INTRODUCTION

Most of Senfl’s works that were published during the sixteenth century first appeared in anthologies, above all in the collections edited by Hans Ott. However, there is a small number of prints cited in bibliographies that contain only works by Senfl, including sets of partbooks of magnificats and odes, a mass ordinary, and the “lost” Quinque salutationes. An overview, ordered by year (except for reprints which are listed immediately after the first edition), is given in Table 1. RISM identifies the printer of only four of the prints (1, 3–5), and gives a date for only seven of the prints (1, 3–6, 11, and 13; but its postulated date for 6 is not supported by more recent evidence). Evidence in this chapter identifies the printer of each of the prints, and gives a postulated date (or revised postulated date) for each of the undated prints.¹

Table 1: Senfl Einzeldrucke

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>#</th>
<th>YEAR</th>
<th>AUTHOR/EDITOR: TITLE</th>
<th>PLACE: PUBLISHER</th>
<th>RISM</th>
<th>VD16</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1</td>
<td>1520</td>
<td>L. Senfl [ed.]: Liber selectarum cantionum</td>
<td>Augsburg: S. Grimm &amp; M. Wirsung</td>
<td>S 2804 1520</td>
<td>S 5851</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2</td>
<td>1526</td>
<td>Quinque salutationes</td>
<td>Nuremberg</td>
<td>—</td>
<td>—</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3</td>
<td>1534</td>
<td>Varia carminum genera</td>
<td>Nuremberg: H. Formschneider</td>
<td>S 2806</td>
<td>ZV 26802</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4</td>
<td>1537</td>
<td>Magnificat octo tonorum</td>
<td>Nuremberg: H. Formschneider</td>
<td>S 2807</td>
<td>ZV 26537</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5</td>
<td>1538</td>
<td>S. Heyden: Catechistica summula fidei christiana</td>
<td>Nuremberg: J. Petreius</td>
<td>S 2808</td>
<td>ZV 7913</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

* I would like to thank Grantley McDonald for insightful comments on an earlier draft of this chapter, and Stefan Gasch and Sonja Tröster for their sharp editorial eyes. I did not examine all of the Senfl Einzeldrucke first hand, but in cases where I did not I used digital scans. I am grateful to the following libraries that allowed me to visit and examine rare prints in their collections: A-Wn, D-Ju, D-Kl, D-Mbs, D-Nla, D-Rs, and D-ROu.

The prints can be divided into four groups:

1. Prints that have been identified in bibliographies as Einzeldrucke but which are not Einzeldrucke: nos. 1–2
2. Formschneider prints: nos. 3–4
3. Petreius prints and their reprints: nos. 5–10

A bibliographical description of each of the prints in groups 2–4 is given in the appendix together with, for nine of the ten extant prints, a reference to a freely available complete digital online scan; given the availability of these scans, no facsimiles are included in this chapter. Most of the prints in groups 2–4 have received relatively little attention in the literature; indeed, only two of eleven, nos. 3 and 13, were cited as sources in the 11-volume Senfl, Sämtliche Werke (1937–1974).

GROUP 1: “EINZELDRUCKE” THAT ARE NOT EINZELDRUCKE

The two prints in the first group are not actually Einzeldrucke. The first is included here because it is listed in RISM under the Senfl Einzeldrucke, but it is an anthology. The second is included here because it has been frequently cited in the literature, but it is a “ghost.”
1. L. Senfl (ed.): *Liber selectarum cantionum* (Augsburg: S. Grimm & M. Wirsung, 1520)

The *Liber selectarum cantionum* is a very famous motet anthology, and there is an extensive literature on it. Although included by RISM as an Einzeldruck, it is an anthology edited by Senfl and so should be deleted from the list of his Einzeldrucke. For the transmission of Senfl's works it is of great interest owing to his inclusion of several of his own motets, which we may assume he considered to be his finest work in this genre written before 1520.

2. *Quinque salutationes* (Nuremberg, 1526)

In his monumental *Biographie Universelle des Musiciens*, François-Josef Fétis gave as the first item in the list of works following the entry “Senfl”:


Such a print is not extant, nor has anyone since Fétis claimed it to be. Carl Ferdinand Becker (1847) cited the title. Fétis repeated the entry in 1867, without change, in the second edition of his *Biographie Universelle*. August Wilhelm Ambros (1868) cites the print and uses the title as evidence that Senfl was “musicus intonator” in Munich by 1526. Anselm Schubiger (1873) cites the print, but

---


4 Carl Ferdinand Becker, *Die Tonwerke des 16. und 17. Jahrhunderts oder Systematisch-chronologische Zusammenstellung der in diesen zwei Jahrhunderten gedruckten Musikalien*, Leipzig, 1847, col. 119; Becker’s entry is identical to that cited by Fétis, except that he writes “æ” as “ae,” and has “excuse” instead of “excussæ.” The entry in the second edition of Becker’s *Tonwerke* (Leipzig, 1855, col. 119) is identical to that in the first.

5 Vol. 8, 1867, p. 15.

adds no information additional to that given by Fétis. Robert Eitner (1876) accepts the print but states that he has never seen it, citing Ambros and Schubiger as his sources. Julius Joseph Maier (1879) notes, in his entry on D-Mbs Mus.ms. 10, that the first motet in that manuscript, the Quinque salutationes, had been printed, citing Fétis. Eitner (1892) uses information from the title page to argue that Senfl was in Munich as "Musicus intonator" by 1526. Adolf Sandberger (1894) cites Fétis, Ambros, and Schubiger, giving the title, uses it as evidence that Senfl was attached to the Munich Hofkapelle in 1526, and notes that although the print is lost, the work exists in manuscript in Munich. Theodor Kroyer (1903) is sceptical: he refers to it as the "alleged" print, his argument, in translation, that "we have well-founded cause to believe that Fétis is in error, because the pursuance of his footsteps leads finally to a copy of the Munich manuscript"; subsequent scholars have generally ignored his view. Eitner (1904) includes the print in the bibliography of his entry on Senfl, noting that it was cited by Becker and by Carl Proske in his Musica Divina; he notes manuscript concordances in Munich and Brussels, and a concordance that was entered into the catalogue of the library of the Paris Conservatoire that does not state whether it is a print or a manuscript. Paul Cohen (1927) questions the print, wondering whether it is not a manuscript. Arnold Geering (1965) is the first source of which I am aware that assigns the print to Formschneider, but he provides no evidence for this; mis-citing Fétis and Kroyer, he notes that the print

7 Anselm Schubiger, Die Pflege des Kirchengesanges und der Kirchenmusik in der deutschen katholischen Schweiz: Eine musikalisch-historische Skizze, Einsiedeln, [1873], p. 36.
13 Robert Eitner, "Senfl (Sennfl, Senfl, Senffel), Ludwig," in Biographisch-Bibliographisches Quellen-Lexikon der Musiker und Musikgelehrten, vol. 9, Leipzig, 1903, p. 140. The reference to Becker should be to column 119, not page 119. I have been unable to locate the reference to the preface of Carl Proske, Musica Divina, vol. 4, Regensburg, 1863 (posthumously edited by Georg Wesselack).
has been missing since 1867.\textsuperscript{15} Martin Bente (1968) states that Fétis’ case is almost convincing; presumably following Geering he assigns the print to Formschneider. He suggests, on account of the detailed dedication on the title page, that the manuscript in Munich was possibly the printer’s copy.\textsuperscript{16} Bartlett R. Butler’s (1970) acceptance of the print is qualified by “if Fétis was correct”; he suggests that Baumgartner may have been involved in having it printed in Nuremberg, although he concedes that there is no “concrete evidence” that they knew each other before 1530.\textsuperscript{17} Walter Gerstenberg (1974) does not offer an opinion but refers the reader to Kroyer (1903) and Bente (1968).\textsuperscript{18} Bente (1980/rev. 2001) includes Fétis’ city and date, but unlike his 1968 book does not assign a printer.\textsuperscript{19} Howard Mayer Brown (1986) cites Bente (1968) and assigns the print to Formschneider.\textsuperscript{20} Although there is a large body of literature that refers to the “lost” print and that uses it as a basis of information for observation and arguments, some of which are noted above, all references to a print of the Quinque salutationes ultimately derive from Fétis, who is therefore the single source of information about the print.

Important sources of information on sixteenth-century prints are sixteenth- and early seventeenth-century catalogues of institutional libraries and of private collections. No copy of a printed edition of the Quinque salutationes has been located in catalogues of collections that include music printed in the German-speaking area before 1540 (the date of the catalogue is included in brackets), including the court chapels at Kassel (1613);\textsuperscript{21} Jena (sixteenth century);\textsuperscript{22} Mont-

