no. 236. This manuscript is viewable online as Mus.ms. 1508.

52 The presence of printed staves is not noted in the description of D-Mbs Mus. MS 1508 in Census-Catalogue, 2:220–221. This information is therefore also absent from the DIAMM description.


54 None of the copyists of Mus. MS 1508 has been identified. The distribution of hands is listed in Taricani, ‘A Chansonnier’, 139, and sample images are supplied at 140–147.


56 Ibid., 135.

57 For instance, in late Tudor England music paper was definitely printed by (or for) Thomas East, who at the time was London’s principal music printer; see Fenlon and Milsom, ‘Ruled Paper Imprinted’, and Butler, ‘Printed Borders’. The evidence that Moderne printed music paper as well as music is outlined in the present article; the evidence for Attaingnant follows below. The Tallis-Byrd monopoly of 1575 effectively gave the two men control over all three principal retail opportunities for notated music: printing music, selling imported music, and selling music paper.

58 For a document of 1554 referring to the sale of Attaingnant’s papier réglé, see Heartz, Pierre Attaingnant, 191.

59 Heartz, Pierre Attaingnant, 72.

60 F-Pm Rés. 8° 30485 A. The presence of printed music paper within this volume is mentioned in Heartz, Pierre Attaingnant, 286, and in Census-Catalogue, 3: 37.
Forney, ‘Tielman Susato’, 129, music type A.

I am indebted to Martin Ham for the following observations.

This conclusion has been reached after viewing digital images of a wide selection of German partbooks printed in the 1530s and 1540s, as catalogued in the vdm database. Printers who owned or used fonts of linear type, such as Formschneider, Rhau and Berg & Neuber, created blank staves by abutting short segments of cast type. Printers who owned or used fonts of nested type, such as Petreius, Kriesstein and Ulhart, built blank staves out of nested staff-lines.


Of course, date of manufacture does not necessarily equate with date of subsequent use by a抄影. Nonetheless, when a substantial manuscript has been made wholly from a single edition of a printed music paper, as is the case with Dow (using an edition of the Tallis-Byrd quarto design) and the first layer of repertory in Munich Mus. MS 1508 (using Paper X), then the date of copying may well correlate with the date of acquisition of a printed paper, and, in turn, with its approximate date of printing. The numerous editions of the Tallis-Byrd quarto design imply that print-runs were relatively short, and indeed it could have been more convenient and economical to print new editions afresh when needed, rather than store large quantities of sheets printed as a single edition.

Various publication dates between 1542 and 1556 have been proposed for Musicque de joye; see Pogue, Jacques Moderne, 182–183. However, nobody has yet looked at staff-deterioration as a latent source of evidence. For Moderne’s other undated publications, see the items listed in parentheses in Pogue, Jacques Moderne, 272–278.

Royal Appendix MSS 17–22, 23–25, 26–30, 31–35, 49–54 and 57, surveyed in overview in Milsom, ‘Nonsuch’, 162–164; suggestions made there for other possible Gerarde holographs can now largely be excluded. The fullest discussion to date of Gerarde and his manuscripts is Milledge, ‘The Music of Dyricke Gerarde’, which includes transcriptions of all Gerarde’s known compositions found in English manuscript sources.

Fenlon and Milsom, ‘Ruled Paper Imprinted’, Table 1 (p. 146), designs 1c, 1f, 1h, 1i and 1j.

GB-Lbl Royal Appendix MS 57; see Butler, ‘Printed Borders’, especially the summary at 201.

At the time of writing, the images can be accessed through DIAMM, but not at The British Library’s own website. Gerarde revised many of his compositions; his methods can be followed by comparing the online images with the score transcriptions in Milledge, ‘The Music of Dyricke Gerarde’, downloadable from Durham University Library’s website.

To date, nobody seems to have created a ‘virtual font’ of a music typeface by extracting sample sorts from digital images. Scope exists for the creation of a database of all sixteenth-century music fonts, searchable by (for instance) clefs, mensuration signs and directs.
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Part II
Notes
Preliminary remarks

In the first decades of the Reformation, the free imperial city of Strasbourg was the most important centre in the production of printed music for the emerging Evangelical churches. The number of editions printed there far exceeds all other places in Germany, such as Wittenberg, Augsburg, Leipzig, Magdeburg, Nuremberg and Erfurt. Only in the second half of the century did the production of hymnbooks in Strasbourg decline, and production shift to other cities. This is associated with the politically difficult situation of Strasbourg following the 1547/1548 Diet of Augsburg, when Catholic worship was forcibly readmitted in Strasbourg for several years.

The most common type of printed book containing sacred music published at Strasbourg was the hymnbook, intended either for liturgical or personal use. Several of these were obviously intended for use in worship by the new Protestant churches in Strasbourg; others were produced for private use, within the city or beyond. In any case, the Strasbourg hymnbooks, with one exception to which we will return, were not official ‘church hymnbooks’ authorised by the clergy. The role played by publishing, technical and pragmatic questions in the design of hymnbooks has not yet been fully explored.

In this chapter we will examine this corpus of printed sacred music from Strasbourg with regard to various aspects: contents, repertoire, paratexts such as prefaces, notation, printing technique, mise-en-page, decoration and target audience. We will be guided by the question of the necessary conditions for the production of hymnbooks at Strasbourg in the early days of the Reformation.

Previous research has established that most of the first Protestant hymnbooks were not initiated directly by the Reformers. One exception is the Geneva Psalter. For more than twenty years following his return to Geneva in 1541, Jean Calvin worked towards the publication of the translation of the complete Psalter in verse. The corresponding titles of the Geneva Psalter editions up to 1562, that is, *Fifty Psalms in French (Cinquante Pseaumes en françois)* or *Eighty-three Psalms by David (Octante trois Pseaumes de David)*, show their provisional character as well as the goal, which was clearly defined from the beginning: that all 150 biblical psalms should be completely provided with melodies for use in worship.¹

What Daniel Trocmé-Latter wrote in his study on the first Strasbourg liturgies, namely, that ‘[they] were not commissioned by the reformers but were more likely to have been attempts by opportunistic publishers to profit from the uncertain situation and lack of any official decree on the matter’, applies similarly to almost all the hymnbooks printed in the city.² These books were produced and distributed on the initiative of the printers, albeit
usually in consultation with the preachers. Martin Bucer, the Reformer of Strasbour, first set out the foundations of singing within the new worship service in his reformatory declaration *Ground and Reason* (1525). But it can hardly be assumed that all Strasbour hymnbooks followed these guidelines from this moment on.

The Corpus

The numerous editions of the hymnbooks in Strasbour in the sixteenth century are well known. Any open questions are likely to concern multiple issues and pamphlets of only a few pages. Besides ‘natural enemies’ in Strasbour, the devastating fire in the library during the siege and bombing of the city in the Franco-Prussian War of 1870 was responsible for the probably definitive loss of some editions.

From the beginning of the Reformation until the end of the Interim shortly after the middle of the century, that is, a period of thirty years, about fifty editions containing sacred songs are known. Almost half were printed between 1524 and 1527. After this time, the frequency decreases significantly. After 1547, no German hymnbooks appeared until after the Interim. During the Interim, two French Psalters were printed. The next hymnbook printed in Strasbour was *All the Psalms, hymns and spiritual songs* (*Alle Psalmen/ Hymni/ vnnd Geystliche Lieder*), published by Paul and Philipp Köpfel in 1557. In other words, not a single German hymnbook was printed in Strasbour during the Interim, a period of almost ten years.

The production of hymnbooks during these three decades can be divided into three phases. The first years of the Reformation, until the middle of the 1530s, represented a period of experimentation. The Catholic services, both the Mass and the Liturgy of the Hours, continued to exist at first (albeit limited to a few churches), but were increasingly suppressed. The Mass was only officially abolished in 1529 by a decision of the city’s justices (*Schöffen*). This first phase saw the production of single editions containing one or a few songs: the German Credo (1525), Matthias Greiter’s version of Psalm 51 (1525), *Es ist die Wahrheit bracht an Tag* (1527), the German *Te Deum* by Johannes Brenz together with a translation of Psalm 46 by Johannes Frosch (1529), as well as several editions with just a few psalms each, all printed in 1527.

The abolition of the Mass marks the beginning of a second phase of consolidation, which came to an end in the late 1530s. During this period, fewer songbooks were printed, but a large corpus of the Psalms and canticles was created. The first part of the ‘Strasbour Psalter’, with probably 131 songs, most of them with notes, was printed in 1537, apparently simultaneously in two different editions with identical titles: *Psalms and spiritual songs*. The first edition was printed by Wolfgang Köpfel in octavo, while another octavo edition (with slightly larger pages) was printed for Köpfel by Johannes Prüss the Younger. Probably in the following year, 1538, Köpfel reprinted the same hymnbook. In 1541 he commissioned Georg Messerschmid to reprint the book on his behalf. In 1543, Köpfel reprinted the book again, apparently for the last time.

The second section of the Psalter contains 148 texts, most of which are supplied with notes. This was intended as a supplement to the first section, since it contains no duplicates. The title betrays the claim to present a complete rhymed Psalter: *Psalter, that is, all the Psalms of David, with their melodies, together with many beautiful Christian songs* (*Psalter. Das seindt alle Psalmen Davids/ mit jren Melodeien sampt vil Schönem Christlichen liedern*).
A reprint of this edition (with melodies) appeared in 1544. Thus a normative repertoire of about 220 songs (psalms and biblical canticles) was available. However, it was only in use in the Protestant service for a short time.

In the final phase, which lasted until the Interim, which began with Bucer’s forced exile in 1549, a change in repertoire is already discernible. The Gesangbuche of 1541 contains only sixty-six songs, which – as the title page notes – were ‘collected from the hymnbooks of the Wittenberg, Strasbourg, and other churches’. The two editions of A new and select songbook (Ein Neuer Auserlesen Gesangbuchlin, 1545 and 1547) also contain mostly songs of the Wittenberg Reformation, especially those by Luther.

A turning point in the production of hymnbooks in Strasbourg coincides with the defeat of the Protestants by Emperor Charles V in the Battle of Mühlberg (1547). From this year, no more German hymnbooks were printed in Strasbourg until after the end of the Interim. Only two different editions of the French rhyming Psalter (still incomplete) appeared in 1548 and 1553. Hymnbook production recommenced in Strasbourg only after the end of the Interim, with the Peace of Augsburg in 1555, and the abdication of Charles V in 1556. From this time until the end of the sixteenth century, forty-five hymnbooks were printed. The titles clearly show the new, orthodox Lutheran confessional orientation under Johannes Marbach: Luther’s name is often mentioned explicitly, for example, on the numerous editions of Psalms, Spiritual Songs and Canticles (Psalmen, Geystliche Lieder und Lobgesänge).

Apart from hymnbooks containing the repertoire of the ‘official’ church of Strasbourg, two other repertoires were printed in the city during our period. Between 1534 and 1536, Katharina Zell, the wife of the Münster preacher Matthäus Zell, commissioned the printing of an extensive hymnbook in four sections, which contained the songs of the Bohemian Brethren: Of Jesus Christ our Saviour (Von Christo Jesu vnserem sächtmacher). This four-part work was published by Jakob Frölich. This was a courageous step at a moment when a Strasbourg synod decided to take tougher measures against dissidents. The four booklets were not intended for worship, but for private piety. In the preface, addressed to laypeople, especially housewives, Katharina Zell describes the origin of the publication: she had received the hymnbook of the Bohemian Brethren, but she did not know the author, Michel Weiße, personally. The aim of her hymnbook was to replace the rejected songs in circulation with catechetical songs in which one might simultaneously learn about the life of Jesus. These hymns were suitable for regular days, special days in the Christian calendar, and various crucial moments during the believer’s life. She explains that she divided 158 songs from Weiße’s extensive hymnal into four parts, which were to be sold at a low price (’ij. iij. vnd iiiij. pfenning’). She names the target audience precisely: the simple folk, the craftsmen, the peasants, the maidservants, the housewives, who would, she hoped, sing spiritual songs in their daily tasks. The songs are accompanied by notated melodies.

A French repertoire was also printed in Strasbourg during the period under study. In 1539, less than a year after his arrival in the city, Jean Calvin commissioned Johannes Knobloch the Younger to print a simple but carefully produced booklet, without preface or liturgical order. It contains twenty-two songs – nineteen psalms, the Nunc dimittis, the Decalogue and the Credo – all with melodies. It would take a little more than twenty years for this inconspicuous booklet to become the complete Geneva Psalter, with its impressive history. After Calvin’s departure, two extended reprints of this French psalm repertoire appeared at Strasbourg until the Interim, in 1542 and 1545.
The printers

Music had been printed at Strasbourg since the 1470s. In the period studied, that is, between 1524 and 1555, a total of twenty-five workshops in the city printed music. However, only a handful were active in printing German hymnbooks.

The most important Strasbourg music printer in the first half of the sixteenth century was Peter Schöffer the Younger (c. 1475/1480–1547), who came to Strasbourg from Mainz or Worms in 1529.25 Bucer and Capito helped him set up his workshop. Since 1533 he had worked together with Mathias Biener, called Apiarius (1495/1500–1554), who came from Basel, where he had learnt the printing trade, to Strasbourg. The special technical feature of the workshop of Schöffer and Apiarius is that, for the first time in Strasbourg, these partners printed music not from woodblocks, but in type, using the technique pioneered by Petrucci for mensural music. Their most important publication is the collection of the Sixty-five German songs (Fünff vnd sechzig teütscher Lieder), published in 1536 in five part-books.26 It contains up-to-date pieces, mainly by composers who were still alive or had died only recently. It is therefore not surprising that the only polyphonic sacred music with German text that appeared in Strasbourg between the beginning of the Reformation and the Interim was printed by Schöffer and Apiarius, namely Johann Walter’s Gesangbuch, which was imported from Wittenberg.27

The most important printer of hymnbooks in Strasbourg in the first half of the sixteenth century was Wolfgang Köpfel, who had a monopoly in this area. Köpfel was born in Hagenau and came from Basel to Strasbourg in 1522, where he was active until his death in 1554. He benefited from the support, including financial backing, of his uncle, the Strasbourg Reformer Wolfgang Capito (a Latinised form of ‘Köpfel’).28 Thus Köpfel became the most important printer of the Strasbourg Reformation, publishing writings by Luther, Bucer, Capito and Zell.29 Up to the Interim, almost all liturgical books and hymnbooks for the German-speaking church of Strasbourg originated from Köpfel’s workshop. His only competition came in the first years of the Reformation, from Johannes Knobloch the Elder, who printed musical broadsheets, such as the German Credo, in 1524/1525.30 In 1527 Johannes Prüss the Younger published a polemic on the Last Supper controversy, which also contained a song with notes.31 Songs with notes are also contained in the Order of the Lord’s Supper, which Johannes Schwan published in two editions in 1525 (see Figure 3.1).32

For more extensive editions, Köpfel also worked with other printers as a publisher. He commissioned others to print the first part of the Psalter: two editions by Johannes Prüss the Younger in 1538;33 another by Georg Messerschmid 1538 or 1539; and a final edition in 1541, again by Messerschmid.34 The latter (also known as Waldmüller)35 also produced the most magnificent of all musical editions printed at Strasbourg in the sixteenth century, the Gesangbuch of 1541.36 Surprisingly, the name of the printer is not mentioned on the title page of the first edition; it appears only in the next edition (1560).37 But Martin Bucer mentions him in his preface: ‘the honourable printer Jörg Waldmüller, called Messerschmid, acceded to requests and commands to print a songbook for the good of the dear church, and to promote pious singing in Christian congregations, schools and places of instruction, with considerable expense and effort and with great diligence, as the book itself attests, so that the psalms and spiritual songs included in it might be issued in the neatest and most carefully corrected edition possible’.38

Messerschmid printed from 1541 to 1560 in the workshop of Johannes Knobloch the Younger, from whose father he had probably learnt his trade. Later, at an unknown time, the Knobloch workshop seems to have passed into Messerschmid’s possession.39 It is
surprising that this magnificent work of the Protestant church of Strasbourg was not entrusted to the ‘house printer’ Köpfel. Either Köpfel did not have the necessary expertise to carry out multiple-impression printing, or he did not want to take the risk of publishing such a work, with its attendant costs. Bucer’s formulation ‘with not inconsiderable expense and effort’ (‘nicht mit geringem kosten vnd müh’) in the preface points in this direction.

The psalm collections for the French-speaking exile community in Strasbourg were first published by local printers. In 1539, Calvin’s *Aulcuns pseaulmes et cantiques mys en chant* was published by Johannes Knobloch the Younger, who took over his father’s workshop after his death in 1538. In 1542 appeared Pierre Brully’s ‘pseudo-Romanus’ (so called because of the fictitious printing address of Rome), both collections containing French psalm songs. The lost successor of the pseudo-Romanus, *La forme des prieres et chantz ecclesiastiques*, was probably published by Messerschmid in the Knobloch workshop in 1545. However, printers exiled from France were also active in Strasbourg. The printer François Perrin worked together with the bookseller Pierre Estiart. The two were in close contact with the centres of the French book trade, Geneva and Lyons, but also with Basel, and in the 1550s supplied France and the Netherlands with the writings of Rhenish and Swiss theologians. Less important on a European level, even if musically important, was the printer
Rémy Guédon, who printed the Pseaumes de David traduitz en rithme françoise in Strasbourg in 1548. Finally, in 1553, Wolfgang Köpfel published the Pseaumes de David, mis en rime Francoyse, the last French psalm collection.

Prefaces

Practically all Strasbourg hymnbooks of the period studied contain a preface. Broadsheets and pamphlets, which contain only one or a few songs, are the exception to this tendency. Apart from titles with purely Lutheran repertoire, which can be described as ‘imported products’ and which contain a foreword by Luther, almost all prefaces to the German-language Strasbourg hymnbooks come from the respective printer, who was in most cases Wolfgang Köpfel. It is unusual that the Strasbourg reformers did not write forewords, since Luther had recognised from the beginning the importance of the foreword as a propagandistic and catechetical instrument in the service of the Reformation. From the review of the prefaces it can be seen that the printers acted on their own initiative, even if in accordance with the will of the preachers.

The first edition of the Teutsch kirchen ampt (1524) does not yet include a foreword. The next edition, printed the same year, is accompanied by a short preface without any indication of the author; however, the text reveals that the author was the printer Wolfgang Köpfel. He writes in the first person, in the name of the ‘servants of the Word’, that is, of the preachers. He explains that these have introduced new songs: ‘For this reason I have printed them besides other prayers’ (‘Deßhalb habe ich sye neben anderen gebetten getruckt’).

In the detailed foreword to the Psalms, Prayers and Church Order of 1530, the full name of the printer is given as follows: ‘Wolfgang Köpfel, printer at Strasbourg’ (‘Wolfgang Köpfel Buch trucker zü Straßburg’). His remarks show that he personally selected the forty-six songs in the hymnbook, and even reveal his criteria. On one hand he limited the selection so that the congregation would not be overwhelmed by songs. On the other, he largely renounced ‘spiritual songs by estimable and spirited authors’ (‘geistliche lieder von achtbaren vnd geystreichen’), since the congregation could easily be blinded by the famous names. In concrete terms this means that no song by Luther or the other Wittenberg poets appears in the hymnbook. Was Köpfel responsible for this, or was he acted on the instructions of Bucer and the preachers?

When Köpfel published the second part of the Psalter in 1538 (see Figure 3.2), which presented a total of 189 Psalms and twenty-six canticles, the printer announced his publishing project in the preface (‘Wolff Köpfel zum Leser’):

Dear reader, until now I have printed the Psalms and spiritual songs, as they are sung here and there in Christian congregations, piecemeal, as I have been able to get my hands on them. However, now that the complete German translation of the whole Psalter has recently been brought to completion through the great diligence of many famous, distinguished poets, I have printed it along with the previous church orders and spiritual songs in a single volume.

Johannes Schwan, a former Franciscan from Marburg who had joined the Reformation and came to Strasbourg, also appears in his own name in the foreword to his Order of the Lord’s Supper (1525): ‘I, Johannes Schwan, citizen of Strasbourg’ (‘ich, Johannes Schwan, burger zu Straßburg’). He made it clear that he acted in harmony with the preachers: ‘And since they (the servants of the Word) are not hesitant to carry this out, since they are preaching the Word of God, I have printed this current [liturgical] use’ (‘Und so nün sy
The Reformer Martin Bucer wrote a foreword to only one printed collection of songs: the great Gesangbuch, which Georg Messerschmid printed in 1541. The title refers to a change in repertoire: Song book, in which all the most distinguished and best Psalms, spiritual songs and chant melodies, gathered from the song books of Wittenberg, Strasbourg and other churches, corrected and printed with particular care (Gesangbuch, darinn begriffen sind, die aller fürnemisten vnd besten Psalmen/ Geistliche Lieder/ vnd Chorgeseng/ aus dem Wittenbergischen/ Strasburgischen/ vnd anderer Kirchen Gesangbüchlin zusamen bracht/ vnd mit besonderem fleis corrigiert vnd gedruckel). The previous psalm repertoire, which was apparently distributed in numerous editions through Köpfel’s efforts, was pushed back and replaced by a Lutheran repertoire.
widespread throughout Protestant Germany. The paradigm shift is also supported by the fact that in the \textit{Gesangbüch}, for the first time, the authors of each some are named systematically in the title of each song. This \textit{Gesangbüch} is also the first example of the genre of the \textit{Cantional} in Strasbourg.

Bucer’s extensive preface is the only preface to a hymnbook written by a Strasbourg reformer until the Interim, apart from reprints of Luther’s prefaces. It is a verbose apology and justification of church song, a theological statement that refers explicitly to Luther in several places. In his preface, Bucer worries above all about correct singing, that is, that ‘very beautiful and spiritual songs’ (‘recht artige vnd geistliche Lieder’) are sung and nothing ‘unspiritual and incorrigible’ was ‘mixed in’ (‘ongeistlichs vnd onbesserlichs eingemischet’). Bucer’s preface was reprinted in the following (extended) editions (1545 and 1547, as well as after the Interim).\textsuperscript{56} However, these editions are attributed simply to a ‘Servant of the Word to the Churches at Strasbourg’ (‘Diener des Worts der Kirchen zu Strasburg’). (In the meantime Bucer had fallen out of favour and went into exile in England.) The preface also contains some changes. According to the preface, the hymnal, which was now greatly reduced in size (to octavo format), was supposed to be inexpensive so that young and old might buy and use it.

The French-language hymnbooks were supplied with prefaces only after Calvin’s departure from Strasbourg in September 1541. The aforementioned ‘pseudo-Romanus’, which Johannes Prüss the Younger printed in 1542, contains a short French foreword addressed ‘To the Christian reader’ (‘Au Lecteur Crestien’), which legitimises psalm singing in a conventional way. The anonymous author could be Calvin (or someone who excerpted Calvin’s preface) because the content is similar to that of the edition of the Geneva Psalter printed the same year.\textsuperscript{57} The preface was obviously reprinted again in the Strasbourg edition of 1545.\textsuperscript{58} We cannot say anything more exact, since no copy of this edition is preserved.

\section*{Printing technique}

The Strasbourg printers Johannes Schwan, Wolfgang Köpfel and Jakob Frölich printed the musical notation in their hymnbooks from woodblocks until the mid-1540s. The somewhat clumsy \textit{Hufnagel} notation was well served by this printing technique. The printer clearly used the same wooden blocks for multiple editions over several years. Each staff was produced on a single block and could thus be placed at different points on the page. However, some degradation would occur, and a comparison between Köpfel’s two editions of \textit{Psalms, prayers and church order} (\textit{Psalmen gebett und Kirchenübung}) from 1526 and 1530 shows that thin lines such as dividing lines have often broken in the later edition.\textsuperscript{59}

The quality of Strasbourg editions printed with woodblocks is satisfactory, but not excellent. Woodcut technology could not be used for large print runs. However, the manufacturing costs may have been relatively low, as Katharina Zell mentions in her foreword. Johann Knobloch the Younger produced high-quality woodcuts for the printing of Calvin’s \textit{Aulcuns pseaulmes et cantiques mys en chant} (1539).\textsuperscript{60} Here the printer used mensural notation, not the \textit{Hufnagel} notation customary for liturgical repertoire in Latin or German in books produced in the German cultural area, including Strasbourg. Knobloch printed this French psalm repertoire again in 1545 (with some additions), but since no copy has survived, nothing can be said about the printing technique.\textsuperscript{61} Rémy Guédon’s edition of French psalms (1548) also used mensural notation in block printing, again of a high quality.\textsuperscript{62} Finally, in 1553 Köpfel reprinted the French psalm repertoire, once again using woodblock printing.\textsuperscript{63}
It is noticeable that all French-language Strasbourg hymnbooks were printed in mensural notation. The fact that the Strasbourg printers Knobloch, Prüss and Köpfel did not use Hufnagel for the French hymnbooks is due to the target audience, which consisted of French and Flemish exiles. Moreover, these editions were also to be sold beyond Strasbourg, especially in Lorraine.

Polyphonic music in mensural notation, such as the two editions of the Wittenbergisches Gesangbüchlein (1534 and 1537), which was printed in partbooks using a multiple-impression technique, perfected by the workshop of Peter Schöffer and Matthias Apiarius in Strasbourg. In 1545 the technique was used for the first time at Strasbourg to print hymnbooks, and from then on replaced woodblock printing. In 1545 and 1547 Wolfgang Köpfel printed two editions of the Lutheran vocal repertoire in mensural notation by means of single-impression printing.

An exception to the tendency towards single impression is the large Gesangbőch of 1541, which Georg Messerschmid produced in multiple-impression printing; indeed, the book was produced elaborately in every respect: the staves were first printed in red, and the notes – in Hufnagel notation – in black.

Decoration and mise-en-page

The Strasbourg hymnbooks from the period under investigation are generally small, in octavo or quarto format. The format and the woodblock printing used kept the production costs relatively low. The selling price obviously played a role in the decoration, because these books usually have no other decoration apart from the title page. The practice of providing each section of the hymnbook with a suitable picture only emerged after the Interim.

The title pages of the early Strasbourg hymnbooks mostly have simple ornamental borders on the four sides, as familiar from Wittenberg hymnbooks. The woodcuts were often used for several editions, even for different works. Thus Köpfel used the same title strips for Ordnung und ynnhalt Teütscher Mess und Vesper (1524/1525) and the Enchiridion geistlicher Gesänge (with fictitious place of printing). Köpfel later used the same illustrations for at least six subsequent editions of Psalmen gebett und Kirchenübung (between 1526 and 1536), thus creating a graphic unity through the recognition effect. The Psalter of 1538 deviates from this scheme for the first time. Instead of four decorative borders around the outside, a uniform frame in the form of a classical Roman arch is used (see Figure 3.2). Köpfel dispenses with religious iconography, except, at most, the cornerstone (Psalm 118:22 or Matthew 21:42), which was in any case Köpfel’s printer’s mark. Several title pages of early hymnbooks show a profane pictorial language such as putti, mythical creatures, ancient vases or acanthus decoration. The title page of the German Credo, published as a pamphlet in 1524/1525 by Johannes Knobloch the Elder, even features a naked woman.

Köpfel quickly established a characteristic composition of the title page, whose pictorial language was already programmatically religious in the earliest editions. The Teütsch kirchen ampt (1524), for example, shows two symbols of the evangelists in the upper register (the ox for Luke and the lion for Mark), while in the middle God the Father (with mitre) stretches out his hands. In the left register Jesus preaches the Sermon on the Mount in front of a crowd of people; above is the inscription ‘Believe in the Good News’ (‘Gloubet dem Evangelio’). On the right we see Jesus’ baptism in the Jordan. In the previous edition of the same year, in the lower register we see the two other evangelists: on the left an eagle for John, on the right a man for Matthew. In the following issue, however, a
polemical image is inserted: in the middle, Jesus preaches before a crowd of people, among whom one can read ‘the just man lives by faith’ (‘Der gerecht uß dem Glouben lebt’, Romans 1:17, Galatians 3:11, Hebrews 10:38), a key verse in Luther’s theology of justification, while on the left side, the Pope is imprisoned within the walls of Rome.

The great Gesangbuch of 1541 also differs from all other Strasbourg hymnbooks from our period in terms of its mise-en-page. The large-format print is two-coloured throughout (red and black), the initials are elaborately executed, and the rubrics are adorned with decorative strips. A finely executed woodcut, probably designed by Hans Baldung Grien, is used on three occasions, at the beginning of new sections.

The target audience

The question about the target audience of the hymnbooks appears easy to answer, as hymnbooks seem to belong in the hands of worshippers. Ideological historiography of the nineteenth and twentieth centuries sees the hymnal as one of the most important media for the dissemination of the Reformation (and German culture). However, it is unclear whether the hymnbook was actually used in the sixteenth century during the divine service or for private piety. In the latter case, it may be assumed that a single copy per household was sufficient.

The entire congregation – men, women, children – sang in the church services of the Strasbourg churches probably as early as the mid-1520s, but this does not necessarily mean that hymnbooks were actually used in the service. We must consider two factors: the number of copies in circulation and the culture of reading and singing.

Since Köpfel was the only printer supplying the churches of Strasbourg with hymnbooks, it was impossible for him to produce enough copies to provide each parishioner with a hymnbook. At the beginning of the Reformation, Strasbourg had a population of around 20,000. Added to these were the inhabitants of the villages on either side of the Rhine, which were directly dependent on the city. Even if we count only adults, this would amount to at least 10,000 to 15,000 persons. It is obvious that such a great number of hymnbooks could not be achieved by woodblock printing.

Second, it cannot be assumed that the reading of text – and even more so, of music – was generally widespread. If the hymnal had essentially been used only to read the text, why would printers have taken the trouble to produce woodcuts of the notes, which certainly made the production more expensive? The hymnbooks were thus aimed at a small group of humanistically educated citizens who had learnt to read music as part of their education, either at Latin schools or the arts faculty of a university. Music lessons were already on the curriculum of school at the Carmelite monastery under Otto Brunfels in the 1520s, and regular music lessons were prescribed at the Protestant school of Johannes Sturm, founded in 1538. However, only a small number of male pupils from the better urban milieus benefited from these lessons. The vast majority of worshippers learnt text and melody by listening to the precentor choir, which consisted of students from Sturm’s school.

It is possible, however, that a change in practice was prompted by the rapidly growing repertoire – by the end of the 1530s there were well over 200 songs – and the influence of music lessons at school. Köpfel mentions in the New Auserlesen Gesangbûchlin (1545) that he numbered the verses, ‘so that the people might the better find where and what they were to sing’ (‘daher die leut desto bas finden, wo vnd was man singet’). This could suggest that at least some worshippers sang from a hymnbook during the worship service.
With regard to the target audience, the great *Gesangbuch* of 1541 constitutes an exception. Due to its elaborate production and its unusual format of about 33 × 50 cm, it was not intended for individuals, but for parishes and schools, where it was used to teach the choir, and during church services, when it was placed on a lectern. Its price must have been enormous, so that some smaller rural communities preferred to copy out the text and music by hand rather than purchase it.\(^{73}\)

An indication of a target audience outside Strasbourg is given by the aforementioned ‘pseudo-Romanus’ of 1542. This edition of some French psalms was obviously not intended exclusively for the French and Flemish exile community at Strasbourg, because Johannes Prüss the Younger also supplied foreign places. To avoid the confiscation of his goods by Roman Catholic authorities, he printed the following fictitious colophon at the end of the booklet: ‘Printed at Rome by the commandment of the pope, by Théodore Prüss, a German, his ordinary printer’ (‘Imprime a Rome par le commandement du Pape. par Theodore Brüss Allemant. son imprimeur ordinaire’).\(^{74}\) However, this bold assertion became his downfall. When he delivered 600 copies to the Protestant congregations in Metz in early 1542, the delivery was confiscated by the Metz authorities precisely because the hymnal allegedly contained ‘papist’ songs. Pierre Brully, Calvin’s preacher and successor, sent a petition to the Strasbourg Council to intervene in favour of Prüss, the printer, to release the confiscated copies. The councillors of Metz did not allow themselves to be deceived by the colophon, which was made ‘from the ill-advised and excessive zeal of the printer’ (‘aus onberathenem überigen vleis vom drucker hinbeigethon’).\(^{75}\) The council acceded to the request and on 25 March stated that its secretary should write that Prüss’ book conformed to the ones printed and used at Metz (‘sogleich und früntlich schriben, und sein hier getruckt undt den psalmbüchlin allhie gemess, schriben’).\(^{76}\) Obviously, the Strasbourg intervention was successful, because when one and a half years later in Metz ‘heretical’ books and writings were banned by imperial decree, there was explicit mention of ‘Psalms in French with the melodies, which are commonly called “Marotines” [that is, named after Clément Marot], and other similar psalms or songs’ (‘Psaulmes en François avec les notes des chants qui s’appellent vulgairement Marotines et d’aultres semblables Pseaulmes ou chantz’).\(^{77}\)

**Conclusion**

At the beginning of the Reformation, the initiative for printed liturgical books for the new church communities at Strasbourg clearly came from the printers. In this early period there was a great demand to be able to read about the innovations practised in the churches, as Köpfel hints in the foreword to the *Strasbourg church order* (1525).\(^{78}\) This also led to tensions between printers and preachers, as the printed church orders and chants did not necessarily correspond to custom. In that foreword, the printer Köpfel admitted that he had published the previous editions himself and without the consent of the preachers: ‘against their will and agreement’ (‘wider jren willen und gehelle’). With the publication of Martin Bucer’s *Ground and Reason from the Holy Scripture for the novelties in the celebration of the Lord’s Supper*, commonly called the *Mass* (*Grund und Ursach auß gotlicher Schrift der Neuerungen an dem Nachtmal des Herren so man die Mess nennet*, 1524), printed by Köpfel, the situation had changed: the preachers now recognised Bucer’s principles for a kind of singing consonant with the Gospel, and he, Köpfel, would now present these improved songs: ‘And if previously I may have inadvertently served the congregation and the preachers ill with my books, I hope to make good this fault with this better book’ (‘Und hiemit, wes ich züuor auß vnwissen der gemeyyn vnd den predicanten durchein mein trucken mißdient
haben mag, will ich, als ich hoff, mit dißem bessern trucken erstattet vnd widerlegt hab-
en’). Bucer’s *Ground and Reason* of 1524 did indeed represent the theological basis for innovations in the divine service and described the course of a communion service. But with regard to the selection of songs, nothing concrete can be found in the Bible, so it was not possible to use it as justification in the development of the rapidly growing repertoire. Wolfgang Köpfel now established himself, probably because of his relatives and his contacts, as the ‘house printer’ of the Strasbourg Reformation. Thus, until the constitution of a genuine Strasbourg repertoire at the end of the 1530s, he acted in consort with the Reformers, but certainly on his own responsibility. He knew how to exploit this monopoly to his economic advantage, printing inexpensive hymnbooks in mediocre quality and with minimal adornment. The distribution of large number of songs (over 200) over a short period of time also had an economic aspect, since it allowed buyers to acquire a new hymnal with new songs quickly.

The great *Gesangbüch* of 1541, an official hymnbook of the Strasbourg church, marks a caesura. The number of songs (only sixty-six) is very limited. Only a few psalms from Köpfel’s repertoire were taken over. The names of the authors are given, a practice which Köpfel expressly rejected. Moreover, the target audience and the function of the *Gesangbüch* differ from the previous hymnbooks. The ‘official’ *Gesangbüch* was also not printed by Köpfel, but by Georg Messerschmid, who seems to have financed it largely himself.

The situation is different with the hymnbooks of the French exile community. Behind these clearly stood an individual: Jean Calvin, the head of the Strasbourg congregation, and later his successor Pierre Brully. The target group here was not only the few members of the local refugee community, but also foreign French-speaking communities, as is documented in detail in the case of Metz. Katharina Zell’s four-part hymnal, containing the repertoire of the Bohemian Brethren, was also an individual initiative, this time private.

So there can be no talk of a targeted guidance on the part of the ‘church’ until the Interim. At Strasbourg at least, Evangelical songbooks were products of the free market. Of course the preachers influenced the content of the editions, but only indirectly, since it is difficult to sell what is not sung during the church services. The printer also had to reckon with disadvantages if he did not come to terms with the representatives of politics and church. Even with an ‘official’ hymnbook of the church, like the *Gesangbüch* of 1541, the financing was obviously private, that is, carried by the printer, thus acting simultaneously as publisher.

**Appendix**

**HDB**

*Hymnological Database*. Co-operative project between the Johannes Gutenberg-Universität Mainz and Université de Strasbourg, directed by Beat Föllmi and Ansgar Franz. https://hdb.univoak.eu

**Meyer**


**Pidoux**

### Table 3.1 Hymn Books Printed in Strasbourg from 1524 Until the End of the Interim

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Year</th>
<th>RISM</th>
<th>HDB</th>
<th>Meyer</th>
<th>vdm</th>
<th>Title</th>
<th>Printer</th>
<th>Preface</th>
<th>Liturgy</th>
<th>Score</th>
<th>Printing technique</th>
<th>Nb. songs</th>
<th>Remarks</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>[1524]</td>
<td>1524/15</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>182</td>
<td><em>Teutsch Kirchen ampt</em></td>
<td>[Wolfgang Köpfel]</td>
<td>Yes</td>
<td>Woodcut</td>
<td>11</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>[1524]</td>
<td>1524/16</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>183</td>
<td><em>Teutsch Kirchen ampt</em></td>
<td>Wolfgang Köpfel</td>
<td>Yes</td>
<td>Yes</td>
<td>14</td>
<td>=1524/15 Woodcut</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>[c. 1524/1525]</td>
<td>1525/02</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>186</td>
<td><em>Der Glaube Deutsch zu singen</em></td>
<td>[Johannes Knobloch the Elder]</td>
<td>Yes</td>
<td>Yes</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>Trocmé-Latter: Köpfel</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>[1524/1525]</td>
<td>—</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>—</td>
<td>—</td>
<td><em>Ordenung und ynhalt Teutscher Mess</em></td>
<td>[Johannes Schwan?]</td>
<td>Yes</td>
<td>No</td>
<td>1</td>
<td></td>
<td>7</td>
<td>Trocmé-Latter: Köpfel</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>[c. 1525]</td>
<td>1525/03</td>
<td>10</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>187</td>
<td><em>Ein schon kurzer begriff des vatter unsers</em></td>
<td>[Johannes Schwan]</td>
<td>Partly</td>
<td>Woodcut</td>
<td>4</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1525</td>
<td>1525/10</td>
<td>11</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>194</td>
<td><em>Enchiridion geistlicher gesenge</em></td>
<td>[Wolfgang Köpfel?]</td>
<td>Yes</td>
<td>Woodcut</td>
<td>27</td>
<td>Fictitious place of publication: Wittenberg</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1525</td>
<td>1525/14</td>
<td>12</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>198</td>
<td><em>Der LI Psalm Davids</em></td>
<td>[Johannes Schwan]</td>
<td>Yes</td>
<td>Woodcut</td>
<td>1</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1525</td>
<td>1525/18A</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>7 (1)</td>
<td>248</td>
<td><em>Theutsch kirchen ampt (part 1)</em></td>
<td>[Wolfgang Köpfel]</td>
<td>Yes</td>
<td>Yes</td>
<td>17</td>
<td>=1524/16 Woodcut</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>[1525]</td>
<td>1525/18B</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>7 (2)</td>
<td>1563</td>
<td><em>Theutsch kirchen ampt (part 2)</em></td>
<td>[Wolfgang Köpfel]</td>
<td>Yes</td>
<td>Yes</td>
<td>14</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>[1525]</td>
<td>1525/18C</td>
<td>9</td>
<td>7 (3)</td>
<td>1564</td>
<td><em>Theutsch kirchen ampt (part 3)</em></td>
<td>[Wolfgang Köpfel]</td>
<td>Yes</td>
<td>Yes</td>
<td>7</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>[1525]</td>
<td>1525/19</td>
<td>13</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>247</td>
<td><em>Ordnung des Herren Nachtmal</em></td>
<td>[Johannes Schwan]</td>
<td>Yes</td>
<td>Yes</td>
<td>4</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>[1525]</td>
<td>1525/20</td>
<td>14</td>
<td>9</td>
<td>252</td>
<td><em>Ordnung des herren Nachtmal</em></td>
<td>[Johannes Schwan]</td>
<td>Yes</td>
<td>Yes</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>=1525/19 but 8 songs Lost</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1525</td>
<td>1525/21</td>
<td>15</td>
<td>10</td>
<td>265</td>
<td><em>Straßburger kirchen ampt</em></td>
<td>[Wolfgang Köpfel]</td>
<td>Yes</td>
<td>Woodcut</td>
<td>26</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1526</td>
<td>1526/08</td>
<td>16</td>
<td>11</td>
<td>307</td>
<td><em>Psalmen gebett und Kirchenübung</em></td>
<td>[Wolfgang Köpfel]</td>
<td>Yes</td>
<td>Yes</td>
<td>36</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

(Continued)
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Year</th>
<th>RISM</th>
<th>HDB</th>
<th>Meyer</th>
<th>vdm</th>
<th>Title</th>
<th>Printer</th>
<th>Preface</th>
<th>Liturgy</th>
<th>Score</th>
<th>Printing technique</th>
<th>Nb. songs</th>
<th>Remarks</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1526</td>
<td>1526/09</td>
<td>17</td>
<td>12</td>
<td>308</td>
<td>Psalmen gebett und Kirchenübung</td>
<td>Wolfgang Köpfel</td>
<td>Yes</td>
<td>Yes</td>
<td></td>
<td>Woodcut</td>
<td>36</td>
<td>=1526/08</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1526</td>
<td>1526/10</td>
<td>18</td>
<td>13</td>
<td>309</td>
<td>Psalmen gebett und Kirchenübung</td>
<td>Wolfgang Köpfel</td>
<td>Yes</td>
<td>Yes</td>
<td></td>
<td>Woodcut</td>
<td>36</td>
<td>=1526/08</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1527</td>
<td>1527/10</td>
<td>85</td>
<td>14</td>
<td>344</td>
<td>Warer verstand, von des herren Nachtma [Johannes Prüss the Younger]</td>
<td>Wolfgang Köpfel</td>
<td>Yes</td>
<td>No</td>
<td></td>
<td>Woodcut</td>
<td>1</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>[c. 1527]</td>
<td>1527/11</td>
<td>22</td>
<td>15</td>
<td>345</td>
<td>Der siben und dreysigst psalm Der zweyen Psalmen</td>
<td>Wolfgang Köpfel</td>
<td>Yes</td>
<td>Woodcut?</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>Lost</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1527</td>
<td>1527/12</td>
<td>23</td>
<td>16</td>
<td>346</td>
<td>Die zweyen Psalmen</td>
<td>Wolfgang Köpfel</td>
<td>Yes</td>
<td>Woodcut</td>
<td>3</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1527</td>
<td>1527/13</td>
<td>24</td>
<td>17</td>
<td>347</td>
<td>Das Te deum laudamus vertreutsch</td>
<td>Wolfgang Köpfel</td>
<td>?</td>
<td>?</td>
<td></td>
<td>Woodcut?</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>Lost</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1530</td>
<td>1530/06</td>
<td>19</td>
<td>19</td>
<td>375</td>
<td>Psalmen gebett und Kirchenübung</td>
<td>Wolfgang Köpfel</td>
<td>Yes</td>
<td>Yes</td>
<td></td>
<td>Woodcut</td>
<td>46</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1533</td>
<td>1533/01</td>
<td>20</td>
<td>20</td>
<td>383</td>
<td>Psalmen gebett und Kirchenübung</td>
<td>Wolfgang Köpfel</td>
<td>Yes</td>
<td>Yes</td>
<td></td>
<td>Woodcut</td>
<td>49</td>
<td>=1530/06 + 3 songs</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1534</td>
<td>1534/07</td>
<td>250</td>
<td>—</td>
<td>112</td>
<td>Wittenbergische Gsangbüchli durch Johan. Waltern</td>
<td>Peter Schöffler and Matthias Apiarius</td>
<td>Yes</td>
<td>Types, multiple</td>
<td>53</td>
<td>Polyphonic songs</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1534</td>
<td>1534/02</td>
<td>38</td>
<td>21</td>
<td>386</td>
<td>Von Christo Jesu unserem sälmigacher</td>
<td>Jakob Frölich</td>
<td>Yes</td>
<td>Woodcut</td>
<td>22</td>
<td>Hyemnal of Katharina Zell, part 1</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1535</td>
<td>1535/05</td>
<td>39</td>
<td>22</td>
<td>405</td>
<td>Das ander Byechelin der Geystlichen gesäng</td>
<td>Jakob Frölich</td>
<td>Yes</td>
<td>Woodcut</td>
<td>21</td>
<td>Hyemnal of Katharina Zell, part 2</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1536</td>
<td>1536/01A</td>
<td>40</td>
<td>23</td>
<td>414</td>
<td>Das dritt Byechlin der Geystlichen gsäng</td>
<td>Jakob Frölich</td>
<td>Yes</td>
<td>Woodcut</td>
<td>26</td>
<td>Hyemnal of Katharina Zell, part 3</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Year</td>
<td>Year RISM</td>
<td>Nb.</td>
<td>Title</td>
<td>Printer</td>
<td>Preface</td>
<td>Liturgy</td>
<td>Score</td>
<td>Remarks</td>
<td>Woodcut</td>
<td>Polyphonic songs</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>------</td>
<td>-----------</td>
<td>-----</td>
<td>-------</td>
<td>---------</td>
<td>---------</td>
<td>---------</td>
<td>-------</td>
<td>---------</td>
<td>---------</td>
<td>-----------------</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1526</td>
<td>1526/09</td>
<td>12</td>
<td>Psalmen gebett und Kirchenübung</td>
<td>Wolfgang Köpfel</td>
<td>Yes</td>
<td>Yes</td>
<td>Woodcut 36</td>
<td>1526/08</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1527</td>
<td>1527/10</td>
<td>13</td>
<td>Warer verstand, von des herren Nachtmal</td>
<td>[Johannes Prüss the Younger]</td>
<td>Yes</td>
<td>No</td>
<td>Woodcut 1</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1527</td>
<td>1527/12</td>
<td>16</td>
<td>Die zwen Psalmen</td>
<td>Wolfgang Köpfel</td>
<td>Yes</td>
<td>Woodcut 3</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1527</td>
<td>1527/13</td>
<td>17</td>
<td>Die zween Psalmen</td>
<td>Wolfgang Köpfel</td>
<td>Yes</td>
<td>Woodcut 5</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1529</td>
<td>1529/04</td>
<td>18</td>
<td>Das Te deum laudamus verteutscht</td>
<td>Wolfgang Köpfel</td>
<td>?</td>
<td>?</td>
<td>Woodcut? 2</td>
<td>Lost (unknown)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1530</td>
<td>1530/06</td>
<td>19</td>
<td>Psalmen gebett und Kirchenübung</td>
<td>Wolfgang Köpfel</td>
<td>Yes</td>
<td>Yes</td>
<td>Woodcut 46</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1533</td>
<td>1533/01</td>
<td>20</td>
<td>Psalmen gebett und Kirchenübung</td>
<td>Wolfgang Köpfel</td>
<td>Yes</td>
<td>Yes</td>
<td>Woodcut 49</td>
<td>1530/06 + 3 songs</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1534</td>
<td>1534/07</td>
<td>25</td>
<td>Wittenbergische Gsangbüchli durch Johan. Waltern</td>
<td>Peter Schöffer and Matthias Apiarius</td>
<td>No</td>
<td>Yes</td>
<td>Woodcut? 26</td>
<td>Hymnal of Katharina Zell, part 3</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1535</td>
<td>1535/05</td>
<td>22</td>
<td>Das ander Byechlin der Geystlichen gesäng</td>
<td>Jakob Frölich</td>
<td>Yes</td>
<td>Woodcut 21</td>
<td></td>
<td>Hymnal of Katharina Zell, part 2</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1536</td>
<td>1536/01A</td>
<td>23</td>
<td>Das dritt Byechlin der Geystlichen gsäng</td>
<td>Jakob Frölich</td>
<td>Yes</td>
<td>Woodcut 26</td>
<td></td>
<td>Hymnal of Katharina Zell, part 3</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1536</td>
<td>1536/01B</td>
<td>24</td>
<td>Das vierde Byechlin der Geystlichen gsäng</td>
<td>Jakob Frölich</td>
<td>Yes</td>
<td>Woodcut 89</td>
<td></td>
<td>Hymnal of Katharina Zell, part 4</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1536/1537</td>
<td>1537/03</td>
<td>26</td>
<td>Psalmen gebett und Kirchenübung</td>
<td>Wolfgang Köpfel</td>
<td>Yes?</td>
<td>Yes?</td>
<td>Woodcut 131? Unique copy damaged</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1537</td>
<td>1537/05</td>
<td>27</td>
<td>Psalmen und geistliche Lieder</td>
<td>Johannes Prüss the Younger for Wolfgang Köpfel</td>
<td>Yes</td>
<td>Yes</td>
<td>Woodcut? 131? Lost</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1537</td>
<td>1537/08</td>
<td>28</td>
<td>Wittenbergisch Gsangbüchli durch Johan. Waltern</td>
<td>Peter Schöffer and Matthias Apiarius</td>
<td>Yes</td>
<td>Polyphonic songs 53</td>
<td>1534/02</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1538</td>
<td>1538/02</td>
<td>29</td>
<td>Psalmen und Geystliche lied</td>
<td>Georg Messerschmid, Wolfgang Köpfel</td>
<td>Yes</td>
<td>Yes</td>
<td>Woodcut 131</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1538</td>
<td>1538/06</td>
<td>30</td>
<td>Psalter. Das seindt alle Psalmen Davids</td>
<td>Wolfgang Köpfel</td>
<td>Yes</td>
<td>Woodcut 148</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1539</td>
<td>—</td>
<td>45</td>
<td>Psalter mit aller Kirchenübung</td>
<td>Wolfgang Köpfel</td>
<td>Yes</td>
<td>No</td>
<td>Woodcut 276</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1539</td>
<td>—</td>
<td>30114</td>
<td>Aulcuns psaulmes et cantiques mys en chant</td>
<td>Johann Knobloch the Younger</td>
<td>Yes</td>
<td>Woodcut 22</td>
<td>French psalms and hymns</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1541</td>
<td>1541/05</td>
<td>30</td>
<td>Psalmen und Geistliche lied</td>
<td>Georg Messerschmid, Wolfgang Köpfel</td>
<td>Yes</td>
<td>Yes</td>
<td>Woodcut 131</td>
<td>1537/03</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1541</td>
<td>1541/06</td>
<td>31</td>
<td>Gesangbuch, darinn begriffen sind…</td>
<td>Martin Bucer</td>
<td>Yes</td>
<td>Multiple dichromatic impression (type) 66</td>
<td>Cantional, large dimensions</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Year</td>
<td>RISM</td>
<td>HDB</td>
<td>Meyer</td>
<td>vdm</td>
<td>Title</td>
<td>Printer</td>
<td>Preface</td>
<td>Liturgy</td>
<td>Score</td>
<td>Printing technique</td>
<td>Nb. songs</td>
<td>Remarks</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>------</td>
<td>------</td>
<td>-----</td>
<td>-------</td>
<td>-----</td>
<td>----------------------------------------------------------------------</td>
<td>---------</td>
<td>---------</td>
<td>---------</td>
<td>-------</td>
<td>----------------------</td>
<td>-----------</td>
<td>--------------------------</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1542</td>
<td>—</td>
<td>30528</td>
<td>—</td>
<td>1507</td>
<td><em>La maniere de faire prieres aux egles Francoyses</em></td>
<td>Theodore Brüß (Johannes Prüss the Younger)</td>
<td>Pierre Brully</td>
<td>Liturgy</td>
<td>Yes</td>
<td>Woodcut</td>
<td>44</td>
<td>‘pseudo-Romanus’</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1543</td>
<td>1543/09</td>
<td>42</td>
<td>32</td>
<td>1234</td>
<td><em>Psalmen und Geistliche lieter... Das Erst Teyl</em></td>
<td>Wolfgang Köpfel</td>
<td>Wolfgang Köpfel</td>
<td>Liturgy</td>
<td>Yes</td>
<td>Woodcut?</td>
<td>131</td>
<td>=1541/05</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1544</td>
<td>1544/04</td>
<td>332</td>
<td>33</td>
<td>1235</td>
<td><em>Das ander teyl, aller Psalmen Davids</em></td>
<td>Wolfgang Köpfel</td>
<td>Wolfgang Köpfel</td>
<td>Yes</td>
<td>Woodcut?</td>
<td>?</td>
<td>150</td>
<td>Lost, =1538/06 + 2 songs</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1545</td>
<td>1545/05</td>
<td>48</td>
<td>34</td>
<td>1284</td>
<td><em>Ein New Auserlesen Gesangbächlein</em></td>
<td>Wolfgang Köpfel</td>
<td>Strasbourg clergy (=Martin Bucer)</td>
<td>Yes</td>
<td>Single impression (type)</td>
<td>88</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1545</td>
<td>—</td>
<td>30529</td>
<td>—</td>
<td>1508</td>
<td>[La forme des prieres et chantz ecclesiastiques]</td>
<td>Johannes Knobloch the Younger</td>
<td>Jean Calvin</td>
<td>Yes</td>
<td>Yes</td>
<td>?</td>
<td>50</td>
<td>Lost</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1547</td>
<td>1547/03</td>
<td>49</td>
<td>35</td>
<td>1285</td>
<td><em>Ein New Auserlesen Gesangbächlein</em></td>
<td>Wolfgang Köpfel</td>
<td>Strasbourg clergy (=Martin Bucer?)</td>
<td>?</td>
<td>Single impression (type)?</td>
<td>89?</td>
<td>Lost, =1545/05</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1548</td>
<td>—</td>
<td>30550</td>
<td>—</td>
<td>1509</td>
<td><em>Pseaumes de David traduictz en rithme francoyse par Clement Marot</em></td>
<td>[Rémy Guédon]</td>
<td>Clément Marot</td>
<td>Yes</td>
<td>Woodcut</td>
<td>57</td>
<td>Psaumes de David, mis en rime Francoise, par C. Marot</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1553</td>
<td>—</td>
<td>30549</td>
<td>—</td>
<td>—</td>
<td><em>Pseaumes de David</em></td>
<td>Wolfgang Köpfel</td>
<td>Yes</td>
<td>Yes</td>
<td>Woodcut</td>
<td>56</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Notes

1 Pidoux GE 43, HDB 30557; Pidoux GE 53, HDB 30558.
2 Trocmé-Latter, *The Singing of the Strasbourg Protestants*, 57. This refers to the liturgical orders printed in 1524 and 1525 by Wolfgang Köpfel and others, either with or without melodies. Trocmé-Latter, however, implicitly assumes that this was an abuse motivated by greed for profit. (See Martin Bucer’s letter to Huldrych Zwingli of 1524, published in Bucer, *Correspondence*, 281, no. 81.) It also leaves open the question of what happened once the ‘official decree’ existed. Furthermore, he also assumes that hymnbooks were usually commissioned by the churches.
3 *Grund und Ursach auss gotlicher Schrifft der Neüwerungen an dem Nachtmal des Herren, so man die Mess nennet, Tauff, Feyrtagen, Bildern und Gesang in der Gemein Christi, wan die zusamen kompt, durch unnd auff das Wort Gottes, zuo Strassburg fürgenomen* (Strasbourg: Wolfgang Köpfel, 1525); published in Bucer, *Deutsche Schriften*, 1: 310–344.
4 The Strasbourg sources and their content were catalogued for the first time by Meyer, *Les mélodies des Églises protestantes de langue allemande*.
5 The Interim (or Augsburg Interim) was a decree ordered by Charles V on the Diet of Augsburg (May 1548) after the defeat of the Protestant League in the Schmalkaldic War. The decree restored Catholicism but allowed also some Protestant practices. The Interim decree was revoked in 1552.
6 RISM DKL 1557/08, HDB 50. An extended list of all Strasbourg hymnbooks is given in Table 3.1 in the appendix.
7 *Der Glaube Deutsch zu singen*, RISM DKL 1525/02, HDB 4, vdm 186.
8 *Der li. Psalm Dauids*, RISM DKL 1525/14, HDB 12, vdm 198.
9 *Warer verstand, von des herren Nachtmal*, RISM DKL 1527/10, HDB 85, vdm 344.
10 *Das Te deum laudamus verteütscht*, RISM DKL 1529/04, HDB 26, vdm 359.
11 *Der siben and dreyssigst psalm*, RISM DKL 1525/14, HDB 23, vdm 446, with Ps 37 and two Cantica; *Die zwen Psalmen*, RISM DKL 1527/12, HDB 23, vdm 446, with Ps 114, Ps 139 and the Song of Simeon (Nunc dimittis); *The two Psalms*, RISM DKL 1527/13, HDB 24, vdm 447, with Ps 114, Ps 115, Ps 139 and two songs by Paul Speratus and Martin Luther.
12 See also Föllmi, ‘The Strasbourg Psalter’.
13 *Psalmen und geystliche Lieder*, RISM DKL 1537/03, HDB 27, vdm 439, for the smaller edition and RISM DKL 1537/05, HDB 28, vdm 441, for the larger edition.
14 *Psalmen vnd Geystliche lieder*, RISM DKL 1538/02, HDB 29, vdm 452.
15 *Psalmen uud Geistliche lieder*, RISM DKL 1541/05, HDB 30, vdm 1233.
16 *Psalmen und Geistliche lieder*, RISM DKL 1543/09, HDB 42, vdm 1234.
17 RISM DKL 1538/06, HDB 43, vdm 457.
18 *Der ander teyl aller Psalmen Dauids*, RISM DKL 1544/04, HDB 332, vdm 1235.
19 *Gesangbüch, darinn begriffen sind, die aller fürnemisten vnd besten Psalmen/ Geistliche Lieder/ vnd Chorgeseng/ aus dem Wittembergischen/ Strasburgischen/ vnd anderer Kirchen Gesangbüchlin z sammen bracht*, RISM DKL 1541/06, HDB 46, vdm 1245.
20 RISM DKL 1545/05, HDB 48, vdm 1248, and RISM DKL 1547/03, HDB 49, vdm 1285; there are no copies of the 1547 edition.
21 First published in 1569, RISM DKL 1569/16, HDB 36.
22 The first part was published in 1534 under the title *Von Christo Jesu vnserem säligmacher*, RISM DKL 1534/02, HDB 38, vdm 386, the following parts, published in 1535 and 1536, are only called *Byeclhin der Geystlichen gsäng*, RISM DKL 1535/05, HDB 39, vdm 405; RISM DKL 1536/01 (for parts 3 and 4), HDB 40, vdm 414, and HDB 41, vdm 415.
23 RISM DKL 1534/02, HDB 38, vdm 386. The preface of 1534 is printed in Wackernagel, *Bibliographie*.
24 *Aulcuns pseaulmes et cantiques mys en chant*, HDB 30114, vdm 903. Facsimile edition with commentary and transmission of the melodies by Terry, ’Calvin’s First Psalter, 1539’.
26 RISM DKL 1536/08, vdm 27. A critical reissue of the original can be found in Moser, *65 Deutsche Lieder*.
27 *Wittenbergische Gsangbüchli*, RISM DKL 1534/07, HDB 250, vdm 112, and 1537/08, HDB 266, vdm 113.
29 See also Chrisman, ’L’édition protestante à Strasbourg 1519–1560’, 221.
Der Glaube Deutsch zu singen, RISM DKL 1525/02, HDB 85, vdm 186.
Warer verstand, von des herren Nachtmal, RISM DKL 1527/10, HDB 85, vdm 344.
RISM DKL 1525/19, HDB 13, vdm 247; RISM DKL 1525/20, HDB 14, vdm 252.

Psalmen vnd geystliche Lieder, die man zu Straßburg, vnd auch die man inn anderen Kirchen pflegt zu singen, RISM DKL 1537/03, HDB 27, vdm 439, and RISM DKL 1537/05, HDB 28, vdm 441. From the first edition a single defective copy is known (F-Sn); from the second, none at all.

Psalmen vnd geystliche Lieder, die man zu Straßburg, vnd auch die man inn anderen Kirchen pflegt zu singen, RISM DKL 1537/03, HDB 27, vdm 439, and RISM DKL 1537/05, HDB 28, vdm 441. From the first edition a single defective copy is known (F-Sn); from the second, none at all.

RISM DKL 1538/02, HDB 29, vdm 452.

RISM DKL 1541/06, HDB 46, vdm 1245.

Johannes Ficker suspected that due to the high costs the entire planned volume of songs could not be printed and that the resulting incompleteness of the print had led to neither publishers nor printers being named. In my opinion, this argumentation is unlikely in view of the enormously representative character of the hymnal. Ficker, ‘Prachtwerk’, 217.

Preface, fol. A3v:

[…] der Ersam buchtrucker Jörg Waldmüller, genant Messerschmidt, zü güt den lieben Kirchen, vnd das gotselig gesang inn den Christlichen Versammlungen, Schulen vnd Lerheusern zü fürderen, nicht mit geringem kosten vnd müh [hat] sich lassen erbeten vnd bestellen, ein Gesangbüch zutrücken, auch allen fleis anzüwendende, wie es das werk selb zueget, das die Psalmen vnd geistliche Lieder, so hierin begriffen, auffs seuberlichest, vnd zum besten corrigeret ausgiengen.

Also printed in Ficker, ‘Prachtwerk’, 228f.

See also Ritter, Histoire, 217.

HDB 30114, vdm 903.
HDB 30528, vdm 1507; for the fictitious location of printing, see below.
HDB 30529, vdm 1508.
HDB 30550, vdm 1509.
HDB 30549.

Enchiridion geistlicher gesenge, 1525, RISM DKL 1525/10, HDB 11, vdm 194; Wittenbergisch Gesangbüchli durch Johan. Walthern, 1534, RISM DKL 1534/07, HDB 250, vdm 112, and 1537, RISM DKL 1537/08, HDB 266, vdm 113.
RISM DKL 1524/15, HDB 5, vdm 182.
RISM DKL 1524/16, HDB 6, vdm 183.

‘Vorred’, fol. A IV; printed by Hubert, Ordnungen, 139.
RISM DKL 1530/06, HBB 19, vdm 375, fol. Br; preface printed by Hubert, Ordnungen, 141–143.
Psalter. Das seindt alle Psalmen Davids, 1538, RISM DKL 1538/06, HDB 43, vdm 457; preface printed by Hubert, Ordnungen, 144. The preface of the first part, RISM DKL 1537/03, HDB 27, vdm 439, published in 1537, is not known because the only known copy (F-Sn) is incomplete.

Fol. IIv:

Ljeber leser/ Bitzhiehar hab ich die Psalmen/ vnd Geistlichen Lieder wie man die inn den Christlichen gemeinden hien vnd wider pflegt zü singen stucks weiß/ Wie ich die selben zu yeder zeyt hab mögen bekummen/ getruckt/ Nach dem aber/ ietz neülich der gantz Psalter/ mit höchstem fleiß/ eigentlich zü Teutsch gsang Psalmen/ durch vil berümpert fürbindigerl Dichter vnd Poeten/ bitz ans ende volnbracht ist worden. So hab ich mit sampt den vorigen Kirchen übungen/ vnd Geistlichen liedern hie züsimen inn ein Büchlin getruckt [...].

RISM DKL 1525/19, HDB 13, vdm 247.
Fol. A IV; printed by Hubert, Ordnungen, 139–140.
Fol. A IIv.
RISM DKL 1541/06, HDB 46, vdm 1245.

Ein New Auserlesen Gesangbüchlin, RISM DKL 1545/05, HDB 48, vdm 1284, and 1547/03, HDB 49, vdm 1285.

La forme des prieres et chantz ecclesiastiques (Geneva: Jean Girard, 1542), Pidoux GE 42, HDB 30555.

La forme des prieres et chantz ecclesiastiques (Strasbourg: Johann Knobloch the Younger, 1545); Pidoux, ST 45, HDB 30529, vdm 1508.

RISM DKL 1526/08, HDB 16, vdm 307, or RISM DKL 1530/06, HDB 19, vdm 375. For examples of the gradual degradation of woodcuts over time, see Ham’s chapter in this book.
60 Pidoux ST 39, HDB 30114, vdm 903.
61 Pidoux ST 45, HDB 30529, vdm 1508, a reprint of the fifty Psalms of Marot published in Geneva in 1542 under the same title, Pidoux GE 42, HDB 30555.
62 Pidoux ST 48, HDB 30550, vdm 1509.
63 Pidoux ST 53, HDB 30549. The name of the printer is not given, but the printer’s mark is that of Köpfel.
64 RISM DKL 1534/07, HDB 250, vdm 112, and RISM DKL 1537/08, HDB 266, vdm 113.
65 RISM DKL 1545/05, HDB 48, vdm 1284; RISM DKL 1547/03, HDB 49, vdm 1285 (this edition is lost).
66 RISM DKL 1525/10, HDB 11, vdm 194.
67 RISM DKL 1526/08, HDB 16, vdm 307; RISM DKL 1526/09, HDB 17, vdm 308; RISM DKL 1526/10, HDB 18, vdm 309; RISM DKL 1530/06, HDB 19, vdm 375; RISM DKL 1533/01, HDB 20, vdm 383. The 1536 issue is missing, RISM DKL 1536/03, HDB 21, vdm 427.
68 RISM DKL 1525/02, HDB 4, vdm 186.
69 So it is in RISM DKL 1524/15, HDB 5, vdm 182.
70 RISM DKL 1524/16, HDB 6, vdm 183.
71 See also Fournier, Gymnase.
72 RISM DKL 1545/05, HDB 48, vdm 1284.
73 Such a copy for the Evangelical parish of Effringen (today part of the town of Wildberg in the Black Forest) was made around 1553. Held by the Landeskirchliche Zentralbibliothek, Stuttgart: A13 1553/H31. See also Föllmi, ‘Musik und Gesang’, 140.
74 Printed by Pidoux, Psautier huguenot, 2: 13.
75 Ibid., 10.
76 Ibid., 11.
77 Ordonnance of 13 October 1543, reprinted in Pidoux, Psautier huguenot, 2: 22.
78 Straßburger kirchen ampt, RISM DKL 1525/21, HDB 15, vdm 265, Foreword: ‘die gemein begirig was sollichs zů lesen’. Printed by Hubert, Ordnungen, 140–141.
79 Straßburger kirchen ampt, RISM DKL 1525/21, HDB 15, vdm 265. Printed by Hubert, Ordnungen, 141.
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The Melopoiae, printed at Augsburg in 1507, has always held a special place in the hearts and minds of early music scholars – and for good reason.\(^1\) As a material object it is remarkable: printed by Erhard Oeglin and published by Johannes Rynmann in Augsburg, it was among the first publications to use the multiple-impression technique for printing polyphony north of the Alps.\(^2\) Moreover, it is in small folio format, rather unusual for polyphony, and contains many paratexts, including a memorable title page, a number of dedicatory poems and two full-page woodcuts.\(^3\) Its musical content also attracts attention. With its twenty-two metrical settings of odes – nineteen settings of Horace, followed by three settings of poems by Celtis, Lucan and Alcuin – exemplifying the different Latin metres, set to music by the Austrian schoolmaster Peter Treibenraif (Petrus Tritonius), it is the first source on this scale of the so-called humanist ode setting. And behind it all stands the impressive figure of the German ‘arch-humanist’ Konrad Celtis.

Over the past decade, the Melopoiae had to give up some of its claims: although long heralded as the first publication of polyphony printed from moveable type north of the Alps, it now shares this claim to fame with Mewes’ Concentus harmonici.\(^4\) Its position as the fountainhead of the transmission of polyphonic ode settings has also been revised.\(^5\) Likewise, its usability has been scrutinised: the number of mistakes in the musical text – including many that bear on performance, such as wrong clefs and missing flats – and the lack of text underlay in three of the four voices render it impractical as a basis for performance.\(^6\) These problems were rectified in the Harmonie, a second edition containing only Tritonius’ settings of Horace, in a smaller format (quarto) and without the paratexts. Here the text underlay is given in every voice and most of the mistakes were corrected.\(^7\)

Despite these blemishes to its reputation, the Melopoiae remains remarkable in many respects, in particular in the effect it had on its owners, readers and users. Its publication had a lasting influence, in two principal ways. From the perspective of the genre, Tritonius’ settings resonated with publishers and composers. As Gundela Bobeth put it, it played a ‘key role in the manifestation and continuation of humanist ode-settings’.\(^8\) The humanistic appeal of the Melopoiae and its connection to Celtis meant that the book was prized for more than just the repertoire. It was widely collected and studied in a variety of contexts for centuries to come.

After briefly summarising the first aspect, this chapter will focus on this second point: the dissemination and use of the Melopoiae in the sixteenth century and beyond. A study of individual copies illustrates the varied roles this publication played in the libraries and lives of early modern users, partially reflecting the different uses intended by its makers, partially going beyond them.
Musical resonances of Tritonius’ settings

Tritonius’ settings, first made widely available in the Melopoiae and Harmonie, had a lasting impact on composers, theorists and publishers. Immediate evidence of their impact is the re-publication or copying of Tritonius’ pieces: after 1507 they also appeared in the Odarum Horatij Concentus, printed by Christian Egenolff in Frankfurt (1532)9 and in the later, extended edition Geminae undeviginti odarum (1551).10 Even before Egenolff, Hans Judenkünig transcribed them for lute and published them in an appendix to his Utilis et compendiaria introductio (1523).11 The inclusion of these settings in a number of lute manuscripts further shows their role in instrumental music of the time.12 Other printers included individual settings in anthologies,13 and four of Tritonius’ ode settings frequently appeared in books of music theory throughout the sixteenth century.14 At the same time several manuscripts, for example, from Irsee, Zwickau and Basel, also contain Tritonius’ settings.15 These were, however, rarely direct copies from one specific source. Rather, they formed part of what Gundela Bobeth has called a ‘creative reception of an ever-changing repertoire’.16

Further manifestations of this creative reception are the contrafacta and adaptations of Tritonius’ settings. These include, for example, a manuscript in Munich containing one of Tritonius’ tenors with Sebastian Brant’s hymn Veritas summi patris.17 A much later example was printed in 1587, when Georg Rhon, cantor at the Latin school in Görlitz, edited a school song book which includes Tritonius’ lam satis terris, contrafacted with Melanchthon’s hymn Dicimus grates.18 This is just one example of the use of metrical settings in hymn singing, a tradition that lasted well into the seventeenth century.19

Among the most prominent musical resonances of Tritonius’ settings are the recompositions by other composers, most famously Ludwig Senfl, who reharmonised Tritonius’ tenors.20 While the direct connection here to Tritonius is obvious, it is more difficult to assess his influence in the wider genre of metrical settings, which was to grow significantly in the two decades after the Melopoiae was published. It most prominently includes metrical settings by Wolfgang Grefinger,21 Paul Hofhaimer22 and Michael N.23 While these mostly have no direct musical link to Tritonius, the frequent use of the same Horatian texts is evidence of a tightly knit network of references. This ‘complex intertextual web’, as Grantley McDonald called it, might not have started with the publication of the Melopoiae, but the Augsburg publication undoubtedly played a crucial role in the acceleration and intensification of this process.24

In most of the mentioned cases it is unclear which edition of Tritonius’ publications later publishers and composers used (the Melopoiae or Harmonie), or whether they were even working with a different strand of transmission. Gundela Bobeth has shown, for example, that Egenolff probably used the Harmonie.25 As this edition is both more accurate and user-friendly, it was a sensible choice by this famously pragmatic printer. The Harmonie thus evidently played an important role in the musical dissemination of Tritonius’ work. What, then, was the position of the famous Melopoiae? A close examination of both the intentions of the makers and the evidence from early owners and users shows how the Melopoiae had a range of different functions in the early modern period.

The many roles of the Melopoiae

As with most authors, editors and publishers, the individuals behind the Melopoiae, particularly Konrad Celtis, had a number of different purposes and intended uses in mind. Some of these are made explicit in the paratexts, while others can be deduced. Scholars have
interpreted the intention behind the *Melopoiae* mainly in two ways: panegyric or practical / didactic. The latter notion – that the *Melopoiae* was made predominantly for performance to aid students in learning classical metre – was long the dominant interpretation. Although acknowledging that the elaborate printing technique and paratexts made this book into more than a schoolbook, much previous scholarship emphasised the pedagogical use of collections of ode settings in general and the *Melopoiae* in particular. More recently, the former idea – that this work is a self-made homage to Celtis – has gained more importance. Birgit Lodes has concluded that ‘[t]he common reading of this publication as a primarily didactic publication thus needs to be revised’.26 This is underlined by a closer evaluation of the *Harmonie*, more evidently a pedagogical publication, if not necessarily used in schools then at least for adult education.27 Some of the surviving copies, as, for example, the copy in the British Library, contain evidence of their use in a pedagogical context.28 The use of the *Harmonie* in a school context, combined with the smaller number of annotations of this kind in the *Melopoiae* has led to a perceived dichotomy, both in conception and use, between the *Melopoiae* as the panegyric, representative book on one hand, and the *Harmonie* as the schoolbook on the other.29 However, assigning the practical, educational use solely to the *Harmonie* is also misleading. Despite its admittedly impractical layout and many mistakes, the *Melopoiae*’s didactic role should not be underestimated. In fact, considering these two intentions – the panegyric and practical / didactic – in more detail shows that they are not mutually exclusive, but in fact support each other.

### Panegyrics of Celtis

The panegyric quality of this book is obvious in the way it celebrates its instigator, Konrad Celtis. Birgit Lodes has convincingly argued that Celtis conceptualised this publication as a way of installing himself as the German Horace, directly inspired by Apollo.30 On the title page, for example, he refers to his own ‘Apollonian’ verses: ‘Celtis is said to have verses worthy of Apollo’ (‘Celtis apollineos fertur habere modos’). The woodcuts – Apollo on Parnassus and with the nine Muses – further underline this association, and are both closely linked to Celtis.31 Moreover, Celtis’ own odes – modelled on those of Horace – would only appear in 1513, after Celtis’ death in 1508. The *Melopoiae* may thus be seen as a preparatory publication, an important step in Celtis’ self-fashioning as the German Horace, a project whose completion was however frustrated by the poet’s death.32 In a table on fol. 1v of the *Melopoiae* Celtis placed the titles of his own poems next to the Horatian texts given in the book, as alternatives that could be sung to the same music. Throughout this book, as in his other publications, Celtis thus presents himself as the German ‘arch-humanist’.

There is much to be said in favour of understanding the *Melopoiae* as a humanist publication and not primarily a book of music or music pedagogy. Its similarities with other humanist publications have been pointed out, in particular with Celtis’ edition of the *Ligurinus* of Gunther von Pairis (1507) – both in regard to its material make-up as well as the ideas it disseminates – and place it in the context of Celtis’ self-fashioning as a humanist.33

### Practical / didactic use

Despite the rich humanistic soil from which it grew, the *Melopoiae* has traditionally been seen as predominantly a practical publication, one that would enable the singing of Horace’s odes. This was to serve two different purposes: first, to help students appreciate the fine points of poetic diction and memorise classical metre. This didactic aim governed how the texts were selected as representatives of each of the nineteen lyric metres used by
Horace. Second, this publication was intended to disseminate ancient practices of performing poetry, at least as Celtis imagined these practices to be.

Previous literature has usually placed the origins of the settings firmly into a pedagogical context, specifically Celtis’ lectures on Horace at the University of Ingolstadt. In the preface to Senfl’s collection of ode settings (1534), Simon Minervius writes that Tritonius, encouraged by Celtis,

composed harmoniae for the nineteen metrical species used by Horace, which he offered to his fellow students to sing together each day, like some kind of rallying-cry, at the end of the lectures on Horace which Celtis was giving at the time to a packed hall, modifying them with the sweet sound of the benevolent Muses.34

This narrative is plausible to the extent that Tritonius and Celtis overlapped at the University of Ingolstadt for a few months in 1497, ten years before the publication of the Melopoiae.35 While the idea for the ode settings might well have originated in Celtis’ classroom, it is questionable whether the specific settings later published the Melopoiae were the ones sung at the lectures. If they were, then they were probably not performed in polyphonic versions. These harmonisations were likely only composed later; possibly, as has been suggested, in the context of the University of Vienna.36 Leaving the precise date of origin behind, Minervius clearly references a didactic purpose of this publication, specifically that of learning about Latin prosody. This is also referenced on the title page of the Melopoiae, when Celtis writes:

Excellent lover of the Muses, carefully observe the strophes, that is, the repetition of the verse forms, the elisions, the joining and marrying of the feet, as they relate to the emotion, the motion of the mind and the gestures of the body (‘Optime musiphile strophos id est Repeticiones carminnm [sic] collisiones syllabarum coniugationes et connubia pedum pro affectu animi motu et gestu corporis dilligenter observa’).37

The other didactic reason for Celtis to foster the performance of the odes was his wish to resurrect the ancient way of performing poetry, a prominent idea among humanists in Italy and increasingly also in Germany. They felt that this was one of the (for music rather rare) instances in which ancient practices could be resurrected. Ode settings were, in the words of Johannes Cochlaeus, a “representation of antiquity” (“antiquitatis simulacrum”).38 The humanists argued that to sing, rather than purely recite poems, was what the ancient poets themselves had done and intended. As Horace wrote, ‘I speak words worthy of being joined to the sound of strings’ (“verba loquor socianda chordis”).39 Grantley McDonald has shown how this echoed the Neoplatonic view of poetics, as understood by Celtis and others.40 On the title page of the Melopoiae, Celtis explicitly refers to this when he writes how fortunate the Germans are that they can now finally sing in the way the ancient Greeks and Romans did: ‘How lucky you are, o land of Germany, which now sings poems in the manner of Greece and Rome’ (“felix nunc o Germanica tellus Que graio & lacio carmina more canit”).41

In early modern Europe there was little knowledge about how exactly the ancients sang Latin poetry, and different approaches to resurrecting this practice co-existed. In Italy, singing extempore Latin poetry, accompanied by the lira da braccio or lute, became popular in the fifteenth century. Yet, due to the spontaneous nature of this practice, hardly any written sources from the fifteenth century survive.42 North of the Alps, Celtis and his contemporaries approached the topic mainly through the metrical settings. Celtis probably did not believe
that ancient poetry was sung in four voices in the way we find Tritonius’ ode settings in the *Melopoiae*. However, he does not address this discrepancy in any way in the publication. What was important to Celtis, it seems, is that they were sung, not merely read. As with other cases, what we find here is an early modern reinterpretation of an ancient practice rather than an actual resurrection with any claim to authenticity. This stands somewhat in contrast to the humanists’ rhetoric: that they, after the ignorance of the Middle Ages, were finally reading the classics as they were intended, directly and pure. Textual scholars, however, have shown that in reality that was rarely the case. The humanists did not encounter the classics in an unmediated fashion. As Anthony Grafton writes, ‘humanistic manuscripts and printed books were not the revival of something old, but the invention of something new’.

The practical difficulties of using the *Melopoiae* may have been a serious impediment to its use for practical or didactic purposes, but made little difference for its utility in disseminating the idea of singing poetry. The *Harmonie*, or any one of the many later publications that follow in its footsteps in format, text underlay and so on, would have been a more obvious choice for such contexts. However, for the second aspect – the dissemination of the idea of ancient sung poetry – the awkward layout and mistakes mattered much less. Hence, even if the *Melopoiae* was not used directly in performance, it could be used to educate (oneself or others) about this practice; to this extent it should still be considered a pedagogical publication. In this it is similar to the many textbooks for use at school or university, which appeared in German-speaking lands in the sixteenth century and beyond. They were not intended for performance. In fact, in most cases they do not contain entire pieces, but only extracts. But they taught students about music, and how to sing. In that sense, the *Melopoiae* also educates about a practice which Celtis believed worthy of resurrection.

At the same time, this didactic approach, the spreading of this idea, also serves the earlier function of the *Melopoiae*, that of the panegyric of Celtis. By introducing this new, yet ostensibly ancient practice, Celtis manifests his position as Germany’s arch-humanist. In good humanist fashion, he aimed to resurrect a technique and thus to enrich his contemporaries’ experience of the ancient texts. From this perspective, the ‘didactic’ and ‘panegyric’ purpose are not mutually exclusive, but in fact support each other. With the introduction of this practice, Celtis also contributed to the dissemination and appreciation of Horatian poetry. Of course, the *Melopoiae* include Horatian texts, although in selective and truncated form. More importantly, however, it gives individuals a way to enjoy these texts in a new, seemingly authentic form.

**Christian hymns**

One further intention behind the publication of the *Melopoiae* has recently been highlighted: namely, its role in the context of efforts to revive Christian singing. Andrea Horz has convincingly argued just how involved some early German humanists, including Celtis, were in resurrecting the singing and composition of hymns, specifically, the composition of new hymns for various saints. At the end of the *Melopoiae* is a catalogue of church hymns listed by metre, which could be sung to the settings presented in this volume. This is also a precursor to a range of four-voice hymn settings according to metrical rules. Once again the *Melopoiae* might not have been directly useable to sing these hymns to metre – after all, only the titles are given. Readers would have had to know the hymns by heart to sing them, which is, of course, a possibility, or consult another book containing these texts. However, its merit predominantly lies in introducing this idea, again serving a didactic, if not directly practical use.
To summarise, this was both a humanist as well as a didactic book, with the didactic element cementing its humanist nature. The ‘resurrection’ of the ancient tradition of singing poetry and the metric singing of hymns serve both as ways to underline the profoundly humanistic character of the book – and by extension the cultural mission of its instigator, Celtis – as well as a didactic purpose. A closer examination of surviving copies of the Melopoiae shows how these intentions are reflected in the ways in which early readers interacted with their copies of the Melopoiae, in ways that also went beyond the immediate intentions of its makers.

Owning and reading the Melopoiae

While some work on individual copies of this exceptional publication has been done, the overall impression remains that ‘the often referenced radiance and importance of the ode repertoire first published in the Melopoiae stands in an astonishing mismatch to how much we actually know about details of its reception and influence’, as Gundela Bobeth put it. Thus, a closer look at surviving copies enriches our understanding of its reception. Two main questions guide this quest. First, who bought and owned the Melopoiae? Second, how did they use their copies? The ‘use of a book’ in this context is understood rather broadly. It can include its uses in performance, as reading material, basis for study or as an item worthy of collection. Consequently, ways of asserting that use are equally diverse. There are the obvious, delightful signs revealing the presence of early users, such as marginal annotations and corrections, as well as the less obvious ones, in particular the examination of the books with which they were bound, as a basis for understanding the context in which they were used or collected.

There are in fact, an astonishing twenty-five surviving copies (see Appendix 4.1). This number is especially high if compared to other music publications of the time: Mewes’ Concentus harmonici, published in Basel in the same year, survives in only one complete copy, and an additional altus partbook. One of Oeglin’s songbooks exists is three known copies, another in only one. Often a negative correlation between survival and use has been postulated: books that were heavily used, particularly music books used as performance material, often did not survive. Hence a high survival rate may signify that the book was not much used. To some extent this axiom can also be applied to the Melopoiae: it was, after all, not particularly useful as performance material. This particular view, however, neglects uses beyond performance. Moreover, other factors also contributed to this particularly high survival rate. Most important is its format. Books in folio format survive more often than smaller ones. Additionally, big books were often made as impressive presentation items that would be highly valued. But even if they were used in performance, the format of a book had a directly correlation with its likelihood of survival: bigger books are harder to lose. Another example of this is the famous Liber selectarum cantionum, the only other book of polyphonic music printed in folio format in the German-speaking areas during the first decades of the sixteenth century, which survives in twenty-two copies. In this case, size does matter.

The celebrated woodcuts also added a further advantage for the Melopoiae’s survival chances. Although not by Dürer himself (as believed for some time), but rather by an unidentified ‘Celtis-Meister’, they were valued items, as can also be seen by their preservation separate from the rest of the publication: in at least two of the surviving copies of the Melopoiae the woodcuts have been removed. On the other hand we know of two instances where fragments (with at least one woodcut) survive separately from the rest of the book: one is bound at the end of a copy of Celtis’ Ligurinus (also printed by Oeglin in 1507), now
in the Austrian National Library. In addition to both woodcuts from the Melopoiae individually (probably printed on single sheets) it also contains folios 1 and 10 of the Melopoiae: that is, the title page with the ‘Crater Bachi’, and the final folio. According to an inscription on the final page, the volume formerly belonged to the Augustine monastery of St. Dorothy in Vienna, which was dissolved in 1786 and its library dispersed. The same two folios (A1 and A10) are also bound with a copy of Gaffurius’ Practica musicae in the University Library of Salzburg. With its celebrated woodcuts and large format, impractical for use as performance material in schools, the Melopoiae had a good chance of survival; the high number of surviving sources is thus not surprising. The context in which these copies were bought, given away, collected and used, however, shows a range of ways in which readers might engage with it.

**Book collectors**

There were (and are) several reasons to collect this book: for example, as part of a broad, universal library, to represent a specific musical genre, or to commemorate an important step in the development of (music) printing. As for universal collectors, it comes as no surprise that the bibliophile omnivore, Ferdinand Columbus, purchased a copy of the Melopoiae at Nuremberg in December 1521. Columbus, who was interested in basically every early printed book, probably did not seek out the Melopoiae for any particular reason, but simply acquired it as one item in his extensive collection.

Another famous bibliophile who assembled one of the largest private collections of the later fifteenth and early sixteenth century was the Nuremberg physician Hartmann Schedel. Of his library, 370 manuscripts and 460 individual printed titles survive in the Bayerische Staatsbibliothek in Munich. Among them is his copy of the Melopoiae, easily identifiable as one of his books by the distinctive red and blue markings and foliation (see Figure 4.1). Schedel’s book collecting, although broad in its approach, was governed by his specific interests. Apart from medical works, he keenly collected and copied antique texts, contemporary writers, and books on European history and geography. As a student in Padua in the 1460s he had come into contact with Italian humanist writers, and throughout his life he keenly collected their works, often specifically requesting new Italian publications or manuscripts from book agents. At the same time he was closely involved with German humanists, including Celtis, and shared their enthusiasm for showcasing the role and status of Germany in contemporary culture, an endeavour that led to his famous Weltchronik. The two catalogues of his library reflect these interests.

Absent from Schedel’s particular interests or his understanding of the studia humanitas is music. This might seem at odds with the fame of his (only) music manuscript, the so-called Schedelsches Liederbuch. However, Martin Kirnbauer has convincingly shown how this manuscript was part of Schedel’s wider interest in copying texts (Greek, Latin, diagrams) and not a basis for or record of performance or even a sign of a particular interest in music. The few known items of musical interest in his library consist of a copy of Guido of Arezzo and a volume of music theory, both listed under the mathematics section of his catalogue. Furthermore, his collection included a few items of musical interest in the context of the veneration of St. Sebald (patron saint of Nuremberg, Schedel’s home for most of his life) and a music textbook connected to the reform of Nuremberg’s schools.

To these known items, a few more publications containing musical notation can be added, which illustrate Schedel’s interest in humanist plays with music. The first is a copy of the Ludus Dianae, Celtis’ panegyric play written for Maximilian, which contains two homophonic choruses for four voices and is – with its association with Celtis, German humanism and homophonic musical settings – a close cousin of the Melopoiae. Similarly,
Schedel’s library also contains two different editions of one of the most famous and most frequently printed early modern plays, Johannes Reuchlin’s *Scaenica progymnasmata*. Both editions, printed in Basel 1498 and Tübingen 1511 respectively, contain four monophonic choruses with notation. A further chorus for four voices is part of the *Rhythmus die divi Martini*, a ‘rhythmical song performed on St Martin’s day’ by the Italian Antonio Urceo Codro. Schedel owned a German edition of this popular pamphlet; interestingly, only the German editions, not the Italian ones, contain the music in addition to the text. Schedel presumably purchased – or was presented with – the *Melopoiae* as part of this humanist endeavour by a convinced humanist, but was by no means a musically minded collector.

**Honouring Celtis**

Schedel’s copy of the *Melopoiae* could also be seen as evidence that contemporary collectors honoured the association of this publication with Celtis. More specifically, Birgit Lodes has...
pointed to the copy in Wolfenbüttel, which reflects the Celtis panegyric in the way it is collected, including some woodcuts of or connected to Celtis, the *Melopoiae*, the *Ligurinus* and a lamentation on Celtis’ death. Similarly, the copy in Lund is also bound with the *Ligurinus*, in a beautiful wooden binding. According to an inscription on the title page it belonged to Celtis’ pupil Gregor Nitsch. In fact, Nitsch claims, this volume was presented to him by Celtis himself before the poet’s death.

The copy in Freiburg University Library contains another reference to Celtis: on fol. 1r an early user has entered the words ‘Nota: Haec stropha. Carminum dulces etc. Desumpta est ex ode ultima lib. I ad Phoebum et Musam Suam. Incipit: Quid graves nos mentis mihi fers Labore’. This user has correctly identified that the lines from the title page of the *Melopoiae* (‘Carminum dulces resonemus odas/ Concinant laeti pueri tenores/ Et graves fauces cythara sonante, temperet alter’) are exactly repeated in one of Celtis’ own odes. They appear in ‘Ad Phoebum et Musam suam’, the final poem in the first book of Celtis’ odes (1513), exactly as the scribe indicates. Moreover, this particular ode speaks to Phoebus Apollo, who is depicted on the next page.

**Humanist learning – The Melopoiae as a didactic text**

Several surviving copies attest to the *Melopoiae*’s place in humanist learning. The copy in the University Library of Wrocław is bound with six other items. The sixteenth-century leather binding and the consecutive numbering of all items in brown ink suggest that they were bound together for an early (probably sixteenth-century) owner – maybe the person who has identified himself on the title page of the first item as ‘Henricus Cohelinus [?]’. Bound together are:

   c) Agostino Nifo, *De diebus criticis seu decretorius aureus liber: nuper editus et maxima cum diligentia impressus*, Venice: Giacomo Penzio for Alessandro Calcedonio, 1504 (USTC 844630).

In short, the *Melopoiae* here is preceded by an astronomical bestseller from the thirteenth century (produced in more than 300 editions and here in a version with commentary by leading scholars of the early sixteenth century) and a work on Ptolemaic astronomy by one of these commentators, Austrian astronomer Georg von Peuerbach. Next are three short titles by the Italian philosopher Agostino Nifo, and a volume of astronomic tables by the German mathematician and astronomer Johannes Stöffler. After that the *Melopoiae* is followed by another early modern bestseller, Gaffurius’ *Practica musica*. 
One common denominator of all these volumes is clearly their format. It could be supposed that these books were purely bound together on this basis. However, the folio format was rather common for text publications, unlike music publications of the time. Most of Agostino Nifo’s books, for example, were printed in folio. Thus we can assume that the collector of these books had a range of folio books to choose from and selected them not purely on the basis of their format. Moreover, the coherence around the theme of astronomy for many of the titles suggests a purposeful selection. We might surmise then that this collector thought that Melopoiae belonged among his books about astronomy, cosmology and, with Gaffurius, music theory. This collected volume thus represents humanistic scholarship with a particular interest in astronomy.

Another example of the Melopoiae in a collection of early sixteenth-century learning is the copy now in the Stiftsbibliothek in St. Gallen. The specific selection of themes, however, is rather different to the one just discussed. The St. Gallen copy is bound with nine items, all printed around 1500. On the title page of the first item the words ‘Liber S. Galli’ have been entered; later, on fol. A2 it reads: ‘Hunc librum aere proprio sibi frater Melchior Ratzenhofer comparavit aere [?] anno domini 1575’. This date, and the presence of sixteenth-century annotations in all titles of the compound volume has led Sabine Bachofner to suggest that the entire volume was already bound together in the sixteenth century, and became part of the library in St. Gallen early. The Melopoiae here finds itself in the illustrious company of books on ancient philosophy, poetry, and law, Porphyry’s introduction to Aristotle’s Categories (a standard textbook on logic), Boethius’ Consolation of Philosophy, Cicero’s De officiis and Horace’s Satires, all in editions from the early sixteenth century. It was thus collected in the context of interest in ancient philosophical writing and poetry – a perfect fit for Horatian odes in a publication trying to resurrect an ancient musical tradition. There is furthermore evidence of the ways in which an early reader used the Melopoiae: on fol. 9v (the overview of Christian hymns) he entered some grid diagrams to explain the metre as well as some further explanations (see Figure 4.2). Such grid schemata were another popular way to illustrate Latin metre and were used by Celtis himself in his Ars versificandi et carminum, first published in 1486. This copy thus exemplifies how the Melopoiae was both collected and read in a learned context, in particular here with a view of learning Latin metre. A further example of learned collecting is the copy of the Melopoiae now in the Stiftsbibliothek Zwettl, which was bound with a Latin translation of Diogenes Laertius’ Lives and Opinions of Eminent Philosophers, and Aulus Gellius’ Attic Nights, his miscellany with notes on a range of subjects.

Resurrecting the ‘authentic way of singing’

Evidence that Celtis’ mission to resurrect the ‘authentic way of singing’ interested an early reader might be seen in the copy of the Melopoiae now held in the University Library in Munich. The copy is bound on its own and has a moderate amount of underlining and some marginal annotations. These represent three different ways of engaging with the printed book.

First, annotations to help to identify the publication. They include, for example, the addition of the date ‘1507’ on the title page, information otherwise only given in the colophon. Similarly, the early user has underlined the part of the colophon identifying the book’s printer and publisher. Second, the reader underlined sections to aid the navigation on the page, for example, the headings in the table on fol. 1v, which are not clearly
distinguished typographically. Similarly, next to the woodcut of Apollo on Parnassus, an early user has entered the names of the items depicted, mostly copying the captions already given in the woodcut. Rather than identifying them, it seems he was learning them through scribal repetition.

Finally, the reader underlined specific words or phrases, which seem to indicate his specific interests while reading this publication: On the title page, for example, he first underlines the words ‘Excellent reader …’ (‘Optime musiphile strophos …’) and thus the section which explains the novelty of this approach. Later the sentence ‘Three and four times happy, o German land, which now sings poems in the manner of Greece and Rome’ (‘Terque quater felix nunc o Germanice tellus/ Que graio & lacio carmina more canit’) is also marked. This sentence also refers to Celtis’ intention of resurrecting the ‘authentic’ way of performing Latin poetry, to his humanist programme and part of its self-identification, ideals which apparently resonated with this reader.82

Figure 4.2  Konrad Celtis and Petrus Tritonius, Melopoiae (Augsburg: Erhard Oeglin, 1507), vdm 55, fol. 9r.
Source: St. Gallen, Stiftsbibliothek Ink. 379.
Musical uses

Finally, several surviving copies show evidence that they were used for the performance of the ode settings, or to collect a repertoire of such settings. One of the two copies now held in the British Library was used in an attempt to perform some of the musical settings, or at least to understand how they could be performed. On the first opening with music, an early user has entered the text of *Iam satis terris* in the discantus voice, further aided by hyphens to divide the notes according to the text (see Figure 4.3). Quickly, it seems, he realised the difficulty of this endeavour and gave up, since none of the other pages have similar markings.

Next, the copy now held in the University Library in Basel gives evidence of this publication’s role in the collection, preservation and probably performance of the quantitative verse setting. It once belonged to Christoffel Wyssgerber (Christopherus Alutarius), a teacher from Basel and local humanist. At the end of his copy of the *Melopoiae* he added a number of folios on which he entered further settings and arrangements of those contained in the printed book. These additional leaves, now kept separately as manuscript F II 35, offer a fascinating window into the reception of the repertoire. Wyssgerber’s manuscript additions have been dated to around 1534 and the reworkings and addition of pieces, many of which were intended for the performance in school plays, show an active engagement with the repertoire twenty-five years after it first appeared in print. Apart from the additional pages, the printed book itself also shows signs of use: on folio 3r, an early reader (probably Wyssgerber) has entered the correct tenor voice of *Sic te diva potens*, probably copied from the *Harmonie*.

The copy in the Newberry library in Chicago is of interest for two additions, one textual and one musical. The latter falls into the same category of use as the copy just described. On the lowest two empty staves on folios 3v–4r, the second opening that contains music, an early user entered a four-voice quantitative setting of Ovid’s *Hanc tua Penelope* (see Figures 4.4 and 4.5). This text – a fictional love letter by Penelope to Ulysses – was, as far as we are aware, not set to music by Tritonius, though others, including Ludwig Senfl, Benedict

![Figure 4.3 Konrad Celtis and Petrus Tritonius, *Melopoiae* (Augsburg: Erhard Oeglin, 1507), vdm 55, fol. 2v. Source: London, British Library, Hirsch III 1130.](image-url)
Ducis, Johannes Heugel, and Michael N. did. In this rather unusual setting, the tenor moves very little, and then mainly in conjunct motion, while the other voices have some large leaps. This setting does not overlap with any of these mentioned settings. This particular opening in the *Melopoiae* was an obvious place to enter additional music, as it has the most free space on the printed staves. The scribe followed the layout of the printed book and entered the tenor and discantus on the left, the altus and bassus on the right side of the opening. Whether it was copied from another book or composed by the scribe, it is in any case a good example of the way readers could use a printed book as a starting point, enlarging it with related content.

A second addition to this copy is of particular interest. Entered in the empty space next to the tenor of *Iam satis* on fol. 2 is a ten-strophe rhymed text starting ‘Vive vive mi Luthere’ (see Figure 4.6), a song celebrating Luther’s burning of the papal bull of excommunication on 10 December 1520 in Wittenberg. The text (see transcription in Appendix 4.2), attributed
to the reformer Urbanus Rhegius, celebrates this event, ending each three-line strophe with a joyful refrain, ‘Io, Io’. This text survives in several different versions. Presumably the earliest is a printed single sheet surviving in Berlin. Many decades later, in 1591, Andreas Stangwald included it in his second edition of Luther’s table talk, in a shorter and altered version. Yet another version is also found in the *Confessio Augustana oratio historica* – an account of the history of Protestantism – in a form closer to that on the single sheet than Stangwald’s text. This last-mentioned source most closely resembles the text entered in the Newberry copy of the *Melopoiae*. However, the differences are too significant to suggest it was copied from this particular publication; moreover, the handwriting in this copy appears to be from the earlier sixteenth century. In the Newberry copy, the scribe also only gives the text, but no explanatory details, title or the initials of the author (V[rbanus]. R[hegius].), as included, for example, on the single-sheet publication. Evidently a number

Figure 4.5 Konrad Celtis and Petrus Tritonius, *Melopoiae* (Augsburg: Erhard Oeglin, 1507), vdm 55, fol. 4’.
Source: Chicago, The Newberry Library, VAULT Case VM 1490.T83m.
of different versions of this text were in circulation throughout the sixteenth century. Its inclusion in the Melopoiae shows that this copy was apparently still in use after December 1520, when Luther burned the bull. It also suggests that this copy of the Melopoiae might have been used within a pro-Lutheran context, or at least in conjunction with pro-Lutheran publications which might have contained this text.

**Conclusion and later history**

There were many reasons to collect and use the Melopoiae, some of which reflected the diverse intentions of its makers, particularly Konrad Celtis. It was collected as part of universal libraries and often had a place in compendia focussed on humanist learning, some specifically in connection to Celtis. At the same time, some early owners did indeed use it
to learn Latin metres. Others were, it seems, particularly interested in the idea that it would help to resurrect an ancient way of reciting poetry. For others, then, it was a starting point of an active engagement with the genre of metrical settings.

This diversity of approaches continued well beyond the sixteenth century. A second, otherwise rather ‘clean’ copy of the *Melopoiae*, now held in the British Library, gives evidence that the *Melopoiae* was desirable for universal collectors for many centuries to come: it was bought by the physician and keen book collector Georg Kloss in the early nineteenth century. The copy now held in Rochester, NY, on the other hand, was once owned by Alfred Henry Littleton, a music publisher who lived at the turn of the twentieth century, who compiled a library to facilitate his work on the history of music printing. Clearly the *Melopoiae*’s status as one of the first examples of multiple-impression printing north of the Alps made it an attractive item for Littleton. A different type of nineteenth-century collector was Georg Poelchau – pupil of Telemann, owner of the largest private collection of Bach manuscripts, and avid collector of all kinds of books of music. Among his rich collection of more than 2,600 items, now held in the Staatsbibliothek Berlin, is another copy of the *Melopoiae*, which bears no other signs of use or ownership. This book was collected then as part of the library of a musician and bibliophile with a specific interest in music – rather the opposite of Schedel a few hundred years earlier. This wide range of ambitions and potential uses – offering something for everyone, it seems – also keeps this book in its central position in musicological scholarship.

### Appendix 4.1 Extant copies of the *Melopoiae*

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Location</th>
<th>Shelfmark</th>
<th>Condition</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>A-Su (Salzburg, Universitätsbibliothek)</td>
<td>F II 475 (angebunden)</td>
<td>Only fols. [1] and [10]</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>A-Wn (Wien, Österreichische Nationalbibliothek)</td>
<td>SA.76.A.3</td>
<td>Complete</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>A-Wn (Wien, Österreichische Nationalbibliothek)</td>
<td>53.C.26</td>
<td>Only fols. [1] and [10]</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>A-Z (Zwettl, Zisterzienserstift, Bibliothek und Musikarchiv)</td>
<td>StiBZ Inc. I/138</td>
<td>Complete</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>B-Br (Brussels, Bibliothèque Royale de Belgique)</td>
<td>Fétis 2.207 C (Réserve précieuse)</td>
<td>Complete</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>CH-Bu (Basel, Öffentliche Bibliothek der Universität Basel)</td>
<td>kk I 27</td>
<td>The two woodcuts have been cut out, with resulting loss of musical text. Lacks pp. 9-12</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>CH-SGs (St. Gallen, Stiftsbibliothek)</td>
<td>Ink. 397</td>
<td>Complete</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>D-As (Augsburg, Staats- und Stadtbibliothek)</td>
<td>Cim 44 2 Tonk 28</td>
<td>Complete</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>D-B (Berlin, Staatsbibliothek zu Berlin – Preußischer Kulturbesitz, Musikabteilung)</td>
<td>Mus.ant.pract. T 150</td>
<td>Final folio missing; photos from D-Mbs Rar. 291</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>D-FRu (Freiburg im Breisgau, Universitätsbibliothek)</td>
<td>Rara F 9222</td>
<td>Complete</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>D-Mbs (München, Bayerische Staatsbibliothek)</td>
<td>Rar. 291</td>
<td>Complete</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>D-Mu (München, Universitätsbibliothek der Ludwig-Maximilians-Universität)</td>
<td>0014/W 2 Art. 269</td>
<td>Complete</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Location</td>
<td>Shelfmark</td>
<td>Condition</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>---------------------------------------</td>
<td>-------------------------</td>
<td>----------------------------</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>D-W (Wolfenbüttel, Herzog August Bibliothek)</td>
<td>A: 12.9 Poet. 2° (4)</td>
<td>Complete</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>DK-Kk (Copenhagen, Det Kongelige Bibliothek)</td>
<td>U292, mu 6603.0131</td>
<td>Complete</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>F-CO (Colmar, Bibliothèque municipale)</td>
<td>XI 10979</td>
<td>No information available</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>F-SEL (Sélestat, Bibliothèque municipale)</td>
<td>K 1132d Incunables</td>
<td>No information available</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>GB-Ge (Glasgow, University Library, Euing Music Collection)</td>
<td>Sp Coll R.x.57</td>
<td>No information available</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>GB-Lbl (London, British Library)</td>
<td>Hirsch III.1130</td>
<td>Complete</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>I-Bc (Bologna, Museo internazionale e biblioteca della musica di Bologna)</td>
<td>Q.112/B</td>
<td>No information available</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>PL-WRu (Wrocław, Biblioteka Universytecka)</td>
<td>407078</td>
<td>Complete</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>S-L (Lund, Universitetsbiblioteket)</td>
<td>Fol Utl Vitt Nylat = Guntherus</td>
<td>Complete</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>S-Sk (Stockholm, Kungliga biblioteket)</td>
<td>RAR: 147 F</td>
<td>No information available</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>US-Cn (Chicago, IL, The Newberry Library)</td>
<td>VAULT Case VM 1490 .T83m</td>
<td>Complete</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>US-NYp (New York, NY, New York Public Library at Lincoln Center, Music Division)</td>
<td>JOG 94-6</td>
<td>Folio 1 is separate and does not seem to belong to this copy. Folio [A10] is missing. Complete</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>US-R (Rochester, NY, University, Eastman School of Music, Sibley Music Library)</td>
<td>M1490 .T839M</td>
<td>Complete</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**Appendix 4.2 Transcription of a song celebrating Luther’s burning of the papal bull, 1520, from the copy of *Melopoiae* in Chicago, The Newberry Library, VAULT Case VM 1490.T83m, fol. 2°**

Vive vive mi Luthere  
Cuncti tibi dicant χαῖρε  
Veritatis column. Io Io

Leti este Lutherani  
Nam uos estis Christiani  
Antichristum temnite. Io Io

Vobis illucescit lumen  
Quod ab alto dedit numen  
Fugite scholasticos. Io Io

Libertatem Christianam  
Non existimantes vanam  
Fortiter defendite. Io Io
Nil nocebit bulla minax
Veritatem timet fugax
Sathane invencio. Io Io

Plange Roma fraudulenta
Bulla iacet virulenta
Et famesa/ [sc. famesce] curia. Io Io

Reum querunt nunc papistae
Regnum perit antichristi
Cum corona triplici. Io Io

Veniarum nundinator
Fidei depopulator
Resipisce Pontifex. Io Io

Si te ventris onus urget
Ius combustum nates purget
Cum sit antichristicum. Io Io

Nomen vestri iam patroni
Scire vultis Curtisani
Danielem legite. Io Io
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30 See Lodes, ‘Concentus, Melopoiae und Harmonie’, 42. On Celtis’ conscious imitation of Horace, see also Auhagen et al., Horaz und Celtis.
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44 The double purpose of practical use and humanist ideal is also made clear in Horz, ‘Heinrich Glarean’, 176–178.
45 Horz, ‘Hymnen und Metrik’.
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64 See Stauber, Die Schedelsche Bibliothek, 107.
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66 Konrad Celtis, Ludus Dianae (Nuremberg: Hieronymus Höltzel, 1501), vdm 59, copy D-Mbs 4 Inc.c.a. 1723#Beibd.4.
67 Scaenica progymnasmeta ([Basel]: Johann Bergmann von Olpe, 1498), vdm 73, copy D-Mbs 4 Inc.c.a. 1542 n; and Scaenica progymnasmeta (Tübingen: Thomas Anshelm, 1511), vdm 77, copy D-Mbs Res/4 P.o.lat. 756,23.
68 Urceo Codro, Rhythmus die divi Martini pronunciatus (Wittenberg: Johann Grunenberg, 1511), vdm 95, copy D-Mbs Res. 4º P.o.lat. 743 26. See also: McDonald, ‘The Cult of Luther in Music’, 206, 207, 222.
69 Unfortunately none is specifically named in Schedel’s catalogues, which would allow a better understanding of where he located them in his system of knowledge and learning. This is not unusual, as many of the entries evidently refer to collected volumes, but only name one or a few of the individual titles.
70 Lodes, ‘Concentus, Melopoiae und Harmonie’, 46.
71 I am grateful to Åsa Sjöblom (University Library Lund) for this information.
72 The inscription reads ‘Conradus Celtis primus poeta germanicus in carmine lirico presertim non mediocrer doctus/ Obijt .Mº.dº.viiijº. Wiene/ me Gregorio Nitsch canonico Olomucensem/ tunc illis constituto et illius parentalibus interesser/ Hic me paulo ante obitum suum hoc libro/ donauit vivat deo eterno’.
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74 PL-WRu, shelfmark 407078.
75 This name is accompanied by the inscription: ‘Take care not to spurn the stars if you derive your life from the stars’ (‘Caue astra spernas vitam qui ducis ab astra’).
The USTC lists 120 titles in folio, versus nineteen in quarto, nineteen in octavo and one in sextodecimo.

CH-SGs Barocksaal SGST DD Mitte III 6 (K9); also Ink 397.

They are now in a binding from the eighteenth century, which likely replaced an earlier binding. The inscription on the fore-edge of the entire volume looks to be from a sixteenth-century binding. Moreover, annotations in a sixteenth-century hand can be found in all volumes. I am grateful to M.A. Sabine Bachofner (Stiftsbibliothek St. Gallen) for her help and detailed discussion of this volume.

For another use, also see Brinzing, *Neue Quellen*, 14–15.

Diogenes Laertius, *Vita et sententia philosophorum* (Venice: Philippus Pincius, 1497); Aulus Gellius, *Noctes Atticae* (Venice: Boneto Locatelli for Octavian Scotus, 1494), A-Z StiBZ Inc. I/138. I am grateful to Dr. Andreas Gamerith (Stiftsbibliothek Zwettl) for this information.

D-Mu W2 Art. 269. I am grateful to Dr. Sven Kuttner (Universitätsbibliothek München) for his detailed information on the copy. His suggestions that this was Heinrich Glarean’s personal copy is however probably incorrect, given the handwriting and in particular the level and content of the annotations. I am grateful to Prof. Iain Fenlon for sharing his expertise in identifying Glarean’s books.

On the music pages we only find two changes: in the tenor of *Sic te diva* one pitch is corrected and the b-flat crossed out. Moreover, the first word of the twenty-second setting, *Floreat in studiis*, is entered by hand in the tenor voice.

GB-Lbl Hirsch III.1130.

On fol. 7r in the first system of the bassus, a fermata has been added. Further text was also added on the bottom of fol. 2v, which is unfortunately too faded to read.

CH-Bu kk I 27.

For more on the manuscript, see Kmetz, *Die Handschriften der Universitätsbibliothek Basel*, 42–45.

US-Cn VAULT Case VM 1490.T83m. I am grateful to Katie Bank and Grantley McDonald, who brought it to my attention.

First published in Ludewin Senfl, *Varia carminum genera* (Nuremberg: Hieronymus Formschneider, 1534), vdm 97. Another setting by Senfl was included in Hofhaimer’s *Harmoniae poeticae* (Nuremberg: Johannes Petreius, 1539).

Two different versions by Benedict Duci are included in *Geminiae undeviginti odarum Horatii melodiae* (Frankfurt am Main: Christian Egenolff, 1551), RISM B/I 15517.

In *Isagogicus rerum grammaticarum* (Erfurt: Melchior Sachse the Elder, 1548), vdm 1518. Later it is included with a different text in 155117. On this also see Tröster, ‘Theobald Billican and Michael’s Ode Settings’, 237.

A three-voice setting is included in *De partium orationis adaequationibus compendium*, Marburg: [Franz Rhode], 1531, vdm 138. See Tröster, ‘Theobald Billican and Michael’s Ode Settings’, 243.

For further examples of this practice in the early sixteenth century, see Giselbrecht, ‘Manuscript and Print Combined’.

See, for example, Kawerau, ‘3. Ein Lied auf die Verbrennung’.

The full title is: CARMINE VICTORIALE IN SOLENNEM illum actum quo D Martinus Lutherus X die Decembris, anno domini M.D. XX. VVittenbergae ante portam S Crucis, Jus Canonicum & omnia Papistica Decreata cum Decretalibus combussit. Cited after the transcriptions of this source in ‘Actenstück zur Reformationsgeschichte’, and Kawerau, ‘Ein Lied auf die Verbrennung’, 232–233. Volz questioned Kawerau’s assertion that the single surviving copy of this sheet belonged to Luther and carries annotations in his hand on the basis of the handwriting; see Volz, ‘Lutherana’. The text in Chicago differs from that on the broadsheet in several ways: the Chicago source has an additional strophe between strophes 2 and 3 of the broadsheet, but does not have what is strophe 6 (*Iam primatus ille*) in the broadsheet. The order of strophes 7 and 8 is also reversed.

This version is different from both others described here, with a variant beginning and end, and only eight strophes.


This version does contain the same verse as US-Cn between strophes 2 and 3 that is not in the broadsheet (starting with ‘Nobis’). The version in the *Oratio* includes an additional strophe starting with ‘Iam primatus ille’, but not the strophe starting ‘Plane Roma’.
‘Georginus [or Georgius?] Kloss M.D. Francforti ad Moenum’.

This resulted in the publication of his Catalogue of One Hundred Works. Parts of his collection are now held at Senate House Library, London. I am grateful to David Coppen (Sibley Music Library, Eastman School of Music, Rochester) for providing me with a scan and additional information about this copy.

I am grateful to Dr. Roland Schmidt-Hensel (Staatsbibliothek Berlin) for the detailed information on this copy.
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Part III

Music printing at Wittenberg
Power and ambition: Georg Rhau’s strategies for music publishing

Moritz Kelber

There is almost no fundamental study on the Reformation that does not emphasise the importance of printing for the movement’s success: the printing press first made Martin Luther famous beyond a narrow theological context.¹ In the early years of the Reformation, Wittenberg became a centre of printing and publishing, despite lacking basic preconditions for success.² Lying in the Empire’s North-East, it was far from major trading routes, unlike cities such as Augsburg, Nuremberg, Frankfurt or Mainz. Although Luther and his circle complained about the problems caused by Wittenberg’s isolation, they succeeded in establishing Wittenberg as a unique place – a unique brand – in the printing and publishing market.³

Even before Luther’s Reformation transformed the printing industry across the Empire, a fledgling printing industry existed in Wittenberg. Its motor was the university, founded by Elector Friedrich III (‘the Wise’) of Saxony in 1502, to serve mainly as a centre for the education of administrative staff.⁴ Early Wittenberg printers such as Nikolaus Marschalk, who produced the first printed book in Wittenberg in December 1502, or Wolfgang Stöckel, the first official university printer, produced their books mainly for local educational purposes. The first printer in Wittenberg who published music was Johannes Grunenberg.⁵ In 1508, he was invited by Johannes von Staupitz (c. 1465–1524), one of the founders of the university, to establish a printing workshop. In 1511, Grunenberg printed a small pamphlet containing a piece for four voices, a student drinking song in humanistic fashion, with woodblocks of low quality.⁶

This chapter focusses on Georg Rhau, one of the key figures of Wittenberg printing in the first half of the sixteenth century. Rhau was not only one of the most productive printers of theological and propagandistic literature of his time, but also the most active music printer. The first part of this chapter presents general observations about Rhau’s activities as a music printer, based mainly on the data collected by the vdm team.⁷ The paper then focusses on Rhau’s polyphonic music books, outlining Rhau’s efforts to use the Wittenberg brand to market polyphonic music books. The third part presents new evidence about polyphonic music books produced for special occasions, a genre that has been largely neglected by musicological scholarship. Finally, the fourth part of this chapter discusses a lost polyphonic music book by Rhau that prompts some questions about the role of this genre in the music printing industry.

Georg Rhau and his printing workshop

Georg Rhau is an exceptional figure in early modern music printing for many reasons, not least for his musical education. He was born in 1488 in the central German town of Eisfeld,
and studied at Erfurt and Wittenberg from 1508 to 1514. For about four years, he worked in the printing workshop of Johann Grunenberg at Wittenberg. Between 1518 and 1520, he was cantor of St Thomas’s Church in Leipzig, and taught music theory at the University of Leipzig. In 1519, Rhau’s twelve-voice Missa de Sancto Spirito opened the disputation between Martin Luther and Johannes Eck. After only two years Rhau had to leave Leipzig, apparently because of his sympathies for Luther and his teachings. Before he moved back to Wittenberg to start his career as printer and publisher in 1523, he worked for a short time as schoolmaster in Eisleben and Hildburghausen.

Although it is uncertain when Rhau gained access to Luther’s circle, he had established close personal connections to many key figures of the Reformation by the time he started publishing books under his own name. Given Rhau’s role as a key agent of the Reformation and one of the most important printers and publishers of music in sixteenth-century Germany, it is not surprising that scholarship has developed a lively interest in his activity, although most accounts of his biography are still based on the early research of Willy Woelbing. Marie Schlüter, Jürgen Heidrich and Victor H. Mattfeld have mainly concentrated on Rhau’s role as music editor and publisher. Perhaps the most spectacular recent development in Rhau scholarship comes from the field of archaeology. Recent excavations in the city centre of Wittenberg have revealed pieces of metal type from the sixteenth century, some of which are from a music font. Most were found within the former Franciscan monastery, home to several printing workshops after the cloister was abandoned in 1522. Georg Rhau moved his printing workshop to these buildings in 1538. The discovery of original music type used by Rhau has not only sharpened the understanding of his production processes but has also provided a better understanding of the particularities of his music books.

As is the case with most other printers in fifteenth- and sixteenth-century Germany, most of Georg Rhau’s books did not contain musical notation. However, music printing was a key element in his marketing strategy. In a publication of Mass propers from 1545, he explicitly refers to himself as a music printer (‘musicae typographus’). The production of music books in Rhau’s printing workshop was shaped by the demands of a market formed by the Reformation. It also surpassed other printing firms both in the extent of its forward planning of series of publications, and its vicinity to the political elites. The publication programme of Rhau’s firms was also influenced deeply by his own personal interests and expertise, especially in music theory. During the period of his activity (1525–1548), Rhau was responsible for more than 40% of all music-theory books containing musical notation that were printed in German-speaking lands. Among these were nine editions of Nicolaus Listenius’ school music-theory treatise. Of the ninety-five known musical editions published by Rhau’s firm during its founder’s life, more than half are music-theory books, including first and later editions.

The year 1538 was a turning point in Rhau’s career. In this year he moved his printing workshop to the abandoned buildings of the old Franciscan monastery in Wittenberg, and created his own single-impression type for printing music. Until that point he had used only woodcut to print musical notation. The design of Rhau’s music font was derived from Hieronymus Formschneider’s successful type. Donald Krummel assumed that Rhau bought them directly from Nuremberg. However, Daniel Berger and his colleagues have argued that the Wittenberg printer most likely purchased the punches and matrices from Formschneider to produce his own letters. The similarities between the two typefaces are striking. Like the Nuremberg printer, Rhau uses a distinctive g-clef that resembles an ‘E’. Both use a rectangular c-clef placed outside the system, and both print the accidentals on
the staff lines. Breves and longs are printed with serifs in both typefaces. The differences between Rhau’s and Formschneider’s typefaces are limited to minor typometric differences. Formschneider’s single-impression music books look slightly neater because of his exceptionally careful alignment of type.

From 1538, most of Rhau’s music books were printed in single-impression technique. He used his music type not only for polyphonic music books, but also for other genres. However, for re-issues of books first published before 1538, he continued to use the old woodblocks. Printing polyphonic music became a cornerstone of Georg Rhau’s company. However, the preparations for the endeavour took some time. In the preface to Listenius’ *Rudimenta musicae* of 1533, Johannes Bugenhagen mentions that Rhau was soon to print music by Josquin and others (‘quam primum aediturum insignibus characteribus, carmina IOSQVINI & aliorum’). Wolfgang Reich assumes that it might have taken Rhau a considerable amount of time to collect music and make preparations for the numerous editions which were published very quickly. In only eight years, between 1538 and 1545, Rhau printed twenty editions containing polyphony, making him the most productive German music printer of that genre in the first half of the sixteenth century (see Table 5.1).

Most of Rhau’s polyphonic publications contain exclusively sacred repertoire. Together, they represent a massive project to disseminate an extensive repertoire of sacred polyphony.

Table 5.1 Polyphonic music books printed by Georg Rhau between 1538 and 1545

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>vdm</th>
<th>Title</th>
<th>Year</th>
<th>Dedicatee</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>36</td>
<td><em>Selectae harmoniae quatuor vocum de passione domini</em></td>
<td>1538</td>
<td>–</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>40</td>
<td><em>Symphoniae iucundae atque adeo breves</em></td>
<td>1538</td>
<td>–</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>46</td>
<td><em>Officia paschalia de resurrectione et ascensione domini</em></td>
<td>1539</td>
<td>Jodocus Schalreuter</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>49</td>
<td><em>Vesperarum precum officia psalmi feriarum et dominicalium dierum</em></td>
<td>1540</td>
<td>City council of Coburg</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1019</td>
<td><em>Opus decem missarum quatuor vocum</em></td>
<td>1541</td>
<td>City council of Torgau</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1145</td>
<td><em>Novum ac insigne opus musicum triginta sex antiphonarum</em></td>
<td>1541</td>
<td>Church and school of Wittenberg</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1023</td>
<td><em>Tricia tum veterum tum recentiorum</em></td>
<td>1542</td>
<td>City council of Hilpertshausen</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1024</td>
<td><em>Sacrorum hymnorum liber primus</em></td>
<td>1542</td>
<td>City council of Joachimsthal</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1159</td>
<td><em>Respensiorum numero octoginta</em></td>
<td>1543</td>
<td>–</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1028</td>
<td><em>Magnificat octo modorum</em></td>
<td>1544</td>
<td>Johann Goskau</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1029</td>
<td><em>Newe deutdsche geistliche Gesenge CXXIII</em></td>
<td>1544</td>
<td>City council of Eisfeld</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1158</td>
<td><em>Wittembergisch deutsch geistlich Gesangbichelein</em></td>
<td>1544</td>
<td>–</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1160</td>
<td><em>Respensiorum numero octoginta</em></td>
<td>1544</td>
<td>–</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1161</td>
<td><em>Cantio septem vocum</em></td>
<td>1544</td>
<td>Johann Friedrich of Saxony</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1162</td>
<td><em>Novum opus musicum</em></td>
<td>1544</td>
<td>Melchior Kling</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1035</td>
<td><em>Officerum de Nativitate</em></td>
<td>1545</td>
<td>Nikolaus Kind</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1036</td>
<td><em>Secundus tomos biciniorum</em></td>
<td>1545</td>
<td>Caspar Hemel</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1163</td>
<td><em>Bicina gallica, latina, germanica</em></td>
<td>1545</td>
<td>Johannes Hemel</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1504</td>
<td><em>Novum opus musicum</em></td>
<td>1545</td>
<td>Melchior Kling</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1517</td>
<td>[Motet for seven voices]</td>
<td>1545</td>
<td>[City council of Annaberg?]</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

*Vdm lists two separate editions of the Vesperarum precum officia (vdm 49 and vdm 1555), which contain minor variants in the first gathering.*
for use within the Protestant liturgy and beyond. Heidrich argues that, although liturgical repertoire dominates Rhau’s publications, the institutional focus is clearly on the Protestant school milieu. Indeed, churches and schools in many Protestant and Catholic cities formed a symbiotic organism. After Rhau’s death in 1548, his heirs continued printing until the mid-1560s. However, they stopped printing polyphonic music in 1550 with the Epitaphia Rhauorum, a musical epitaph for various members of the Rhau family, composed by the young musician Johann Reusch.

Marketing polyphonic music from Wittenberg

Georg Rhau’s polyphonic music books combine German and international repertoire. Most of the composers form a Lutheran canon, from Josquin des Prez to Ludwig Senfl, and including unambiguously Protestant composers such as Johann Walter and Sixt Dietrich. However, the editor Rhau crossed confessional boundaries by drawing directly from Italian music books. For his 1544 collection of Magnificats (vdm 1028), he directly copied an anthology published two years earlier by Scotto in Venice. Several times Rhau stated on title pages and in paratexts that he wished to make available an extensive polyphonic repertoire for schools and churches alike. For liturgical use he published a series of six collections of polyphony for vespers and three anthologies containing polyphonic settings of the Mass ordinary and propers. The collections of bicinia (vdm 1163 and 1036), tricinia (vdm 1023), Latin motets (vdm 40, 1504, 1162), and German hymns (vdm 1029) are explicitly or implicitly directed to educational purposes.

Rhau created an exceptional consistency of his publications through repertoire, paratexts and imagery. His close contacts to Martin Luther and his Wittenberg circle enabled him to win prominent reformers such as Philipp Melanchthon, Johannes Bugenhagen, and even Luther himself as authors for paratexts in his music books. Epigrams, addresses to the readers, and extensive prefaces were key elements in Rhau’s marketing strategy and instruments of Protestant authorisation. The two 1538 editions that mark the beginning of Wittenberg polyphonic music printing contain prefaces by Martin Luther (vdm 40) and Philipp Melanchthon (vdm 36) instead of dedicatory letters. Both reformers contributed liminal texts in polyphonic music books alongside other famous Lutherans such as Johann Spangenberg and Johann Bugenhagen.

From 1540 onwards, almost all polyphonic music books from the Rhau workshop were published with a dedication to an individual or an institution (see Table 5.1). City councils in Ernestine or Albertine Saxony dominate: Coburg, Wittenberg, Torgau, Eisfeld, Hildburgshausen, Freiberg, and presumably Annaberg. The motet collection Sacrorum hymnorum liber primus (vdm 1024) is dedicated to the city council of the mining town Joachimsthal (now Jáchymov), close to the Saxon border. Although Rhau included dedications in other kinds of music books as well, urban institutions were the exclusive dedicatees of publications containing polyphonic music. The probable motive for addressing city councils in polyphonic music books was their responsibility for local schools. This link becomes obvious in the first dedicatory letter by Rhau to a city council, included in the Vesperarum precum officia psalmi (vdm 49 and 1555), a collection of mainly simple polyphony. The text deals with educational issues right from the start:

It was always my highest endeavour, most wise and distinguished men, that I should benefit schoolboys first and foremost through my printing workshop. Thus, for the past few years, I have neglected more serious authors and primarily taken on the special task of printing basic handbooks of the arts for children. Led on by this same reason, I have decided now to
print with metal type the psalm-tones appropriate for weekdays use, or four voices in simple counterpoint, with the melodies varied as necessary, of the sort we are accustomed to sing in church to give the boys good practice both on weekdays and on Sundays.\textsuperscript{29}

Rhau added a second letter at the end of the book, this time addressed to ‘all learned and faithful schoolmasters’ (‘omnibus eruditis & fideliibus Ludimagistris’), further underlining the pedagogical ambition of this publication. When evaluating Rhau’s strategy for addressing dedications, one must remember that he himself was a member of the council in Wittenberg from 1541 on. Thus, dedicating a book to the council of another city was an explicitly political act.

Rhau dedicated other polyphonic music books to individuals from his own private circle. Jocodus Schalreuter, the dedicatee of the \textit{Officia paschalia} from 1539 (vdm 46), was cantor of the Ratsschule in Zwickau.\textsuperscript{30} In the dedicatory letter, Rhau thanked the kindly and musically experienced (‘humanissimo, musicaeque peritissimo viro’) Schalreuter for his help during the preparation of the book. The 1544 collection of Magnificats (vdm 1028) is dedicated to Johann Goskau, a scribe in Jessen, a town close to Wittenberg, whom Rhau addressed as a familiar and very dear friend (‘Familiari ac amico suo longe charissimo’). The dedicatory letter to Goskau maintains an extraordinarily personal tone. The first volume of Rhau’s \textit{Bicinia} (vdm 1163) is dedicated to Johannes Hemel, while the second (vdm 1036) addresses his son, Caspar.\textsuperscript{31} There is very little information about Hemel’s biography except that he studied in Wittenberg and in 1556 published a rhymed German paraphrase of the seven Penitential Psalms (VD16 B 3529). The dedication of Sixt Dietrich’s \textit{Novum opus musicum} (vdm 1162 and 1504), first issued on 1544, is of special political relevance. The dedicatee, Melchior Kling, who acted as an advisor to the Saxon Elector from 1542, was accused by Martin Luther of being an agent of papal authority in 1544, and fell into the disfavour of Elector Johann Friedrich.\textsuperscript{32} When the \textit{Novum opus musicum} was re-issued in 1545, right at the climax of the conflict, the same dedicatory letter was included. Although the dedicatory letter was written by Sixt Dietrich, who lived in Constance and was probably not aware of all the theological and political conflicts in Wittenberg (even though he had spent some time there), it remains unclear why Rhau, a close friend of Luther, published a dedicatory letter to this controversial figure even after he had fallen into disgrace.

In his instructive analysis of Rhau’s Latin dedicatory letters, Raimund Redeker outlines the importance of the dissemination of Lutheran repertoire in schools, churches and small parishes against the possible economic interests of the music publisher Rhau. Taking Rhau’s prefaces and dedications and their topoi of modesty literally, Redeker even speculates about an intentional self-limitation concerning commercial success.\textsuperscript{33} Since we know so little about Rhau’s business model, we can only guess about his economic success. As Royston Gustavson has pointed out, he clearly had a different strategy from that of his colleagues from Frankfurt, Augsburg, Strasbourg and Nuremberg, in that he aimed explicitly at a Protestant audience.\textsuperscript{34} The development of this overtly evangelical marketing strategy is obvious in the evolving visual imagery of the polyphonic collections printed at Wittenberg. Most of Rhau’s editions have highly decorated title pages. In most cases, the title page of the tenor partbooks varies from that of the other voices. The first polyphonic music books from the Rhau printing workshop have a remarkably standardized appearance. Almost all editions published until 1542 use the same framing title woodcut, which depicts various musical instruments (see Figure 5.1).\textsuperscript{35} Starting in 1542 with the \textit{Sacrorum hymnorum liber primus} (vdm 1024), Rhau began to employ explicitly Protestant imagery. The title page of the tenor partbook of this collection shows the emblems of five Reformers in round garlands: Luther’s rose, Johann Bugenhagen’s harp, the elevated snake of
Melanchthon, Justus Jonas’ symbol of the whale, and the dove of Caspar Cruciger (see Figure 5.2). Rhau re-used this design for three further anthologies (vdm 1029, 1159, 1160). From 1544 he employed a second layout for his title pages, which was likewise clearly political. The tenor partbook of the collection *Magnificat octo modorum* (vdm 1028) shows portraits of Martin Luther, Elector Johann Friedrich of Saxony, and Philipp Melanchthon in medallions (see Figure 5.3). The printer re-used the same design for the two editions of his *Novum opus musicum* (vdm 1162, 1504). For the tenor title page of the anthology *Officiorum (ut vocant) de Nativitate* (vdm 1035), Rhau only used the upper half of this layout, which is decorated with woodcut acanthus decorations and three medallions displaying Luther’s rose, two crossed swords for the Elector of Saxony, and Melanchthon’s snake. The lower half of the title page displays the canting arms of the publication’s dedicatee, Nicolaus Kind (see Figure 5.4). Most of Rhau’s collections of polyphony have an explicitly Electoral Saxon appearance, either through a woodcut coat of arms or even a portrait of the Elector Johann Friedrich himself. Although Rhau dedicated only one edition to the Elector, his persistent use of Electoral Saxon imagery marks his music publishing as a ‘national’ enterprise. Woelbing suggested that the depiction of the Elector’s arms and portrait had a function similar to a printing privilege. In evidence, Woelbing cites a letter by the theologian Georg Major to the King of Denmark:

At the forthcoming Autumn Fair, we want to buy paper for bibles, and to negotiate with Hans Luft so that he might start printing soon after Michaelmas etc. Furthermore, we ask Your Grace to excuse us to the Elector and to ask him that he may graciously confirm our old privilege for our books, so that we should not be afraid of any reprints. We would take special care to have a woodcut portrait of the Elector designed and cut in the best way possible, and to print it next to the privilege at the beginning of the bible, in the same manner as we did with the old Elector Johann Friedrich, with his Grace’s permission and to his pleasure. We are comforted by the hope that the Elector will graciously protect us as his subjects and maintain us in our old rights [...]. 15 July 1558.

Figure 5.1 Title page of discantus partbook from Rhau’s *Symphoniae iucundae atque adeo breves* (vdm 40).

Source: Munich, Bayerische Staatsbibliothek, Mus.pr. 12.
There is no evidence that Rhau possessed such a privilege from the Elector; likewise it remains unclear whether the political imagery could have served as a surrogate privilege. In the Saxon Electorate, which would have been the scope of an Electoral privilege, Georg Rhau dominated the production of polyphonic music books. Polyphonic music printing was a highly specialized business, in which few printers dared to invest during the first
half of the sixteenth century. Thus, it is at least questionable if Rhau needed legal protection by a privilege at all.38

Georg Rhau’s marketing strategy was clearly aimed at an orthodox Lutheran audience. Judging from the repertoire included in most of the anthologies, one might wonder why the editor did not follow the example of his colleagues in Nuremberg or Augsburg, who chose to publish music collections attractive to Catholics and Protestants alike. Evidence of antipathy towards the Lutheran message among some of those who owned or used copies of Rhau’s books can be seen in one copy of the Novum opus musicum of 1544 (vdm 1162), which perhaps belonged to the monastery of SS Ulrich and Afra in Augsburg, or in any case to a Catholic interested in the music but disturbed by the imagery; this reader has conscientiously blacked out the three medallions of Luther, Elector Johann Friedrich and Melanchthon (see Figure 5.5).

Concerning the repertoire, Rhau’s orthodoxy had its limits. The 1542 hymn collection Sacrorum hymnorum liber primus (vdm 1024) contains a detailed excuse for having included hymns intended for feasts not recognised by the Lutheran church:

In these past few days we have […] here in our printing workshop finished the Liber primus sacrorum Hymnorum, in which we collected 134 hymns, both de tempore and de sanctis, which are outstanding not only for their suavity and sweetness, but also for their brevity and ease of execution. As we were giving the finishing touches to this anthology, […] it occurred to us how malicious the judgments of many are, in the perverse age in which we live. Because our holy church of Wittenberg forbids the invocation of saints and other idolatrous forms of worship, whenever they discover hymns about certain Saints in this our collection that are not in conformity with the theological meaning of Scripture, perchance immediately clamour that I want to restore or approve the old impieties. For this reason, we affirm with this letter that we, like all pious people, despise all dogmas inconsistent with the writings of the prophets and apostles. Thus, if there are hymns concerning the Saints in this collection that are inconsistent with the harmony of the Holy Scripture, the reader should remember that they have been added because of the suavity of the music and to give boys practice in singing. Let us not dwell on the so-called idolatrous texts, but condemn them.39

Figure 5.4 Title page of tenor partbook from Rhau’s Officiorum de Nativitate (vdm 1035).
Source: Berlin, Staatsbibliothek, Mus.ant.pract. R460.
The liminal texts to Georg Rhau’s polyphonic music books paint a picture of turbulent times, when even the members of the inner circle disagreed about liturgical key questions, such as the role of responsories during Lutheran services.40

It is difficult to judge Rhau’s economic success in publishing polyphonic music. The extant historical catalogues of contemporary libraries indicate that he sold books to many churches and schools in his core market, the Protestant regions in the North-East of the Empire.41 The sixteenth-century Ratsschulbibliothek in Zwickau, for example, possessed most of the polyphonic music printed in Wittenberg before 1550.42 However, that observation might relate to the close personal relationship between Rhau and Jocodus Schalreuter, the Cantor at the Ratsschule in Zwickau.

Today the Ratsschulbibliothek in Zwickau and the British Library hold the largest collections of Rhau’s polyphonic music books. The London editions were acquired by the library from Berlin booksellers in the nineteenth century.43 Other surviving copies of Rhau’s publications are traceable to institutions in Leipzig, Bitterfeld, Görlitz, Meißen and elsewhere.44

Georg Rhau ceased producing polyphonic music books in 1545. It is possible that his programme of publishing liturgical polyphony for the Lutheran rite was complete after eight years of activity. Alternatively, his further plans may have been frustrated by the outbreak of the Schmalkaldic War in July 1546, and the attendant shifts in political priorities. His firm continued to print music books, though it now focussed on broadsheets and pamphlets, such as the monophonic Vermanlied of 1546 (vdm 1339), which deals with events of the war. There are indications that Georg Rhau even had to provide a mobile printing press for the campaigns of the Saxon Elector.45 It is also possible that the end of Rhau’s programme of printing polyphony was caused by the frail health to which he alluded in the dedicatory letter to Johannes Goskau in 1544.46
Publications containing polyphonic music for special occasions

In the tense political climate of the 1540s, the printing of political, polemical, and propagandistic pamphlets and broadsheets reached a peak. Many used music as a tool to transport their message. Although religion dominated ideological conflicts, publications containing occasional music – sometimes even polyphonic music – arose in other contexts as well. Between 1530 and 1550, several short publications in partbook format appeared, many containing only one piece, associated with a single person, a group of people, an institution, or an occasion (see Table 5.2). The partbooks were printed in the same format as the larger anthologies, and could thus easily be bound in a composite volume with other editions. Three such editions were produced in the Rhau printing workshop in Wittenberg; one of these has been unknown in musicological scholarship to this point.

Probably the most famous book in this small group is the Epitaphia Rhauorum (vdm 1154), a musical epitaph for various members of the Rhau family published in 1550 by Georg Rhau’s heirs after his death. The compositions were written by Johann Reusch, a young musician who studied at the University of Wittenberg in the early 1540s. Because of its importance for the biography of Georg Rhau, this book has already received some scholarly attention, and thus will not be further considered here.

Another well-known set of short partbooks from the Rhau workshop was printed in 1544. It contains one motet for seven voices, in five partes (Cantio septem vocum), written for the dedication of the chapel in Schloss Hartenfels, Torgau. The composer of this extraordinary piece was Johann Walter, who directed the Torgau chapel at that time. The composition was performed during the consecration of the chapel on 5 October 1544. Martin Luther himself delivered the sermon in the presence of Elector Johann Friedrich and Philipp Melanchthon. The published edition of the Cantio comprises a synopsis of the political symbolism of the polyphonic music books that Rhau had published to that point.

The music is printed in four partbooks, each with at most six leaves. The choice of seven voices is rare in the oeuvre of Walter, found in only two motets. The visual design of the title pages clearly expresses the political context. Three partbooks are decorated with the arms of the Saxon Elector (see Figure 5.6), framed by a floral wreath, while the main title page has a poem honouring the dedicatee. Woodcut portraits and symbols of the Elector, of Martin Luther and of Philipp Melanchthon, printed on several pages inside the partbooks, emphasise the political context. Rhau did not produce any new woodcuts for the Cantio septem vocum, but re-used portraits, coats of arms and symbols from other editions. The partbooks thus are not only the expression of the political symbolism of this one important event: they are embedded in a larger iconographical programme.

Table 5.2 Sets of short partbooks (containing a single or few mostly occasional compositions) printed in German-speaking lands until 1550

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>vdm</th>
<th>Title</th>
<th>Year</th>
<th>Printer</th>
<th>Place</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>62</td>
<td>Epicedion Thomae Sporeri musicorum principis</td>
<td>1534</td>
<td>Peter Schöffer the Younger &amp; Matthias Apiarius</td>
<td>Strasbourg</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1517</td>
<td>[Motet for seven voices]</td>
<td>1545</td>
<td>Georg Rhau</td>
<td>Wittenberg</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1161</td>
<td>Cantio septem vocum</td>
<td>1544</td>
<td>Georg Rhau</td>
<td>Wittenberg</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1038</td>
<td>Epitaphium D. Martini Lutheri</td>
<td>1546</td>
<td>Berg &amp; Neuber</td>
<td>Nuremberg</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1154</td>
<td>Epitaphia Rhauorum</td>
<td>1550</td>
<td>Georg Rhau’s heirs</td>
<td>Wittenberg</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1139</td>
<td>Proteleios euche qua chorus musicus bene precatur</td>
<td>c. 1550</td>
<td>Berg &amp; Neuber</td>
<td>Nuremberg</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Although the four tenor voices are strictly canonic, and could have been easily notated in a single partbook, Rhau and Walter decided to print the canon’s resolution, which meant notating each part separately. The decision for four instead of the necessary two partbooks is – beside representative needs – most likely determined by the necessity of binding such a short set into another larger composite volume.

The most striking characteristic of Walter’s motet is probably its polytextuality: three different texts are sung at the same time. The canonic voices and the discantus sing the words of Psalm 119. The altus and bassus, however, convey the composition’s political message. The former, illustrated with three woodcut portraits of the Elector, praises Johann Friedrich as defender of true religion and peace. The latter, decorated with portraits and symbols of Martin Luther and Philipp Melanchthon, honours the two Reformers as luminaries (see Table 5.3). The text is set under two corresponding ‘melodic’ lines. The bassus alternates between $c$ and $G$, while the altus voice has an ostinato $g'$.

![Figure 5.6 Title page of *tertia et quarta voces* partbook from Rhau’s *Cantio septem vocum* (vdm 1161).](image)

Source: Munich, Bayerische Staatsbibliothek, 4 Mus.pr. 106#Beibd.11.

### Table 5.3 Text of Johann Walter’s *Cantio septem vocum* (vdm 1161), Psalm 119 (118)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Discantus and canonic voices</th>
<th>Bassus</th>
<th>Altus</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>(1) Beati immaculati in via, qui ambulant in lege Domini.</td>
<td>Vive Luthere, Vive Melanthon,</td>
<td>Vivat Joannes Friderich,</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>(2) Beati qui scrutantur testimonia eius, in toto corde exquirunt eum.</td>
<td>Vivite nostrae Lumina terrae,</td>
<td>Vivat Elector et</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>(5) Utinam dirigantur viae meae, ad custodiendas iustificationes tuas.</td>
<td>Charaque Christo Pectora, per vos</td>
<td>Dux Saxonom,</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>(6) Tunc non confundar cum perspexero in omnibus mandatis tuis.</td>
<td>Incllya nobis Dogmata Christi</td>
<td>Vivat Defensor</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>(12) Benedictus es Domine, doce me iustificationes tuas.</td>
<td>Reddita, vestro Munere, pulsis</td>
<td>veri dogmatis,</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>(35) Deduc me in semita mandatorum tuorum, quia ipsam volui.</td>
<td>Nubibus atris, Prodiit ortu</td>
<td>Vivat Pacisque</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>(36) Inclina cor meum in testimonia tua, Et non in avaritiam.</td>
<td>Candidiore Dogma salutis,</td>
<td>custos pervigil,</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>(37) Averte oculos meos, ne videant vanitatem, in via tua vivifica me.</td>
<td>Vivite longos Nestoris annos.</td>
<td>Vivat per omne</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
This results in a quite static musical texture which is rhythmically and harmonically limited (Example 5.1).

**Example 5.1**

Because of its association with the biography of Martin Luther and Philipp Melanchthon, the motet has received some attention. August Wilhelm Ambros saw it as a peculiar occasional composition, more a ‘monument’ than a work of art. Walter Blankenburg tried to revise this idea and traced the compositional models back to Josquin des Prez and others. Among the concordant sources, the most important is the so-called Gotha Choirbook, a manuscript written for the Torgau chapel soon after its consecration, under the supervision of Johann Walter. The extensive choirbook transmits a rich repertoire of compositions by Walter as well as representative liturgical repertoire from mid-century.

This choirbook also contains a sister-composition of the consecration motet, a setting of Psalm 121 for seven voices. Because of its close similarity to Walter’s setting of Psalm 119, Otto Kade describes the composition, which he believed to be a unicum, as a sequel, and judged both motets as ‘monstrous works of art’. This unfavourable interpretation has been reiterated by Walter Blankenburg, who interprets the Psalm 119 setting as Johann Walter’s ‘artistic Credo’ (‘künstlerisches Glaubensbekenntnis’). Jürgen Heidrich describes it as musically and artistically unsatisfying and schematic.

The motet is a monumental work indeed. Its nine parts surpass even the motet for the Torgau festivities. However, the general architecture is nearly identical. Here too there are three different texts. The discantus and the four canonical tenor parts sing verses from the Vulgate translation of the Psalm, while bassus and altus sing sacred texts that comment on the Psalm (see Example 5.1). Again, the altus part repeats an ostinato for the whole piece, while the bassus alternates between G and c. The motet’s text was probably written by Johann Walter, whose name appears as an acrostic in the first letter of each verse. In contrast to the consecration motet, this setting has no clear connection to any specific person, institution or occasion. For a composition of these dimensions this is surprising. Especially because of its artificiality and its polytextuality, it does not fit with our expectations for devotional or liturgical music of the mid-sixteenth century.

In his comprehensive study of the life and work of Johann Walter, Blankenburg wondered why Walter did not print the composition, as he did with the Cantio. It appears that Blankenburg had fine instincts. While working for the vdm project in the Austrian National Library in Vienna, I discovered a printed music book hitherto unknown to musicological scholarship, containing the polytextual setting of Psalm 121 by Walter known from the Gotha Choirbook. It is bound in an incomplete set of partbooks, directly before the printed version of Walter’s consecration motet. The surviving title pages give the voice names and the words ‘The Word of the Lord endureth for ever, 1545’ (‘Verbum domini manet in aeternum 1545’, 1 Peter 1:25), a famous device of the Reformation movement, framed with a floral wreath. The partbook of the first and second voice, which most likely contained more detailed information about the context of the edition, is lost. There is however a colophon in all three surviving partbooks, which indicates that it was printed by Georg Rhau’s workshop at Wittenberg.

There are many visual similarities with the Cantio septem vocum and other Wittenberg polyphonic music books of this time. Rhau used a familiar imagery, starting with the fonts and the woodcut ornamentation. The musical notation is printed with Rhau’s single-impression type, while the underlay is given in Roman type, as is normal in Rhau’s editions. As seen in the setting of Psalm 119 for Torgau, the voices bearing either the panegyric poem or the Psalm text are printed in their respective partbooks alongside one of the canonic tenor parts.
The most interesting aspect of the motet’s printed version are major changes to the text, which shed some light on the background of our composition. The most important difference can be found in the text of the bassus part. Unlike the version in the Gotha Choirbook, which presents the composer’s name as an acrostic, the printed partbook presents a political text in honour of the ‘holy city whose name is derived from Anne’ (‘sancta retinens Urbs nomen ab Anna’), probably the Saxon city of Annaberg (see Table 5.4 in the Appendix). The first verse of the strophe is of special interest, because it is repeated in precisely the same form in the first seven parts of the composition, thus emphasising the political symbolism of the piece. In the printed version, the text expresses a prayer for peace and economic prosperity, especially for the mining industry; this desire is indicated most strongly in the sixth strophe of the text in the bassus. The theme of this prayer resonates with the opening of the Psalm, and its mountain imagery: ‘I will lift up mine eyes unto the hills’ (‘Levavi oculos meos in montes’). A handful of places in the German-speaking lands are named after Anne, the legendary mother of Mary and patron saint of miners. However, it seems likely that Walter’s motet refers to Annaberg in Saxony. In the first half of the sixteenth century, Annaberg was one of the largest cities in the region. Founded in 1496, it grew rapidly because of the flourishing silver mining industry. In 1540, the town had an estimated population of 12,000. (In comparison, the largest German cities, Nuremberg and Augsburg, at that time had between 20,000 and 40,000 inhabitants.) In the first decade of the town’s existence, the citizens built churches, monasteries and schools under the protection of the Saxon dukes. To musicologists, Annaberg is best known for two handwritten choirbooks kept there from the early sixteenth until the twentieth century. The choirbooks, a collection of liturgical music from the pre-Reformation period, are the only evidence of the rich musical life of this city.

Since the main title page of the set of partbooks is missing, it is difficult to contextualise this edition. However, one might assume that the edition was prompted by a special occasion, as was the case for the ‘sister-edition’. In none of the several chronicles from Annaberg which cover the 1540s could I find any indication of an event for which this version of Walter’s motet plausibly might have been composed or arranged. The motet’s text also lacks concrete contextual evidence. However, it is likely that it was composed after 1539, the year when Annaberg officially became Protestant, following the death of Georg of Saxony in the same year. The fourth strophe, which emphasising the now shining ‘light of the Gospel’ (‘lux Evangelii’), suggests a Protestant reading. Whatever the occasion for the composition of this motet, its mere existence might be seen as an expression of the economic power and ambition of the flourishing mining town. It cannot now be determined which of the two variant texts is earlier. The handwritten choirbook from Torgau was finished in 1545, the same year the partbooks were published. Both chronologies are plausible: Walter may have adapted the political text for liturgical use in the Torgau chapel, replacing the text in praise of the city of Annaberg with a more generally appropriate one. Alternatively, he might have reworked textual elements of a sacred composition to fit the needs of an occasional publication.

The discovery of a monumental musical ovation to a city such as Annaberg supports the picture of a de-centralized cultural life in many German-speaking regions. Annaberg, as well as other cities in the Erzgebirge, was a growing urban centre with a rich musical life, as attested by the choirbooks. Johann Walter’s motet thus expresses the wealth, prosperity and cultural ambition of the whole region. On the other hand, the newly discovered polyphonic edition is perfectly consistent with the economic and political agenda of Georg Rhau, who addressed many city councils in a bid to promote his products.
Lost polyphonic music books by Rhau

The discovery of an unknown short polyphonic music book by Rhau raises another question, connected to the materiality of this kind of objects. The data collected in the vdm, VD16, and RISM databases, indicate that most occasional polyphonic music books from the time before 1550 survive in very few copies. Even the musical epitaph for Martin Luther only survives in four known exemplars (vdm 1038). The reasons for this are obvious. Firstly, the number of copies produced was probably quite low compared to non-occasional titles, which could be sold years after production. Furthermore, because of the occasional nature of such broadsheets and small partbooks, their novelty might have worn off quickly. Sometimes the political message of a music book might have even led to their intentional destruction. Grantley McDonald distinguishes ‘ephemeral’ editions, intended to be consulted once or only a few times, from ‘archival’ publications, which were meant to be read several times. Occasional or ephemeral sets of partbooks celebrating a specific occasion probably have to be located somewhere in between. They embody both the ephemerality of a special occasion, and an element of archivability, since they possess the physical characteristics requisite for their inclusion as part of a composite volume. It is unclear how many such occasional music books produced in the early sixteenth century have disappeared without a trace. However, it is possible that occasional polyphonic music printing was a much larger phenomenon than is suggested by the modest surviving corpus.

An early inventory of the Ratsschulbibliothek in Zwickau contains some evidence for further lost polyphonic music from Rhau’s printing workshop. The chapter listing the printed music includes a ‘song for five voices by Adrianus Petit Coclico, a student of Josquin, which he composed to adorn his wedding at Wittenberg, 15 November 1545’ (‘Cantus quinque Vocum Adriani petit coclico. D. Josquini discipuli, quem composuit in decorum nuptiarum suarum Vitebergae anno M.D. XLV. die 15 Novemb.’). Since Rhau was the only person who printed polyphonic music books at this time in Wittenberg, he would have been the logical choice as printer for this wedding motet. The Zwickau catalogue lists another possible title that today might be lost: ‘Song for five voices, in praise of Emperor Charles V, half a sheet’ (‘Carmen quinque Vocum compositum in gratiam Caroli V. Imperatoris. Ist ein halber bogen’). This entry may refer to a broadsheet version of a canonic composition that Rhau included in the second volume of his Bicinia. There is even evidence for yet more lost short polyphonic music books from the Rhau workshop. In an undated letter to Georg of Brandenburg, Johann Walter mentions that he has sent the margrave a ‘printed spiritual song along with some other songs’ (‘gedruckt geistlich Lied neben anderem gesange’), probably a lost pamphlet, a broadsheet or even a set of short partbooks. Unfortunately it is impossible to say how many polyphonic music books from the Rhau printing workshop are now lost.

* Our overview of Georg Rhau’s polyphonic music printing must necessarily remain incomplete. In particular, the role of short polyphonic music books celebrating special occasions remains open, because of the apparently high rate of loss. Rhau was a key figure of German music printing not only because of his productivity, but also because of his political agenda. His polyphonic music books created and displayed an image of Electoral Saxon as a Lutheran stronghold. Rhau identified his work visually with Elector Johann Friedrich, Martin Luther and Philipp Melanchthon, as well as many different local
institutions and personalities. The recently rediscovered edition, presumably dedicated to the city of Annaberg, shows that this policy extended over the borders of Ernestine Saxony to other Protestant regions. Polyphonic music books thus not only served as a medium to foster the Reformation in liturgy and domestic music, but also as a means to display a political agenda.

Appendix

Table 5.4 Bassus text of Johann Walter’s setting of Psalm 121 (manuscript and printed edition in comparison)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>D-Gol Chart. A 98</th>
<th>[Motet for seven voices]. Wittenberg: Rhau, 1545</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Ingruerent postquam violenti turbine venti,</td>
<td>Inclyta praecelar celebreta Urbs nomine Salve,</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Omne fretum cepit tumidis servere procellis</td>
<td>Eximium Diva retines quae nomen ab ANNA.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Auxilio casos oculos ad culmina montis</td>
<td>Salve iterum, laudes propria Virtute tuorum</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Non sine lugenti lacrimum voce levabam,</td>
<td>Quae cumulas, fama Proavos maiore decorans.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Non animi stabam dubius, quin me tua Dextra</td>
<td>Propterea nullo peritum tempore Nomen</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Eriperet salvumque dare, presumque levaret.</td>
<td>TE manet, &amp; multis Decus indelebile seclis.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

| Vera mihi vis auxilii, protectione firma | Inclyta praecelar celebreta Urbs nomine Salve. |
| Vera salus, in qua liceat confidere tuto | Aucta bonis, quae mundus habet, quae desinei summus |
| A Domino descendit ut a praedivite cornu. | Dat Pater a celso sacra mittens munera medio |
| Larga manus, cuius fabrefecit mobile coelum | Iusticiae, Pacis & Pulcherrimus Urbis |
| Tum stabilem, fulcit a suo que pondere terram | Munera, te dudum patriae iustissima tangit |
| Hoc, mala, defensore tibi, non ulla nocebunt. | Cura tuae, cives placida sub Pace gubernas. |

| Ecce tuos gressus relegens considerat oves. | Inclyta praecelar celebreta urbs nomine Salve, |
| Retro tuos servatque pedes ne forte ferrantur | Nam tua te Virtus celebrem, Prudentia magnum |
| Obvia ne vel sint lubrici pressus | Te facit, & sanctae Pietatis, Religionis, |
| Excubias sed semper agit custodia servans | Iusticiae, Pacis & Pulcherrimus Urbis |
| Languida nec claudit superanti lumina somno | Ordo tuae, nunquam trepido Republica motu |
| E specula servat mala ne te damna sequatur. | Quassa labat, vivunt placida sub Pace coloni. |

| Concipe spes animo dubiis diffidere noli. | Inclyta praecelar celebreta urbs nomine Salve, |
| Tutus enim cunctos poteris contemnere ventos. | Cui sacra lux Evangelii nunc fulget, & almo |
| Ota nam nunquam petet hic secuera quietis | Sydere, propulsis redierunt sancta tenebris |
| Rara nec ascendunt cerebro spiracula vaporum. | Dogmata, credentes animas donantia coelo. |
| Illud ut irrorent, tribuat quo tempora somno. | Scilicet a summo veniunt haec tanta parente |
| Scilicet Israel populum, qui pace gubernat. | Munera, quae grata veneraris mente, fovetque. |

| Sub dyleo dextre velutie testudines quadam | Inclyta praecelar celebreta urbs nomine Salve, |
| Atque sub alarum gracilis te sustinet umbra | Prompta iuventutie tenevae succurrere, doctas |
| Xysticus opponens veluti se viribus hosti | Dum tegis, ac ornas studio non deside Musas, |
| Omnipotens sic dextre Dei non sequior illo est. | Paegaseos curras latices, formosus Apollo |
| Ne qua tibi vis vel Boreae vel turbidus Auster, | Sanctaque doctarum celebrans te turba sonorum. |
| Impetus aut Euris noceat vel frigora Cauri. | Tollet, & aeterna faciet te laude decorant. |

| Aestus et excitus, gravibus squaribus urgens | Inclyta praecelar celebreta urbs nomine Salve, |
| Solibus aestivis, ubi findit Sirius arva | Prompta iuventutie teneva sucurre, doctas |
| Indomitus non te feriat fervoribus ardens, | Dum tegis, ac ornas studio non deside Musas, |
| Menstrua nec fratri radii obsxia luna. | Paegaseos curras latices, formosus Apollo |
| Pallida cum surgit, gelida sub nocte molestet | Sanctaque doctarum celebrans te turba sonorum. |
| Humida cum terrae sitienti frigora spargit. | Tollet, & aeterna faciet te laude decorant. |

| Pallida cum surgit, gelida sub nocte molestet | Inclyta praecelar celebreta urbs nomine Salve, |
| Humida cum terrae sitienti frigora spargit. | Te Deus aeterni cumulavit munere Verbi, |
| Addit opes, monstrans gravida tellure metalium, | Promit & argentii muneroso pondere massas, |
| Terra tibi pandit precioso viscoa partu, | Scilicet ut Musas foveas verique ministros. |
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Three *Libri missarum* of early Lutheran Germany: some reflections on their repertory

Carlo Bosi

By the time Johann Petreius, Hieronymus Formschneider and Georg Rhau issued their important mass collections (1539, 1539 and 1541, respectively), all three men were already well-established and successful printers.¹ Both Petreius and Rhau were accomplished musicians; Rhau was even a composer; both could therefore act as editors and publishers of their anthologies. By contrast, Formschneider, whose family name was Andreae, was ‘only’ a very gifted type- and wood-cutter, as his sobriquets Formschneider (‘type-cutter’) and Grapheus (‘graphic artist’ or ‘scribe’) suggest. Formschneider acted exclusively as printer and had thus little or no control on the contents of ‘his’ publications; indeed, it is even doubtful whether he possessed any musical knowledge.² However, his achievements and reputation as a proficient artisan attracted music publishers, such as Hans Ott, who commissioned him to print several editions in 1538, but also the *Missae tredecim quatuor vocum*, published in 1539, all funded and edited by Ott. At the start of the lengthy dedicatory letter prefaced to the tenor partbook, Ott states that with this mass collection he wanted to make available ‘monuments’ by celebrated composers not only so that they might be in the hands of many, but also in order to preserve them for posterity.³

A synoptic comparison of the three collections (see Table 6.1) shows that while all three of them draw for the most part from a well-established international repertory, the only overlap concerns the two early Josquin masses *L’homme armé super voces musicales* and *Fortuna desperata*, found in both Petreius and Formschneider/Ott. This has led Michael Meyer to hypothesise that the two publishers perhaps intentionally aimed at issuing two complementary Josquin repertories.⁴ However, as Stephanie Schlagel has shown, whereas Petreius’ copy is based on one of Petrucci’s editions *Misse Josquin liber primus*, containing both of them, Ott had to rely on incomplete and partly faulty copies.⁵ On the other hand, Josquin is completely absent from Rhau’s book. However, Rhau does transmit two masses based on chansons by Josquin: the *Missa Adieu mes amours* by Adam Rener and the *Missa Baisez moy* by Petrus Roselli, and one based on a chanson-mass attributed in some sources to Josquin (Isaac’s *Missa Une Musique* [sic] *de Biscaye*).⁶ For the rest, Josquin is most heavily represented in Petreius’ book, with six masses out of fifteen. Of the thirteen masses in Formschneider, Ott (or his sources) ascribes five to Josquin. But of these ascriptions, two are certainly incorrect: the mass *Sub tuum praesidium* is by Pierre de la Rue, while the *Missa Da pacem* is attributed to Josquin only in peripheral sources, such as Toledo 19, whereas more reliable manuscripts, such as Munich 7, ascribe it to Noël Bauldeweyn, an ascription now commonly accepted.⁷ Interestingly, in the contratenor partbook of Formschneider/Ott, the *Missa Sub tuum praesidium* is ascribed to ‘Petrus de la Rue’,⁸ whereas the ascription of *Missa Da pacem* to Josquin is only found in the index in the tenor and at the beginning of the ‘Kyrie’ in the discantus partbooks.
It is intriguing to note, in addition, that three masses in Petreius’ book apparently allude to Josquin: in two cases to songs (the Missae Adiu [sic] mes amours by Francesco de Layolle, and À l’ombre d’ung buissonet by Antoine Brumel), in one case to a mass (the Missa Hercules dux Ferrariae by Lupus Hellinck). However, one of these masses actually based on a composition by Josquin is Brumel’s mass À l’ombre d’ung buissonet in Petreius. Layolle’s Missa Adiu [sic] mes amours is not based on Josquin’s famous song, but ‘is a parody of Mouton’s chanson which uses the same melody as Josquin’s better-known setting’. In Hellinck’s Missa Hercules dux Ferrariae, the hexachord syllables used by the composer as cantus firmus do not match its title. Rather, Bonnie Blackburn has suggested that the title was added by Moderne, who first published the work in 1532. Moderne, however, did not just invent this ascription because a mass anthology containing works attributed to Josquin promised to sell well; the overall structure of the mass, including the way the cantus firmus is presented, closely resembles Josquin’s more famous work. If, on the other hand, Petreius’ choice of this mass was motivated not only by the marketability of Josquin, but also by the intention to provide an exemplary instance of a soggetto cavato dalle parole, then he fell short of his target, since, as we noted already, the suggested hexachord syllables do not match.
the syllables of the title. He evidently copied the title from Moderne’s Liber decem missarum, his likely source for this mass and for Layolle’s Missa Adieu mes amours. However, the apparent suggestion that these works were written by Josquin is a mirage. The masses by Layolle and Isaac (printed by Rhau) are based not on Josquin’s songs, but on the melodies he used for his arrangements. In Roselli’s Missa Baisez-moy, on the other hand, material from Josquin’s eponymous canonic chanson, as it appears in Petrucci’s Canti B, is indeed cited, but only in the Sanctus (see Figure 6.1); in Kyrie II, Roselli’s quotes Quant je vous voye, another song by Josquin. Despite the fact that these masses only have a tenuous link to Josquin, the suggestion that they were genuine works by the master was probably important for their relatively wide diffusion.