\begin{itemize}
  \item \textsuperscript{16} Martin Bente, Neue Wege der Quellenkritik und die Biographie Ludwig Senfl: Ein Beitrag zur Musikgeschichte des Reformationszeitalters, Wiesbaden, 1968, pp. 68f.
  \item \textsuperscript{17} Bartlett R. Butler, Liturgical Music in Sixteenth-Century Nürnberg: A Socio-Musical Study, Diss. University of Illinois at Urbana-Champaign, 1970, p. 413.
  \item \textsuperscript{18} Walter Gerstenberg, critical commentary to Senfl, SW XI, p. 125.
  \item \textsuperscript{19} Martin Bente, “Senfl, Ludwig,” in New Grove, vol. 17, p. 135, in the works list as Ave Domine Jesu Christe, 4vv, Quinque salutationes (Nuremberg, 1520); Martin Bente and Clytus Gottwald, “Senfl, Ludwig,” in New Grove, vol. 23, p. 84.
  \item \textsuperscript{20} Howard Mayer Brown, “Introduction,” in Munich, Bayerische Staatsbibliothek, Mus. Ms. 10, New York, 1986 (Renaissance Music in Facsimile 14), p. vii, fn. 7: “On the possibility that this first motet in Munich 10 may have been intended as copy for a printer and that Hieronymus Formschneider of Nuremberg may actually have printed the motet in 1526 as a separate publication, see Bente, Neue Wege, pp. 68–69.”
  \item \textsuperscript{21} Ernst Zulauf, “Beiträge zur Geschichte der Landgräflich-Hessischen Hofkapelle zu Cassel bis auf die Zeit Moritz des Gelehrten,” in Zeitschrift des Vereins für hessische Geschichte und Landeskunde, Neue Folge 26 (1903), pp. 1–144, esp. 99–136.
  \item \textsuperscript{22} See the unpublished sixteenth-century catalogue D-Ju Ms. Appendix 22B (4d) “Cantionum varia libri insigniti.”
\end{itemize}
béliard (1555),22 Neuburg an der Donau (1544),24 or Stuttgart (1589);25 the library of Duke Albrecht of Prussia (1540–1548);26 the extraordinary private collections of Hans Heinrich Herwart (ca. 1586),27 the Fuggers (1566),28 Georg von Werdenstein (1592),29 and above all Fernando Colón (1530s), who “owned a copy of nearly every now known music book published up to and including 1535, plus a considerable number that have disappeared altogether,” including most extant German prints of polyphonic music from this period;30 or the catalogues of other church or school libraries including the Kantorei St Anna, Augsburg (1620),31 Kantorei, Bitterfeld (1575),32 Kreuzkirche, Dresden (1575, 23 Christian Meyer, "Un inventaire des livres et des instruments de musique de la chapelle des Comtes de Montbéliard (1555),” in FAM 38 (1991), pp. 122–129.
30 Catherine Weeks Chapman, "Printed Collections of Polyphonic Music Owned by Ferdinand Columbus,” in JAMS 21 (1968), p. 34 (quotation) and pp. 56–84 (catalogue). From the extant catalogues of his collection, it is known that Columbus purchased music and music treatises in Nuremberg in December 1521, including a copy of the first edition of the Tritonius odes. See Dragan Plamenac, "Excerpta Colombiana: Items of musical interest in Fernando Colón’s „Regestrum,” in Miscel·l·inea en Homenatge a Monseñor Higinio Anglés, Barcelona, 1958–1961, vol. 2, pp. 663–687; the eleven items purchased in Nuremberg are nos. 79, 90, 134, 624, 905, 922, 946, 1439, 1471, 1496, and 1781 (pp. 669–674). Some of these prints had previously been mentioned in Higinio Anglés, "La música conservada en la Biblioteca Colombina y en la Catedral de Sevilla,” in AnnM 2 (1947), pp. 3–39; the prints purchased in Nuremberg are listed in the first part of his catalogue (pp. 8–26) as nos. 49–50 (= Plamenac 90), 52 (= 1496), 54 (= 1471); and in the second part of his catalogue (pp. 26–30) as nos. 1–2 (= 624), 3 (= 905), 4 (= 922), and 6 (= 1781).
31 Richard Schaal, Das Inventar der Kantorei St. Anna in Augsburg, Kassel, 1965 (Catalogus musici 3).
masses, lamentations, hymns, and magnificats by Carpentras published in the Thomaskirche, Leipzig (1551, 1557, 1564), or the Stadtschule, Meissen (1575).

The print is not cited in the retrospective music bibliographies published in Conrad Gesner’s Pandectae (1548), the eleven bibliographies of Georg Willer, Johannes Cless, or Georg Draudius (1592 to 1625), or among the 1299 music prints in Paulus Bolduanus’ Bibliotheca philosophica (1616).

Although many sources have not survived, Fétis states that the print is in folio and, as large and costly prints, folio.

There is only a single extant sixteenth-century source of the Quinque salutationes: Munich, Bayerische Staatsbibliothek, Mus.ms. 10, fol. 1r–18v. This manuscript was copied between 1525 and 1530 for the court chapel of Duke Wilhelm

37 Rautenstrauch, Luther und die Pflege der kirchlichen Musik (as in fn. 32), pp. 76–78.
38 PANDECTARVM SIVE || Partitionum uninuerfalum Con || radi Gfnreri Tigrinui, medici || & philofohpie profello || ris, libri XXI. || … || TIGVR1 EXCVDEBAT CRISTO-PHORS || Frohschouerus, Anno M.D.XLVIII. ||. The chapter on music is on fol. 81r–86v; the titles are listed in the appendix to the chapter on fol. 84r–86v (exemplar examined: GB-Lbl 130.g.9). A transcription of the music bibliography appears in Lawrence F. Bernstein, “The Bibliography of Music in Conrad Gesner’s Pandectae (1548),” in AMI 45 (1973), pp. 119–163.
39 Horst Heussner and Ingo Schultz, Collectio Musica: Musikbibliographie in Deutschland bis 1625, Kassel, 1973 (Catalogus musicae 6); a facsimile of the music sections of the 1611 and 1625 Draudius bibliographies is published in Konrad Ameln, Georg Draudius: Verzeichnisse deutscher musikalischer Bücher 1611 und 1625, Bonn, [1957].
40 Donald W. Krummel, Bibliotheca Bolduaniana: A Renaissance Music Bibliography, Detroit, 1972 (Detroit Studies in Music Bibliography 22), includes German music prints from the 1530s.
IV of Bavaria, where Senfl was employed from 1523 until his death in 1543. The dedication from Senfl to Duke Wilhelm IV, cited as the title by Fétis, reads in translation:

Five salutations of our Lord Jesus Christ, by commission of the most illustrious Prince and Lord, William, Count of the Rhenish Palatinate and Duke of both Bavarias, etc., prepared and presented by Ludwig Senfl, humble musician of the same illustrious Duke, with the highest zeal and obedience.

In the second edition of his Biographie Universelle, Fétis refers to the Quinque salutationes as being in this manuscript (p. 14), but does not delete the reference to the print, and so believed that they were different sources.

D-Mbs Mus.ms. 10 contains fourteen works, ten of which were published in the Novum et insigne opus musicum (vol. 1 = RISM 1537 and vol. 2 = RISM 1538) by Hans Ott. Of the four that are not included in Ott’s edition, two were presumably excluded because Josquin’s settings of the same texts (Miserere mei deus I.13 and O virgo prudentissima I.37) were included in the edition, and one is in German and would therefore be out of place in a printed collection including only Latin-texted pieces. The only Latin-texted work that would not duplicate other texts that was excluded is the Quinque salutationes. Was it omitted because it had been previously published? Another manuscript, D-Mbs Mus.ms. 12 forms a two-volume set with Mus.ms. 10, and six of the ten works in Mus.ms. 12 also appear in the Novum et insigne opus musicum (nos. 1, 2, 3, and 5 in RISM 1537 and nos. 6 and 8 in RISM 1538). One of the motets in Mus.ms. 12 that was not published by Ott carries, like the Quinque salutationes, an elaborate dedication to Wilhelm IV — again, the only work in the manuscript with such a dedication.

---

41 Brown, Mus. Ms. 10 (as in fn. 20), p. v.
42 There is only one known sixteenth century source for each of these motets.
43 D-Mbs Mus.ms. 12, fol. 1r–19r = Novum et insigne opus musicum vol. I, no. 5; fol. 20r–31r = I.2; fol. 32r–54r = I.6; fol. 70r–95r = I.22; fol. 96r–111r = II.13; fol. 121r–132r = II.10 (the text of the secunda pars was changed by Ott to “Eya mater”). Motets 1–5 may have been intended for publication in volume I, and motets 6–10 for volume 2. Motet 4 was excluded from volume I presumably owing to the dedication to the Duke. Motet 10, Popule meus quid feci, was presumably excluded from volume II as it was printed by Rhaw in RISM 1538, and motets 7 and 9 may have been excluded from volume II which, unlike volume I, owing to a change in editorial practice by Ott is less likely to include motets that are Marian (Gaude dei genitrix virgo) or that commemorate particular Saints (O gloriosum lumen).
44 D-Mbs Mus.ms. 12, motet 4, fol. 55r–60r, Mater digna Dei; the dedication on fol. 55r reads: “Oratio ad incomparabilem Virginem || Mariam com[m]endatitio, ex f[ing]ulari || deuotione et mandato, Serenissimi || utiusque || Principis Guilielmi || ipse || utius || clementis || Principis || ob= || diruendo || dicataq[ue]. ||”
Are we to postulate a second lost print? The *En opus musicum festorum dierum*, a set of four manuscripts containing works by Isaac and Senfl (D-Mbs Mus.mss. 35–38), carries an elaborate title and a dedication to Wilhelm IV dated 1531, and virtually none of the large number of works by Senfl in these manuscripts was published in the sixteenth century. Are we to postulate a third lost print? A simple hypothesis, which would explain these dedications, is that the works with elaborate dedications were prepared for the Duke himself (the manuscripts are not illuminated and so are unlikely to have been intended as gifts from the Duke), and that the works were not intended for publication, but restricted to performance in the Duke’s own chapel, possibly at the Duke’s own command.
The print was not in Munich in 1795, as it is not listed in the detailed catalogue copied by Johann Baptist Bernhart, nor was it there in 1879 as Maier, in his catalogue of the Munich manuscripts, cites Fétis for a printed concordance to Mus.ms. 10. It is not in the catalogue of the Fétis collection printed in 1877, nor is it known to RISM France which is important as Fétis was librarian of the Paris Conservatoire from 1586 to 1830 and so would have been familiar with music sources in Paris. Thus, there is no evidence, direct or circumstantial, that the *Quinque salutationes* was printed, other than Fétis’ claim, which must now be examined in more detail.