**Rhau’s sources**

The presence of a mass by Rener in Rhau’s Opus decem missarum is easy to explain, given that the composer, born in Liège and trained at Maximilian’s court, served in the Electoral Saxon court chapel and was involved in preparing the manuscripts (now in Jena) compiled for the Saxon chapel. His masses Adieu mes amours and Octavi Toni, however, are otherwise only preserved in the incomplete partbooks Leipzig 51; although these are later than Rhau’s print, Noblitt has suggested that the Leipzig manuscripts may have been copied from a now lost Formschneider/Ott anthology. Rhau’s 1541 edition is also the earliest source for the other mass by Rener, Missa Dominicalis; the only other source is the manuscript partbooks Rostock XVI-49, copied at Hamburg around 1566. In the case of Isaac’s mass Une Musque de Biscaye, Rhau may have had access to Berlin 40021, a large manuscript possibly compiled in Torgau, which is also the main source for this composition. Indeed, his transmission only shows few and insignificant variants compared with the earlier
Rhau’s reliance on local sources for the other mass attributed to Isaac, Missa Carminum, is evident, since the reading of this work in the Opus decem missarum is nearly identical to its concordance in Jena 36.19

On the other hand, the Missa Baisé-moy by Petrus Roselli or ‘Rouseli’, first published in Antico 1516, was subsequently copied in several sources redacted by Johann Walter and his collaborators in Torgau just before or around the time that Rhau published his mass collection.20 It is revealing that Rhau’s dedicatory epistle is directed to the city council of Torgau as patron of the local Latin school, given that the Opus decem missarum was conceived for the musical training of schoolboys.21 Rhau’s transmission of Roselli’s mass is nearly identical to Antico’s (see Figure 6.2). Even his text underlay seems to follow Antico quite closely, as shown, for example, by syllable division in melismatic passages of long textured movements, such as the Gloria or Credo (see Figure 6.3).22 On the other hand, Rhau’s readings are quite different from those of the later transmission (c. 1540–1545) in the Torgau choirbooks Berlin 40013, Weimar B and Gotha A.98.23 Gotha A.98, for instance, has minor rhythmical variants, and an entirely different passage at the end of Kyrie II in the discantus (see Figure 6.4). In the printed editions, the Cum sancto spirito is a subsection in triple time following directly after the Qui tollis, whereas in the Torgau manuscripts it is an autonomous section, musically distinct from that given by Antico and Rhau. Moreover, while the Benedictus is a duet (tenor and bassus) in Antico and Rhau, in all Torgau choirbooks it has completely different music for four voices. Additionally, in none of the Walter choirbooks does Roselli’s mass carry the title Baisé-moy; instead, it is called simply Missa Petri Roselli.24 It thus seems likely either that Walter and his copyists had at least partly different exemplars than Rhau, or that they tinkered with the mass as found in Antico in

Figure 6.2 Kyrie, discantus, from Petrus Roselli, Missa Baisé moy in Antico 1516, fol. 140v (left) and Rhau 1541, fol. 195v (detail, right).
Sources: London, British Library K.9.a.12 (Antico 1516); Kassel, Landesbibliothek und Murhardsche Bibliothek der Stadt, 4° Mus. 63/1 (Rhau 1541).
order to produce what they thought would be more satisfying solutions, such as a fuller
sonority in the four-voice Benedictus. Similar ‘filling-in’ of reduced scoring does not occur
in the few other masses by older masters transmitted by the Walter choirbooks, such as the
Missa super Nisi dominus by Senfl in Gotha A.98. These Torgau versions of the Roselli mass
also deviate from the other known manuscript transmission in San Petronio (San Petronio
A.31 and A.46.). The copy in the incomplete partbooks Leipzig 51, probably compiled in
Leipzig about fifteen years later than Rhau 1541, is largely dependent on it. But Rhau did
not just passively copy Roselli’s mass from Antico: in at least one case he slightly changed
the rhythm without altering the substance: at the words ‘Et expecto’ in the Et in spiritum
sanctum section of the Credo (see Figure 6.5), towards the end of a triple-time passage, he
resolves two blackened ligatures in the bassus, changing blackened sb–sb b–b into black-
ened sb–b b–sb, thereby assimilating this voice to the analogous passage in the discantus
and tenor. One might suppose that Rhau did not have the necessary types, but in fact the

Figure 6.3 Gloria, discantus, from Petrus Roselli, Missa Baisez moy in Antico 1516, fol. 141v (left) and
Rhua 1541, fol. 195v (right).
Sources: London, British Library K.9.a.12 (Antico 1516); Kassel, Landesbibliothek und Murhardsche Bibliothek
der Stadt, 4° Mus. 63/1 (Rhua 1541).

Figure 6.4 Kyrie, discantus, from Petrus Roselli, Missa Baisez moy in Rhau 1541, fol. 195v (left) and
Gotha A.98, fol. 288v, with framed out variant at the end of Kyrie II.
Sources: Kassel, Landesbibliothek und Murhardsche Bibliothek der Stadt, 4° Mus. 63/1 (Rhua 1541); Gotha,
Forschungsbibliothek Gotha, Schloss Friedenstein, Chart. A.98 (Gotha A.98).
ligatures in question occur several times in his print. We may therefore conclude that this change was an editorial intervention. This conclusion is indirectly corroborated by the fact that the Walter choirbooks have the same reading here as Antico.

Rhau’s 1541 book has a further concordance with Antico 1516: the Credo from the Missa De beata virgine by Antoine Brumel.26 Rhau substituted the Credo of Brumel’s mass for Rener’s Missa Dominicalis. The only other known source for this mass, the much later Ros- tock XVI-49, includes Rener’s own Credo, though in an incomplete form, stopping at ‘Et homo factus est’. If Rener’s mass was only transmitted with this incomplete Credo, it is not surprising if Rhau wished to supplement it with a full movement. As we have seen, he probably had a copy of Antico 1516, which opens with Brumel’s mass, even if Brumel’s Credo is quite long and undermines Rhau’s wish to provide short masses, as he states in his preface (see below). However, Brumel’s Credo as well as Rener’s Gloria and (incom- plete) Credo are all based on chant ordinary melodies in the fourth mode, so that Rhau’s choice was probably motivated by modal considerations.27 Rhau’s transmission of Brumel’s Credo, including text underlay, is also essentially identical with Antico’s. However, at mm. 173–174, Rhau splits a breve in the discantus to accommodate all the syllables of ‘Qui cum patre & filio’ (see Figure 6.6). This is also reflected in the transmission in Capp. Sist. 16; though very close to Antico and Rhau, in a couple of cases its cadences are more ornamented (see Figure 6.7). In another case, at the end of the Patrem section in the tenor, Rhau repeats the words ‘factus est’ for the last two notes, a semibreve and a final longa, untexted in the other sources; in order to accommodate the three syllables, he splits the semibreve into two minims. This is one of numerous cases where Rhau repeats portions of text, a repetition which the other transmissions may imply, as is often the case, without specifying it. This may represent further evidence of the didactic ambition of Rhau’s edition.28 Further evidence of Rhau’s pedagogic aim is provided by the fact that in the bassus, he explicitly notates all Bs in the melodic gesture A-B-A as fa, that is, with a b sign.29 This is not simply a slavish application of the rule of fa supra la, since analogous gestures in the discantus are left uninflected. Rather, in the bassus this gesture is always part of a recurrent motive directly taken from Credo I, on which Brumel’s mass movement is based, a motif often reached via imitation at a fifth from the upper voices.

By contrast, the reading of Senfl’s Missa Nisi dominus is very close to that transmitted by Walter’s workshop in Nuremberg 83795, Gotha A.98 and Berlin 40013.30 It is possible that Rhau and Walter had the same or very similar exemplars at their disposal.31 The only minor divergences are lesser rhythmic variants with no major consequence on the
music itself. Occasionally, however, Rhau shows a humanistic concern for consistent text declamation, especially by the repetition of text fragments. Contrary to all Walter sources, for instance, he begins the last Kyrie declamation of Kyrie II (b. 13) with a crotchet rest (see Figure 6.8), echoing the two preceding declamations, which also begin with a rest and which, moreover, represent transpositions of the same motivic material. The Missa De Feria by Matthaeus Pipelare was also available in a source close to Rhau: Jena 21, one of the Alamire choirbooks owned by Duke Frederick the Wise, compiled around 1521–1525. Rhau’s reading is essentially identical to that in Jena 21. Rhau probably selected this mass for his publication mainly because of its concision, since, as he states in the dedicatory letter, he chose the ten masses of his collection not only on account of their elegance and sweetness, but also due to their brevity. It is not difficult to imagine that Rhau copied this mass directly from Jena 21, given that the Alamire manuscripts that had belonged to Frederick the Wise were housed until 1547 at the All Saints Church in Wittenberg, and were thus easily available to him. In any case, no other sources of this mass are known. Finally,
the masses by the mysterious ‘Sampson’ and by Johann Stahel, both unica, might have been available to the publisher through his own networks: Stahel was a local glory, most of whose surviving works appear in editions by Rhau; ‘Sampson’ was probably active in central Germany, since the song upon which his mass is based opens the edition Berg and Neuber 1549.

Three German editions in a wider European context

It is likely that the three masses that seem to refer to Josquin were available at some point in Wittenberg. Isaac’s international fame, as well as the strong Central European and German transmission of many of his works, together with Rener’s local significance, are probably sufficient to explain Rhau’s choice.35 As for Roselli’s mass, it is likely, as we have seen, that Rhau had access to Antico’s 1516 edition, and used this rather than one of the Torgau manuscripts, or their sources, compiled under the aegis of Johann Walter in or around 1540. But, of course, Rhau could just as well have chosen another mass, such as the Missa Baisés-moy by Mathurin Forestier, more closely modelled on Josquin’s song, and also transmitted in a local source, Jena 4, held at Wittenberg until around 1547, like the other Alamire choirbooks now in Jena.36 The only plausible explanation for Rhau’s choice is that Roselli’s mass, like most of the others in Rhau’s book, is compact and largely syllabic, especially in the Gloria and Credo, elements that made it suitable for young students. Despite these qualities, it is perhaps surprising that Roselli’s work attracted such attention in the Torgau-Wittenberg orbit.

The Missa Baisés moy is the only known work of this composer who is now rather obscure. Almost nothing is known of his life. He may perhaps be identified with the singer Pietro Rossello, active in the chapel of Ercole I d’Este in Ferrara between 1499 and 1502; to judge from the alternative spelling of his surname (Roussel), he was probably French.37 He might have been related to Rémy Roussel (Remigius Ruffus), canon at the cathedral of Tours, to whom Attaingnant dedicated a collection of works by Pierre de Manchicourt in 1539.38 Perhaps he was related to another Rémy Roussel, to whom several humanistic and religious works published at Paris between 1515 and 1517 were dedicated. From some of these, it emerges that this Rémy Roussel – for chronological reasons probably different from the canon in Tours – was a professor from Aquitaine.39 If the two men are
related, it could be that Petrus Roselli was of southern French origin. The broad diffusion of this single mass, and the fact that nearly all sources attribute the work to Roselli, could indicate that he was a composer of some renown in his lifetime. It seems unlikely that the apparent popularity of this mass was due simply to its allusion to the famous Josquin song.\textsuperscript{40} For example, the eponymous mass by Mathurin Forestier did not enjoy such a comparable diffusion, although it is much more intimately connected with Josquin’s song, its material pervading moreover each mass movement, and not just one, as in Roselli’s mass.

Antico also figures prominently among Petreius’ sources. This is the case at least for Josquin’s \textit{Missa de beata virgine} and for Brumel’s \textit{Missa À l’ombre d’ung buissonet}.\textsuperscript{41} Moulu’s mass \textit{Duarum facierum} is also transmitted by an Italian source, in this case Giunta 1522.\textsuperscript{42} However, this is not the source Petreius used, as Anna Pranger convincingly demonstrated by comparing the readings of a few passages from Moulu’s mass in the various sources. For example, in the Sanctus, Giunta gives four additional measures in the tenor, causing a misalignment with the other voices; this and other errors in Giunta’s readings do not occur in Petreius.\textsuperscript{43} Petreius’ title \textit{Duarum facierum} also suggests that Giunta’s edition was not his exemplar. Rather than this title, Giunta gives a canonic inscription in macaronic French, \textit{Si vous voulem [sic] avoir Misse de cours, Cantés sens pauses en sospir sende cours}, which suggests the possibility of performing a faster mass (‘\textit{misse de cours}’) if sung without rests (‘\textit{sens pauses}’).\textsuperscript{44} Petreius also gives a canonic inscription suggesting a performance without rests, given in an elegant Latin hexameter \textit{Tolle moras, placido maneant suspiria cantu}, an allusion to Lucan.\textsuperscript{45} The table of contents gives the title \textit{Missa duarum facierum & plus. Canitur enim vel cum pausis vel sine pausis} (‘Mass of two or more appearances; for it is sung either with or without rests’) (see Table 6.1). But where did Petreius get the title \textit{Duarum facierum} from? Only three earlier sources survive. The first is Bologna Q.25, compiled in Italy between 1525 and 1550, according to Joshua Rifkin, of which only the altus and tenor partbooks are extant.\textsuperscript{46} Second is the choirbook Cambrai 3, redacted at Cambrai cathedral between 1526 and 1530. Third is the choirbook ‘s-Hertogenbosch 72B, copied in Brussels or Mechelen around 1530 by the Alamire workshop for the Confraternity of Our Lady in ‘s-Hertogenbosch. Of these, only Cambrai 3 and ‘s-Hertogenbosch 72B carry a title above the mass: \textit{À deux visaiges ou plus} in Cambrai 3, and \textit{La nouvelle messe de Moulu à deux visaige[s] ou plus} in ‘s-Hertogenbosch 72B.\textsuperscript{47} Both additionally have the canonic inscription to be found in Giunta, but this time in more correct French (\textit{Se vous voullés aoeer messe de cort chantés sans pauses en suspirant de court}), which in ‘s-Hertogenbosch 72B is written vertically on the left side of the folio, whereas \textit{Alma redemptoris}, the title of the antiphon on which the mass is actually based, is underlaid to the superius and tenor.\textsuperscript{48} If it is clear that Giunta 1522 has a corrupted version of the French canon to be found in the two manuscripts, it is even clearer that the Latin title \textit{Duarum facierum} in Petreius is a translation of the French \textit{À deux visaiges}. Since Petreius has both a Latinised paraphrase of the canon and a Latin version of the motto-like title, it is also clear that he must have had access to a source that, like ‘s-Hertogenbosch 72B, contained both. This hypothetical source may have originated within the cultural orbit of the French royal court, with which Moulu was associated. I was not able to check Cambrai 3, but the reading in ‘s-Hertogenbosch 72B is quite close to Petreius, so both must have a common ancestor better than that available to Giunta. In Petreius’ book, Moulu’s mass follows another conceived on the principle of multiple performance possibilities: Okeghem’s \textit{Missa Cui-usvis toni} (see Table 6.1). This cannot have happened by chance, even if masses based on constructivist devices abound in this edition.
Conclusion

The three *libri missarum* here examined establish a kind of repertory or canon of exemplary works of great masters, mostly of past generations. This is especially so for Petreius and Formschneider/Ott, in whose anthologies Josquin occupies a place of honour. Rhau, on the other hand, with a didactic aim in mind, collects masses of medium length which are less challenging to perform. However even he cannot resist a hint at the French master, perhaps with a wink at his friend Martin Luther, who praised Josquin’s music as ‘flow[ing] out in a joyful, pleasing and mild way, and is not forced or hidebound by the rules, just like the song of the finch’. 49

Source abbreviations

*Manuscripts*

Bayeux: Paris, Bibliothèque nationale de France, f. fr. 9346
  Berlin 40021: Staatsbibliothek zu Berlin – Preußischer Kulturbesitz, MS Mus. 40021
  Bologna Q. 25: Museo Internazionale e Biblioteca della Musica di Bologna, MS Q.25
  Cambrai 3: Cambrai, Médiathèque municipale MS 3
  Cambrai 4: Cambrai, Médiathèque municipale MS 4
  Capp. Sist. 16: Città del Vaticano, Biblioteca Apostolica Vaticana, MS Cappella Sistina 16
  Capp. Sist. 39: Città del Vaticano, Biblioteca Apostolica Vaticana, MS Cappella Sistina 39
  ’s-Hertogenbosch 72B: ’s-Hertogenbosch, Archief van de Illustre Lieve Vrouwe Broederschap MS 72B
  ’s-Hertogenbosch 72C: ’s-Hertogenbosch, Archief van de Illustre Lieve Vrouwe Broederschap MS 72C
    Jena 4: Jena, Universitätsbibliothek MS 4
    Jena 21: Jena, Universitätsbibliothek MS 21
    Jena 36: Jena, Universitätsbibliothek MS 36
    Leipzig 51: Leipzig, Universitätsbibliothek, MS Thomaskirche 51 (1–2) (*olim* III A.a. 22–23)
  Munich 7: Munich, Bayerische Staatsbibliothek, Mus. MS 7
  Nuremberg 83795: Nuremberg, Bibliothek des Germanischen Nationalmuseums, MS 83795
  San Petronio A.31: Bologna, Archivio Musicale di S. Petronio MS A.XXXI
  San Petronio A.46: Bologna, Archivio Musicale di S. Petronio MS A.XXXXVI
  Toledo 19: Archivo y Biblioteca Capitular de la Catedral Metropolitana, MS 19
  Weimar B: Bibliothek der Evangelisch-Lutherischen Kirchengemeinde, MS B

*Printed sources*

Antico 1516: *Liber quindecim missarum electarum quae per excellentissimos musicos compositae fuerunt* (Rome: Andrea Antico, 1516)
  *Canti B: Canti B numero cinquanta* (Venice: Ottaviano Petrucci, 1502)
Formschneider/Ott 1539: *Missae tredecim quatuor vocum a praestantissimis artificibus compositis* (Nuremberg: Hieronymus Grapheus, 1539), vdm 43

Giunta 1522: *Missarum decem a clarissimis musicis compositarum nec dum ante exceptis tribus editorum* (Roma: Giovanni Giunta, 1522)

Moderne 1532: *Liber decem missarum a praecelis musicis contextus, nunquam ante hac in lucem aeditus. Quarum nomina et autores sub sequentis paginae index commonstrat* (Lyons: Jacques Moderne, 1532)

Petreius 1539: *Liber quindecim missarum, a praestantissimis musicis compositarum, quarum nomina unà cum suis autoribus sequens pagina commonstrat* (Nuremberg: Johann Petreius, 1539), vdm 42

Rhau 1541: *Opus decem missarum quatuor vocum, in gratiam scholarum atque adeo omnium musices studiosorum* (Wittenberg: Georg Rhau, 1541), vdm 1019

Berg and Neuber 1549: *Der ander Teil des außbunds kurzweylicher frischer Teudtscher Liedlein/ zu singen sehr lustig / mit etlichen Newen Liedlein gemeheret* (Nuremberg: Berg and Neuber, 1549), vdm 1134

Notes

1 Petreius began by printing two volumes of lute music by Neusidler, then published two motet books and a broadsheet by Senfl. Formschneider started with two volumes of instrumental and lute music, in this case by Gerle, following with three *Lieder* books by Senfl, Finck and others, a *Magnificat* volume by Senfl, two motet anthologies and a volume of three-voice mostly German songs. Rhau, on the other hand, had mainly published liturgical music for the Passion, Easter and Vespers, in addition to a motet book by several authors. Further on Petreius, see Keunecke, ‘Johannes Petreius’; Teramoto and Brinzing, *Katalog der Musikdrucke*; concerning Formschneider, see, in particular, Lenckner, ‘Formschneider in Nürnberg’; Gustavson, ‘Novum et insigne opus musicum’; on Rhau, see Cuyler, ‘*Opus decem missarum*’; Seebass, ‘Venus’; Heidrich, ‘Georg Rhau’. See moreover the respective entries in *MGG* and *Grove Music Online*.


4 See Schlagel, ‘Fortune’s Fate’, 195 and 206–207. For possible reasons as to why Ott’s Josquin transmission is so unsatisfying, see Meyer, *Zwischen Kanon und Geschichte*, 92–93.

5 See Fallows, *Josquin*, 268–269 doubts that Josquin wrote the *Missa Une Musque de Biscaye*.

6 The convincing attribution of this mass to Bauldeweyn was first made by Sparks, *The Music of Noel Bauldeweyn*, and was adopted by the editors of the New Josquin Edition (NJE), who accordingly excluded it from their edition. See *NJE* 3, XIII and *Critical Commentary*, 47–52.

7 This double ascription in Formschneider/Ott was also noted by Meconi, *Pierre de la Rue*, 279 and 320, who, however, did not mention that the la Rue attribution is only recorded in the contratenor. For a discussion of this ascription, see Lindmayr-Brandl, ‘Pierre de la Rue’s Posthumous Career’.

8 On these masses see, respectively, Francesco de Layolle: *Collected Works*, vol. 6 (1973), XV (critical apparatus) and 1–20 (music) and Crawford, ‘Reflections on Some Masses’, 84–87; *Antonii Brunel opera omnia*, vol. 4, edited by Barton Hudson (1970), XV–XVI (critical apparatus) and 52–64 (music); Blackburn, *The Lupus Problem*, 42 and 108–122; Vendramini, ‘Le cantus firmus’, 37–38 and 39–41. See, additionally, the relevant articles in *MGG* and *Grove Music Online*.

9 See Crawford, ‘Reflections on Some Masses’, 84.


11 This is moreover indirectly shown by the almost identical wording of the last part of the title in the two mass anthologies: … *Quarum nomina et autores sub sequentis paginae index commonstrat* (Moderne), and … *quarum nomina unà cum suis autoribus sequens pagina commonstrat* (Petreius). On Petreius’ print, see also Pranger, ‘Luther’s Polyphony’.
14 On Josquin’s ‘canonization’ in sixteenth-century Germany, see especially Meyer, *Zwischen Kanon und Geschichte* and Schlagel, ‘Fortune’s Fate’.
15 On Rener’s masses, see Kindermann, ‘Die Messen Adam Reners’; a modern edition is contained in *Adam Rener, Gesamtausgabe/Collected Works*. On Rener more generally, see the respective entries in *Grave Music Online* and *MGG Online*.
18 This, according to Louise Cuyler, was perhaps not casual, ‘but the deliberate substitution of a word likely to have meaning for Rhau’s German clients’. See Cuyler, *The Emperor Maximilian I and Music*, 144, fn. 1. On the mass in general, see *Heinrich Isaac: Opera omnia*, vol. 7 (1984), XL–XLIII (Critical Apparatus) and 114–134 (Music), in addition to Staehelin, *Die Messen Heinrich Isaacs*, passim. On Berlin 40021 see particularly Just, *Der Mensuralkodex Mus. ms. 40021* and *Der Kodex Berlin 40021*.
21 See also Heidrich, ‘Die polyphone Messe’, 297. It is in this context significant that none of the masses in the *Opus decem missarum* figures in a table of liturgical music prescribed for the church of St. Marien in Wittenberg around 1543/44, the very church in which Luther used to preach: see Menzel, ‘Ain herlich Ampt in figuris’, 545–547.
22 Rhau employs a G3 clef for most soprano parts of his mass collection, including Roselli’s mass, though the much more current C1 clef would have had the same meaning. Rhau’s high clef choice seems rather unusual; within the printed sources examined here, it is only to be found elsewhere in the spurious Josquin mass *Da pacem* in Formschneider/Ott 1539. Rhau also employs the G3 clef extensively in most of his other musical editions. However, a determination of incidence of the G clef in contemporary manuscript and printed music is beyond the scope of the present chapter.
23 Without going into detail Heidrich, ‘Die polyphone Messe’, 295, surmised that the Walter manuscripts were the basis for Rhau’s mass edition.
25 Kyrie, Gloria and Credo were copied in A.46, whereas Sanctus and Agnus were entered in A.31. For these manuscripts, see Tirro, ‘La stesura del testo nei manoscritti di Giovanni Spataro’, 52 (A.31); Tirro, *Renaissance Musical Sources*, 11, 15fn, 17–18, 21, 22fn, 23, 46–49 and 52 (A.31); 10, 11, 16–17, 21, 34, 47 and 49–55 (A.46).
26 See *Antonii Brunel opera omnia*, XIII–XIV (critical apparatus) and 1–34 (music).
27 See *Liber Usualis*, 58–59 and 64–66 respectively.
28 On Rhau’s ‘improved’ text placement, see Staehelin, *Die Messen Heinrich Isaacs*, 3: 56.
29 Note that the bassus of this Credo has been erroneously entered into the tenor partbook.
30 For a comprehensive and updated list of all sources, see *Senfl Catalogue Online*, accessed on 18 February 2019.
32 For a modern edition of this mass, see *Matthaeus Pipelare: Opera omnia*, vol. 2, 11–22, critical commentary at IX. Concerning Jena 21, see *The Treasury of Petrus Alamire*, 103–105.
33 See Rhau 1541, tenor, fol. Aij: *Profero nunc illis* [seil. *Studiosis ac amatoribus Musices] decem Missas, cum elegantes ac suaves, tum etiam per breves […].
35 For the transmission of Isaac’s works in central European sources, see the list of sources and the critical apparatus in *Isaac: Opera omnia*, vol. 7, XL–XLIII (critical apparatus); 114–134 (music); Staehelin, *Die Messen Heinrich Isaacs*, passim and Staehelin, ‘Isaac’, accessed on 28 January 2019.
36 For this mass, see the modern edition with critical commentary in *Mathurini Forester: Opera omnia* and Milsom and Saunders, ‘Who Composed the Missa Cueur langoreulx?’, 145–154, with some biographical extrapolations on Forester at 160. See also more generally MacCracken, ‘The Sacred Music of Mathurin Forestier’, esp. 349 and 351–353.

38 See in Heartz, Pierre Attaingnant, 100.


40 Josquin’s song, first transmitted à 4 in Canti B, is itself an arrangement of a ‘popular’ melody transmitted in Bayeux.

41 See Pranger, ‘Luther’s Polyphony’, 49.

42 On the editions of the Giunta family, see Pettas, The Giunti of Florence.

43 See Pranger, ‘Luther’s Polyphony’, 54–55.


45 See Blackburn and Holford-Strevens, ‘Junó’s Four Grievances’, 164. The same Latin canon with the Duarum facierum title is present in Rostock XVI-49, which is obviously derived from Petreius 1539.

46 See Census-Catalogue, 1: 77.

47 For Cambrai 3, see Coussemaker, Notice sur les collections, 24–32, the Moulu mass being briefly mentioned at 28–29. Note, however, that the author misread the title above the mass as À deux viliages ou plus instead of À deux visaiges ou plus; for ‘s-Hertogenbosch 72B see Roelvink, ‘The Alamire Manuscripts’ and The Treasury of Petrus Alamire, 81, where a detail of fol. 154v containing the beginning of the mass is reproduced. It is possible that Bologna Q.25 also had an inscription in one of the lost partbooks, but in the absence of these books, this cannot be verified.

48 See ibid., where, however, only the superius is visible. The same canonic inscription is visible in a much later source of this mass, Capp. Sist. 39, copied between 1558 and 1563 (see DIAMM, https://www.diamm.ac.uk/sources/2633/#/, accessed on 22 February 2019 and Schiltz, Music and Riddle Culture, 128, fn. 138). In this connection it is interesting to observe that another Alamire manuscript compiled for the Illustris Lieve Vrouwe Broederschap in den Bosch (‘s-Hertogenbosch 72C) has concordances with Cambrai 4, a source contemporary with Cambrai 3 and partially compiled by the same scribes (see DIAMM https://www.diamm.ac.uk/sources/1663/#/, accessed on 22 February 2019). Whether this might imply some form of repertoire exchange between Cambrai cathedral and the collegiate church of ‘s-Hertogenbosch lies outside the scope of the present chapter.

49 Luther, Tischreden, 2: 11–12, no. 1258: ‘Sic Deus praedicavit Euangelium etiam per musicum, ut videtur in Josquin, des alles composition frohlich, willig, milde herausfleust, ist nitt zwungen und gnedigt per regulas, sicut des fincken gesang’. See also Østrem, ‘Luther, Josquin and des fincken gesang’, 51; Meyer, Zwischen Kanon und Geschichte, 114–122.
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Part IV

Music printing in the Low Countries
A date with Tylman Susato: reconsidering the printer’s editions

Martin Ham

In 1542, Antwerp saw the first dated books of polyphonic music to be produced in the Low Countries from moveable type: a book of motets from Vissenaecken’s press, and a collection of Benedictus Appenzeller’s chansons printed by Loys and Buys. Despite ambitious plans, neither of these enterprises established itself; no other music from them is known. Where they seemingly failed, Tylman Susato – composer, scribe, instrumentalist and music printer – certainly succeeded. Over the course of nearly twenty years from 1543, he issued no fewer than fifty-five collections, reprinting most of them, some more than once. Accordingly, Susato has attracted significant scholarly interest. Nevertheless, uncertainties remain about aspects of his output, particularly the collections reprinted with false dates. This chapter reconsiders Susato’s *Libri ecclesiasticarum cantionum*, the chanson collections, and the impetus behind their reissue. This re-examination provides a fuller picture of Susato’s commercial activities. There is comparatively little overlap of typographical materials between the motet and chanson books, and so it is more convenient to discuss them separately. Founts and changes of individual sorts help materially in establishing likely patterns of production; details are provided in Appendix 7.1.

The *Libri ecclesiasticarum cantionum*

Susato issued the fourteen *Libri ecclesiasticarum cantionum* in the 1550s. (I shall refer to them as EC 1–14; for all other abbreviations, see Appendix 7.2.) EC 13 is lost; the surviving books contain around 250 motets by some sixty composers from the major to the otherwise now unknown. They form a treasury of the mid-century Netherlands motet. The books are of uniform size overall. EC 1–4 are for four voices; each partbook comprises five gatherings of four leaves in oblong quarto. EC 5–12 and 14 are for five voices, but have only four gatherings per voice each, so that every collection is formed of twenty sheets of paper, that is, one sheet per gathering.

In her study of Susato, Ute Meissner drew attention to apparent anomalies of dating and variants on the title pages of exemplars held in three libraries. She advanced no detailed explanation for these anomalies, but considered it likely that the entire series was first issued in 1553, with one or more subsequent editions. Meissner’s observations were valid as far as they went. Howard Mayer Brown considered that they revealed a sizeable problem that needed clarification. The generally accepted alternative view is that Susato printed these books over a period extending into 1558, reprinting most titles in the series in those same years under their earlier dates. In other words, there was a hidden and partial second edition. The most recent overview of Susato’s printing activities is given in Table 7.1.
It has been argued that the incentive for a second edition of these motet books was the meeting of the Order of the Golden Fleece at Antwerp in January 1556. The many visitors, some perhaps staying for an extended period, would have provided a ready market. Attractive though this hypothesis is, variants and anomalies raise questions about their nature and significance. Up to now, they have largely been explained as errors, typesetting differences, accidents or the result of atypical production methods. However, these explanations seem not to correspond with typographical evidence provided by the books.

The first uncertainty is whether Susato began the series in 1552, as indicated in Table 7.1. The only dedication contained in any volume in the series appears in EC 1, addressed to Antoine Perrenot, Emperor Charles V’s counsellor and secretary of state. It is dated 10 March 1553 *stilo Romano*, that is, with the year starting on 1 January, rather than at Easter or Lady Day (Annunciation, 25 March). No exemplars of EC 1–3 or 5 dated 1552 have been recorded, and there is nothing overt in those exemplars I have seen to verify that year. In addition, the features of the first edition of EC 1 of 1553, as we shall see below, also show that it was without doubt the first of the series printed. I therefore work on the assumption that Susato started issuing these collections in 1553.

When we are trying to establish the sequence of publication, two typographical markers help us to identify those books that were most likely printed in 1556 at the earliest, whatever their ostensible date. In 1556–1557 Susato issued his first four books of *Souterliedekens*, most set by Clemens non Papa, with a few by Susato himself. As in Simon Cock’s earlier monophonic version, these covered the complete psalter, together with biblical canticles and hymns. Susato presumably would have wanted to offer all four books as a set to those who could afford them. Given that the last of the series is dated 1557, the others are likely to be from the latter end of 1556. These four books display two distinctive sorts within Susato’s Basel italic: lower case ‘v’ and ‘w’ (shown in Appendix 7.1). The ‘w’ was useful only for the Dutch vernacular collections; it was needed for neither Latin nor French texts. When he came to print the first three volumes of his *Musyck boekkens* in 1551 (abbreviated here as MB), Susato still had yet to obtain one. Instead, he used a combination of ‘v’ and/or ‘u’ on their title pages, and in the indexes of MB 1–2. (The headers and texts in these books were set in pica italic.) However, in these new books almost every header, now set in Basel italic, required it. To judge from their design, these two sorts constituted a pair created by the same punchcutter. Susato would have had no use for the ‘w’ in any intervening edition, and already had a serviceable ‘v’, and so we can assume that he acquired the sorts while preparing for the 1556–1557 SL 1–4 collections. Any other book containing either or both of these sorts is therefore likely to have been printed around mid-1556 at the very earliest. Since the ‘v’ is extremely common, it makes a particularly useful indicator.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>RISM B/I sigla</th>
<th>Dating</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>EC 1–3</td>
<td>15538–10</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>EC 4</td>
<td>15548</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>EC 5</td>
<td>155312</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>EC 6–8</td>
<td>155313–15</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>EC 9</td>
<td>15549</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>EC 10–11</td>
<td>15558–9</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>EC 1–11 ex. 4</td>
<td>1555–1556 hidden second edition</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>EC 12</td>
<td>15575</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>EC 14</td>
<td>155316 (Q) + 15574/15583</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Table 7.1 Current dating of the EC series
Further details support the existence of a dividing line in 1556 between the use of old and new forms. The new ‘v’ is not present in those sets of EC partbooks stamped with the years 1555 (US-Lu) and 1556 (D-Kl, except for quinta pars; D-B(ii)) on their original bindings. Neither does it appear in any part of the 1555 editions of EC 10–11, TS 14 (Lassus’ ‘op. 1’) of the same year, or any of those motet or chanson collections that can be shown on typographical grounds to precede them (see below). In the other direction, the new ‘v’ sort entirely replaced the old one in all of Susato’s editions dated 1556 onwards, or which can be dated later on the basis of other evidence, such as the last edition of the chanson collections. Within the EC series itself, the distinction by old or new ‘v’ sort is also marked by consistent differences in the details of title pages (see Figure 7.1). One obvious to the eye, for example, is that those with the old sort have ‘uocum’ in large Roman type, while

![Figure 7.1 Examples of title pages.](image)

(a) A(i) 1553: Liber quintus ecclesiasticarum cantionum quinque vocum ... Quinta Pars (Antwerp: Susato, 1553).

(b) B(i) 1555: Liber undecimus ecclesiasticarum cantionum quinque vocum ... Superior (Antwerp: Susato, 1555).

(c) B(ii) 1557: Liber quintus ecclesiasticarum cantionum quinque vocum ... Quinta Pars (Antwerp: Susato, ‘1553’ [actually 1557]).
Source: Universitätsbibliothek Kassel, Landesbibliothek und Murhardsche Bibliothek der Stadt Kassel, 4° Mus. 107[5.

(d) C 1558: Liber decimus ecclesiasticarum cantionum quinque vocum ... Quinta Pars (Antwerp: Susato, ‘1555’ [actually 1558]).
Source: Universitätsbibliothek Kassel, Landesbibliothek und Murhardsche Bibliothek der Stadt Kassel, 4° Mus. 107[5.
the others have ‘vocum’, in line with the 1557 and 1558 partbooks of EC 12 and 14. The occasional use of the ‘w’ sort in composers’ names conforms to the same pattern.

A further point concerns Susato’s use of standing type. To explain variants as compositors’ inconsistencies or errors supposes that each title page within a collection was composed individually. However, that was not Susato’s practice. Without exception, his other collections – leaving aside those few too incomplete for comparisons to be made – show that essentially a single setting of type was used for the title page, and the index where this is separate, as in the large majority of his books. Sometimes a dedication or other prefatory matter required restructuring of the opening leaf of an individual voice, but even then the compositor reused a greater or lesser element of the available composed type as was convenient. Apart from such instances, only voice names had to be changed. Keeping type standing for reuse significantly reduced the time – and therefore the cost – taken to compose, proof and correct those pages. Susato frequently went further, using large portions of standing type for the title pages of several books within a series. This was even easier when he standardised their layout to a degree, as in the EC collections.11 If then a printer reset a title page for some reason during production, the new version would flow through to the next voice and possibly to the next book. Put another way, it is not feasible to have a reset title page within a series of otherwise identical title pages.12

Since the title pages and indexes in the EC series appear on opposite sides of the opening folio, they are part of the outer and inner formes respectively. As far as the printing process for a sheet is concerned, these are entirely separate events. If a problem with the title page or index had arisen, there would have been no need to reset the other unless the whole sheet was being reset, whether as a cancel (a leaf reset to correct an error) or for some other reason. That provides a convenient means to check whether we are dealing in a given case with a separate state, a reset sheet or a different edition. However, reset sheets are an unlikely explanation for variants. The high cost of paper as a proportion of the direct cost base makes cancels something an experienced printer such as Susato would take pains to avoid, as they would reduce his realisable profit. Resetting sheets for other reasons would similarly cost time and money.13 As to the explanation of differences of publication year as ‘accidents’, the loss of an individual piece of type is a theoretical possibility in some cases – if, for example, it was pulled out of the forme during inking – but not all. Again, Susato’s use of standing type means that title pages and indexes in the various partbooks of the same publication should otherwise be identical. Although there is comparatively little common material within a set of partbooks beyond the opening leaf, Susato employed vertical setting, that is, setting an individual gathering in one voice – usually the superior – then the same gathering in each of the remaining voices. In this way, some portions of composed type could be shared between partbooks, for example, headers, folio numbers, signatures and sometimes portions of underlaid text.14

Three examples illustrate different aspects of these observations.15 First, let us examine EC 10. On the face of it, all five voices of this book are dated 1555. However, the contratenor of some copies gives the date as M.D.LIIIIII, while the other partbooks give it as M.D.LV (see Figure 7.2). With these two ways of expressing the year, there can be no question of an accident during printing. Even a cursory inspection shows that the title page of the contratenor was not printed from the same setting of type as that used for the remaining voices.16 Closer examination shows that the final II of M.D.LIIIIII was an addition made after the sheet had been printed, using a piece of type as a stamp, as shown by the difference in inking and the variations in alignment between surviving copies. Thus, sheets bearing the year 1553 were altered to make the purchaser believe that they belonged to the later
The indexes also vary significantly; moreover, the headers and folio numbers of the rest of the gathering are set in pica italic, like Susato’s earlier editions, and not in Basel italic, like the remaining portions. The differences only extend, though, to the first sheet. However, in one exemplar (D-As), the entire contratenor book, including the first gathering, comes from the same edition as the remaining voices. The musical readings in the first gathering of this exemplar disclose no significant differences that might lead us to consider one version as faulty and the other a cancel. Furthermore, its existence confirms that Susato indeed printed the appropriate sheet at the time in 1555, using the same type as for the other voices. Finally, the 1555 title page of EC 10 was reused for EC 11, printed the same year. This demonstrates that the type for the title page was not distributed back into the case or reset, but was kept standing.

EC 12 (1557) shows a similar combination of features; once again, the contratenor has an aberrant gathering. In this instance, though, no attempt was made to adjust the date. Pulled type or similar accident can be ruled out. M.D.LVII cannot become M.D.LIII by the loss of an individual piece, nor – as the alignment makes clear – by the insertion of an incorrect piece in substitution. Nor would pulled type account for the many other varying details on the title page. Two additional points may be noted. First, the aberrant gathering uses the earlier ‘v’ sort in Basel italic, while the remaining gatherings, in line with their date, use the form introduced in 1556, as well as the ‘w’ sort in the name of one composer (‘Hauweel’). Second, the contents of the book were adjusted between editions. Two motets listed in the
1553 index were replaced with others, and the old titles simply crossed through by hand: Gallus’ *Ecce panis angelorum* was replaced by Willaert’s *Creator omnium*, while Barbion’s *Girum coeli* took the place of Vaet’s *Quid Christum*. A four-voice setting of the latter text, also by Vaet, was included in *EC* 3, but there is no way of knowing if these were different settings, or if the four-voice original was included in this five-voice collection, perhaps with an additional voice. Aside from the indexes, the change of the contents is not obvious from the remaining exemplars, simply because the works in question were not in the opening gathering. A further gathering also seems to be taken from a different edition: gathering C of the superior does not fit with any of the other voices, with significant variants in both formes. As has been noted, it was Susato’s general practice to print the superior first; this can be seen in the mistaken inclusion on fol. 4r of the tenor and quinta pars of that voice name. The fact that the superior is anomalous is noteworthy, as is the omission of detail in the lower voices, as that is the voice from which the others were usually copied, and from which some type was always reused. Perhaps more conclusively, one folio number in sheet C, fol. xii was misprinted, and although attempts were made to correct it, the original misprinted number clearly used the earlier form of Basel italic ‘v’, unlike the remainder of the leaves in the partbook.18

The variants taken together (see Table 7.2) show that this sheet must have been printed before 1557. However, the headers of this gathering are in Basel italic, and not the pica italic of the opening gathering of the contratenor. It cannot belong with the edition that that sheet represents. Rather, these two sheets are remnants of two separate editions, printed prior to the main portion of the surviving books dated 1557.

*EC* 14 contains perhaps the best-known mixture of dates, highlighted by the fact that it has been given three RISM sigla. Two of these sigla (RISM 1557/1/1558/1) refer to a single edition; Susato printed it over the year-end, and adjusted the year from 1557 to 1558 after the superior had been completed. The title pages for the four voices dated 1557/58 are otherwise identical. All three surviving exemplars of the quinta pars are, like *EC* 10 and 12, dated 1553 (RISM 1553/16). Yet again, the title pages, indexes and typographical details and sorts allow us to establish that this initial gathering is from a separate edition. It has been asserted, though, that the date 1553 given in the quinta pars was caused by the accidental loss of the ‘V’ in ‘M.D.LVIII’, resulting in the misleading date ‘M.D.LIII’.19 There are good reasons to reject this view. First, the title page of the quinta pars shows no gap where the ‘lost’ letter ‘V’ could have been pulled. Practical experience shows that it is not possible in a locked forme to adjust the type to close such a gap. If the pressmen did anything following the accidental pulling of a ‘V’, it was surely to replace it in the resulting gap rather than unlocking the forme and moving the ‘III’ to the left. Second, even if one were to construct

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Sig.</th>
<th>Superior</th>
<th>All other voices</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>C1r</td>
<td><em>Superius Secunda Pars</em></td>
<td>[voice] Secunda Pars.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>C1v</td>
<td><em>Ieronimus Vinders</em></td>
<td><em>Vinders</em></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>C2r</td>
<td><em>Secunda Pars.</em></td>
<td><em>Secunda Pars.</em></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>C2v</td>
<td><em>Lucæ xxij Nico. Gombert</em></td>
<td><em>N. Gombert.</em></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>C3r</td>
<td><em>Secunda Pars</em></td>
<td><em>Secunda Pars</em></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>C3v</td>
<td><em>In festo Purificationis HauVueel</em></td>
<td><em>Io. Hauweel.</em></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>C4r</td>
<td><em>Secunda Pars</em></td>
<td><em>Secunda Pars</em></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>C4h</td>
<td><em>Christianus Hollandere</em></td>
<td><em>Christianus Hollandere</em></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
a hypothetical scenario in which this sheet in the last voice had to be reset (to explain its
variants), it would be impossible for it to mirror exactly the pages printed from standing
type from sheets in other books; yet it does, and uses the earlier Basel italic ‘v’ form. There
can be no doubt the date of 1553 in the contratenor was intentional.20

As with EC 12, there was also some change of content in EC 14: Homo quidam by Phinot
replaced Gaudent in coelis by Havericq. Unlike the manual crossing-through found in EC
12, the index here was altered by means of a pasted slip in Susato’s own fount with the
distinctive new ‘v’ sort (Figure 7.3). Havericq’s motet had already been printed in EC 12,
and so it appears that Susato himself was correcting an error of duplication in an earlier
dition. The deleted motet and its replacement did not fall within that first gathering, and
so there was no greater problem to fix than patching the index.

Leaving aside the late hidden edition (see Table 7.3), further aberrant first gatherings
are found in each of the exemplars of EC 5–9 dated 1553.21 Typographical details similar to
those outlined above preclude any of these sheets being a cancel, or having been reset for
any other reason. Moreover, when their title pages are considered as a group with those
of EC 10, 12 and 14, they are found to share an identical layout and typesetting, including
exactly the same form of privilege. Moreover, the headers and folio numbers were printed
in pica italic, Susato’s style in his previous MB 1–3, not in the Basel italic that he used in
all the EC series from 1554 at the latest. Several aberrant sheets beyond the initial gather-
ings can be identified in books other than EC 12. One seems peculiar to a single surviving
exemplar (in GB-Lbl): here, the final gathering (E) in the bassus partbook of EC 4 comes
from a later edition, while the original sheet for the edition is bound in the bassus partbook
of EC 7 from the same set of books.22 An even greater degree of confusion can be seen in
EC 6. In three of the voices, all the surviving copies show the same mixture of sheets from
two editions. The respective gatherings can be distinguished by the founts used for the

![Figure 7.3 Index of EC 14, quinta pars, showing pasted slip correction in Susato’s fount: Liber XIII ecclesiasticarum cantionum quinque vocum ... Quinta Pars (Antwerp: Susato, 1553), A1v.
Source: Uppsala University Library, Utl.vok.mus. i tr. 535–538.](image)
headers as well as by their content. Only a single gathering (B) is consistent between all the voices. In each case there is agreement in the headers of the respective editions, except gathering A of the contratenor, which is unique. It seems then that the surviving exemplars were made up of sheets from two editions, five from one and fifteen from the other, put together almost at random.

Without such differences in the founts used for headers and signatures, it is more difficult to identify aberrant gatherings beyond the first one, especially where a single gathering in all voices might have been taken from a different edition from the rest. However, one instance seems likely.23 The first gathering of the contratenor book in EC 5 is aberrant; this is yet another example of a title page and index in one partbook being distinct from those of the other voices (Figure 7.4 shows the indexes). The respective gatherings, though, also differ in a basic element of the layout. In all voices apart from the contratenor, the compositor inserted blank staves in gatherings A and B where the musical text was too short to fill the page, as was usual. However, in gatherings C and D he did not; in that respect these gatherings are the same as the aberrant contratenor. This distinction is also found in the aberrant gatherings of EC 8–9, 12 and 14, as well as all voices of EC 2–3 (the relevant sheets of EC 7 and 10 are full). This therefore appears to have been a characteristic of early house style, found in certain titles; later EC books consistently included empty staves. As such, it is likely that these sheets all belong to a single edition. For EC 5, the individual gatherings are internally consistent, apart from gathering A in the contratenor; the book was thus likely compiled from sheets from two editions, but collated in a different manner from EC 6.24

Typographically, the surviving exemplars and aberrant sheets fall into two distinct groups. On one hand are those which precede EC 10 (1555), and which share a large amount of standing type on their title pages. These are indicated as A(i–iii) in Appendix 7.3, where the overall position is summarised, and the make-up of exemplars described where known. On the other hand are the editions from EC 10 of 1555 onwards (indicated as B–C in Appendix 7.3); these are more varied in their typesetting (see Figure 7.1). EC 9 (A(iii) in Appendix 7.3), as implied by its date of 1554, is undoubtedly the last book of those printed within these first two years. The top left corner of the ornamental block initial for the bassus partbook sustained damage during the print run, not yet evident in any of the other books of this group.25

A number of features suggest that those listed under A(i) constitute the first edition. EC 1 has minor errors and variants between the title pages of the various partbooks, and an incorrect explicit altered by hand.26 The title page of EC 2 carried forward the format of the tenor partbook of EC 1, with the small alteration of NVNQVAN to NVNQVAM. From EC 3 onwards, the phrase *Antea nunquam excusus* was set in Basel italic rather than Roman type. This is followed in all later editions, with the exception of the late hidden edition, which

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Edition</th>
<th>Evidence for</th>
<th>Possible extent</th>
<th>Year</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1 (α)</td>
<td>1–10, 12, 14</td>
<td>1–14</td>
<td>1553</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2 (β part hidden?)</td>
<td>5–8, 12</td>
<td>1–14</td>
<td>1553–1554</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3 (γ)</td>
<td>4, 9–11</td>
<td>1–11</td>
<td>1554–1555</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4 (δ hidden)</td>
<td>1–8</td>
<td>1–8</td>
<td>1556–1557</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3 (γ continued)</td>
<td>12, 14</td>
<td>12–14</td>
<td>1557–1558</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4 (δ hidden, cont.)</td>
<td>9–11</td>
<td>9–14</td>
<td>1558</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
A DATE WITH TYLMAN SUSATO

Figure 7.4 Indexes of EC 5: Liber quintus ecclesiasticarum cantionum quinque vocum ... Quinta Pars (Antwerp: Susato, 1553).
Source: Universitätsbibliothek Kassel, Landesbibliothek und Murhardsche Bibliothek der Stadt Kassel, 4° Mus. 1072.

(a) A(i) contratenor.
Source: Universitätsbibliothek Kassel, Landesbibliothek und Murhardsche Bibliothek der Stadt Kassel, 4° Mus. 1072.

(b) A(ii) other voices except quinta pars (bassus illustrated).
Source: Universitätsbibliothek Kassel, Landesbibliothek und Murhardsche Bibliothek der Stadt Kassel, 4° Mus. 1074.

copied quite slavishly. A designation of the mode was added from EC 5. Oês Primi toni, a phrase found in EC 5–7, was clearly printed from the same block of type, transferred with the rest of the title page. However, this designation was incorrect for the motets of EC 7, an error which Susato amended in later editions of this book. The style of headers, set in pica italic, in all the surviving sheets from this edition, is unchanged from MB 1–3. Within this first edition, Susato’s compositor experimented in search of the best format for the index before he finally fixed upon a solution. The index of EC 1 again mirrored those in the earlier MB 1–2 (MB 3 is not relevant), giving the partes of each work but no attribution. By the time he came to set EC 6, he had settled on the form used in later editions, which gave text incipits and composers.27 Susato would have found, too, that this simplified form of presentation – one that subjectively seems the most useful for the singer or reader – was also the easiest, and therefore the most economical to compose.28

Most of the standing type for those books and sheets listed under A(ii) was still that used from the tenor of EC 1 until the surviving quinta pars of the first edition of EC 14. However, these books display a slightly modified privilege line, again dated 1553. It is not clear whether this implies the existence of a new privilege. Given the length of the series, several listed under A(ii) reprinted with the year 1553 may well have been issued in 1554.29 Those listed under A(iii) have the identical privilege but a date of 1554. As the date formed part of the standing type, any alteration to it must have been intentional. Had EC 4 been printed before those later in the series listed under A(ii), then the year would necessarily have been changed twice. EC 4 also has a comma after ‘Susato’, introduced into the standing type during the second printing of EC 7; this comma appears on none of the title pages of the first edition, nor on those of EC 5–6 of the second edition.30 It therefore seems probable that EC 4 and 9 of 1554 were printed after the second edition of EC 8; in other
words, they are part of a third edition. The change in house style – from pica italic in the first edition and EC 5 of the second edition, to Basel italic for headers, folio numbers and signatures in the second edition of EC 6 – again allows us to place EC 4 later, not as part of the same sequence, as it too uses Basel italic for these elements. This evidence, along with the aberrant sheet from EC 12 of 1557, allows us to posit the existence of two prior editions. It thus seems likely that all the books truly dated from 1554–1558 form part of a third edition produced over an extended period.

Although the editions listed under B–C in Appendix 7.3 form a less coherent group typographically than those listed under A, a comparison of standing and reset type shows overlapping concordant details that establish the sequence in which these books were printed. A significant proportion of the type on the common title page of EC 10–11 was taken forward to EC 1δ. Yet because the latter was copied from the first edition, that is, before Susato had standardised his layout, part was changed more to resemble its model. At the same time, ‘ñcum’ in large Roman type on the title page was altered to ‘vocum’, and the newer Basel italic ‘v’ replaced the older throughout. Both these changes are consistent in all the later EC books. It is unlikely therefore that EC 1δ was printed earlier than mid-1556, but no closer approximation is possible at present. Susato seems to have printed EC 3δ next, rather than EC 2δ as one might have expected. While he reversed the few atypical elements of the title page of EC 1δ, he still took over some lines as they stood. Even so, the changes go beyond those strictly necessary to recreate his more usual format; thus it is probable that their printing was not consecutive. The resetting of one line of text is of particular evidential value: the phrase ‘ANTVVERPIAE EXCVDEBAT’ acquired a number of readily distinguishable peculiarities unlikely, if not impossible, to have been replicated by chance, and certainly not time after time (see Figure 7.5). Its specific mixture of characteristic elements can be traced from EC 3δ through EC 12γ, EC 2 and 4–8δ, to EC 14γ of 1557/58. EC 3δ was undoubtedly followed closely by EC 12γ of 1557. Much of its title page was printed from the same type, suggesting no break for other work. EC 3δ was therefore most probably printed in 1557 too.

It seems that something then interrupted the reprinting of this series, as a considerable portion of the type was composed anew after EC 12γ, or in some instances perhaps simply respaced. For example, the features of the main title line in those titles printed between EC 11 and EC 12γ (by way of EC 1 and 3δ) disappear. The reset lines pass from EC 2 to 4 and EC 5δ before other minor alterations become apparent. Although the further changes are small, they are enough to suggest that the standing type had been cannibalised to an extent for other publications printed in the interim. This typesetting then remains stable from EC 6 to EC 8δ. The now lost EC 13 must have been printed at some point around this time, but there are still significant elements in common between EC 8δ and EC 14γ. As a result, EC 2 and 4–8δ can all confidently be assigned to 1557.

The title page of EC 9δ, although the same in overall style as previous books, was wholly reset, while those of EC 10–11δ (C) differ from all others; here the compositor simplified their composition by reducing the variety of founts used. All three are bound together in

Figure 7.5  Example of type transferred from EC 3δ to EC 14γ: Liber XIII ecclesiasticarum cantionum quinque vocum … Superior (Antwerp: Susato, 1553), A1’. Source: Uppsala University Library, Utl.vok.mus. i tr. 535–538.
an exemplar (D-Kl Quinta), the binding of which is dated 1557, but it is impossible that they could have been produced within the period covered by EC 1δ–14γ. The partbook includes EC 14 as well, so cannot have been bound before 1558; the binder was presumably reflecting a customary change of year at Easter or Lady Day. That would mean that the voices of EC 10–11δ united in this binding were printed no later than the first three months or so of 1558, but nothing is presently known to confirm whether Susato reprinted EC 12–14 to complete this fourth edition of the series. At present we know of no editions of any of his collections printed in 1559. Of the surviving exemplars of the motet collections, only a single reprint of Laet’s 1556 Lassus collection – the 1560 EC 15 – is known to have been printed after 1559. Overall, the number of reprints postdating EC 12γ again confirms that probably four editions in total existed originally, despite the manner in which the editions have survived. Certainly, so much has been lost that it would be unwise to doubt the original existence of editions presumed printed or reprinted (Table 7.3 gives a summary of the probable editions). Besides the total loss of EC 13, significant portions of other editions survive in nothing more than a single sheet. The fact that the production of the second edition apparently followed very soon after the first suggests that Susato had hit something of a publisher’s jackpot, and probably made the most of the commercial opportunity.

The chanson collections

Susato’s editions of chanson collections are less complicated than the EC motet books, and the outline of their production comparatively easy to discern. There were three series of all but the octavo Fleur series, which survives so incompletely that little can be deduced, other than the existence of two editions of the first two books. (Only Fleur 5 survives intact.) Those exemplars thought to represent the final printing of the quarto collections (all in A-Wn) share characteristics with the one book of this group that was redated, TS 12 of 1558. It is entirely plausible therefore that the others were printed at around the same time, perhaps beginning in 1557. The principal remaining doubt is the dating of the intermediate reprint (shown as β). It has been posited that this second edition (of TS 26, 1–6 & 8 and TS Susato), possibly representing the remains of a more complete reissue of prior books, was reprinted in 1545–1546, and that, as with the EC motet collections, Susato sought to take advantage of a meeting of the Order of the Golden Fleece, this time held at Utrecht in January 1546. But here too, typographical features of the books point to a different chronology.

Susato made several additions to his typographical material after completing his first run of chanson books with TS 10 in August 1545. One is a ‘v’ sort in English italic first seen later in 1545 (in Missae 2). The second, his Basel italic fount, a larger text type whose first dated use is from August 1546 (in Missae 1). After using English italic for underlaid text in Missae 2, Susato evidently decided that it was too small for this use in the upright format of these books, and replaced it. It is unlikely therefore that any book printed with this new fount can have been printed earlier than 1546. Once Susato had obtained this fount, he used it extensively in all his editions of 1546–1547. He also used it for the indexes to three of the four volumes of Sacrae cantiones. The folio numbers given in these indexes feature a Roman ‘v’ in the new italic fount. This was replaced by an italic sort in TS 11, printed in October 1549. That new sort can be traced through TS 12–13 of 1550 to MB 1 of 1551. Susato, however, reverted to his original Roman form in MB 2 of the same year, possibly because the italic letter did not always register well.

Much of the title page and index of TS 26β is set in Basel italic, with the upright form of ‘v’ as in the editions of 1546–7 and post MB 1, while TS 1β displays the interim italic form.
Both include the ‘v’ sort in English italic, seen before only in *Missae 2*. *TS 26β* must post-date the 1545 *Missae 2*, not only because it includes the Basel italic, but also on the basis of a split in the ornamental initial C (see Figure 7.6) which occurred during the printing of *Missae 2*. Because of the presence of the interim ‘v’ sort, it seems improbable that *TS 1β* could have been printed before *Sacrae cantiones 4* of 1547; more likely, it was printed in 1549–1551. The circumstances surrounding the production of Susato’s *TS 11* suggest that both *TS 26β* and *TS 1β* were actually printed in late 1549.

As far as it is known, Susato’s press lay idle for some two and a half years following the printing of *Sacrae cantiones 4* in March 1547. The lack of any noticeable wear on his ornamental initials between 1547 and 1549, and the lack of any other evidence, argues against the possibility that Susato filled this hiatus by issuing reprints. At present it is not known whether he had fulfilled his printing and publishing ambitions after issuing sets of collections in the three main musical genres – chansons, masses and motets – or whether other factors led him to suspend activity. There are signs that the printing of *TS 11* in October 1549 was not a long-planned resumption of printing, but a response to relatively immediate financial pressures, even if Susato was comparatively well off. For a printer

![Figure 7.6 Wear on ornamental initials.](Source: Munich, Bayerische Staatsbibliothek, 4 Mus.pr. 201.)


such as Susato, with no steady trade in other kinds of books, the practicalities of supplies, labour, financing and distribution would mean that printing two or more collections over a relatively short period would generally be more cost-effective than printing individual items evenly spread over time. Indeed, Susato’s earlier output seems to reflect this pattern. It may be doubted that TS 11 was atypical in this respect. However, the small number of editions he printed between TS 11 and the series of Musyck boexken (1551) suggest he had built up only a limited amount of new repertory. Reprints may well have helped to pad out his production schedule, while his purchase of a new sort was probably associated with a general resumption of printing.

On 11 September 1549, Philip of Spain and Charles V, accompanied by the Queens Regent and Eleanor of France, made a Joyous Entry into Antwerp. Philip was heartily disliked by the people. During the days of ceremony that followed the Entry, the town band fell foul of the Antwerp authorities, though it is unclear whether or not this was directly connected with Philip’s presence. Susato and four colleagues were sacked, and paid off on 13 September; only one was later reinstated. In his privilege application for TS 11, Susato wrote that he had begun preparing the book in September, that is, around the time he lost his position in the town band. However, the privilege was granted only on 21 November, after Benedictus Appenzeller had examined and approved the collection just the previous day. Appenzeller’s approval was based, as was normal, on a manuscript copy of the texts; it gives no reason to suppose that the authorities knew the work had already been printed. Yet Susato had gone ahead before his octroi (licence) had been granted, producing the work in October. There was no acknowledged patron for this collection, and Susato therefore appears to have taken a large financial risk, possibly even jeopardising his general privilege by acting before the work was approved for printing. The sequence of events suggests a degree of urgency on his part to secure an alternative income; likewise, the delay taken to approve the collection looks like a deliberate mark of official displeasure at his earlier offence, and an implicit warning to conduct himself better in future. Even so, Susato requested and received protection for six years, instead of the three that he had received for his earlier books (where the period is known), again suggesting that financial considerations were much to the fore. One could also read into the choice of repertory for TS 11 an attempt to mend fences with the authorities, who were as alert to the value of positive propaganda as they were to the dangers of heterodox beliefs. The title page specifically singles out Crecquillon, Charles V’s most favoured court composer and Clemens, also within the wider court circle. Moreover, Crecquillon and the other members of the peripatetic Imperial chapel would have been present in Antwerp when Susato was preparing this publication; this would have given Susato ready access to material, had he need of it.

The Emperor’s military triumphs formed a prominent iconographical theme of the Antwerp Entry. TS 26 contains an extended verse dedication to the Queen Regent and with a woodcut depicting her deigning to accept the book. It also contains a canon by Susato, whose solution requires the singer to know the precise date and time of Charles V’s return to Brussels after his great victory at Tunis in 1535. Had Susato been forced by necessity to restart printing, as seems likely, he was probably looking for ways to restore his reputation through a display of loyalty; in the context of the Entry, a reprint of TS 26 would have been fitting. Alternatively, he could have chosen it to print as something uncontroversial while he prepared TS 11. Since the occurrence of the new English italic ‘v’ sort in TS 11 and TS 1β suggests that they were printed after TS 26β, it is likely that TS 26β was printed in September or October 1549. The typographical evidence is not sufficiently clear to determine whether TS 1β was printed earlier or later than TS 11, but the apparent pressures on Susato suggest that
TS 1\(^b\) was printed in late 1549 or possibly early 1550. TS Susato\(^b\) (tenor partbook in GB-Lbl) can for similar reasons be placed in the same period.\(^{53}\) Susato’s limited dated output of just two books in 1550 does imply that he had managed to recover his position by that time, or that he was constrained by the difficult economic conditions of that year.

Susato apparently reprinted his chanson books in order. Wear or damage to ornamental woodblock initials shows that TS 2\(^b\) and those books that followed must have been printed later than 1549, after TS 26\(^b\), TS 1\(^b\) and TS Susato\(^b\) (see Figure 7.6). The break in the right side of the lower frame of the woodblock for the majuscule C occurred after TS 11 and 13 had been printed – this initial does not appear in TS 12 – during the production of TS 2\(^b\). In the first two voices (superius and tenor) it is undamaged, but in the other two voices the deterioration is clearly visible. This damage, along with a further addition to Susato’s text founts (described below), provides a firm terminus a quo for TS 2–3\(^b\). This terminus also applies to subsequent books, because the comparison of a second initial, the L block, confirms that TS 4\(^b\) and the remainder were printed later still.\(^{52}\)

The addition to Susato’s text founts arose from the introduction of his second and smaller music type in MB 1 of 1551. His existing italic text founts were both too large to partner it; for this he needed a third: his pica italic. This has identified with a fount used by Steelsius of Antwerp, which also appeared first in 1551. Although this identification is questionable, it still seems doubtful that Susato would have purchased his fount before 1550–1551.\(^{53}\) While Susato used his pica italic for the first time in the dedication of TS 13 from 1550 (if this date is accurate), and not in MB 1, he certainly had not employed it in any previous publication dated with a true year of printing.\(^{54}\) Moreover, as it contains a ‘w’ sort, he clearly intended to use it for the Musyck boexken series, in which it would be required to set Dutch texts.

This new pica italic fount appears extensively in both TS 2 and 3\(^b\). TS 2\(^b\) uses it on the title page, for the entire index, and for headers throughout, while a large portion of the combined title page and index of TS 3\(^b\) is set in this fount (see Figure 7.7). The presence of the pica italic fount confirms the evidence provided by observations of wear to the woodcuts, to support the conclusion that these two reprints were produced no earlier than 1550–1551. A further detail from two of the EC motet series allows us to narrow the range of possible production dates even further. In the EC series, Susato confined himself to pica and/or Basel italics (except for title pages). He used English italic only on two occasions: for the signatures in the first edition of EC 1 and 2. EC 1 varies between the expected pica italic and English italic, while EC 2 has only a single instance of English italic, though transferred between voices.\(^{55}\) In EC 1, this cannot have been the result of foul case (the presence of sorts from another fount in the case, resulting from carelessness in replacing the type after printing); the consistent make-up of the respective signatures from eight different compartments of the case makes this impossible. A similar mixture of these two founts is also found in the signatures of TS 2\(^b\). We can infer that the case of English italic was being used for TS 2\(^b\) at the same time as EC 1 was being typeset. It is therefore probable that the editions TS 2–3\(^b\) date from early 1553, when Susato was beginning production of the EC series. In addition to the cumulative wear on ornamental initials, the use of Susato’s later house style (Basel italics for headers) in TS 4–6 and 8\(^b\) places them later still.\(^{56}\) However, there is no sign of the cracking evident in the large woodblock initial T found in the tenor partbook of Susato’s Lassus collection, TS 14 of 1555 (see Figure 7.8). Given that Susato was concentrating on producing motet books through 1553 and much of 1554 (if not the entire year), we may suppose that TS 4–6 and 8\(^b\) were reprinted in 1555, prior to TS 14.\(^{57}\)
Figure 7.7 Title page of TS 3° showing the extensive use of pica italic: *Le tiers livre de chansons a quatre parties* (Antwerp: Susato, ‘1544’ [actually c. 1553]), superius, A1’.
Source: Munich, Bayerische Staatsbibliothek, 4 Mus.pr. 201.

Figure 7.8 Comparison of ornamental initials between TS 4° and TS 14 of 1555.
Source: Munich, Bayerische Staatsbibliothek, 4 Mus.pr. 201.

(b) TS 14: *Le quartoiriesme livre à quatre parties* (Antwerp, 1555), tenor, A2’.
Source: Munich, Bayerische Staatsbibliothek, 4 Mus.pr. 135.
Summary

This reconsideration of Susato’s motet and chanson books and their reprints shows that he was less active as a printer in the 1540s than has previously been thought, but much more productive in the 1550s. The revised dates of production I propose here may still represent an under-estimate of his later activities. The pattern of production of EC collections in 1557, for instance, suggests that he produced more reprints than can currently be identified. Moreover, he may have produced a second edition of the first four books of Souterliedekens at some point. It is unclear whether Susato’s earlier, more limited output reflects the lack of a developed market or distribution network, or his own wish to balance printing with his other activities. Perhaps surprisingly, Susato did not take great assemblies as major marketing opportunities for series of newly issued reprints. It may be that his pace of production was too slow, and the consequent accumulation of invested capital and debt too great to make this an attractive proposition. In any case, the evident success of the EC motets would have made reliance on special occasions redundant; and by then Susato obviously had the means of effective dissemination regardless.

The later years of Susato’s printing office have at times been characterised as a period of decline in which he produced comparatively few new works. The dating of a complete edition of the EC books to 1553 means that he produced even fewer than previously thought. However, his emphasis on reprints highlights a necessary distinction, which may be applied more widely: from a modern perspective, a paucity of new works may make a printer’s output less immediately interesting, but that is not necessarily to be equated with decline. Repeat editions had decided advantages for the printer: he had no need to source fresh repertory or apply for a new privilege; a tested market; and no requirement for specialised editorial input. That made a reprint copied from a previous edition quicker and cheaper to produce, while the use of hidden editions allowed the printer to chisel his backers. Apparent decline can actually signal the continuing marketability of the original product with greater profit margins; in other words, commercial success.

More narrowly, the existence of redated and hidden editions – the choice of model in the latter case possibly determined simply by the books Susato had readily to hand – together with the presence of a mixture of sheets and editions within individual bindings, provides a frame in which to reconsider variants and problems of attribution, and in some cases explain them.

Finally, Susato’s success gave a commercially viable example for others to follow. It can be argued that Phalèse in particular was an imitator, rather than an independent rival. So by that very success, Susato indirectly enriched the common legacy well beyond his own specific contribution.

Appendix 7.1

Susato’s music and text founts

1. Music type 1: from 1543 onwards. Used for chanson books except for octavo Fleur 1–6; Missae 1–3 and SC 1–4.
2. Text type 1: English italic, mainly used with music type 1 for underlaid text in chanson books except for Fleur 1–6, prior to reprints (ii) (see Appendix 7.2), plus Missae 2 (1545).
4. Text type 2: pica italic. First dated use 1550, TS 13; mainly used for underlaid text with music type 2; also used with music type 1 in chanson reprints (ii) and TS 14.

5. Text type 3: Basel italic. First dated use August 1546, Missae 1; used for underlaid text only for Missae 1 and 3, and SC 1–4. Otherwise Text type 3 is used for title pages, some indexes, headers etc.

Changing/new sorts within founts

1. English italic ‘v’
   a) 1543–1545, TS 10:
   b) 1545, Missae 1; chansons 1549, TS 11 onwards:

```
vousvoye
```

2. Basel italic ‘v’ and ‘w’
   a) 1546–1547 and 1551 MB 2 to 1556:
   b) from October 1549, TS 11, to 1551, MB 1
   c) 1556, SL 1 onwards:
   d) ‘w’ from 1556 SL 1 (no earlier form):

```
vi
```
Appendix 7.2 Susato’s publications, other than Liber primus—XIII ecclesiasticarum cantionum

Estimated dates of undated or hidden editions are given in square brackets; dated editions without brackets.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Year</th>
<th>RISM siglum</th>
<th>Collection</th>
<th>Reprints (i)</th>
<th>Reprints (ii)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1543</td>
<td></td>
<td>Vingt et six chancons [sic] (TS 26)</td>
<td>[1549]</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1543 Nov.</td>
<td>154315</td>
<td>Premier livre des chancons [sic] a quatre (TS 1 etc.)</td>
<td>[1549–1550]</td>
<td>[1558]</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1544</td>
<td>S7238</td>
<td>Premier livre des chansons a troix (Susato) (TS Susato)</td>
<td>[1549–1550]</td>
<td>[1558]</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1544 Sept.</td>
<td>154410</td>
<td>Le second livre … a quatre</td>
<td>[1553]</td>
<td>[1558]</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1544</td>
<td>[1544]11</td>
<td>Le tiers livre … a quatre</td>
<td>[1553]</td>
<td>[1558]</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1544 Oct.</td>
<td>154412</td>
<td>Le quatriesme livre … a quatre</td>
<td>[1555]</td>
<td>[1558]</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1544 Dec.</td>
<td>154413</td>
<td>Le cincquesme livre … a cinq et a six</td>
<td>[1555]</td>
<td>[1558]</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1544 Dec./</td>
<td>154514</td>
<td>Le sixesme livre … a cinq et a six</td>
<td>[1555]</td>
<td>[1558]</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1545 Jan.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1545</td>
<td>154515</td>
<td>Le septiesme livre … a cinq et six</td>
<td>[1558]</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1545 May</td>
<td>154516</td>
<td>Le huitiesme livre … a quatre</td>
<td>[1555]</td>
<td>[1558]</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1545 July</td>
<td>M270</td>
<td>Le neufiesme livre … a quatre</td>
<td>[1558]</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1545 Aug.</td>
<td>154517</td>
<td>Le dixiesme livre</td>
<td>[1558]</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1546 Aug.</td>
<td>15463</td>
<td>Liber primus missarum</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1546</td>
<td>15464</td>
<td>Liber tertius missarum</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1546</td>
<td>15467</td>
<td>Liber secundus sacrarum cantionum quinque vocum1 (Sacrae cantiones / SC 2 etc.)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1546</td>
<td>15468</td>
<td>Liber primus sacrarum cantionum quinque vocum</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1547</td>
<td>15475</td>
<td>Liber tertius sacrarum cantionum quatuor vocum</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1547 March</td>
<td>15476</td>
<td>Liber quartus sacrarum cantionum quatuor vocum</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1549 Oct.</td>
<td>154920</td>
<td>L’unziesme livre … a quatre</td>
<td>[1558]</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1550</td>
<td>155013</td>
<td>Le douziesme livre … a cinq</td>
<td>R=15589</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1550</td>
<td>155014</td>
<td>Le treziesme livre … a six et a huit</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1551</td>
<td>155118</td>
<td>Het erste musyck boexken mit vier partyen (MB 1 etc.)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1551</td>
<td>155119</td>
<td>Het tveeste musyck boexken mit vier</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1551 S7238a</td>
<td></td>
<td>Het derde musyck boexken</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>[1552]</td>
<td></td>
<td>La fleur de chansons et premier livre a quatre (Fleur 1 etc.)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>[1552]</td>
<td>[1552]7</td>
<td>La fleur … second livre a quatre</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>[1552]</td>
<td>S7239</td>
<td>Tiers livre … a deux ou a troix2</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>[1552]</td>
<td>[1552]9</td>
<td>La fleur … quatriesme livre a quatre</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Year</td>
<td>RISM siglum</td>
<td>Collection</td>
<td>Reprints (i)</td>
<td>Reprints (ii)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>---------</td>
<td>-------------</td>
<td>------------------------------------------------</td>
<td>--------------</td>
<td>---------------</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1552 May</td>
<td>1552¹⁰</td>
<td>La fleur ... cincquiesme livre a troix</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1552 July</td>
<td>1552¹¹</td>
<td>La fleur ... sixiesme livre a troix</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1555</td>
<td>1555²⁹/¹⁹</td>
<td>Le quatoirsiesme livre ... a quatre/Il primo libro (Lassus)</td>
<td>[1557]</td>
<td>1560</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1556</td>
<td>C2708</td>
<td>Souterliedekens I Het vierde musyck boexken (Clemens) (SL 1/MB 4 etc.)</td>
<td>??³</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1556</td>
<td>C2709</td>
<td>Souterliedekens II (Clemens)</td>
<td>??</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1556</td>
<td>C2710</td>
<td>Souterliedekens III (Clemens)</td>
<td>??</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1557</td>
<td>C2711</td>
<td>Souterliedekens IIII (Clemens)</td>
<td>??</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1560</td>
<td>L763</td>
<td>Orlando di Lassus. Liber decimus quintus ecclesiasticarum cantionum</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1561</td>
<td>M2384</td>
<td>Souterliedekens V Het achste musyck boexken (Mes)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>ditto</td>
<td>Souterliedekens VI (Mes)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>ditto</td>
<td>Souterliedekens VII (Mes)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>ditto</td>
<td>Souterliedekens VIII (Mes)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

1. Typographical details show that SC 2 was printed before SC 1.
2. It is unclear whether or not this was intended as part of the Fleur series, but it is in the oblong octavo format found otherwise only in this series, and uses the same text and music founts introduced in 1550–1551.
3. See note 58 in this chapter; it is uncertain whether the series was reprinted, but it seems quite probable.

Appendix 7.3 Liber primus–XIII ecclesiasticarum cantionum

Known exemplars

CZ-AbK: EC 1–9
D-As: EC 1–12
D-B(i): EC 8–11:
D-B(ii) formerly Bds-Tü: EC 1–12
D-Kl: EC 1–14 (Q only for 12 & 14); https://orka.bibliothek.uni-kassel.de/viewer/
D-LÜh: EC 1–11 (S & Q)
D-Mbs: EC 1–7; https://www.digitale-sammlungen.de/
GB-Lbl EC 1–11 (ex. S: 6, 10–11); http://explore.bl.uk/
GB-En EC 1–8 (B)
H-BA: EC 7 & 10 (STQ)
NL-DH: EC 4–11 (A+SB for 5–7)
S-Sk: EC 5–11 (S)
S-Vx: EC 1–11 (ex S)
Us-Lu: EC 1–8
US-NYp: EC 1–11

Privately owned: EC 1–8 (T); sold at auction by Sotheby’s in 2011, present whereabouts unknown. To judge from information kindly supplied by Sotheby’s, it may be a companion partbook to GB-En.
**Brief distinguishing markers**

A(i): quatuor / quinque uocum; *Vulgo Moteta uocant ... copofitarum; M.D.LIII; Cum gratia & privilegio | | Cefāreæ Maiëtatis | | [Hedera]; headers in pica italic
A(ii): as A(i) with privilege: *Cum gratia & privilegio | | Cefāreæ Maiëtatis | | De Lange. | | [Hedera]; headers in Basel italic from EC 6 onwards
A(iii): as A(ii) with year: *M.D.LIII. All headers in Basel italic.
B(i): quinque uocum; *Vulgo Moteta uocant ... copofitarum; M.D.LV; Cum gratia & privilegio Cefāreæ | | Maie. Sub figne de Lange | | [Hedera] (EC 10–11 only)
B(ii): quatuor / quinque vocum; *Vulgo Moteta vocant ... copofitarum; M.D.LIII or M.D.LIII for hidden eds.; (privilege follows model in hidden ed.). *EC 9* has *Vetri* for *Veteri* of all earlier editions.

C: quinque vocum; *Vulgo Moteta vocant ... Compoſitarum. all in Basel italic.

---

**Exemplars by edition for those seen or for which information is available**

Sheets belonging to earlier editions than the remainder are shown thus: Voice [sig.]; the later reference is to be read as excluding any such sheets.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Ed. α</th>
<th>Ed. β</th>
<th>Ed. γ (part)</th>
<th>Ed. γ (part)</th>
<th>Ed. δ (part)</th>
<th>Ed. δ (part)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>A(i)</td>
<td>A(ii)</td>
<td>A(iii)</td>
<td>B(i) &amp; (ii)</td>
<td>B(ii)</td>
<td>C</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>EC 1</strong></td>
<td>D-As D-Kl</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>D-LUh D-Mbs</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>GB-En S-Vx</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Us-Lu US-NYp</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>EC 2</strong></td>
<td>D-As D-Kl</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>D-LUh D-Mbs</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>GB-Lbl GB-En</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>S-Vx Us-Lu</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>US-NYp</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>EC 3</strong></td>
<td>D-As D-Kl</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>D-LUh D-Mbs</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>GB-En S-Uu</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>S-Vx Us-Lu</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>US-NYp</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>EC 4</strong></td>
<td>see note 2</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>D-As D-Kl</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>D-LUh</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>D-Mbs GB-</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Lbl³ GB-En</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>S-Vx Us-Lu</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>US-NYp</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>EC 5</strong></td>
<td>C[a] &amp; All[c-d]:</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>D-As D-Kl(xQ)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>D-LUh D-Mbs</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>D-Mbs E-Mn</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>E-Mn GB-En</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>S-Sk S-Vx</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Us-Lu US-NYp</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>EC 6</strong></td>
<td>ST[c-d] C[a]:</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>D-As D-Kl</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>D-LUh D-Mbs</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>GB-Lbl S-Uu</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>GB-En S-Sk</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>S-Vx US-NYp</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Ed. α</td>
<td>Ed. β</td>
<td>Ed. γ (part)</td>
<td>Ed. γ (part)</td>
<td>Ed. δ (part)</td>
<td>Ed. δ (part)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>-------</td>
<td>-------</td>
<td>-------------</td>
<td>-------------</td>
<td>-------------</td>
<td>-------------</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>A(i)</td>
<td>A(ii)</td>
<td>A(iii)</td>
<td>B(i) &amp; (ii)</td>
<td>C</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>EC 7</strong></td>
<td>C[a]: D-As D-Kl</td>
<td>D-As D-Kl(xQ)</td>
<td>D-B(ii)</td>
<td>D-Kl(Q)</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>D-Mbs, GB-Lbl</td>
<td>D-LÜh D-Mbs</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>S-Vx Us-Lu</td>
<td>E-Mn GB-Lbl</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>US-NYP</td>
<td>GB-En S-Sk</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>S-Uu S-Vx</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Us-Lu US-NYP</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>EC 8</strong></td>
<td>C[a]: D-As D-Kl</td>
<td>D-As D-Kl(xQ)</td>
<td>D-B(ii)</td>
<td>D-Kl(Q)</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>D-Mbs GB-Lbl</td>
<td>D-LÜh D-Mbs</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>S-Vx Us-Lu</td>
<td>E-Mn GB-Lbl</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>GB-En S-Sk</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>S-Uu S-Vx</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Us-Lu</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>EC 9</strong></td>
<td>C[a]: D-As D-Kl</td>
<td>D-As D-Kl(xQ)</td>
<td>D-B(ii)</td>
<td>D-Kl(Q)</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>GB-Lbl S-Vx</td>
<td>D-LÜh E-Mn</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>US-NYP</td>
<td>GB-Lbl S-Sk</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>S-Uu S-Vx</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>US-NYP</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>EC 10</strong></td>
<td>C[a]: D-Kl</td>
<td>D-As D-Kl(xQ)</td>
<td>D-B(ii)</td>
<td>D-Kl(Q)</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>GB-Lbl S-Vx</td>
<td>D-LÜh E-Mn</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>US-NYP</td>
<td>GB-Lbl S-Sk</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>S-Uu S-Vx</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>US-NYP</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>EC 11</strong></td>
<td>C[a]: D-As D-Kl</td>
<td>D-As D-Kl(xQ)</td>
<td>D-B(ii)</td>
<td>D-Kl(Q)</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>GB-Lbl S-Vx</td>
<td>D-LÜh E-Mn</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>US-NYP</td>
<td>GB-Lbl S-Sk</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>S-Uu S-Vx</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>US-NYP</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>EC 12</strong></td>
<td>C[a]: D-As D-Kl</td>
<td>D-As D-B(ii)</td>
<td>D-B(ii) S-Uu</td>
<td>D-Kl(Q)</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>D-B(ii)</td>
<td>D-B(ii) S-Uu</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>? S[c]: D-As</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>D-As D-B(ii)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>D-Kl(Q)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>S-Uu</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>EC 14</strong></td>
<td>Q[a]: D-B(ii)</td>
<td>D-B(ii) S-Uu</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>D-Kl S-Uu</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

1 RISM entries for EC 4 at US-R & US-Wc are in error.
2 RISM notes exemplar(s?) of EC 4 with dates of 1553 in S & C. These are not in the copies seen. Nevertheless, early bibliographies give convincing evidence of a 1553 first edition. See for instance Becker, ‘Goudimel et son oeuvre’, 351.
3 See text regarding sheets in this exemplar and EC 7.
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Notes

1 RISM B/I 1542 and RISM A/I A1291. See Vissenaecck’s address to the reader (in the tenor part-book), and the privilege for Loys and Buys, in Thompson, ‘Henry Loys and Jehan de Buys’, 113.
2 Of particular relevance to this study are Meissner, *Antwerpener Notendrucker*; Forney, ‘Tielman Susato’; Forney, ‘New Insights’; Forney, ‘Orlando di Lasso’s “Opus 1”’; Cardamone and Jackson,
‘Multiple Formes’; Dehnert, ‘Libri’. It has been suggested that the ‘Kamper liedboek’ may have been printed in Antwerp c. 1535; see Fallows, ‘The Printed Songbook at Kampen’.

3 Susato resurrected the title for his 1560 reprint of Lassus’ motet collection (EC 15), first issued by Laet in 1556.

4 Meissner, *Antwerpener Notendrucker*, vol. 1, Section II.2; her variants list, 74, is partly inaccurate.


6 Forney, ‘New Insights’, 20. The original existence of EC 13 has been flatly denied (Bernet Kempers, ‘Die Sigel’, 108–109) or doubted (Dehnert, ‘Libri’, 1). Bernet Kempers’ unprovable assertion that it was omitted for superstitious reasons takes no account of the signatures, which make it clear that a thirteenth book was part of Susato’s plan, and hardly squares with the fact that Susato earlier printed TS 13. This particular superstition is in any event more recent: ‘Thirteen: unlucky number’, *A Dictionary of Superstitions*, gives for its earliest literature reference the year 1893.


8 See, for example, on EC 14: Bernet Kempers, ‘Die Sigel’; *Clemens non Papa: Omnia opera*, 4/13: vii; Forney, ‘Tielman Susato’, 103–104. Forney’s subsequent ‘Lassus “Op. 1”’, 42 n. 41, did recognise Meissner’s points, and put forward a brief hypothesis of an ‘atypical production method’. It is in some crucial respects incompatible with her later chronology quoted above.

9 Which would have made it 1554 in modern reckoning.

10 There is no published evidence, as far as I can find, to support the statement that several of the series were first printed in 1552.

11 An estimate given by a highly experienced modern compositor suggests that it would have taken three to four hours to set the title page and index of each partbook, amounting to twelve to sixteen hours’ work per five-voice collection if these elements were reset, plus additional time for proofing and corrections. Of course, this does not mean that minor elements might not be adjusted. Maintaining as much as possible of the title page between books would again result in worthwhile savings. For an example, even where much of the title pages were different, see TS 5 and 6 from 1544/5, especially the quinta & sexta pars of each. In referring to identical title pages, I take necessary changes for voice, series number and so on as read. When other work supervened, standing type might be cannibalised, so that only parts remained for reuse.

12 No resetting will ever reproduce exactly the distribution of individual type pieces with distinctive facets, damage or wear, even if the orthography is unaltered.

13 A single sheet represents a rather higher percentage of a modestly sized set of partbooks such as Susato’s, compared with one in a larger book; the cost implications of a cancel sheet would be correspondingly greater.

14 Voices were often worked in pairs, superior-tenor, contratenor-bassus, with the quinta pars taking set type from the others as convenient. Superior, rather than superius, was Susato’s own designation of the voice in almost all the EC series.

15 Relevant exemplars are identified in Appendix 7.2. Several can be compared online.

16 The variations go well beyond the small portion of the page shown in Figure 7.2: in swash letters, faults on other letters and so on.

17 That is taking account of the shrinkage of the paper on drying after its initial printing.

18 In addition, the signatures in this gathering of the superior are set in pica italic, not the Basel italic of all the other voices. There are further variants; for example, the gathering opens with the secunda pars of Barbion’s *Girum coeli*. In the superior, the text reads: ‘et thronus meus in columba [sic] nubis’; that in all the other voices is ‘et tronus meus in columna nubis’. The correction of ‘columba’ to ‘columna’ in the other voices also suggests that this gathering was printed earlier. While errors and variant spellings are to be found between voices in a single edition, they are likely to be significant in combination with the other distinguishing features.

19 See note 8; Bernet Kempers correctly pointed out the fact of a single edition in 1557/58.

20 In two partbooks ‘Liber XIII’ has been crudely altered by hand to read ‘XIII’, suggesting that someone, lacking EC 13, wanted to give the appearance of complete runs.

21 The CZ-AbK (Kroměříž Archepiscopal Castle library) copy of EC 9 has been catalogued under 1553. It may therefore represent a more complete survival, but I have been unable to verify the details.

22 The British Library online catalogue (accessed 31 January 2019) identifies the errant sheet in EC 7, but is incorrect in noting that it represents a different edition to GB-Lbl EC 4. It is the relative sheet in EC 4 that is aberrant. On the original binding, see Milsom, ‘The Nonsuch library’, 154–155.
Gathering E of EC 1 shows a marked divergence between the superior and the other three voices in both headings and some points of orthography. However, taking into account some peculiarities of the underlaid text, the initial letters and signatures, it seems likely the differences arose during the production of a single edition.

This supposition is strengthened by the later of these two editions’ indexing Manchicourt’s Ave stella matutina as Clemens’ Ave maris stella (probably confused with this motet in EC 6 when reprinting).

Compare, for example, the D-Kl and S-Uu exemplars.

‘Finis liber primus’; all the relevant copies seen have this altered to ‘Finis libri primi’, and so it was likely done in-house.

Again, other than in the later hidden edition.

Susato in EC 3 had listed composers, but the number of works meant the index had to be set in pica italic, a much more time-consuming process than using Basel italic.

The possible reasons for the mixture of hidden and truly dated editions within the corpus and the variation in privileges need more extensive discussion than can be accommodated here.

A comma within a line of type may seem a negligible difference, but in terms of practical printing and the reuse of standing type, it is far from being so.

Because of their apparent overlap, I have distinguished the hypothetical editions as in Table 7.3.

For example, the line ‘Antea nonquam excessis’ is set not in Basel italic, but in small Roman capitals; furthermore, the printer and address lines and privilege have been changed. Though the comparisons rest on rather more points, for two easily seen identifying details in what was carried across from EC 11 to EC 1 δ, and then to 3 δ and 12, see the faults on the second C and first A in ECCLESIASTICARVM.

In addition, the Basel italic ‘w’ sort appears in EC 2, 5 and 8 δ, as well as in EC 12 δ.

The printer/address line and date are clear and indicative.

‘quatuor vocum’ is from the same type in both EC 1 and 3 δ. The change to ‘quinque vocum’ for EC 12 δ must have come after EC 3 δ.

The three lines Vulgo Moteta vocant … are possibly identical, but certainly respaced if so.

See again the printer/address line and date. The distinctive spacing mentioned in the previous note is also still evident.

The balance of the evidence suggests that EC 13 was printed between EC 8 δ and 14 δ, but in the absence of a known exemplar, this hypothesis cannot be validated.

The date is unclear on my reproduction. I take it from Horstmann, Katalog, 284.

Appendix 7.2 shows that many of the surviving exemplars of the earlier editions contain an identical mixture of aberrant sheets. One possible reason for this, in part at least, is that Susato may have been printing his second and third editions while sheets from the first were still in his warehouse or that of a significant distributor. It is easy to imagine new sheets sometimes being placed on top of the relevant pile, but at other times being more carefully put underneath any remaining sheets from earlier. Then, when sheets were collated for sale or further distribution, they would all be taken off the top, resulting in a number of exemplars with the same make-up, and sheets being used some time after they were produced.

I have been unable to see a copy of the F-CH partbook of Fleur 2, which might offer clues as to its dating.

Forney, ‘Tielman Susato’, 191–192, Table 11, summarises the editions for most of the exemplars then known. I base my comments on the relevant exemplars at D-Mbs and GB-Lbl. The RISM opac listings (accessed 31 January 2019) do not include copies of TS 1–3 or 8 at E-Bbc or TS Susato at B-A. Forney identified the second edition from the corrections to Susato’s initially idiosyncratic index numbering of folios. His use of fonts supports Forney’s categorisation. On her dating of the second and third editions, see ‘New Insights’, 9–10, 20.

If Susato’s Basel italic was cut specifically for him, it might help explain the prolonged gap between Missae 2 and Missae 1.

Sacrae cantiones 2, printed before Sacrae cantiones 1, uses Roman type for the index.

Idle periods, though not quite so extended, occur earlier in Susato’s output. Even so, the press might not actually have been unproductive; presses could be rented out to other printers, and printers might take on subcontract work.

The documents are in Meissner, *Antwerpener Notendrucker*, 2: 159; Forney, *Tielman Susato*, 252–258. The relevant ordinance forbade any printing whatsoever without a general privilege; then, before being printed, each individual book required the grant of a specific octroi, which depended on official approvals – both ecclesiastical and lay – of its contents; music was not exempt in any way, nor was retrospective approval countenanced. Sale and distribution could only take place once a printed copy had been lodged with, and checked by, the authorities as conforming to the permissions: *Mandement de Limperiale Maieste* (Louvain: van Sassen, 1546), sigs. B[i]r–Biir.

The punishment for an admitted printer breaching the ordinance was, by the letter at least, death and loss of all privileges (to avoid heritable value). The circumstances do not suggest bureaucratic delay, such as mentioned by Plantin rather later and under very different conditions (see Correspondance de Christophe Plantin, 4: 190–191, no. 579, dated 31 October 1574). Had this been the usual timescale, Susato would have known to date his edition later to avoid the appearance of flouting the regulations, especially after his recent difficulties with the authorities. However, Plantin’s letter confirms that printers were extremely careful, at least later, to have their specific privileges in hand before beginning production.

Earlier, Susato seems to have relied heavily on the Imperial chapel as a source of repertory; see Ham, *Crecquillon*.

For a brief description, see Strong, *Art and Power*, 89–90.


PL-Kj has a complete set (Mus. ant. pract. 1811) which, from information kindly supplied by the library, appears to be from the same edition as the tenor partbook in GB-Lbl.

Although inking and impression can lead to apparent variations even within a single book, the blocks appear sufficiently often in these and later editions to rule out such factors.

Forney, *Tielman Susato*, 109, 129, identifies it as Italic 13 from Vervliet, *Sixteenth-Century Printing Types*, 306–307. Forney gives the twenty-line measure of solid type as 70 mm. My measurement of Susato’s pica italic, taken over three different books, averages 82 mm (80 mm based on the longest ascenders/descenders). Besides individual letter forms that are quite distinct, the proportions of the Steelsius fount are noticeably different. (Examples can be compared online in the digital library of D-Mbs.) Forney provides no reconciliation between her identification and date of the fount and her dating of the second edition.

The explicits to TS 13 show that Susato originally began printing it as his twelfth book, but TS 12 leapfrogged it during production. Incorrect explicits in TS 13 (S/T/Q) were not simply carried over in error from TS 12; they are distinct. What might have led Susato to delay its completion is unclear. Evidence from earlier books suggests that the sheet bearing the dedication was often printed last. Here that voice, the bassus, carries no date on the title page or on the dedication itself. If there had been problems with securing his patronage, the printed date could conceivably be too early.

The fount used for an individual signature in the EC books was occasionally varied between Basel and pica italics to facilitate placing the furniture in the chase. The variants here are far more extensive and seemingly unrelated to a practical matter such as this, and with a fount not elsewhere used.

TS 5β (GB-Lbl), gathering C in the contratenor book comes from the first edition of 1544.

The distribution of type after EC 9 of 1554 also suggests that Susato needed it for other things before he went on to print EC 10–11.

Much of the title page for SL 1–3 was in common, but not transferred to SL 4. The single surviving exemplar of SL 4 may represent a different edition; alternatively, Susato may have interrupted the printing of the set to produce other books. Given his general practice, the former possibility seems more probable.

See note 29; to anticipate later discussion, aspects of Susato’s hidden editions lead me to conclude that a degree of financial chicanery or manipulation was involved.
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Over the course of more than forty-five years, the famous music-printing shop of Phalèse in Antwerp was run by the sisters Madeleine Phalèse (1586–1652) and Marie Phalèse (1589–c. 1675), usually under the joint imprint ‘Heirs of Phalèse’.¹ Like their grandfather Pierre Phalèse I (c. 1505/10–1573/6) and their father Pierre Phalèse II (c. 1545–1629), the sisters devoted themselves solely to printing and publishing music. In another respect, they were different from many other women music printers in Northern Europe, in that they inherited the printing house from their father, rather than taking over the business from their late husbands.² Despite the rather modest size of the printing house, their production was considerable; indeed, in this chapter we will show that it was significant larger than previously estimated. In addition to the printing office, the Phalèse bookshop constituted a nodal point in a large network of distribution of all kinds of music throughout the Low Countries and other areas of Northern Europe.

Women music printers in early modern Europe

The printing business was one area of production in early modern Europe where women played an important and visible role in the urban community. This is also true for a sub-branch of the industry, the music-printing business. In sixteenth-century Nuremberg, Kunigunde Hergot (d. 1547) ran the family’s printing firm, at first together with her first husband Hans Hergot. After Hans’ death in 1526, Kunigunde printed under her own name until 1538, even after her remarriage.³ Another woman printer in the same city with a large musical output was Katharina Gerlach (c. 1515/20–1592), one of the best known early female music printers.⁴ In the eighteenth century, many women ran a music-printing business together with their husbands and sons; in several cases, the widow issued music under her own name after the death of her husband. Of eighteenth-century women printers, Maria Helena Volland (1710–1791) in Nuremberg, and Johanna van Rhee (c. 1730–1801) in Amsterdam probably had the most extensive output of printed music. Volland printed music under her own name over two decades, and Van Rhee continued to run the printing shop with her son after her husband’s death in 1781.⁵

Antwerp was not only one of the most vibrant commercial centres in seventeenth-century Europe; it also had a long history of women who took an active and independent part in commercial life. The Italian Ludovico Guicciardini noted in his description of the Low Countries from 1567 that in Antwerp, women were

often going about their business unaccompanied, not only within the town but also frequently across country from one town to another with very little company and yet without incurring blame. They are assuredly most serious and most active: dealing not only with
domestic matters, with which very few men have to do, but concerning themselves with buying and selling goods, and property, and turning both hand and voice to all the masculine concerns [...].

The fact that the sisters Phalèse ran a printing house was thus nothing extraordinary. The guild of St Luke, to which Antwerp printers and bookshop owners belonged, accepted women. From the archives of the printing house Plantin, where the documentary material is richer than that for other printers, we know that at least two of the daughters of Christophe Plantin ran a trading business at the age of 15 to 17, although in this case their activity was not specifically connected to printing.

Madeleine and Marie Phalèse

The Phalèse music-printing firm was established by Pierre Phalèse I (c. 1505/10–1573/6) at Leuven in 1546. His son Pierre Phalèse II (c. 1545–1629) continued its activities after the transfer of the printing house to Antwerp in 1581. Pierre Phalèse II had four daughters and one son, all born in Antwerp:

1 Barbara Phalèse, born between 1583 and 1585, married Jean de Vos on 20 July 1610. They had four children, among them the daughter Maria de Vos and the son Jan Baptista de Vos. She died before 1652.
2 Madeleine Phalèse, baptised on 25 July 1586, died 30 May 1652 and buried 3 June 1652.
3 Marie Phalèse, baptised 10 December 1589, married Édouard de Meyer on 1 February 1615, with whom she had two daughters, Marie de Meyer and Elisabeth de Meyer; she died c. 1675.
4 Pierre Phalèse, baptised 20 July 1594, became an Augustinian friar and died on 25 March 1671.
5 Anne Phalèse, baptised 18 July 1603, never married and died before 1652.

On the death of Pierre Phalèse on 13 March 1629, his daughters took over the family business and started to print in their own name. In the records of the St Luke’s guild from 1629, ‘the daughters of Phalèse, book dealers’ (‘De dochters van Walesius, bockvercopers [sic]’), are included in the list of the ‘sons of masters’ (‘meesterssonen’). The designation ‘Phalèse’s daughters’ suggests a joint enterprise. From the beginning of 1629, Phalèse editions were issued under the plural imprint of the ‘Heirs of Phalèse’. Madeleine and Marie were probably both involved in the printing office and the bookshop from the beginning. Their joint involvement in the retail business is indicated by the fact that both sisters delivered music books to St Jacob’s church from 1632. Madeleine probably had a more conspicuous role for the printing house than her married sister. She signed two of the very few introductory texts included in the Phalèse editions, both printed in 1640. Madeleine pleaded for money for the publication of Gilles Hayne’s Motetti sacri (Antwerp, 1646) in a letter to Wolfgang Wilhelm, Count Palatine of Neuburg (1578–1653), which suggests that she managed the financial aspects of the business. In the late 1640s and early 1650s, some of the editions appeared under the imprint ‘Madeleine Phalèse and joint-heirs’ (‘Magdalena Phalesia & cohaeredes’), and another few under Madeleine Phalèse’s single name, which indicates that by then, she had main responsibility for the printing business. After Madeleine’s death in May 1652, Marie continued to run the firm, using the ‘heirs of Phalèse’ imprint. In the records of the guild of St Luke from September 1652, a ‘Miss
Phalèse’ (‘Jouffr. Valeseus’), not specified by her first name, is listed among the sons of the masters; this most likely refers to Marie. She signed the dedication to Jan-Baptist Halbos included in a publication from 1663. The last known edition from the ‘Heirs of Phalèse’ was printed in 1675. Marie probably died soon afterwards. Nothing suggests that the two sisters Barbara and Anne had any decisive role in the printing business. The brother, Pierre Phalèse, was an Augustinian friar (ordo eremitarum). A piece of occasional music by him was printed at the family’s printing house in 1662.

When the two sisters Phalèse took over the family’s printing house in 1629, they were forty and forty-three years old respectively. They had probably both been actively involved in the business before that point. They must have been trained early in the skills necessary to run a printing house and bookshop. We can compare this to the Plantin family, even if their printing business was considerably larger. For example, Christophe Plantin’s five daughters, from the age of four or five until twelve, had to do proofreading. Since Pierre Phalèse was skilled in music, he likely trained his daughters to read music, a skill that would become useful in their later business.

**Printing music**

The Phalèse firm was one of the few in the Low Countries solely dedicated to printing music. Its stock of rare music typefaces was crucial for the business. Typefaces were generally passed on together with other technical equipment through marriage or inheritance. Typefaces could also be sold or traded in business negotiations. In Nuremberg, Katharina Gerlach used a music typeface she inherited from her former husband, which had earlier been used by the firm of Berg & Neuber. Berg probably had the typeface from Formschneider or Petreius, who both were type cutters. In the same way, Madeleine and Marie had all the equipment from their father, together with the printing press. Pierre Phalèse II used at least three different typefaces for music printing. The typefaces for printing lute tablature were no longer used from the beginning of the seventeenth century, neither was the larger music type. According to the estate inventory from 1655, at that point the firm had 829 pounds (around 400 kg) of type, although this would have included ordinary non-music typefaces for the text underlay as well. From 1629 to 1675, the Phalèse firm seems to have used only one typeface for all the music it printed. As Anne Tatnall Gross observes, as early as 1626, before the death of Pierre Phalèse II, the type was already ‘badly worn’; during the following decades, the ‘printing materials became increasingly shabby’, even if some type and initial letters were replaced in the middle of the century. This judgement contrasts with remarks on the quality of the printing of the Heirs of Phalèse made by the musician and music collector Sébastien de Brossard in his *Cabinet de musique* (1724). He found the quality of the printing of the Heirs of Phalèse to be generally good, and particularly praised the bar lines. By contrast, Brossard disliked Italian printed editions. ‘Not excessively well printed’ (‘Pas trop bien imprimé’) was his laconic remark on a print from the printer Sala in Venice. Regarding an Italian edition that he considered well-made, Brossard adds that this contrasted with other printed music from Italy.

After the death of Marie in or after 1675, Lucas de Potter (c. 1632–1681) took over the equipment of the Phalèse printing firm, using the same typeface, though printing music under his own name. Potter expanded the palette of typefaces owned by the printing house when he married the widow of the printer Hendrik Aerissons II (1622–1663). After Potter’s death, his widow ran the firm for some more years before her son, Hendrik III
Aertssens, took over the printing business. He used the same music typeface, although with some new type, until 1708. The further history of this music type is obscure.

Tatnall Gross draws the conclusion that the Phalèse firm, from its beginning in the sixteenth century until the death of Marie in or after 1675, had only one printing press. This seems consistent with the known output of the firm between 1629 and 1675, as discussed below. On average, the printing press of Phalèse thus printed at least one edition every two months. It is not known how many workers were needed to manage the printing activity, or how many staff were employed in the activities of the bookshop. The estate inventory from 1655 includes a record of the ‘monthly cost for working wages for the servants who worked in the printing office’, but as this cost is combined with other costs for the household, it is difficult to estimate the sum, and to establish the number of workers.

The output of the Phalèse printing house 1629–1675

Based on information in present catalogues, 158 editions printed by the Heirs of Phalèse are known to have survived. Some are not yet included in the RISM catalogue. The preservation status for these editions is generally poor. More than half of the editions have survived only in a single set of part books. Most sets lack one or several of the original partbooks. Approximately 150 sets of parts survive in an incomplete state, another seventy appear intact, while it has not been possible to determine the preservation status of the rest. Considering the poor preservation of these sets, it is relevant to ask how many editions that once have existed are now completely lost, without a single surviving part book. In order to answer this question, I have examined inventories and library catalogues which list material now lost. These inventories and catalogues (shown in Table 8.1, Appendix) attest to the existence of more than seventy-five editions that are now lost.

In many cases, the former existence of a now lost edition is attested by entries in more than one catalogue or inventory. Three key data are necessary to identify a lost edition: title, year of printing and place. The title of course identifies the work in question; the year of printing distinguishes separate editions; and the place of printing differentiates Antwerp editions from those printed elsewhere, especially when the titles are identical or very similar. In many cases, the identity of the printer is included in the record, but where it is not, the presence of repertoire typical for this firm, or music by composers frequently represented in Phalèse editions, can allow us to attribute further editions to this firm with a degree of certainty.

Counting extant and lost editions, we can thus identify more than 230 editions, distributed over 160 titles, as listed in Table 8.2 in the Appendix. This gives a fairly accurate picture of the total output of the firm during this period. The non-surviving editions constitute 32% of total known production. This is consistent with other estimates of the rate of loss of printed music from this time. Rudolf Rasch estimates that about 30% of all editions printed in the Low Countries in the early seventeenth century have not survived. In case of the Ballard library in Paris, Laurent Guillo suggests that 21% of the editions listed in the inventory have not survived.

The production of the Heirs of Phalèse seems to have peaked at the beginning of the 1640s; in 1640 alone they issued eleven editions. The overall production decreased in the 1670s: only fifteen editions were issued in the years between 1670 and 1675 (see Figure 8.1). The production of the Heirs of Phalèse was modest compared to that of other early modern music printers. Katharina Gerlach, for example, issued about 150 music editions and treatises during a ten year period (1565–1575), and her output even increased in the 1570s and 1580s.
Repertoires: selection and editing

The repertoire issued by the Heirs of Phalèse includes sacred and secular, vocal and instrumental music by composers active in the region of Low Countries, in addition to music by Italian, French and English composers. The share of Italian music is remarkably high: almost half of all editions comprised music by Italian composers, as discussed below. Although the Phalèse sisters most likely had musical skills and knowledge, they probably had assistance in selecting and editing the music. In the case of anthologies, the role of the editor is central. Considering the limited number of anthologies issued by the sisters, it seems that they did not favour this medium. Some of the anthologies were more or less exact reprints of anthologies issued earlier, by their father or by Italian printers. Nevertheless, the small number of anthologies edited at Antwerp between 1629 and 1675 reveals something of the sisters’ network of suppliers and co-workers.

The only edition that names the editor on the title-page is a collection of Flemish songs published by Marie Phalèse in 1663. The editor, Jan-Baptist Halbos, was a tradesman and an amateur musician. The dedication suggests that Halbos supported the printing house financially, but he could also have been of significance for the firm in his role as tradesman.

Rudolf Rasch and Henri Vanhulst have discussed the question of editorship in the cases of the anthologies Livre septième des chansons and Cantiones natalitae, both successful enterprises, to judge from the number of reprints. Rasch shows that the addition of new compositions to an anthology, often at the end of the volume, often can be interpreted as ‘the editor’s signature’. Moreover, Rasch convincingly argues that Guilielmus Messaus (1589–1640), singer and choirmaster at St Walburgis’, Antwerp, lay behind the Livre septième edition of 1636, as well as the Laudes vespertinae, issued several times from 1629 and 1648. The relationship between Messaus and the Phalèse firm was of long standing. Pierre Phalèse I consulted Messaus, and his daughters printed a volume of his masses in 1633. In 1635, the sisters also issued a volume of motets for the church year by Messaus. Messaus was involved in the two editions of Italian music in the new concertato style.
issued by the sisters in the 1630s, containing motets by Giovanni Battista Ala. Messaus was possibly also involved in the compilation of an anthology of Marian music printed in 1636, although he was only one of several local composers represented in the volume.

Further musicians in the circle of the Phalèse printing house possibly played a role in the selection and publishing of music at the firm, beyond supplying their own music. Anthonis Vermeeren (b. 1618, d. after 1667), organist and choirmaster at St Philip and St Jacob, Antwerp, had at least three volumes of his own music issued by the sisters. Compositions by Vermeeren also appear at the end of an anthology issued by the sisters in 1661, which otherwise reproduced the Roman motets contained in the Italian original. Another figure close to the sisters was Philippus van Steelant (1644–1670), organist at St Jacob’s church. Apart from his Op. 1, Missae et motetta (1654/1656, RISM A/1S 4726), compositions by van Steelant were included in an anthology of masses, in the volume edited by Halbos mentioned above, and in three different editions of Cantiones natalitiae. Another person who was probably significant for the musical production by the Heirs of Phalèse was the musician and composer Gilles Hayne (1590–1650), superintendent of the musical establishment of Wolfgang Wilhelm of Neuburg from 1638 onwards. Hayne had four volumes of music published by the Heirs of Phalèse in the 1640s. As mentioned above, Madeleine Phalèse tried to attract financial support from Wolfgang Wilhelm to cover the printing costs of Hayne’s work. Hayne may have acted as mediator between the Phalèse sisters and the two Italian composers Giovanni Pietro Finatti (dates unknown) and Biagio Marini (1594–1663), who both worked at the Palatine court in Neuburg and Düsseldorf, to negotiate the publication of their music by the Phalèse firm.

Besides these few anthologies, the Phalèse sisters devoted themselves largely to volumes by single composers. Coincidentally, Katharina Gerlach also started her career with anthologies and collections of hymns, but after her break with Neuber, she focussed on volumes by single composers, such as by Orlando di Lasso.

The bookshop

Antwerp printers traditionally controlled all parts of printing and distribution, with no clear division between producer and seller. In many cases, it is more relevant to speak of the activities of the bookshop than the printing office. Indeed, many members designated as booksellers in the records of the guild of St Luke were also printers. Information on the location of the shop usually constituted part of the imprint, often indicated by the word ‘apud’ (‘at the house of’). Most of the printing shops in Antwerp were located in the same district of the city; the Phalèse firm was located ‘ad insigne Davidis Regis’ (‘at the sign of King David’) in the Corte Cammerstraete.

The Phalèse sisters had a broad network, and delivered music directly to individuals and institutions within Antwerp and beyond, in such places as Duffel, Lier, Waasmunster, Mechelen, Brussels, Ghent, Bruges, Liège, Termonde, Hasselt, Huy, Corsendonck, Tournai, Scherpenheuvel, Douai, Lieveuarden, Lille, Aelst, Tongres, Eindhoven, Dinant, Gheel, Ypres, Oudenaarde, Utrecht, Rotterdam and Amsterdam. The firm had also a significant network of distributors. The inventory of the estate lists different printing houses who had received books – presumably music printed by the Phalèse firm – but had not yet paid for them: Jean van Geertsom and Pierre van Waesberghe in Rotterdam, Thierry van Ackersdyck and Gisbert van Zyll in Utrecht, Pauwels Matthyssens in Amsterdam, François Foppens in Brussels, Balthasar Bellere in Douai, Alexandre Sersanders in Ghent, Andreas Quinque in Tournai, as well as other printer-booksellers active in Antwerp.
Apart from selling music printed by their own firm, music printers in early modern Europe also sold music issued by other printers. In his printing shop in early seventeenth-century Douai, Balthasar Bellère sold titles printed by other printers in the Low Countries, including Pierre Phalèse II and the Heirs of Phalèse, in addition to music printed in Italy, France and Germany. At the end of the century, another famous printing house, that of Estienne Roger in Amsterdam, sold printed music from Bologna, Venice and Antwerp. The Italian editions Roger sold in his shop did not contain the same music as the ones he reprinted himself; rather, the repertoires were complementary.

The Heirs of Phalèse probably also sold music printed by other firms. While other printing houses produced music as one activity among others, the Phalèse family was one of the few in the region who devoted themselves solely to music printing. Their printing shop would thus have constituted an obvious centre for music trade in the Antwerp region. Over the course of almost one year (from 13 August 1652 until 8 July 1653), the Phalèse firm sold music books to the value of 1,116 Gulden and 19 Stuivers. The Phalèse estate inventory records a stock of music books worth 3,129 Gulden, almost € 30,000 in purchasing power today. Unfortunately, no list of the contents of these music books has survived, but it presumably contained of music by other printers, including music printed abroad. Since paper often was the most expensive part of printing activity, printers tended to print a limited number of copies of an edition, producing a second edition only when there was an apparent demand. This suggests that printing houses did not store many copies of their own editions.

Much of the foreign printed music surviving in collections in England and Northern Europe was probably bought in bookshops like that of Phalèse in the Southern Netherlands and the Dutch Republic. A musical manuscript copied by the English composer Matthew Locke was probably compiled in Antwerp. The volume includes several Italian pieces, many copied from editions issued by the Heirs of Phalèse. Other Italian pieces included in Locke’s volume suggest that he had access to Italian editions in Antwerp.

The Italian music

A significant part of the total output of the Phalèse firm during the entire period under examination was devoted to Italian music. More than a hundred of the known editions, constituting more than half of the entire output, contain music by Italian composers. Italian music had been printed (or reprinted) in various parts of Europe from the sixteenth century onwards. Many publications containing Italian music were anthologies issued in Germany or the Southern Netherlands by publishers such as Pierre Phalèse II. The existence of several reprints suggests that his editions were successful and attractive. When reissuing Italian collections, Pierre Phalèse II often reproduced the contents more or less exactly as in their Italian originals. His daughters largely followed this practice. Not only was the content of the volumes the same as in the originals; it was often presented with similar disposition and layout, including elements such as page breaks. As Rudolf Rasch points out, the use of terms such as ‘piracy’ or ‘unauthorized editions’ at this period seems inappropriate, as it presupposes the existence of international regulations or laws that did not exist in Early Modern Europe. Instead of dismissing this production as ‘piracy’, it seems more important to highlight the significant role of the Phalèse sisters in the dissemination of Italian music in Northern Europe.

At the beginning of our period, the Italian music printed by the Phalèse sisters consisted in reissues of music previously printed by their father. Most of these editions appeared
in the years following Pierre’s death in 1629, reproduced by his daughters more or less unchanged. Soon the sisters embarked on printing Italian music in the new concertato style, mainly small-scale sacred concerti for a few voices, often accompanied by obbligato instruments besides basso continuo. In 1633–1634, the sisters issued their first editions of music in the new style: Giovanni Battista Ala’s first and second book of Concerti ecclesiastici, originally issued in Venice in 1618 and 1621. The two collections were reprinted in Antwerp in 1633 and 1634 under the name of *Luscinia sacra* and *Pratum musicum*. This early group of issues of such new repertoire also included three books of motets (Op. 4–6) by Francesco Colombini, first published by Vincenti at Venice in the 1620s. The sisters reprinted them at Antwerp in 1638–1639, again with new titles. Further composers followed: Giovanni Rovetta, Paolo Cornetti, Giovanni Legrenzi, Gaspari Casati, Maurizio Cazzati, Francesco della Porta, Orazio Tarditi and Francesco Foggia. A few Italian anthologies were also reprinted at Antwerp in their entirety by the Heirs of Phalèse: Sacra corona motetti, edited by Bartolomeo Marcesso (Venice: F. Magni, 1656), RISM B/I 16561, reprinted with the same title (Antwerp: Phalèse, 1659), RISM B/I 16592; Scelta di motetti, edited by Antonio Poggioli (Rome: L. Grignani, 1647), RISM B/I 16471, reprinted as *Delectus sacrarum cantionum* (Antwerp: Phalèse, 1652), not in RISM; and one of the many anthologies edited by Florido de Silvestris, *Florida Verba a celeberrimis muices auctoribus* (Rome: G. B. Robletti, 1648), RISM B/I 16481 and 16494, reprinted with the same title (Antwerp: Phalèse, 1661), RISM B/I 16611.

This repertory was apparently attractive, as testified by the multiple editions. Eleven titles containing Italian music printed by the Heirs of Phalèse were reprinted at least a second time. Thanks to shorter distances and established trade routes, it was probably cheaper to buy Antwerp editions than their Italian equivalents in Northern Europe. The esteem enjoyed by these composers of ‘very good taste’ ('très bon gout') north of the Alps is testified by Sébastien de Brossard, in his remarks on the music issued by the Phalèse sisters. Brossard described the music of Francesco della Porta as ‘good and excellent music which cannot be praised too highly’ ('bonne et excellente musique et on ne peut trop la louer'). The music of Giovanni Pietro Finatti was ‘gracious and sweet, and in a word worthy of good taste’ ('gracieuse et moëlleuse, en un mot digne du bon goût'). For Brossard, Maurizio Cazzati was ‘one of the most fertile geniuses of his century’ ('un des genies les plus feconds de son siècle'). The music of Francesco Petrobelli was ‘in very good taste throughout’ ('le tout de tres bon goû').

The freshness of the music when it was reissued in Antwerp probably became increasingly important during our period. The sisters’ first editions of Italian music had been published in Italy more than ten years earlier. By contrast, in the 1640s and the 1650s the sisters reprinted music from Italy more swiftly after its original publication, indicating both the market for up-to-date Italian music in Northern Europe, and improved supply from Italian printing houses.

Most titles reprinted in Antwerp were selected from the production of the two famous Venetian printing firms Vincenti (more than half of the total) and Gardano/Magni. The Phalèse sisters possibly had the Italian printing catalogues at hand in Antwerp, and could plan their acquisitions. They probably also had help from suppliers with the delivery of the music from Italy. The estate inventory lists a tradesman named van Eyck, who had ‘collected and delivered Italian music books and arranged for their carriage from Italy’, to a sum of 53 Gulden. This record might refer to Italian editions used as originals when preparing the Antwerp editions, as well as imported Italian music to be sold in the Phalèse printing shop. The contacts might also have sent rare Italian music disseminated solely in
When the anthology Scelta di mottetti de diversi eccellentissimi autori (ed. Poggioli, Rome: L. Grignani, 1647) was reprinted at Antwerp in 1652, an additional piece by Giacomo Carissimi, Egredimini caelestis curiae, was included. As this motet had not been included in any printed edition up to that point, the sisters must have had the music in manuscript, unless of course it was transmitted in a now lost edition. Since Carissimi’s music circulated only within a narrow circle around the composer, the inclusion of this motet in the Phalèse edition suggests that they had well-informed and well-connected mediators.84

Besides the geographical aspect of this transfer are elements of social and confessional transfer. In the Low Countries, Italian sacred motets and concerti were used in church in the Roman Catholic context, while in Calvinist areas, the same repertoire might be performed in bourgeois private circles and in Collegia Musica, thus preserving the Calvinist border between religious services and domestic music-making.85 Lutheran musicians and Kapellmeisters also employed small-scale Italian sacred motets within Lutheran services. Indeed, several copies of Phalèse editions of Italian music have survived in collections and libraries of Lutheran institutions in Northern Europe.86 Italian music also circulated in northern Europe in manuscript, nearly all copied from printed editions, including reprints issued by the Heirs of Phalèse. This is evident when examining extant seventeenth-century music collections, such as the music libraries of the Swedish Hofkapellmeisters (the Düben collection), and the cantors in Grimma (Grimma collection).87 It becomes even more apparent when we take into account lost music whose existence is recorded in catalogues and inventories.88 Although it is often difficult to establish the sources from which manuscripts were copied, the fact that so much of the Italian music that circulated in manuscript occurs in editions reprinted in Antwerp suggests that in many cases the Antwerp editions probably served as originals. In seventeenth-century England, the Phalèse editions of Italian music were even more decisive. Indeed, almost half of the extant copies of Phalèse editions with Italian music survive in libraries in Great Britain.89 This dominance is also patent when we consider manuscript music. Of the thirteen ‘favourite copy-sources’ from which English music scribes selected Italian music, seven were published in Southern Netherlands; of these, six were produced by the Heirs of Phalèse.90

The recontextualisation of this repertoire, as it was relocated from Antwerp to the Dutch Republic or to Lutheran institutions in Northern Europe, provides a key to understanding how this transfer was possible. Antwerp’s placement was essential for the processes of cultural and confessional transfer. The confessionally liminal area of the Low Countries was conducive to a transfer from Roman Catholic regions to Protestant ones. From Antwerp, books and printed material were easily transferred for sale in the Dutch Republic.

Summary

In this chapter we have seen that the total output of the printing house of Phalèse, while it was run by Madeleine and Marie Phalèse, was significantly more extensive than previously estimated. The small printing office, with probably only one printing press, constituted one of the nodes of the dissemination of music in Antwerp and beyond. The Phalèse sisters not only printed music; at the same time they also ran a significant business for the sale and trade of printed music through a large network. They also became key mediators of Italian sacred music to Protestant institutions in Northern Europe. For nearly fifty years straddling the middle of the seventeenth century, the Heirs of Phalèse, under the guidance of the sisters Madeleine and Marie, continued the tradition begun by their
grandfather, combining traditional typographical materials inherited from the first decades of single-impression printing with a keen sense for changes in musical taste among their customers in the Southern Netherlands and far beyond.

Appendix

Table 8.1 Catalogues and inventories containing entries of now lost editions, which contribute to a reconstruction of the estimated total output of the Heirs of Phalèse, 1629–1675

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Person/institution</th>
<th>Type of source</th>
<th>Date</th>
<th>Literature</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>De la Fage</td>
<td>Sales catalogue</td>
<td>1862</td>
<td>Catalogue de la bibliothèque musicale de feu J. A. de La Fage. Traités généraux et spéciaux sur la théorie de la musique et de la composition; histoire; biographie; œuvres de musique pratique de divers genres; partitions, etc.; liturgie et plain chant; ouvrages sur l’art dramatique et le théâtre, etc., etc., etc. Paris: L. Potier, 1862.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Rudolf Rasch. ‘How much is lost, or Do we know what we don’t know? Observations on the loss of printed music from the seventeenth and eighteenth centuries’. In Album amicorum Albert Dunning in occasione del suo 65 compleanno. Edited by G. Fornari. Brepols: Turnhout, 2002, 461–494. (Continued)
Table 8.1 continued

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Person/institution</th>
<th>Type of source</th>
<th>Date</th>
<th>Literature</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>P. Gerotton, D. Moillerus, Livinus Perquin</td>
<td>Sales catalogue</td>
<td>1771</td>
<td>Catalogue d’une nombreuse collection de livres, choisis, curieux et rares en toutes sortes de langues et facultés, delaissses par feu Monsieur P. GEROTTON, Dr. En Droit, Mr. D. MOILLERUS, Dr en Medecine, et MR. LE CURE LIVINUS PERQUIN Lesquels seront vendus publiquement aux plus offrans Lundi 3 Juin 1771 &amp; onze Jours suivants, à la Haye en Hollande par la Veuve JEAN VAN DUREN Libraire sur le Plein. The Hague: van Duren, 1771.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Novum Registrum Confraternitatis Sanctae Ceciliae in Oppido Hasselensi</td>
<td>Inventory</td>
<td>1670–1767</td>
<td>MS inventory in Collectie van Het Stadsmus, Hasselta: <a href="https://www.erfgoedplus.be/details/71022A51">https://www.erfgoedplus.be/details/71022A51</a>. priref.1137</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

aI am thankful to Eugène Schreurs who alerted me on this inventory, and has generously shared his knowledge about this and other inventories in the region.

Table 8.2 A reconstruction of the series of editions printed by the Heirs of Phalèse, 1629–1675

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Person/institution</th>
<th>Type of source</th>
<th>Date</th>
<th>Literature</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>CatNombColl</td>
<td>Catalogue d’une nombreuse collection de livres, choisis, curieux et rares en toutes sortes de langues et facultés, delaissses par feu Monsieur P. GEROTTON, Dr. en Droit, Mr. D. MOILLERUS, Dr en Medecine, et MR. LE CURE LIVINUS PERQUIN Lesquels seront vendus publiquement aux plus offrans Lundi 3 Juin 1771 &amp; onze Jours suivants, à la Haye en Hollande par la Veuve JEAN VAN DUREN Libraire sur le Plein. The Hague: van Duren, 1771.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Composer</td>
<td>Title</td>
<td>Printing Year</td>
<td>Extant Edition or Records of Lost Edition</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>----------</td>
<td>-------</td>
<td>---------------</td>
<td>------------------------------------------</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Orlando di Lasso</td>
<td>La fleur des chansons d’Orlande</td>
<td>1629</td>
<td>RISM A/I L 1034</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Symphonia angelica di diversi eccellentissimi musici</td>
<td>1629</td>
<td>RISM B/I 1629</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Cornelius Burgh</td>
<td>Hortus marianus</td>
<td>1630</td>
<td>RISM A/I B 5019</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Melodia olympica de diversi eccellentissimi [...] raccolta da Pietro Philippi</td>
<td>1630</td>
<td>RISM A/I P 1987, RISM B/I 1630</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>‘Vincenzo Guami Giardino de madrigali a 5. voci con suo basso continuo’</td>
<td>1630</td>
<td>[Doorn, Bellère]</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>‘[Andreas d’Ath] Servia sive corona Mariana 3 4 5 &amp; 6 vocibus cum basso continuo’</td>
<td>1630</td>
<td>[Doorn, Göhler]</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>H. Hollander</td>
<td>Parnassus ecclesiasticus</td>
<td>1631</td>
<td>RISM A/I H 6326</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>G. G. Gastoldi</td>
<td>Balletti a tre voci</td>
<td>1631</td>
<td>RISM A/I G 541</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>G. G. Gastoldi</td>
<td>Balletti a cinque voci</td>
<td>1631</td>
<td>RISM A/I G 527</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>‘Trias Harmonica sacrarum cantionum Leonardi Nerui Capucini cum basso continuo ad organum, in 4’</td>
<td>1631</td>
<td>[Bellère, GoovaertsBibl, Doorn, Ballard]</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>‘Petri Philippi angli [...] operum posthumorum pars prima, sive missae ac psalmi VIII ac IX vocum cum B. cont. ad organum’</td>
<td>1631</td>
<td>[BallardBro, Ballard, Doorn]</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>‘Harmanii Hollanders Iubilus filiorum Dei a 1. 2. 3. &amp; 4. vocum cum basso Generali’</td>
<td>1631</td>
<td>[Doorn, Göhler]</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>L. Marenzio</td>
<td>Madrigali a cinque voci</td>
<td>1632</td>
<td>RISM A/I M 575</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>‘Henrici Liberti Pudanesi gailliardses courants &amp; un ballet à 5. parties’</td>
<td>1632</td>
<td>[Doorn, CMGroningen, Bellère]</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>‘[Benedetto Pallavicinio] Bicinia seu cantiones suavissima duarum vocum’</td>
<td>1632</td>
<td>[Doorn]</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>‘Ioannis. Croce Cantiones sacre octo vocum’</td>
<td>1632</td>
<td>[Doorn]</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>G. B. Ala / G. Messaus</td>
<td>Luscinia sacra</td>
<td>1633</td>
<td>RISM A/I AA 553b</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Composer</td>
<td>title</td>
<td>Printing year</td>
<td>Extant edition or records of lost edition</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>----------</td>
<td>-------</td>
<td>---------------</td>
<td>------------------------------------------</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>G. Messaus</td>
<td>Missae quinque, sex, octo, decem et duodecim vocum</td>
<td>1633</td>
<td>RISM A/I MM 2385</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Peter Philips</td>
<td>Paradisus sacris [...] secunda pars</td>
<td>1633</td>
<td>RISM A/I P 1989</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>[Andreas d’Ath] Philomela Christiana</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1633</td>
<td>[Doorn]</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Iacobi Finetti concerti ecclesiastici</td>
<td>2 3 4 5 6 vocum cum basso continuo</td>
<td>1633</td>
<td>[Doorn]</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Philippi van Heymissen</td>
<td>Harmonia Angelica sacrarum cantionum cum letaniis octo vocum cum basso continuo</td>
<td>1633</td>
<td>[Doorn]</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>G. B. Ala / G. Messaus et al.</td>
<td>Pratum musicum</td>
<td>1634</td>
<td>RISM B/I 1634²</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>H. Hollander</td>
<td>Jubilus filiorum Dei</td>
<td>1634</td>
<td>RISM A/I H 6327</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Musica divina [... raccolta da Pietro Phalesio</td>
<td>1634</td>
<td>RISM B/I 1634⁶</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Peter Philips</td>
<td>Gemmulae sacrae binis et ternis vocibus</td>
<td>1634</td>
<td>RISM A/I P 1979</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>R. Dering</td>
<td>Cantiones sacrae</td>
<td>1634</td>
<td>RISM A/I D 1318</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>J. de Castro</td>
<td>Sonets, chansons à deux parties, lib I</td>
<td>1634</td>
<td>RISM A/I C 1500</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>J. de Castro</td>
<td>Chansons, sonets, stanses et epigrammes, lib. II</td>
<td>1634</td>
<td>RISM A/I C 1502</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>‘Il suave Rossignoletto di Madrigali moderni a 4. Voci con Basso continuo di Philippo van Heymissen’</td>
<td>1634</td>
<td>[Bellère, Doorn, Göhler]</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>[Petri Philippi] Delitie Sacre 2. &amp; 3. vocibus cum basso continuo’</td>
<td>1634</td>
<td>[Doorn]</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>‘Cantiones sacrae praecepuis anni festis accomodatae, octo vocum cum Missa Maiali. a II, tam vocibus quam instrumentis, cum basso continuo ad organum, auctore Guillielmo Messaus, phonasco ecclesiae parochialis S. Walburgis Antverpiae’</td>
<td>1635</td>
<td>[GoovaertsBibl, Bellère, CatNombColl, Doorn]</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>[Petri Philippi] Cantiones sacrae quinis vocibus cum basso continuo’</td>
<td>1635</td>
<td>[Doorn]</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>[Stephani Bernardi] Madrigali a tre voci cum basso continuo’</td>
<td>1635</td>
<td>[Doorn]</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>‘Laudes vespertinae B. Mariae Virginis’</td>
<td>1635</td>
<td>[Rasch]⁶</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>[J. B. Verrijt] II primo libri de canzoni amorosi a tre voci con basso continuo e senza’</td>
<td>c. 1635⁷</td>
<td>[João IV]⁷</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>[J. B. Verrijt] II secondo libri de canzoni amorosi a quatro voci, con basso continuo e senza’</td>
<td>c. 1635</td>
<td>[João IV]</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Gratulationes Marianae per XXVI Salve Regina</td>
<td>1636</td>
<td>Not in RISM: IRL-Dm</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Liere septième des chansons</td>
<td>1636</td>
<td>Not in RISM: PL-Kj</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>[Petri Philippi] missa &amp; psalmi octo &amp; novem vocum operum posthumorum pars prima cum basso continuo’</td>
<td>1636</td>
<td>[Doorn, CatNombColl]</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>‘Litaniae seraphicae Beatae Mariae Virginis, a 3, 4, 5, 6, 7 et 8 vocibus col basso C. ad organum autore Tiburcio Bruxell’</td>
<td>1636</td>
<td>[Ballard, Doorn]</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Composer</td>
<td>Title</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>----------</td>
<td>-------</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>A. Marino:</td>
<td><em>Psalmi vesperarum</em></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>G. G. Gastoldi:</td>
<td><em>Balletti a cinque voci</em></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>P. Philips:</td>
<td><em>Deliciae sacrae...</em> ed. tertia</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>[Petri Philippi]</td>
<td>operum posthumorum pars secunda sive cantiones octo vocum pars secunda cum basso'</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Giulio Caesare Bianchi.</td>
<td>Motetti de Beata Virgine a una, due, tre, quattro e cinque voci, e Messa a quattro voci. In Anversa. Appresso Pietro Phalesio al Re David'</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>F. Colombini:</td>
<td><em>Mel musicum</em></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>'Ioannis Baptista Verrijt Paduanes 5. vocum cum basso Generali'</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>'Giacomo Gastoldi'</td>
<td>Balletti à tre voci'</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>A. Grandi:</td>
<td><em>Cantiones sacrae</em>, lib. III</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>C. Monteverdi:</td>
<td><em>Madrigali, lib. VI</em> novamente ristampati</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>J. Willems:</td>
<td><em>Primitiae Marianae</em></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>S. Todeschi:</td>
<td><em>Sacrae cantiones</em></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>'Balthasaris Richardi cantiones sacre a 5 6 7 8 9. vocibus cum basso continuo'</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>'Introitus missarum octo vocum, autore Valerio Bona'</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>A. Grandi:</td>
<td><em>Liber sextus motectorum</em></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>G. Hayne:</td>
<td><em>Moteta sacra</em></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>G. B. Rovetta:</td>
<td><em>Motetta concertata</em></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>G. Sabbatini:</td>
<td><em>Madrigali</em></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>F. Colombini:</td>
<td><em>Madrigali concertati</em></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>J. Dromal:</td>
<td><em>Sertum musicum</em></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>G. G. Gastoldi:</td>
<td><em>Balletti a cinque voci</em></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>F. Colombini:</td>
<td><em>Mel musicum</em></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>L. de Hodemont:</td>
<td><em>Armonica recreatione, Villanelli a tre voci</em></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>'Joh. Ceresini, Covolla flagrone a 2, 3 vel 4 voc.'</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>'Missae septem et octo vocum, autore Matthia Pottier. Antverpiae. Apud Haeredes Petri Phalesii Typographi musices'</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>J. Dromal:</td>
<td><em>Convivium musicum</em></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>J. Dromal:</td>
<td><em>Corona sanctorum</em></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>G. G. Gastoldi:</td>
<td><em>Balletten mit dry stemmen</em></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>P. Philips:</td>
<td><em>Paradisi sacris</em> ed. tertia</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><em>Livre septième des chansons</em></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>'Amorose Vaghezze a tre voci concertate di Simplicio Tedeschi Veronese novamente composte et date in luce con basso continuo. In Anversa. Presso i heredi di Pietro Phalesio al Re David'</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>J. Dromal:</td>
<td><em>Missae sex, litaniae</em>, Op. 4</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>G. Sabbatini:</td>
<td><em>Sacrae laudes</em>, Op. 3</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

(Continued)
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Composer</th>
<th>Title</th>
<th>Printing year</th>
<th>Extant edition or records of lost edition</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Quadriga musicalis</td>
<td>1642</td>
<td>Not in RISM: NL-R</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>F. Colombini: Nectar caelicum</td>
<td>1642</td>
<td>RISM A/I C 3449</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>J. Stadlmayr: Missae IX vocum</td>
<td>1643</td>
<td>RISM A/I S 4303</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>C. Monteverdi: Il quinto libro di madrigali</td>
<td>1643</td>
<td>RISM A/I C 1417</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>'Florentii Valentiini de Christo Patiente et Virgine matre dolorosa sacrae modulationes item litania B. Virginis et psalmus De profundis concertantes I. II. III. IV. vocibus et musicis instrumentis opus novum et recens in lucem editum cum basso contin. ad organum'</td>
<td>1643</td>
<td>[Ballard, CatNombColl]</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>'[Joh. Ceresini], Hennii madrigali a 5 voc.'</td>
<td>1643</td>
<td>[CMGroningen]</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>'H. Hollander, Parnassus Ecclesiasticus'</td>
<td>1643</td>
<td>[CatNombColl]</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>G. Casati: Sacri concentus duarum vocum</td>
<td>1644</td>
<td>RISM A/I C 1413</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>G. Casati: Sacri concentus III. et IV. vocum</td>
<td>1644</td>
<td>RISM A/I C 1417</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>C. Monteverdi: Il quarto libro de Madrigali a cinque voc</td>
<td>1644</td>
<td>RISM A/I M 3474</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>B. Marini: Corona melodica, Op. 15</td>
<td>1644</td>
<td>RISM A/I M 666</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>'J. Loisel. Musice hactenus inaudita sive Missae IV quinque et sex vocum, novo ac moderno modulamine concertatae cum Instrumentis et ripieno duplici (seu duobus aliis choris) si places. Antverpiae, apud heredes Petri Phalesii'</td>
<td>1645</td>
<td>[GoovaertsBibl, Ballard, CMGroningen, CatNombColl]</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>D. Philetaero: Dei Deiparae divorumque laudes Cantiones natalitiae</td>
<td>[c. 1645]</td>
<td>Not in RISM: NL-U</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>'[Gilles Hayne] 4 Missae solemnnes octo vocum, autore de Eagiode Hennio'</td>
<td>1645</td>
<td>[Ballard, GoovaertsBibl]</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>'[Joh. Ceresini], Missae 8 vocum'</td>
<td>1645</td>
<td>[CMGroningen]</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>F. Colombini: Ambrosia sacra [...] hac secunda editione</td>
<td>1646</td>
<td>RISM A/I C 3451</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Composer</td>
<td>Title</td>
<td>Printing year</td>
<td>Extant edition or records of lost edition</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>----------</td>
<td>-------</td>
<td>---------------</td>
<td>-----------------------------------------</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>[Joh. Ceresini], Motetti a 3, 4 vel 5 voc.</td>
<td>1646</td>
<td>[CMGroningen]</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Michae. Angl. Grascini, [?], a 2, 3 vel 4 voc.</td>
<td>1646</td>
<td>[CMGroningen]</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>‘G. Gastoldi, Balletten met 3 Stemmen’</td>
<td>1646</td>
<td>[CatNombColl]</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>[Il primo libro di messe concertate a cinque et a sei voci di D. Romualdi Honorii]</td>
<td>1646</td>
<td>[Ballard]</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>G. Casati: Operis primis pars continens moteta</td>
<td>1647</td>
<td>RISM A/I C 1421, RISM B/I 1647¹</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>G. Casati / P. Cornetti: Primi partus foetu [... suavissimis modulis]</td>
<td>1647</td>
<td>RISM B/I 1647³</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>N. a Kempis: Symphoniae, Op. 2</td>
<td>1647</td>
<td>RISM A/I K 378</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>‘Joh. Babtistae Verryth, Divinae ac piae oblectiones 8 voc. et 4 instrum.’</td>
<td>1647</td>
<td>[CMGroningen, CatNombColl]</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>‘[Joh. Loisel] Flores musici 8 voc. et instrum.’</td>
<td>1647</td>
<td>[CMGroningen]</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>‘[Joh. Dromal, Bellaria sacra 8 voc. et instrum.’</td>
<td>1647</td>
<td>[CMGroningen]</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>L. Pietkin: Sacri concentrates, Op. 1</td>
<td>1648</td>
<td>RISM A/I P 2342</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>G. B. Rovetta: Bicinia sacra [...] lib. III</td>
<td>1648</td>
<td>RISM A/I R 2975</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>J. Loisel: Modulationes, Op. 4</td>
<td>1648</td>
<td>RISM A/I R 2974</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>[T. van Brussel:] De gheestelycke tord-duyve Laudes vespertinae B. Mariae Virginis</td>
<td>1648</td>
<td>RISM B/I 1648²</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>G. B. Rovetta: Motetta concertata, Op. 5</td>
<td>1648</td>
<td>RISM A/I R 2969</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>J. Dromal: Sertum musicum</td>
<td>1648</td>
<td>RISM A/I D 3579</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>G. Casati: Amoenum rosarium, Op. 5</td>
<td>1649</td>
<td>RISM A/I C 1424</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>N. a Kempis: Symphoniae, Op. 3</td>
<td>1649</td>
<td>RISM A/I K 379</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>G. B. Rovetta: Gemma musicalis</td>
<td>1649</td>
<td>RISM A/I R 2977</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>J. Loisel: Motetta sacra</td>
<td>1649</td>
<td>RISM A/I L 2763</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>J. B. Verrijt: Flammae divinae, Op. 5</td>
<td>1649</td>
<td>RISM A/I V 1308</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>O. Tarditi: Litanee concertatae</td>
<td>1649</td>
<td>RISM A/I T 204</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>G. G. Gastoldi: Balletten met vyf, ses en acht stemmen</td>
<td>1649</td>
<td>RISM A/I G 532</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>‘[Richard Dering] Cantica sacra cenis vocibus autore Richardo Direngo’</td>
<td>1649</td>
<td>[Ballard]</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>‘Dionys. d’Ortho, Psalterium jucundum a 2, 3, 4, 5, 6, 7 et 8 voc. cum instrum.’</td>
<td>1649</td>
<td>[CMGroningen]</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>F. della Porta: Cantiones, Op. 3</td>
<td>1650</td>
<td>RISM A/I P 5199</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>‘Lamb. Peytkyn, secunda pars Sacrorum concentratum a 2, 3, 4 vel 5 voc.’</td>
<td>1650</td>
<td>[CMGroningen]</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>‘Joh. Petri Finatti, Sacri concentus, 2, 3, 4 et 5 voc.’</td>
<td>1650</td>
<td>[CMGroningen]</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

(Continued)
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Composer</th>
<th>Title</th>
<th>Printing year</th>
<th>Extant edition or records of lost edition</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>M. Cazzati</td>
<td>Coretti et balletti</td>
<td>1651</td>
<td>RISM A/I C 1666, RISM B/I 1651&lt;sup&gt;7&lt;/sup&gt;</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>G. B. Chinelli</td>
<td>Missarum, lib II, Op. 8</td>
<td>1651</td>
<td>RISM A/I C 2065</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>G. P. Finatti</td>
<td>Missae motetta, Op. 2</td>
<td>1652</td>
<td>RISM A/I F 802</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>F. Godefrido</td>
<td>Fasciculus musicus</td>
<td>1652</td>
<td>RISM A/I G 2925</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>N. a Kempis</td>
<td>Symphoniae, Op. 4</td>
<td>[1652?]</td>
<td>RISM A/I K 380</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>G. B. Rovetta</td>
<td>Novi concentus sacrae</td>
<td>1653</td>
<td>RISM A/I R 2979</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>N. W. Young</td>
<td>Balletti a tre voci. In Anversa, Presso i heredi di Pietro Phalesio, al Re David’</td>
<td>1653</td>
<td>[GoovaertsBibl]</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>N. W. Young</td>
<td>Sonate e canzone a tre, quattro e cinque stromenti. In Anversa, Presso i heredi di Pietro Phalesio, al Re David’</td>
<td>1653</td>
<td>[GoovaertsBibl]</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>F. della Porta</td>
<td>Motetta, Op. 4</td>
<td>1654</td>
<td>RISM A/I P 5201</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>G. Casati</td>
<td>Operis primis pars continens moteta</td>
<td>1654</td>
<td>RISM A/I C 1422</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>G. de Verlit</td>
<td>Missae et motetta, III. IV. vocum</td>
<td>1658</td>
<td>RISM A/I C 1598a</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>M. Cazzati</td>
<td>Motetti e hymni</td>
<td>1656</td>
<td>RISM A/I C 1464</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>G. Casati / P. Cornetti</td>
<td>Primi partus foetus</td>
<td>1658</td>
<td>RISM A/I C 1599</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>A. Vermeeren</td>
<td>Missae et motetta, [lib I]</td>
<td>1660</td>
<td>RISM A/I V 1659&lt;sup&gt;2&lt;/sup&gt;</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>G. de Verlit</td>
<td>Missae et motetta [...] III. IV. vocum</td>
<td>1658</td>
<td>RISM A/I V 1246</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>D. Castello</td>
<td>Sonata concertate</td>
<td>1658</td>
<td>RISM A/I C 1461</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>A. Vermeeren</td>
<td>Missae et motetta</td>
<td>1660</td>
<td>RISM A/I B 3768</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>G. de Verlit</td>
<td>Missae et motetta</td>
<td>1660</td>
<td>RISM A/I P 1644</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>A. Vermeeren</td>
<td>Missae et motetta</td>
<td>1660</td>
<td>RISM A/I M 3039</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>C. Casati</td>
<td>Sacri concentus 3 vel 4 voc.</td>
<td>1656</td>
<td>RISM A/I V 1314</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>G. Casati</td>
<td>Suonate, Op. 18</td>
<td>1657</td>
<td>RISM A/I C 1603</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>J. F. a Kempis</td>
<td>Cantiones natalitiae</td>
<td>1657</td>
<td>RISM A/I K 736</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>F. Foggia</td>
<td>Concentus ecclesiastic</td>
<td>1658</td>
<td>RISM A/I F 1441</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>G. de Verlit</td>
<td>Missae et motetta</td>
<td>1658</td>
<td>RISM A/I V 1246</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>G. de Verlit</td>
<td>Missae et motetta</td>
<td>1658</td>
<td>RISM A/I V 1246</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>D. Castello</td>
<td>Sonata concertate</td>
<td>1658</td>
<td>RISM A/I C 1461</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>M. Cazzati</td>
<td>Motetti e hymni</td>
<td>1658</td>
<td>RISM A/I C 1599</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>G. Casati</td>
<td>Primi partus foetus</td>
<td>1658</td>
<td>RISM B/I 1658&lt;sup&gt;1&lt;/sup&gt;</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>A. Vermeeren</td>
<td>Missae et motetta</td>
<td>1660</td>
<td>RISM A/I V 1247</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>[Composer] titlea</td>
<td>Printing year</td>
<td>Extant edition or records of lost edition</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>------------------</td>
<td>---------------</td>
<td>-----------------------------------------</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>G. Verlit: <em>Cantiones natalitiae IIII. et V. tam vocibus</em> Florida verba</td>
<td>1660</td>
<td>RISM A/I V 1244</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>G. Verlit: <em>Missae et motetta […] IV. V. VI. vocum Septiesme livre</em></td>
<td>1661</td>
<td>RISM A/I V 1245</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>‘A. Vermeren, Missae &amp; Motetta. à 1. 2. &amp; 3. Voc. &amp;c.’</td>
<td>1661</td>
<td>Not in RISM: B-Ampri</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>P. V. S. Optata dudum gaudia</td>
<td>1662</td>
<td>RISM A/I IN 237</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>G. Casati: <em>Operis primis pars continens moteta</em></td>
<td>1662</td>
<td>RISM A/I C 1423</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>‘A. Grossi, Orfeo Pellegrino’</td>
<td>1662</td>
<td>[CatNombColl]</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><em>Vermaecellijcke duytsche liedekens</em></td>
<td>1663</td>
<td>Not in RISM: B-OU</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>M. Uccellini: <em>Sonate correnti</em>, Op. 4</td>
<td>1663</td>
<td>RISM A/I U 16</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>G. Bussé: <em>Het gheestelyck Blomhofken</em></td>
<td>1664</td>
<td>RISM A/I B 5115</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>‘F. Colombini: Mel musicum’</td>
<td>1664</td>
<td>[CatNombColl]</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>G. Legrenzi: <em>Sentimenti devote</em>, Op. 6</td>
<td>1665</td>
<td>RISM A/I L 1616</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>J. van der Wielen: <em>Cantiones natalitiae</em></td>
<td>1665</td>
<td>RISM A/I W 1056</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>A. Vermeeren: <em>Missae et motetta</em>, lib. III</td>
<td>1665</td>
<td>RISM A/I V 1249</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Compositioni sacre de diversi excellenti autori</td>
<td>1665</td>
<td>RISM B/I 16652</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>‘Step. Filipini, Concerti sacri a 2 3 4 et 5 voc. opera secunda’</td>
<td>1666</td>
<td>[CMGroningen]</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>A. Grossi: <em>Orfeo Pellegrino</em>, Op. 4</td>
<td>1667</td>
<td>RISM A/I G 4741</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Cantiones natalitiae</td>
<td>1667</td>
<td>RISM B/I 16673</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>M. Uccellini: <em>Compositioni armoniche / Sonate sopra il violino</em>, lib. VII</td>
<td>1668</td>
<td>RISM A/I U 20/U 21</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>G. Casati: <em>Sacri concentus duarum vocum</em></td>
<td>1668</td>
<td>RISM A/I C 1416</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>G. B. Rovetta: <em>Bicinia sacra</em>, lib. III</td>
<td>1668</td>
<td>RISM A/I R 2976</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

(Continued)
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>[Composer] title</th>
<th>Printing year</th>
<th>Extant edition or records of lost edition</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>‘G. de Verlit, Missae et motetta’</td>
<td>1668</td>
<td>[CatNombColl]</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>‘Franc. Sisto de Reina, Florida corona, a 2, 3 vel 4 voc.’</td>
<td>1668</td>
<td>[CMGroningen]</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>M. Uccellini: <em>Sinfonie boscarecie</em>, Op. 8</td>
<td>1669</td>
<td>RISM A/I U 23</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>‘G. Casati. Moteta’</td>
<td>1669</td>
<td>[CatNombColl]</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>J. Berckelaers: <em>Cantiones natalitiae</em>, lib. II</td>
<td>1670</td>
<td>RISM A/I B 1983</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>G. Bart: <em>Philomela sacra</em></td>
<td>1671</td>
<td>RISM A/I B 1055</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>L. Royet: <em>Missa, litania</em></td>
<td>1671</td>
<td>RISM A/I R 3004</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>P. F. Munninckx: <em>Balletti, allemande</em></td>
<td>1672</td>
<td>RISM A/I M 8145</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>‘Benedicti Josephi, Flosculi musici a 1, 2, 3 vel 4 voc. cum instr. 8 vol.’</td>
<td>1672</td>
<td>[CMGroningen, CatNombColl]</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>T. Becker: <em>Musicalische lendt-vruchten</em></td>
<td>1673</td>
<td>RISM A/I B 1526</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>J. Cocx: <em>Ferculum musicum</em></td>
<td>1673</td>
<td>RISM A/I C 3259</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>G. Doré: <em>Motetta et psalmi</em></td>
<td>1673</td>
<td>RISM A/I D 3428</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>B. a Sancto Josepho: <em>Corona stellareum</em>, Op. 2</td>
<td>1673</td>
<td>RISM A/I B 1922</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>G. Bart, <em>Missae et motetta</em></td>
<td>1674</td>
<td>RISM A/I B 1056</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>‘Nicol. Miscoquece, Area parthenica a 1, 2, 3, 4 vel 5 voc. cum instrum.’</td>
<td>1674</td>
<td>[CMGroningen]</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>‘[Guil. Bart], Litaniae sacrae a 3, 4 vel 5 voc. cum instrum.’</td>
<td>1675</td>
<td>[CMGroningen, CatNombColl]</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>F. Loots: <em>Cantiones natalitiae III. vocum et III. instrum.</em></td>
<td>1664</td>
<td>RISM A/I L 2821a</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

*aIn the case of lost editions, the title is given according to the first reference. Titles given in italics are extant; those given in inverted commas are taken from the inventories listed above. 

*bVanhulst suggests that this is identical to a publication recorded in Doorn and João IV with the title ‘Giardino de madrigali’ and the same year of publication. Since the composer died in 1615, after an active career in Antwerp, this edition may have been printed in Antwerp even earlier, during the time of Pierre Phalèse II, although no copy seems to have survived that could prove this.

*cThe fair catalogue from 1631 gives the place and printer as ‘Antv. Ap. Belleros’; this is probably a mistake, since Jean Bellère died in 1595, and his son Balthazar was active at Douai.

*dThe imprint given by Goovaerts in *Histoire et bibliographie de la typographie musicale dans les Pays-Bas* (p. 351), ‘apud Petrum Phalesium’, could suggest that the year is incorrect, and that this publication was printed before 1629, by Pierre Phalèse II.

*eThe imprint given by Goovaerts in *Histoire et bibliographie de la typographie musicale dans les Pays-Bas* (p. 357), ‘Ex Officina Petri Phalesii’, could suggest that the year is incorrect, and that this publication was issued before 1629, by Pierre Phalèse II. An earlier edition of this work (RISM L 689) was published in 1622.

*fAlthough some copies of *Cantiones natalitiae* and *Laudes vespertinae* lack the printer’s name, it seems most likely that Heirs of Phalèse printed several of them. For a thorough discussion on this issue, and
on other questions relating to the many different editions of *Cantiones natalitiae* and *Laudes vespertinae*, see Rasch, ‘De cantiones natalitiae’.

On the possible existence of an edition from c. 1635, see Rasch, ‘De cantiones natalitiae’, vol. 1, 46.


The large gap between the publication of the *Psalmi vesperarum* lib. II (Venice: G. Scoto, 1578) and the Phalèse reprint (1637), suggests that there might have been an earlier Antwerp reprint, during the time of Pierre Phalèse II. Apart from Marino’s collection of Vesper psalms, no other collection including only Vesper psalms is known to have been printed by Heirs of Phalèse, while Pierre Phalèse II issued at least one collection of Vesper psalms in 1615, by the little-known composer Angelo Terzachi (or Terzaghi). The two Antwerp editions with Vesper psalms were perhaps issued at the same time. The two collections have almost identical titles, and both collections were supplied with basso continuo parts in Antwerp. See footnote a.

The imprint given by Goovaerts in *Histoire et bibliographie de la typographie musicale dans les Pays-Bas* (p. 362), ‘Appresso Pietro Phalesio’, could suggest that the printing year is incorrect, and that the publication was printed before 1629, by Pierre Phalèse II.

De la Fage gives the printing year 1538, which apparently is wrong, and most likely should be 1638, as it is in Doorn.

On the problems of dating this edition, which seems to have both the printing year 1641 and 1661, corrected in hand in the surviving copies to 1643/1663, see Rasch, ‘Basic Concepts’, 40.

The copy in F-Lfc has 1654 as year of publication, whereas the copy in A-Wgm has the year 1656.

Volland was married to Balthasar Schmid (1705–1749) and named herself as the widow of Balthasar Schmid in her publications. Van Rhee was widow of Siegfried Markordt (c. 1720–1781) and published under the name of ‘Chez la Veuve Markordt Marchande de Musique’. On Volland, see Heussner, ‘Der Musikdrucker Balthasar Schmid’.


See, for example, Jacobs, ‘Guilds and the Open Market’; Rombouts and van Lerius, *De liggeren*.


*This* first edition seems to have been issued between 1666 (the year of publication of his Op. 1) and 1673, when the second and augmented edition was printed. See Van Der Meer, ‘Benedictus a Sancto Josepho’, 132.

The contents of this volume is listed in Van Der Meer, ‘Benedictus a Sancto Josepho’, 133.

Notes

1 They are also referred to by their Latin names, Magdalena and Maria Phalesius.

2 On other daughters taking over the music-printing business from their father, see Rasch, ‘De dochters van Estienne Roger’.


5 Goovaerts in *Histoire et bibliographie de la typographie musicale dans les Pays-Bas* (p. 362), ‘Appresso Pietro Phalesio’, could suggest that the printing year is incorrect, and that the publication was printed before 1629, by Pierre Phalèse II.


7 See, for example, Jacobs, ‘Guilds and the Open Market’; Rombouts and van Lerius, *De liggeren*.


10 The following biographical details about Pierre Phalèse’s children are drawn from the still most comprehensive study on the Phalèse firm during the period 1629 to 1675: Goovaerts, *Histoire*, 55. Goovaerts seems to have collected the information from the records of Onze-Lieve-Vrouwe church in Antwerp. Other details can be drawn from the substantial Phalèse estate inventory from 1655: ‘Staet ende masse van alle ende jegelijcke de goederen […]’, Antwerp City Archives,

11 Rombouts and van Lerius, *De liggeren*, 1: 666.

12 This was observed by Rombouts and van Lerius, *Liggeren*, 1: 666–667.


16 Of this publication, Guillaume Bart’s *Litaniae sacrae* for three to five voices and instruments no copy seems to have survived, but it is referred to, for example, in the inventory of the *Collegium Musicum* in Groningen, ‘Register der musykboeken, het Edel Achtbaere Collegium Musicum toehoorende’; for details, see Appendix, Table 8.2. Susan Bain and Henri Vanhulst place Marie’s death in c. 1674 (Bain and Vanhulst, ‘Phalèse family’, accessed 27 February 2019). That Marie would have died in 1675 rather than 1674 would be more consistent with the first known edition, printed by the successor Lucas de Potter, as it was printed in 1676 (Maurizio Cazzati, *Sacri concerti a due, tre, quattro, e cinque*, Op. 47). Although Marie was married with Edouard de Meyer, her husband seems not to have been taken an active part in the business.

17 The imprint ‘Magdalena Phalesia et cohaeredes’ puts the heirs in plural. It is difficult to decide whether this is simply conventional, or if it actually indicates the existence of additional siblings apart from Marie.


20 From the period from 1629 to 1675, the Phalèse firm printed only one known item that is not a music collection. The publication *Tyrœcinium musicum tradens facilíssimam methodum perfecte quascumque notas dignoscendi, perdiscendique vel horarum spacio; idque nova methodo, et hactenus incognita: praeterea mensurarum distinctions et figuras* (Antwerp: Apud haeredes Petri Phalesii, typographici musices, 1664) was a singing method. No copy seems to have survived, but is recorded in Goovaert, *Histoire*, 406, and Hulthem, *Bibliotheca Hulthamiana*, 211.


23 Fragments of the same type of typeface have survived in the Plantin Moretus Museum MA 101b (nineteen matrices). This type is not included in any of Plantin’s inventories. It could possibly have been included in Tylman Susato’s sale in 1565. Susan Bain states that Plantin ‘received some type from the firm of Phalèse in settlement of debt’. Bain, ‘Plantin’, accessed 20 February 2019.


25 Brossard, *La Collection*.


28 ‘Tres bien imprimé, beaux caracteres, beau papier etc. contre l’ordinaire des impressions d’Italie’. Brossard’s comments relate to *Salmi concertati a 4 voci con strumenti, di D. Isabella Leonarda,"
29 Spiessens, ‘Muziektypografische bedrijvigheid Potter’. About twenty editions are known to have been printed under the Potter imprint. The last known music edition under the name of Potter was printed in 1684. Some of Potter’s editions were reprints of editions printed earlier by the Phalèse sisters; this demonstrates that not only the equipment for printing music, but also musical repertoires could be passed on from the previous owner of a printing house.

30 Spiessens, ‘Muziektypografische bedrijvigheid Aertssens’.


32 ‘montcosten […] voor de arbeijtsloonen vande knechten inde Druckerye gewerckt hebbende’, according to the transcription of the estate inventory in Goovaerts, Histoire et bibliographie, 105. See footnote 10.

33 Gratulationes marianae (1636) IRL-Dm; Colombini, Madrigali concertati (1640) RUS-SP; Gastoldi, Balletten mit dry stemmen (1641) B-Gu; Quadriga musicalis (1642) NL-R; Delectus sacrarum (1652) GB-Och; and Vermaeckelijcke duytsche liedekens (1663) B-OU [Stadsarchief]. On editions of Livre septième de chansons (1636, 1641/43 [?]) and 1661) missing from RISM, as well as the many problems with establishing a correct printing year for these editions, see Rasch, ‘Basic Concepts’, 40, and the editions included in Fontes hymnodiae Neerlandicae impressi. For editions of Cantiones natalitiae (c. 1645, 1654, 1658, c. 1660) missing from RISM, see Rasch, ‘De cantiones natalitiae’. Moreover, a number of single copies of editions printed by the Heirs of Phalèse are not recorded in RISM. No surviving editions containing only one or two compositions can be assumed to have been printed by the Phalèse printing firm between 1629 and 1675. This could suggest that occasional music was not part of their production, but since printed occasional music were not always provided with an imprint, this question can only be clarified by further studies.

34 Several other catalogues and inventories list music that is now lost; and new editions are sometimes discovered. For a substantial list of inventories in the Low Countries, see Appendix in Beghein, ‘The Famous and New Italian Taste’, 451. For this examination, I have restricted the selection of inventories and catalogues to those included in Table 8.2, since they mostly cover the information found in other inventories or catalogues.

35 The inventory of Collegium Musicum at Groningen provides an exception. It contains unique entries of a few now lost editions most likely printed by Heirs of Phalèse, but which are not included in other inventories or catalogues. The composer ‘Joh. Ceresini’ seems to be unique for the Groningen inventory, most certainly referring to the composer Giovanni Ceresini (1684–after 1659). The inventory records four publications by this composer. All were printed at Antwerp in the 1640s, most likely by the Heirs of Phalèse, to judge from the type of repertoire. The first, ‘Joh. Ceresini, Covolla flagrone, a 2, 3 vel 4 voc. Antwerpiae 1640, 5 volum.’, is possibly a reprint of Ceresini’s Op. 5, Motetti concertati a due, tre, et quattro voci, con le letanie della B. Vergine (Venice: Alessandro Vincenti, 1638). The Heirs of Phalèse often replaced conventional Italian titles such as Motetti concertati with two-word titles of this type. The three subsequent volumes by Ceresini were ‘Hennii madrigali a 5 voc. [Antwerpiæ] 1643, 6 volum.’, ‘Missae 8 vocum’, [Antwerpiæ] 1645, 9 volum.’ and ‘Motetti a 3, 4 vel 5 voc. [Antwerpiæ] 1646, 6 volum.’. In none of these cases has an original Italian edition survived. Since Ceresini lived until at least 1659, it is reasonable to assume that he continued to publish music after his last surviving collection (Op. 5), printed in 1638. ‘Register der musyckboeken, het Edel Achtbaere Collegium Musicum toehoorende’, transcribed and published in Spellers, ‘Collegium musicum te Groningen’.

36 It is possible that some entries are incorrect and refer to editions that never existed. I have included all entries in Appendix, even doubtful ones, in the expectation that new findings will prove or disprove the existence of these missing publications. The number of editions included in Appendix contrasts to previous estimations of the total production. For example, Susan Bain and Henri Vanhulst estimate the total output of the Heirs of Phalèse at around 180 volumes. Bain and Vanhulst, ‘Phalèse Family’, accessed 27 February 2019. The following discussions of repertoire and context rely on this reconstructed total output.