Fétis cites a number of writers in his article on Senfl, including Sebald Heyden, Glareanus, Johann Gottfried Walther, Ernst Ludwig Gerber, Alexandre-Étienne Choron and François Joseph Fayolle, Felix Joseph Lipowsky, Friedrich Adolf Beck, and cites from Johann Nikolaus Forkel’s *Musikalischer Almanach … 1784* and the preface to the *Liber selectarum cantionum*. The text is followed by a work list of fourteen prints (“7” is used twice, cited 7[i] and 7[ii]) and eight manuscripts. There is no evidence that Fétis saw the originals of any of the sixteenth-century prints or manuscripts that he cites. All twenty-two sources, and virtually all of the information about them, are found in the following six reference works that are listed in the published catalogue of his library:

48 B-Br Ms. II 4138 Mus. Fétis 5379: Johann Baptist Bernhart, Churfürstl. Hofbibliothek Scriptor, *CATALOGVS || LIBRORVM MUSICORVM || TVM MANVSCRIPTORVM || TVM IMPRESSORVM, IN || ELECTORALI BIBLIOTHE- || CA BAVARICA MONA- || CEN- || SI ASSERVATORVM. || Preface dated 29 July 1795. I am grateful to B-Br for supplying me with a microfilm of this manuscript.

49 See fn. 9.

50 *Catalogue de la Bibliothèque de F. J. Fétis acquise par l’État belge*, Brussels, 1877.

51 I am indebted to Dr Catherine Massip, head of RISM France and Directeur of the Département de la Musique, Bibliothèque Nationale de France, for this information.

52 Fétis had a copy of each of these in his private library; see the *Catalogue de la Bibliothèque de F. J. Fétis*, pp. 640f., #5458; p. 671, #5726; p. 374, #3107 and pp. 374f., #3108; p. 554, #4688; p. 554, #4689; p. 557, #4718; p. 544, #4597 and p. 428, #3552; and pp. 207f., #1679, respectively.

53 The number assigned in the *Catalogue de la Bibliothèque de F. J. Fétis* is given in square brackets at the end of each entry. Fétis followed a similar procedure in preparing the second edition, where the works list includes eight manuscripts for which the descriptions are extended and the references to Thibaut removed, and twenty-three prints; prints 15, 17, 18 and 19 were taken from Anton Schmid, *Ottaviano dei Petrucci da Fossombrone, der erste Erfinder des Musiknotendruckes mit beweglichen Metalltypen, und seine Nachfolger im sechzehnten Jahrhunderte*, Vienna, 1845, pp. 168–170, 162, 185f., and 199.


5. Verzeichnis der von dem verstorbenen Grossh. Badischen Prof. der Rechte und Geheimenrathe Dr. Anton Friedrich Justus Thibaut zu Heidelberg hinterlassenen Musikaliensammlung, welche als ein Ganzen ungetrennt veräußert werden soll, Heidelberg, 1842, p. 30; the entries on Senfl are #472–#479.24 [#5180]

6. Manuscripts from the Perne collection purchased by Fétis in 1834.55 [Many, including #1679, #1808, and #1810–#1812]

The list below is ordered as follows: the number assigned to the items by Fétis in his Senfl work-list, identification of the prints and manuscripts by RISM sigla, a transcription of Fétis’ entry, a transcription of Fétis’ postulated source/s, and comments or discussion. Fétis lists the Einzeldrucke first (1–3), then the anthologies (4–11), and then the manuscripts (12–19).

1. Lost. Perne manuscript, Fétis #1808, no. 12. Does not include the information on date and place of publication or format.

2. RISM S 2807. "Magnificat octotonorum [sic] quatuor vocum, auctore Ludovico

54 Anton Thibaut (1772–1840) was a German amateur musician, resident in Heidelberg from 1803; his collection of sacred vocal music and folksongs “became one of the largest of its kind in Germany.” Richard D. Green, “Thibaut, Anton Friedrich Justus,” in *New Grove*, vol. 25, p. 393. A digital scan of the exemplar in D-Mbs is available online at urn:nbn:de:bvb:12-bsb10509960-3.


4. RISM 1520. “Liber selectarum cantionum quas vulgo mutetas appellant sex, quinque et quatuor vocum, Augsburg, 1520, in-folio m°, sans nom d’imprimeur. On y trouve de Senfel le motet à six voix Sancte Pater divus decus, le motet à cinq voix Gaude Maria Virgo, et enfin, les motets à quatre voix: Discipulis Jesu com discipulis; Usque quo, Domine; Beati omnes qui timent Dominum. Ces motets ont été inconnus à tous les historiens de la musique.” Perne manuscript, Fétis catalogue # 1679, is a diplomatic transcription of the entire print but in which the name of the printer, according to the catalogue, has been omitted.


6. RISM 1547. “Glareani Dodecachordon, etc., Basileae per Henr. Petri, 1547, in-folio. On trouve dans cet excellent ouvrage un motet à quatre voix, de Senfel, morceau curieux établi sur le thème du solfège des divers intervalles, un Deus in adjutorium meum intende à quatre voix, et un canon énigmatique à trois voix avec l’inscription: Omne trinum perfectum.” Gerber 1790, cols. 501f.: “In Glareans Dodecach. findet man zwey kompositionen von ihm, als: 1) Deus in adjutorium meum intende, ein Exempel der Lydischen tonart mit 4 Stimmen, s. p. 233, und Omne trinum perfectum, ein dreystimmiger Canon in der Hypoäolischen Tonart, pag. 444.” The place and date of publication and the format are given in Gerber’s entry “Glarean,” in Neues historisch-biographisches Lexikon, vol. 2, 1812, col. 340. Fétis includes additional information, including the name of the publisher; he may have had direct acquaintance with an exemplar through his time as librarian at the Paris Conservatoire; he also had an exemplar in his private library (# 5726), but it is unknown when he acquired it.

7. [i] RISM 1544. Fétis’ detailed 15-line description – the most detailed of all the entries – is not transcribed here, but contains exactly the same information in the same order as Forkel, p. 676. Fétis was directed to Forkel by Gerber 1792, col. 502, who mentions this print in his entry on Senfl, citing Forkel’s Musikalmanach of 1784, p. 165, which gives much less detail than the Geschichte. There are a few typographical errors introduced by Fétis, such as “in” instead of “im” (line 4), and “Mannenmacher” instead of “Wannenmacher” (line 15). (In the second edition of Fétis, a typographical error results in the date being given as 1554.)

7. [ii] RISM 1542. “Psalmorum selectorum a praestantissimis hujus nostri temporis in arte musica artificibus in harmon. quatuor, quinque et sex vocum reductorum
Senfl in Print: The Einzeldrucke

Senfl, Nuremberg, 1542, in-4. Une deuxième édition de ce recueil a été publiée en 1553, dans la même ville. On y trouve les psaumes Miserere, et In exitu Israel, de Senfel. Gerber 1792, cols. 501f.: “... besitzt Herr Dokt. Forkel noch zwey Collectiones Psalmorum selectorum a praestantissimis huiss nostri temporis in arte musica artificibus in Harmonias quatuor, quinque, et six vocum redactorum, deren eine 1542 und die andere 1553 zu Nürnberg herausgekommen ist. In der ältern befindet sich, ausser 3) einer vierstimmigen Komposition der Worte: In Domino confido etc. und 4) einem Quinque: Ne reminiscaris etc. ” The title in Forkel and Gerber 1792, cols. 501f.: “… besitzt Herr Dokt. Forkel noch zwey Collectiones Psalmorum selectorum a praestantissimis huiss nostri temporis in arte musica artificibus in Harmonias quatuor, quinque, et six vocum redactorum, deren eine 1542 und die andere 1553 zu Nürnberg herausgekommen ist. In der ältern befindet sich, ausser 3) einer vierstimmigen Komposition der Worte: In Domino confido etc. und 4) einem Quinque: Ne reminiscaris etc. ” The title in Forkel and Gerber 1792, cols. 501f.: “… besitzt Herr Dokt. Forkel noch zwey Collectiones Psalmorum selectorum a praestantissimis huiss nostri temporis in arte musica artificibus in Harmonias quatuor, quinque, et six vocum redactorum, deren eine 1542 und die andere 1553 zu Nürnberg herausgekommen ist. In der ältern befindet sich, ausser 3) einer vierstimmigen Komposition der Worte: In Domino confido etc. und 4) einem Quinque: Ne reminiscaris etc. ”

Neither of the Senfl motets named by Fétis are in either edition of this anthology, but there are settings of these texts by Mouton in the first (RISM 1538, no. 23, and RISM 1539, no. 11).

Fétis writes at this point: “Lipowsky cite aussi les collections suivantes où l’on trouverait des compositions de Senfel; mais les titres qu’il en donne sont fort abrégés, et probablement peu exacts.”

Lipowsky, no. (c): “Teutsche Lieder mit 4 und 5 Stimmen. (Nürnberg 1534)” Gerber 1814, no. 6: “Lieder, von Senfl, Breitengraser und von Bruck, 1534 gedruckt.” (Gerber cites information from Lipowsky in his entry 23, apparently not realising that they are the same print; Gerber cites Dr Ernst Florens Friedrich Chlaudni for the information in his entry no. 6.)
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Lauing. 1587.”16 Fétis described these prints in his entry on Paix. Finally, he turns to manuscripts, writing “On trouve en manuscrit dans la bibliothèque royale de Munich quelques messes et motets de Senfel; en voici l’indication,” again drawing on Gerber 1814, adding additional information from the catalogue of the Thibaut collection.

12. D-Mbs Mus.ms. 5. “Missae Senfl, et P. Platensis, cod. 5. Une copie de la Messe paschale de ce recueil se trouvait dans la collection du professeur Thibaut, à Heidelberg.” Gerber, no. 9: “Missae s. Cod. 5. fol. reg. nebst des de la Rue Komposit.”; Fétis gives the Latinised form of La Rue, “Platensis.” Thibaut catalogue, p. 30, #477: “Missa paschalis 5 vocum”; this manuscript is now at D-Mbs Mus.ms. 1048. It is not known how Fétis knew that the mass transcribed by Thibaut was in this manuscript.