37 These estimations were issued from the entries in the catalogue of Johannes van Doorn, Catalogus Librorum Musicorum, qui venales reperturunt in Officina Ioannis à Doorn Bibliopole Trajectensis (Utrecht: Joannis a Doorn, 1639). Rasch, ‘How Much Is Lost’, 465.

39 Jackson, ‘Gerlach’.
40 On the repertoire, see Vanhulst, ‘De Antwerpse muziekuitgaven’, 60–62.
41 On Pierre Phalèse as editor, see Hammond, ‘Pierre Phalèse as Music Editor’. Concerning the anthologies with Italian music reprinted by the Phalèse sisters, see further down below.
42 On a more general discussion on the role of the editor of music anthologies, see Hammond, Editing Music, 13–44, 181–187.
43 VERMAECKELLYCKE DUYTSCHES LIEDEKENS MET III. IV. STEMMEN, Van verscheeyden Vermaerde Meesters van desen tijd, BY EEN VERGADERT DOOR JOANNES BAPTISTA HALBOS, OP-GHEDRAGHEN AEN MYN HEERE, MYN HEERE ADRIANUS VAN ALPHEN, Canonick inde Collegiale Kercke van S. Peeter tot Turnhout (Antwerp: Phalèse, 1663), not in RISM, Stadsarchief van Oudenaarde. On Halbos see Spiessens, ‘Jan-Baptist Halbos’.
47 Missae quinque, sex, octo, decem et duodecim vocum, cum basso continuo ad organum (Antwerp: Apud haeredes Petri Phalesii typographi Musices, 1633), not in RISM.
48 Cantiones sacrae praccipuis anni festis accomodatae, octo vocum, cum Missa Maiiali. a II, tam vocibus quam instrumentis, cum basso continuo ad organum, auctore Guilielmo Messaus, phonascio ecclesiae parochialis S. Walburgis Antverpiae (Antwerp: Apud haeredes Petri Phalesii, typographi musices, 1635). See Table 8.1 in the Appendix for the details of this lost publication.
49 Luscinia sacra (1633, RISM A/I AA553b), with the addition of Sancta Maria by Monteverdi and one composition by Messaus, and Pratum musicum (1634, RISM B/I 16344), with the addition of pieces by Guilielmus Messaus, Henricus Liberti and Jacobus Mollet.
50 Gratulationes Marianae per XXVI Salve Regina, et V. Ave Maria diversorum authorum, IV, V, VI, VII, VIII, IX, XII vocibus decantanda, cum Basso continuo, partim selectae, partim nunc primum composi
52 Heirs of Phalèse’s Florida verba. A celeberrimis musices auctoribus […] (Antwerp: Phalèse, 1661), RISM B/I 16611, is a reprint of R. Floridus Canonicus de Sylvestris a Barbarano Florida Verba a celeberrimis muices auctoribus (Rome: G. B. Robletti, 1648), RISM B/I 16481, and includes four additional pieces by Vermeeren.
54 On Hayne, see Bianco, Corswarem and Vendrix, ‘Gilles Hayne’.
55 Finatti’s Missae motetta litaniae B Virginis cum quator eius solennibus antiphonis duabus tribus quator & quinque vocibus cum instrumentis & suis replementis ad lictum ... autore Ioanne Petro Finatti serenis
tsimo Guiliemo Voolfango Ducii Neuburgico &c. inscriptum, lib. I, Op. 2, includes a dedication to Wolfgang Wilhelm of Neuburg, and is signed by the composer at Brussels. A copy of this publication in Piacenza (I-PCd) is the only known copy in Italy of Italian music printed by Heirs of Phalèse, an interesting example of a reversed direction of transfer. Finatti may have brought the copy to Italy himself, but since almost nothing is known of his activities and life, it is difficult to trace a plausible way of transfer. Corona melodica (RISM A/I M 666), with music by Biagio Marini, includes a dedication to Anna Catharina Constantia (1619–1651), wife of Wolfgang Wilhelm’s son, Philip William of Neuburg (1615–1690). It was printed in 1644, when Marini was Kapellmeister at the court in Neuburg.
56 Jackson, ‘Gerlach’.
58 Rombouts and van Lerius, De liggeren.
According to the estate inventory from 1655. See footnote 10.

The close relationship between Phalèse and Geertsom is also testified by common repertoire. See Dixon, ‘Jan van Geertsom’.

Vanhuilst, ‘Balthasar Bellère’, Table III, 188–190 and [Annexe].


According to the estate inventory from 1655. See footnote 10.


Locke copied music from Giovanni Rovetta, Op. 5 and 10, Galeazzo Sabbatini, Op. 3 and 7. All these were reprinted by the Heirs of Phalèse. An addition, Locke copied music from Galeazzo Sabbatini, Op. 9 and motets by Costanzo da Cosa, however none of these are known to have been reprinted by the Phalèse firm.

It is worth noting that the Italian impact was operating on other levels as well. Several of the local composers, such as Cornelius Burgh and Johannes Dromal, composed music in a significantly Italianate style.

On editions with German translations, see Hammond, Editing Music in Early Modern Germany.

In the period 1580–1610, the Phalèse firm printed about seventy titles with music by Italian composers. ‘Phalèse the younger […] was clearly the first to recognize that there was a market for whole books devoted entirely to Italian music’. Hoekstra, ‘The Reception and Cultivation of the Italian Madrigal’.

‘It does not seem appropriate to speak of piracy when music was published or republished after (and especially long after) the composer’s death or on markets that were out of reach for the composer or the publishers with whom he had associated. The latter situation holds, for example, for Western-European reprints of Italian music, from the sixteenth-century madrigal to the eighteenth-century sonata or concerto. Basically, the Italian publishers had no efficient means to sell their products systematically in England, Netherlands, or Northern Germany, leaving much room for reprinting by local publishers’. Rasch, ‘Publishers and Publishers’, 204. By contrast, on the use of privileges as a means of protection within a given jurisdiction – in this case within the Holy Roman Empire – see the chapter by McDonald and Rose in the present volume.

Three editions of Gastoldi’s two books of Baletti printed by the Heirs of Phalèse provide exceptions, as they were provided with new texts in Dutch: Balletten met dry stemmen (1641 and 1646) and Balletten met vyf, ses en acht stemmen (1649). On these publications, see Rasch, ‘The Balletti’.

A few examples of music by the earliest generation of Italian composers in the new concertato style had been introduced by Pierre Phalèse II already in the 1620s, by composers such as Lucio Barbieri, Giulio Belli, Andrea Biachi, Giacomo Finetti, Crisostomo Rondino, Lodovico Viadana and Giovanni Battista Cociola. Some of this music was first mediated north of the Alps by German publishers, before it was issued by Pierre Phalèse II. For example, the contents of the anthology Corona Sacra (Antwerp: Pierre Phalèse II, 1626), RISM B/I 1626, seems to have been compiled from another anthology printed in the same year in Ingolstadt: Deliciae Sacrae (RISM B/I 1626). Notably, Madeleine and Marie did not reprint any of these publications. One contributory factor could have been that none of these collections had any instrument accompaniment apart from the basso continuo.

The two-part compositions from Casati’s II terzo libro de sacri concerti, Op. 3 (Venice: B. Magni, 1640) were reprinted no less than three times in Antwerp.
Although prices are included in the sales catalogues from the Vincenti firm in Venice, I have not been able to find any extant detailed information of the prices of specific Antwerp editions, or of imported Italian volumes sold in the Low Countries.

Libri primi cantionum (1650, RISM A/I P 5197), Cantiones II. III. IV. V. (1650, RISM A/I P 5199) and Motetta II. III. IV. et V. (1654, RISM A/I P 5201). De Brossard, La Collection, 115.


The question is in some cases complicated by now lost editions without a known printing year. For example, Francesco Petrobelli’s Motetti a due e tre voci e laetanie, lib. II, Op. 5 (Antwerp: Phalèse, 1660) is probably a reprint of a Venetian publication, although no Italian original is known. Johann Gottfried Walther writes in his Lexikon (1732) that Petrobelli had a collection of motets published at Venice in 1657. Walther, Musikalisches Lexikon, 473. See also Roche, “‘Aus den berühmsten italiänischen Autoribus’”, 22.

In a handful of cases, the Antwerp editions were printed within two years after their Italian originals were issued: Rovetta Motetta (Venice: Vincenti, 1639, repr. by Phalèse in 1640), Rovetta Moletti concertati (Venice: Vincenti, 1647, repr. by Phalèse in 1648), Cazzati Motetti e himni (Venice: Vincenti, 1655, repr. by Phalèse in 1656), Cazzati SVONATE a due violin (Venice: Magni, 1656, repr. by Phalèse in 1657). At least twenty-two of the Italian titles selected by the Phalèse sisters to be reprinted in Antwerp were the subject of later editions also by their Italian printing houses, demonstrating the popularity of this music in Italy. Casati’s Il terzo libro de sacri concerti is seemingly the most frequently reprinted in Italy, with new editions in 1642, 1644, 1650, 1654 (the last with only pieces for two and three parts), all printed in Venice.

The many music manuscripts preserved in England that include this piece have all most likely been copied from the Phalèse edition.

The many music manuscripts preserved in England that include this piece have all most likely been copied from the Phalèse edition.

‘Item den negensten Meye XVI° dreyenvyftich betaelt aenden Cassier van Mijnheer van Eyck, coopman in der Vleminkstraete soo over het ontbieden ende levering van Italiaensche musieck boecken als voor de vracht van Italien gesonden voor desen sterffhuyse tsaemen de somme van 53 guldens’. See footnote 10.

The many music manuscripts preserved in England that include this piece have all most likely been copied from the Phalèse edition.

Noske, Music Bridging, 7, 23–25.

Such as the music library of St Mary in Lübeck (now in A-Wgm), the music library of the Swedish Hofkapellmeisters Düben (now in S-Uu), the Royal Library in Copenhagen (DK-Kk).

The Düben collection in S-Uu.

The Grimma collection in D-Dl.

Most of the copies are held by the libraries GB-Och, GB-DRc, and GB-Lbl.

Wainwright, Musical Patronage, 205.
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Part V

Printing privileges
Privileges for printed music in the Holy Roman Empire during the sixteenth century

Grantley McDonald and Stephen Rose

The words *Cum privilegio* on a printed book distinguish it as something special, an implicit promise of quality. Why is this book so privileged? What indeed *is* a privilege in the context of books? This chapter explores medieval antecedents for the privilege system and explains the typical structure of a supplication and the resulting privilege. It then examines musical editions from the sixteenth century which were protected by privileges, offering hypothetical remarks about the presence or absence of privileges in individual books. Consequently the chapter aims to show the ways in which authors, printers and publishers calculated the costs of privileges, and negotiated them with imperial and princely authorities.

This chapter focusses on privileges issued by the Holy Roman Emperor, the principal authority to grant such legal documents in German-speaking lands, and by subordinate authorities such as the Electors of Saxony and Brandenburg, who regularly issued privileges by the late sixteenth century. Evidence concerning privileges comes principally from information within the books, especially the title pages. Imperial privileges are also documented by material in the former Habsburg court archive in Vienna (Haus-, Hof- und Staatsarchiv [henceforth HHStA]), specifically from the archive of the imperial council (*Reichshofrat*), in the series *Impressoria*, which runs from the time of Maximilian to that of Napoleon.¹ This collection is evidently incomplete; many books bearing the *cum privilegio* label on their title page are not documented in these files. Nevertheless, it still contains information concerning the publication of thousands of books. Further archival holdings relating to privileges within constituent territories of the Holy Roman Empire can be located in state archives such as the Sächsisches Hauptstaatsarchiv, Dresden.

Antecedents of printing privileges

Historians of copyright have often claimed that printing privileges were a kind of proto-copyright. Moreover, they argue that the development of the printing press caused – or at least coincided with – a rising consciousness of the value of individual creative products, and hence to the idea of natural rights, basic to the notion of copyright.² An extreme statement of this view is given by the legal historian Hansjörg Pohlmann, whose 1962 monograph goes so far as to compare the *Cum gratia et privilegio* rubric on a title page with the © sign.³ However, we would question this teleological view.⁴ On the one hand, it is clear that at least some medieval authors were intensely aware of the value and integrity of their works: witness the care with which poets such as Chaucer or Machaut, or prose writers such as Christine de Pisan or Jean Froissart, ensured the preservation of their work in reliable manuscripts.⁵ On the other hand, the legal mechanisms that allowed
privileges to be given for printed books were already centuries old by Gutenberg’s time. From the thirteenth century, the Latin word *privilegium* – usually translated into German as *Privileg* or *Freiheit* – indicated a special right granted by a higher authority to its subjects, whether individuals or corporations. It might consist in a monopoly for the production of, or trade in a particular good, perhaps one derived from a particular source. It might grant an exclusive right to exercise a particular skill or manufacturing process. It might confer an exemption from the regular course of law or custom. For example, the statutes of the Order of the Teutonic Knights (1264) note that those in holy orders were exempt from secular jurisdiction through ‘privileges and freedoms issued by the See of Rome’. The usage of various synonyms, such as *Gnade* and *Herrlichkeit*, implied the exceptional nature of the privilege and the existence of a feudal relationship between the parties involved. For example, a 1304 charter from Friedberg mentions a *Gnade* (‘grace’) granted by King Albrecht. The synonym *Herrlichkeit* – a ‘lordly action’, attested from the late fourteenth century onward in this narrow sense as an act done by a lord for a vassal – likewise presupposes the existence of a feudal relationship. From the middle of the fourteenth century onwards, the word *privilegium* also implied the existence of a document recording and delimiting its terms. The terms *Privilegigewölblein* and *Privilegikämmerlein*, as descriptors of the special archives where such documents were stored, are testified from 1613 and 1622 respectively. In the period of our examination, a privilege was thus a legal instrument through which an authority granted its recipient an extraordinary right. Such a suspension of normal laws and customs in a particular case required recording in a document that was then stored in a special archive with similar documents.

By contrast, copyright law holds that a creative product is automatically protected from infringement, either because of the public interest or the natural rights of the author. Copyright law protects a creator from the potential loss in rightful financial exploitation that such infringements might cause. No such sense of natural rights existed in common law before the seventeenth century; instead, the usual presumption was that any intellectual products were gifts of God to be shared for the common good. Previous attempts to interpret printing privileges as primitive expressions of copyright have failed to recognise that these legal instruments were specific exceptions to the general assumption of freely shared intellectual products. Privileges were not free and automatic rights, but were the result of a commercial calculation and the active solicitation of, negotiation of and payment for an extraordinary prerogative.

If we must seek a modern analogy to the early printing privilege, it is not copyright law, but patent law. The relationship with patent law is suggested by some of the earliest privileges for printing, which offered monopolies to practitioners in order to protect and encourage their technical innovations. In 1469 Johannes of Speyer, the first printer in Venice, received a privilege from the Republic for a period of five years, granting him the sole right to operate a press in the city. The privilege described printing as ‘an innovation, unique and particular to our age… [which] must be supported and nourished with all our goodwill and resources’; it was revoked when Johannes of Speyer died a few months later. Similarly in 1498 Petrucci successfully petitioned the Republic for a twenty-year privilege to print polyphonic music for voices, organ and lute, using the double-impression technique of which he described himself as the ‘first inventor’ (‘primo inventor’). As he said in his supplication, ‘it is most widely reputed that your Serenities, through your grants and privileges, invite and inspire ingenious minds to think upon new inventions for the public benefit’. Such patents stemmed from a desire to protect technical innovation, especially in
trades not already controlled by guilds, and also to encourage economic expansion, especially of specialist trades conducted by immigrants to specific towns and cities.

A further pre-modern context for privileges can be found in processes whereby publications were regulated and censored. The notion of the publication of a text ('librum in lucem edere') was not an innovation of the fifteenth century, but had existed since antiquity. In ancient Rome, the public reading of a text, often by the author, constituted its publication. In the middle ages, manuscript publication was normal. Harold Love has shown that scribal publication remained important into the seventeenth century. Yet the sheer number of copies that could be produced in a relatively short time by a printing press led to efforts by rulers and other authorities to control printed publication.

Attempts to regulate printing began early. In Leuven, printers joined the booksellers, who had become part of the *congregatio universitatis* in 1429, by swearing not to engage in fraudulent practices. This gave them the same legal immunities and exemptions as the other members of the university, but also placed them directly under the scrutiny of the faculty of theology. The medieval church had exercised censorship, but it was not formalised and regular. However, in 1515, Leo X promulgated the bull *Inter sollicitudines*, in which he prohibited certain classes of books and granted curial officials the right to censor works before they could be printed. In the Low Countries, this responsibility was exercised by the University of Leuven, under whose direct patronage printers in that city now stood. These developments led to the development of the various iterations of the *Index of forbidden books*, issued in manuscript from the 1520s onwards, and in printed lists from the 1540s. The 1521 Edict of Worms prohibited the printing, trade and possession of Lutheran and other evangelical works, under threat of fines, confiscation and even execution. From this point onwards, the process of applying for a privilege, especially in the areas of theology, law, politics and schoolbooks, involved an element of censorship.

A final context for privileges can be found in the various forms of official licence found in printed books. In the pre-Reformation period, many bishops commissioned printers to produce liturgical books for their dioceses. Some of these, such as missals and agendas, routinely contained printed music. Many contained a mandate or letter of commission from the bishop, usually printed at the beginning of the book, and sometimes with a woodcut bearing the bishop’s heraldic arms. These mandates often commanded clergy within the bishop’s jurisdiction to purchase copies of this edition. Many mandates justified the production of a given edition by claiming that there were not sufficient copies available, or that previous printed editions were in some way defective. Johannes Thurzó, coadjutor bishop of Breslau, reassured the priests of his diocese that the printers had gone to great pains to ensure the accuracy of the edition. In such cases, the bishop, who paid for the printing and saw to the disposal of the copies, thus acted as publisher. Such mandates are closely related to the medieval idea of the *privilegium* as an exclusive right to produce a good using a particular process. However, they necessarily lack other elements normally associated with printing privileges, notably the active solicitation of such a right from an authority.

**Applications for imperial privileges**

The first step in receiving an imperial privilege for printing or publishing a book was to submit a supplication to the emperor, by way of the imperial council (*Reichshofrat*). Although some supplications were doubtless written by lawyers on behalf of their clients,
they sometimes contain revealing personal information about the applicant or the circumstances surrounding the writing of the book. Submission of the supplication was subject to a fee, on a sliding scale according to variables such as the size and price of the book, and the length of the protection being sought, but usually stood between about five and twelve florins. This fee, however, was sometimes waived for applicants favoured by the emperor or his advisors. In addition to the petition, applicants might submit supplementary material such as manuscript or printed samples of the proposed work, or supporting letters from a patron or ecclesiastical authority.

Decisions about the suitability of work were initially handled by the emperor himself, then deputed to trusted men such as the imperial counsellor Conrad Peutinger, the court historian Johannes Stabius or the jurist Wolfgang Ösler. As the process became rationalised and depersonalised, responsibility passed to the chancellor and the two advisory councils (Ratskollegien). Many surviving privileges are signed by members of the chancery (especially the vice-chancellor). Sometimes advice was sought from other specialists associated with the Habsburg court, for instance an evaluation from the Hofkapellmeister Philippe de Monte in connection with the privilege application by the tenor singer in the imperial chapel, Franz Sales. From 1569, the implementation and enforcement of privileges, as well as the collection of sample copies, was entrusted to the newly established imperial book commission, which regulated the book fair at Frankfurt am Main.

Many of the first imperial privileges were granted to poets, historians, jurists and publishers associated closely with the court of Maximilian. During this early period, the granting of a privilege was thus an act of favour, reflecting glory on the ruler and binding the recipients more closely to him. As the system of privileges developed into a mechanism for regulating the book trade, prospective applicants had to balance the commercial benefits and prestige of a privilege against its potential disadvantages. The process of applying for a privilege cost time and money, both in application fees and delays. It demanded high standards of production, thus driving costs up even further. Furthermore, it invited close scrutiny of the applicant’s output, perhaps placing him or her under unwelcome restraints. After all that, a privilege was no guarantee of commercial success. In his supplication for an unusually long privilege of twenty years, the mathematician Philipp Apianus claimed that the market for such books was very small: he was lucky if three or four copies of his book sold in a year. The same evidently went for many music books, explaining why they were still available for sale decades after their publication.

The later sections of this chapter examine the privileges for specific music books in light of the balance struck by publishers and composers between commercial risk and princely protection.

The format of privileges

The individual files preserved in the Impressoria series of the archive of the court council often include only the drafts of privileges, since the fair copies were typically sent to the applicant. These drafts can be difficult to read, on account of numerous excisions and additions that often indicate how the terms of the privilege were hammered out in the council. Figure 9.1 shows the draft for the 1603 privilege to Philipp de Ohr for Hieronymus Praetorius’ Latin motets, with corrections updating the document as the basis for a subsequent privilege granted to Georg Frobenius. In some cases, no text for the privilege survives, but annotations have been added to the supplication, indicating that the privilege had been granted and for how long.
Three kinds of privilege could be offered. Most common were special privileges, offering protection for a specific book. Less frequent were general privileges, protecting the entire output of a publisher or author within a particular genre for a defined period. Rarest of all were universal privileges, protecting the past, present and future works of an author in perpetuity. Orlande de Lassus is the only musician known to have received a universal imperial privilege, doubtless because of his fame.

The formulations used in the privileges often employ stock phrases that originate in the medieval traditions of the chancery. Even if parts of the formulation are bolted together from legal boilerplate, the phrasing of each privilege is part of the enactment of imperial power in an individual case. Typically, a privilege includes several distinct parts. First is an enumeration of the name and the titles of the emperor. This serves both to project his imperial majesty and to guarantee his territorial and political jurisdiction over the matter. Next, the publication (also known as the promulgation or notification) indicates that the contents of this privilege should be published. This part of the privilege was important, since it was...
legally and psychologically necessary to make one’s claim to a privilege known in order to prevent contraventions. One printer-bookseller, Nicolaus Bassaeus, posted his privileges on the shutters of his shop. From about 1569, the imperial book commission stipulated that booksellers should display their privileges at the Frankfurt book fair.

The next section of the privilege, the arenga, outlines the reasons that moved the emperor to grant the privilege. Typically these included the promotion of the public good, and the protection of the investment of money, effort and labour undertaken by the applicant. It was important for the emperor that products associated with his name would not damage his reputation or the dignity of the church, but were of high quality and value. Accordingly, some privileges specify that books under privilege were to be printed on good paper with good type well set. The arenga tends to be most detailed in privileges from the reign of Emperor Maximilian I; under subsequent emperors, it was more common to include a brief narratio giving reasons taken from the applicant’s supplication for the granting of the privilege.

Next follows the dispositio, which declares the will of the emperor or his vicar in protecting the publication. This section usually specifies the duration of the privilege, usually three, five or ten years. It also outlines the punishment for those found guilty of infringing a privilege. First, the remaining copies were usually seized; second, the guilty party was fined, usually ten Marks of pure gold, but sometimes as much as thirty Marks. (According to the Reichsmünzordnung of 1524, a Mark was equivalent to eight ounces; at 2021 prices, eighty ounces of gold would cost about € 118,000 or US$ 142,500, though an exact equivalence in buying power is difficult to calculate.) Half of this amount was to be paid to the fiscus (chancellor of the exchequer) of the imperial chancery, as a fine for contravening an imperial command; the other half was to be paid to the holder of the privilege as damages. The seized books were also handed over to the holder of the privilege. Some imperial privileges authorised their holders to take action themselves by confiscating pirated copies.

Most privileges also lay out the responsibilities incumbent on the privilege holder; failure to conform to these requirements could lead to the revocation of a privilege. Foremost among these responsibilities was the submission of deposit copies. In 1538, a voluntary agreement encouraged printers and publishers to submit sample copies to the University of Vienna. From the middle of the sixteenth century, many privileges obliged privilege holders to submit deposit copies to the imperial council. For example, a privilege granted to Heinrich Petri specified that a failure to send ‘a certain number of copies’ (‘aliquot exemplaria’) immediately following publication would result in the loss of the privilege. By the seventeenth century, this requirement had become more specific and more onerous, typically demanding between three and seven copies, so that there were individual exemplars for the imperial chancery, the court library and the emperor himself. Even higher demands for deposit copies were made by subordinate princes who issued privileges, with the Elector of Saxony typically demanding between twelve and eighteen copies.

A further set of responsibilities committed the holder of the privilege to submit to various types of censorship. In the 1540s and early 1550s, some imperial privileges granted to non-Catholics contain a clausula religionis, forbidding the publication of works contrary to the Catholic faith. From the late 1570s, in an atmosphere of heightened confessionalisation, numerous privileges stipulate that the books should not damage the Catholic faith nor the imperial constitution. An example can be found in the 1603 imperial privilege granted to the Hamburg publisher Philipp de Ohr for the music of Hieronymus Praetorius: presumably because Praetorius was a Protestant, this privilege instructed ‘that the songs should contain nothing in the preface or in the texts that is scandalous or opposed to Roman
Catholic orthodoxy, or to the imperial constitution.\textsuperscript{42} Such provisions were motivated by the desire to repress heresy, to avoid associating the emperor with ideas inconsistent with his position, and to prevent the publication of material likely to cause political unrest.\textsuperscript{43} However, it is unclear how far such provisions were upheld, particularly for general privileges that could cover an array of future publications. Further research is required to show how far the imperial book commission in its activities at the Frankfurt book fair investigated the religious content of music books issued under privilege.

Although the archives generally contain only draft versions of privileges, each of these documents would also be issued in a fair copy. Often fair copies of privileges were impressive documents on large oblong sheets of paper. They contained the signature of the granter and the imperial seal, as a guarantee of authenticity and as a further enactment of imperial majesty. The magnificence of such documents indicates that the power contained in privileges was partly generated by the ritualistic performance involved in granting these legal instruments: through such splendour, issuers of privileges hoped to persuade lesser authorities in the decentralised German realms to uphold their will.\textsuperscript{44}

Privileges for music books before 1550

Of the nearly 1200 titles listed in \textit{vdm} (which covers the period up to 1550), only sixty explicitly mention privileges, granted mainly by the emperor, sometimes by territorial princes, both secular and ecclesiastical. Of these, fifty-six were printed between 1501 and 1550, the final year of the sample. In all likelihood, many of these items were covered not by specific privileges but rather by general privileges granted to such individuals as the printer Johann Petreius or the editor-publishers Sigmund Salminger and Hans Ott. It is no coincidence that these men were based in the most important commercial centres of German-speaking land before 1550, namely, Nuremberg and Augsburg.

The first known music book issued under an imperial privilege was Arnold Schlick’s \textit{Spiegel der Orgelmacher} (\textit{Mirror of the organ builders}, 1511). The ten-year privilege granted to Schlick, printed in the \textit{Spiegel}, is addressed to the officers of the empire as well as to all printers, publishers and booksellers, and emphasises the work’s utility: Philip, Elector Palatine, had encouraged Schlick to write a work on the construction of organs suitable for accompanying the chant (that is, probably in alternation). Schlick undertook this work to reveal these skills to everybody, first to the honour of God, and second to save some of the expense that would otherwise be incurred in maintaining unsound instruments. Schlick had applied for a privilege for two reasons: first, so that he might more easily find a printer who would print this work with a ‘sharp and legible font’, and second, so that he might derive some financial profit from the sale of the book in recompense for his efforts. In seeking to protect his disclosure of specialised knowledge about organ-building, Schlick’s privilege shows some affinities with those patents granted to protect technical innovation. The privilege was intended to cover both the \textit{Spiegel} and another work, \textit{Tabulaturen etlicher Lobgesang und Lidlein uff die Orgeln und Lauten} (\textit{Tablatures of certain songs of praise and secular songs for the organ and lute}), which was in the planning stage. Maximilian granted the privilege for the reasons detailed in the supplication, and to promote the common good. For this reason, he exhorted the officers of the empire and all members of the book trade to protect Schlick, for Maximilian’s sake. Accordingly, they were not to print the work within ten years without Schlick’s permission, or to permit unauthorised editions printed in Italy or elsewhere outside the empire to be sold within its boundaries. Imperial agents were to prevent the unlawful reprinting of Schlick’s work, to avoid the necessity of invoking legal remedies.\textsuperscript{45}
A poem included in Schlick’s *Tabulaturen* (1512) refers directly to this privilege:

Diß artlich bůch und künstlich wergk  
Gepflanzet aus Orpheus bergk  
Getruckt zu lob got vnd der welt  
Nůn mergk was wirt hiebei gemelt  
Das die keiserlich maiestat  
Dis buch gefreit und bgnadet hat  
Keynen trucker zů trůcken noch  
In zehen iarn bei grossem roch  
Und straff darzů einr grossen pen  
Wie die in dem mandat dann sten  
Das thů ich euch verkůnden hie  
Das keiner sich entschuldig wie  
Ym das nit ofenbaret wer  
Der das verbrech dem würds zů schwer

(‘This elegant book and artful work, / cultivated from Orpheus’ mountain, / [is] printed to the praise of God and [for] the world./ Mark now what is detailed here:/ that His Imperial Majesty/ has given this book a privilege, / that no printer may reprint it/ for a period of ten years, under pain of great displeasure/ and moreover punishment of a large fine, / as detailed in the mandate./ I inform you of this now, / that no-one might excuse himself by claiming/ that this was not brought to his attention./ Those who offend will suffer considerable difficulty.’) 46

This text, building on the tradition of vernacular didactic poetry, emphasises the pious intention and utility of the book, and advertises the existence of an imperial privilege of ten years, under pain of a stiff penalty. The inclusion of this warning was considered sufficient notice to any potential pirates.

The next musical work to contain an imperial privilege is Johannes Foeniseca’s *Quadratum sapientiae* (Augsburg: Johann Miller, 1515 [vdm 436]). It bears a privilege from Maximilian I that forbade unauthorised reprinting for five years, under pain of five gold Marks and confiscation of unrightfully printed copies. However, this book is a kind of encyclopaedia in which music comprises only one part. It thus stands closer to the genre of learned literature than printed music, even if it does contain a little musical notation, printed in multiple impression. The same may be said for two further works containing a little musical notation underlaid with text in one of the biblical languages: Johannes Reuchlin’s *De accentibus et orthographia linguae hebraicae* (Hagenau: Thomas Anshelm, 1518) and Philipp Melanchthon’s *Institutiones graecae grammaticae* (Hagenau: Thomas Anshelm, 1518). Another ‘learned’ work of music theory covered by imperial privilege was Ottmar Luscinius’ *Musurgia*, first printed in 1536 with a five-year privilege and reissued in 1542 with under a further five-year privilege. These privileges were held not by Luscinius, but by the printer-publisher Schott.47

Most music printed in the Empire during the first half of the sixteenth century, if covered by a privilege at all, was protected by a general privilege held by the printer in his capacity as publisher. For example, the first collection of polyphonic music granted an imperial privilege – not to mention a papal privilege as well – was *Liber selectarum cantionum* (1520), which was presumably covered by a privilege held by the printer-publishers Sigmund Grimm and Marx Wyrsung, though in the absence of further
information within the edition, it is difficult to be sure. Sometimes printers, acting simultaneously in the capacity of publishers, received a privilege for a particular work. For example, Peter Schöffer the Younger received a privilege specifically for a collection of twenty-eight motets for five voices (1539). Ferdinand’s grant mentioned that Schöffer had specifically sourced pieces in Italy, thus signalling both the cost he had incurred in collecting this music for the German market, and the cultural premium of these pieces, composed with ‘gravity and sweetness’. Yet general privileges were undoubtedly more common. Of the fifty-six titles with privileges in the vdm database from 1501 to 1550, ten were printed and published by Johannes Petreius. The Impressoria files contain only one supplication from Petreius, dated 1538, for a five-year privilege covering publications of psalms, probably the *Tomus primus psalmorum selectorum* (1538), *Tomus secundus psalmorum selectorum* (1539) and *Tomus tertius psalmorum selectorum* (1542). None of the other privileged editions by Petreius indicates who held the privilege, but it is likely that Petreius simply held a general privilege, which has however left no documentary trail in the Impressoria files.

Nine of the titles in the vdm database with privileges were printed by the musically illiterate, commercially unscrupulous but visually talented printer Hieronymus Formschneider, but he was not their publisher. Indeed, there is no evidence that Formschneider held any privileges. Rather, most of his music books were protected by privileges granted either to the editor and publisher Hans Ott, or to the lute teacher Hans Gerle, to whom we shall return. In 1533 and 1545, Ott applied for privileges to protect his financial investment. The original Latin text of his first, four-year privilege was printed in the *Novum et insigne opus musicum* (1537), but had appeared earlier in German translation in *Hundertundainundzweintzig newe Lieder* (1534). Ferdinand’s privilege to Ott praises his zeal and diligence, and the qualities of the music he had collected. These pieces are characterised as serious and delightful, thus conforming to the poetic requirement of instruction and delight (Horace, *Ars poetica* 333). Ferdinand justified the privilege as a means to protect Ott from financial loss and thus indirectly to promote the moral formation of the young through music. The privilege also acknowledges the multiplicity of printing techniques available in the sixteenth century by explicitly covering all music published by Ott, however it was printed (excusa quoquo modo). The protection was also retroactive, covering Ott’s back-catalogue as well as future publications, for the duration of the privilege’s validity. It proscribed not only the unauthorised reprinting and sale of Ott’s books, but also any attempt to reprint or sell them. Accordingly, it was aimed not merely at other printers, but also more broadly to all authorities and especially to book copyists and dealers (bibliographi & bibliopoli), who were forbidden from dealing in illegally reprinted copies. Those found guilty of infringing Ott’s privilege were to be fined ten gold Marks, of which half was to be paid to the imperial treasury, and half to Ott. The contraband copies were to be seized and ceded to Ott.

Although Ott’s privilege explicitly addresses music scribes, they were not forbidden from exercising their primary activity – that is, copying books, including music books, by hand – but simply from trading illegally printed copies. This was perhaps for practical reasons. It was probably impractical to police the trade in manuscript music, and difficult to prove that a scribe had copied from a source protected by privilege. It is also possible that a policy decision lay behind this exclusion: most manuscript copies were presumably made by and for students, in whose interest Ott’s privilege was granted in the first place. Moreover, the production of manuscript in low numbers may have been deemed insufficiently threatening to warrant proscription.
Otto was not the only active editor-publisher of polyphony in mid-sixteenth-century Germany. Ten of the fifty-six titles with privileges from 1501 to 1550 in the vdm database were edited by Sigmund Salminger. Of these, four were printed by Melchior Kriegstein, and six by Philipp Ulhart the Elder. These titles were covered by Salminger’s privilege, granted to him on 4 October 1539 in his capacity as editor and publisher. Commercial considerations played a major part in the explicit justification of these privileges granted to specialist editor-publishers such as Otto and Salminger, because the imperial authorities sought to protect those financially dependent on their ability to make a living from commercial sales of sheet music. The decentralised nature of the music printing market in German-speaking lands also meant that granting a privilege would not easily lead to a monopolistic situation, in the same way as it did in France, where the printing of music lay in fewer hands.

Maximilian’s successors Charles V and Ferdinand I granted privileges to individual instrumentalists who wished to protect their instructional manuals and collections of repertory from piracy. Prior to the introduction of printed tablatures, such instrumentalists would have normally kept their repertory secret, disclosing it only to pupils or apprentices who paid the necessary fee; they therefore risked losing a major source of their income if they disclosed their repertory in print. Hans Gerle, who commissioned Hieronymus Formschneider to print his books, applied for an imperial privilege after publishing his first book of lute tablatures (1532), but before publishing his second (1533). It is not known whether Gerle had experienced the annoyance and loss caused by unauthorised reprints of his work, or simply wished to guard against this possibility; in either case, no pirated copies of his books have survived.

The lutenist Hans Neusidler likewise aggressively protected his exclusive right to publish his books of tablatures, which were printed by several printers at Nuremberg on commission from Neusidler, who acted simultaneously as author and publisher. Neusidler advertised the existence of this privilege by having it printed prominently at the head of his volumes. The privilege claims that Neusidler had been prompted to apply for it after realising that a collection of ‘certain pieces for the lute and similar instruments’ (‘ettliche stückh zu der Lauten vnd der gleichen Seytelspil gehörig’) published ‘for the good of the young and lovers of this art’ (‘der Jugent vnnd allen Liebhabern derselben kunst/ zu gutem’) might be immediately pirated by others ‘for their own use and advantage’ (‘zu jrem selbs nutz vnd vorteyl’). This is not to say that such a loss had actually occurred; all the verbs are in the subjunctive, which implies that Neusidler was guarding against potential loss rather than reacting to real loss. It is also unclear whether the collection mentioned in the privilege is a lost and otherwise unknown work predating Neusidler’s Newgeordnet künstlich Lautenbuch (1536), or this book itself. In any case, Neusidler successfully applied for a privilege, which was granted on 15 May 1535 for five years. Both parts of Neusidler’s instruction manual appeared in 1536 under this privilege (vdm 33, 34). When he published a new collection in 1540, it was protected by a two-year privilege. On 22 February 1543, he received a five-year extension of his original privilege, under which he published four known editions (vdm 1030, 1031, 1032, 1118). His last known collection appeared in 1549 under a further five-year extension (vdm 1136). The correspondence of the Zwickau town clerk Stephan Roth clarifies the financial risk that Neusidler took in the publishing and sale of his lute-books: reportedly the composer bought all the copies of the print-run of the Lautenbuch from Johann Petreius at one florin each, to sell on at two florins each. By acting as a self-publisher, Neusidler sought to retain the income that previously he would have gained by teaching the lute and selling repertory to pupils. As with Gerle, Neusidler’s
privileges show that the imperial authorities recognised the need to protect instrumentalists who shared their technical skill in print in order to promote the public good.

The materials in the Impressoria files in the court archive in Vienna illuminate the ways in which the terms of the privilege were worked out, and their provisions realised. In 1544, Matthias Apiarius, former business partner of the late Peter Schöffer the Younger, applied for a privilege to protect some of his works, including musical editions, from piracy (see Appendix 9.1). His petition has not survived, but we have the draft of the privilege, granted by Ferdinand on 20 May 1544. This privilege emphasises that Apiarius printed these works ‘for all lovers of art and for future remembrance’. The draft originally listed ‘certain copies, compositions and books, namely two versions of the Magnificats in all the tones, responsories, hymns and motets, as well as books about music, arithmetic, the Catalogue of years and princes [i.e., the Catalogus annorum et principum, 1540]’. This was then altered to ‘new sacred and secular songs, compositions and motets, as well as other works about music and arithmetic’. The authors listed were Johannes Vannius (Wannenmacher), Cosmas Alder and Sixt Dietrich. The privilege then states that Apiarius wished to protect himself from the loss of effort that would result from the open or covert transport and sale of unauthorised reprints. For this reason, Ferdinand informed the population of his territories, especially printers and book dealers, that contravention of the privilege bestowed on Apiarius would result in a fine of ten Marks, of which five would be paid to the imperial chancery, and five to Apiarius.

The privilege seems to be retroactive as well as prospective, for it refers to editions that had already appeared as well as ones that were yet to appear. The ‘two versions of the Magnificats in all the tones’ (‘zwayerlay Magnificat ad omnes Tonos’) may refer to the two editions of Sixt Dietrich’s Magnificats in the eight tones, liber primus, which Apiarius printed in 1535 and again in 1537, or perhaps to lost reprints of this collection. Alternatively, it may refer to a liber secundus which has since disappeared. Only one complete set and one bassus partbook survive from the 1537 edition of the liber primus, which suggests that survival rates for such editions are very low. The only known work by Johannes Wannenmacher printed by Apiarius appeared in 1553. In the dedication of that work, dated 13 August 1553, Apiarius announced his intention to publish further, larger-scale works by Wannenmacher, Alder and Dietrich. In partial fulfilment of this promise, he published a volume of hymns by Alder in 1553, but no more editions of music by Sixt Dietrich or Wannenmacher from Apiarius’ presses are known. It is possible that such editions have vanished without a trace. Alternatively, it is possible that Apiarius’ application for a privilege in 1544 reflected a long-term business plan that was realised only partially. This would hardly be surprising. As John Kmetz, Elisabeth Giselbrecht and others have repeatedly shown, music represented an insignificant segment of the output of every sixteenth-century German printer who bothered to enter this market. In the ten years between 1544 and 1553, VD16 identifies seventy-seven editions printed by Apiarius; further editions have almost certainly disappeared without trace. Thus Apiarius’ failure to print any further editions of Wannenmacher’s music was hardly likely to push him over the edge of bankruptcy.

The material in the Impressoria files also gives information about editions which were evidently planned, but which have left no other evidence of their existence. For example, in 1544, the Nuremberg printer Hans Kilian presented a supplication to the emperor, in which he describes how he, mindful of the social benefits of music, especially for the young, had asked some experienced musicians to edit instrumental tablatures which he intended to publish to the honour of the emperor and for the benefit of beginning students (see Appendix 9.2). However, conscious of the risk of financial loss, Kilian requested a privilege
to protect him against potential piracy of any musical work he might publish over the next ten years, whether tablature, vocal music or any other kind of music book. Moreover, he requested that this protection should extend for ten years from the publication of each title. The imperial council approved Kilian’s request, at least for tablatures; however, no printed tablatures printed by Kilian are known. Once again, this could be because no copies have survived, or because he never acted on this privilege. Similar examples of privileges for works that never appeared or are now lost can be found in the later sixteenth century and early seventeenth century.65

The vdm database also contains some surprising cases relating to privileges. In 1525, the Strasbourg printer-publisher Wolfgang Köpfel printed the first evangelical church orders for Strasbourg, including the songs to be sung in the liturgy there. From 1526, he reprinted this order at least four times, with strongly worded warnings directed towards other printers and booksellers in which he asserted that he possessed a privilege that prevented others from producing unauthorised reprints of these books, under pain of fines.66 Unfortunately none of his editions includes the wording of this privilege. The earliest known editions by Köpfel that include references to this privilege are a manual on commercial arithmetic and a Hebrew grammar, both published in 1525 under a three-year imperial privilege.67 Technically, publication of the evangelical liturgies would have been banned under the terms of the Edict of Worms (1521), which prohibited the publication of ‘heretical’ writings. The Hebrew grammar was accompanied by a letter of commendation from Ulrich Varnbühler, chancellor of the imperial regency council, addressed to the author of the book, Wolfgang Fabritius Capito, a relative of the printer Köpfel. It is possible that Köpfel had received a general privilege for the Hebrew grammar, perhaps through Varnbühler’s support, and simply slipped his evangelical church orders under this blanket protection. Köpfel’s 1530 edition of the Strasbourg liturgy and hymn book also contains a reference to an imperial privilege; either he had renewed the three-year privilege first mentioned in his titles in 1525, or simply hoped that no-one would notice that his privilege had run out.68

Since the Impressoria series in Vienna contains no privilege supplication from Wolfgang Köpfel, we can only speculate about the nature of his privileges. However, in 1559 Wolfgang’s son and heir Paul Köpfel applied for an extension of the privilege granted to his father, justifying it on the grounds of financial difficulty: Wolfgang had suffered financial disaster as a result of a shipwreck on the Rhine, which his heirs were still paying off. Although Paul Köpfel applied for a privilege of ten years, he received protection for only three (see Appendix 9.3).

Privileges for music books 1550–1600

An account of printing privileges for music books after 1550 is hindered by the lack of any music-bibliographical tool with coverage or depth equivalent to vdm. The following comments are based on inspection of surviving copies (often guided by library catalogues with full transcriptions of title pages) and further archival work in Vienna and Dresden. Without comprehensive bibliographical coverage, it is not possible to give statistics for the frequency of privileges. Nonetheless, some trends are evident, including the growing importance of privileges from Protestant rulers (notably the Elector of Saxony) and the increasing use of privileges for single-composer partbook collections of vocal polyphony. Already in the first half of the sixteenth century, imperial privileges were primarily associated with publications promoting Catholic orthodoxy, whereas publishers of more aggressively Protestant works would sometimes seek privileges from Protestant princes such as Joachim II of Brandenburg.69 In the second half of the sixteenth century, wider
confessional divisions opened in the book trade, with the increasing activities of the imperial book commission as censors at the Frankfurt am Main book fair leading to the expansion of the Leipzig book fair for Protestant publications. The Leipzig book fair was regulated by the Saxon book commission, which upheld Saxon privileges against unauthorised publications. Consequently, publishers of Protestant literature, or publishers focusing on a market serving Saxony and adjacent territories, increasingly sought privileges from the Elector of Saxony. From the 1570s onwards, Electoral Saxon privileges are occasionally found on music published in cities such as Dresden, Leipzig and Magdeburg. Some of the first known partbooks to bear a Saxon privilege are the various publications of music by Gallus Dressler issued in Magdeburg, including his Cantiones quatuor (1570, which states a five-year Saxon privilege on its title page) and XVI Geseng (1570). The unspecified privileges mentioned on the title pages of Leipzig hymnals of the 1580s were presumably also issued by the Elector of Saxony. The earliest archival documentation currently known for Saxon privileges for music, however, dates from 1594. It consists of a petition and draft privilege for Seth Calvisius’ Hymni sacri latini et germanici and a petition and draft privilege for Abraham Ratz’s edition of Jakob Regnart’s songs. Electoral Brandenburg privileges were also used by musicians in that territory, for instance, Bartholomaeus Gesius, and would be a fruitful topic for further research.

The second half of the sixteenth century saw a substantial growth in the number of music publications produced annually in German-speaking lands. Much of this growth consisted of editions containing vocal polyphony by a single composer, suggesting that increasing initiative was taken by some musicians to publish their music, and also that a composer’s name held a growing power to sell music. The title pages of many of these partbook editions mention a (usually unspecified) privilege, giving the impression of increasing use of privileges in the period (although confirmation of this hypothesis would require a comprehensive statistical survey). In 1565 the Munich printer Adam Berg received from Maximilian II a general privilege covering all his output; this imperial privilege is stated on the title page of all of Berg’s music publications, and an excerpt from it is printed in Berg’s most prestigious outputs such as the Patrocinium musices, a series of choirbooks containing sacred polyphony by Orlande de Lassus (see Figure 9.2). Most of the partbook editions issued by the Gerlach firm in Nuremberg likewise list an imperial privilege on their title pages. Although no archival documentation has so far been located, it is likely that Katharina Gerlach and her partners held a general imperial privilege. Alternatively, it is possible that publishers submitted summary lists to the relevant authority for a privilege to be issued or renewed. Such a list survives from the Leipzig publisher Abraham Lamberg in conjunction with the renewal of Saxon privileges; it specifies Erhardt Bodenschatz’s anthologies Florilegium selectissimarum cantionum (1603), Psalterium Davidis (1607) and Harmoniae angelicae cantionum ecclesiasticarum (1608) alongside many educational, devotional and theological books. Through the protection of general privileges, publishers sought to protect their investment in titles that they presumably considered would sell well.

Musicians also applied for privileges for the publication of their own works. Some of these were instrumentalists, doubtless motivated by the same reasons discussed above, to protect themselves against the risk of publishing repertory that they would normally disclose only to pupils for a fee. Archival documentation exists for the imperial privileges issued to the lutenists Valentin Bakfark and Melchior Neusidler. The Leipzig organist Elias Nikolaus Ammerbach advertised a six-year imperial privilege on the title page of his 1575 organ tablature and this may likewise have been an individual privilege or could have been the same general privilege presumably held by Gerlach (his publisher). In the last quarter of the seventeenth century, supplications for privileges were also made by
composers of vocal music. One of the first composers documented archivally to have such an individual privilege was Lassus, with his 1581 perpetual imperial privilege for past, present and future works. Lassus’ example may have encouraged other musicians contemplating the publication of their polyphonic compositions to apply for imperial printing privileges. Examples documented archivally include Jakob Handl (Gallus), Hans Leo Hassler and Franz Sales. However, references on title pages of printed music suggest that a wider range of musicians may have applied for individual privileges, despite the lack of archival documentation. As already mentioned, the publications of the Magdeburg cantor Gallus Dressler list a Saxon privilege, and this privilege is also mentioned (along with an imperial one) on Dressler’s music issued by Katharina Gerlach. It seems unlikely that Gerlach would seek a Saxon privilege given that her output was usually protected by imperial privileges and targeted for sale in markets under imperial jurisdiction; more likely
is that this Saxon privilege was acquired individually by Dressler, which might explain why Gerlach’s editions of his music carry the rubric ‘Imprimebat cum consensi Autoris’.83

The increasing use of individual privileges for musicians gave rise to the question of whether such privileges took precedence over a publisher’s general privilege. In 1582 Katharina Gerlach published the Fasciculi aliquot sacrarum cantionum, containing many Las-sus motets that had previously been published by Adam Berg. The title page of Gerlach’s edition clarified it was published under the terms of Lassus’ individual privilege (‘Privilegium sacrae Caes. Maiestatis peculiari’), and an extract from this privilege was contained within.84 Berg, however, petitioned the Nuremberg council, complaining that this edition contravened his own general privilege. The council dismissed his case on the grounds that ‘she [Gerlach] printed the songs with the knowledge and consent of Orlandus, and the latter bears himself another and better special privilege’ compared to Berg’s.85 Berg appealed against the decision to the imperial Hofrat in Vienna, which upheld the initial ruling:

Because the privilege is general and does not relate specifically to these songs, and [as a privilege granted by] Maximilian II it has expired on his death, and because it is not known whether Berg has a special privilege for Nuremberg or not, and particularly because the author himself has sold his books, because the executio of the privilege states that he can take books for himself, therefore [Berg’s] petition was denied.86

Analysing this verdict, Pohlmann commented that ‘the notable feeling for a conceptual separation of publisher’s rights from creator’s rights is to be recognised’.87 Yet the court rulings make no specific mention of the role of creator, instead giving precedence to the most recent and most specific privilege. Lassus’ role as an author is mentioned in the context of his selling books himself; while there is no other evidence that he acted as a bookseller, the Hofrat’s wording suggests a concern to protect books as items of publishers’ stock rather than as intellectual objects.

Indeed in the early seventeenth century, musicians who held printing privileges tended to be those who published their own compositions, including Johann Hermann Schein, Heinrich Schütz and Johannes Schultz. In his 1617 supplication to the Elector of Saxony, Schütz explained that a privilege would protect his investment in publication, specifically against the risk that ‘on completion of the opus, experienced booksellers and printers might immediately undertake to publish, reprint and sell it; consequently my copies might remain unsold and cause me significant and considerable harm’.88 Schein also noted the importance of a privilege in upholding the accuracy of texts: ‘many times, carefully disseminated things among others are liable to be reprinted with mistakes, not without special prejudice and disadvantage to the author’ (a point previously made by Lassus in his 1581 application for an imperial privilege).89 Thus for composers who self-published, a privilege offered protection not merely for their financial investment in an edition, but also for the reputation that might be gained through dissemination of accurate texts. For buyers of printed music, a privilege therefore might signal texts that were more likely to be trustworthy and hence worthy of purchase.

Conclusions

The mechanism of imperial privileges offered protection from piracy within the empire, but no guarantee outside the emperor’s jurisdiction. Books printed within the empire were regularly pirated by the printers of Lyons, Paris and Venice. Privileges issued in territories such as Electoral Brandenburg and Saxony were equally limited in their efficacy, providing
no protection in the Holy Roman Empire more widely. Although the existence of a privilege implied a certain cachet, the process of application was tedious and involved some expense, and was no guarantee of success. For many twentieth-century scholars such as Hansjörg Pohlmann, living in an age in which intellectual property is hedged about by legal protections as a matter of course, there may have been a temptation to exaggerate the attractiveness and pervasiveness of privileges. However, the low incidence of titles bearing privileges in the vdm database – less than 5% – suggests that these legal instruments were relatively unattractive to authors, printers and publishers of music in the decades before 1550. After 1550, as mechanisms for regulating the book trade became more developed with the establishment of the imperial and Saxon book commissions, privileges appear to have been more widely used, particularly for partbook editions issued in the 1570s and 1580s.

A privilege held a variety of meanings of authors, publishers and consumers. For publishers, the decision of whether to apply for a privilege demanded a calculation balancing projected profits against the expense and bother of acquiring a privilege. It is probably no coincidence that the middle of the sixteenth century, when the imperial chancery began to regulate book privileges more effectively, also saw the publication of the first treatise on insurance, the science of balancing present costs against future risk, Tractatus de assecurationibus et sponsionibus mercatorum, by the jurist Pedro de Santarém, printed at Venice in 1552 – without a privilege. A privilege could easily be understood as a kind of insurance against potential loss. At the same time, a privilege could be a powerful statement of prestige, enhancing buyers’ impressions of the authority and value of editions. Privileges are prominently displayed in some of the most lavish music books of the sixteenth century, such as Adam Berg’s Patrocinium musices series containing sacred polyphony by Lassus, where the excerpt from the imperial privilege (see Figure 9.2) complements the display of authority given by the title page (with its depiction of coats of arms of Catholic rulers who support music) and the frontispiece portrait of Crown Prince Wilhelm of Bavaria. A study of printing privileges therefore highlights the different ways in which music books carried value in the sixteenth century, offering clues as to the commercial and non-commercial motives of authors and publishers.

Appendix 9.1 Draft of privilege granted to Matthias Apiarius, 27 May 1544


Ad mandatum domini Regis proprium
H. Renner

Source: Vienna, Haus-, Hof- und Staatsarchiv, RHR, Impressoria 2-23, fol. 168v.

Appendix 9.2 Supplication of Hans Kilian, approved
26 April 1544

ettlichen fürnemen kunstreichen Musicis/ vnd erfarnen Instrumentisten/ souil ver-

tflichen fürnemen kunstreichen Musicis/ vnd erfarnen Instrumentisten/ souil ver-

tflichen fürnemen kunstreichen Musicis/ vnd erfarnen Instrumentisten/ souil ver-

tflichen fürnemen kunstreichen Musicis/ vnd erfarnen Instrumentisten/ souil ver-

tflichen fürnemen kunstreichen Musicis/ vnd erfarnen Instrumentisten/ souil ver-

tflichen fürnemen kunstreichen Musicis/ vnd erfarnen Instrumentisten/ souil ver-

tflichen fürnemen kunstreichen Musicis/ vnd erfarnen Instrumentisten/ souil ver-

tflichen fürnemen kunstreichen Musicis/ vnd erfarnen Instrumentisten/ souil ver-

Eur Kaÿserlicher Maiestet/ als mein allergnedigisten Herrn/ mein vnndertenigists bitten/ Eur Kaÿserliche Maiestet/ welle mir/ Ain Priuilegium vnd Freÿhait (on welhe jch nichts ins werghkh bringen kan noch mag) des jnnhallts/ das aller mein Musicalischer drugkh/ souil jch/ dess/ auf waserlay Instrument es sey/ Orgl/ oder lautten Tabulatur/ oder gsang/ vnd was jch sonst darzwischen/ von Allerlaÿ schriften/ in den nechstuolgenden zehen Jarn/ ausgeen lassen würd/ Auch ain ýdes werghkh/ von seinem dato/ vnd ausgann an/ auch in Zehen Jarn/ beý ainer Peen/ nit nachgedrugkht werden soll/ allergnedigist mittailen/ vnd sölichs vor [280r] nie gesehen werghkh/ an Eur Maiestet nit erwidren las-

Appendix 9.3 Draft of privilege granted to Paul Köpfel,
30 May 1559

Allerdurchleuchtigister Großmechtigister vnüberwinndlichster Romischer Kayser aller-
gnedigister Herr Euer Romischen Kaÿserlichen Maiestet seÿenn meine allervnderthonig-
ste ganntz getrewe vnd gehorsame diennst alles hochstenn vermogenn yeder zeit beuor/
Alls Euer Romischen Kaÿserlichen Maiestet höchstloblichster vorfare Karl Romischer Kayser &c weylant Wolffgang Kopflinn gewesenn Bürgern zuStraßburg meýnem lieb-
enn vatter seliger nach seiner buchtrucker hanndel mit einem Kayserlichen priuilegio aller
gnedigst begabet vndn gefreyett/ vff form vndn massenn wie bejuerwarte Collacionierte
vnd vnndersenabreiche abschrifft außweyßt vndn mit brinngt/ Er meinn vatter aber hie
zwischen mit tod verscheÿden jnn dessen getrÿbenen hanndel ich sein verlassener Sonne
eingedreternn/ Nunn kann aber Eurer Römischen Kayserlichen Maiestet alls einem mitt-
leÿdennlichenn aller gnedigst Haupt jch aller vnnderthonigst nit verhaltennn/ das bemelter
meýn vatter seliger nach erlangung bestimpten Kayserlichen Priuilegij einen merckli-
chen ansehenlichenn schadenn durch ein Schÿffbruch auff dem Rhein erlÿttenn Welchenn
schadenn er biz, jnn sein ennde/ nicht wider erholenn oder ergötzt werdenn mog darann
auch jch [fol. 348v] vndn annders meine geschwistern aller gnedigst zu erscheinen/ das will gegen Eure Romische

Kayserliche Maiestet ich alle Zeit meins lebens dannckpar vnnd jnngedennck sein/ Vnnd es daneben jnn aller hochsten vnnderthonigkait alles vermogenns mit darstreckung liebs vnd gutts aller vnnderthonigst verdienen/ thue mich derenn zu gnadenn aller vnnder-thonigst beuelhennde/ dern allergnedigstenn anntwurt erwartennde.

Euer Romischen Kayserlichen Maiestet Aller vnnderthonigst gantz getrewer vnd gehorsamer

Paulus Köpfflin
Buchtrucker vnd Bürger zu Wormbs

[Decision on fol. 349r:] Fiat ain Renouation diß Priuilegiums wie es sein Vatter gehabt/ Vnnd auf drej Jar lanng Den 30 Maij Aº &c 59º

Source: Vienna, Haus-, Hof- und Staatsarchiv, RHR, Impressoria 38-34, fol. 348r–349v.
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The French scholar Marin Mersenne (1588–1648) described the process of getting his Harmonie universelle printed as ‘unbelievably hard work’. He finished the manuscript in 1634 after ten years’ work, but could only send the complete printed work to his friend and patron Nicolas-Claude Fabri de Peiresc in 1637. During the three years of printing, the voluminous book was produced piecemeal. According to Mersenne, the primary cause of the delay was the intervention of Pierre Ballard, the Music Printer to the King. Ballard famously held the privilege on music printing in France, and with this privilege, Ballard was the only one who could print musical notation or allow others to do so. Mersenne’s dissatisfaction with Ballard has long been noted, and traces of the chaos attending the printing process can be found throughout the work. However, little attention has been given to the role of music printing in Mersenne’s work. The technique of music printing, the presses of Pierre Ballard and the royal privilege are important elements in understanding how we encounter the Harmonie universelle today. Moreover, Mersenne’s role as an author and intermediary in early modern print culture still demand closer investigation. This chapter attempts to locate Mersenne at the printing press, to see how he negotiated, brokered and handled the restrictions and possibilities of music printing in early seventeenth-century Paris.

Readers of the Harmonie universelle have long commented upon its complex structure. The number of books is said to differ with each copy. This is complicated by the fact that there are three variants, each with a different printer on the title page. The majority of the surviving copies were published under the names of Sébastien Cramoisy and Pierre Ballard. The second variant features only Ballard’s name on the title page (see Figure 10.1). The third variant is published under the name of Richard Charlemagne. Mersenne’s own copy – the one by Cramoisy and Ballard – is full of improvements and alterations, indicating that the result continued to bother him. Simultaneously, Mersenne published the Latin counterpart of his book, the Harmonicorum libri, made for those who could not read French. It was printed by Guillaume Baudry with Ballard’s musical characters in 1635 and re-issued the next year with a new preface of the printer. The Harmonie contains newer material that was only added after 1636. Nonetheless, the Latin version also contains material that cannot be found in the French book, thus confusing its history even more.

How can we approach the use of music printing in a theoretical work? In recent years, musicological studies have explored the variety of ways in which contemporary print culture
shaped books on music theory. By examining title page, size, shape of the book and marginal notes, several studies have explored how music printing influenced methods of music theoretical authorship and practices of reading and musical scholarship. Cristle Collins Judd’s *Reading Renaissance Music Theory* explores the ways sixteenth-century music theorists utilised and depended on music printing for their musical examples. Kate van Orden has explored how musical authorship developed in the age of music printing and how ‘composers’ were increasingly turned into ‘authors’. Simultaneously, scholars have argued for a more critical approach to specific authors and audiences. Early modern music theory encompassed a wide variety of practices and activities, and terms such as ‘music theorist’ or ‘music theory’ require critical examination. As Jessie Ann Owens writes, ‘we need to find words that are specific to the particular activity and reflect the character of the audience and social function of the text(s) under consideration’. This also becomes clear in Mersenne’s work. The subtitle
for the *Harmonie universelle* is ‘the theory and practice of music’. Music here is understood in its broadest sense, which for Mersenne also included sound propagation, mechanics and instrument building, topics that today are typically omitted from the history of music theory. Moreover, for musical authors like Mersenne, as Penelope Gouk has argued, ‘it was the possession of higher academic degrees in philosophy and theology’ rather than any practical experience that qualified them to write about music. By focussing on how Mersenne approached music printing and the privilege of Ballard, we can understand the influences of print culture on the practice of publishing music books in seventeenth-century France. Print and printing privileges determine and delimit what musical theoretical knowledge is included and how it is transmitted. It is here that the printer Ballard and his privilege play a large role in understanding the *Harmonie*. Before we discuss Mersenne’s role and the process of printing, we must therefore focus first on the printer, Ballard.

**Ballard’s privilege**

After Adrien le Roy’s death in 1599, Pierre Ballard took over the printing firm Le Roy & Ballard that from now on would bear only his name. His father had founded the firm with Le Roy in 1551 and was made ‘royal printer of music’ two years later. During the second half of the sixteenth century, Ballard and Le Roy had few competitors and thus could establish a virtual monopoly. The production of other printers in Paris, such as Nicolas du Chemin, diminished in the 1570s, and other important centres of printing such as Lyons were only secondary to Paris in music. Pierre Ballard was appointed Music Printer to the King on 25 March 1607, a privilege renewed in 1611 and 1633. Until his death in 1639, he would dominate French music printing. Because he possessed the sole privilege to print music within France, no one was allowed to print musical characters (vocal or instrumental of any kind) without Ballard’s permission, otherwise they had to pay a fine and hand over the musical type.

Ballard’s position, however, was not undisputed. Several other printers wanted to break open the privilege and print music themselves. In 1633 Nicolas Métru, for example, received a privilege to have his music printed, sold and distributed by any printer or bookseller of his choice, a right that contradicted Ballard’s privilege. Ballard went to court to defend his own privilege and Métru’s letters were cancelled, under the condition that Ballard would print and distribute the composer’s works. With some composers, Ballard would make specialised contracts for the printing and distribution of their works. In 1638, for example, he made an agreement with Nicolas Formé to publish three masses with the stipulation that he would refrain from publishing any similar works. Such contracts, however, seem to have been rare.

The printing privilege of Ballard was ‘a restrictive, monopolistic measure’ ‘to support individual printers’ as Richard Agee describes. In France especially, privileges and monopolies were given to the King’s Printers from the sixteenth century onwards. A privilege could have wide ranging influences. As Daniel Heartz has shown, Pierre Attaingnant primarily published the music of composers close to the court. Robert Ballard preferred to publish collections of music by various composers, rather than devoting books exclusively to a sole composer, arguing that sales would go down if he did so. During the first half of the seventeenth century, the taste and preferences of Pierre Ballard controlled the French music scene, favouring *airs de cour* and songs over ensemble music and keyboard repertoire. For composers outside Paris, it was especially difficult to get their work published. In 1633, the Rouen organist Jean Titelouze hoped some more works of his would see the light of day, ‘if Ballard wants it’.
Not only composers relied on the willingness of the printing firm; music theorists like Mersenne were similarly dependent on Ballard. The printing of music treatises was not a priority for Le Roy and Ballard in the sixteenth century. The treatises that they did print, such as a text by Jean Yssandon (1582) and an anonymous work (1583), were uncomplicated and primarily used for elementary music education. In the early seventeenth century, Pierre Ballard printed several treatises, including instructions for instruments such as Luis de Briceño’s *Metodo muy facilissimo* (1626), two anonymous music treatises (1602 and 1616) and Antoine Parran’s *Traité de la musique* (1639; 1646) (see Table 10.1). As Laurent Guillo has shown, Pierre and Robert III Ballard were responsible for almost half of the treatises on music and music instruction in France and more than half of those printed in Paris. When we look at the list of treatises printed by Pierre Ballard, Mersenne’s work figures prominently. Not every music book, however, was deemed fit for print. Antoine de Cousu’s *La Musique universelle* (1658), for example, was such a book. Although Titelouze announced in 1633 to Mersenne that Ballard would soon print de Cousu’s book, it took eventually until 1658. According to Mersenne, the work in question was ‘so long and useless’ that it could not be printed in France. He asked Giovanni Battista Doni if he could help with finding someone to publish the book in Rome. De Cousu’s long discussion of metres and notational systems that were no longer in use seemed to disqualify it from printing. Money was most likely an issue. De Cousu eventually financed the printing himself but the process was interrupted by his death, leaving the publication unfinished.

Pierre Ballard did not only influence whether musical treatises were printed, but also – directly and indirectly – on what music was being discussed. It is clear that the influence of Ballard extended deep into Mersenne’s *Harmonie*. It is also clear that Mersenne knew very well what was available in Ballard’s shop, which was ‘filled with all kinds of examples of the best masters who have ever existed’. Throughout the book we find references to the stock of Ballard’s bookshop. Mersenne refers to the lute pieces that Ballard ‘prints every year’ and the *airs* being printed every day. As Laurent Guillo has made clear, the composers referred to by Mersenne reflected the interest of the printer. Mersenne relied heavily on musical examples of Eustache du Caurroy, and on the airs of Antoine Boësset and Etienne Moulinié. As I will discuss later, he also acted as agent for composers who wanted to print or buy music. To get his own book printed, however, proved more difficult.

**Table 10.1 Music treatises 1599–1652**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Composer</th>
<th>Title</th>
<th>Year</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>[anonymous]</td>
<td><em>Traité de musique</em></td>
<td>1602</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>[anonymous]</td>
<td><em>Traité de musique</em></td>
<td>1616–1617</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Marin Mersenne</td>
<td><em>Quaestiones</em></td>
<td>1623</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Louis de Briceño</td>
<td><em>Metodo muy facilissimo</em></td>
<td>1626</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>François Bourgoing</td>
<td><em>Brevis psalmodiaci ratio</em></td>
<td>1635</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Marin Mersenne</td>
<td><em>Traite de l’Orgue</em></td>
<td>1635</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Marin Mersenne</td>
<td><em>Harmonicorum libri</em></td>
<td>1636</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Marin Mersenne</td>
<td><em>Harmonie universelle</em></td>
<td>1636</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Antoine Parran</td>
<td><em>Traité</em></td>
<td>1639</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Marin Mersenne</td>
<td><em>Cogitata physico-mathematica</em></td>
<td>1644</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Antoine Parran</td>
<td><em>Traité</em> (2nd ed.)</td>
<td>1646</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Marin Mersenne</td>
<td><em>Harmonicorum libri</em></td>
<td>1648</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Jean Denis</td>
<td><em>Traité de l’accord de l’épinette</em></td>
<td>1650</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Marin Mersenne</td>
<td><em>Harmonicorum libri</em></td>
<td>1652</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Denis Macé</td>
<td><em>Reigles très faciles</em></td>
<td>1652</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Data from: Guillo (2003).
Printing the *Harmonie universelle*

It is unclear whether Mersenne considered publishing his *Harmonie* outside of France. He had already relied on Ballard’s music font in his *Celeberrimae Quaestiones in Genesim*, printed by Cramoisy.²⁸ For most of his other works on music printed before the *Harmonie*, Mersenne did not use a music font.²⁹ The compositional examples in the book draw heavily on the music published by Ballard, and would have been difficult to print elsewhere. Although Mersenne sought out other printers than Ballard to print the musical examples, Ballard did not let him. A letter from Mersenne to Peiresc in 1634 reveals the tension caused by Ballard’s control. Mersenne identifies Ballard as the cause of delay, yet he was not allowed to print his work elsewhere:

[...]

The physical music type is at the centre of this problem. Mersenne was obviously annoyed by the costs, and Ballard’s insistence on printing the book himself. He would have let someone who had purchased the necessary matrices by chance print the musical examples, but Ballard objected to this. We have little further information from Mersenne’s letters on contacts with other printers, since such contact would have been conducted in person. It seems in any case that he wanted to get on with this project quickly. In Mersenne’s letters from the previous years, we find lists of questions, depictions of instruments and musical experiments that he aimed to incorporate in his future work. He collected material on a wide variety of instruments and their construction; visited makers and musicians; performed acoustic experiments with strings, organ pipes and guns; and studied the remaining sources on ancient music. All of this was supposed to come together in his *Harmonie*, which, as Peiresc wrote, was ‘put together under great pressure’.³¹ It remains unknown why Mersenne was in such a hurry, but it is clear that by this moment, it was time to bring his work to the printers.

Mersenne had already received the printing privilege for the *Harmonie* and the *Harmoniorum libri* in 1629.³² This privilege was given to Cramoisy seven years later, on 26 April 1636, when printing was already underway. In the intervening years, we find repeated references to the slow progress of the printing. Mersenne divided his work into smaller treatises, limiting the use of musical notation to those books where it was necessary, since he had to wait on Ballard’s convenience.³³ During the process, Mersenne already issued separate parts, for example, the treatise on the organ, signed by Ballard in 1635, and the first book on sound.³⁴ His patron Peiresc tried to calm Mersenne, writing that he did not find it strange that the music printer was causing him pains, since printers were mostly ‘folk without mercy’.³⁵ Mersenne was most likely eager to satisfy his patron and not run out of money during the process. He wrote that he if he were not bound by his oath of poverty, he would have printed it himself, ‘so that only honest men will handle it’.³⁶ The total cost of printing was estimated to be 1,000 écus, of which the printer demanded a hundred in
advance. Peiresc happily provided Mersenne with his part. In the end, the remaining expense of the investment was probably divided among the three different printers, who each made their own title page. The last two books of the Harmonie do not contain any musical examples and were added in 1637 or 1638. Mersenne also fashioned an index and a small summary (‘Abrégé’), which his correspondents continued to request. In the end, he even despaired of the use of printing entirely: ‘If we stayed with the old method of writing by hand, we would often have a more satisfying and better account’. 

Mersenne as middleman

Throughout his life, Mersenne acted on behalf of others to get books printed or obtain privileges. Although he was not always successful in the execution of such tasks, he offered many authors help in publishing or dissemination and saw himself as an entremetteur or middleman. This was not always easy; the early seventeenth century saw an increasing role of censorship and control, especially with the rise of Cardinal Richelieu and his agent for books, Chancellor Séguier. As Mersenne wrote to René Descartes: ‘Never has the censorship of books been more painstaking than at present’. Books on theology and politics – but also literature and mathematics – were diligently investigated. Still, Mersenne saw himself as someone who could navigate such waters. In his first surviving letter to Galileo Galilei, Mersenne proposed to assist in publishing his work in France: ‘I can assure you that if you are willing to trust this treatise to me and to send me a copy by a reliable method, I will make so bold as to undertake to have it published’. When Descartes tried to get a privilege for his scientific essays and the Discourse on Method, he sought out Mersenne and the Dutch diplomat and poet Constantijn Huygens. Descartes handed Huygens the material that was already printed in the Low Countries, who forwarded it to Mersenne to arrange the formal request of the privilege in Paris.

In the field of music, Mersenne occupies a similar role of intermediary. When Constantijn Huygens wanted to have his song collection Pathodia Sacra et profana (1647) published by Robert Ballard in Paris, he turned to Mersenne for help. Huygens hoped that Mersenne could help him persuade the composer Jean Baptiste Boësset to supervise the printing process, but he declined. Eventually Thomas Gobert and Christophe-Nicolas Tassin would be in charge. Mersenne played an important role in establishing the necessary contacts. According to a letter written 5 May 1646, Mersenne instructed Tassin to deliver the nine Latin songs to Ballard and let him arrange a meeting with Boësset. In subsequent correspondence, they discussed technicalities such as layout, type and tablature, a realm in which Mersenne played a lesser role: such matters were handled between Huygens, Tassin, Gobert and Ballard himself. The cost of printing was a salient issue; Ballard wanted to know how much Huygens could contribute. Huygens was also asked to provide a basso continuo instead of lute tablature, since those sold better. Mersenne wrote to Huygens at the end of September that he would ask Gobert to come over so that they could sing through Huygens’ songs, and that they would then bring them to Ballard for printing. In the next few months, Huygens wanted to see the proofs; he wrote to Mersenne again and complained about Ballard’s tardiness in completing the publication. Mersenne wrote back that he could do little about Ballard’s working tempo and that Huygens should contact Gobert, since ‘he can do more about the laziness of Ballard than me’. In the following letter, Mersenne reflects upon the state of music printing, comparing it to that in Italy, the Low Countries, and even the Ottoman Empire:

Mr Gobert has promised me every kind of care and diligence in regard to Ballard. It is strange that in such a large kingdom, we have only this one printer of music, while in Italy there is
hardly a village without one. But you are in this one aspect even poorer than us: for all the
villages that print good and bad books, you have none for poor old music. She will, as I see
it, always be as miserable in this country of France as she is in Turkey.50

Almost a decade after his experience of printing the Harmonie, it was still difficult for
Mersenne to understand the lack of other printers of music. Huygens was annoyed with
the delay but eventually declared proudly in his letters that his music was printed in the
French capital, and not in the Low Countries.51 Paris and Ballard still stood for quality and
prestige, even if these came at a price. Robert Ballard himself denied the accusation that he
was not interested in printing Huygens’s Pathodia and worked especially slowly, claiming
that he was merely waiting for Huygens to decide on technical issues.52

The limitations of music printing

In Mersenne’s writing on music notation and embellishments, we see in detail the influ-
ence of printing technologies on the development of music theoretical ideas. Mersenne
often expressed frustration with the limitations of musical typography, for example,
when discussing newer genres such as the monody, or the special characters of organ
tablature. Mersenne complained that the musical characters in use could not express
the subtleties and exclamations of the human voice or indicate performance practices
such as the ‘martelemens’, ‘tremblemens’ and ‘battemens’ which players used to adorn
their playing.53 But more fundamentally, Mersenne considered that the difficulty of mu-

sic printing and Ballard’s privilege both disrupted musical practice and the transfer for
musical knowledge. One way to circumvent this was to create other forms of notation
that did not rely on music type. Like many of his contemporaries, Mersenne devised
several new music notational systems. He was especially interested in updating the sol-
misation system and translating notes into numbers. In book sixteen, ‘On singing well’
(‘de l’art de bien chanter’), the second proposition deals with the notation of music using
ordinary letters. As examples, he demonstrates several alternatives for compositions by
Eustache du Caurroy, including a setting of the text Misericordias Domini. In the next
proposition, he gives symbols to write and compose any kind of music easily, for voice
or instrument, without relying on musical notation (see Figure 10.2). However, it was not
possible to indicate rhythms with these methods. Although such practices clearly relate
to the seventeenth-century interest in universal languages and cryptography, Mersenne
also saw his efforts as serving the practical need to preserve musical compositions that
would otherwise be lost because of the lack of a sufficiently flexible technique of music
printing in France:

All this being said, one can easily write, read, and sing every kind of music with ordinary
printing type, without any need for music type. So all those who compose airs and motets
will communicate their thoughts and intentions to all kinds of people, and we will be able to
have a number of good compositions which are being lost, and which we cannot enjoy for
lack of music type, which is very rare in France.54

In another instance, Mersenne envisioned the possibility for composers and theorists to
share their compositions more easily, without having to print them with music type:

This manner of composing, which I explain here, can be used by learned theorists who wish to
compare and send their compositions to each other, or who wish to have them printed with-
out using the customary notes, which are not encountered at all amongst ordinary printers.55
Through an alternative system of letters or numbers, other printers would be able to print musical compositions, facilitating the sharing of music. Such practices were not an innovation, though; solmisation methods are the most common example, and alternatives to musical notes were developed throughout early modern period.

The viability of such methods and their ability to compete with the presses of Ballard remain unknown. Mersenne himself composed a hymn with numbers and sent it to Jean Titelouze, who tried to decipher it.56 This attempt was not particularly successful. However, it is certain that Mersenne’s notational system served didactic, theoretical and demonstrative purposes. By assigning numbers to the position according to the bass or tonal system, readers could scan the harmonies and progressions quickly. Alternatively, Mersenne suggested using the number of air vibrations as a notational method. By extending a string and counting the number of vibrations, Mersenne was able to quantify the movement of air and the pitches produced. He devised several uses of this method, for example, to show how pieces of music might be sung at the same pitch all over the world.57 It could also be used to write down music. As he writes: ‘In fact, we cannot represent sound better than by the number of beatings (‘battemens’), since they are in no way different from sound, which we call sonorous or sounding number’.58 As an example, he gives an air by Boësset, represented with the number of air vibrations of the individual pitches (see Figure 10.3).

The extent to which such notational systems served practical purposes remains unclear. Although Mersenne’s notation compresses musical notation, it removes almost all the musicality we associate with staff notation, and turns a musical composition into a mere series of numbers. Mersenne believed, however, that music could be more easily shared, learnt and, transmitted by this method. Moreover – not unimportantly – one would not have to wait on the dilatory Ballard. One of Mersenne’s companions, Jean le Maire, also developed such a notational method. Mersenne commented on le Maire’s system in his Harmonie and in his annotations.59 He discussed le Maire’s system only briefly, since its characters could not yet be printed. However, he did send examples to several correspondents. Constantijn Huygens, for example, discussed the characters with Joan Albert Ban. Although Huygens did not think much of Le Maire’s characters, he believed that they could one day be made public through the printing press.60 Ban saw no need for new characters and thought that ordinary music notes sufficed.51
An investigation of printing cannot ignore the continuation of manuscript traditions and scribal cultures. As many studies have shown, a culture of scribal book production continued to flourish long after the introduction of printed books. This was no different in the field of music. Throughout Mersenne’s letters, we find leaflets and references to musical notation by hand. In his personal annotations, he wrote down melodies and larger pieces, such as an organ composition by Charles Racquet, one of his friends. Moreover, throughout the Harmonie, Mersenne refers to the impossibility of printing several characters. For example, several characters for the study of lute tablature devised by Parisian lutenist Jehan Basset could not be printed within the musical examples. Although they are mentioned in the text and illustrated in woodcuts, they are missing in the musical examples set by Ballard, which relied on moveable type. Those who wanted to learn the piece according to the method Mersenne described needed to visit the author himself or find his copy at the printer: ‘But those who desire to mark them up will find them in my copy, where they are interpolated by hand because they had none of these characters at the print shop, and they will transcribe them rather easily’. He instructs the reader to wash the paper with a solution of alum to prevent the paper from absorbing excess ink. In another instance, he writes: ‘I shall lend my copy to accommodate the characters of this page, which could not be found in the printing houses of Paris’. Such practices of lending and circulation of books can tell us much about the transfer of musical knowledge in Mersenne’s circle. A closer investigation of the remaining copies of the Harmonie with annotations would be necessary to see if any annotations match those by Mersenne. Mersenne’s insistence on
the necessity of writing by hand demonstrates that he considered music books as dynamic, unstable objects that were inscribed and altered by their users over time.

Conclusion

Within the *Harmonie universelle* we see two privileges at work. First was the privilege requested by Mersenne in 1629 to publish his two books. Authors who wanted to print their work needed at least the approbation of the doctors of the Sorbonne and could, at their discretion, request a privilege that would protect their work from reprints. A privilege could be requested first by the author and then handed to the printer, as Mersenne did, giving his privilege to Cramoisy in 1636. Secondly, this text illustrates the effects of Pierre Ballard’s general privilege to print music type, which amounted to a monopoly on publishing music. As others have pointed out, Ballard exerted wide influence though this privilege, determining whether or not composers were published. As a businessman, Ballard always made decisions on collections or volumes, tablature or continuo, printing together with an eye to the potential market and sales. Mersenne had to rely on his patron Peiresc to print his work; this enabled him to be less dependent on printers, unlike other musical authors, as the example of Antoine de Cousu makes clear.

When we look at the *Harmonie* through the lens of music printing, our attention is drawn to the musical examples Mersenne discussed, the ways in which he organised his work into smaller treatises, and how his efforts to develop a new notational system gained extra urgency. The *Harmonie* is full of tables, text, notes and images, each of them to be ‘read’ in a specific way. A thorough study of the afterlives of the *Harmonie universelle* might uncover possible readings. Through his network of correspondents, Mersenne circulated and mediated the music printed by Ballard in Paris. Mersenne acted as an intermediary and provided his contacts outside Paris, such as Huygens and Peiresc, not only with information and news, but also with actual prints and books. In the fields of music and music printing, Mersenne acted on behalf of others to obtain privileges or transmit material to the printer. Scholarly books and music books moved within the same fields and across the same networks.

The complicated structure of the *Harmonie* and the discrepancies between the surviving copies testify to the chaotic printing process. With his need for extensive images, music examples and Greek and Hebrew letters, Mersenne demanded a lot from his printers, and such requests could not be fulfilled by a single printer in Paris at the time. Still, such discrepancies during the printing process were hardly exceptional in the world of early modern books. The printing history and Mersenne’s continuous reworkings should remind us that the music book is not a singular, stable object, but rather an exceptionally fragile one. Tracing the challenges of a book’s production illustrates the complexity of the printing process and the various economic, social and material influences that could affect the production of a work of music theory. Mersenne’s approach to the printing press shows what unbelievably hard work stands between writing and final publication.
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Part VI

The book trade
The Montanus & Neuber catalogue of 1560: prices, losses, and a new polyphonic music edition from 1556

Royston Gustavson

Introduction

The importance of early catalogues to music bibliography, especially in identifying lost editions, has long been known.¹ Well-known examples of such studies include Albert Göhler’s study of booksellers’ catalogues for the Frankfurt and Leipzig book fairs, Catherine Chapman’s study of the catalogue of the book collector Ferdinand Columbus, and Lawrence Bernstein’s study of music in Conrad Gesner’s Pandectae.² Of the many types of catalogues, printers’ catalogues are particularly valuable, since they permit analysis of many salient data, for example, how long books remained in print, or which kinds of books were less likely to be collected. Christian Coppens, who is working on a census of publishers’ and booksellers’ catalogues up to 1600, has written that there survive about eighty such editions published in Germany.³ There has been comparatively little study of these catalogues in the musicological literature, with notable exceptions including Konrad Ameln’s study of the Gerlach catalogue and my own study of the Egenolff catalogue.⁴ I am currently undertaking a study of music editions in printers’ catalogues. Of the many catalogues I have seen to date, by far the most interesting – besides those of Gerlach and Egenolff – is that by the Nuremberg firm led by Johann vom Berg (Montanus) and Ulrich Neuber. The firm of Montanus & Neuber was one of the major, if not indeed the major, German music printing house of the mid-sixteenth century. Their catalogue is unusual in that, like that of Gerlach, it has a section explicitly devoted to music, and even more unusual in that it specifies for each item either printed prices or the number of printed sheets in each copy of the edition. The present study of the catalogue, in addition to providing further information on known editions, identifies a number of lost editions and includes a description of an extant anthology of polyphonic music from 1556 that has not previously been noted in the literature.

The catalogue in the historical literature

The Montanus & Neuber catalogue does not appear in the VD16 or the USTC. The first reference to it in the literature occurs in Johann Ernesti’s Die Wol-eingerichtete Buchdruckerey (1733). Ernesti, who saw an exemplar of the catalogue,⁵ transcribed the Latin part of the title (only) and reproduced the book titles and prices of the folio volumes in Latin (fol. 2r), and all but the last two of the folio volumes in German (fol. 2r-v).⁶ Most subsequent discussion of this catalogue, including that in the musicological literature until 2018, has been based on Ernesti, and has stated that the catalogue is no longer extant.⁷ The next independent reference to the catalogue was in 1793, in Georg Andreas Will’s Bibliotheca Norica...
Williana, in which he transcribed both the Latin and the German text on the title page. Although Will’s exemplar of the catalogue was bequeathed, along with the rest of his library, to the Stadtbibliothek Nürnberg, it was missing by 1888.

Günter Richter’s 1974 catalogue of sixteenth- and seventeenth-century booksellers’ catalogues identified an extant exemplar in the Staatsbibliothek Bamberg, and gave a bibliographical description including title, signatures, collation, brief (four-line) description, four items of literature (not including Will) and the holding library. Importantly, given his deep knowledge of publishers’ catalogues, Richter noted that ‘[t]his index is particularly noteworthy as an early example of a catalogue from the German-speaking area containing prices and information about the size of books’. Richter also noted that an exact dating, which he does not attempt to give, would require an examination of its content. The next reference to the catalogue as extant, in 2002, is in a list of catalogues of Nuremberg publishers and booksellers by Renate Jürgensen. Jürgensen transcribes the title and lists exemplars in Nuremberg (which is not noted as missing) and Bamberg; her entry appears to be based on Richter and on the Bibliotheca Norica Williana.

Although my 2004 entry on ‘Montanus & Neuber’ in the print edition of MGG2 did not include a list of music editions and noted that the catalogue was lost, my revised 2018 entry for MGG Online included a new work-list that drew in part on the Bamberg exemplar of this catalogue.

**Bibliographical description**


**Colophon:** [none]

**Format:** upright octavo

**Collation and blank pages:** single gathering of eight leaves, 1v and 8r–v blank

**Signatures:** unsigned; leaves 2, 3, 4 and 5 numbered in the signature line in Arabic numerals

**Watermarks:** crown with double contoured half-arches (but no monde), with pearls, surmounted by a cloverleaf cross, chainlines c. 25 mm apart, split across leaves 2, 3, 6 and 7 on the upper inner margin and thus difficult to examine in detail

**Exemplars:** D-BAs 22/H.l.d.5 (formerly D-BAs Gb.II.194); lost: D-Nst Will. VIII, 308 (missing by 1888)

**Catalogues:** not in VD16; not in USTC

The sole known extant exemplar is in the Staatsbibliothek Bamberg, shelfmark 22/H.l.d.5. It is in a new grey cardboard binding, with the endpaper consisting only of a pastedown at the front and back, with the old and current catalogue numbers written on the front pastedown. The exemplar has been heavily trimmed, and now measures between 134 mm (spine) and 136.5 mm (fore-edge) high, and 84 mm wide. The presence of the signature lines suggests that nothing has been lost, despite the heavy trimming, as nothing should be printed below each signature line. Stitching holes visible in the paper on fol. 5–8 indicate that this exemplar was formerly in an earlier binding, and that when it was rebound the stitching was not made in exactly the same place. The library stamp ‘Staats-Bibliothek Bamberg’ occurs on fol. 1v and fol. 7v. The exemplar shows early signs of use. On the verso of the title page, numbers have been written in ink: 5, 6, 8, 10, 11, 13, 14,
12, 15, 16 and 5. Of particular interest is the inscription on fol. 8v which reads: ‘Eucharius Schö[n]|dono|edit[i.e. gave as a gift] NE. || 3 Februarij || 1562. ||’ Schönmann was a deacon of St Jacob, Nuremberg, from 1562 to 1567.16

Overview of the catalogue

The catalogue, transcribed in full in Appendix 11.2, lists 190 book titles. For ease of reference, I have assigned each title a number that is made up of an editorial page number followed by an editorial item number, e.g. [10.04]. The catalogue lists multi-volume editions as a single title, but usually specifies the number of volumes; for example, ‘Luther’s commentary on Genesis, in four volumes’ (‘Quatuor Tomi Lutheri in Genesim’ [1.03]). Sometimes further bibliographical information is hidden within a single entry; for example, in the ‘Six volumes of the Gospels’ (‘Sex Tomi Evangeliorum’ [12.01]), each of the six volumes consists of a set of partbooks, and so this one entry consists of a total of thirty partbooks. On the other hand, ‘The evangelical citizen’s handbook’ (‘Des Evangelischen Burgers Hand-Büchlin’ [6.20]) consists of two volumes, but the catalogue does not indicate this. For the purposes of my analysis, I have counted each title only once, regardless of the number of volumes: as a single price is given for each title, this clearly implies that they were sold as a single unit.

The books are typically divided into sections by format, from folio to 32mo, and within format by language (Latin, then German). The two exceptions are the section headed ‘Scholasticalia’ (‘School Books’), interposed between the Latin and German sections for octavo as they are all in octavo format; and a separate section headed ‘Musici Libri’ (‘Music Books’) on the final page that is not further subdivided by format and language. It is very unusual for a sixteenth-century German catalogue to have a section devoted to music; the only other ones of which I am aware are those prepared by Gerlach (one catalogue that was printed and one catalogue that is in manuscript).17 The ‘Musici Libri’ are all editions of polyphonic music; music-theory books are listed under ‘Scholasticalia’, and books containing one or more hymns (Kirchenlieder) appear in the relevant sections of the catalogue according to format and language.

Each entry gives a short title, then in many cases the author, and finally either the price or the number of sheets in the book (those for [3.08], [6.02], [6.06] and [7.09] are omitted, apparently by error); the year of publication is not given. The inclusion of either a printed price or the number of sheets for each book is unexpected. Coppens writes that ‘Catalogues with fixed prices seem to be meant for retail, while catalogues listing the number of sheets in the book but not prices certainly point to the wholesale market, where a large part of the trade between booksellers was carried out by barter’.18 The printed prices appear to be for ‘premium’ editions such as Latin folios and polyphonic music, and the number of sheets for smaller formats such as school books. Perhaps this catalogue could serve both functions: in addition to those given by Coppens, where number of sheets is given the retail purchaser could be given the price per sheet to calculate the total price, and the fixed prices indicate to the wholesale market particular editions that were not available for trade on a sheet-by-sheet basis.

It is important to note that fol. 8v is blank and so more titles could have been included on these pages without extending the catalogue to more than eight leaves of octavo (that is, a single printed sheet). There is thus no reason to believe that any available titles were omitted.

The catalogue is not dated. The presence of the manuscript date ‘3 February 1562’ in the extant exemplar means that the catalogue must have been published before that date.
I looked for Montanus & Neuber editions in standard bibliographies, searching for the most recent edition of each title up to 1562, and noting whether or not they were included in the catalogue. For example, all known polyphonic music editions from 1555–1560 were included, but none of the three first editions from 1561 and 1562. Again, the Montanus & Neuber edition of the Deutsche musica (1560) by Martin Agricola that was enlarged and edited by Wolfgang Figulus is included, but their only edition of Wilflingseder’s Musica teutsch (1561) was not. Of the 190 titles in the catalogue, the earliest extant Montanus & Neuber edition of six titles dates from 1561 or later, and so it is reasonable to assume that, for each of these titles, there were earlier lost Montanus & Neuber editions. As such, I have assigned the catalogue a deduced date of 1560.

Analytical methodology

To analyse the catalogue, I set up a spreadsheet as follows. This allowed for multiple ways of manipulating the data to better understand the relationships between the various components:

- Catalogue page and assigned item number for each entry
- Transcription of the entry itself
- Author/editor/translator (standardised spelling)
- Format
- Language
- Price or number of sheets
- Price standardised in Pfennig
- Where an extant exemplar is known:
  - VD16/RISM/Claus number or, if in none of these catalogues, the holding library
  - Year of publication taken from extant exemplars
  - Number of leaves
  - Number of sheets (number of leaves divided by format)
  - Price per sheet

To identify titles and copies, I used the VD16, USTC, KVK, Claus’ Melanchthon-Bibliographie and, for music, also RISM and vdm. Where an author was not given, searches for the title in several cases gave a likely author; these names are indicated in Appendix 11.2 in square brackets. Where a title has been identified as extant, the format and number of sheets have been used to confirm the identification.

The entries for the thirty-six school books (‘Scholasticalia’) do not specify their format. The placement of this section in the catalogue, between the Latin books in octavo and the German books in octavo, supports the supposition that all the school books were likewise in octavo, the regular format for school textbooks at this time. Indeed, of the twenty-seven titles that survive, all are indeed in octavo. Consequently, my calculations for the school books assume that all titles are in octavo. All the school books are written in Latin, except for the last edition in the list, a music-theory textbook in German.

Analysis of this list must also take typographical errors into account. For example, one edition, [2.02], stood out as an anomaly. The Catalogue stated that it was printed on 273 sheets, but both known Montanus & Neuber editions of this book were printed on 173 sheets. It may be assumed then that 273 was a typographical error that should have read 173. Accordingly, this has been amended in Appendix 11.2.
In some instances, the stated number of sheets matches the number of sheets in extant editions nearly but not exactly, typically with a discrepancy of 0.5 or one sheet. This particularly affects books assigned a printing date of 1559 [1.14], [2.04], [3.09], [4.03] and [4.13] but not 1560. In some of these instances, the discrepancy may be a result of irregular gatherings in the middle of a work. For example, [2.04], a folio, is expected to be of 173 sheets but is of 174; the ‘extra’ sheet may be from gathering ee having an extra bifolium: the edition is signed a–z²aa–dd³ee⁵a–z⁵Aa–Dd³Ee–Ff⁵. As an example of a ‘missing’ half sheet, [4.15], signed a-h³aa–cc³dd³, an octavo is listed at 12.5 sheets but is actually of twelve sheets; it finishes with a four-leaf gathering which presumably accounts for the 0.5, but gathering i is also a half sheet of four leaves, and may have been counted as a full sheet in the calculation. This suggests that rather than counting the sheets, the person who compiled the catalogue perhaps used the final signature as a shortcut to calculate the number of sheets. Where the calculation differs other than in such instances, I have assumed that the edition mentioned in the catalogue is not identical to an extant edition, and include the extant edition in a footnote but not in the table itself (see Appendix 11.2).

Ulrich Neuber’s brother, Valentin

Six titles in the catalogue [5.14], [5.20], [6.03], [9.01], [9.23] and [10.09] are not extant in any edition printed by Montanus & Neuber, yet do survive in editions printed by Ulrich Neuber’s brother, Valentin, who likewise had a printing workshop in Nuremberg. Each of these six titles has a format of octavo or smaller. Montanus & Neuber is best known for high-end folio and quarto editions and polyphonic music, whereas Valentin Neuber is best known for smaller, cheap editions, and so was not a direct competitor. This raises the question of whether Montanus & Neuber included some of Valentin Neuber’s editions in their catalogue. However, this can be ruled out. The clearest evidence is that in four of the six cases, the number of sheets given in the catalogue does not precisely match the number of sheets in the extant Valentin Neuber edition, and there is no reason why this should be so; and in another other instance, the Montanus & Neuber edition and the Valentin Neuber edition are in different formats. That these titles were printed by both printing houses is not surprising: they were popular titles by best-selling authors – Erasmus, Luther and Melanchthon – that were not covered by a printing privilege; editions of these works were typically issued by many printers. As noted above, the Montanus & Neuber catalogue had two blank pages at the end, and so a section listing non-competing editions by Valentin could have been included if they had so desired. The absence of such a list provides further evidence against the existence of a sales and marketing relationship between the two printing houses.

Interpreting prices

Whenever considering sixteenth-century prices, we must properly understand the currency denominations. Different cities or areas had different currency systems that may use different names for the coins and units of accounting. Even where the same name was used for currency, it may have had a different relative value: for example, the number of Pfennig in a Florin varied from region to region.

The catalogue uses four currency denominations: Florin, Ort, Batzen and Pfennig. I have referred to books that reference Nuremberg currency to determine the relationship between these denominations. An arithmetic book by the mathematician Michael Stifel (1487–1567), printed in Nuremberg by Johannes Petreius in 1546, states, under the heading ‘On the
currency of Nuremberg (‘Von Nürnbergischer Müntz’), that 2 Heller = 1 Pfennig; 30 Pfennig = 1 Pfund; and 8 Pfund and 12 Pfennig (252 Pfennig) = 1 Florin or Gulden. Stifel then gives the abbreviation used for each denomination. Later, he notes that 1 Batzen = 16 Pfennig. Stifel does not mention the ‘Ort’, since it was not a coin but a measure in accounting; it is defined in an arithmetic book printed by Valentin Neuber in 1549 as equivalent to a quarter of a Florin, that is, in Nuremberg currency, 63 Pfennig or approximately 4 Batzen (64 Pfennig).

If we arrange the books by price, from lowest to highest, the order includes the series: 2 Batzen, 2.5 Batzen, 3 Batzen, 3 Batzen, 1 Ort, 1 Ort, 5 Batzen, 5 Batzen, 0.5 Florin, 0.5 Florin, 0.5 Florin, 0.5 Florin, 3 Ort, 13 Batzen, 14 Batzen. The amount 4 Batzen (64 Pfennig) is not used, but 1 Ort (63 Pfennig or ¼ of a Florin) is used instead; again, the amounts 8 Batzen and 2 Ort are not used, but 0.5 Florin is used instead. This implies that the highest denomination was used by preference.

The prices of the books are expressed in the following denominations:

- 153 by number of sheets of paper (ranging from 1.5 to 250 sheets)
- one in Pfennig (a polyphonic music book too small to be priced in a higher denomination)
- seventeen in Batzen
- three in Ort
- twelve in Florins
- four unpriced (each is surely an error)

For books priced in Batzen, Ort or Florins, each sheet typically cost approximately 1.5 Pfennig. The only book priced in Pfennig is not extant but there is no reason to assume that this did not have a similar pricing method. This cost is approximate, as the correlation cannot be exact; for example, the cost of books priced in Florins is given in half or whole Florins, and thus in multiples of 126 Pfennig. Using a price of 1.5 Pfennig per sheet, a book consisting of 84 sheets would cost half a Florin (126 Pfennig); a book of 168 sheets would cost 1 Florin (252 Pfennig). But books priced in Florins would normally not have this exact number of sheets. We can determine the number of sheets at which the price changes from half a florin to a florin. I have developed a model (see Table 11.1) to predict this, where each half florin increment includes a range from 59 sheets (70%) below the exact increment, up to 25 sheets (30%) above the exact increment. As a lower number of sheets for a given price increases profit, it is not unexpected that the split is 70/30 and not 50/50. All but one of the folio titles is consistent with this calculation. The exception is Luther’s massive four-volume commentary on Genesis, priced at only 1.05 Pfennig per sheet, which suggests that Montanus & Neuber may have had excess stock that needed to be sold. The same principle that a single price point could correspond to a varying number of sheets also applied to books priced in Batzen and Ort. In books priced at 12 Batzen or more, the cost per sheet lies between 1.46 and 1.49 Pfennig per sheet, thus approximating a nominal cost of 1.5 Pfennig per sheet.

What determined the choice of denomination? Patterns between types of books and pricing suggest that some formats or types of books were considered premium products: Books listed by number of sheets:

- None of the Latin folios or quartos
- Nine of the sixteen German folios
- All but one of the German quartos
• All but one of the octavos, duodecimos (12\text{mo}), sextodecimos (16\text{mo}) and trigesimo-secundos (32\text{mo}) regardless of language, but none of the editions in these formats of polyphonic music
• All ‘Scholasticalia’ (including all music theory)

Books priced in Florins, Ort, Batzen or Pfennig:

• All Latin folios and quartos
• The only Czech folio
• Seven of the sixteen German folios
• One of the German quartos
• One of the German octavos
• All polyphonic music editions

There is a pattern for instances where some of a type of book are priced in sheets and others priced in currency. The German folios aimed at institutional or commercial purchasers, such as Luther’s \textit{Kirchen Postilla} or the \textit{Handel Buch} are priced in currency, but those aimed at personal purchasers, such as Luther’s \textit{Haußpostill} or Veit Dietrich’s \textit{Kinder Postill} are priced in sheets. The only German quarto priced in currency is Johannes Mathesius’ \textit{Leychpredigten}; that the firm had a particular relationship with Mathesius is demonstrated by the only records from before 1600 relating to the firm or its successors applying for an Imperial privilege are for writings by Mathesius.\textsuperscript{28} The only octavo priced in currency, the first edition of a book on making fireworks, has many specialised woodcut illustrations.\textsuperscript{29}

\section*{Format and language}

An examination of the formats shows that half of the titles listed were in octavo, with about a quarter of titles in larger formats, and a quarter in smaller formats (see Table 11.2); most of the titles in smaller formats, including all of the smaller format music, were German-texted. On fol. 6\textsuperscript{v}, the catalogue refers to ‘Columlein’, which refers to the imposition of the pages on a sheet of paper, and hence format.\textsuperscript{30}

\section*{Survivals and losses}

The catalogue provides information on the factors that determine the survival or loss of books. The task of identifying whether or not a particular edition survives in at least one exemplar is ongoing, as the holdings of smaller libraries slowly appear in bibliographies.

\begin{table}[h]
\centering
\caption{Relationship between pricing in Florins and number of sheets}
\begin{tabular}{|c|c|c|c|c|c|}
\hline
Florins converted to Pfennig & Price converted to sheets at 1.5 Pfennig per sheet & Minimum number of sheets at each price & Price/sheet & Maximum number of sheets at each price & Price/sheet \\
\hline
0.5 & 126 & 84 & 25 & 5.0 & 109 & 1.2 \\
1 & 252 & 168 & 109 & 2.3 & 193 & 1.3 \\
1.5 & 378 & 252 & 193 & 2.0 & 277 & 1.4 \\
2 & 504 & 336 & 277 & 1.8 & 361 & 1.4 \\
2.5 & 630 & 420 & 361 & 1.7 & 445 & 1.4 \\
\hline
\end{tabular}
\end{table}
and in online catalogues. If editions presently considered to be lost are rediscovered, the calculations in this section may change slightly.

There is a direct correlation between the size of a book and its chances of survival. If we look at format, that is, size calculated by the dimensions of page, folios are the most likely to survive and the tiny 32\text{mo} volumes, at only 7.5 × 5 cm, the least likely (see Table 11.3). If we look at the number of sheets (which is also correlated with the price), we also see that the editions printed on more than fifteen sheets have a much higher survival rate than those printed on fifteen or fewer sheets (see Table 11.4). Whichever method we use to calculate size, we can conclude that bigger books are more likely to survive than smaller

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Format</th>
<th>Latin</th>
<th>%</th>
<th>German</th>
<th>%</th>
<th>Polyphonic music</th>
<th>%</th>
<th>Total</th>
<th>%</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>2\text{o}</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>4.2</td>
<td>16</td>
<td>8.4</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0.0</td>
<td>24</td>
<td>12.6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4\text{o}</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>2.6</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>4.2</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>3.7</td>
<td>20</td>
<td>10.5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>8\text{o}</td>
<td>44</td>
<td>23.2</td>
<td>46</td>
<td>24.1</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>2.1</td>
<td>94</td>
<td>49.5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>12\text{mo}</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>2.1</td>
<td>34</td>
<td>17.8</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0.0</td>
<td>38</td>
<td>20.0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>16\text{mo}</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>1.0</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>3.1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>0.5</td>
<td>9</td>
<td>4.7</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>32\text{mo}</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0.0</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>2.6</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0.0</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>2.6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total</td>
<td>63</td>
<td>33.2</td>
<td>115</td>
<td>60.5</td>
<td>12</td>
<td>6.3</td>
<td>190</td>
<td>100.0</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Table 11.3 Editions surviving in at least one exemplar, analysed by format

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Format</th>
<th>Latin</th>
<th>%</th>
<th>German</th>
<th>%</th>
<th>German</th>
<th>%</th>
<th>Polyphonic music</th>
<th>%</th>
<th>Polyphonic music</th>
<th>%</th>
<th>Total</th>
<th>%</th>
<th>Music partbooks (complete)</th>
<th>%</th>
<th>Music partbooks (complete)</th>
<th>%</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>2\text{o}</td>
<td>8 of 8</td>
<td>100</td>
<td>15 of 16</td>
<td>94</td>
<td>0 of 0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>23 of 24</td>
<td>96</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4\text{o}</td>
<td>5 of 5</td>
<td>100</td>
<td>6 of 8</td>
<td>76</td>
<td>7 of 7</td>
<td>100</td>
<td>18 of 20</td>
<td>90</td>
<td>78 of 79</td>
<td>99</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>8\text{o}</td>
<td>35 of 44</td>
<td>80</td>
<td>37 of 46</td>
<td>80</td>
<td>3 of 4</td>
<td>75</td>
<td>75 of 94</td>
<td>80</td>
<td>32 of 36</td>
<td>89</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>12\text{mo}</td>
<td>3 of 4</td>
<td>75</td>
<td>15 of 34</td>
<td>44</td>
<td>0 of 0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>18 of 38</td>
<td>47</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>16\text{mo}</td>
<td>0 of 2</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0 of 6</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>1 of 1</td>
<td>100</td>
<td>1 of 9</td>
<td>11</td>
<td>2 of 4</td>
<td>50</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>32\text{mo}</td>
<td>0 of 0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0 of 5</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0 of 0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0 of 5</td>
<td>0</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Table 11.4 Editions surviving in at least one exemplar, analysed by the number of sheets in one complete copy of an edition

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>number of sheets</th>
<th>total number of titles</th>
<th>number of surviving editions</th>
<th>percentage of editions that survive</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>35.1+</td>
<td>48</td>
<td>43</td>
<td>90</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>30.1–35</td>
<td>11</td>
<td>9</td>
<td>82</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>25.1–30</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>100</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>20.1–25</td>
<td>17</td>
<td>14</td>
<td>82</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>15.1–20</td>
<td>15</td>
<td>14</td>
<td>93</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>10.1–15</td>
<td>33</td>
<td>19</td>
<td>58</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5.1–10</td>
<td>29</td>
<td>15</td>
<td>52</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1–5</td>
<td>33</td>
<td>17</td>
<td>52</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
books. However, length and breadth (format) are a much stronger determinant of survival than thickness (number of sheets), probably because books printed on a small number of sheets were often bound together in a single volume, thus vitiating the ‘thickness effect’ of the individual titles in a convolute volume.

There is thus a correlation between what has survived and the decisions taken by printers and publishers regarding the format in which they printed and – at least for anthologies – the cumulative length of the work being printed. A further factor is also at work. It seems that collectors preferred editions in octavo or larger formats, and that which was collected has a greater chance of survival.

This hypothesis is borne out by the rate of survival of partbooks of polyphonic music printed by Montanus & Neuber. The twelve entries of polyphonic music in their catalogue consist of a total of 119 partbooks. Of these, a total of 112 survive in at least one complete exemplar, two survive incomplete and only five are completely lost. Of those that are lost, one was printed in quarto, one in sextodecimo and three were a set partbooks, probably in octavo format, in which the entire set was printed on four sheets (that is, only one or two sheets per partbook). This unusually high survival rate of at least one exemplar may be a result of the fact that almost all are in octavo or larger format, typically consisting of a larger number of sheets, and all having premium pricing.

This finding has significant implications for the survival of polyphonic music and music theory. Polyphonic music in the German-speaking area was almost always printed in relatively larger formats: quarto, and to a lesser extent octavo. Only rarely were music books printed in folio (the Liber selectarum cantionum is such an exception), sexto (Oeglin’s songbooks) or formats smaller than octavo (mostly the duodecimos of Peter Schöffer the Younger, and the sextodecimos of Egenolff and Montanus & Neuber; none of the sets of sextodecimo partbooks survives complete). This implies that polyphonic music editions would be expected to have a higher survival rate that the average rate of survival of all editions, simply because of their size.

Books of music theory (whether learned treatises or instructional works) were printed, by the time that the firm of Montanus & Neuber was founded, most commonly in octavo, then quarto and then folio. The typical format of such books also changed over time; in the early sixteenth century, such school textbooks were usually in quarto, while octavo format became more popular as the century wore on. The vdm catalogue lists five works on music theory in folio, seventy-five in quarto, seven in oblong quarto, two in oblong sexto, 105 in upright octavo format, but none in 12mo or 16mo. Some 47% of Montanus & Neuber’s 12mo editions and 11% of the 16mo editions survive. From this we might suppose that if any books of music theory were printed in duodecimo format, some of them would have survived: but there are none known. This suggests that these tiny formats were not used for music-theory editions. The higher survival rates for larger formats imply that music-theory editions have a higher survival rate than the average survival rate for all books (regardless of size).

**Polyphonic music books**

As mentioned above, the final page of the catalogue is devoted to ‘Musici Libri’, all of which are polyphonic music books. Of the twelve titles, ten have long been known, and an eleventh, the De laude musices from 1556 [12.07], can now be added to music bibliographies. The sole known exemplar (DAT5; missing B) came to light when it was purchased by the British Library in 2001. This edition, not in RISM online, is described in Appendix 11.1.
The collection contains seventeen settings of texts in praise of music, including six settings of ‘Musica Dei donum’ and four settings – thee of which are unica – of Georg Fabricius’ poem ‘Divina res est Musica’. These two texts had previously been published by Montanus & Neuber in 1549 on the final leaf (fol. Qr–v) of the inferior vox of the Diphona amoena et florida, which was edited by Erasmus Rotenbucher. Two other texts are set multiple times: ‘Decantabat populus’ in two settings, both of which had been previously published; and ‘Laeta graves abigit’ in two settings, both of which are unica. Seven of the seventeen compositions appear to be unica; of particular interest for the compilation of this edition is that three of the unica are by composers with an association with Heidelberg: Caspar Othmayr, Gregor Peschin and Stephan Zirler. The other ten motets had been previously published: seven in Susato’s Liber … ecclesiasticarum cantionum (vols. 2, 3, 8, 9 and 10, published between 1553 and 1555), and three in other editions.

The lost edition, the Oratio Didonis tribus vocibus [12.12.], was given at the price of 6 Pfennig, and thus presumably contained four sheets, one or two sheets for each of the three partbooks. Montanus & Neuber printed all of their known editions of two-voice and three-voice compositions in octavo, which suggests that this edition may have also been an octavo. From the title, we may assume that the edition contained settings of texts from book 4 of Vergil’s Aeneid, and given number of leaves in each partbook and the inclusion of multiple settings of the same text in De laude musices, it is probable that the edition contained more than one motet. There are two extant three-voice motets that would be suitable for inclusion: both are settings of ‘Dulces exuviae’, one by Gregor Peschin (D-Rp B 220–222, no. 29) and the other transmitted anonymously in Georg Rhau’s Tricinia (RISM 15429, no. 50; there are multiple concordances).

It is noteworthy that the multi-volume sets such as the six-volume Evangelia [12.01], the five Forster Lied Anthologies [12.04] and the three-volume Magnus opus musicum [12.03], were only available as complete sets – of thirty, twenty-one and fifteen partbooks respectively. There was no pricing for individual volumes.

Table 11.5, which lists the editions of polyphony produced by Montanus & Neuber, shows that most editions published after 1547 are included in the catalogue; the only editions not included are those for two or three voices (the bicinia and tricinia), and very slender books for special occasions – for example, the Proteleios euchê, which consists of four leaves of quarto per partbook and may have been a private commission and so not offered for general sale. Several editions in the catalogue, all anthologies of Lieder, were reprints of earlier editions; the earlier editions are indicated in the table by a superscript letter ‘E’ after the catalogue number, and later editions are indicated by a superscript letter ‘R’. Unlike the rest of the catalogue, the titles in this section, ‘Musici libri’, are not arranged by (and do not give) the format, which is supplied editorially in Appendix 11.2, nor by language, but appear to be ordered by price from highest to lowest (with two editions, numbers [12.07] and [12.10], being out of order).

Music theory

Music-theory books are represented by three titles listed at the end of the section for school books (‘Scholasticalia’). All are listed by number of sheets. This tells us that music theory – at least when printed in octavo editions – did not carry premium pricing.

Table 11.6 (p. 259 below) is a list of all Montanus & Neuber music-theory books up to and including 1563. Two theoretical treatises known to have been printed by Montanus & Neuber are not included in the catalogue, and had presumably sold out: Heinrich Faber’s
Table 11.5  All known polyphonic music printed by Montanus & Neuber

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>M&amp;N Cat. No</th>
<th>Year</th>
<th>vdm</th>
<th>RISM</th>
<th>Composer or editor</th>
<th>Standardised short title</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>1544</td>
<td>1027</td>
<td>1544²⁰</td>
<td>Hans Ott, ed.</td>
<td>115 guter neuer Liedlein</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>1546</td>
<td>1110</td>
<td>1546⁸</td>
<td>Johannes Montanus, ed.</td>
<td>Selectissimae symphoniae compositae</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>1546</td>
<td>1039</td>
<td>O 258</td>
<td>Caspar Othmayr</td>
<td>Cantilenae aliquot elegantes</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>1546</td>
<td>1038</td>
<td>O 259</td>
<td>Caspar Othmayr</td>
<td>Epitaphium D. Martini Lutheri</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>1547</td>
<td>1117</td>
<td>O 260</td>
<td>Caspar Othmayr</td>
<td>Bicinia sacra: Schöne geistliche Lieder</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>1547</td>
<td>1168</td>
<td>O 261</td>
<td>Caspar Othmayr</td>
<td>Symbola illustrissimorum principum</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
| 12.5        | 1549 | 1120| 1549¹  | Kaspar Brusch, ed. | Lamentationes illustri
|             | 1549 | 1222| 1549¹⁶ | Erasmus Rotenbucher, ed. | Hieriae Prophetae |
| 12.⁴E       | 1549 | 1130| 1549³⁵ | Georg Forster, ed. | Teutsche Liedlein 1 |
| 12.⁴E       | 1549 | 1134| 1549³⁶ | Georg Forster, ed. | Teutsche Liedlein 2 |
| 12.⁴E       | 1549 | 1135| 1549³⁷ | Georg Forster, ed. | Teutsche Liedlein 3 |
|             | 1549 | 1169| O 262  | Caspar Othmayr | Tricinia in pias aliquot |
| 12.⁹E       | 1549 | 1143| O 263  | Caspar Othmayr | Reutterische und jegerische Liedlein |
|             | [between 1549 and 1559] | 1142 | [c. 1550]²² | Caspar Othmayr | Reutterische und jegerische Liedlein |
| 12.⁶        | 1550 | 1137| 1550²  | Kaspar Brusch, ed. | Carmina vere divina |
|             | 1551 | 1551²⁰ | Erasmus Rotenbucher, ed. | Bergkreyen auff zwo Stimmen componirt |
|             | 1551 | RR 1814 | I,1 | Joannes Rodestoggius | Bicinia sacra: Geistliche Lieder und Psalmen |
| 12.⁴E       | 1552 | 1552²⁷ | Georg Forster, ed. | Teutsche Liedlein 1 |
| 12.        | 1552 | 1552²⁸ | Georg Forster, ed. | Teutsche Liedlein 3 |
| 12.⁸        | 1552 | C 3258 | Adrianus Petit Coclico | Consolationes ex psalmis |
| 12.²        | 1553 | 1553⁴  | Johannes Montanus, ed. | Psalms selecti 1 |
| 12.²        | 1553 | 1553⁵  | Johannes Montanus, ed. | Psalms selecti 2 |
| 12.²        | 1553 | 1553⁶  | Johannes Montanus, ed. | Psalms selecti 3 |
| 12.        | 1553 | 1553⁷  | Georg Forster, ed. | Teutsche Liedlein 2 |
|             | [1553] | [1554]³⁰ | In Epitaphiis Gasparis Othmari | Evangelia 1 |
| 12.¹        | 1554 | 1554¹⁰ | Johannes Montanus, ed. | Psalms selecti 4 |
| 12.¹        | 1554 | 1554¹¹ | Johannes Montanus, ed. | Evangelia 2 |
| 12.¹        | 1555 | 1555¹⁰ | Johannes Montanus, ed. | Evangelia 3 |
| 12.¹        | 1555 | 1555¹¹ | Johannes Montanus, ed. | Evangelia 4 |
| 12.¹        | 1555 | 1555¹² | Johannes Montanus, ed. | Evangelia 5 |

(Continued)
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Cat. No</th>
<th>Year</th>
<th>vdm</th>
<th>RISM</th>
<th>Composer or editor</th>
<th>Standardised short title</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>12.1</td>
<td>[1556]</td>
<td>[1556]</td>
<td>Johannes Montanus, ed.</td>
<td>Evangelia 6</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>12.4</td>
<td>1556</td>
<td>1556</td>
<td>Georg Forster, ed.</td>
<td>Teutsche Liedlein 4</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>12.4</td>
<td>1556</td>
<td>1556</td>
<td>Georg Forster, ed.</td>
<td>Teutsche Liedlein 5</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>12.7</td>
<td>1556</td>
<td>Not in RISM</td>
<td>Johannes Montanus, ed.</td>
<td>De laude musices</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>12.3</td>
<td>1558</td>
<td>1558</td>
<td>Johannes Montanus, ed.</td>
<td>Novum opus musicum 1</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>12.3</td>
<td>1559</td>
<td>1559</td>
<td>Johannes Montanus, ed.</td>
<td>Novum opus musicum 2</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>12.3</td>
<td>1559</td>
<td>1559</td>
<td>Johannes Montanus, ed.</td>
<td>Novum opus musicum 3</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>12.9</td>
<td>1559</td>
<td>1141</td>
<td>Caspar Othmayr</td>
<td>Reüttersche und jägerische Liedlein</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>12.11</td>
<td>1559</td>
<td>L 1841</td>
<td>Mattheus Le Maistre</td>
<td>Catechesis numeris musicis</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>12.10</td>
<td>[1560]</td>
<td>[1560]</td>
<td>Johannes Montanus, ed.</td>
<td>Selectissimorum triciniorum 1</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>12.10</td>
<td>1560</td>
<td>1560</td>
<td>Johannes Montanus, ed.</td>
<td>Selectissimorum triciniorum 2</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>12.10</td>
<td>[1560]</td>
<td>F 720</td>
<td>Wolfgang Figulus</td>
<td>Selectissimorum triciniorum 3</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>12.4</td>
<td>1560</td>
<td>1560</td>
<td>Georg Forster, ed.</td>
<td>[dedication dated 1559]</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>–</td>
<td>1561</td>
<td>D 1728</td>
<td>Michel Desbuissons</td>
<td>Epithalamia duo in nuptijs</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>–</td>
<td>1561</td>
<td>1561</td>
<td>Christoph Schweher</td>
<td>Veteres ac piae cantiones</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>–</td>
<td>1562</td>
<td>L 768</td>
<td>Orlando di Lasso</td>
<td>Sacrae cantiones 5v</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>12.10R</td>
<td>1563</td>
<td>1563</td>
<td>Wolfgang Figulus, ed.</td>
<td>Selectissimorum triciniorum 3</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>12.04R</td>
<td>1563</td>
<td>1563</td>
<td>Georg Forster, ed.</td>
<td>Teutsche Liedlein 3</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>–</td>
<td>1563</td>
<td>L 775</td>
<td>Orlando di Lasso</td>
<td>Sacrae cantiones 5v</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>12.11R</td>
<td>1563</td>
<td>L 1842</td>
<td>Mattheus Le Maistre</td>
<td>Catechesis numeris musicis</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>–</td>
<td>[undated]</td>
<td>1139</td>
<td>1550</td>
<td>Andreas Schwartz, Jakob Meiland</td>
<td>Protelios euchê, qua chorus musicus</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>12.12</td>
<td>[lost]</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Oratio Didonis tribus uocibus</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

The date 1559 and title for Cat. 12.9 are from Charteris, Werdenstein, 179.

*Ad musicam practicam introductio*, which they printed once in 1550, was presumably superseded by Faber’s *Compendiolum musicae* (1555 and later editions). The other theory edition no longer available was Coclico’s *Compendium musices*, but its accompanying music edition [12.08] was still available.

**Editions containing Kirchenlieder**

The catalogue includes six editions containing *Kirchenlieder*; one of those editions additionally contains Latin-texted liturgical music. These appear under the format and language headings, where they are mixed in with non-music books (see Table 11.7).

If we examine them in the order in which they appear in the catalogue, the first is the *Kirchenordnung* of Wolfgang Pfalzgraf Pfalz-Zweibrücken [2.07]. Although Montanus &
Table 11.6 All known music-theory books printed by Montanus & Neuber

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>M&amp;N Cat. No</th>
<th>Year</th>
<th>vdm</th>
<th>RISM</th>
<th>Author</th>
<th>Standardised short title</th>
<th>Leaves</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>5.21</td>
<td>[155X]</td>
<td>1550</td>
<td>B VI, 301</td>
<td>Heinrich Faber</td>
<td>Ad musicam</td>
<td>96</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5.22E</td>
<td>1555</td>
<td>1550</td>
<td>B VI, 302</td>
<td>Heinrich Faber</td>
<td>Compendiolum musicae</td>
<td>16</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5.22E</td>
<td>1557</td>
<td>1550</td>
<td>B VI, 302</td>
<td>Heinrich Faber</td>
<td>Compendiolum musicae</td>
<td>16</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5.22</td>
<td>1558</td>
<td>1550</td>
<td>B VI, 302</td>
<td>Heinrich Faber</td>
<td>Compendiolum musicae</td>
<td>16</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5.23</td>
<td>1560</td>
<td>1550</td>
<td>B VI, 69</td>
<td>Martin Agricola, ed. Wolfgang Figulus</td>
<td>Deutsche Musica</td>
<td>112</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>1561</td>
<td>1550</td>
<td>B VI, 893</td>
<td>Ambrosius Wilfflingseder</td>
<td>Musica Teutsch</td>
<td>56</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5.21R</td>
<td>1562</td>
<td>1550</td>
<td>B VI, 509</td>
<td>Nicolaus Listenius</td>
<td>Musica</td>
<td>44</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5.23R</td>
<td>1563</td>
<td>1550</td>
<td>B VI, 69</td>
<td>Martin Agricola, ed. Wolfgang Figulus</td>
<td>Deutsche Musica</td>
<td>112</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>1563</td>
<td>1550</td>
<td>B VI, 517</td>
<td>Lucas Lossius</td>
<td>Erotemata musicae</td>
<td>112</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Table 11.7 All known editions containing monophonic liturgical music or hymns printed by Montanus & Neuber

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>M&amp;N Cat. No/ *Heyden</th>
<th>Year</th>
<th>vdm</th>
<th>RISM or VD16</th>
<th>Composer or editor</th>
<th>Standardised short title</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>*</td>
<td>1542</td>
<td>1253</td>
<td>154208</td>
<td>Hans Gamersfelder</td>
<td>Der gantz Psalter Davids</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>[after 1542]</td>
<td>1263</td>
<td>154306</td>
<td>Sebald Heyden</td>
<td>Ein Lobgesang</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3.07E</td>
<td>1543</td>
<td>1147</td>
<td></td>
<td>Veit Dietrich</td>
<td>Agend Büchlein</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3.07E</td>
<td>1543</td>
<td>1148</td>
<td></td>
<td>Veit Dietrich</td>
<td>Agend Büchlein</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>* E</td>
<td>1544</td>
<td>1280</td>
<td>154409</td>
<td>Sebald Heyden</td>
<td>Die Einsetzung … des heyligen Abentmals</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3.07E</td>
<td>1544</td>
<td>1151</td>
<td></td>
<td>Veit Dietrich</td>
<td>Agend Büchlein</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>*</td>
<td>1545</td>
<td>1286</td>
<td>154507</td>
<td>Sebald Heyden</td>
<td>Der christliche Glaub</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3.07E</td>
<td>1545</td>
<td>1152</td>
<td>154510</td>
<td>Veit Dietrich</td>
<td>Agend Büchlein</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>*</td>
<td>[1546]</td>
<td>1336</td>
<td>154603</td>
<td>Sebald Heyden</td>
<td>Der lxxx Psalm</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3.07E</td>
<td>1548</td>
<td>1155</td>
<td>154806</td>
<td>Veit Dietrich</td>
<td>Agend Büchlein</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>* E</td>
<td>[1548]</td>
<td>1125</td>
<td>R.1198</td>
<td>Sebald Heyden, ed.</td>
<td>Liber canticorum</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>*</td>
<td>1549</td>
<td>1347</td>
<td>154905</td>
<td>Sebald Heyden</td>
<td>Der lxvij Psalm</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>*</td>
<td>[1549]</td>
<td>1559</td>
<td></td>
<td>Sebald Heyden</td>
<td>Die Einsetzung … des heyligen Abentmals</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>* E</td>
<td>1550</td>
<td>1126</td>
<td>ZV 13102</td>
<td>Sebald Heyden, ed.</td>
<td>Liber canticorum</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>6.22E</td>
<td>[c. 1552]</td>
<td>1132?</td>
<td>155201</td>
<td>Jan Roh</td>
<td>Gesangbuch der Brüder in Behemen und Merherrn</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>9.01E?</td>
<td>1553</td>
<td>155305</td>
<td>Martin Luther (Preface)</td>
<td></td>
<td>Geistliche Lieder zu Wittenberg</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3.07E</td>
<td>1553</td>
<td>155308</td>
<td>Veit Dietrich</td>
<td></td>
<td>Agend Büchlein</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3.07E</td>
<td>1553</td>
<td>155309</td>
<td>Veit Dietrich</td>
<td></td>
<td>Agend Büchlein</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>6.22E</td>
<td>[c. 1554]</td>
<td>155404</td>
<td>Jan Roh</td>
<td></td>
<td>Gesangbuch der Brüder in Behemen und Merherrn</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

(Continued)
Neuber are named as printers in the 1557 edition, they are not named as printers in the 1560 edition; however, the secondary literature, including the VD16 and Claus’ *Melanchthon-Bibliographie* (1560.79), assigns this edition to them. RISM DKL gives the format of both editions as quarto, but in fact they are folios signed and gathered in fours. The edition is in two parts, each with a separate series of foliation (beginning 1) and signatures (beginning a); the second part is devoted to music. Folios 2r–65v contain German-texted monophonic music in white mensural notation, and folios 66r–93r print Latin-texted monophonic music in Gothic chant notation. This is followed by ten pieces of four-voice homophonic music (Discantus, Altus, Tenor, Bassus): ‘Isometra symphona ad Psalmum quemlibet accommodabilis’ in the first and fifth tones on folios 93v–95v, and a set of eight Magnificats, one in each of the eight tones, on folios 95v–119v. This edition is set at premium pricing, here in Batzen at 1.45 Pfennigs per sheet. Half of the German editions in folio format have premium pricing, and it cannot be determined whether or not in this instance the pricing

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>M&amp;N Cat. No/ <em>Heyden</em></th>
<th>Year</th>
<th>(vdm)</th>
<th>RISM or VD16</th>
<th>Composer or editor</th>
<th>Standardised short title</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>6.22E</td>
<td>[c. 1555]</td>
<td>155501</td>
<td>Jan Roh</td>
<td>Gesangbuch der Brüder in Behemen und Merherrn</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>6.22E</td>
<td>[c. 1556]</td>
<td>155601</td>
<td>Jan Roh</td>
<td>Gesangbuch der Brüder in Behemen und Merherrn</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3.07E</td>
<td>1556</td>
<td>155608</td>
<td>Veit Dietrich</td>
<td>Agend Büchlein</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2.07E</td>
<td>1557</td>
<td>155707</td>
<td>Wolfgang Pfalgraf Pfalz-Zweibrücken</td>
<td>Kirchenordnung</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3.07E</td>
<td>1557</td>
<td>155709</td>
<td>Veit Dietrich</td>
<td>Agend Büchlein</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>6.22E</td>
<td>[1557]</td>
<td>W 1635</td>
<td>Jan Roh</td>
<td>Gesangbuch der Brüder in Behemen und Merherrn</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>*</td>
<td>1558</td>
<td>ZV24828</td>
<td>Sebald Heyden, ed.</td>
<td>Liber cantorum</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>6.22E</td>
<td>[1558]</td>
<td>155801</td>
<td>Jan Roh</td>
<td>Gesangbuch der Brüder in Behemen und Merherrn</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3.06</td>
<td>1559</td>
<td>155909</td>
<td>Johannes Mathesius</td>
<td>Trostpredigten</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>6.22</td>
<td>1560</td>
<td>156003</td>
<td>Jan Roh</td>
<td>Gesangbuch der Brüder in Behemen und Merherrn</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2.07</td>
<td>1560</td>
<td>156005–06</td>
<td>Wolfgang Pfalgraf Pfalz-Zweibrücken</td>
<td>Kirchenordnung</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3.07</td>
<td>1560</td>
<td>156015</td>
<td>Veit Dietrich</td>
<td>Agend Büchlein</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>6.22E</td>
<td>1561</td>
<td>156104</td>
<td>Jan Roh</td>
<td>Gesangbuch der Brüder in Behemen und Merherrn</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>6.22E</td>
<td>1561</td>
<td>156105</td>
<td>Jan Roh</td>
<td>Gesangbuch der Brüder in Behemen und Merherrn</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3.06E</td>
<td>1561</td>
<td>156119</td>
<td>Johannes Mathesius</td>
<td>Trostpredigten</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1562</td>
<td>156214</td>
<td>Johannes Mathesius</td>
<td>Sarepta oder Bergpostill</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1563</td>
<td>156303</td>
<td>Hans Gamersfelder</td>
<td>Der gantz Psalter Davids</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>[1563]</td>
<td>156313</td>
<td>Johannes Mathesius</td>
<td>Vom Ehestandt und Hauffwesen</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1563</td>
<td>156314</td>
<td>Johannes Mathesius</td>
<td>Vom Artikel der Rechtfertigung</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Lost and undated

| 9.01 | Gesangbüchlein D. M. Luther |
| 10.09 | Kirchen gesang büchlein |
resulted from the inclusion of printed music. However, as three of the volumes discussed below consisted mostly of printed music (including one using both white mensural and Gothic chant typefaces), but are not set at premium pricing, it is more likely that the association with the Pfalzgraf was the decisive factor.

The next item is the *Leychpredigten* of Johannes Matthesius [3.06]. This is the only upright German quarto in the catalogue that is not listed by number of sheets but priced in Batzen, which implies that the publisher wished to single out this volume as being of special significance. Of its some 600 pages, only three have printed music (fol. Aa2v, Pp3r and Dddd2v), in each case a single monophonic hymn. It was printed on 75.5 sheets and is priced at 5 Batzen, approximately 1 Pfennig per sheet to the nearest Batzen.34

Item [3.07] is the *Agenda Viti*. The edition of 1560 comprises 124 leaves in quarto, that is, thirty-one sheets, which matches the number of sheets stated in the catalogue. Montanus & Neuber had printed at least nine earlier editions of this work, making this title one of their bestsellers. As this work was likely to be updated regularly, it was necessary to reprint it regularly, rather than printing larger editions.

The title ‘Der Picarden Gesangbuch’ [6.22] surely refers to *Ein Gesangbuch der Brüder inn Behemen vnnd Merherrn, Die man auß haß vnd neyd, Pickharden, Waldenses, &c. nennet*. The 1560 edition has 248 leaves of octavo, which matches the catalogue description of thirty-one sheets. Again, this was a bestseller, having been through at least six earlier editions. Like the *Kirchenordnung*, two music typefaces are used in this edition: white mensural and Gothic chant.

The ‘Gesangbüchlein D. M. Luther’ [9.01] cannot be identified as extant. We can calculate from the format (duodecimo) and number of sheets (thirty-two) that we are looking for a substantial volume of about 384 leaves. Georg Serpilius, in the section of his *Lieder-Gedancken* devoted to Nuremberg, lists a ‘Gesangbüchlein/ darinnen der gantze Psalter Davids nach Ordnung der Psalmen/ sammt andern geistlichen Gesängen mit ihren Melodeyen begriffen/ mit Fleiß übersehen und corrigiret/ 1560. in 12*.35 This edition is no longer extant, and is listed as such as DKL 156010. Although there is much that matches – the title, city and format – the omission of Luther’s name would be unexpected. In 1553, Montanus & Neuber had printed a *Geistliche Lieder zu Wittemberg* (DKL 155305) of 180 leaves in duodecimo, and the present edition may be a significantly expanded edition of that one. On the other hand, in 1562 Valentin Neuber printed a *Geystliche Lieder. Mit einer newen Vorrede D. Mart. Luth.* (DKL 156207) which was 372 leaves of duodecimo, of which this may be an earlier edition. In any case, this ‘Gesangbüchlein D. M. Luther’ is evidently lost.

The *Kirchen gesang büchlein* [10.09] in sextodecimo and printed on seven sheets would have been of 112 leaves. This approximates the *Kirchengesenge mit vil schönen Psalmen* (DKL 154907) printed in sextodecimo by Valentin Neuber in 1549, but at 7.5 sheets (and so 120 leaves), that edition is half a sheet larger than expected. Given that the known edition was dated eleven years earlier, and that these small editions were presumably designed to sell quickly, the edition in the catalogue may be a lost reprint of the 1549 edition.

Let us turn briefly to the editions containing hymns printed by Montanus & Neuber, but which are not in the catalogue, and in particular the many editions by Sebald Heyden, who spent almost his entire life in Nuremberg. Not one of his six different titles containing printed music is included in the catalogue; to make it visually apparent that most of the editions in Table 11.7 that are not in the catalogue are Heyden editions, I have indicated his editions with an asterisk in the column of the table that gives the catalogue numbers. Indeed, only four titles by this prolific author are included, all non-music titles sequentially under the heading ‘Scholasticalia’. It is not surprising that his five tiny editions from
the 1540s containing hymns are not listed, as three of them were only four leaves in duodecimo. The absence of the much more substantial 1558 Liber canticorum (168 leaves, or twenty-one sheets, of octavo), a new edition of a title that Montanus & Neuber had previously printed in [1548] and 1550, suggests that this work had sold quickly.36

**Conclusion**

This Montanus & Neuber catalogue gives us rare evidence of the publisher’s price of new unbound music books in the mid-sixteenth century. It demonstrates that, at least for this major printing firm, music theory and monophonic music was priced at the generic level for printed editions, but that volumes of polyphonic music attracted premium pricing, which in this instance was approximately 1.5 Pfennig per sheet. It also tells us that all editions, both generic and premium, were priced directly according to the number of sheets of paper used to print a copy of the edition. While this is not surprising, it is good to have evidence.

The catalogue also provides strong evidence for the forces that guide the survival or loss of individual copies. The most important factors are format and, to a lesser extent, the number of sheets. This is important as catalogues other than those of printers, publishers and booksellers include what was actively collected, which was only a selection of what was on the market. To judge from the catalogues of early collections, the total disappearance of so many tiny books in 12mo, 16mo and 32mo from the record began soon after their production. The survival of early printed books to our day thus began with decisions taken by the printer or those commissioning the printing, and related to the function and format of the book. Being aware of the loss of these smaller editions is important: Peter Stallybrass has argued that ‘Reprints and job printing had to support the deluxe volumes. But the deluxe volumes, surviving in substantial numbers, dominate accounts of the history of printing, while the great majority of broadsides, almanacs, pamphlets, and schoolbooks have disappeared completely’.37 That the Montanus & Neuber catalogue – an octavo pamphlet of eight leaves – itself survives in only a single exemplar forcefully reminds us of the forces of attrition that acted differently on printed material of different kinds.

**Appendix 11.1 De laude musices (Nuremberg: Montanus & Neuber, 1556)**

**Title:**


**Titles of other partbooks:**

[Woodcut in ornamental box:] DISCANTVS || [Type] IN CANTIONIBVS || DE LAVDE MVSICIS. || M. D. LVI. ||
[Woodcut in ornamental box:] ALTVS || [Type] IN CANTIONIBVS || DE LAVDE MVSICIS. || M. D. LVI. ||
[lost; inferred:] [Woodcut in ornamental box:] BASSVS || [Type] IN CANTIONIBVS || DE LAVDE MVSICIS. || M. D. LVI. ||
[Woodcut in ornamental box:] VAGANS || [Type] IN CANTIONIBVS || DE LAVDE MVSICIS. || D. M. LVI. [sic] ||

**Colophon:** [none]

**Format:** oblong quarto
Collation and Signatures: all gatherings except the first have the name of the partbook in the signature line of the first leaf of the gathering:

**Tenor:**
- 36 leaves, a–i4
- a1v, a4v, i4v blank
- $3 signed in Roman lowercase and Arabic numerals (-a1; mis-signing a2–3 in italic, [a4] as aa2)

**Discantus:**
- 36 leaves, AA–II4
- AA1v, AA2v, II3v–4v blank
- $3 signed in double Roman uppercase and Arabic numerals (-AA1; mis-signing AA2 as aa2; BB3 as bb3)

**Altus:**
- 36 leaves, aa–ii4
- aa1v, aa2v, ii3v–4v blank
- $3 signed in double Roman lowercase and Arabic numerals (-aa1)

**Bassus:**
- [inferred as 36 leaves, A–I4]
- [inferred as $3 signed in Roman uppercase and Arabic numerals]

**Vagans:**
- 20 leaves, Aa–Ee4
- Aa1v, Aa2v, Ee3v blank (Ee4 missing, presumably blank)
- $3 signed in Roman uppercase and lower case and Arabic numerals (-Aa1)

Watermarks:
- [letter] K (Tenor gatherings A, E, I; Discantus gatherings A, C, E, G; Altus gatherings B, C, G, I; Vagans no watermarks)a
- [letter] P (Discantus gathering B)b

Exemplar: GB-Lbl K.11.e.21 (missing Bassus; bound in a sixteenth-century binding, whose endpaper bears the heraldic arms of Saxony, along with *Veteres ac piae cantiones* (Nuremberg: Montanus & Neuber, 1561; RISM 15611) and Johann Spangenberg, *Versus ex hymno de passione Christi* (Jena: Richtzenhain, 1561; RISM S 4045); purchased in 2001)

Contents (transcribed from the Index in the Tenor partbook; composer names in square brackets are the forms used in MGG2, except for Tylman [not Tielman] Susato):  

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>#</th>
<th>Composer</th>
<th>Title</th>
<th>Concordant sourcesc</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>CANTIONES QVINQVE VOCVM</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>I</td>
<td>Ioannes Louuys [Jean Louys]</td>
<td>Muifica Dei donum</td>
<td>RISM 155315</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>II</td>
<td>Ioannes Gallus</td>
<td>Muifica Dei donum</td>
<td>RISM 1554a</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>III</td>
<td>Nicolaus Rogier [Nicolaus Roggius]</td>
<td>Muifica Dei donum</td>
<td>RISM 1554a</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>IV</td>
<td>Ioannes Crespel [Johannes de Crespel]</td>
<td>David rex Propheta</td>
<td>RISM 1554a</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

---


b See WZI, type – Buchstaben/Ziffern – Buchstabe P – frei, einfache Form – Schaft zweikonturig, ohne Balken – senkrecht, ohne Beizeichen – ohne Schnörkel – Bogen quadratisch. Between two chainlines, 30.5 mm apart. The mark is most similar to https://www.wasserzeichen-online.de/wzis/struktur.php?ref=AT8100-PO-106487
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>No.</th>
<th>Composer</th>
<th>Series</th>
<th>Notes</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>V</td>
<td>Clemens non Papa [Jacobus Clemens]</td>
<td>Decantabat populus</td>
<td>12 sources including: RISM 1554, RISM 1555&lt;sup&gt;13&lt;/sup&gt;</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>VI</td>
<td>Ioannes Caftelleti [Jean Guyot de Châtelet known as Castileti]</td>
<td>Decantabat populus</td>
<td>RISM 1555&lt;sup&gt;8&lt;/sup&gt;</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>VII</td>
<td>Steffanus Cirlerus [Stephan Zirler]</td>
<td>Læta graues abigit</td>
<td>unicum</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>VIII</td>
<td>Antonius Scandellus [Antonio Scandello]</td>
<td>Diuina res eſt Muſica</td>
<td>unicum</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**CANTIO SEX VOCVM**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>No.</th>
<th>Composer</th>
<th>Series</th>
<th>Notes</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>IX</td>
<td>Tilmannus Suſato [Tylman Susato]</td>
<td>Muſica Dei donum</td>
<td>RISM 1540&lt;sup&gt;7&lt;/sup&gt;</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**CANTIONES QVATVOR VOCVM**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>No.</th>
<th>Composer</th>
<th>Series</th>
<th>Notes</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>X</td>
<td>Clemens non Papa [Jacobus Clemens]</td>
<td>Muſica Dei donum</td>
<td>RISM 1553&lt;sup&gt;10&lt;/sup&gt;</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>XI</td>
<td>Iacobus Sothi</td>
<td>Muſica Dei donum</td>
<td>RISM 1553&lt;sup&gt;9&lt;/sup&gt;, 'Incertus author'</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>XII</td>
<td>Georgius Pelthin [Gregor Peschin]</td>
<td>Ne impedias Muſicam</td>
<td>unicum</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>XIII</td>
<td>Gaſpar Othmair [Caspar Othmayr]</td>
<td>Læta graues abigit</td>
<td>unicum</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>XIV</td>
<td>Ioannes Reuſchius [Johann Reusch]</td>
<td>Diuina res eſt Muſica</td>
<td>RISM R 1210</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>XV</td>
<td>Heinricus Faber [Heinrich Faber]</td>
<td>Diuina res eſt Muſica</td>
<td>unicum</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>XVI</td>
<td>Andreas Schuuartz</td>
<td>Quid Muſica præſ[antius]</td>
<td>unicum</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>XVII</td>
<td>Incerti authoris</td>
<td>Diuina res eſt Muſica</td>
<td>unicum</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

---

*I am grateful to Bonnie Blackburn for bringing the sole concordances to nos. VI, XI and XIV to my attention, and for a reference to XIV in Heidrich, ‘Musik und Humanismus’, 104. It is interesting that in each instance the motet is the final setting in the concordant edition.*

**Appendix 11.2 Edition of the catalogue**

The Transcription, Price and the Latin or German headings for each of the sections are transcribed from the catalogue. All other columns are editorial; authors’ names are standardised as given in VD16. RISM numbers are only given when the edition is not included in VD16. The words Florin, Groschen, and chartae (sheets of paper), abbreviated in the catalogue as the initial letter of each word followed by a flourish that looks somewhat like a cursive letter ‘ℓ’, are transcribed as ℓf, ℓg, and ℓc respectively.

RISM 1540<sup>7</sup> *Selectissimae necnon familiariſsimae cantiones* (Augsburg: Kriesstein, 1540)
RISM 1553<sup>9</sup> *Liber secundus ecclesiasticarum cantionum* (Antwerp: Susato, 1553)
RISM 1553<sup>10</sup> *Liber tertius ecclesiasticarum cantionum* (Antwerp: Susato, 1553)
RISM 1553<sup>15</sup> *Liber octavus ecclesiasticarum cantionum* (Antwerp: Susato, 1553)
RISM R 1210 *Melodiae odarum Georgii Fabricii: compositae a M. Ioanne Reuschio Rotachense* (Leipzig: Gunther, 1554)
RISM 1554<sup>4</sup> *Liber sextus cantionum sacrarum vulgo moteta vocant* (Louvain: Phalèse, 1554)
RISM 1554<sup>9</sup> *Liber nonus ecclesiasticarum cantionum* (Antwerp: Susato, 1554)
RISM 1555<sup>8</sup> *Liber decimus ecclesiasticarum cantionum* (Antwerp: Susato, 1555)
RISM 1555<sup>13</sup> *Tertius liber modulorum, 4, 5, et 6 vocum* (Geneva: Dubosc & Guéroult, 1555)
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Page and item number</th>
<th>Author</th>
<th>Transcription</th>
<th>Price with denomination, or number of sheets</th>
<th>VD16, RISM, Claus or holding library</th>
<th>Year</th>
<th>Leaves</th>
<th>Sheets</th>
<th>Price/sheet</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1.01</td>
<td>Hus, Jan</td>
<td>Opera Ioannis Hus.</td>
<td>$2 \frac{1}{2}$ ℓ</td>
<td>H 6154</td>
<td>1558</td>
<td>878</td>
<td>439</td>
<td>1.44</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1.02</td>
<td>Schöner, Johannes</td>
<td>Opera Ioannis Schoneri.</td>
<td>$1 \frac{1}{2}$ ℓ</td>
<td>S 3465</td>
<td>1551</td>
<td>472</td>
<td>236</td>
<td>1.63</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1.03</td>
<td>Luther, Martin</td>
<td>Quatuor Tomi Lutheri in Genefim.</td>
<td>$2$ ℓ</td>
<td>I: B 2999</td>
<td>1555</td>
<td>960</td>
<td>480</td>
<td>1.05</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>II: B 3000</td>
<td>1556</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>III: B 2996</td>
<td>1555</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>IV: ZV 1578</td>
<td>1560</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1.04</td>
<td>Regiomontanus, Johannes</td>
<td>In Ptolomæi Almagestum Regiomanus.</td>
<td>5 Batz</td>
<td>M 6535</td>
<td>1550</td>
<td>116</td>
<td>58</td>
<td>1.38</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1.05</td>
<td>Ulmer, Johann Conrad</td>
<td>De Horologijs Sciotericis.</td>
<td>2 Batz</td>
<td>U 65</td>
<td>1556</td>
<td>42</td>
<td>21</td>
<td>1.52</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1.06</td>
<td>Weller, Hieronymus</td>
<td>Psylla Hieronymi Velleri 123.</td>
<td>$\frac{1}{2}$ ℓ</td>
<td>E 4418</td>
<td>1558</td>
<td>256</td>
<td>128</td>
<td>0.98</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1.07</td>
<td>Monte, Giovanni</td>
<td>Conilia Montani medici.</td>
<td>14 Batz</td>
<td>M 6245</td>
<td>1559</td>
<td>304</td>
<td>152</td>
<td>1.47</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1.08</td>
<td>Weller, Hieronymus</td>
<td>Vuellerus in Secundum Regum.</td>
<td>2 Batz $\frac{1}{2}$ ℓ</td>
<td>W 1817</td>
<td>1560</td>
<td>86</td>
<td>43</td>
<td>0.93</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1.09</td>
<td>Luther, Martin</td>
<td>Bibel Doctoris Lutheri.</td>
<td>$2 \frac{1}{2}$ ℓ</td>
<td>B 2736</td>
<td>1554</td>
<td>876</td>
<td>438</td>
<td>1.44</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1.10</td>
<td>Luther, Martin</td>
<td>Kirchen Psylla D. Lutheri.</td>
<td>$1 \frac{1}{2}$ ℓ</td>
<td>L 5627</td>
<td>1560</td>
<td>390</td>
<td>195</td>
<td>1.97</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1.11</td>
<td>Luther, Martin</td>
<td>Haupspoll D. Lutheri.</td>
<td>250</td>
<td>A-Wn</td>
<td>1558</td>
<td>496</td>
<td>248</td>
<td>1.01</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1.12a</td>
<td>Spangenberg, Johann</td>
<td>Psylla Johann Spangenberg.</td>
<td>227</td>
<td>S 7920</td>
<td>1557</td>
<td>446</td>
<td>223</td>
<td>1.02</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1.13</td>
<td>Spangenberg, Johann</td>
<td>Psylla Spangenberg Behmiich.</td>
<td>$1 \frac{1}{2}$ ℓ</td>
<td>S 8010</td>
<td>1557</td>
<td>542</td>
<td>271</td>
<td>1.39</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1.14</td>
<td>Corvinus, Antonius</td>
<td>Psylla Antonij Coruni.</td>
<td>150</td>
<td>D-MUu 2’ G+2 1260</td>
<td>1559</td>
<td>302</td>
<td>151</td>
<td>0.99</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2.01</td>
<td>Huberinus, Caspar</td>
<td>Psylla Ca’spar Huberini.</td>
<td>218</td>
<td>H 5404</td>
<td>1557</td>
<td>436</td>
<td>218</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2.02</td>
<td>Dietrich, Veit</td>
<td>Kinder Psylla Viti Thedori.</td>
<td>273 [recte 173]</td>
<td>D 1577</td>
<td>1558</td>
<td>346</td>
<td>173</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2.03</td>
<td>Weller, Hieronymus</td>
<td>Psylla Hieronymi Welleri.</td>
<td>3 ert</td>
<td>W1785</td>
<td>1559</td>
<td>392</td>
<td>196</td>
<td>0.96</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2.04</td>
<td>Dietrich, Veit</td>
<td>Summaria Viti Thedori vber die Bibel.</td>
<td>173</td>
<td>D 1647</td>
<td>1559</td>
<td>348</td>
<td>174</td>
<td>0.99</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2.05</td>
<td>Brenz, Johannes</td>
<td>Brentius vber die Acta.</td>
<td>208</td>
<td>B 7693</td>
<td>1551</td>
<td>414</td>
<td>207</td>
<td>1.00</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2.06</td>
<td>Huberinus, Caspar</td>
<td>Spiegel der Haußzucht C. Huber.</td>
<td>156</td>
<td>B 4093</td>
<td>1558</td>
<td>312</td>
<td>156</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2.07</td>
<td>Wolfgang Pfalzgraf</td>
<td>Kirchenordnung Her. Wolff.</td>
<td>13 Batz</td>
<td>P 2274</td>
<td>1560</td>
<td>286</td>
<td>143</td>
<td>1.45</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2.08</td>
<td>Cyprianus, Thascius Caecilius</td>
<td>Opera Cypriani. 8. gl [2 vols.]</td>
<td>138</td>
<td>C 6518</td>
<td>1553–1554</td>
<td>276</td>
<td>138</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

(Continued)
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Page and item number</th>
<th>Author</th>
<th>Transcription</th>
<th>Price with denomination, or number of sheets</th>
<th>VD16, RISM, Claus or holding library</th>
<th>Year</th>
<th>Leaves</th>
<th>Sheets</th>
<th>Price/sheet</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>2.09</td>
<td>Meder, Lorenz [author unidentified]</td>
<td>Handel Buch.</td>
<td>1/2 ft</td>
<td>M 1856</td>
<td>1558</td>
<td>106</td>
<td>53</td>
<td>2.38</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2.10</td>
<td>Werner, Johannes</td>
<td>Außchreibung der 3. Stedt</td>
<td>1/2 ft</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Libri in Quarto Latini.</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2.11</td>
<td>Haiyāt, Abū-ʿAlī Yalḥā Ibn-Ǧalīb al-Werner</td>
<td>Albohali.</td>
<td>1 Batz</td>
<td>A 58</td>
<td>1549</td>
<td>64</td>
<td>16</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2.12</td>
<td>Ministério Ibn-Ṭaʾrī</td>
<td>Canones Verneri de iudicio Auræ.</td>
<td>1/2 Batz</td>
<td>W 2036</td>
<td>1546</td>
<td>20</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>1.60</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2.13</td>
<td>Ministério Ibn-Ṭaʾrī</td>
<td>Melūḥāde al-Elementīs &amp; orbībus coelestibus</td>
<td>1 Batz 1/2</td>
<td>ZV 10470</td>
<td>1549</td>
<td>48</td>
<td>12</td>
<td>2.00</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2.14</td>
<td>Ministério Ibn-Ṭaʾrī</td>
<td>[2.13 with] Scriptum cuiuṣdam Saraceni continens</td>
<td>2 Batz</td>
<td>ZV 10470</td>
<td>1549</td>
<td>90</td>
<td>22.5</td>
<td>1.42</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2.15</td>
<td>Tricasso, Patricio, and Ronsseus, Balduinus</td>
<td>[Part 1] Tricasis Cerarīnīs Mantuani Enarrās</td>
<td>3 Batz</td>
<td>T 1930</td>
<td>1560</td>
<td>138</td>
<td>34.5</td>
<td>1.39</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Deutsche Bücher in Quarto.</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3.01</td>
<td>Melanchthon, Philipp</td>
<td>Hauptartickel Philippī Melanī</td>
<td>88</td>
<td>M 3683</td>
<td>1559</td>
<td>352</td>
<td>88</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3.02</td>
<td>Huberinus, Caspar</td>
<td>Mancherley form zu predigen Calpar</td>
<td>60</td>
<td>H 5626</td>
<td>1557</td>
<td>240</td>
<td>60</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3.03</td>
<td>Huberinus, Caspar</td>
<td>Die 40. Predig Huberini vber den</td>
<td>38</td>
<td>H 5446</td>
<td>1557</td>
<td>152</td>
<td>38</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3.04</td>
<td>Luther, Martin</td>
<td>Troṭpruch D. Martinī Lutheri.</td>
<td>22 1/2</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3.05</td>
<td>Schiltberger, Hans</td>
<td>Hiṭoria vom Schilteberger.</td>
<td>16</td>
<td>S 2876</td>
<td>1549</td>
<td>64</td>
<td>16</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3.06</td>
<td>Mathesius, Johannes</td>
<td>Leychtpredig [sic] Johan. Matth.</td>
<td>5 Batz</td>
<td>M 1520</td>
<td>1559</td>
<td>298</td>
<td>74.5</td>
<td>1.07</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Item</td>
<td>Author/Title</td>
<td>Price/Sheet</td>
<td>Price/Volume</td>
<td>Date</td>
<td>Pages</td>
<td>Volumes</td>
<td>Description</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>------</td>
<td>--------------</td>
<td>-------------</td>
<td>--------------</td>
<td>------</td>
<td>-------</td>
<td>----------</td>
<td>-------------</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3.07</td>
<td>Dietrich, Veit</td>
<td>Agenda Viti.</td>
<td>31</td>
<td>A 646</td>
<td>1560</td>
<td>124</td>
<td>31</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3.08</td>
<td>Asphe, Paul</td>
<td>In Daniele Prophetam Paulus</td>
<td></td>
<td>Afpe.</td>
<td>[omitted]</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**Latini libri in Octauo.**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Item</th>
<th>Author/Title</th>
<th>Price/Sheet</th>
<th>Price/Volume</th>
<th>Date</th>
<th>Pages</th>
<th>Volumes</th>
<th>Description</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>3.09</td>
<td>Luther, Martin</td>
<td>Lutherus in 25. priores Psalms &amp; aliquot</td>
<td></td>
<td>sequentiar in operibus non impressi.</td>
<td>35</td>
<td>B 3450</td>
<td>1559</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3.10</td>
<td>Luther, Martin</td>
<td>Defensioni toti rerum Cœnae per Lu.</td>
<td></td>
<td>therum.</td>
<td>14 1/2</td>
<td>L 4280</td>
<td>1556</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4.01</td>
<td>Weller, Hieronymus</td>
<td>Antidotum Hieronymi Vuelleri Contra</td>
<td></td>
<td>omnis generis tentationes.</td>
<td>31</td>
<td>W 1762</td>
<td>1554</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4.02</td>
<td>Weller, Hieronymus</td>
<td>De Officio Ecclesiastic, Politico, &amp;</td>
<td></td>
<td>Oeconomico.</td>
<td>11</td>
<td>W 1822</td>
<td>1552</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4.03</td>
<td>Weller, Hieronymus</td>
<td>Vuellerus in Epistolam ad Ephesios.</td>
<td>31</td>
<td>B 5102</td>
<td>1559</td>
<td>240</td>
<td>30</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4.04</td>
<td>Fritsche, Markus</td>
<td>Libellus elegans de Meteoris Marci</td>
<td></td>
<td>Fryetij.</td>
<td>33 1/2</td>
<td>F 3027</td>
<td>1555</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4.05</td>
<td>Hessus, Helius Eobanus</td>
<td>Epistola Eobani Heši.</td>
<td>25</td>
<td>C 480</td>
<td>1553</td>
<td>200</td>
<td>25</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4.06</td>
<td>Poppius, Menso</td>
<td>Aeglogae Septem, in quibus totius papæ</td>
<td></td>
<td>òtici regni fraudes defcrintur.</td>
<td>3 1/2</td>
<td>K 2126</td>
<td>1560</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4.07</td>
<td>Schrymphius, Johannes</td>
<td>Libellus de Tribus peccatis, Ioannis</td>
<td></td>
<td>Schrymphij.</td>
<td>6 1/2</td>
<td>S 4207</td>
<td>1560</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**SCHOLASTICALIA.**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Item</th>
<th>Author/Title</th>
<th>Price/Sheet</th>
<th>Price/Volume</th>
<th>Date</th>
<th>Pages</th>
<th>Volumes</th>
<th>Description</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>4.08c</td>
<td>Serranus, Johannes</td>
<td>Synonima Ioannis Serrani.</td>
<td>30 1/2</td>
<td>C 2998</td>
<td>1556</td>
<td>124</td>
<td>15.5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4.09</td>
<td>Cicero, Marcus Tullius (ed. Georg Fabriciæ)</td>
<td>Elegantiae Georgij Fabricij.</td>
<td>15 1/2</td>
<td>C 2998</td>
<td>1556</td>
<td>124</td>
<td>15.5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4.10d</td>
<td>Terentius Afer, Publius [ed. P. Melanchthon]</td>
<td>Terentius.</td>
<td>23</td>
<td>T 451</td>
<td>1558</td>
<td>184</td>
<td>23</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4.11</td>
<td>Camerarius, Joachim</td>
<td>Fabulae Aeopii, Ioach. Came. inter.</td>
<td>20 1/2</td>
<td>A 510</td>
<td>1557</td>
<td>164</td>
<td>20.5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4.12</td>
<td>Camerarius, Joachim</td>
<td>Fabellae Aeopii per Camera.</td>
<td>12</td>
<td>ZV 27182</td>
<td>1550</td>
<td>92</td>
<td>11.5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4.13</td>
<td>Clénard, Nicolas</td>
<td>Grammatica Clenardi græca.</td>
<td>25</td>
<td>C 4167</td>
<td>1559</td>
<td>192</td>
<td>24</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4.14</td>
<td>Melanchthon, Philipp</td>
<td>Grammatica Philippi Maior.</td>
<td>25</td>
<td>M 3382</td>
<td>1558</td>
<td>200</td>
<td>25</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4.15</td>
<td>Melanchthon, Philipp</td>
<td>Grammatica Philippi Minor.</td>
<td>12 1/2</td>
<td>Claus 1556.57</td>
<td>1556</td>
<td>96</td>
<td>12</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4.16</td>
<td>Schottenius, Hermann</td>
<td>Confabulationes Hermý Schot. Heši.</td>
<td>12 1/2</td>
<td>S 4024</td>
<td>1556</td>
<td>98</td>
<td>12.25</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

(Continued)
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Page</th>
<th>Author</th>
<th>Transcription</th>
<th>Price with denomination, or number of sheets</th>
<th>VD16, RISM, Claus or holding library</th>
<th>Year</th>
<th>Leaves</th>
<th>Sheets</th>
<th>Price/sheet</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>4.17</td>
<td>Melanchthon, Philipp</td>
<td>Sintaxis Philippi Melant. Maior. Donatus cum commentarijs Culman.</td>
<td>12 1/2</td>
<td>M 4280</td>
<td>n.d.</td>
<td>100</td>
<td>12.5</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4.18e</td>
<td>Culmann, Leonhard, ed.</td>
<td>Sintaxis Philippi Maior.</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>D 2286</td>
<td>1548</td>
<td>64</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4.19</td>
<td>[Culmann, Leonhard, ed.]</td>
<td>Donatus Minor.</td>
<td>5</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4.20</td>
<td>Culmann, Leonhard</td>
<td>Sententiæ Leonhardi Culman.</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>ZV 4170</td>
<td>1557</td>
<td>40</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5.01</td>
<td>Terentius Afer, Publius</td>
<td>Excerpta ex Terentio.</td>
<td>9</td>
<td>D-SI Phil.oct.944</td>
<td>1557</td>
<td>72</td>
<td>9</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5.02</td>
<td>Stirpianus, Johannes</td>
<td>Sententiarum Memorabiles ex Bibliis.</td>
<td>5 1/2</td>
<td>S 9153</td>
<td>1559</td>
<td>44</td>
<td>5.5</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5.03</td>
<td>Heyden, Sebald</td>
<td>Pedonomia Sebaldi Heyden.</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>H 3406</td>
<td>1556</td>
<td>64</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5.04f</td>
<td>Heyden, Sebald</td>
<td>Nomenclatura Sebaldi Heiden.</td>
<td>3</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5.05g</td>
<td>Heyden, Sebald</td>
<td>Catechistica ssumula Seb. Heiden.</td>
<td>1 1/2</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5.06</td>
<td>Heyden, Sebald</td>
<td>Quæstiones de Octo partibus oratio.</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>H 3366</td>
<td>1557</td>
<td>24</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5.07h</td>
<td>Donatus, Aelius</td>
<td>Quæstiones de Octo partibus oratio.</td>
<td>6</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5.08</td>
<td>Spangenberg, Johann</td>
<td>Evangelia Dominicalia ueribus descripta</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>E 4535</td>
<td>1545</td>
<td>40</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5.09</td>
<td>Murmellius, Johann</td>
<td>Loci communes Murmelij.</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>ZV 25778</td>
<td>1555</td>
<td>32</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5.10</td>
<td>Cicero, Marcus</td>
<td>Epitolae Ciceronis.</td>
<td>5</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5.11</td>
<td>Wölflin, Sigmund</td>
<td>Erotemata Lupuli.</td>
<td>4 1/2</td>
<td>L 2748</td>
<td>1559</td>
<td>136</td>
<td>17</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5.12</td>
<td>Melanchthon, Philipp, ed. Lucas Lossius</td>
<td>Erotemata Dialectices Philippi Melan.</td>
<td>17</td>
<td>L 2748</td>
<td>1559</td>
<td>136</td>
<td>17</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5.13</td>
<td>Erasmus, Desiderius</td>
<td>Epitome Colloquiorum Eras. Rote.</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>Claus 1556.55</td>
<td>1556</td>
<td>32</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5.14</td>
<td>Erasmus, Desiderius</td>
<td>De Ciuitate morum latine &amp; Germanic.</td>
<td>6 1/2</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5.15</td>
<td>Mosellanus, Petrus</td>
<td>Tabulæ Schematix Pet. Moëlan.</td>
<td>3 1/2</td>
<td>S 2201</td>
<td>1550</td>
<td>28</td>
<td>3.5</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5.16</td>
<td>Mosellanus, Petrus</td>
<td>Paedologia Moëlan.</td>
<td>4 1/2</td>
<td>ZV 13778</td>
<td>1560</td>
<td>36</td>
<td>4.5</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5.17</td>
<td>Vergilius Maro, Publius</td>
<td>Bucolica Virgilij.</td>
<td>2 1/2</td>
<td>ZV 17159</td>
<td>1555</td>
<td>20</td>
<td>2.5</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5.18</td>
<td>Luther, Martin</td>
<td>Paruus Catechismus D.M.Lutheri.</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>ZV 27933</td>
<td>1558</td>
<td>24</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5.19</td>
<td>Luther, Martin</td>
<td>Catechismus græce &amp; latine Lutheri.</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>ZV 25237</td>
<td>1560</td>
<td>32</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5.20</td>
<td>Melanchthon, Philipp</td>
<td>Prouerbia Salomonis.</td>
<td>7</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Deutsche Bücher in Octauo.