13. D-HEms/Th Sen [the work is also in D-Mbs Mus.ms. 10]. “Die Sieben Worte Christi (Les sept paroles du Christ). Une copie de cet ouvrage existait dans la bibliothèque du même amateur.” Thibaut catalogue, p. 30, #479, reads: “Die Sieben Worte Christi. Partitur nach einer Münchener Handschrift u. Clavierauszug. | Mit 21. a. St.|”; this manuscript is now at D-HEms/Th Sen. The Thibaut entry does not note that the work appears in either D-Mbs or more specifically in D-Mbs Mus.ms. 10, but Fétis reasonably inferred that the reference to a Munich manuscript was to D-Mbs.


56 Brown 1583, and Brown 1590; the latter is dated 1587 by Gerber and so may be a lost first edition (cf. Brown [1587]).
Item 3 is an interesting example of Fétis at work, and of the way errors creep in. He cites Lipowsky, who discussed the print and drew material from its preface but didn’t give the print’s title (from the information given it is the *Variae melodiae octo vocum*, cod. 52). Gerber, no. 19: “Variae Melodiae 8. voc. von Senfl. s. Cod. 52. Nebst Stücken von andern Komponisten.”

How certain is it that Fétis’ source of information was the Perne manuscript of the *Quinque salutationes* and not a print? All of the manuscripts and most if not all of the prints containing works by Senfl that were cited by Fétis appear to have been known to him only through sources that were in his personal library. That he did not search more widely is evident from the omission of many sources, including all of the manuscripts other than those cited by Gerber or in the Thibaut collection, and of a number of prints, including the *Novum et insigne opus musicum*, one of the central printed sources of Senfl’s works. The internal structure of the works list also supports this: both lists of prints, the *Einzeldrucke* and anthologies, draw on the postulated sources in the same order: Perne, then Gerber (supplemented by Forkel when cited by Gerber), then Lipowsky. Further, there are only two sources about which Fétis makes comments that are not drawn from secondary sources: the style of the music of the *Quinque salutationes* and the listing of the motets in the *Liber selectarum cantionum* together with the statement that those Senfl motets were unknown to historians of music; both of the postulated sources that form the basis for these comments are Perne manuscripts.

Only three manuscript sources of the *Quinque salutationes* have ever been cited: the sixteenth-century Munich manuscript (D-Mbs Mus.ms. 10, fol. 1r–18r), an eighteenth-century manuscript that was in the Paris Conservatoire (now F-Pn Mus. Ms. D. 12455), and the nineteenth-century Perne manuscript.
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(now B-Br Ms. II 3854 Mus. Fétis 1808, fol. 77r–83r). Fétis saw none of the other Munich material, and so there is no reason to believe that he saw Mus.ms. 1808. He owned the Perne manuscript. He would have been aware of the Paris manuscript through an annotation on the Perne manuscript, but it is not known if he ever saw that manuscript.

Fétis gave another clue when he wrote: “Les quatre parties de ces motets sont imprimées en regard: Je les ai mis en partition.” (“The four voices of these motets are printed in choirbook format: I have put them into score.”) This is the only Senfl work he refers to as having in score. An examination of the catalogue of Fétis’ library published in 1877 shows that the scores of Senfl’s works that he owned included one in a book by Becker, and others in manuscripts from the Perne collection (Fétis #1808, no. 12, *Quinque salutationes*; Fétis #1810, no. 15, the Senfl *Miserere*). The score to which Fétis refers is surely the Perne manuscript. Further evidence for this comes from a comparison of the titles as given by Fétis, Perne, the Paris manuscript, and the Munich manuscript (the line breaks are not noted; the titles are vertically aligned). The major changes are Fétis and Perne both omitting word twelve, “Domini,” and spelling word twenty-four as “Senflio” rather than “Sennphlio”; there are also changes which are insignificant in themselves, but which become significant when taken together, such as word twenty-five as “eijusdem” instead of “eiusdem,” and word thirty-two as “dicatæque” rather than “dicateque.” The errors with the ordering of the long and short “s” in “Jllustrisimi” and “Comiisione” in the Paris manuscript are silently corrected by Perne. The only instance in which Fétis significantly departs from the other sources is in the second last word where he has “ae” instead of the synonymous “et.”
Senfl in Print: The Einzeldrucke

Fétis:  
Quinque salutationes Domini nostri Hieus Christi, ex illustrissimi Principis

Perne:  
Quinque Salutationes Domini Nostri Hieus Christi, Ex Jllustrissimi Principis

Paris:  
Quinque salutationes domini Nefi Hieus Christi, Ex Jllustrissimi Principis

Munich:  
Quinque salutationes Dufi nefi Hieus Christi, Ex Jllustrissimi principis

Fétis:  
et Domini  Wilhelm Comitis Palatini Rheni, utriusque Bavariæ Ducis, etc.

Perne:  
et Domini  Wilhelm Comitis Palatini Rheni, utriusque Bavariæ Ducis, &c.

Paris:  

Munich:  

Fétis:  
Commissione a Ludovico Senflio ejusdem illust. D. musico intonatore humilimo

Perne:  
Comisione A Ludovico Senflio ejusdem illust. D. Musico Jntonatore humilimo

Paris:  

Munich:  

Fétis:  
excussæ dicatæque summis et studio ac obedientia

Perne:  
Excusæ dicatæque summis et studio et obedientia.

Paris:  
Excusae dicateq, Summis Et Studio, et obedientia.

Munich:  
excusae Dicateq, Suriās et studio, et obedientia.

Perne gives some information about his source: on the bottom right hand of the title page (fol. 77r) he wrote: “Ces motets existent a la Bibliothèque de L’Ecole Royale dans un cahier ou les quatre Parties sont copiées en regard. 12 mai 1823.” (“These motets exist in the library of the Royal School in a notebook where the four voices are copied in choirbook format. 12 May 1823.”) This note was written at the beginning of the copying; the date 20 June 1823 appears at the end of the work. This is apparently the source of Fétis’ information that the motets are copied “en regard.” A source similar to that described by Perne was in the Bibliothèque de L’Ecole Royale: it is the eighteenth-century manuscript now at F-Pn Mus. Ms. D. 12455. A comparison of the readings in the Munich manuscript with those in the Paris manuscript indicates that the Paris manuscript was copied from the Munich choirbook: the readings are identical except for a few errors, the page turns and ligation are identical, and the alignment of syllables to the text is generally identical. Thus the Paris manuscript is a diplomatic transcription of the Munich manuscript. Perne’s score contains errors that result from the errors in the Paris manuscript, independently confirming that it was copied from the Paris manuscript.63

Further evidence for a direct connection with the Munich manuscript is that

63 The Paris manuscript has a note on the bottom left hand of the title page that the work exists in score in Perne’s library (“cet ouvrage existe en Partition dans la Bibliothèque de M’ Perne.”).
another work by Senfl in a manuscript from the Perne collection is his *Miserere mei Deus*. Like the *Quinque salutationes*, it is found in only one extant source from the sixteenth century, D-Mbs Mus.ms. 10: indeed, it is the very next work in that manuscript. Bente has demonstrated that these two works belong to different sections of Mus.ms. 10, the first to part A and the second to part B, 64 which therefore does not permit the suggestion that both motets were intended as printer’s copy for the one volume. The *Quinque salutationes* occurs as the last work in Fétis #1808, which is otherwise devoted to eleven works by Josquin that had been published in prints, exemplars of which are in F-Pn; 65 the *Miserere* occurs as the last work in Fétis #1810, which is otherwise devoted to compositions from the late sixteenth and early seventeenth centuries that had been published in prints, exemplars of which are also in F-Pn. 66 Perne did not, however,

---

64 Bente, *Neue Wege* (as in fn. 16), p. 67.

65 I am grateful to B-Br for supplying me with a microfilm of this manuscript. All of the works in the manuscript, other than the *Quinque salutationes*, are copied from prints; one motet appears in both diplomatic transcription and score, all others in score only. The principal source, the Liber selectarum cantionum, was the source for seven of the twelve works in the manuscript (the folio number in the index to the Liber selectarum cantionum is given in brackets following the name of the motet): 1. *De profundis clamavi* (214); 2. *Inviolata integra et casta* (122); 3. *Miserere* (104); 4. *Stabat mater* (157) appears twice: first as a diplomatic transcription (on hand-ruled manuscript pages to match the layout of the staves in the print), followed by a score; 9. *Praeter rerum seriem* (14); 10. *Virgo prudentissima* (23); and 11. *O virgo prudentissima* (38). Glarean’s *Dodekachordon* is identified in the manuscript as the source for two consecutive motets: 7. *Planxit autem David*, inscribed “Glarean 418,” and 8. *Liber generationes*, inscribed “Glarean 376.” Two consecutive masses, nos. 5–6, *Missa L’homme armé* and *Missa La sol fa re mi* were printed in both RISM J 669 (1520), of which there is a complete exemplar at F-Pn Rés. Vm. 30; I have not collated the readings to confirm the source.