5.21 Listenius, Nicolaus Mufica Lißenij. 5 1/2 L 2037 1550s 44 5.5 1
5.22 Faber, Heinrich Mußces compendium Heinrici Fabri. 2 F 60 1558 16 2 1
5.23 Agricola, Martin / Figulus, Wolfgang Deutiche Mufica. 14 A 1057 1560 112 14 1
5.24 Deutiche Bücher in Octauo.

6.01 Luther, Martin Haußpostill Mar. Lutheri. 136 1/2 B 3531 1560 420 52.5
6.02 Luther, Martin Kinder Poßtill Martini Lutheri. [omitted]
6.03 Luther, Martin Teßtament D. Mar. Lutheri. 50
6.04 Luther, Martin Wie man die kinder zur Schul halten soll / D. | | Mar. Lutheri. 8
6.05 Luther, Martin Von Christlicher gerechtigkeyt oder vergebung | | der fünden D. Mar. Lutheri. 5 ZV 30149 [1550] 40 5 1
6.06 Luther, Martin Die 25. erffen vnd etliche nachfolgende Pfälmen | | außgelegt / durch D. Mar. Lutheri vorn nie ge- | | druckt. [omitted]
6.07 Spangenberg, Johann Poßtill Johann Spangenberg. 120
6.08 Cordatus, Konrad Poßtill Conradi Cordati. 91 E 4599 1556 728 91 1
6.09 Melanchthon, Philipp Poßtill Philippi Melanthion. 71 1/2 E 4597 1555 564 70.5 1.01
6.10 Mathesius, Johannes Poßtill Mattheij. 42 M 1505 1558 336 42 1
6.11 Corvinus, Antonius Poßtill Antonij Coruini. 94
6.12 Brenz, Johannes Catechißmus Johann Brentij. 55 B 7569 1560 440 55 1
6.13 Huberinus, Caspar Catechißmus Caßparis Huberini. 38 H 5374 1558 304 38 1
6.14 Huberinus, Caspar Vom Christlichen Ritter Caßpar Huberin. 16 H 5457 1558 128 16 1
6.15 Huberinus, Caspar Wie man die krancken trößen fol Caßp. Hub. | | Wie man von der Oberkeyt zum tod verurteylte | | leut trößen fol/ Caßpar Huberinus. [by error the number of sheets was listed after both the first part and again after the second part]
6.16 Dietrich, Veit Paßio Christi außgelegt durch Vitü Dietrich. 25 D 1613 1556 200 25 1
6.17 Dietrich, Veit Der 91. Pfälmen außgelegt durch Vitum Diet. 19 D 1564 1556 152 19 1

(Continued)
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Page and item number</th>
<th>Author</th>
<th>Transcription</th>
<th>Price with denomination, or number of sheets</th>
<th>VD16, RISM, Claus or holding library</th>
<th>Year</th>
<th>Leaves</th>
<th>Sheets</th>
<th>Price/ sheet</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>6.18</td>
<td>Dietrich, Veit</td>
<td>Summaria vber die Euangelia Viti Diet.</td>
<td>19</td>
<td>ZV 4545</td>
<td>1555</td>
<td>152</td>
<td>19</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>6.19</td>
<td>Dietrich, Veit</td>
<td>Gebet auff alle Sontag Viti Dietrich.</td>
<td>11 1/2</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>6.20n</td>
<td>Meynertzhagen, Johannes</td>
<td>Des Euangeliſchen Burgers hand</td>
<td>41 1/2</td>
<td>E 4665 E 4666</td>
<td>1557</td>
<td>332</td>
<td>41.5</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>6.21</td>
<td>Roh, Jan</td>
<td>Der Picarden Gefängbuch.</td>
<td>31</td>
<td>W 1636</td>
<td>1560</td>
<td>248</td>
<td>31</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>6.22</td>
<td>Lauterbeck, Georg</td>
<td>Jefus Syrach Lauterbach.</td>
<td>14 1/2</td>
<td>B 4090</td>
<td>1555</td>
<td>116</td>
<td>14.5</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>6.23</td>
<td>Langer, Johannes d. Ä.</td>
<td>Sprüch Salomonis.</td>
<td>14</td>
<td>B 3629</td>
<td>1552</td>
<td>112</td>
<td>14</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>7.01</td>
<td>Fincel, Hiob</td>
<td>Wunderzeychen Job Fincelij.</td>
<td>23 1/2</td>
<td>F 1104</td>
<td>1556</td>
<td>188</td>
<td>23.5</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>7.02</td>
<td>Rauscher, Hieronymus</td>
<td>Loci Communes Hieronymi Rauſchers.</td>
<td>12</td>
<td>R 408</td>
<td>1558</td>
<td>96</td>
<td>12</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>7.03</td>
<td>Rauscher, Hieronymus</td>
<td>Vrach fo die leut auffhalten vom Sacrament</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>R 419</td>
<td>1559</td>
<td>16</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>7.04</td>
<td>Rauscher, Hieronymus</td>
<td>Gebet auff heyliger Schrift auff alle Sontag</td>
<td>7 1/2</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>7.05</td>
<td>Rauscher, Hieronymus</td>
<td>Orationes Patrum Hieronymi Rauſcher.</td>
<td>13 1/2</td>
<td>R 413</td>
<td>1558</td>
<td>108</td>
<td>13.5</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>7.06</td>
<td>Rhegius, Urbanus</td>
<td>Wie man fürfichtig vnd on ergernuß von den Artikeln Christlicher lehr reden fol Urbani</td>
<td>11 1/2</td>
<td>R 1809</td>
<td>1558</td>
<td>92</td>
<td>11.5</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>7.07</td>
<td>Schneider, Paul</td>
<td>Kellermeyſterey.</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>S 3232</td>
<td>1560</td>
<td>40</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>7.08</td>
<td>Walther, Georg</td>
<td>Troſtbüchlein Georgij Walters aüß D. Lutheri</td>
<td>21</td>
<td>W 982</td>
<td>1559</td>
<td>168</td>
<td>21</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>7.09</td>
<td>Walther, Georg</td>
<td>Vermanung zum Sacrament/ mit vnterrichtung</td>
<td>[omitted]</td>
<td>ZV 13259</td>
<td>1560</td>
<td>100</td>
<td>12.5</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>7.10</td>
<td>Heshusen, Tilemann</td>
<td>Bekantnuß vom Sacrament Thilmani Heß.</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>H 3001</td>
<td>1560</td>
<td>16</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>7.11</td>
<td>Dietrich, Veit</td>
<td>Vom Sacrament Veit Dietrich.</td>
<td>24</td>
<td>ZV 4551</td>
<td>1561</td>
<td>192</td>
<td>24</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>7.12</td>
<td>[Schemp, Wendel]</td>
<td>Der zwolff Apoſtel leben.</td>
<td>31 1/2</td>
<td>ZV 28158</td>
<td>1559</td>
<td>252</td>
<td>31.5</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Page</td>
<td>Item</td>
<td>Author</td>
<td>Title</td>
<td>Price</td>
<td>Year</td>
<td>Leaves</td>
<td>Sheets</td>
<td>Price/Sheet</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>------</td>
<td>------</td>
<td>--------</td>
<td>-------</td>
<td>-------</td>
<td>------</td>
<td>--------</td>
<td>--------</td>
<td>-------------</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>6.18</td>
<td>21</td>
<td>Dietrich, Veit</td>
<td>Summaria über die Euangelia Viti Diet.</td>
<td>W 1766</td>
<td>1560</td>
<td>168</td>
<td>21</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>6.19</td>
<td>11</td>
<td>Dietrich, Veit</td>
<td>Gebet auf alle Sontag Viti Dietrich.</td>
<td>W 1827</td>
<td>1557</td>
<td>168</td>
<td>21</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>6.20</td>
<td>41</td>
<td>Meynertzhagen, Johannes</td>
<td>De Euangeliſchen Burgers hand</td>
<td></td>
<td>Bütlin.</td>
<td>E 4665</td>
<td>E 4666</td>
<td>1557</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>6.21</td>
<td>31</td>
<td>Roh, Jan</td>
<td>Der Picarden Geſangbuch.</td>
<td>W 1636</td>
<td>1560</td>
<td>248</td>
<td>31</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>6.22</td>
<td>14</td>
<td>Lauterbeck, Georg</td>
<td>Jeſus Syrach Lauterbach.</td>
<td>B 4090</td>
<td>1555</td>
<td>116</td>
<td>14.5</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>6.23</td>
<td>14</td>
<td>Langer, Johannes d. Ä.</td>
<td>Sprüch Salomonis.</td>
<td>B 3629</td>
<td>1552</td>
<td>112</td>
<td>14</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>7.01</td>
<td>23</td>
<td>Fincel, Hiob</td>
<td>Wunderzeychen Job Fincelij. Ander theyl der Wunderzeychen.</td>
<td>F 1104</td>
<td>1556</td>
<td>188</td>
<td>23.5</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>7.02</td>
<td>12</td>
<td>Rauscher, Hieronymus</td>
<td>Loci Communes Hieronymi Rauſchers.</td>
<td>R 408</td>
<td>1558</td>
<td>96</td>
<td>12</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>7.03</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>Rauscher, Hieronymus</td>
<td>Vrſach die leut auffhalten vom Sacrament</td>
<td></td>
<td>Hieronymi Rauſcher.</td>
<td>R 419</td>
<td>1559</td>
<td>16</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>7.04</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>Rauscher, Hieronymus</td>
<td>Gebet aus heyliger Schrifft auf alle Sontag</td>
<td></td>
<td>Hieronymi Rauſcher.</td>
<td>R 413</td>
<td>1558</td>
<td>108</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>7.05</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>Rhegius, Urbanus</td>
<td>Wie man fürſichtig vnd on ergernüß von den Artickeln Christlicher lehrſol Vrbani</td>
<td></td>
<td>Regij.</td>
<td>R 1809</td>
<td>1558</td>
<td>92</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>7.06</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>Schneider, Paul</td>
<td>Kellermeyſterey.</td>
<td>S 3232</td>
<td>1560</td>
<td>40</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>7.07</td>
<td>21</td>
<td>Walther, Georg</td>
<td>Troſtbüchlein Georgij Walters aus D. Lutheri</td>
<td></td>
<td>Schrifften gezogen.</td>
<td>W 982</td>
<td>1559</td>
<td>168</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>7.08</td>
<td>12</td>
<td>Theseling, Paul</td>
<td>Vermanung zum Sacrament mit vnterrichtung</td>
<td></td>
<td>nötiger lehr vñ widerlegung etliches jrrthumbs</td>
<td></td>
<td>Georgij Walters.</td>
<td>ZV 13259</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>7.09</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>Heshusen, Tilemann</td>
<td>Bekantnuß vom Sacrament Thilmani Heß.</td>
<td>H 3001</td>
<td>1560</td>
<td>16</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>7.10</td>
<td>24</td>
<td>Dietrich, Veit</td>
<td>Vom Sacrament Veit Dietrich.</td>
<td>ZV 4551</td>
<td>1561</td>
<td>192</td>
<td>24</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>7.11</td>
<td>31</td>
<td>Schemp, Wendel</td>
<td>Der zwölff Apoſtel leben.</td>
<td>ZV 28158</td>
<td>1559</td>
<td>252</td>
<td>31.5</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>7.12</td>
<td>21</td>
<td>Weller, Hieronymus</td>
<td>Antidotum oder Geyſtliche Artzney D. Hieronymi Welleri.</td>
<td>W 1766</td>
<td>1560</td>
<td>80</td>
<td>10</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>7.13</td>
<td>9</td>
<td>Weller, Hieronymus</td>
<td>Haußtaſſel Hieronymi Welleri.</td>
<td>W 1766</td>
<td>1560</td>
<td>80</td>
<td>10</td>
<td>1.60</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

---

**In Duodecimo.**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Page</th>
<th>Item</th>
<th>Author</th>
<th>Title</th>
<th>Price</th>
<th>Year</th>
<th>Leaves</th>
<th>Sheets</th>
<th>Price/Sheet</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>9.01</td>
<td>32</td>
<td>Luther, Martin</td>
<td>Gefangbüchlein D. M. Luther.</td>
<td>W 1766</td>
<td>1560</td>
<td>168</td>
<td>21</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>9.02</td>
<td>21</td>
<td>Rörer, Georg</td>
<td>Viler schöner Troſtíprich. D. M. Lutheri.</td>
<td>R 2814</td>
<td>1557</td>
<td>252</td>
<td>21</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>9.03</td>
<td>11</td>
<td>Luther, Martin</td>
<td>Das ichöne Conſtemeni D. M. Luther.</td>
<td>L 5824</td>
<td>1558</td>
<td>132</td>
<td>11</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>9.04</td>
<td>13</td>
<td>[author unidentified]</td>
<td>Euangelia vnd Epiftel auff alle Sontage.</td>
<td>D 1560</td>
<td>1549</td>
<td>312</td>
<td>26</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>9.05</td>
<td>26</td>
<td>Dietrich, Veit</td>
<td>Etliche Schrifften für den gemeinen Mann/</td>
<td></td>
<td>Veit Dietrich.</td>
<td>D 1560</td>
<td>1549</td>
<td>312</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>9.06</td>
<td>20</td>
<td>Dietrich, Veit</td>
<td>Pfalter mit Summarien/ Veit Diet.</td>
<td>D 1560</td>
<td>1549</td>
<td>312</td>
<td>26</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>9.07</td>
<td>15</td>
<td>[Dietrich, Veit]</td>
<td>Summario vber die Euangelia.</td>
<td>D 1560</td>
<td>1549</td>
<td>312</td>
<td>26</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>9.08</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>Dietrich, Veit</td>
<td>Der 32. Pfalz Außgelegt Veit Dietrich.</td>
<td>D 1560</td>
<td>1549</td>
<td>312</td>
<td>26</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>9.10</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>Luther, Martin</td>
<td>Catechimus klein Lutheri.</td>
<td>L 5079</td>
<td>1556</td>
<td>84</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>9.11</td>
<td>15</td>
<td>Rhau, Georg</td>
<td>Luſtfarten Jeorg Rawen.</td>
<td>R 1694</td>
<td>1556</td>
<td>180</td>
<td>15</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>9.12</td>
<td>12</td>
<td>[Schmaltzing, Georg]</td>
<td>Pfalter Betſweyß.</td>
<td>R 1694</td>
<td>1556</td>
<td>180</td>
<td>15</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>9.13</td>
<td>12</td>
<td>Sarcerius, Erasmus</td>
<td>Creutzbüchlein Emf. Sarcerij.</td>
<td>Claus 1554.42</td>
<td>1554</td>
<td>144</td>
<td>12</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>9.14</td>
<td>20</td>
<td>Spangenberg, Johann</td>
<td>Ehelichen orden iſpiegel Spangenberg.</td>
<td>S 7777</td>
<td>1555</td>
<td>240</td>
<td>20</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>9.15</td>
<td>16</td>
<td>Rebhun, Paul</td>
<td>Haussfried Pauli Rebhun.</td>
<td>ZV 12973</td>
<td>1557</td>
<td>192</td>
<td>16</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>9.16</td>
<td>11</td>
<td>Menius, Justus</td>
<td>Oeconomia, von Christlicher Haßhaltung.</td>
<td>M 4552</td>
<td>1556</td>
<td>132</td>
<td>11</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

(Continued)
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Page and item number</th>
<th>Author</th>
<th>Transcription</th>
<th>Price with denomination, or number of sheets</th>
<th>VD16, RISM, Claus or holding library</th>
<th>Year</th>
<th>Leaves</th>
<th>Sheets</th>
<th>Price/sheet</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>9.17</td>
<td>Caelius, Michael</td>
<td>Der 133. Pfälz/wie die Eheleut &amp;c.</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>C 1824</td>
<td>1553</td>
<td>48</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>9.18</td>
<td>[author unidentified]</td>
<td>Fewerzeug Christlicher andacht.</td>
<td>14</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>9.19r</td>
<td>Rheticus, Urbanus</td>
<td>Seel Artzney Vrb. Regij.</td>
<td>14</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>9.20</td>
<td>[author unidentified]</td>
<td>Betbüchlein für allerley gemein anligen.</td>
<td>14</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>9.21</td>
<td>Rauscher, Hieronymus</td>
<td>Loci communes Hieronymi Rauscher.</td>
<td>9</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>9.22</td>
<td>Lauterbeck, Georg</td>
<td>Iesu Syrach Geor. Lauterbach.</td>
<td>13</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>9.23</td>
<td>[Melanchthon, Philipp]</td>
<td>Die Sprüche Salomonis.</td>
<td>7</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>9.24</td>
<td>Luther, Martin</td>
<td>Haubartickel Lutheri.</td>
<td>12</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>9.25</td>
<td>Weller, Hieronymus</td>
<td>Etliche Sprüche aus den Propheten/ Hierony...</td>
<td>12</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>9.26</td>
<td>Weller, Hieronymus</td>
<td>Der 32. Pfälz Hieronymi Weller.</td>
<td>8</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>9.27</td>
<td>Weller, Hieronymus</td>
<td>Kurtzer bericht vom Sacrament/ Hierony...</td>
<td>8</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>10.01†</td>
<td>Savonarola, Girolamo</td>
<td>Der 51. Pfälz/ Hier. Sauanarole.</td>
<td>6</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>10.02</td>
<td>[author unidentified]</td>
<td>Sehr schöne Trostprüche.</td>
<td>3</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>10.03</td>
<td>Aquila, Kaspar</td>
<td>Enchiridion Cæparis Aquile.</td>
<td>3</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>10.04</td>
<td>Caelius, Michael</td>
<td>Der 34. Pfälz/ Michel Celij.</td>
<td>13</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>10.05</td>
<td>[author unidentified]</td>
<td>Brunn des leben.</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>F 1823</td>
<td>1560</td>
<td>96</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>10.06</td>
<td>Lasius, Christoph</td>
<td>Das Gülde kleinodt.</td>
<td>15</td>
<td>L 569</td>
<td>1556</td>
<td>180</td>
<td>15</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>10.07a</td>
<td>Luther, Martin</td>
<td>Ein einfaltige weyß zu betten/ D. M. Luther.</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>US-NYpl</td>
<td>1560</td>
<td>72</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Jn Sedecimo.</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>10.08</td>
<td>[author unidentified]</td>
<td>Euangelia vnd Epitkel.</td>
<td>9</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>10.09</td>
<td>[author unidentified]</td>
<td>Kirchen gefang büchlein.</td>
<td>7</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>10.10v</td>
<td>Luther, Martin</td>
<td>Catechismus klein/ Luth.</td>
<td>4 1/2</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>10.11</td>
<td>[author unidentified]</td>
<td>Betbüchlein für allerley anligen.</td>
<td>2 1/2</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>10.12w</td>
<td>[Luther, Martin]</td>
<td>Iesu Syrach.</td>
<td>7 1/2</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>10.13</td>
<td>[author unidentified]</td>
<td>Catechismus Lateiniich vnd Deutfch.</td>
<td>4</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Jn 32. Columlein.</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>10.14</td>
<td>Dietrich, Veit</td>
<td>Trölliche vnd ware Außlegung des spruchs</td>
<td>5</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

*Note: The table contains entries from a historical catalog of books, including authors, titles, prices, and publication details.*
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Page</th>
<th>Item</th>
<th>Author</th>
<th>Transcription</th>
<th>Price with denomination, or page number of sheets</th>
<th>Year</th>
<th>Leaves</th>
<th>Sheets</th>
<th>Price/sheet</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>10.15</td>
<td>9.17</td>
<td>Caelius, Michael</td>
<td>Der Pſalm/wie die Eheleut &amp;c.</td>
<td>4 C 1824</td>
<td>48</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>1</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>10.16</td>
<td>9.18</td>
<td>[author unidentified]</td>
<td>Fewerzeug Christlicher andacht.</td>
<td>14</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>10.18</td>
<td>9.20</td>
<td>[author unidentified]</td>
<td>Betbüchlein für allerley gemein anligen.</td>
<td>14</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>10.19</td>
<td>9.21</td>
<td>Rauscher, Hieronymus</td>
<td>Loci communes Hieronymi Rauſcher.</td>
<td>9</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>10.20</td>
<td>9.22</td>
<td>Lauterbeck, Georg</td>
<td>Syrach Jeorg Lauterbach.</td>
<td>13</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>10.21</td>
<td>9.23</td>
<td>[Melanchthon, Philipp]</td>
<td>Die Sprüche Salomonis.</td>
<td>7</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>10.22</td>
<td>9.24</td>
<td>Luther, Martin</td>
<td>Haubtartickel Lutheri.</td>
<td>12</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>10.24</td>
<td>9.26</td>
<td>Weller, Hieronymus</td>
<td>Der Pſalm Hieronymi Weller.</td>
<td>8</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>11.02</td>
<td>10.01</td>
<td>Savonarola, Girolamo</td>
<td>Der Pſalm/ Hier. Sauanarole.</td>
<td>6</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>11.03</td>
<td>10.02</td>
<td>[author unidentified]</td>
<td>Sehr ſchöne Troſtſprüch.</td>
<td>3</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>11.04</td>
<td>10.03</td>
<td>Aquila, Kaspar</td>
<td>Enchiridion Caſparis Aquile.</td>
<td>3</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>11.05</td>
<td>10.04</td>
<td>Caelius, Michael</td>
<td>Der Pſalm/ Michel Celij.</td>
<td>13</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>11.06</td>
<td>10.05</td>
<td>[author unidentified]</td>
<td>Brunn des leben.</td>
<td>8 F 1823</td>
<td>1560</td>
<td>96</td>
<td>1</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>11.07</td>
<td>10.06</td>
<td>Lasius, Christoph</td>
<td>Das Gülde kleinodt.</td>
<td>15 L 569</td>
<td>1556</td>
<td>180</td>
<td>15</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>11.08</td>
<td>10.07</td>
<td>Luther, Martin</td>
<td>Ein einfeltige weyß zu betten/ D. M. Luther.</td>
<td>6 US-NYpl</td>
<td>1560</td>
<td>72</td>
<td>1</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>11.09</td>
<td>10.08</td>
<td>[author unidentified]</td>
<td>Euangelia vnd Epiftel.</td>
<td>9</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>11.10</td>
<td>10.09</td>
<td>[author unidentified]</td>
<td>Kirchen geſang büchlein.</td>
<td>7</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>11.11</td>
<td>10.10</td>
<td>Luther, Martin</td>
<td>Catechiſmuß klein/ Luth.</td>
<td>4 1/2</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>11.12</td>
<td>10.11</td>
<td>[author unidentified]</td>
<td>Betbüchlein für allerley anligen.</td>
<td>2 1/2</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>11.13</td>
<td>10.12</td>
<td>[Luther, Martin]</td>
<td>Jeſus Syrach.</td>
<td>7 1/2</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>11.14</td>
<td>10.13</td>
<td>[author unidentified]</td>
<td>Catechiſmus Lateinſch vnd Deutſch.</td>
<td>4</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>11.15</td>
<td>10.14</td>
<td>Dietrich, Veit</td>
<td>Tröſtliche vnd ware Außlegung des</td>
<td></td>
<td>ſpruchs</td>
<td></td>
<td>Johan. am 1. Viti Diet.</td>
<td>5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>11.16</td>
<td>10.15</td>
<td>[author unidentified]</td>
<td>Gebet auff alle Sontag.</td>
<td>3</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>11.17</td>
<td>10.16</td>
<td>[author unidentified]</td>
<td>Gebet für allerley gemein anligen.</td>
<td>6 1/2</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>11.18</td>
<td>10.17</td>
<td>[author unidentified]</td>
<td>Sehr ſchöne Troſtſprüch.</td>
<td>3</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>11.19</td>
<td>10.18</td>
<td>[Dietrich, Veit]</td>
<td>Wie man das Vatter vnſer betenſol.</td>
<td>3</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Libri in Sedecimo.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Page</th>
<th>Item</th>
<th>Author</th>
<th>Transcription</th>
<th>Price with denomination, or page number of sheets</th>
<th>Year</th>
<th>Leaves</th>
<th>Sheets</th>
<th>Price/sheet</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>11.01</td>
<td>10.01</td>
<td>Luther, Martin</td>
<td>Inſignes Sacrae ſcripturae ſententiae, ex</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>polite per D. Mar. Lutherum.</td>
<td>24</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>11.02</td>
<td>10.02</td>
<td>[author unidentified]</td>
<td>Pfalterium in modi orationi reducti.</td>
<td>17</td>
<td>ZV 1680</td>
<td>1552</td>
<td>204</td>
<td>17</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>11.03</td>
<td>10.03</td>
<td>Weller, Hieronymus</td>
<td>De Officio Ecclesiatico, Politico, &amp;</td>
<td></td>
<td>Oeconomico, Hieror. [sic] Vuelleri.</td>
<td>14</td>
<td>ZV 17500</td>
<td>1558</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>11.04</td>
<td>10.04</td>
<td>Mörlin, Maximilian, ed.</td>
<td>Apophthegmata ex Euſebio, collecta</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>per D. Maximilianum Morlinum.</td>
<td>10</td>
<td>E 4294</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

MVSICI LIBRI.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Page</th>
<th>Item</th>
<th>Author</th>
<th>Transcription</th>
<th>Price with denomination, or page number of sheets</th>
<th>Year</th>
<th>Leaves</th>
<th>Sheets</th>
<th>Price/sheet</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>12.01</td>
<td>10.05</td>
<td>Montanus, Johannes, ed.</td>
<td>Sex Tomi Euangeliorum. [4vo]</td>
<td>38 Batz</td>
<td>RISM 1554</td>
<td>1554</td>
<td>1660</td>
<td>415</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>12.02</td>
<td>10.06</td>
<td>Montanus, Johannes, ed.</td>
<td>Quatuor Tomi Pfälzorum. [4vo]</td>
<td>25 Batz</td>
<td>RISM 155510-12</td>
<td>1555</td>
<td>1556</td>
<td>49</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>12.03</td>
<td>10.07</td>
<td>Montanus, Johannes, ed.</td>
<td>Opus Magnum Muſicum, 6. 5. 4. Voſ</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>cum. [4vo]</td>
<td>2 fl 1/2</td>
<td>RISM 155510-12</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>12.04</td>
<td>10.08</td>
<td>Forster, Georg, ed.</td>
<td>Quinq. Tomi Deutſche liedere Forſteri,</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>4. 5. &amp; plurium Vocum. [8vo]</td>
<td>2 fl</td>
<td>RISM 155510-12</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>12.05</td>
<td>10.09</td>
<td>Brusch, Kaspar, ed.</td>
<td>Lamentationes Hieremiae Prophetæ, 4.</td>
<td></td>
<td>&amp; 5. Vocum. [4vo]</td>
<td>1 ort</td>
<td>L 172</td>
<td>1549</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>12.06</td>
<td>10.10</td>
<td>Brusch, Kaspar, ed.</td>
<td>Carmina uere diuina. 5. Vocum. [4vo]</td>
<td>3 Batz</td>
<td>C 1188</td>
<td>1550</td>
<td>156</td>
<td>39</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>12.07</td>
<td>10.11</td>
<td>Montanus, Johannes, ed.</td>
<td>De Laude Muſices. 4. 5. Vocum. [4vo]</td>
<td>1 ort</td>
<td>1556</td>
<td>164</td>
<td>41</td>
<td>1.54</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>12.08</td>
<td>10.12</td>
<td>Codico, Adrianus Petit</td>
<td>Confolutiones ex Pſalmis. 4. uocū. [4vo]</td>
<td>3 Batz</td>
<td>ZV 11318</td>
<td>1552</td>
<td>132</td>
<td>33</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

(Continued)
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Page and item number</th>
<th>Author</th>
<th>Transcription</th>
<th>Price with denomination, or number of sheets</th>
<th>VD16, RISM, Claus or holding library</th>
<th>Year</th>
<th>Leaves</th>
<th>Sheets</th>
<th>Price/sheet</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>12.10</td>
<td>Montanus, Johannes, and Wolfgang Figulus, eds.</td>
<td>Tres Tomi Triciniorum. [8vo]</td>
<td>1/2 (\ell)</td>
<td>RISM F 720 RISM 15601-2</td>
<td>[1560]</td>
<td>648</td>
<td>81</td>
<td>1.56</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>12.11</td>
<td>Le Maistre, Matthaeus</td>
<td>Catechesis numeris Muficis ornata, triu</td>
<td>1 Batz</td>
<td>ZV 17175</td>
<td>1559</td>
<td>72</td>
<td>9</td>
<td>1.78</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>12.12</td>
<td>[composer unidentified]</td>
<td>Oratio Didonis tribus uocibus. [8vo?]</td>
<td>6 d</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

*This edition consists of three separately foliated sections and exists in only two known exemplars, both of which are incomplete; the difference in the number of sheets may indicate additional material that has been lost.
*This edition does not name Montanus & Neuber as printer, but their role as printer is evident from typographical evidence and from the 1557 edition, VD16 P 2273, which names them as printer.
*VD16 S 5295 (1562), printed on 30.5 sheets (244 leaves of octavo), must be a later edition of this lost edition.
*The VD16 gives this edition as 173 leaves; this is the number of leaves extant in the incomplete exemplar in D-Mbs, not the number of leaves that would be in a complete exemplar, for which see Claus 1558.48.
*Although the number of leaves differs from that given in the VD16, it has been confirmed as correct by examination of a digital scan of the edition.
*VD16 H 3401 (1580), printed by Montanus & Neuber’s heir, Gerlach, on 3 sheets (24 leaves in octavo) is a later edition of this lost edition.
*VD16 H 3342 (1548), printed on 2 sheets (16 leaves in octavo), is an earlier edition of this lost edition.
*VD16 D 2286 (1548), printed on 7 sheets (56 leaves in octavo), is an earlier edition of this lost edition.
*VD16 ZV 10089 (1561), printed on 129 sheets (1032 leaves in octavo), is a later edition of this lost edition.
*VD16 L 5694 (1544), printed on 8.5 sheets (68 leaves in octavo), is an earlier edition of this lost edition.
*VD16 ZV 14597 (1558) is Trinity to Advent, 536 leaves in octavo, and so possibly part of this edition.
*This edition does not carry the Montanus & Neuber imprint but their 1555 edition of this title does.
*VD16 ZV 27960 (1563), printed on 95 sheets (760 leaves in octavo), is a later edition of this lost edition.
*This is a two-volume set sold as a single item; the first volume covers the Old Testament, the second covers the New Testament.
*The VD16 incorrectly gives the format as sextodecimo.
*This edition does not name Montanus & Neuber as printer, but they are assigned as such by Claus 1554.42. VD16 S 1741 (1554), another edition of this title, is also printed on twelve sheets (but on 187 leaves in sextodecimo); again it does not name Montanus & Neuber, but they are assigned as such by the VD16.
*This edition has 128 leaves (11.67 sheets) but may have been sold as 12 full sheets; the signatures are A\(\text{a}\)B\(\text{b}\)C\(\text{c}\)D\(\text{d}\)…T\(\text{v}\)V\(\text{w}\)X\(\text{x}\). All numbers in the catalogue are either whole or half numbers, with no other fractions; to sell as a half sheet would have been to sell at a loss, and so I have assumed that the number would have been rounded up, even though it is possible, but unlikely, that one third was cut off the last sheet.
*VD16 R 1917 (1548) is printed on sixteen sheets (192 leaves in duodecimo) and so may be an earlier edition of this lost edition.
*VD16 L 4814 (1562) is printed on twelve sheets (144 leaves in duodecimo) and so may be a later edition of this lost edition.
*VD16 S 2014 (1562) is printed on six sheets (72 leaves in duodecimo) and so may be a later edition of this lost edition.
*VD16 ZV 25237 (1560) is printed on four sheets (32 leaves in octavo) and so may be an edition in a different format to this lost edition.
*VD16 ZV 1823 (1554) is printed on 11 sheets (132 leaves in duodecimo) and so may be an edition in a different format to this lost edition.
Notes

1 I am grateful to the staff of the Staatsbibliothek Bamberg for their assistance during my visit to examine the only known exemplar of this catalogue, to Grantley McDonald for comments on earlier drafts of this chapter, and to Bonnie Blackburn for comments on the music edition De laude musices and for sending me concordances that I had missed. This chapter is dedicated to Susan Jackson, whose ground-breaking research on Montanus & Neuber has laid a foundation for all future research on this important music publishing house.

2 Göhler, Verzeichnis; Chapman, ‘Printed Collections’; Bernstein, ‘Bibliography’.


5 Ernsti, who led the Endter printing house in Nuremberg from 1717 until his death in 1723, may have used the exemplar subsequently owned by Georg Andreas Will. (Kelchner, ‘Entdter’, 111.)

6 Ernsti, Die Wol-ingerichtete Buchdruckerey, fol. f2–f3.

7 For example, directly, such as Jackson, ‘Berg and Neuber’, 11–12 and Engelsing, ‘Festpreise’, 30–31; or indirectly through Kirchhoff, Geschichte, 24 and 32, such as Wohnhaas, ‘Montanus’, col. 488. As recently as 2015, Reske, Buchdrucker, 739, repeated that the catalogue was not extant.

8 Will, Bibliotheca Norica Williana, 8: 63, Nr. 308, under the heading ‘7. Res libraria. a. Typographia. [Unnumbered subsection] In Octavo’. He transcribes the entire title with minor typographical standardisation. Wagner, ‘Nachträge’, 131, cites Will’s entry and notes that Will’s exemplar was missing. Grimm, ‘Buchführer’, col. 1235, doesn’t cite the source for his knowledge of the catalogue, but the only author in his bibliography who mentions it is Wagner.

9 I am grateful to Carolin Gillich, Stadtbibliothek Nürnberg, for this information (email of 24 April 2019).


11 ‘Dieser Index ist als frühes Beispiel eines Katalogs mit Preisen und Umfangsangaben für das deutsche Sprachgebiet besonders bemerkenswert’ (Richter, ‘Bibliographische Beiträge’, 218). In a later article, ‘Humanistische Bücher’, 200–201, Richter made additional comments on the rarity of sixteenth-century German catalogues giving either prices or number of sheets.

12 Jürgensen, Bibliotheca Norica, 1693.


15 See Piccard, Kronen-Wasserzeichen, Abteilung X (mit Kleeblattkreuz), most similar to watermark 2. The provenance of all Abteilung X watermarks is Upper Rhine/Vosges. See also the type Wasserzeichen-Informationssystem: Symbole/Herrschaftszeichen – Krone – Bügel zweikonturnig – frei, ohne Beizeichen – Bügel mit Kleeblattkreuz – Bogen mit Perlen außen – Reif mit Perlen und Zacken (www.wasserzeichen-online.de).


17 Ameln, ‘Ein Nürnberger Verlegerplakat’ and also a manuscript Gerlach catalogue in Vienna in the Haus-, Hof- und Staatsarchiv – Reichshofrat – Miscellanea – Bücherkommission im Reich, 1 (1557–1628), folder 57, fol. 42v. For examples of other printed catalogues see Richter, ‘Die Sammlung’ and Richter, Verlegerplakate.


19 Catalogue numbers [4.08] (1562), [6.01] (1561; 129 sheets, not the expected 136.5, and so this is not the edition in the catalogue), [6.11] (1563), [7.11] (1561), [9.24] (1562) and [10.01] (1562).

20 Although this is pure speculation, there could have been a 1559 catalogue (published or not) that included books which were in preparation but which had not yet appeared; if so, there may have been slight differences between the expected number of sheets and the actual number of sheets, but with the expected number appearing in the 1560 catalogue.

21 Erasmus’ De Ciuilitate [5.14] is priced at 6.5 sheets, but the Valentin Neuber edition (VD16 E 2267) is 6 sheets (48 leaves) of octavo; Luther’s Testament [6.03] is priced at 50 sheets, but the Valentin Neuber edition (VD16 ZV 16378) is 52 sheets (416 leaves) of octavo; the Gesangbüchlein D. M. Luther [9.01] is priced at 32 sheets, but the Valentin Neuber edition (RISM 1562a) is 31 sheets (371 leaves) of duodecimo; the Kirchen gesang büchlein [10.09] is priced at 7 sheets, but the Valentin Neuber edition (VD16 K 935) is 7.5 sheets (120 leaves) of sextodecimo. Although Melanchthon’s Die Sprüche Salomonis [9.23] is priced at 7 sheets and the Valentin Neuber edition (VD16 B 3604) is printed on 7 sheets, the Montanus & Neuber edition is in duodecimo format whereas the Valentin
Neuber edition is in octavo format. The only exception is Melanchthon’s *Prouerbia Salomonis* [5.20], priced as 7 sheets; the Valentin Neuber edition (VD16 ZV 26825) consists of 7 sheets of octavo. This could be explained if one edition was a copy of the other, or if both were copies of an earlier edition by another printer.

22 An anomaly in the catalogue that I have not been able to resolve is item [2.08]: ‘Opera Cypriani. 8. *gℓ* 138 *cℓ*’. This is the only instance of an edition having what appears to be both a price in currency and a number of sheets. The extant Montanus & Neuber edition of this item is printed on 138 sheets and so the reference to 138 sheets is correct. Jacob, *Rechenbuch*, fol. 148’, gives ‘*gℓ*’ as being an abbreviation for ‘Groschen’; if the abbreviation here indicates ‘Groschen’ this would be the only reference to Groschen in the catalogue. One Groschen in Nuremberg at this time was worth 7 Pfennig (Köbel, *Rechenbuch*, fol. 15v, ‘Münzt zu Nürenberg’: ‘VII. Pfenning ein Grosch. XXXVI. Groschen ist ein Gulden.’), and so 8 Groschen was 56 Pfennig. A price of 0.4 Pfennig per sheet, against the demonstrated 1.5 Pfennig per sheet (almost four times the price) for premium editions does not seem feasible, and so the abbreviation presumably does not mean ‘Groschen’. The book is in folio format and so the ‘8’ cannot be related to format. An examination of this edition has not resulted in any further possibilities of that the ‘8. *gℓ*’ could mean.


26 The number of sheets is followed by the abbreviation ‘*cℓ*’, which Richter, ‘Humanistische Bücher’, 201, identifies as an abbreviation for ‘chartae’. This abbreviation is also used for ‘Zentner’, a one-hundredth part (see Werner, *Rechenbuch*, fol. D2v) and ‘Centner’, a unit of weight of 100 pounds (‘ein Centner, das sind 100. lb.’ and the next page where the abbreviation is given; Henning, *Gerechnet Rechenbüchlein*, fol. )((sic)5v-5v).

Richter, ‘Humanistische Bücher’, 201, based on his observation that the two ways of indicating the cost to purchaser changed back and forth throughout the catalogue, suggested that they are therefore interchangeable. However, he did not analyse the types of books assigned to each category; such an examination demonstrates that his conclusion is not substantiated.

28 Koppitz, *Druckprivilegien*, 40: Johann vom Berg Erben, Karton 6, Nr. 14 of 5 April 1566; 180: Dietrich Gerlach, Karton 23, Nr. 30 of 27 July 1568; 96: Alexander Dietrich, Karton 13, Nr. 29, undated, referring to Dietrich Gerlach’s privilege for Mathesius’ *Postilla*; 178: Valentin Geissler (who married Neuber’s widow), Karton 23, Nr. 17, of 14 December 1575, about taking over Dietrich Gerlach and Alexander Dietrich’s privilege for Mathesius; 271: Paul Kauffmann, Karton 35, Nr. 12, dated 15 April 1592, taking over the privilege of 27 July 1568 held by his ancestor (‘Ahnherr’) [no -n] Dietrich Gerlach. A few other editions or sets of editions that have privileges, but for which there are no Imperial records, are discussed in Jackson, ‘Berg and Neuber’, 73–74; for at least some of those the privilege was held by individuals other than Montanus & Neuber.

29 The edition carries a five-year [Imperial] privilege. There is no record of who held the privilege. Montanus & Neuber reprinted the book in 1561 (VD16 S 3121).

30 Vietor’s 1679 book on layout is titled *Neu-auffgesetztes Format-Büchlein: Worinnen Alle Figuren abgefasset | | wie man die Columnen recht ordentlich außschiessen und stellen soll | | so wohl in groß- als kleinen Formaten*. Geßner’s 1740 definition in his *Buchdruckerkunst*, 178, reads: ‘Columnen, heisen [sic] die Seiten der Blätter; Nachdem nun ein Bogen in Octav, Quart, oder Folio gedruckt wird; So hat er viel, oder wenig, Columnen’.

31 I am grateful to Bonnie Blackburn for bringing to my attention Joachim Heller’s two-voice setting of ‘Divina res est Musica’ as No. 98 of this anthology; this led to me noticing the printed texts at the end of this edition. Grantley McDonald has pointed out to me that ‘Divina res est Musica’ was ‘one of many paratexts in the published version of a poem by Joannes Holtzheuser on the dignity and powers of music, recited during a lecture on music given at the University of Wittenberg by Heinrich Faber on 26 April 1551. Indeed, the theme of the 1556 publication, “On the praise of music”, is precisely that of Holtzheuser’s own work, which suggests a connection between the two publications. See Holtzheuser, *Encomium Musicae*, fol. A1v. Further on this event, see Leaver, *Luther’s Liturgical Music*, 84–85’. One of the unica in *De laude musices* is a setting of this text by Heinrich Faber.

32 Bonnie Blackburn has kindly pointed out to me that the text ‘Laeta graves abigit’ also appears in Rotenbucher’s *Diphona amoena* (No. 4) as a contrafactum text for the Pleni of Brumel’s *Missa Je nay deul*; this is the only setting of this text listed on RISM-online.
Othmayr died in 1553, and so his motet is unlikely to have been specifically composed for this collection; Peschin disappears from the records in 1547, and so the same is presumably true for his setting.

According to the catalogue it is quarto, the same format given in VD16; RISM DKL gives the format as octavo. All sources indicate that this book has 388 or 390 leaves, but my examination of the exemplar in A-Wn gave 298 leaves (Part I: *6A–Z4Aa4 = 102 leaves; Part II: Bb–Pp4 = 56 leaves; Part III Qq–Zz4Aaa–Zzz4Aaaa–Dddd4 = 140 leaves).

Serpilius, Georgii Serpilii, 69, No. CCX. Serpilius is cited by Wackernagel, Bibliographie, 307, No. 794, which is cited by RISM DKL.

Heyden’s involvement is indicated only by the fact that the poem ‘Ad lectorem’ on f. A2v is signed ‘S. H.’.

Stallybrass, ‘Little Jobs’, 322. I am grateful to Kate van Orden for bringing Stallybrass’ chapter to my attention.
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Relatively little is known about the sale of printed books of polyphony in late sixteenth-century Europe, including such details as the geographical spread of copies and how long individual titles remained available for sale. However, the sales records of the Officina Plantiniana, founded by Christophe Plantin (c. 1520–1589), provide unique information that illuminates these elusive questions. Although polyphonic music publication made up only a small percentage (0.57%) of titles issued by Plantin, an investigation of the sales and dissemination of his music books, and of his firm’s sales of music books published by others, provides important insights into the identities and methods of Plantin’s agents and purchasers, his systems of distribution and sales and his strategy for pricing.1

This study provides an analysis of the records of Plantin’s sales of polyphonic music between 1578 and 1600, complementing Henri Vanhulst’s study of music sales between 1566 and 1578.2 These years, which cover the period when Plantin produced editions of polyphony, are of particular interest. The primary sources analysed here are the firm’s Journals, which contain the daily records of the business of printing and selling books.3 The entries in these annual Journals, arranged in chronological order, record details of the purchase or sale of books, paper and parchment, and the costs of commercial bookbinding carried out through the firm.4 A list of music sales by the Officina Plantiniana, compiled from these Journals, forms the basis for my analysis of sales numbers, geographical spread and trends or preferences in the repertory disseminated.5

The market for Plantin’s music books reflected the trading connections of Antwerp. Access to the North Sea provided maritime routes to Baltic ports, the Iberian Peninsula and the Atlantic. Land routes connected Antwerp to Cologne and Paris to the east and south-west, and southwards to Frankfurt, Augsburg and Italy. Plantin cited this easy access to transport routes in a letter to Pope Gregory XIII (9 October 1574), in which he requested permission to set up his business in Antwerp.6

To reach European markets, Plantin primarily sold his books at major trading hubs, including the Frankfurt book fair: 42% of his choirbooks and 28% of his partbooks were sent directly to his Frankfurt warehouse. Moreover, he sent consignments to Cologne, served local markets within the Low Countries, and established strong trading relationships with other publishers and booksellers in centres such as Douai, Danzig, London and Rouen; many of these trading partners had left Antwerp following the siege of the city in 1585 and its forcible re-Catholicisation.7

Between 1578 and 1600, the Officina Plantiniana published five choirbooks and nine collections of polyphonic vocal music in partbooks; details of these can be found in Table 1.6 in the Appendix.8 Through analysis of the Journals for this period, it is possible to identify
total sales of 210 copies of Plantin’s grand folio choirbooks and 2,279 separate sets of his partbooks. This difference in raw numbers shows that there was a much stronger market for partbook collections than for the specialised, prestigious and costly choirbooks.

**Destination of sales**

Table 12.1 summarises the geographical spread of the choirbooks, using broad areas based on those studied by Bowen and Imhof. Together with Figure 12.1, these figures demonstrate the wide geographical distribution of Plantin’s polyphonic choirbooks despite the relatively few copies sold over a period of twenty-three years. Most of Plantin’s choirbooks were sent to the Frankfurt book fair for onward sale. (Their final destinations will require a separate study.) Plantin sold many of his choirbooks where he was represented by his own bookshop, such as at Paris, or by an agent at a fair, as at Cologne. Cologne lay on the route to Frankfurt, and was itself a major marketplace for books. Some of the consignments for the Frankfurt fair were dropped off in Cologne. Leon Voet, the leading modern historian of Plantin’s business, states that Plantin and his son-in-law Jan I Moretus (1543–1610), who would later inherit the business, ‘seem regularly to have broken their journeys to talk business with Cologne booksellers over a drink’. Smaller sales were made to a variety of destinations, including towns in the Low Countries such as Ath, Ghent, Kessel and Tournaï, but also locations further afield, including cities under Spanish control such as Seville, Albergaria (in Portugal) and Veracruz (on the Gulf of Mexico), and Protestant cities such as Königsberg, a Hanseatic city on the Baltic Sea.

In some cases, the destination of sales reflected the composer’s own connections. Alard du Gaucquier (c. 1534–1582) served Emperors Maximillian II and Rudolf II while residing in the Low Countries. It is not a surprise therefore that copies of his *Quatuor missae* (1581) were sold to local customers in Antwerp, Ath and Crespin, as well as being exported to centres further afield, including Seville and Königsberg, generally in one or two copies per location. However, most exemplars (sixteen copies, half of the total documented sales) were disseminated through the Frankfurt fair.

In contrast, the *Quatuor missae* (1583) of Jacobus de Kerle (c. 1531–1591) sold less well in the Low Countries. Following the early years of his career in the Low Countries, de Kerle spent most of his time working in Augsburg, Vienna and finally in Prague. It is therefore unsurprising that his *Quatuor missae* sold best in German-speaking lands. Of the twenty-eight documented sales of this collection, twenty-one were made in Frankfurt or Cologne. Twelve of the copies that passed through Cologne went to an agent, who then passed them to de Kerle in fulfilment of his contractual obligation to purchase twelve copies.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Geographical area</th>
<th>Percentage</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Low Countries</td>
<td>17</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>France</td>
<td>15</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Germany/Habsburg territories</td>
<td>14</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Frankfurt book fair</td>
<td>42</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Iberia</td>
<td>3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Italy</td>
<td>4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Americas</td>
<td>3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Unidentified</td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Figure 12.1 Total sales by destination for all choirbooks published by the Officina Plantiniana, 1578–1600.
copies from Plantin. As with the masses by du Gaucquier, the remaining copies were sold to local destinations at an average of one to two copies each.

The Journal entries relating to sales of the *Octo missae* (1578) by George de La Hèle (1547–1586) are more complicated. Plantin’s contract with La Hèle stipulated that the composer was to purchase forty copies of the choirbook. La Hèle did not meet this obligation, claiming difficulties due to a faltering political and financial climate. Indeed, the limited sales of Plantin’s choirbooks subsequently suggest that this was an unrealistic obligation. The four books sent to La Hèle are not listed in the Journals, but appear in the Grand Livre (large-format summary records including sales from the Journals, cash accounts and consignments to authors), dated 6 September 1578 and addressed to Tournai. Although these were never paid for, they are included in Figure 12.2 for the sake of completeness.

As with the choirbooks of du Gaucquier and de Kerle, most copies of La Hèle’s masses were sold locally in the Low Countries, or to Plantin’s agents in Paris and Frankfurt. Of particular interest in Figure 12.2 are the six copies sold to the Spanish settlement of Veracruz in Mexico. From 1570 onwards the Augustinian cleric Señor Alonso in Veracruz wanted to set up a trade relationship with Plantin, although Plantin had concerns regarding the risks and limited profitability of such ventures. Alonso’s six copies of La Hèle’s *Octo missae* were possibly sent on to a number of cathedrals recently established in Mexico, such as Mexico City’s Catedral Metropolitana, the Catedral de San Cristóbal de las Casas or the Catedral de Mérida, Yucatán. Given that Plantin started publishing polyphonic music possibly to win favour with Philip II of Spain (and perhaps also to use up excess stocks of grand folio paper), it is not surprising that copies of his first polyphonic choirbook reached Veracruz, one of Philip II’s outlying domains. Moreover, La Hèle was also the only composer printed by Plantin who subsequently worked in Philip’s service.

These costly, prestigious choirbooks spread over a wide geographical area: approximately 80% of them were sold outside the Low Countries. Since these publications were usually bought by religious institutions or nobility, there was a limited opportunity for

![Figure 12.2 Sales by destination of La Hèle’s Octo missae, 1578–1600.](image-url)
Table 12.2 Geographical destination of Plantin’s partbook sales, 1578–1600

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Geographical Area</th>
<th>Percentage</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Low Countries</td>
<td>50</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>France</td>
<td>11</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Germany / Habsburg territories</td>
<td>5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Frankfurt book fair</td>
<td>28</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Iberia</td>
<td>0.3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Italy</td>
<td>0.7</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>England</td>
<td>3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Unidentified</td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

local sales. The higher prices of these deluxe editions also accounts for lower sales figures. The prices of these books are analysed in Table 12.3.

Table 12.2 and Figure 12.3 show that partbooks sold better in the local market of the Low Countries and Northern France; local consumption of partbooks accounts for 50% of total sales, as opposed to 17% for choirbooks. Approximately a quarter of total sales of partbooks were made via the Frankfurt fair, a much smaller proportion than for choirbooks. There are also differences in patterns of export: Plantin’s partbooks were exported to England, but not to the Americas. As with the choirbooks, the Paris bookshop of Michel Sonnius, previously run by the Officina Plantiniana, purchased a large quantity of partbooks, predominantly of the *Livre de mélanges* (1585) by Claude Le Jeune (c. 1528/30–1600). Trade in partbooks with Douai – both Plantin’s own publications and those he sold on behalf of other publishers – was also very strong, chiefly through Plantin’s trading relationship with Jean Bogard.

The copies of Le Jeune’s *Livre de mélanges* travelled to other French centres alongside Paris; Le Jeune’s French nationality probably determined the destination of sales. The three titles by Séverin Cornet (c. 1520–1582) which Plantin published in 1581 (*Cantiones musicæ*, *Madrigali* and *Chansons françoyses*) sold in significantly lower numbers (208 partbook sets in total) in proportion to the other partbooks. Many copies of the four collections of chansons (1589–1591) by Andreas Pevernage (1542/3–1591) were exported to the London booksellers Ascanius de Renialme and Hans Wanteneel (sixty-seven sets of partbooks); these were the only copies of Plantin’s polyphonic music publications to travel to England.

**Customers**

The sales records also reveal the occupations of typical purchasers of choirbooks and partbooks. While publishers often aimed to make books appeal to as wide an audience as possible, specific books might be published with a targeted audience in mind. A publisher’s decisions about paper quality, format and book length would depend upon the potential clientele for the book. Owners and buyers of books came from many sectors: merchants, artisans, craftsmen, tradespeople, nobility and other booksellers.17

Figure 12.4 shows that the majority of Plantin’s sales of choirbooks – besides sales to booksellers and envos to the Frankfurt fair – were made to clerics. However, the Journals do not record any direct sales of choirbooks to cathedrals in the Low Countries.18 However, in several instances multiple choirbooks were sold in one transaction. Some of these were probably to booksellers’ agents: on 10 September 1583, Servatius Mercus from Maastricht purchased copies of the four choirbooks that Plantin had published prior to this date, as well as two copies of Cornet’s *Cantiones* to take to Königsberg.19 Other examples
Figure 12.3 Total sales by destination for all partbooks published by the Officina Plantiniana, 1578–1600. Destinations are grouped by composer rather than being shown for single publications. The Cornet entry includes three separate publications. The Pevernage entry covers four separate collections published between 1589 and 1591.
of multiple book purchases were probably for a single institution, as, for example, the purchase made by Monsieur De Bellefontaine, the Abbot of Goailles in Salins, France. His purchase included three choirbooks, one partbook and two books manufactured by other publishers.

As with the choirbooks, the majority of Plantin’s partbooks were sold to booksellers or sent to the Frankfurt fair (see Figure 12.5). Merchants or booksellers were more likely to buy the partbooks on speculation, but probably bought choirbooks with a particular client in mind. The predominantly secular content of the partbooks and appeal to a broader market meant that they had potentially greater sales than choirbooks, which were limited principally to large churches or cathedrals. Although the geographical reach of choirbooks was greater, they sold in fewer copies due to their specialist nature and greater cost.

Figure 12.4 Customers for Plantin’s choirbook publications, 1578–1600.

Figure 12.5 Profession of customers for Plantin’s partbook publications, 1578–1600.
Price

The price of a book depended on several factors: the quality and quantity of paper; the use of specialist type, illustrations or coloured inks; the workers required for production; and the strength of the market for this item. Due to the expert knowledge required to set music, as well as the larger formats required by choirbooks, these books were charged at prices similar to other specialised books. Royston Gustavson has shown, on the basis of a 1560 catalogue issued by the Nuremberg publishers Montanus and Neuber, that while books of theory and of monophonic music were priced at rates similar to generic printed editions, collections of ‘polyphonic music attracted premium pricing, here of 1.5 times the generic price’. The greater amount of work required in setting music was related to setting non-conventional type, but also involved what Stanley Boorman calls a double process: ‘setting the music, and then setting the text correctly aligned with the music’.

From the Journal accounts, it is possible to observe some general patterns in the pricing of Plantin’s publications. Although Voet states that discounts may have been offered to wholesalers (varying between 5% and 25%), he notes that the account records hardly ever mention a discount. This is also true of the Journal entries for printed music.

Plantin allowed a discount of 5%–10% for small orders paid in cash. For more important transactions it might be much greater. In the seventeenth century the standardised rate of discounts for large orders was 20% for service books using black and red ink, and 25% for ordinary editions. Favoured wholesale customers of this kind receiving discounts for music books were Jacques Dupuis of Lyons, Jan Dessersans and Ascanius de Renialme, who operated in London, Arnold Birckmann of Cologne and Michel Sonnius of Paris. Orders made by Philip II also attracted a discount. Merchants who occasionally exported books abroad were also able to obtain a discount. The principal Antwerp and Netherlands booksellers with whom Plantin did regular business certainly received a discount on credit accounts, at least in special circumstances.

Table 12.3 shows the large variation in sale prices charged for Plantin’s choirbooks. Prices in the Low Countries were charged in florins (fl.) and stuivers (st.), where twenty stuivers equalled one florin. A general pattern of pricing emerges when we calculate the price per sheet, the way by which the publications would have been costed. Plantin’s first
choirbook was also the most expensive; prices dropped significantly towards the end of his production of choirbooks. The variation in prices between the choirbooks may reflect the fact that some were given away as gifts, as well as differences in quality of paper and the possible addition of binding for the higher priced publications. (Normally, prices were for unbound copies.)

Copies of La Hèle’s *Octo missae* were most commonly sold for 18 fl.; the only significantly discounted sale was the six copies sent to Veracruz at 4 fl. each. This low price may have been intended to encourage further sales in the Spanish colonies. In contrast, De Monte’s single mass, *Benedicta es*, was generally sold at a price between 1 fl. 5 st. and 1 fl. 10 st. The price decreased from 1 fl. 10 st. to 1 fl. 5 st. over the period here analysed, except when sold to Frankfurt bookdealers, who were always charged at 1 fl. 10 st. per copy, even for a consignment of thirty copies. None of the other choirbooks experienced a decline in the charged price over time.

The Journal figures suggest that higher prices were charged for bound copies or those prepared for special presentation. The Abbot of Wissembourg (Alsace) was charged 10 fl. each for the books of masses by Du Gaucquier and De Kerle. These copies were probably sold bound, and would thus also incur higher shipping costs besides the charge for binding itself. In one instance the Genoese merchants in Antwerp, Carolo Spinola and Giovanni Battista Grilli, were charged 20 fl. for the masses of Du Gaucquier and De Kerle bound together. Their copy of La Hèle’s masses was charged at 25 fl. rather than the average price of 18 fl., again suggesting either a higher grade of paper or the cost of binding.

In two notable instances, the Frankfurt copies were charged at a marginally lower rate. In one case, the Du Gaucquier was sold at 5 fl. per copy rather than the average 6 fl.; in another, four copies of De Monte’s *Missarum Liber I* were charged at 16 fl. each, unlike all other sales of this book, which were charged at the regular price of 18 fl. per copy. Besides copies charged at a substantially higher rate, free copies were sometimes given to clerics: Plantin gave copies of the Du Gaucquier to a certain Fr. Andrea in Málaga and to the Abbot of Crespin. On 1 August 1586, Plantin sent copies of each of his polyphonic publications to that point to the Jesuit college in Antwerp, which had recently reopened after the end of the Spanish siege. The absence of any record of prices for this consignment of 201 titles, which also included liturgical works and humanist publications, suggests that these books were a gift from Plantin to the school.

The partbooks were charged at a significantly lower price per sheet than the choirbooks. This may be due to the use of cheaper paper, fewer woodcut initials and the fact that the compositors did not have to worry about the complex layout of choirbooks, in which the page-breaks had to be calculated precisely to coincide in each voice. Gustavson comments on how publishers balanced the financial risks of specific ventures; should a particular edition require only few sheets of paper, a firm could bear the danger posed by piracy or poor sales. The lower cost of producing the partbooks presumably made them a lesser financial risk for Plantin than the larger and more costly choirbooks. The purpose of the choirbooks was not necessarily to generate profit, but to create value from reputation and patronage. Moreover, partbooks contained more music by composers born or resident in Antwerp at the time of publication, which would predictably lead to greater local sales.

As with the choirbooks, the prices of partbook sets also varied (see Table 12.4). The *Livre de mélanges* by Le Jeune shows more fluctuation than the others: Plantin’s son-in-law Raphelengius received three copies for the price of one, and the Cologne bookseller Bernard Wolters received a copy for half price. In some instances, no price is listed at all. No price is given for the entry recording fifty copies of Le Jeune’s *Mélanges* sent to Mylius in Cologne, a
city often used as a way-station or deposit for the Frankfurt book fair. However, the prices listed in the Journals for the Frankfurt book fair consignments are clearly inconsistent. Pricing was generally provided for the Frankfurt consignments, though in many of other entries no figure is given.35

The records of sales of Le Jeune’s Mélanges to Phalèse display some variation, due perhaps in part to the reciprocal arrangement between Plantin and Phalèse, who acted as agents for one another, and the consequent use of credit and other methods of accounting which are not immediately clear from the Journals. In the Journal, the prices charged to Phalèse for copies of Le Jeune’s Mélanges fluctuate between 1 fl. 10 st. and 3 fl. 10 st. per copy. However, over a period of eight years the average price per copy equates to the normal amount charged for this book. This relative stability of prices may indicate the steady commercial demand and larger market for partbook editions. The prices charged for Le Jeune’s Mélanges also seem to correlate with the buying-power of the purchaser. While some booksellers were charged marginally less than the average price, nobility or councillors were sometimes charged more: for example, the Mayor of Antwerp and the Jesuits in Danzig were charged 3 fl. per copy. Alternatively, this might once again also reflect the added cost of binding. Other notable examples of higher prices charged include a copy of the De Brouck sold to the Genoese merchants, Grilli and Spinola, at more than three times the average price. Their copy of the Le Jeune was also more than double the normal price.

The prices charged for the chansons of Cornet show the smallest variation, usually between 2 fl. 5 st. and 2 fl. 15 st., with one major exception: a discounted copy to the Abbot of Goailles, near Salins-les-Bains. However, the abbot was charged the regular amount or more for his copies of Plantin’s choirbooks. The prices charged for the Pevernage chansons were likewise consistent. Unlike the slightly inflated prices charged to rich purchasers of Le Jeune’s Mélanges, city councillors or similar were charged slightly less than the average for the chansons of Pevernage, who was based in Antwerp himself.

On rare occasions, no price is given; these entries therefore have not been included in Tables 12.4 and 12.5. Copies sent to Frankfurt were charged at the standard retail price. In some instances, no prices are noted, as in single occasions for Phalèse (Antwerp), Boulet (Lille), Bogard (Douai), Pierre Moretus (Antwerp) and fifty-six copies sent to Plantin’s

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Partbook</th>
<th>Price range</th>
<th>Typical price</th>
<th>Total number of pages per partbook set</th>
<th>Typical price per page</th>
<th>Typical price per sheetb</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>De Brouck</td>
<td>1 fl. – 3 fl. 18 st.</td>
<td>1 fl. 2 st.</td>
<td>354</td>
<td>0.06 st.</td>
<td>0.48 st.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Cornet 1–3</td>
<td>11 1/2 fl. – 2 fl. 15 st.</td>
<td>2 fl. 5 st.</td>
<td>(1) cantiones 174 (2) madrigals 260 (3) chansons 176</td>
<td>0.26 st.</td>
<td>2.08 st.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Le Jeune</td>
<td>1 fl. 2 st. – 4 fl. 18 st.</td>
<td>2 fl. 10 st.</td>
<td>702</td>
<td>0.07 st.</td>
<td>0.56 st.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Pevernage 1–3</td>
<td>10 st. – 20 st.</td>
<td>10 st.</td>
<td>(1) 90 (2) 80 (3) 80</td>
<td>0.11 st.</td>
<td>0.88 st.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Pevernage 4</td>
<td>15 st. – 30 st.</td>
<td>15 st.</td>
<td>90</td>
<td>0.17 st.</td>
<td>1.38 st.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Range of prices and page numbers do not appear in Stellfeld’s Bibliographie. The way in which details are listed for each piece varies substantially.

See Table 12.6 for full title information.

b1 sheet = 8 pages (quarto).
son-in-law Jan Spirinck, who represented the Officina Plantiniana in Hamburg (1577–1583) and Antwerp (from 1588). Prices for the Pevernaye chansons increased marginally and consistently towards the end of the period here studied. This is the opposite of what happened with the grand folio sheets of De Monte’s *Benedicta es*, but might reflect continued demand for the diminishing supply of copies, as the Officina Plantiniana did not reprint any of their music books (see Figure 12.6).

### Longevity of sales

This study also suggests some answers to a question often asked by scholars of music printing: how long did music books remain available for sale? Did all copies sell rapidly after publication, or did sales persist over a long period? With regard to sixteenth-century Italy, Stanley Boorman states that ‘there is much evidence to suggest that music-sellers and publishers had copies available for sale many years after publication’. Royston
Gustavson also shows that copies of books printed by Egenolff still appeared in a catalogue from 1579, more than two decades after Egenolff’s death, sitting in a warehouse and tying up capital. By contrast, most of Plantin’s documented sales of music books were made shortly after publication. This was largely because he sent books to the Frankfurt fair as soon as possible after publication, which allowed him to shift stock quickly and thus release capital for further projects. This confirms Boorman’s observation that ‘publishers sent material to booksellers and their agents almost immediately on publication’. Following the initial sales spike, partbooks realised only a few sales in the decade after publication. Only the partbooks of Pevernage’s music (1589–1591) seem to match Boorman’s hypothesis of a longer sales cycle, with small numbers of sales continuing until 1600 (see Figure 12.7).

Sales of choirbooks show a different pattern: after an initial burst of sales shortly after publication, there was usually a steady trickle of sales thereafter, more directly replicating Boorman’s hypothesis. Perhaps this slower cycle of sale reflected the symbolic function of these publications, or the types of customers looking to purchase such editions. Colin Clair has found that ninety-one copies of the 1579 edition of Philippe de Monte’s Missa Benedicta es remained in stock as late as 1640. Besides the consignments to the Frankfurt fair, where items were sold together purely on the basis of their publication date rather than their content, the choirbooks would also often be sold alongside other liturgical publications. Thus on 11 June 1579, Plantin sold two copies of La Hèle’s Octo Missae to Sire Charles Pesnot’s shop in Lyons, alongside 110 books of hours, 75 breviaries, 8 missals and other religious publications including 1 copy of the Psalterium for choir.

Figure 12.6 Plantin’s partbook publications sales by year, 1578–1600 (2279 copies in total).
On 31 May 1580, Plantin sold three copies of De Monte’s *Missa Benedicta es* in two separate transactions. The second consignment, which included two copies of De Monte’s mass, also included seven missals, seven breviaries, six books of hours and numerous offices and other works, totalling seventy-six separate entries in all. On 14 October 1581, the same Fr. Andrea in Málaga purchased one copy of Du Gaucquier’s *Quatuor Missae* alongside small numbers of breviaries and books of hours among other works. On 29 October 1587, Michel Sonnius, one of Plantin’s favoured clients, purchased 285 books of hours, together with six copies of De Monte’s *Liber I Missarum*. The polyphonic choirbooks and partbooks sent to the Jesuit College in Antwerp on 1 August 1586 constituted six out of a total of 201 items sent to aid the re-establishment of this religious educational institution.

Although these choirbooks were usually sold alongside other books of religious content, they were often of different format; some of the Books of Hours were produced in tiny 32\(^{mo}\) format, suitable for carrying in a pocket. These examples remind us of the different structures for worship, and also that the customers of Plantin were often booksellers themselves, who acted as distributor to further destinations. The longevity for sales of the choirbooks could be due to the use of choirbooks as items for liturgical worship and the ongoing relevance of their content – in the seventeenth century, *stile antico* polyphony remained a prestigious language for liturgical music – just as was the case for the other religious and liturgical texts with which they were bought.
Plantin as an agent for other publishers

The final element to analyse within these sales Journals are the entries relating to the sales of music books not published by the Officina Plantiniana.45 Voet has written that in 1566 Plantin sold books to the value of 16,340 fl., and that the purchases recorded in his accounts for the same year came to 6,109 fl., a figure just under a third of total sales.46 Voet is also prudent to note that ‘this probably falls short of the real amount by some sum no longer exactly calculable’, as the lists of purchases at the Frankfurt fair are likely incomplete.47 Between 1578 and 1600, the Officina Plantiniana sold 1,596 music books on behalf of other publishers, compared to total sales of 2,279 of its own partbooks and 210 of its own choirbooks. The musical publications from other publishers sold through the Officina Plantiniana were a mixture of sacred and secular music in partbook format, mainly popular publications printed in multiple editions.

The most popular titles included anthologies such as *La fleur des chansons* (RISM B/I 15922), *Harmonia celeste* (RISM B/I 158314), *Il lauro verde* (RISM B/I 15913), *Melodia olympica* (RISM B/I 159110), *Musica divina* (RISM B/I 158315), *Pratum Musicum* (RISM B/I 158412) and *Symphonia angelica* (RISM B/I 158519). All of these anthologies of motets or secular songs were produced by Jean Bellère and Pierre Phalèse the Younger, with the exception of *La fleur des chansons d’Orlande de Lassus*. This latter collection contained, in Richard Freedman’s words, some of ‘the most widely circulated and beloved musical works of sixteenth-century Europe’.48 Though these were compilations of music by various composers, Lassus’ ongoing authority is reflected by the fact that Plantin’s records sometimes name him in the records of sale of compilations in which he was only one contributor, such as the entry for Phalèse & Bellère’s *Theatrum musicum* (RISM B/I 157116)49 and *La fleur des chansons d’Orlande de Lassus* (RISM B/I 1596).50 Such compilations complemented the devotional and sacred music in Plantin’s single-composer editions.

Just like Plantin’s own partbooks, similar books published by other workshops and marketed through the Officina Plantiniana sold consistently within the Low Countries and subsequently furnished a strong ongoing trade. Significant numbers made their way to Plantin’s strongest trading bases of Cologne, Danzig, Paris, London and the Frankfurt fair. By far the greatest number were sold within Antwerp; this is of particular interest, since the majority of publications he bought to sell on also came from Antwerp.

The publishers with whom Plantin traded significant quantities of stock were Jean Bogard, printer, bookseller and editor formerly in Louvain and now at Douai; and Jean Bellère and Pierre Phalèse the Younger, both printers, booksellers and editors in Antwerp. Plantin acted both as buyer from and as supplier to these businesses. Other booksellers to whom Plantin sold significant numbers of his own music publications included François Boulet in Lille, Nicolas Laurent in Tournai and Philippe Zanger in Louvain, while he sold smaller numbers to Joannes Masius in Ath, Job Matheuszoon in Utrecht and others.

Although Plantin often supplied books to individual customers, he purchased almost exclusively from other booksellers or publishers.51 Pierre Phalèse the Younger was Plantin’s largest supplier; his titles amounted to 54.4% of Plantin’s overall sales. Although much of the trade of Plantin’s own music books went through Frankfurt, those which he sold for others were sold mainly from Antwerp, moving from there to an international clientele. These findings are made clear by Figure 12.8, which demonstrates the spread of destinations, in comparison to Figure 12.9, which shows that almost all the books that Plantin sold on behalf of other publishers were produced at Antwerp.
Figure 12.8 Destination of non-Officina Plantiniana music publications, 1578–1600.
Figure 12.9 Origin of Plantin’s purchases of music publications not published by the Officina Plantiniana, 1578–1600.
Table 12.5 provides the average price charged for some of the music publications by Phalèse and Bellère and sold through the Officina Plantiniana, according to the records at the Museum Plantin-Moretus. Both La fleur des chansons and the Symphonia angelica rose in price marginally in later editions. In 1587, Plantin charged 2 fl. 2 st. for a copy of the 1583 edition of Musica Divina printed on vellum.\(^{52}\) (Incidentally, this is one of the few instances in which a music book printed on parchment is mentioned in the sales accounts.) The highest degree of price variation is found for copies of the lute book Pratum Musicum, which was sold respectively for 1 fl. 3 st., 1 fl. 4 st., 1 fl. 5 st., 1 fl. 8 st. and 1 fl. 10 st. The relatively high cost of production and subsequent sale price of this book resulted from the fact that it required specialist tablature, font and typesetting, and was printed in folio format. The prices Plantin charged for these music books of his contemporaries provide a useful context for the prices of Plantin’s own music publications, which cost anywhere from a similar amount to double the amount per sheet. Again, such high prices may reflect the quality of paper, type and layout used.

Plantin’s sales of music books typically comprised up to six copies of one or two titles.\(^{53}\) Exceptions to this tendency include the multiple titles of Plantin’s choirbooks supplied to one customer, as already mentioned. The largest sale of music books through the Officina Plantiniana between 1578 and 1600 was ‘Pour … le memoire de Valentin Berisch’ (bookseller in Danzig) on 30 September 1597. This sale included popular editions by Phalèse as well as editions of Marenzio and Gallo published by Gardano and Vincenti, Italian publications which Plantin likely found at the Frankfurt book fair. This Journal entry includes eighteen separate titles, demonstrating the importance of the Officina Plantiniana as intermediary for publishers from the Low Countries and the Italian peninsula to centres such as Danzig.\(^{54}\)

The lower cost for de Castro’s Tricinia matches its purpose as an educational publication, a genre of publication where affordability was at a premium. The higher cost of 1 fl. for the eight-voice madrigali collection was caused by the greater number of pages required for this publication. The relatively high price of 1 fl. for Le Rossignol musical des chansons is explained both by its popularity and once again the number of pages it contained. The most expensive publication in this list was Marenzio’s Quinto libro de madrigali; its price was caused by the fact that it had six partbooks, one more than most others, and due to the transport costs from Italy. The Lassus publication La fleur des chansons d’Orlande de Lassus was also expensive, possibly because of his status and popularity. Many of the other publications, mainly collections of madrigals or chansons, were cheaper, fetching between 7 and 15 st.

The absence of any publications by Plantin in this particular sale is noticeable. Nevertheless, although the music books published by the Officina Plantiniana were generally more expensive than those of other publishers, the Officina still sold more of their own music publications than those of any other publisher. Rather than being a loss leader by printing a large volume of books as cheaply as possible, Plantin differentiated himself as a top-end printer, creating authority by publishing music books of the highest quality, thus creating his own market and reputation.\(^{55}\)

**Conclusion**

The Journals of the Officina Plantiniana show that its sales of music books reached a wide international audience. Its customers included merchants, religious institutions and most of all, other booksellers. Despite what Voet has written about the prices of Plantin’s
general stock, the sale prices for music books generally remained consistent over time. Most sales of partbooks were made shortly after their publication date. Although choirbooks experienced the same initial spike, they also enjoyed slower but more steady sales subsequently. The rapid sale of partbooks the Officina Plantiniana contrasts with the findings of Royston Gustavson and Stanley Boorman on the slow sale of music books for German and Italian booksellers. It also reflects Plantin’s role as publisher and desire to move stock onto other booksellers or to his base at the Frankfurt fair. Further studies of the sales records at the fairs might allow an alternative picture to emerge. The Officina Plantiniana also acted as intermediary for music books from other publishers; this is not unexpected, due to Plantin’s number of contacts in the world of bookselling, both locally and internationally. Iain Fenlon and John Milsom have shown that imports of foreign music into England were controlled under privilege and licence by Thomas Tallis and William Byrd, awarded to them by Queen Elizabeth in 1575, but this data shows that other firms were also involved in the English trade.\textsuperscript{56} Finally, Plantin’s sales at the Frankfurt book fair made up a large proportion of his music sales, as it was for other types of publications from his workshop. Plantin’s Journals preserve data more detailed than what is available for any comparable music publisher of the time, and provide unique insights into the functioning of the music market.

Table 12.6  Plantin’s polyphonic music books between 1578 and 1600

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Date</th>
<th>Composer</th>
<th>Title</th>
<th>Publisher</th>
<th>Sacred/secular</th>
<th>Size</th>
<th>RISM ID.</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1578</td>
<td>George de La Hèle</td>
<td>Octo Missae</td>
<td>Plantin</td>
<td>Sacred (Liturgical)</td>
<td>Grand Folio</td>
<td>A/I L 285</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1579</td>
<td>Philip de Monte</td>
<td>Missa Benedicta es</td>
<td>Plantin</td>
<td>Sacred (Liturgical)</td>
<td>Grand Folio</td>
<td>A/I M 3315</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1579</td>
<td>Jacob de Brouck</td>
<td>Cantiones sacrae</td>
<td>Plantin</td>
<td>Both (Devotional)</td>
<td>4°</td>
<td>A/I B 4613</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1581</td>
<td>Alard Gauquier</td>
<td>Quatuor missae</td>
<td>Plantin</td>
<td>Sacred (Liturgical)</td>
<td>Grand Folio</td>
<td>A/I G 577</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1581</td>
<td>Séverin Cornet</td>
<td>Cantiones musicae</td>
<td>Plantin</td>
<td>Sacred (Devotional)</td>
<td>4°</td>
<td>A/I C 3945</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1581</td>
<td>Séverin Cornet</td>
<td>Madrigali 5–8 voci</td>
<td>Plantin</td>
<td>Secular</td>
<td>6 bks</td>
<td>A/I C 3947</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1581</td>
<td>Séverin Cornet</td>
<td>Chansons françoyes</td>
<td>Plantin</td>
<td>Secular</td>
<td>4°</td>
<td>A/I C 3946</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1583</td>
<td>Jacobus de Kerle</td>
<td>Quatuor Missae</td>
<td>Plantin</td>
<td>Sacred (Liturgical)</td>
<td>Grand Folio</td>
<td>A/I K 454</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1585</td>
<td>Claude le Jeune</td>
<td>Livre de mélanges</td>
<td>Plantin</td>
<td>Both (Devotional)</td>
<td>4°</td>
<td>A/I L 1674</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1587</td>
<td>Philip de Monte</td>
<td>Missarum liber I</td>
<td>Plantin</td>
<td>Sacred (Liturgical)</td>
<td>Grand Folio</td>
<td>A/I M 3320</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1589</td>
<td>Andreas Pevernage</td>
<td>Chansons… livre première</td>
<td>Plantin/Moretus</td>
<td>Mainly sacred (Devotional)</td>
<td>5 bks</td>
<td>A/I P 1670</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1590</td>
<td>Andreas Pevernage</td>
<td>Chansons… livre second</td>
<td>Moretus</td>
<td>Mainly sacred</td>
<td>4°</td>
<td>A/I P 1671</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1590</td>
<td>Andreas Pevernage</td>
<td>Chansons… livre troisieme</td>
<td>Moretus</td>
<td>Mainly sacred</td>
<td>4°</td>
<td>A/I P 1672</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1591</td>
<td>Andreas Pevernage</td>
<td>Chansons… livre quatrieme</td>
<td>Moretus</td>
<td>Mainly sacred</td>
<td>4°</td>
<td>A/I P 1673</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Notes

1 Plantin published approximately 2,450 titles in a thirty-four-year career as printer and publisher, whereby religious books were 33% and humanist books 35.5% of his total output. Percentages calculated from information provided in Voet, *The Plantin Press*, vol. 6.

2 Vanhulst, ‘Suppliers and Clients of Christopher Plantin’.

3 The Journals are held at the Plantin-Moretus Museum in Antwerp. For an inventory of the Archives, see Denucé, *Museum Plantin-Moretus*. For a corresponding index to the inventory, see Coppens, *The Plantin Moretus Archives*.

4 Both transactions by account and cash sales were integrated into the Journals.

5 Thanks to Saskia Willaert for offering her own transcriptions of these records for cross-reference.

6 Rooses, *Correspondence de Plantin*, 4: 158–163, no. 566.

7 Israel, *Dutch Primacy*, 28.

8 For a full catalogue of the polyphonic music publications from the Officina Plantiniana, see Stellfeld, *Bibliographie*.


11 Plantin-Moretus Museum, ARCH 60, 102v, 22 June 1582.

12 Plantin-Moretus Museum, ARCH 85, 349v.

13 Plantin-Moretus Museum, ARCH 10, 98v.

14 Plantin-Moretus Museum, ARCH 85, 353v.


16 Plantin produced the majority of liturgical books for the regions under Philip II’s rule. See Costas, ‘International Publishing’. One might argue that it was Plantin’s desire to hold the printing monopoly that led to his commencing the publication of polyphonic music to curry more favour with the king.

17 For further information regarding owners and purchasers of books during the sixteenth century, see Chartier, ‘Publishing Strategies and What People Read’, in *The Cultural Use of Print*, 145–182.


19 Plantin-Moretus Museum, ARCH 61, 123v.

20 Plantin-Moretus Museum, ARCH 65, 157v. Thanks to Grantley McDonald for helping me to identify the abbey of Goailles in Salins.

21 Plantin’s *Psalterium* (1571) cost 8 fl. for a copy printed on paper and 60 fl. for one on parchment. The page size of this book is half that of the choirbooks, but it is still in folio format. Plantin’s *Antiphonarium* (1572/3) cost 17 fl. on ordinary paper, 19 fl. on best quality paper and 162 fl. 10 st. on parchment. Plantin’s 1587 breviary, in quarto with ten illustrations, cost 6 fl. Voet states that Plantin sold his 1581 edition of Guicciardini’s *Descrittione di tutti i Paesi Bassi* for 7 fl. with plates and 2 fl. 10 st. without (Voet, *The Golden Compasses*, 2: 381).

22 See Royston Gustavson’s chapter in this book.


25 Ibid.


27 For further discussion on pricing, see Gustavson, ‘Competitive Strategy’ and Gustavson, ‘Commercialising the *Choralis Constantinus*’.

28 Extra charges for books printed on parchment or supplied with bindings are mentioned only a few times in the Journal accounts for this period.

29 Plantin-Moretus Museum, ARCH 58, 20r, 13 February 1580.

30 Plantin-Moretus Museum, ARCH 72, 193v, 17 November 1595.

31 Kate van Orden has examined the books bound by the Officina Plantiniana before 1578, but this later period still awaits further research. Van Orden, *Materialities*, 58–66.

32 Plantin-Moretus Museum, ARCH 63, 71r.
34 Van Orden states that Le Jeune was present in Antwerp during the siege of Anjou in 1583. Van Orden, Music, Discipline, and Arms, 4.
35 Six copies of De Brouck, ARCH 60, 61v, twelve copies of De Kerle, ARCH 60, 102v, fifty copies of Le Jeune to bookseller Arnold Mylius, ARCH 62, 140v, fifty-six mixed publications of Pevernage to Plantin’s son-in-law Jan Spierinck, ARCH 67, 108v. The only consignments of Plantin’s own publications sent to Frankfurt without a record of the price were for sixty and forty copies respectively of Cantiones Sever[ini] Cornetj 4°, both sent on 7 March 1582; for one copy of Misse de Monte sent in the Frankfurt envoy to Cologne on 14 August 1599 and twenty copies of Pevernage’s Premier livre de chansons, sent on 21 December 1590; ARCH 60, 38v; ARCH 171, 112v; and ARCH 67, 144v respectively.
36 This entry is from 1590.
40 Clair, Christopher Plantin, 147.
41 Plantin-Moretus Museum, ARCH 57, 84v.
42 Plantin-Moretus Museum, ARCH 58, 70v–71v.
43 Plantin-Moretus Museum, ARCH 59, 156v; and ARCH 64, 137v respectively.
44 Plantin-Moretus Museum, ARCH 63, 70v–72v. For detailed entries for these extra publications, please see Hunter-Bradley, ‘Polyphonic Music at the Officina’.
46 Ibid.
47 Ibid.
48 Freedman, The Chansons of Orlando di Lasso, xiii.
49 Plantin-Moretus Museum, ARCH 58, 134v; ARCH 60, 30v, 72v.
50 Plantin-Moretus Museum, ARCH 69, 149v–v; ARCH 70, 3v, 55v, 85v; ARCH 74, 64v, 144v; ARCH 75, 100v, 190v; ARCH 76, 48v.
51 Information taken from these accounts as well as mentioned by Voet, The Golden Compasses, 2: 417.
52 Plantin-Moretus Museum, ARCH 64, 85v.
53 See Appendix to Hunter-Bradley, ‘Polyphonic Music at the Officina Plantiniana’.
54 Plantin-Moretus Museum, ARCH 74, 144v. This entry included three copies of Il trionfo di Dori descritto (RISM B/I 15966) at 12 st. per copy, three copies of Il vago alboreto di madrigali et canzoni (RISM B/I 159715) at 14 st. per copy, three copies of La fleur des chansons d’Orlade de Lassus (RISM B/I 15965) at 1 fl. 10 st. per copy, four copies of Melodia olympica (RISM B/I 15944) at 1 fl. 5 st. per copy, three copies of Madrigali a otto voci (RISM B/I 159712) at 1 fl. per copy, one copy of Tricinia de Castro (RISM A/I C 1484) at 10 st. per copy and four copies of Le Rossignol musical des chansons (RISM B/I 159710) at 1 fl. per copy, all published by Pierre Phalèse. This consignment also included three copies of Di Luca Marenzio il settimo libro de madrigali a cinque voci (RISM B/I 159510) at 1 fl. 6 st. per copy and three copies of Di Luca Marenzio, il quinto libro de madrigali a sei voci (RISM B/I 15958) at 2 fl. 2 st., both published by Antonio Gardano in Venice, and three copies of Il primo libro de madrigali di Gio. Pietro Gallo de Bari (RISM B/I 159720), published by Giacomo Vincenti, at 9 st. per copy. For detailed information regarding the publishers, number of pages and prices, see Hunter-Bradley, ‘Polyphonic Music at the Officina Plantiniana’, Chapter 5 and Appendix.
55 For information on publisher’s positioning, see Gustavson, ‘Competitive Strategy Dynamics’, 202.
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Introduction

By the late fifteenth century, Seville was the most densely populated and prosperous city in Castile. Occupying a strategic position on the banks of the Guadalquivir, at an important crossroads between the Atlantic and Mediterranean maritime trade routes, the city had developed into a major entrepôt for the exchange of a wide variety of commodities during the late middle ages. As the emergent centre of Andalusia, a largely agricultural region and since the reconquest from the Moors in the middle of the thirteenth century effectively its capital, Seville exported wool and fish to both northern and southern Europe while importing mostly finished goods including cloth.1 Links with Mediterranean countries through the Straits of Gibraltar, and with Portugal, France and the Low Countries via the Atlantic, brought Seville into contact with other major European trading centres, including Paris and Antwerp, two major centres of the book trade. Imports from Lyons were transported down the Rhône and then distributed via the major cities along the eastern seaboard of Spain, while Venetian books were transported along a safe route through the terraferma to Milan, capital of Spanish Lombardy, and then to Genoa (after 1528 formally a satellite of the Spanish Empire), and from there across the Mediterranean to Barcelona and Valencia.

As a result of Seville’s cosmopolitan character and commercial opportunities, greatly increased by the import of silver, merchants from elsewhere in Europe had settled there in considerable numbers from the beginning of the sixteenth century. The largest foreign community came from Genoa, whose prosperity was critically dependent upon two elements: Spanish trade with the Indies, and the wealth of Italy. As Fernand Braudel put it: ‘we must imagine the hundreds, perhaps thousands of Genoese merchants of various status, humble clerks, shopkeepers, go-betweens, commission agents, who peopled their own city and all the cities of Italy and Sicily. They were solidly established in Spain, at every level of the economy, in Seville as well as in Granada’.2 To Braudel’s list of mercantile occupations should be added those in the printing and publishing trade, while to the Genoese should be added the French and Flemings who had also arrived in Seville in large numbers, to the extent that two quarters in the parish of Santa Maria la Mayor, close to the Cathedral, were popularly known as the ‘Barrio de Génova’ and the ‘Barrio de los Francos’.3

These two ‘nations’ were to prove crucial for the establishment of the first printing presses in the city. The concentration of capital, much of it provided by Genoese bankers, and easy access to the international trade arteries which fanned out across the ocean as well as inland, made Seville an attractive location for the fledgling trade.4 A group of four native German printers called the Cuatros Alemanes Compañeros began to issue books in 1490;5 their font for printing chant notation was used for the first time in the Manuale
Toletanum. In addition to liturgical books, the Compañeros also catered for the related market for basic music-theory manuals, including the elegant editio princeps of Durán’s Lux bella. Other Sevillian printers also produced manuals with woodcut notation in the first decades of the sixteenth century, including two editions of Alonso Españón’s Introducción, printed by Pedro Brun, an anonymous Arte de canto llano, and a further edition of Durán’s treatise. Such elementary didactic manuals clearly found a ready sale among the Sevillian clergy, who also constituted much of the market for liturgical books. At about the same moment that the Cuatros Compañeros began printing, Meinardo Ungut and Stanislao Polono arrived in Seville from Naples. Among the more than seventy titles which they produced in the nine years of their joint enterprise were a number of liturgical books, some with chant notation, including the Franciscan Processionarium of 1494 (see Figure 13.1). More than any other single incunable, this established the concept of a book of printed music in the Spanish trade.

Figure 13.1 Processionarium ordinis fratrum praedicatorum (Seville: Ungut and Polonus, 1494), fol. d1r. Source: Madrid, Biblioteca Nacional de España. Inc/1268.
Jacopo Cromberger, probably born in Nuremberg, came to inherit the business of the Compañeros at the end of the century, and between late 1503 and his death in 1528 he dominated the Seville trade. More than two-thirds of the editions printed in the city during this period were produced in Cromberger’s workshop, while a further twenty percent came from the presses of his colleague and sometime collaborator Juan de Varela. It is not known when Jacopo obtained the privilege for printing all liturgical books in the diocese of Seville, but he retained the monopoly until his death. As part of his inheritance, Cromberger acquired at least three fonts from the stock of the Compañeros Alemanes, and eight from the workshop of Ungut and Polono. Among the latter was the music font for printing chant notation in liturgical books, which the two collaborators had used in their processional of 1494. This was used by Cromberger in his masterpiece of liturgical music printing, the *Missale secundum usum alme ecclesie Hyspalensis* which survives in three copies, of which one is printed on vellum and expertly illuminated for an unidentifiable patron. He also used it elsewhere, notably in his edition of the Franciscan *Processionarium*.

At Cromberger’s death, control of the family press passed to his son Juan. Under his ownership, editions of liturgical books continued to be produced for dioceses in Andalusia and southern Portugal, while under the Seville monopoly which passed to Varela at least three editions of the Seville missal were produced. For these Varela made use of the font of chant types which was passed on to him by Jacopo Cromberger in 1528, who had obtained it, in turn, from Polono in 1503. These books were evidently widely circulated, not only in Spain but also in the New World. Varela also came into possession of the types and ornaments of the press of the Cuatro Compañeros. Following Juan Cromberger’s death in 1540, the press entered into decline, its list characterised by extraordinary conservatism, and its presswork of inferior quality. In the increasingly difficult environment for Sevillian printers working in the middle decades of the century, the more interesting developments in music printing and publishing, as in other areas of the trade, are to be found elsewhere, beginning in the 1540s.

**Juan de León in Seville**

In 1532, a contract was drawn up between a printer Juan de León, and Juan de Virida, and in the same year a separate document, which refers to someone of the same name as a Frenchman, suggests that he was a specialised punch-cutter. In another archival notice of 1525, a printer named Juan de León, then working in Seville, was connected to the production of playing-cards, traditionally a ready source of income for jobbing printers. Although it is far from certain that all these references are to one and the same person (the name is common), it is possible that one or all of them are the earliest documentary references to the printer who later set up in business in the same city.

Any aspiring craftsman taking such a decision would be immediately burdened with considerable debts unless supported by private means or wealthy patrons. Although the presses themselves were not expensive, matrices, types and type-metal were costly and often had to be bought from itinerant artisans or directly from abroad, since even the major printers in Spain did not own punches. Many of the typographical materials that Juan de León was to use throughout his career were obtained from the ‘impressor’ (in practice probably a bookseller and publisher) Gaspar Zapata, who had caused them to be used in five books printed in 1544, including a collection of Latin poems which ends with an epigram ‘In laudem typographi’ in praise of Zapata. The nature of the relationship is not clear (Juan may have bought the materials from Zapata outright, or had even planned to go into
partnership with him), but within the year the text fonts, initial letters and other decorative elements from Zapata’s books were being used in Juan’s own titles.

This was not the only expense for someone fresh to the business. Quite apart from the cost of typographical materials, sufficient space had to be rented or bought to accommodate the workshop, and to house the employees who were to work there, including the black slaves who were often put to work as beaters and pullers.²⁶ Wages, food, ink and above all paper, the most expensive element of producing a book, had to be bought. Since so little paper was produced in Spain, much of that used by Sevillian printers was imported from Italy and then sold through Genoese merchants in the city.²⁷ The papers used by both Juan de León and his successor Martín de Montesdoca carry marks that were commonly found in paper produced throughout Italy, if not Europe.²⁸ One disadvantage of this supply chain was that unless some form of discount had been agreed, local printers and booksellers did not have a competitive edge over foreigners whose books were imported, and since they also lacked sufficient access to international export markets, their output was essentially aimed at a largely national readership at best, secured through networks and the book fairs in Medina del Campo and elsewhere. Although there was always the possibility of export to the Indies, Juan de León’s main markets were local and regional, principally the cities of Andalusia and Portugal, though some of his books were bought by those operating elsewhere in the peninsula.

In practice, most Spanish printers were also booksellers, and their retail premises were filled with editions produced by other members of the trade as well as imported books. The inventory of Jacopo Cromberger’s property, drawn up in 1529, reveals that much of his stock came from elsewhere, including substantial imports from Lyons, Antwerp and Venice.²⁹ While it is doubtful that Juan de León’s networks were as extensive, his own books did reach beyond his most immediate markets. When a legal contract was drawn up in 1556 in connection with the lease of the premises in Burgos of the Florentine printer and publisher Juan de Junta, son of the famous Florentine publisher Filippo di Giunta, its stock of more than 15,000 books, representing 1,583 titles, contained many editions produced elsewhere in Spain, including at least four editions printed by Juan de León: the quarto edition of Juan Bermudo’s Declaración de instrumentos musicales (1549), Mudarra’s Tres libros de música (1546), the Tractado de la sphera by Johannes de Sacrobosco in the Spanish translation by Hierónymo de Chaves (1545) and the Summa de philosophia by Alonso de Fuentes (1547).³⁰ Nonetheless, while Mudarra’s Tres libros travelled to the north of Spain, there is no evidence that any of the vihuela books (or indeed any music printed in Spain in general) was exported to the imperial territories in Flanders, Lombardy or southern Italy. Although the print runs for some music books were as high as one thousand copies, the market was essentially regional if not national, even for books produced in cities with populations as large as those of Seville or Valladolid. Penetration of Spanish markets by foreign printers was considerable, and affected every aspect of the trade. Liturgical books were often printed abroad, commissioned from Venetian, Parisian and Lyonnais printers by syndicates of Spanish merchants and booksellers. Much imported polyphonic music came along these same routes, above all from Venice via Genoa, and from Lyons down the Rhône valley.³¹

Juan de León evidently did not have either the resources or the necessary powerful ecclesiastical patrons to enter the lucrative market for liturgical books; whatever the reason, he left this aspect of the Sevillian trade to the Crombergers and Juan de Varela. Instead, he adopted the strategy, common among many small provincial printers, of oscillation between the printing of short and technically undemanding volumes and the production of
more substantial ones, in order to ensure that his press was not left idle.\textsuperscript{32} This procedure also meant that income from more saleable and popular titles could be set against the cost of larger projects which took longer to mature and generate a return. Of the six editions that Juan de León is said to have produced in the first year of his career, only three are known to survive: the \textit{Historia imperial} by Pedro Mexia, Hernando del Pulgar’s \textit{Coplas revulgo glosadas} and the influential and much-reprinted short \textit{Tractado de la sphera} by the thirteenth-century astronomer Johannes de Sacrobosco.\textsuperscript{33} In many ways these three titles set the style and tone of Juan’s editorial policies, not merely in relation to the typographical features of his books, but also in terms of their reflection of Sevillian humanistic scholarship, emphasised by the use of an Italic font, still a comparable rarity among Spanish printers. Although the last two of these books, and particularly Sacrobosco’s treatise, were well established in the Spanish market, Juan’s edition of the latter marked a new departure by presenting it in translation by the local humanist scholar Hierónymo de Chaves.\textsuperscript{34} It presents the full range of Juan’s text fonts, being set in two sizes of Gothic, with running heads and numeration of the scholia in Roman capitals, and occasional interventions of a small Italic font in the preliminaries and elsewhere.\textsuperscript{35} All three styles are deployed on the title-page, which frames the text with four woodcuts which re-appear, sometimes in variant form, throughout his career. The text is punctuated by a considerable number of woodcuts, some of which Juan was to call upon again. Entering into the spirit of the enterprise, he also devised an elaborate colophon (again displaying all three of his type designs), which calculates the year of publication according to a number of authorities, and gives the age of the author.\textsuperscript{36} The verso presents a woodcut of showing Hercules and the motto ‘Labor omnia vincit’ (‘Industry conquers all’), an adaptation of a familiar Virgilian tag.\textsuperscript{37} This is apparently Juan’s first printer’s mark, which he used only in this first year, before it was passed on or somehow acquired by Martín de Montesdoca.\textsuperscript{38}

In addition to liturgical books, for which there was a ready market, popular works in the vernacular had become something of a staple in the Seville trade by the middle of the century.\textsuperscript{39} Spanish editions of Pulgar’s \textit{Coplas} had been published since the late fifteenth century, and by the time that Juan de León came to print his own many others had appeared. Juan’s modest octavo is largely printed in Gothic fonts of various sizes, though Italic makes a brief appearance in the colophon: ‘Fue Impreso en Sevilla en casa de || Juan de Leon. A sancta Maria || de Gracia. Año de || 1545’.\textsuperscript{40} This is the earliest indication of the location of Juan de León’s first workshop in the city, but by the next year he had moved to the parish of Santa Marina, located near the northern edge of the city. Most of the pressmen were concentrated to the south, close to the Cathedral and the commercial centre of the city; Santa Marina, by contrast, was largely inhabited by poor silk workers, mostly from Lyons. If the Pulgar edition is undemonstrative in appearance, Pedro Mexia’s \textit{Historia imperial} is altogether more imposing. Set in Gothic type arranged in two columns, with marginal notes in Roman, it comes with an elaborate title-page in which the text is framed by four woodcuts. Here the two side blocks incorporating medallion heads surrounded by laurel wreaths were specially cut for the edition and do not appear elsewhere in Juan’s output. In the centre of the upper register there is a woodcut image of the arms of Philip II, dedicatee of the volume. There is some use of Italic scattered through the work, including the paratexts which also contain a full-page woodcut of Julius Caesar.\textsuperscript{41}

Both Hierónymo de Chaves and Pedro Mexia were local men, the first a mathematician, astrologer and cosmographer who later became the \textit{piloto mayor} of the Casa de Contratación in Seville in succession to Sebastian Cabot, the second a humanist and historian who went on to be appointed as the official court chronicler to Charles V.\textsuperscript{42} While Chaves’...
translation of Sacrobosco’s *Tractado* is the first to appear in Spanish, Juan’s edition of Mexia’s *Historia imperial* is the second edition of a work that first appeared from the presses of another local printer, Domenico de Robertis. It evidently enjoyed considerable success, being reprinted by other printers both in Spain and north of the Alps. This concentration of editorial effort on writers living and working in Seville was extended in the following year when Juan made the decision to print Alonso Mudarra’s *Tres libros de música.*

**Alonso Mudarra, *Tres libros* (1546)**

Mudarra had grown up in Guadalajara, where he received his musical education and was salaried as a vihuelist in the household of Diego Hurtado de Mendoza y Luna, third Duke of Infantado. In 1529, when he would have been about nineteen years old, Mudarra may have travelled to Italy in the company of Inigo Lopez de Mendoza, Marqués de Santillana, as part of an entourage travelling to Bologna to attend the coronation of Charles V. There were plenty of other opportunities to be exposed to the influence of foreign music and musicians, and in the magnificent palace which the Dukes of Infantado had constructed at the end of the fifteenth century, Mudarra would have had plenty of opportunity to encounter them. Charles V was a guest there in 1526, 1528 and again in 1535 *en route* for Barcelona to inaugurate the Tunis campaign, and among other visitors who may have been accompanied by musicians was Francis I. By the time that Mudarra came to compile the *Tres libros*, almost certainly begun during his time in Guadalajara, his knowledge of foreign repertoires, including Italian madrigals, was extensive.

Mudarra was appointed as a canon at Seville Cathedral in late October 1546, just two months before Juan dated the colophon of the *Tres libros*. As such he joined the wealthy ecclesiastical aristocracy of the city; the canons lived well, many found the time to accept university appointments, and beyond attending services had few duties. Mudarra was evidently highly cultivated. At his death in 1580 an inventory was drawn up of his estate. It includes a collection of 117 books, a middle-sized library for someone of his class and occupation, which includes a number of titles which might well have been printed by Juan de León: Mexia’s *Historia imperial*, the *Crónica del Pero* by Cieza de León, the *Chronografía* by Hierónymo de Chaves and the *Summa de filosofía* by Alonso de Fuentes, all of which were printed by Juan during his Seville years. In the midst of these there are just two music books: the *Arte ingeniosa* by Melchior de Torres, and a ‘printed book of vihuela tablature’ (‘libro de cifra de vigüela ympresso’), which is almost certainly a copy of Mudarra’s own *Tres libros*.

As the full title of his vihuela book suggests, its contents are organised by genre. Six pieces are for four-course guitar (the earliest pieces for the instrument to appear in print, preceding those in Melchior de Barberis’ *Intabolatura de lauto* by two years), while Tiento IX is notated for organ or harp. This, the first appearance of this type of tablature in print, consists of fourteen lines and fifteen spaces, with the note to be sounded indicated by a single symbol ‘I’. Throughout the rest of the book three mensuration signs (\(\text{o}, \text{c}, \text{e}\)) designate the tempo of each piece as fast, medium or slow, and the preface breaks new ground by including a discussion of plucking techniques. Another innovation involves placing the circumflex sign over the ciphers that are to be sustained in performance. Mudarra’s collection is a revealing barometer of one professional’s approach to performance, and as such an important moment in the sequence of published vihuela books, notwithstanding its small format and modest appearance on the page in comparison to Milán’s *El maestro* or Fuenllana’s *Orphenica lyra*.
In terms of its design, Mudarra’s *Tres libros* is in landscape quarto format, as is Luis Narváez’ *Los seys libros de Delphin*, so as to create a manageable pocket-sized book instead of the upright format which was to become the norm for vihuela tablatures. Although the Narváez volume may well have been Juan’s model in terms of its appearance, the format of the *Tres libros* also perhaps reflects Mudarra’s contact with Italian and French editions for plucked strings. Then there is the arrival of a new printer’s mark, which incorporates the motto ‘SOLI DEO HONOR ET GLORIA’, which does however carry a more polemical significance. This recurs in a number of Juan’s later publications, including all his other music editions; here it is used on both the title-page of the volume as well as on the independent title-pages of the second and third books, framed in all cases by the same decorative borders. Except for the colophon, which is set in Juan’s Gothic type, the text is printed in Roman.

For the tablature itself, Juan opted for a technologically simple solution. Eschewing the complications of Milán’s *El maestro*, which is printed in red-and-black inks requiring at least two formes and two runs through the press, or Narváez’ *Les seys libros* which is printed by triple impression, Juan settled on a single colour of ink and two fonts. While the ciphers, on a six-line stave with rhythmic symbols above, are printed with independent pieces of type, the vocal lines (in mensural notation) in the *Libro tercero* are also produced in the same way, making this the first example of music printed by the single-impression method in Spain. The elements of the pieces in guitar tablature, on four lines, are also printed from single sorts. This method, which both reduced the cost of the book, and simplified the production process, was later used to print the tablature books of Valderrábano and Pisador.

Juan’s music types are new: the ciphers are not cast from the same matrices as those used in *Les seys libros*, and Mudarra’s system uses a rounded number ‘2’ rather than the more common and angular ‘Z’ used in the books of Milán and Narváez. Since the music fonts do not recur in Juan’s later books, nor did he pass it on together with his other materials to Martín de Montesdoca, they may have belonged to Mudarra, who could have brought them with him from Guadalajara; this might explain how the book was ready to be printed so soon after his appointment at Seville Cathedral, as well as the subsequent disappearance of the types. Unfamiliarity with both the material and the process is clear from the result, since Juan evidently had difficulty in printing the volume. The finished text contains a good number of errors in its pagination, the arrangement of the gatherings and at a more detailed level in the musical notation itself, suggesting that Mudarra did not attend the press, as was common practice, and that Juan, having had no previous experience with setting tablature, was severely challenged by the book’s technical requirements. While it is true that compositors did not have more difficulties with assembling music types than they had with other languages with which they may have been unfamiliar, tablature notation presented particular challenges, since it was set not vertically like mensural or text types, but horizontally, line by line, using seven rows of symbols. Perhaps again following the examples of Milán and Narváez, whose books include illustrations that resonate with humanistic themes, Juan enlivened the text with four woodcuts showing Mercury playing on an instrument made out of a tortoise shell, the Old Testament prophet Elisha accompanied by a vihuelist, an image of King David, and the so-called ‘emblem of peace’, a plumed helmet within a circle accompanied by the text ‘Ex bello pax ex pace concordia ex concordia musica constat’ (‘Peace is established from war, concord from peace, and music from concord’). Most of the decorative elements came out of Juan’s stock, and had been used many times before.
Mudarra’s *Tres libros* represents an ambitious attempt by a printer unused, and to some extent unskilled in producing books of this kind, to enter a market that had already been inaugurated by the tablatures of Milán and Narváez. Once thought to have been an exclusively courtly instrument, the preserve of the educated elite, the vihuela and the printed books of music for its practitioners are now recognised to have had a much wider audience. As John Griffiths has eloquently written:

[... the simplicity of vihuela tablature, the fact that it permitted sophisticated music to be played without requiring extensive prior musical training, and the size of the editions in which it was printed, all suggest that it was one of the principal ways in which the musically untrained bourgeoisie was able to enrich their musical experience within the domestic environment.]

The *Tres libros* is also part of a more general pattern. Printing music was for all Spanish printers merely a minor aspect of their general business, and none of them produced more than one book of music for the vihuela. Following his edition of Mudarra’s tablature, Juan de León returned to more normal fare, printing works by Pietro Aretino and Alonso de la Fuentes in 1547, and by Sacrobosco (another edition of the *Tractado*) and Hierónymo de Chaves in 1548.

**Juan de León in Osuna**

Nicolao de Albenino’s *Verdadera relación*, published in 1549, was the last book to appear from Juan’s workshop in Seville before he was appointed as printer to the newly established University of Osuna, founded by Papal Bull in late 1548, and to its patron, Juan Téllez-Girón, fourth Count of Ureña. This new situation and the opportunities that it brought evidently encouraged Juan to re-configure his editorial orientation. Of the six titles that he printed between his arrival in Osuna and 1555, when he disappears from view, four contain music notation: Juan Bermudo’s three treatises *El libro primero de la declaración de instrumentos* (1549), his *El arte tripharia* (1550) and the final version of the first, *El libro llamado declaración de instrumentos musicales*, which appeared in 1555. It was also during the Osuna years that Juan printed a set of part books, the first to be produced in Spain: Juan Vásquez’ *Villancicos i canciones*, with separate books for tiple, tenor and bass. For these he employed an Italic font for the texts, and again the music font which appears in the earliest two Bermudo treatises.

Taken together these four publications seem to represent a determined attempt not only to print practical music for local consumption, something which Juan had already presumably envisaged with the Mudarra vihuela tablature; but also, in the case of the three Bermudo treatises, to make an impact as a printer-publisher of humanistic texts as befitted the status of a university printer, thus hoping to widen his market. This was undoubtedly in emulation of printers who had gravitated to university towns in the hope of minimising risk by catering to the local population of students and scholars. In Salamanca, the seat of the oldest university in Spain, Juan de Porras had achieved a measure of financial stability by printing academic texts, many of which are in Latin; these include many editions and grammars edited by Antonio de Nebrija, commentaries on the classics (particularly Aristotle), and the only edition of the work of William of Ockham to be printed in Spain. Less successful was Miguel de Eguía’s attempt to establish a university press at Alcalá de Henares, where he had rather ambitiously brought out an anthology of Greek texts, possibly on commission. Such attempts to enter a niche market were brave. Juan’s only
attempt to issue a classical text in Latin was his edition of Valerius Flaccus’ *Argonautica* (which indeed Miguel de Eguía had printed in Alcalá in 1523), with notes by the professor of rhetoric at the University of Osuna, and a proud colophon in Latin announcing Juan’s official position.\(^{66}\) While the high degree of specialisation that now entered Juan de León’s work can be observed in the output of Eguía, Porras and a number of other presses working in a variety urban centres, these usually contained a leavening of the professional classes, people who could be expected to buy books.\(^{57}\) It may have been an appreciation of the commercial limitations of his new environment that prompted Juan to continue as a bookseller in Seville while printing in Osuna.\(^{68}\) Nonetheless, although Osuna in the 1540s was hardly Salamanca, Valladolid or Toledo, it seems that he was able to attract the interest of ecclesiastical and religious patrons when, with the three titles that constitute Juan Bermudo’s *Declaración de instrumentos musicales*, he embarked on the production of the most ambitious and technically demanding project of his entire career as a printer.

**Juan Bermudo, *Declaración***

Bermudo, who came from a distinguished family from Éjica, entered an Observant Minorite monastery at the age of fifteen. After studying in Seville, he then moved to Alcalá de Henares where, in the College of San Pedro y San Pablo, an institution reserved for members of the Franciscan order, he read mathematics.\(^{69}\) The first edition of the *Declaración* is advertised as the first instalment of what had been conceived of as a treatise in four separate books.\(^{70}\) Its dedication, to João III of Portugal, may have been yet another exercise in optimism (booksellers and printer-publishers working in Seville had cultivated the Portuguese market with some success), but with his second publication, Bermudo’s *El arte tripharia*, an abbreviated version of the author’s intended treatise in three books, aimed at students of polyphony, plainchant and organ playing, the patronage nexus becomes a little clearer. This entirely practical guide, fully in keeping with Franciscan attitudes towards the role of music in devotional practice, was written for the nuns of Santa Clara in Montilla at the instigation of the abess of the community, Doña Isabel Pacheco. It was not until 1555 that the definitive version of Bermudo’s text was published, though even then the work was not complete.\(^{71}\) The earlier books consist of elaborations of material from *El arte tripharia*, to which a new fifth book dealing with composition prefaced by a laudatory letter from Cristóbal Morales was added, but a sixth book announced in the front matter was not included and never appeared. The complete publication is dedicated to Francisco de Zúñiga y Avellaneda, Count of Miranda, a prominent member of a local aristocratic family.

Some of the typographical materials used in the printing of the first edition of the *Declaración* had been used in Juan’s Seville imprints. A good deal of new material also had to be prepared, including five woodblocks to print diagrams of some elaboration, and new fonts of music type. It would have been unusual for such a small printing operation to have cut the blocks in its own workshop (not even the Crombergers produced their own), and while it is conceivable that the music type was cast on the premises, it is unlikely that punches were cut or matrices struck there.\(^{72}\) In addition to the woodblocks which are used to print four of the music examples, three different music fonts are used. The first involves double-impression printing, with five-line staves made up of individual pieces of type and printed in red ink, and chant notation then added in black ink in a second run through the press. A second font is used for passages of mensural notation printed in a single impression from independent pieces of type. Finally, there is a single passage in tablature. *El arte tripharia* is altogether more modest in its requirements. Again there are some mensural
music examples printed with woodblocks, but most of the polyphonic notation is executed with the same single-impression font that had been employed in the 1549 edition of the Declaración, which is also the source of a number of the woodcut diagrams.

Some of these make a further re-appearance in the 1555 edition (see Figure 13.2), and woodcut music examples are also still presented there despite the clear intention to make it more ‘modern’ and ‘humanistic’ in appearance. This aim is clearly set out in the arrangement of its title-page, which advertises its humanistic associations typographically by now abandoning Gothic completely, and setting the text in one size of Roman and two sizes of Italic.73 This last is then deployed, unusually for a theoretical treatise which would normally be set with all the gravitas of traditional Gothic, throughout the body of the text, with headings in Roman, the only exception being the sonnet in the preliminaries, for which Gothic is used.74 Two fonts of single-impression music type are used: a larger font that Juan had already used in the 1549 Declaración and El arte tripharia, and a smaller one

Figure 13.2 Juan Bermudo, Comiença el libro llamada declaración de instrumentos musicales (Osuna: Juan de León, 1555), fol. lxxixii\textsuperscript{v}.
Source: New York, Hispanic Society of America (no shelfmark).
that appears here for the first time.\textsuperscript{75} The larger page size of the 1555 edition seems to be the reason for some of the new types employed, including the woodcuts framing the text on the title-page, and the larger arrangements of the tablatures.\textsuperscript{76} Some of the woodblocks used in the 1549 edition were re-used, while others were re-cut to the same design.

In its finished form as presented in Juan’s 1555 edition, Bermudo’s \textit{Declaración} is often described as the high point of sixteenth-century Spanish theoretical writing about music. To a considerable extent the text is rooted in medieval traditions, as can be seen in its references to Avicenna (an author also cited in the vihuela books by Luis Milán and Fuenllana), in its discussion of the beneficial effects of music on the soul and body (particularly as an antidote to pain), and in Bermudo’s knowledge of Al-Farābī’s writings concerning the utility of music, where the familiar analogy between music and human nature is developed.\textsuperscript{77} Elsewhere the authority of Augustine is invoked, and many passages display familiarity with the notion of Aristotelian mimesis.\textsuperscript{78} Perhaps inevitably, the expected anecdotes about the power of music make regular appearances, demonstrating Bermudo’s reading of Boethius and other authors in the Pythagorean tradition. If none of this is particularly surprising, there are also moments of considerable novelty. Among the many references to cosmic harmony as described by Boethius in the first book of the 1555 edition of the \textit{Declaración}, to which Bermudo adds commentaries by Macrobius, Cicero, Pliny and St. Isidore, a new element is added, namely to attach planetary influence to each of the modes, an idea which is also present in Ramos de Pareja, whose \textit{Musica practica} is most likely to have been his source.\textsuperscript{79} The final version of the \textit{Declaración} also offers important insights into the techniques of both composition and instrumental performance in sixteenth-century Spain. In short, this essentially conservative document also displays an innovative imagination at work.\textsuperscript{80} An intellectually ambitious work, it is unparalleled among Spanish theoretical texts in the range of its reading of both ancient and modern authors, matched by the typographical sophistication which Juan de León attempted to bring to its fruition in print. A second edition of Bermudo’s \textit{Declaración} appeared from the press of Juan de León in the course of 1555. After that he disappears from view completely.

\textbf{Martín de Montesdoca and Miguel de Fuenllana’s \textit{Orphenica lyra} (1554)}

A few years earlier another Sevillian printer, Martín de Montesdoca, had begun work. His career and output are the subject of a classic study by Klaus Wagner,\textsuperscript{81} but there are two areas in which there is more to be said. The first concerns the sudden and remarkable shift in editorial politics, which occurred immediately after the appearance of the second version of Fuenllana’s \textit{Orphenica lyra}, a change which Wagner was certainly aware of, but which now can be more substantially explained. The second relates to the details and techniques of Montesdoca’s printing of music, both before and after that shift.

His career as a printer begins in 1553 when his first book, the first part of Pedro Cieza de León’s \textit{Chronica del Peru} was published with a decorative title-page printed in red and black inks, which incorporates the arms of Philip II to whom the book is dedicated; the licence is dated 11 August 1552.\textsuperscript{82} This was a successful start. In his account the author, who had settled in Seville after many years in the Americas, narrates the events of the Spanish conquest of Peru; within a year Montesdoca’s text had been reprinted three times in Antwerp.\textsuperscript{83} Thereafter the exclusively secular texts that he printed were aimed at domestic and civic audiences, culminating in Miguel de Fuenllana’s \textit{Orphenica lyra}, the most typographically complicated vihuela book to be printed since Milán’s \textit{El maestro}.\textsuperscript{84} As with Narváez’ \textit{Los seys libros del Delphin}, the title itself deliberately evokes the humanistic ideals
exemplified by the Italian concept of Orphic song. Between the granting of the licence and the dating of the colophon some fourteen months elapsed, a reflection perhaps of the technical complexities involved. Fuenllana’s book finally appeared with an ambitious dedication to Philip II, a tactic which had been employed in Juan de León’s edition of Mexia’s *Historia imperial*, though in Fuenllana’s case it may even have borne fruit, since following the arrival of Elisabeth of Valois as Philip II’s third wife in 1559, the composer found favour at court, and shortly afterwards joined the entourage of musicians which she had brought with her from France.

As has long been recognised, the *Orphenica lyra* exists in two issues or variant editions, largely distinguished from each other by their first gathering. For the second issue this gathering was largely re-set, with a new title-page and a different sequence of poems in the paratexts. The music itself, set in nested type cast from no fewer than twenty-three matrices, begins on the first folio of the second gathering, and runs to the end of the volume. With one important exception the music gatherings are identical in both issues, perhaps suggesting that a certain number of sheets from the first printing were put aside in the hope that sales from the first edition would justify a second issue. This was a common strategy among printers. The exception however is significant, and concerns the title-page of the *Libro quinto* as it occurs in a number of copies of the second issue. In some copies the lower cartouche is blank, but in others it contains the motto ‘Soli Deo honor | & Gloria’. The title itself is framed by woodcuts of two caryatids to the left and right facing inwards rather than outwards, as they are in other copies. These changes are not merely accidental or insignificant, but relate to the meaning of Juan’s adoption of a new printer’s mark. (The complications of printing the book also resulted in errors. The proofreading, presumably carried out by Fuenllana himself, identified some of them, which were then corrected with printed pasteovers, but others remained.)

The original contract for the *Orphenica lyra* ordered a print run of one thousand copies. It has been estimated on the basis of surviving contracts that the average non-musical Seville edition consisted of 700 copies. This is large, not only in relation to local practice, but also by comparison with what little is known of Italian print runs for music editions. Nonetheless, it is not that unusual in the context of Spanish vihuela tablatures, some of which were printed in editions of 1225 (Cabézon) and even 1500 copies (Daza). Clearly the expectation was that the book would have a market outside Seville, including perhaps the New World. Commercial ambitions may have motivated Fuenllana to include not only a good deal of his own music, but also pieces by prominent contemporary Spanish composers, not only Guerrero and Morales as might be expected, but also a broad conspectus of work by French, Flemish and Italian composers. Madrigals by Arcadelt and Verdelot are prominent among the ‘estrambotes a cinco y a quatro’ of the fifth book, and motets and mass sections by Willaert, Gombert and Jacquet of Mantua are strongly represented in books two, three and four. Sales of the book were further complicated by the existence of fraudulent copies, which Fuenllana authorised his servant Juan Ruiz to collect on his behalf.

As with Juan de León, most of the authors that Montesdoca published were local, while the texts which they provided fall into two chronological groups and generic categories. In an initial phase, which culminates in the printing of the second issue of Fuenllana’s *Orphenica lyra*, the accent is upon secular works. This is then followed by a radical shift in the direction of devotional books, many issued as short pamphlets or more substantial theological treatises, many written by Domingo de Valtanás, a prolific author of religious texts, who was well-known locally as a popular preacher and a rigorous defender of daily communion (and in consequence frequent confession), a practice which he had been
vigorously advocating for years. In the context of mid-century Spanish spirituality this viewpoint, together with his *apologias* in favour of the *conversos* and in defence of mental prayer, placed Valtanás in an isolated position. His arguments, outlined in detail in the *Apología de la frecuentación de la sacrosanta Eucaristía*, were destined to fail, largely because his advocacy took place in the atmosphere of intolerance that followed the appointment of Fernando de Valdés as Archbishop of Seville in 1547. Professor of Canon Law at Salamanca University, and latterly Inquisitor General, Valdés approached the task of eliminating all forms of heterodoxy, particularly those supportive of the *conversos*, or sympathetic to Erasmian or Lutheran beliefs, with enthusiasm. In these circumstances, Montesdoca’s extensive publication of Valtanás’ works was both courageous and risky. Certainly it could arouse strong feelings among readers. In one copy of the *Compendio de sentencias morales*, the section headed ‘De Martín Lutero’ is heavily censored by a contemporary reader, with many passages crossed out and others excised completely, presumably in an independent fit of righteous anger.

In late 1554 Montesdoca issued an edition of the *Vita Christi* and other works with a colophon dated 15 December. This was followed a few months later by the *Doctrina christiana*, the most ambitious of all Valtanás’ catechetical writings. These were the first of no fewer than fifteen further titles by the Dominican that Montesdoca went on to issue, to which should be added a number of editions of which no copies are known to survive, all in the space of four years. This surge in Montesdoca’s publication of devotional and theological texts did not stop there. In addition to Valtanás, he also championed the works of Francisco de Osuna, a Franciscan whose writings were among the most widely read books of popular religion in sixteenth-century Spain. Montesdoca printed no fewer than seven editions of Francisco’s *Abecedario espiritual*, although no copies have survived. Significantly, all these were issued in 1554, precisely the year in which Montesdoca evidently determined to devote his press to octavo and quarto editions of short and accessible spiritual texts. Starting in the following year, he also printed a number of weightier theological disquisitions, this time in Latin, by another local author and fellow Franciscan, Pedro Fermosello, head of the Franciscan monastery in Seville.

In the midst of this deluge of devotional literature, Montesdoca published, quite appropriately in view of his new editorial priorities, two collections of sacred music by local composers: Francisco Guerrero’s *Sacrae cantiones*, a set of five partbooks, only the second collection to be published in this format in Spain (it is also by far the most elaborate), and the *Agenda defunctorum* by Juan Vásquez, who had been living in the city for some years. Of Montesdoca’s three books of music, undoubtedly the most complicated from the technical point of view is the *Orphenica lyra*, often described in the secondary literature as being printed in two impressions, with the red layer executed first. It is more probable that it was set in one forme, and that a frisket sheet was then used to cover all the elements to be printed in red ink (both lines and ciphers), while the first layer was printed in black ink. Following this the black layer would then have been covered with a second frisket sheet, allowing the red layer to be added. The evidence for this procedure is the presence of small areas where black is printed over red, and others where the reverse is true (see Figure 13.3). The vocal parts are printed in mensural notation using woodblocks on a six-line stave.

**Montesdoca, Francisco Guerrero and Juan Vásquez**

In August 1555, Montesdoca entered into a legal agreement with Guerrero, now promoted to the post of *maestro di capilla* at Seville Cathedral, to print 750 copies of a book of his
compositions, as yet untitled, which was eventually published as the *Sacrae cantiones*. By contemporary Italian standards this print run for a set of partbooks is generous, though not even in Italy could there have been any sense of a ‘normal’ number of copies; in practice, the size of each edition printed in Spain would have been established by both the author (who was granted the licence) and the printer-publisher. In addition to the ‘motetes a cuatro y cinco’ specified in Guerrero’s contract, the book was also to contain ‘ocho maníficas, y más otros cosas que quisiéredes a mí dar’ (‘eight Magnificats, as well as other things which you might wish to give me’), but these never appeared. The title-pages of all the partbooks were ornamented with allegorical figures of Music playing a vihuela, and Geometry inscribing a tablet with calipers. For the rest, Montesdoca drew upon his existing stock of types (see Figure 13.4).
In the following year Montesdoca printed his last edition of music, the *Agenda defunctorum* by Juan Vásquez, who since 1551 had been on the payroll of Don Antonio de Zúñiga, son of the third Duke of Béjar, a local Sevillian aristocratic family which at least since the 1460s had maintained a chapel in their palace in the barrio of Santa Cruz. Vásquez is documented in the city on a number of occasions in the 1540s, years in which he was maestro de capilla of Badajoz Cathedral, and by 1551, when Juan de León printed the partbooks of his *Villancicos i canciones* with a dedication to Zúñiga, he was evidently in the service of the family. An *Agenda* is a ritual book containing the texts and sometimes chants for common services such as baptism, wedding services and funeral rites, similar in function to *Caeremonialia* and *Litaniae*. Juan Vásquez’ *Agenda*, which is entirely devoted to music for the dead, provides texts and music for six liturgical components: the invitatory, first, second and third nocturns, lauds and finally the mass for the dead. These structural elements are echoed in Victoria’s *Officium defunctorum* of 1603, which, in turn, forms part of long tradition of *stile antico* requiem settings which persisted in Spain and Portugal for longer than elsewhere in Catholic Europe. In deciding to compile the *Agenda*, it is probable that Vásquez could have been motivated by the recently published polyphonic requiem settings by Morales. Guerrero may have been involved in the project; in August of 1556 he purchased a considerable amount of paper, as he had done the previous year for the publication of his *Sacrae cantiones*. For the *Agenda*, Montesdoca used a font of single-impression mensural music type, and three fonts of text type: Roman underlaid to the music, and two sizes of Gothic for the remaining texts. He also incorporated two woodcut images of the Crucifixion, one large the other small, of the design commonly illustrated in missals. Not found elsewhere in his work, they are of a high artistic standard and may well have been borrowed from another printer.

---

Figure 13.4 Francisco Guerrero, *Sacrae cantiones, vulgo moteta nuncupate quinque vocum* (Seville: Martín de Montesdoca, 1555), Tenor, fol. 1r.
Source: New York, Hispanic Society of America (no shelfmark).
Printing Communities and Music

The impression created by what can be recovered of the activities of Juan de León and Martín de Montesdoca suggests both a reliance on new work by Sevillian authors as well as a certain degree of collaboration about technical matters within the printing trade. Most of Juan de León’s authors were local men. Hierónymo de Chaves was born in Seville and worked there for most of his life, as did Pedro Mexia and Alonso de Fuentes. The same is true of the books published by Montesdoca, who began printing with the *Chronica del Peru* by Pedro Cieza de León, who had settled in Seville in 1551 and also went on to produce editions of Hierónymo de Chaves, Valtanás and Fermosello; all of these were then resident in the city. Taken into consideration with what can be reconstructed of patronage networks, which mostly involved members of the aristocracy, the image of Sevillian printing in the 1540s and 1550s (outside the dominant Cromberger operation) is of a tightly knit community of artisans and small-time entrepreneurs struggling to make a profit in difficult circumstances. Juan de León’s business may have been crippled by the acute paper shortage which began in 1554 (a year in which he printed nothing) and lasted until 1555, when Bermudo mentioned that Juan was unable to print the sixth book of the *Declaración*. In these difficult circumstances it is not surprising that typographical materials were sometimes shared. This is particularly true of ornamental material, which frequently passed from one printer to another, if only temporarily. Sebastián Trugillo, who ran a medium-sized workshop in Seville, occasionally borrowed woodblocks from both the Cromberger press and sometimes from Juan de León. Similarly, Juan de Varela appears to have shared a number of fonts with the Cromberger press, which also lent types from his stock to Varela, or at least passed them on to him. And a number of the woodblocks used by Montesdoca, including those involved in printing the title-pages of the *Orphenica lyra*, had been previously used in books produced in the workshops of Antón Alvarez and Juan de León.

It is more than possible that the spirit of collaboration which connected the professional activities of Montesdoca, Juan de León and other printers working in Seville was, in turn, related to shared confessional sympathies, which are reflected in the work of the authors that they chose to print. Constantino Ponce de la Fuente, whose work Juan de León had published during the 1540s, before he became chaplain to Charles V, was appointed to a canonry in Seville Cathedral at the end of the 1550s, but was almost immediately caught up in the purge of suspected heretics inaugurated by Valdés, tried by the Inquisition and imprisoned. By 1559 his work had been placed on the Index, as had the writings of Erasmus, with whom Constantino had corresponded, and whose *De octo orationis partium constructione* Juan de León had published in Osuna. Closer to home, Gaspar Zapata, from whom Juan had obtained his types before starting work in 1545, was later tried by the Inquisition, as was Alonso Mudarra’s brother Francisco, another canon of the local cathedral, who in 1548 was accused of heresy by the Roman Inquisition and imprisoned in the pontifical prison of Tor di Nona. Domingo de Valtanás, who became Montesdoca’s main author from 1554 until the printer ceased activity four years later, did not fare any better. In 1559 Protestant conventicles were discovered in Seville, and two years later Valtanás was detained by the Inquisition, and subsequently condemned to perpetual confinement in the remote monastery of Santo Domingo de las Cinco Llagas in Alcalá de los Gazules (Cádiz). By then the censors had been at work, and his *Vita Christi*, which Montesdoca had printed, had been placed on the Pauline Index.

Beyond the texts which both printers selected for publication, the most explicit demonstration of Protestant sympathies can be seen in Juan de León’s decision, beginning in...
1546, to introduce a new and surely contentious printer’s mark. By the time he came to print Mudarra’s *Tres libros*, his Hercules mark had passed on to Montesdoca, who used it throughout the rest of his career in conjunction with his more familiar second mark. In its place Juan now adopted a new image, consisting of Golgotha surmounted by the three nails used at the Crucifixion within a circle surrounded by the motto ‘SOLI DEO HONOR ET GLORIA’ and the phrase ‘Sola fides sufficit’ (see Figure 13.5). The concept of ‘Soli Deo [Honor et] Gloria’, one of the five *solae* of the Protestant Reformation, fundamental to the doctrine of salvation as adopted by the Lutheran and Reformed branches of Protestantism, stood in opposition to the teachings of Catholicism, which encouraged veneration of the Virgin, the saints and the angels and archangels; by contrast, ‘Soli Deo Gloria’ taught that glory was due to God alone. Furthermore, the phrase ‘Sola fides sufficit’ (‘faith alone suffices’), although a direct quotation from Thomas Aquinas’ Corpus Christi hymn *Pange lingua*, could serve as a sign to fellow Protestants in the wake of Luther’s proclamation of justification by faith alone. The addition of the words ‘Sola fides sufficit’ further strengthens the Protestant associations of Juan de León’s printer’s new mark, since ‘Sola fide’, one of the three original *solae*, refers to the doctrinal issue that was central for the reformers; Luther wrote: ‘isto articulo stante stat Ecclesia, ruente ruit Ecclesia’ (‘if this article stands, the church stands; if it tumbles, the church also falls’).

Following his departure from the scene in 1559, Montesdoca’s types, including his music font, decorative initials and his Hercules printer’s mark, were acquired by Juan Gutiérrez, who went on to use them to produce the partbooks of the *Recopilacion de sonetos y villancicos* by Juan Vásquez. When Guerrero, arguably the most distinguished composer living in Spain (he was to spend the rest of his career at Seville Cathedral) published his next book of music, he turned to Venice. That decision is symbolic not only of the fragile condition of music printing in the peninsula in general, but also of the difficulties that had beset the Sevillian book trade in the 1550s, and which had a permanent effect. Guttiérez continued to print liturgical books after 1560, but Vásquez’ *Recopilacion* turned out to be the last book of polyphonic music to be printed in Seville.
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15 Liber processionum secundum ordinem fratrum praedicatorum (Seville: Ungut and Polono, 1494).
16 Missale secundum usum ecclesie Hyspalensis (Seville: Jacopo Cromberger, 1507). The illuminated copy is in the British Library, shelfmark C.36.11. See Norton, Descriptive Catalogue, no. 773.
17 Processionarium secundum morem ordinis predicatorem (Seville: Jacopo Cromberger, 1519). See Norton, A Descriptive Catalogue, 919.
18 Missale divinorum secundum consuetudinem sancta ecclesie Hyspalensis (Seville: Juan Varela de Salamanca). Griffin, The Crombergers, 50, notes editions of 1529, 1533, 1534, and 1537. Only three of these (1529, 1534, and 1537) are listed in Wilkinson, Iberian Books, nos. 6413–6415.
20 Griffin, The Crombergers, 105.
21 Ibid., 169.
22 Gestoso y Pérez, Noticias inéditas, 21. Intriguingly, it is also recorded that on 17 March 1551, one Juan de León signed a contract to print two reams of playing-cards daily; ibid., 21.
23 Griffin, Journeymen-Printers, 90.
25 Moll, ‘Gaspar Zapata’. Zapata subcontracted the work of printing these volumes to others, whose names do not appear in their colophons.
26 Seville had the largest Spanish population of black slaves. For their involvement in the printing trade, see Gestoso y Pérez, *Noticias inéditas*, 74; and Griffin, *Journeymen-Printers*, 156–157.

27 On the importance of paper imported from France and Spain for Spanish printers, see Valls i Subirá, *La historia del papel*, vol. 1, and especially 2: 17–30.

28 The paper in the Madrid copy of Mudarra’s *Tres libros* is watermarked with the common design of a hand from whose middle finger is extended a stem supporting a five-petalled flower. A variant occurs throughout some of the copies of Fuenllana’s *Orphenica lyra*, while other common marks such as the ‘pot’ and ‘oxhead’ varieties are also to be found in the books of both printers.


31 For Lyons see Peligry, ‘Les editeurs Lyonnais’ and, for the importation of polyphonic choirbooks, Fenlon, ‘Jacques Moderne’s Choirbooks’.

32 Juan’s rate of production suggests that he maintained a single press operated by just a puller, a beater and one other worker, probably himself.


34 Johannes de Sacrobosco, *Tractado de la sphera … nuevamente traduzido de latin en castellana por el bachiller Hieronymo de Chaves* (Seville: Juan de León, 1545).

35 The sizes are as follows: Gothic (2 mm and 3 mm); Roman (4 mm); Italic (2 mm).
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38 See Vindel, *Escudos y marcas*, no. 185. For further discussion see above, 309, 314, 319.


40 Hernando de Pulgar, *Coplas revulgo glosadas* (Seville: Juan de León, 1545).

41 Pedro Mexía, *Historia imperial* (Seville: Juan de León, 1545), fol. *6v*.

42 On Chaves and the Casa de la Contratación, see Serrera Contreras, ‘La Casa de la Contratación’, 141–176. For his broad intellectual interests, see the inventory of his library published in Wagner, ‘A proposito de la biblioteca’.

43 Peeters-Fontainas, *Bibliographie*, record four editions published in Antwerp between 1552 and 1578, three at the press of Martin Nutius and later his heirs, and one by Pierre Bellère (nos. 783–786).

44 Alonso Mudarra, *Tres libros de música en cifras para vihuela* (Seville: Juan de León, 1546).


46 Roa Alonso, ‘Alonso Mudarra’, 47–50. Francis I visited the palace in 1525, having been taken prisoner following his defeat at the battle of Pavia.


50 Melchior de Barberis, *Opera intitolata Contina. Intabolatura de lauto di fantasie, motetti, canzoni discordate a vari modi … fantasie per sonar sopra la chitara a da sette corde … libro decimo* (Venice: Scotto, 1549).

51 Bordas, ‘The Double Harp in Spain’, 149, where it is also noted that although Mudarra intended to publish further works using this system, the project was unrealised.

52 Luis Milan, *Libro de música … Intitulado El maestro* (Valencia: Francisco Díaz Romano, 1536), the earliest printed tablature for vihuela, uses verbal indicators to express tempo.

53 I am grateful to John Griffiths for these observations.

See above, 309, 314, 319.

The measurements are as follows: vihuela tablature, stave 25 mm high; mensural, staves 13 mm high; guitar tablature, staves 15 mm high.

Enrico de Valderrábano, *Libro de música de vihuela, intitulado silva de sirenas* (Valladolid: Francisco Fernández de Córdoba, 1547); Diego Pisador, *Libro de música de vihuela* (Salamanca: Guillermo de Millis, 1552). In both cases, the gatherings using red and black inks are printed using the frisket method (see above, 315).

See above, 309, 314, 319.

The measurements are as follows: vihuela tablature, stave 25 mm high; mensural, staves 13 mm high; guitar tablature, staves 15 mm high.

Enrico de Valderrábano, *Libro de música de vihuela, intitulado silva de sirenas* (Valladolid: Francisco Fernández de Córdoba, 1547); Diego Pisador, *Libro de música de vihuela* (Salamanca: Guillermo de Millis, 1552). In both cases, the gatherings using red and black inks are printed using the frisket method (see above, 315).


This latter was to re-appear in the *Villancicos i canciones*, fol. 2 in all parts.


Pietro Aretino, *Colloquio de las damas* (Seville: Juan de León, 1547); Alonso de Fuentes, *Summa de philosophia natural en la qual assi mismo se tracta de astruldugia y astronomia, & otras sciencias* (Seville: Juan de León, 1547); Johannes de Sacrobosco, *Tractado de la sphera* (Seville: Juan de León, 1548); Hieronimo de Chaves, *Chronografia o repertorio de los tiempos* (Seville: Juan de León, 1548).

Nicolaao de Albenino, *Verdadera relacion de lo sussedido en los reynos e provincias del Peru* (Seville: Juan de León, 1549).

Juan Vásquez, *Villancicos i canciones a tres y a quarto* (Osuna: Juan de León, 1551). See the introduction to Russell, *Juan Vásquez, Villancicos i canciones*, which however says little about typographical materials and printing techniques.

The Italic type measures 2 mm, the music font 14 mm. Elsewhere, including the title-page which also carries the coat-of-arms of the dedicatee Antonio de Cunniga [Zúñiga], various sizes of Roman are used.


Gestoso y Perez, *Noticias ineditas*, 119, claims that León kept his shop in Seville open during the Osuna years.

Stevenson, *Juan Bermudo*, 1–2.

Juan Bermudo, *Comiença el libro primero de la declaración de instrumentos* (Osuna: Juan de León, 1549).

Juan Bermudo, *Comiença el libro llamado declaración de instrumentos musicales* (Osuna: Juan de León, 1555). For the gestation of the treatise see Freis, *Becoming a Theorist*.


The Roman type measures 4 mm in height, the two sizes of Italic 3 mm and 2 mm.

This is the work of ‘un amigo del autor’.

The larger type measures 14 mm in height, and the smaller one 9 mm. The stave heights are 10 mm (Books I–IV), and 13 mm (Book V).

These are 26 mm high.


Ibid., 201–202, 204–206.

Ibid., 234–236.

Ibid., 238.

Wagner, *Martín de Montesdoca*.

Pedro Cieza de León, *Parte prima de la chronica del Peru* (Seville: Martín de Montesdoca, 1553); see Wagner, *Martín de Montesdoca*, 61, *bibliografía critica*, no. I. As originally planned the *Chronica* was to be printed in four volumes.


Miguel de Fuenllana, *Libro de musica para vihuela, intitulado Orphenica lyra* (Seville: Martín de Montesdoca, 1554).

The fifteen-year privilege is dated 11 August 1553, the colophon 2 October 1554.

87 That is, fols. i–clxiiij, gatherings A–Z8.

88 From among the many other examples, see Giovanni Botero, *Relaciones universales del mundo … primera y segunda parte* (Valladolid: Heirs of Diego Fernandez de Cordova, 1599–1603), where this second issue of the first Spanish edition of Botero’s text is composed of sheets of the first edition of 1599–1600 together with a new title-page carrying the coat-of-arms of the Duke of Lerma, to whom the book is dedicated.

89 Wagner, *Martín de Montesdoca*, Figure 3e.

90 For the mark and its meaning, see above, 309, 314, 319.

91 As in the copy in the Newberry Library in Chicago (VM 125.F95L), fols. clxvii and clxix.


93 See Griffiths, ‘Printing the Art of Orpheus’, 191. As is noted there, choirbooks and sets of part books intended at least in part for the Spanish market were printed in much smaller numbers.

94 For the contract, see Wagner, *Martín de Montesdoca, bibliografia critica*, nos. XVI, XVII, XVIII, all printed in 1555.

95 I am grateful to Elisabeth Giselbrecht and Elizabeth Savage for discussing this point.


97 Both are illustrated in Wagner, *Martín de Montesdoca*, 10b and 10c along with the title-page, which shows the arms of Juan Bravo (Figure 10a), to whom the book is dedicated.

98 From among the many other examples, see Giovanni Botero, *Relaciones universales del mundo … primera y segunda parte* (Valladolid: Heirs of Diego Fernandez de Cordova, 1599–1603), where this second issue of the first Spanish edition of Botero’s text is composed of sheets of the first edition of 1599–1600 together with a new title-page carrying the coat-of-arms of the Duke of Lerma, to whom the book is dedicated.


100 Wagner, *Martín de Montesdoca*, 66–81.

101 Wagner, *Martín de Montesdoca, bibliographia critica*, nos. XVI, XVII, XVIII, all printed in 1555.

102 The sizes are as follows: Roman (2 mm high); Gothic (3 mm / 4 mm high), while the music type measures 12 / 8 mm.

103 For the contract, see Wagner, *Martín de Montesdoca*, 114–115, document 42.


105 Both are illustrated in Wagner, *Martín de Montesdoca*, 10b and 10c along with the title-page, which shows the arms of Juan Bravo (Figure 10a), to whom the book is dedicated.

106 From among the many other examples, see Giovanni Botero, *Relaciones universales del mundo … primera y segunda parte* (Valladolid: Heirs of Diego Fernandez de Cordova, 1599–1603), where this second issue of the first Spanish edition of Botero’s text is composed of sheets of the first edition of 1599–1600 together with a new title-page carrying the coat-of-arms of the Duke of Lerma, to whom the book is dedicated.


109 Civale, ‘Domingo de Baltanás’.

110 The sizes are as follows: Roman (2 mm high); Gothic (3 mm / 4 mm high), while the music type measures 12 / 8 mm.

111 See Griffiths, ‘Printing the Art of Orpheus’, 191. As is noted there, choirbooks and sets of part books intended at least in part for the Spanish market were printed in much smaller numbers.


113 Civale, ‘Domingo de Baltanás’.

114 For the mark and its meaning, see above, 309, 314, 319.

115 As in the copy in the Newberry Library in Chicago (VM 125.F95L), fols. clxvii and clxix.

116 As in the copy in the Newberry Library in Chicago (VM 125.F95L), fols. clxvii and clxix.

117 See Griffiths, ‘Printing the Art of Orpheus’, 191. As is noted there, choirbooks and sets of part books intended at least in part for the Spanish market were printed in much smaller numbers.


120 Wagner, *Martín de Montesdoca*, 66–81.

121 Wagner, *Martín de Montesdoca, bibliographia critica*, nos. XVI, XVII, XVIII, all printed in 1555.

122 For the contract, see Wagner, *Martín de Montesdoca*, 114–115, document 42.


124 The sizes are as follows: Roman (2 mm high); Gothic (3 mm / 4 mm high), while the music type measures 12 / 8 mm.
118 Vindel, Escudos y marcas, nos. 185, 235. As printed on the title-page of the libro segundo of the Orphenica lyra, the Hercules mark is different from the mark shown in Vindel in a number of respects: the motto is printed under the mark in red ink rather than black, and the figure looks to the left not the right as elsewhere. For Montesdoca’s second mark see also Wagner, Martin de Montesdocta, 47, illustration 3.

119 Interestingly, one early reader completed the text of the printer’s mark in his copy of Fuentes, Summa de philosophia natural (Seville: Juan de León, 1547) now in Madrid, Biblioteca de la Real Academia Española, with the comment ‘along with works’ (‘cum operibus’).

120 WA 40.3: 352.

121 Juan Vásquez, Recopilacion de sonetos y villancicos a quarto y a cinco (Seville: Juan Gutierrez, 1560). This dedication, to Gonzalo de Moscoso y Casereres, speaks appreciatively of both Francisco Guerrero and Cristóbal Morales as the ‘light of music’ (‘luz de la música’). The unique copies, in the Biblioteca March in Palma de Mallorca, are bound together with copies of Guerrero, Sacrae cantiones (Seville: Martín de Montesdocta, 1555), Vásquez, Villancicos i canciones (Osuna: Juan de León), and the Septiesme livre de chansons a quatre parties (Louvain: Pierre Phalèse, 1562) in a contemporary blind-stamped leather binding. They are not recorded in Wilkinson, Libros ibericos.
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Guerrero, Francisco 314–317, 319, 323, 324

Guitars 308, 309, 322

Guldenmund, Hans 227

Gutenberg, Johannes 4, 5, 6, 7, 12, 20, 28, 33, 208

Guyot, Jean 264


Halbos, Jan-Baptist 178, 180, 181, 198

Handl see Gallus

Harp 115, 308

Hassler, Hans Leo 220, 228

Hauweel, Johannes 155, 156

Havericq, Damien 264

Hayne, Gilles 177, 181, 189, 190, 191, 196, 198

Hebrew printing 22, 24, 31, 33, 218, 240

Heidelberg 256

Heller, Joachim 276

Hellinck, Lupus 134, 143

Hemel, Caspar 113, 115

Herwart, Hans Heinrich 42, 49, 51, 54, 55, 57

Heshusen, Tilemann 270

Hessus, Helius Eobanus 267

Heugel, Johannes 97

Heyden, Sebald 259, 260, 261, 268, 277

Hildburghausen 112, 114

Hofhaimer, Paul 38, 57, 103, 105, 107

Höltzel, Hieronymus 104

Honterus, Johannes 102

Horace 22, 85–108, 215
Huberinus, Caspar 265, 266, 269
Huygens, Constantijn 236, 237, 238, 240, 242, 243
imposition 42–43, 253
ink 8, 10, 20, 30, 44, 55, 93, 239, 248, 287, 306, 309, 311, 313, 315, 322, 324
Inquisition 315, 318, 323
Isaac, Henricus 25, 133, 134, 135, 140, 144
Isidore of Seville 313
Jagielo, Anna 48–50
Janequin, Clément 1, 2, 11
Jena 105, 135, 136, 139, 140, 142, 144, 263
Jesuit order 288–289, 292
Joachim II of Brandenburg 218
Joachimsthal 113, 114
Johann Friedrich of Saxony 113, 115, 116, 118, 120, 121
Johannes of Speyer 208, 225
Josquin see Desprez
Junta, Juan de 306
Kerle, Jacobus de 281, 283
Kessel 281
keyboards 28, 44, 233; see also organs
Kilian, Hans 217–218, 223–224
Kling, Melchior 113, 115, 128
Knobloch family (printers) 67, 68, 69, 72, 73, 77, 79, 80, 83
Knöfel, Johann 227, 228
Königsberg 93, 281, 284, 285
Köpfel, Jacobus de 281, 283
La Hèle, George de 12, 283, 287, 288, 291
La Rue, Pierre de 133, 134, 143
Lambergs, Abraham 219
Landsberg 49
Langer, Johannes 270
Lasius, Christoph 272
Lasso see Lassus
Lassus, Orlande de 10, 13, 151, 153, 161, 164, 169, 171, 172, 181, 187, 211, 219, 220, 221, 222, 226, 228, 258, 290, 293, 296, 299
Le Maistre, Matheus 258, 274
Lechner, Leonhard 228
Legrenzi, Giovanni 183, 193
Leipzig 65, 112, 119, 135, 137, 142, 144, 185, 219, 227, 228, 247, 264
Leo X (Pope) 209
León, Juan de 305–323
Leuven see Louvain
licences for printing and publication 42, 43, 44, 57, 163, 209, 297, 313, 314, 316
Lille 181, 285, 289, 293, 294, 295
Listenius, Nicolaus 112, 113, 127, 128, 259, 269
Lombardy 303, 306
Louvain 174, 177, 209, 264, 285, 293, 294, 295, 324
Louys, Jean 263
Loy, Henry 151, 171
Lübeck 200, 285, 294, 295
Luscinius, Ottmar 214, 226
lutes 27, 28, 86, 88, 102, 143, 178, 208, 213, 215, 216, 234, 236, 239, 296
Maastricht 284, 285
Macé, Denis 234
Machaut, Guillaume de 207
Macrobius 313
Magdeburg 65, 219, 220
Magni family (printers) 183, 199, 200
Mainz 8, 28, 29, 33, 34, 37, 68, 76, 111, 226
Manchicourt, Pierre de 140, 168, 173
manuscripts 2, 3, 4, 10, 12, 31, 39, 41–62, 86, 91, 96, 100, 103, 104, 105, 123, 126, 127, 133, 135, 136, 137, 139, 140, 141, 144, 145, 163, 182, 184, 200, 207, 209, 210, 215, 231, 239, 249, 275
Marbach, Johannes 69
Marco, Bartolomeo 183
Marenzio, Luca 187, 296, 299
Marini, Biagio 181, 190, 198
Marschalk, Nikolaus 111, 127
Masius, Johannes 293
Mathesius, Johannes 253, 260, 266, 269, 276
Matheussoo, Job 293
matrices 9, 30, 42, 112, 196, 235, 241, 305, 309, 311, 314
Mechelen 141, 181, 285
Meder, Lorenz 266
Meiland, Jakob 228, 258
Meissen 119
Melanchthon, Philipp 5, 86, 114, 116, 118, 120, 121, 123, 125, 214, 251, 260, 266, 267, 268, 269, 272, 275, 276
Menius, Justus 271
Mercus, Servatius 284
Mérida 283
Mersenne, Marin 10, 231–244
Messerschmid, Georg 66, 68, 69, 71, 73, 76, 79, 82
Métrou, Nicolas 233
Mewes, Gregor 21, 22, 24, 29, 31, 32, 33, 34, 35, 38, 85, 90, 104, 107
Mexia, Pedro 307–308, 314, 318, 321
Mexico 8, 13, 281, 283
Meyer, Edouard de 177, 196
Meynertzhagen, Johannes 270
Michael N., 86, 97
Milan 28, 285, 303, 321
Milán, Luis de 308–310, 313
Miller, Johann 24, 25, 31, 32, 33, 34, 36, 214
Minervius, Simon 88, 103
Monte, Giovanni 265
Montesdoca, Martin de 313–319, 322, 323, 324
Montilla 311
Moraes, Cristóbal de 128, 311, 314, 317, 324
Moretus family (printers) 281, 289, 297
Mörlin, Maximilian 273
Mosellanus, Petrus 268
Moulinié, Etienne 234
Moulu, Pierre 134, 141, 145
Mudarra, Alonso 306, 308, 309, 310, 318, 319, 321, 322
Munich 1, 23, 25, 27, 42, 47, 48, 49, 52, 53, 54, 55, 60, 86, 91, 92, 94, 107, 116, 117, 121, 133, 142, 162, 165, 219, 220, 228
Murmellius, Johann 268
Narváez, Luis de 309, 310, 313, 322
Nebrija, Antonio de 310
Neuber, Valentin 251, 252, 261, 274, 275–276
Neusidler, Hans 1, 143, 216, 227
Neusidler, Melchior 219, 228
Niepo, Agostino 93, 94
notation 7, 10, 20, 23, 24, 28, 30, 31, 32, 33, 34, 37, 39, 42, 46, 54, 65, 72, 73, 91, 92, 112, 123, 127, 128, 129, 214, 226, 231, 235, 237, 238, 239, 260, 303, 304, 305, 309, 310, 311, 312, 315
Nutius, Martin 321
Obrecht, Jacob 21, 34, 134
Ockham, William of 310
Oeglin, Erhard 22–35, 38, 39, 85–108
Okeghem, Johannes 134, 141
organs 208, 213, 219, 235, 237, 239, 308, 311; see also keyboards
Ösler, Wolfgang 210
Osuna 310–312, 318–319, 322, 323, 324
Osuna, Francisco de 315
Othmayer, Caspar 256, 257, 258, 264, 273, 277
Ott, Hans 7, 133, 134, 135, 142, 143, 144, 213, 215–216, 226, 227, 257
Ovid 96
Pacheco, Isabel 311
Padua 8, 91
Pallavicino, Benedetto 187
Paris 5, 6, 8, 9, 10, 37, 51, 57, 135, 140, 142, 179, 185, 187, 221, 231–243, 280, 281, 283, 284, 285, 287, 293, 294, 295, 303, 306
Parran, Antoine 234, 241
Peiresc, Nicolas-Claude Fabri de 231, 235, 236, 240, 241, 242
Perrin, Francois 69
Peru 313, 318, 322
Peschin, Gregor 256, 264, 277
Pesnot, Charles 291
Petreius, Johannes 1, 7, 9, 12, 60, 102, 105, 133, 144, 141, 142, 143, 145, 178, 213, 215, 216, 227, 251
Petrobelli, Francesco 183, 192, 200
Petrucci, Ottaviano 7, 9, 10, 13, 20, 21, 28, 31, 33, 34, 38, 47, 57, 68, 133, 135, 142, 208, 225
Peuerbach, Georg von 93
Peutinger, Conrad 22, 23, 25, 104, 210
Pevernage, Andreas 284, 285, 289, 290, 291, 297, 299
Phalèse family (printers) 7, 11, 166, 176–203, 264, 289, 293, 296, 299, 324
Philips, Peter 188, 189
Phinot, Dominique 157
Pipelare, Matthaeus 134, 139, 144
Pisador, Diego 309, 322
Pisan, Christine de 207
Plantin, Christophe 5, 8, 12, 13, 174, 177, 178, 196, 280–302
playing-cards 305, 320
Pliny 313
Poggioli, Antonio 183
Polono, Stanislao 304, 305, 320
Poppius, Menso 267
Porras, Juan de 310, 311
Portugal 281, 303, 305, 306, 311, 317
printing technique: single-impression 10, 19, 29, 33, 34, 37, 38, 57, 73, 80, 112, 113, 128, 185, 309, 311–312, 317; multiple-impression 9, 10, 19–40, 57, 58, 69, 73, 85, 100, 208, 214, 311
Prudentius 34
Pulgar, Hernando de 307, 321
punches 9, 30, 42, 112, 305, 311
Racquet, Charles 239
Ramos de Pareja, Bartolomé 313
Ratz, Abraham 219
Rauscher, Hieronymus 270, 272
Rebhun, Paul 271
Reformation 3, 8, 29, 33, 65–84, 107, 111–132, 133–148, 298, 319
Regiomontanus, Johannes 93, 265
Regnart, Jacob 219
Rener, Adam 133–135, 138, 139, 140, 144
Renialme, Ascanius de 284, 287
Reuchlin, Johannes 38, 92, 214
Reusch, Johann 114, 120, 128, 264
Rhu, Georg 5, 7, 12, 13, 60, 102, 111–132, 133–148, 256, 271
Rhegius, Urbanus 98, 272
Richelieu, Cardinal (Armand Jean du Plessis) 236
Robletti, Giovanni Battista 183, 198
Roggius, Nicolaus 263
Roh, Jan 259, 260, 270
Roman Catholicism 29, 75, 184
Ronsseus, Balduinus 266
Römer, Georg 271
Roselli, Petrus 133–141, 144
Rostock 128, 135, 138, 142, 145
Rotenbucher, Erasmus 256, 257, 276
Rouen 233, 280, 285, 294, 295
Rovetta, Giovanni 183, 189, 191, 192, 193, 199, 200
Ruff, Simprecht 24, 26–28, 31–33, 35, 36, 39
Rynmann, Johannes 22, 38
Sacrobosco, Johannes de (John of Holywood) 93, 306, 307, 308, 310, 321, 322
Sala, Giuseppe 178, 196
Salamanca 285, 310, 311, 315, 320, 322
Sales, Franz 185, 186, 210, 220, 228
Salminger, Sigmund 1, 50, 59, 213, 216
‘Sampson’, 134, 140
Sarciereus, Erasmus 271
Savonarola, Girolamo 272
Scandello, Antonio 264
Schalreuter, Jodocus 113, 115, 119, 128
Schedel, Hartmann 8, 91, 92, 100, 104
Schein, Johann Hermann 221
Schimp, Wendel 270
Schiltberger, Hans 266
Schmalzting, Georg 271
Schmidlap, Johannes 271
Schöffer, Peter the Younger 11, 28–35, 37, 38, 39, 68, 73, 78, 79, 81, 120, 128, 215, 217, 226, 255
Schott, Johann 214, 226
Schottenius, Hermann 267
Schryphius, Johannes 267
Schultz, Johannes 221
Schütz, Heinrich 221
Schwan, Johann 68, 70, 72, 77
Schwartz, Andreas 258
Schwecher, Christoph 258
Scotto, Girolamo 114, 128, 321
Séguiers, Pierre 236
Selvecker, Nikolaus 105, 227
Sennl, Ludwig 25, 34, 38, 86, 88, 96, 103, 105, 107, 114, 134, 137, 138–140, 143, 144, 226
Serpilius, Georg 261, 277
Serranus, Johann 267
Seville 4, 11, 281, 303–326
Sheppard, John 44, 46, 58
slavery 306, 321
soggetto cavato 134
Sonnius, Michel 284, 287, 292
Spain 9, 41, 57, 163, 281, 283, 288, 303–326
Spangenberg, Johannes 102, 114, 263, 265, 268, 269, 271
Speyer 226
Spinola, Carolo 288, 289
Spirinck, Jan 290
Stabius, Johannes 210
Stahel, Johann 134, 140
Stangwald, Andreas 98
Staupitz, Johannes von 111
INDEX

Steelant, Philippus van 181, 192
Steelensis, Johannes 164, 174, 322
Stifel, Michael 251, 252, 276
Stirpianus, Johannes 268
Stöckel, Wolfgang 111
Stockholm 9, 101
Stöffler, Johannes 93
Susato, Tylman 6, 7, 12, 47, 50, 54, 55, 56, 57, 59, 60, 151–175, 196, 256, 264
Sweden 41
Tallis, Thomas 42–47, 55, 56, 57, 58, 297
Tarditi, Orazio 183, 190, 191
Tassin, Christophe-Nicolas 236, 242
Téllez-Girón, Juan 310
theology 69, 72, 74, 76, 111, 115, 116, 118, 209, 219, 233, 236, 314, 315
Titelouze, Jean 183, 193, 198
Toledo 133, 142, 311
Torgau 113–114, 120, 123–124, 135–137, 140
Tournai 181, 185, 186, 187, 209, 256, 264
Tricasso, Patricio 266
Tritonius (Treiberaif), Petrus 22, 34, 38, 85, 86, 88, 89, 92, 95, 96, 97, 98, 99, 102, 103
Trugillo, Sebastián 318
type and typography 1, 5, 8, 9, 10, 12, 13, 19–40, 41–62, 65, 68, 80, 85, 100, 112, 113, 115, 123, 133, 137, 151–175, 178, 179, 196, 197, 212, 231–244, 252, 253, 262, 263, 275, 276, 287, 291, 296, 297, 305, 307–319, 322, 323; see also fonts, matrices, punches
Ulhart, Philipp, the Elder 24, 38, 49, 50, 59, 60, 216, 226, 227
Ulmer, Johann 265
Ulsenius, Dietrich 102
Ungut, Meinardo 304, 305, 320
Utrecht 161, 181, 185, 186, 187, 197, 285, 293, 294, 295
Vaet, Jacobus 156
Valderrábano, Enrico de 309, 322
Valerius Flaccus 311, 322
Valladolid 306, 311, 322, 323
Valtanás, Domingo de 314, 315, 318
Varela, Juan de 305, 306, 318, 320
Vásquez, Juan 310, 315, 317, 319, 322, 323, 324
Veracruz 281, 283, 288
Vergil 268
Vermeeren, Anthonis 181, 193, 198
Vienna 1, 27, 34, 48, 88, 91, 102, 123, 207, 211, 212, 217, 218, 221, 223, 224, 225, 226, 275, 281
Vietor, Hieronymus 27–28, 31–36, 38
Vietor, Johann Ludwig 276
vihuelas 306, 308, 309, 310, 313–314, 321, 322
Vincenti family (printers) 183, 197, 200, 296, 299
Virida, Juan de 305
Wanteneel, Hans 284
Ward, Roger 44, 57
Weimar 136, 142
Weiße, Michael 67
Weller, Hieronymus 265, 267, 271, 272, 273
Willaert, Adriaan 156, 298, 314
Wittenberg 5, 7, 34, 39, 65, 67, 68, 70, 71, 73, 77, 97, 102, 104, 111–132, 134, 139, 140, 143, 144, 259, 276
Wolfgang Pfalzgraf Pfalz-Zweibrücken 258
Wolfgang Wilhelm, Count Palatine of Neuburg 177, 181, 198
Wöllfin, Sigmund 268
Wolters, Bernard 288
Worms 29, 34, 35, 68, 209, 218
Wrocław see Breslau
Wyssgerber, Christoffel 96
xylography see woodcuts
Yssandon, Jean 234
Zanger, Philippe 293
Zapata, Gaspar 305, 306, 318, 320
Zell, Katharina 8, 67, 68, 72, 76, 78, 79
Zirler, Stephan 256, 264
Zwickau 86, 115, 119, 125, 216
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