66 B-Br Ms. II 3856 Mus. Fétis 1810; I am grateful to B-Br for supplying me with a microfilm of this manuscript. For a list of its contents, see the Catalogue de la Bibliothèque de F. J. Fétis, p. 232, #1810. All pieces, except the *Miserere*, were certainly copied from prints; Perne usually identified the print from which he copied, and in one instance even identified the exemplar: on fol. 63v, at the end of no. 13, he wrote that the work was copied at the “Bibliothèque impérial” in 1809. Each of the identified prints is listed in Jules Ecorcheville, *Catalogue du Fonds de Musique Ancienne de la Bibliothèque Nationale*, Paris, 1910–1914, suggesting that this library was Perne’s source for all of the prints from which he copied. The majority of the pieces were copied from RISM 1628*, *Corolla musica missarum XXXVII* … Joannis Donfridi … (F-Pn Vm. 851), the relationship between the works in the manuscript and those in the print being 1=1, 2=2, 3=3, 4=4, 5=6, 6=7, 7=8, 9=9, 10=10, 11=11, 12=12. This source was explicitly indicated for five of the works; for example, at the end of the second work, on fol. 5r, Perne wrote that “this mass is the second in the collection of Donfrid”. Of the works not found in this print, No. 8 is in RISM 1611 (F-Pn Vm. 958), *Promptuarii musici … Collectore Abrahamo Schudato* … the heading of the score, on fol. 33r, reading “Lessus in obitu Annae Espichiae … authore Caspar Vincentii … anno 1611”, and the end of the work, on fol. 36r, reading “Extrait de la Collection de Schad…”. No. 13 is in RISM G 4870, Francisco Guerrero’s *Liber primus missarum, 1566* (F-Pn Rés. B. 1272), the heading of the score, on fol. 55v, reading “Missa pro defunctis authore Francisco Guerrero Hispaniensis 1566.” No. 14 is in RISM 1603 (F-Pn
copy these motets at the same time, as he dated the beginning of the copying of the Quinque salutationes "12 mai 1823," but dated the Miserere "octobre 1808." 67

Although the Perne manuscript supplies most of the information in Fétis’ entry, there is no clear evidence as to why Fétis believed the Quinque salutationes to have been printed, or how he arrived at the place of publication, date and format, the three pieces of information that he typically includes immediately after the title for every print. He may have assumed the Quinque salutationes to have been printed as all other works in the Perne manuscripts Fétis #1679, Fétis #1808, and Fétis #1810 (excluding the Miserere) had been printed, and in most instances Perne clearly indicated the print from which he copied. The obvious place of publication for a Senfl print after 1520 is Nuremberg: seven of the twelve prints cited by Fétis were printed there, and so Fétil may have inferred this. Likewise the format: although it was common practice in Italy to print choirbook format in quarto, it is reasonable to assume that a German publication in choirbook format would be in folio, for example the Liber selectarum cantionum. The date is not so easily explained. Although Fétis’ work is full of wrong dates, we can’t make specific inferences from generalizations, only generalizations from specific instances. Could Fétis have inferred it from the Perne manuscript? The title page of the Miserere in Fétis #1810, fol. 69r, dates the work 1530; fol. 69v contains a transcription and French translation of Gerber’s 1792 entry on Senfl, which states that he was Chapel Master in Munich ca. 1530, which is surely the source for the date on the title page. 68 Only a handful of printed volumes of polyphonic music are extant from 1526, mainly a series of seven reprints of Petrucci titles by Dorico. 69 Two works in Fétis #1808 may have been copied from one of these reprints, RISM J 669, and it is possible that Fétis’ date was somehow derived from this.

Although it is difficult to explain how Fétis arrived at some of the informa-

67 Each is an unrelated addition to an otherwise unified manuscript, which leaves open the possibility, although unlikely, that there were blank pages at the end of each volume after it was bound, and that Perne simply copied them into available space. That there may have been blank folios at the end of the manuscripts after binding is suggested by fol. 37v–50r of Fétis #1810 remaining blank.


69 RISM 1526−4, J 669, J 672, and J 675.
tion, it is certain that the only known source of information about a putative 1526 print of Senfl’s Quinque salutationes is an entry in Fétis’ Biographie Universelle, and there is overwhelming evidence that he based his entry on a manuscript copied by Perne, which was a scoring of a manuscript in the Bibliothèque de L’École Royale, which was a diplomatic transcription of D-Mbs Mus.ms. 10. Although it is virtually impossible to prove that something was not printed, there is no evidence that Senfl’s Quinque salutationes was printed during the sixteenth century; accordingly, the claims for this volume having existed must be dismissed.

GROUP 2: FORMSCHNEIDER PRINTS

Group two consists of two sets of partbooks printed by Hieronymus Formschneider,70 who was by far the most important printer of Senfl’s works, with more than 200 of them issuing from his press. Spread across 14 of his 17 prints, they far exceed the number of works by any other composer whose music was printed by Formschneider; the only other composer rivalling Senfl’s prominence in Formschneider’s output was Heinrich Isaac, driven by the printing of the 3-volume Choralis Constantinus (RISM I 89–I 91). No other composers were represented in his prints by more than fifty works; although Formschneider is well known as a printer of the works of Josquin, this is based on 24 motets and 5 masses in anthologies edited by Hans Ott.

Fomschneider’s prints are the most important sources for the transmission of Senfl’s secular works, and overall are second in importance only to the manuscripts from the Hofkapelle in Munich. Core to Formschneider’s output of Senfl’s works are the six anthologies printed for the publisher and bookseller Hans Ott, which contain 153 Tenorlieder and 18 motets attributed to Senfl.71 The Senfl Einzeldrucke printed by Formschneider, which are the only sets of partbooks among the Senfl Einzeldrucke, contain all of his known magnificats, and 31 of his 43 ode settings. Other Senfl works are found in the Trium vocum carmina (RISM 1538) and are intabulated in four of Hans Gerle’s five lutebooks;72 Senfl’s completions of a very small number of works by Isaac were printed in the third volume of the Choralis constantinus.

70 On Formschneider, see Gustavson, Hans Ott (as in fn. 1), pp. 69–176.
71 RISM 1534, 1536 (for attribution to Ott, see Gustavson, Hans Ott (as in fn. 1), pp. 10–16), 1537, 1538, 1539, and 1544.
72 Brown 1532, 1533, 1537, and 1546.
Given Grantley McDonald’s outstanding essay on the Senfl odes in volume 1 of the Senfl-Studien, it is necessary only to give here a brief outline of the printing of these partbooks. The Varia carminum genera is prefaced by a ten-page dedicatory letter by the humanist Simon Minervius to Bartholomeus Schrenck, which provides an important account of the circumstances surrounding the compilation and publication of the partbooks. Even more important is a series of eight letters from Minervius to the Nuremberg patrician, Hieronymus Baumgartner for, as private communications, they are far more candid. Five letters are extant; summaries of the other three exist in a sixteenth-century index to the letters prepared by Baumgartner’s nephew, Johann Ölhafen. From these letters, a number of things become evident. There was no direct contact between Senfl and the printer, Hieronymus Formsneider. Senfl sent the ode settings to Simon Minervius, who was also in Munich; Minervius then sent them to his brother-in-law Hieronymus Baumgartner in Nuremberg to arrange for their printing, for which Baumgartner approached the printer Hieronymus Forms Schneider. The ode settings were sent in several batches to Baumgartner, who collected them and passed them on to the printer.

The dedication and letters make it clear that neither Senfl nor Formsneider initiated the printing, but that the entire undertaking was driven by Minervius and Baumgartner. Senfl does not appear to have driven the selection of the ode settings that were included in the collection; for example, the inclusion of the hendecasyllabic verses was at the request of Baumgartner (letter 191), and Minervius claims that the settings of Horace were composed at his own request (letter 190). Senfl had no direct contact with the printer, although according to letter 188 he had agreed to look at the first copy to come off the press to check it for errors. This evidence concerning the printing of his odes and his lack of direct contact with the printer gives a precedent against which other prints devoted entirely or substantially to his works may be judged.

An unusual characteristic of the print is its format. Prints devoted to music, excluding prints in folio size, were usually in landscape (oblong) format. Vol-

---

umes of ode settings were almost always in portrait (upright) format, a format used for schoolbooks and literary works. This implies that musical settings of odes were not primarily seen as music prints. However, this print is not in portrait format, but in landscape format. The only other landscape format print of odes with which I am familiar is of odes by Johannes Frisius printed in Zürich by Christoph Froschauer. This implies that the Senfl odes may have been intended as primarily a musical print, which would distinguish it from, for example, the Öglin and Egenolf prints of Tritonius, or the Petreius prints of Hofhaimer and Senfl, all of which were in portrait format.

Further evidence for this is that publication was driven by Minervius, whose focus was on Senfl: a focus communicated not only by his preface and letters, but also by “LVDOVICO SENSELIO HELVETO” appearing in capitals on the title page, but also the name of Horace, while printed in the same size, with an initial capital only. The decision to publish an Einzeldruck may have been further influenced by the precedent set by the publication of the Tritonius ode settings as an Einzeldruck, the two collections being closely related: the first nineteen odes in the Senfl print are rearrangements of the tenors of the odes in the Tritonius print.

4. *Magnificat octo tonorum* (Nuremberg: H. Formscheider, 1537)

Volumes of music published in Germany in the first half of the sixteenth century, whether in anthologies or prints devoted to a single composer, tend to be generically unified: there are prints of *Tenorlieder*, of mass propers, of mass ordnaries, of motets, of magnificats, of Horatian odes, and of collections for vespers. None of the volumes of motets printed by Ott, Petreius, or Rhaw includes magnificat settings. Apart from a lost volume printed by Petrucci, printed vocal anthologies devoted solely to magnificats first appeared in 1534 printed by Attaingnant. Magnificat prints devoted to a single composer appeared from

---

76 The 1554 edition, RISM F 2002 and FF 2002, is available online as a digital scan at http://www.e-rara.ch/doi/10.3931/e-rara-684; I am grateful to Sonja Tröster for the information that the source is available online. The 1555 edition, RISM F 2003 and FF 2003, is at GB-Lbl K.i.e.16 and GB-Lbl Gren. 9408, appended to his *Brevis musicae isagoge*.
77 The Öglin prints are RISM T 1249, TT 1249, and T 1250; the Egenolf are RISM T 1251, TT 1251, and, with additional settings not by Tritonius, RISM 1551; the Petreius anthology of Hofhaimer and Senfl is RISM 1539; and the Petreius Einzeldruck of Senfl odes, RISM S 2808, is discussed below.
79 The magnificats printed by Petrucci in 1507 are known only from the catalogue of the collection of Ferdinand Columbus; see Chapman, *Printed Collections* (as in fn. 30), p. 63, #29. The other three magnificat anthologies were printed by Attaingnant in 1530 (intabulated for
1535, with Sixt Dietrich’s magnificats printed by Peter Schöffer, and Carpentras’ by Jean de Channey. This, the third such volume, comprises eight magnificat settings by Senfl, one in each of the eight tones. It is also significant for, as noted by Butler, “Senfl’s Magnificats constituted the first liturgical polyphony (strictly defined) ever to be published in Nürnberg.”

We know little about this print. The printer and date of publication are known from the colophon, but there is neither dedication nor preface, which is unusual for a Formschneider music print. We can learn something about the print from other music prints with which it was bound by sixteenth-century owners. Of the seven extant exemplars of this print, four are in original sixteenth-century bindings with other music prints (D-Kl, D-Mbs, D-Nla, and D-ROu), and three have been rebound in modern bindings and the original bindings cannot be reconstructed (A-Wn, B-Br, PL-Kj). Of the three known lost

organ, and also containing two preludes and a final Te Deum) and 1534; see Daniel Heartz, Pierre Attaingnant, Royal Printer of Music: A Historical Study and Bibliographical Catalogue, Berkeley, 1969, p. 240, #26, (RISM 1530), p. 206, #52 (RISM 1534), and p. 206; #53 (RISM 1534).

80 Magnificat octo tonorum Auctore Xisto Theodorico Liber I (RISM D 3017); and Liber Canti Magnificat omnium tonorum Authore Carpentras (RISM G 1574 and GG 1574).


82 The only two exceptions are RISM 1536 (which is the second volume of RISM 1534; the dedication and preface are in the first volume), and the third volume of Isaac’s Choralis Constantinus (RISM I 91; the preface and dedication are in the second volume, which was published simultaneously with the third, but five years after the first which has its own dedication and preface).

83 D-Kl: Officia (ut vocant) de nativitate (Wittenberg: G. Rhaw, 1543); Concentus octo, sex, quinque & quattuor vocum (Augsburg: P. Ulhart, 1543); Cantiones septem, sex et quinque vocum (Augsburg: M. Kriestein, 1543); Postremum vespertini officii opus, cuius priores partes, iam antea typis nostris adiit sunt. Magnificat octo modorum seu tonorum numero XXV (Wittenberg: G. Rhaw, 1544); Magnificat octo tonorum (Nuremberg: H. Formschneider, 1537). D-Mbs, Libri quindecim missarum (Nuremberg: J. Petreius, 1539); Missae tredecim missarum (Nuremberg: H. Formschneider, 1539); Officia paschalia (Wittenberg: G. Rhaw, 1539), Magnificat octo tonorum (Nuremberg: H. Formschneider, 1537). D-Nla, Novum et insigne opus musicum (Nuremberg: H. Formschneider, 1537); Magnificat octo tonorum (Nuremberg: H. Formschneider, 1537).

84 The exemplars in A-Wn, B-Br, and PL-Kj are in sixteenth-century bindings, and none are bound with other prints. A-Wn was bound in parchment by “Fr. Hollnsteiner Buchbinder in Wien” but was not cited in Schmid, Petruci (as in fn. 53) and so presumably entered the collection after this time; the catalogue card is dated 1847. There are remnants of tabs on fol. C6 of the Discantus and fol. G4 of the Contratenor, and the impression of a tab on fol. C4 of the Tenor, indicating that the partbooks were originally bound with another print or prints. B-Br bears the seventeenth-century ownership inscription of St Anna in Augsburg, and then entered and was subsequently sold by D-B in the nineteenth century as a duplicate; see Marcus de Schepper, “Ein Musikbuch für Martin Luther: Das Brüsseler Exemplar von Ludwig Senfls
exemplars, the binding of one is known from an early catalogue,\(^5\) the binding of another is known from a sixteenth-century index on the title page of an extant print,\(^6\) but we know nothing of the original binding of the third as it was not

*Magnificat octo tonorum* (Nürnberg 1537)," in *In Monte Artium* 4 (2011), pp. 79–87; PL-Kj, until 1945 in D-B, is in a blue paperboard binding and has no remnants of tabs to suggest that it had formerly been bound with other prints; written on the top right-hand corner of the title page of each partbook is, in black ink, "acc. 580.4"; I am grateful to Małgorzata Krzos, Oddział Zborów Muzycznych, Biblioteka Jagiellońska, for information on this exemplar (email dated 17 April 2013).


86 A sixteenth-century index in brown ink on the title page of five of the six partbooks of the *Novum et insigne opus musicum* at GB-Lbl K.3.d.1 indicates that the Discantus, Contratenor, Tenor, and Bassus partbooks of that print were originally bound with other prints; the following is transcribed from the Tenor: "1 Nouvo & Insigne opus Musicum Iosquinii & aliorum 4:5:6 voc.; "2 fecundus tonus"; "3 Modulationes selectisimae 4 voc.;" [Modulationes aliquot quattuor vocum selectissimae, quas vulgo modetis (Nuremberg: J. Petreius, 1538), RISM 1538]; "4 Lodouici Senfelij Magnificat." The title page of the Sexta Vox partbook of the *Novum et insigne opus musicum* indicates that it was bound with one other print: "1 Novi operis Mulci Iosquinii & aliorum primi tomj 6 Vox.;" "2 fecundi tonmi Quinta & sexta voces." The stamp "Ex Biblioth. Regia Berolinensis" on all partbooks but the Quinta Vox of the *Novum et insigne opus musicum*, and all partbooks of the *Secundus tomus novi operis musici*, indicates that these partbooks were once in D-B. As D-B owned two exemplars of this two-volume set of partbooks – a complete set which they still hold, and an incomplete set, missing the Quinta Vox of the *Novum et insigne opus musicum*, – the incomplete set was sold as a duplicate to A. Asher & Co, who produced one complete composite set from two incomplete sets of partbooks, selling the complete set to GB-Lbl and the remaining partbooks to Scheurleer.
described before it was destroyed in 1945 (D-Ddkk). Of the exemplars of the magnificats in the six known early bindings, three were bound with other music for the Mass and Office, suggesting a thematic binding; and three were bound with Ott publications printed by Formsneider in 1537 or 1538, suggesting that they were bound soon after purchase with other music prints purchased at the same time.

At first sight, we may wish to assign the publisher as Hans Ott, who intended to publish a comprehensive collection of Latin-texted liturgical music, and although we know of volumes of motets, mass ordinaries, and mass propers that he published or intended to publish, he never published magnificats (or other music for the office), and so this could be the “missing” volume of magnificats. The print is in the same format, printed by the same printer, and visually similar in layout to Ott’s other prints, and as noted above three exemplars are, or were, bound with Ott’s first motet anthology, the Novum et insigne opus musicum (1537). However, the compelling and inescapable counterargument against the suggestion that Ott initiated this publication is that the title page carries a six-year privilege: Ott’s 1533 privilege was for four years, and his 1545 privilege was for five years. The six-year privilege was not a typographical error, for it also appeared on another Formsneider print in 1538, the Trium vocum carmina; these are the only two Formsneider prints, musical or non-musical, to carry a six-year privilege. It is perhaps significant that the magnificats were published in the same format as the Novum et insigne opus musicum (quarto, four staves per page), and not in the same format as all of Formsneider’s polyphonic music prints prior to the Novum et insigne opus musicum (octavo, three staves per page). Further, the Ott anthologies and the Senfl magnificats are the only Formsneider quarto partbooks with four staves per page, his other quarto partbooks having five staves per page. The evidence provided by the examination of the early bindings must also be kept in mind, as must the gap in Ott’s publication programme that he did not subsequently attempt to fill. Although the evidence is

87 Although Moritz Fürstenau, “Mittheilungen über die Musikaliensammlungen des Königreichs Sachsen,” in Mittheilungen des Königlichen Sächsischen Alterthumsvereins 23 (1873), pp. 41–58, esp. p. 54, only lists three titles in D-Ddkk dating before 1577, a search of the digital version of Eitner’s Quellen-Lexikon (http://www.musik.uzh.ch/research/eitner-digital.html) produces eight titles: four Petreius titles (all complete), two Formsneider (the Senfl Magnificats, vol. 9, p. 140, listed as missing the Bassus, and the Novum et insigne opus musicum, vol. 7, p. 258, listed as “kompl. ?”), and one Rhaw (complete), all of which date from between 1537 and 1542, and one [Gutknecht] title from 1524. It is therefore possible that the Magnificats were bound with the Novum et insigne opus musicum, with the Bassus volume missing.
88 Gustavson, Hans Ott (as in fn. 1), pp. 51–56.
89 D-Nla (not in RISM), D-ROu, and that discussed in fn. 86.
90 See Gustavson, Hans Ott, p. 160.
far from clear, I suggest that Ott, who had by now established a reputation as a music publisher, may have acted as publisher or agent for an unknown third party (who owned the privilege), picking up the project because it filled in a gap in his publication programme. The identity of the person responsible for initiating the publishing of this set of partbooks remains a mystery.  

Regardless of the question of the publisher, the reason why these magnificats were published as an *Einzeldruck* is clear: there were recent precedents of publishing sets of *Magnificat octo tonorum* as *Einzeldrucke*; doing so would become something of a tradition. It is important to note that this is a *set* of magnificats: this is not a collection or anthology that brings together a number of different works selected by the editor (be it the composer or someone else). As such, this volume may be considered as similar to prints that are *Einzeldrucke* by default as they contain only a single work, rather than as similar to a single-author collection that brings together various works by the same composer.

**GROUP 3: PETREIUS PRINTS AND THEIR REPRINTS**

The third group is the prints of Petreius and their reprints. Petreius was the second most important printer of Senfl’s works after Formschneider. Of the twenty-one editions in Teramoto and Brinzing’s catalogue of Petreius’ music publications (which excludes the prints newly attributed to Petreius in this chapter, numbers 8 to 10 below), Senfl’s works appear in thirteen editions, more than any other composer; Josquin and Isaac are each included in ten editions. Senfl ranks third in total number of compositions, behind Josquin and, owing to his many works in an edition of ode settings, Hofhaimer. The first three prints in this section consist of a Petreius first edition, followed by two reprints.

5. S. Heyden, *Catechistica summula fidei christianae* (Nuremberg: J. Petreius, 1538)  
6. J. Rivius, *Libellus de ratione docendi* (Augsburg: P. Ulhart the Elder, [between 1557 and 1567])  

92 On Petreius, see Mariko Teramoto, *Die Psalmmotettendrucke des Johannes Petrejus in Nürnberg*, Tutzing, 1983 (Frankfurter Beiträge zur Musikwissenschaft 10).  
These three editions each contain the same two odes, with music by Senfl and texts by Sebald Heyden. Senfl’s name does not appear on the title page or in the dedication, but is found only at the end of the odes, as “L. S. Harmoniä S. H. uerfus faciebat” (fol. B8r of the Heyden print). The odes, intended for singing at the beginning and end of instruction, were first appended to Heyden’s Catechistica summula fidei christianae, printed by Johannes Petreius. Heyden’s relationship with Petreius had begun in 1524 with the publication of his Adversus hypocritas calumniatores (VD16 H 3334), but both Heyden himself and his relationship with Petreius are best known to music for his music theory treatises of 1537 and 1540, both of which included an example by Senfl.

We do not know how these ode settings came into being. Heyden wrote, in the dedication of De arte canendi to Hieronymus Baumgartner, dated 1 January 1540—and so after the publication of the Catechistica summula—that he had never met Senfl but hoped that Baumgartner would introduce the two men. As such, we can rule out direct contact between Heyden and Senfl, but given the genesis of the Varia carminum genera discussed above it is possible, perhaps even likely, that Baumgartner was the intermediary.

These two ode settings were included by Johannes Rivius (1500–1553) in his Libellus de ratione docendi, where they are again the only two music settings. The only exemplar included in RISM, RISM S 2805, is in the Bodleian Library, Oxford, and is structured as follows:

94 This print is discussed in Alfred Kosel, Sebald Heyden (1499–1561): Ein Beitrag zur Geschichte der Nürnberger Schulmusik in der Reformationzeit, Würzburg, 1940, pp. 18f. Teramoto/Brinzing, Katalog der Musikdrucke, p. 34, fn. 1 and 2, notes that none of the other editions of Heyden’s Catechistica contain music.
95 The odes are headed “Hymnus in principio exercitiorum in scholis cantandus” and “Hymnus in dimissione puerorum aludo literario cantandus.”
96 VD16 H 3380 and H 3381 respectively. Heyden’s 1532 Musicæ (VD16 H 3382) was printed by Friedrich Peypus.
97 It is also possible that Heyden took two existing ode settings by Senfl and wrote new texts to Senfl’s music, producing contrafacta.
98 Armin Brinzing, Neue Quellen zur Geschichte der humanistischen Odenkomposition in Deutschland, Göttingen, 2001 (Nachrichten der Akademie der Wissenschaften zu Göttingen I. Philologisch-historische Klasse 2001/8; Kleinüberlieferung mehrstimmiger Musik vor 1550 in deutschem Sprachgebiet 5), pp. [31]f., discusses the print, notes the printer, and gives locations, but does not link it to RISM S 2805 and so cites it as a previously unknown music print.
99 I am grateful to Peter Ward Jones, Music Section, GB-Ob, for this information (email dated 14 July 2007); I subsequently confirmed this from a digital scan of the print supplied by GB-Ob.
pp. [1]–279 (fol. A1r–S4r): Rivius print
p. 280 (fol. S4r): “Leges scholasticae”
pp. 282–287 (fol. S5r–S8r): two ode settings by Senfl

RISM gives neither place of publication nor printer nor date. It was reasonable for the compilers of RISM to assume that the print was complete as the text had concluded, and Ulhart’s printer’s device appears on the last page of gathering S; but a comparison with the Munich exemplars of this print makes it clear that the Bodleian exemplar is missing gatherings T–X which contain the index, afterword, and on fol. X8r the colophon which tells us that the book was printed in Augsburg by Philip Ulhart the Elder. Ulhart’s printer’s device appears both on fol. S8r, the verso of the leaf on which the music finishes, and on fol. X8r, the last leaf of the print. 100

Three Rivius prints, all of which were printed by Ulhart, are closely related, and ten of the thirteen known exemplars of this edition of the Libellus de ratione docendi are bound with the other two of them: 101

De dialectica libri VI. Preface dated 1539. Signed A–L’M’, 184 pages (last numbered page is 183; p. 184 is blank) [VD16 R 2599].

De rhetorica libri II. Signed A–H’, 128 pages (last numbered page is 127, misnumbered 227; p. 128 is blank) [VD16 R 2647].


Preliminaries, body, printer’s device. Signed A–S’, 288 pages (last numbered page is 282, pp. 283–288 are not numbered),

Index, afterword, colophon, printer’s device. Signed T–X’, 48 pages (not numbered).

None of these prints is dated, and the dating in the literature ranges from RISM’s suggestion of 1530, which is presumably based on the date in “Sebaldus Heyden figebat 1530,” to suggestions based on the date of the preface of the first

100 (See Appendix, no. 6, for a bibliographical description of this print, including the locations of all identified exemplars.) On this printer’s device, see Howard W. Winger, “The Cover Design,” in The Library Quarterly 38 (1968), p. 184.

101 A-Su [additionally with Rivius, De primis Grammaticae rudimentis, Ulhart, ca. 1555; VD16 R 2616], D-As [additionally with Adam Lonitzer, Arithmetices brevis, 1575; VD 16 L 2411], D-Au, D-FRu, D-Mbs [the copy at Ph.sp. 721], D-NLk, H-Bn, S-Sk, US-Cn, US-PRu. Two of the three exemplars not bound with the other two titles are themselves incomplete.
print, 1539, to the VD16’s suggestion of 1560. Ulhart’s printer’s device that appears in each volume is, according to Winger, of a type first used in 1557, and so these prints must date between that year and his death in 1567.

Of the two other titles by Rivius printed by Ulhart, neither the Grammaticae rudimenta of 1555 [VD16 R. 2616] nor the Institutionum grammaticarum libri octo of 1558 [VD16 ZV 13298] contains music.

The 1578 edition of Rivius’ Institutionum grammaticarum libri octo, printed by Michael Manger, reprints the following from the Ulhart edition:

- p. [735] (fol. Ss’, recte Aa5’): “Leges scholasticae” (cont.), ending: “Sebaldus Heyden figebat 1530”
- pp. [736]–[741] (fol. Aa5’–Aa8’): two ode settings by Senfl
- p. [742] (fol. Aa8’): blank

What is particularly curious is the error in the signature. The leaf that should be signed Aa5 is incorrectly signed S5, which is the signature for the same page, containing the “Leges scholasticae (cont.)” to “Sebaldus Heyden figebat 1530” in the Ulhart edition, making it certain that the Manger edition was copied directly from the Ulhart edition, not the Petreius edition. The last page of the gathering in the Ulhart edition has his printer’s mark, but in the Manger edition the last page is blank as he is named as printer on the title page.

The name “Senfl” appears in none of these three editions as Heyden, and presumably most of his readers, would know who was meant by “L.S.” As we progress further away in place and time, this connection, especially amongst those whose focus was not music, may have been lost.

The odes were presumably included in the Rivius prints not because they were by Senfl, but because of the association with Heyden, a presumption strengthened by the inclusion of Heyden’s signed “Leges scholasticae” immediately preceding the odes in both the Ulhart and Manger editions.

---

1. Senfl in Print: The Einzeldrucke


3. I am grateful to Axel Vogt, Albert-Ludwigs-Universität Freiburg, for the information that the exemplar of the 1558 edition in D-FRu contains no music (email of 12 December 2011).

4. Senfl was frequently identified as “L.S.” in sixteenth-century sources. I am grateful to Stefan Gasch for this information.

5. The 1538 print is discussed at length in Gustav Georg Zeltner, Kurzze Erläuterung der Nürnberger Schul- und Reformations-Geschichte aus dem Leben und Schriften des berühmten Sebald Heyden, Rectoris bey S. Sebald, gesammlet, Nuremberg, 1732, pp. 57ff., and although there is a reference in footnote (pp) to the hymns and to singing, there is no mention of Senfl.
Unlike all of the other Einzeldrucke, these three prints are not music prints but instructional books that include two pieces of music, one to be sung before and the other to be sung after instruction. Given this purpose, it is obvious that two, and only two, odes are needed, and given the “before” and “after” pairing it is not surprising that both works are by the same composer. The conclusion as to why these three prints are Einzeldrucke is the same as for the magnificats: the two odes in each of these editions are a “set,” and so these editions are similar to prints that are Einzeldrucke by default as they contain only a single work, rather than to single-author collections that bring together various works by the same composer.

10. O Crux ave spes [Nuremberg: J. Petreius, 1538]

Each of this set of three prints is a visually spectacular broadsheet (that is, the printing is on one side only of an entire sheet of paper). Each is a canon, with the two notated voices set out in the shape of a cross, each voice resolving into two voices to create a motet for four voices. That these three prints are complete as a set is implied by them having been copied as three parts of a single work in the manuscript D-Mu 8° Cod. ms. 322–325, which was copied in 1527 by a pupil of Heinrich Glarean—a name that will come up again later in this chapter with regard to prints 11 and 12—which is the only source, apart from this set of prints, that transmits more than one of these canons. This also raises the question of whether these should be regarded as three prints or as one print. That they should be regarded as three prints is supported by the following evidence: each is

106 The only known exemplar of this print appears to have been destroyed in 1945; see the bibliographical description of this print in the Appendix for further information and literature on this print.
108 See Clytus Gottwald, Die Musik Handschriften der Universitätsbibliothek München, Wiesbaden, 1968 (Die Handschriften der Universitätsbibliothek München 2), pp. 70–75. They are not in cross format, but each of the four voices is written out in full in the relevant partbook. Full colour facsimiles are available online at http://epub.ub.uni-muenchen.de/view/cim/cim. html.
a separate bibliographical entity that makes no reference to the others (they are not numbered one, two, three; nor are the sheets signed A, B, C), each can be used independently of the others as each contains all voices of the composition that it transmits (unlike, for example, one of a set of partbooks), and the texts of each are not subsections of a larger text (for example, a single psalm text is not divided among the three works).

None of these prints includes the place of publication, the name of the printer, or the date of publication. However, we can infer that all were printed by the same printer. The text and music typefaces and the woodcut crucifix are the same in each. We can also infer they were printed sequentially, as the text opposite the crucifix, “Quatuor vocū. Lud.Senfl. Canon || Mifericordia & Veritas obiauerū fibi, || Iusticia & Pax ofculatae sunt,” is printed from the same setting of type and was therefore left standing, that is, after the printing of one of the broadsheets this type was not redistributed, but left as a block and reused for the other prints. The music is typeset using a single-impression, nested typeface that Krummel has called “Petreius Large,” first used by Petreius in 1538, and so these prints must date from 1538 or later. The watermark on the paper of O Crux ave spes is most similar to a mark identified by Piccard as being in use in Nuremberg in 1538. Petreius sold copies of his typefaces to other printers, and so the occurrence of his type is not by itself sufficient evidence to conclude that he was the printer of a particular edition. However, in this case both of the ornamental woodcut initials found on O Crux ave spes are found in other Petreius prints, and notably both are found in Petreius’ 1538 Senfl print (no. 5 above), on fol. B3r and B4v. As noted above, all three canons appear in D-Mu 8° Cod. ms. 322–325, which was copied in 1527, and so we can be certain that they were composed before the postulated date of printing. Even though my searches to date have not found the woodcut crucifix in a signed Petreius print (or any other print), the evidence suggests that Petreius printed these three broadsheets in 1538.

It is not known who initiated their printing, but my hypothesis is that Sebald Heyden was involved. Heyden’s interest in Senfl in the late 1530s is demonstrated by his inclusion of the two Senfl ode settings in his Catechistica (Nuremberg: J. Petreius, 1538), by his inclusion of Senfl’s Fortuna in the second edition,
Musica (Nuremberg: J. Petreius, 1537, pp. 42–45) and third edition, De arte canendi (Nuremberg: J. Petreius, 1540, pp. 46–49), of his music treatise, and by the often-cited request in the introduction to the third edition that he be introduced to Senfl. As a theorist, Heyden was interested in clever canonic works such as these cross canons, and when discussing “De Canonibus ænigmaticis,” in the Musica (p. 106) and De arte canendi (p. 135) he cites the words “Milericordiam & ụeritatem ụbi obuiaë,” which are essentially the same as those in the text of these broadsheets.

Given the length of the musical lines, the voices could not have been set out in a cross format in any other format than broadsheet unless a very small typeface was used, which would have seriously reduced the prints’ visual impact, and which would have made them difficult to sing from. Indeed, in Crux fidelis, unlike O Crux ave spes, the expected ornamental initials appear to have been omitted owing to lack of space. The broadsheet format has resulted in these, like all broadsheets, being exceedingly rare prints. Given the length of the musical lines, the voices could not have been set out in a cross format in any other format than broadsheet unless a very small typeface was used, which would have seriously reduced the prints’ visual impact, and which would have made them difficult to sing from. Indeed, in Crux fidelis, unlike O Crux ave spes, the expected ornamental initials appear to have been omitted owing to lack of space. The broadsheet format has resulted in these, like all broadsheets, being exceedingly rare prints. That they were printed as broadsheets, and therefore almost inevitably as Einzeldrucke, is explained by looking at the prints themselves. The cross layout is visually impressive, and the prints are works of art as much as of music.

GROUP 4: POSTHUMOUS PRINTS

The fourth and final group is the posthumous prints. While they tell us nothing about Senfl himself, they do inform us of his reputation. An engraving but not a

112 See the appendix for details. Youtens, “Forgotten Puzzles” (as in fn. 107), pp. 85f., fn. 15 includes a catalogue of the broadsheets in D-Mbs 2 Mus.pr. 156, and Thomas Röder, “Verborgene Botschaften? Augsburger Kanons von 1548,” in Canons and Canonic Techniques, 14th–16th Centuries: Theory, Practice, and Reception History, ed. Katelijne Schiltz and Bonnie J. Blackburn, Leuven, 2007 [Analysis in Context 1], pp. 235–251, discusses the Ulhart prints in D-Mbs 2 Mus.pr. 156. Thirty-nine of the 44 broadsheets catalogued in Frieder Schanze, “Gestalt und Geschichte früher deutscher Lied-Einblättdrucke nebst einem Verzeichnis der Blätter mit Noten,” in NiveauNischeNimbus: Die Anfänge des Musikdrucks nördlich der Alpen, ed. Birgit Lodes, Tutzing, 2010 (Wiener Forum für ältere Musikgeschichte 3), pp. 369–410, are extant in only one exemplar. Although not strictly a broadsheet, an interesting example is the two cross canons printed as numbers 31 and 32 in Leonhard Paminger’s Secundus tomus ecclesiasticorum cantionum (RISM 1573). Although the voices are printed on standard staves in standard layout in the Discantus, Altus and Bassus, in the Tenor the works are printed with the two notated voices in cross format, with no. 31 on the recto, and no. 32 on the verso of an entire sheet of paper which is signed G and bound into the partbook between gatherings F and H. For facsimiles, see http://daten.digitale-sammlungen.de/bsb00072014/image_074, http://daten.digitale-sammlungen.de/bsb00072014/image_075, and Angelika Horstmann, Illustrationen aus den Musikdrucken der Kaseler Hofkapelle 1: Buchschmuck, Kassel, 2008, p. 71. A difference in the layout between these and the Petreius broadsheets is that instead of a space where the staves intersect, the stave lines continue, producing a crosshatched effect.
print, Senfl’s *Lied, Ich schwing mein Horn ins Jammerthal*, first published by Ott in 1544, was engraved in stone on a *Liedertisch* in 1575 but destroyed by fire in 1915.\(^{113}\) As an engraving, it bears some of the characteristics of a print, but the purpose of printing is to produce, or enable the production of, multiple identical copies. This unique engraved *Liedertisch* produced, like a manuscript, a single copy, and so is not included in the list of prints.

10. *Ain New lied zu eeren … Caroli des fünfften* (Freiburg: [S. Graf], 1547)
11. *Ain New lied zu eeren … Caroli des fünfften* (Freiburg: [S. Graf], 1547)

Each of these prints, one a reprint of the other, consists of the text of one poem, *Ain New lied zu eeren … Caroli des fünfften* by Heinrich Glarean, and the melody to which it was to be sung, the tenor voice of Senfl’s *Mag ich Unglück nit widerstan*. Although the text appeared in several editions,\(^{114}\) these are the only two editions that contain printed music.\(^{115}\) That the other editions simply mention the name of the tune on the title page and do not print it was very common in *Lied* prints that contained a single poem: the reader was expected to know the tune. *Mag ich Unglück nit widerstan* first appeared in print in 1539,\(^{116}\) and was also disseminated in manuscript,\(^{117}\) and so was presumably widely known.\(^{118}\) To this existing mel-


\(^{115}\) One, with the date in arabic numerals, is an unicum at D-Mbs L.impr.c.n.mss. 1003#Beibd.3; the other, with the date in roman numerals, is an unicum at D-Dl Hist.Germ.B.134.misc.10. I do not know which edition was printed first.


\(^{118}\) The melody with an adapted text version (but the same incipit) also circulated in sacred songbooks; see Sonja Tröster, “*Mag ich Unglück nit widerstan* – Liebe, Tod und Glaubensfragen als Komponenten einer Lied-Karriere im 16. Jahrhundert,” in *Senfl-Studien* 1 (as in fn. 2), pp. 443–493. The text of this print is discussed in Inga Mai Groote, „Kain Gwalt vff diser Erd‘ als hypoeoelische lateinische Ode: Eine unbeachtete Sprachpolemik Heinrich Glareans,” in *Bibliothèque d’Humanisme et Renaissance. Travaux et documents* 72 (2010), pp. 397–401. I am grateful to Sonja Tröster for bringing these two references to my attention.
ody, a new text was set by the famous music theorist, Heinrich Glarean. We know that Glarean was familiar with his Swiss compatriot, Senfl, whose works appear in a set of partbooks from Glarean’s library, now in D-Mu, and examples by Senfl were included in Glarean’s Die dodekachordon which, like this Lied, was published in 1547, albeit a short distance away in Basel.

The printer is not named but, according to Benzing, Stefan Graf was the only printer active in Freiburg between 1543 and 1582; he was the successor to the printer Johannes Faber. That this is a Graf print is confirmed by a comparison of the text typefaces with those in signed Graf prints. The music was printed using the Petreius Small typeface, but this is the only music known to have been printed by Graf. Glarean lived in Freiburg from 1529 until 1563, which explains why a number of his works, including this one, were printed there. This publication was presumably successful, as a second edition was printed the same year.

This small print, of eight pages, the second and last of which are blank, contains only a single song, and so only a single melody. It could not be other than an Einzeldruck.

In Wiesbaden is preserved a volume that binds together seven prints in large folio format, each print consisting of a single mass. The first print in the volume, Senfl’s Missa super Nisi Dominus, is the only print that bears the date 1558, the
others being dated 1559 or 1560. The volume was discussed briefly by Roth in 1892 and Kroyer in 1903, but the first detailed examination was published by Moser in 1935, which remains the standard study of this source.

Printed on fol. A1 of the Senfl mass is both the coat of arms of Anton of Ysenburg (1501–1560), count of Büdingen, and his ex libris “DJS Buch gehört Grauen Antonien Von Yfen= || burgk/ GRAuen Zu Büdingen. ||” The count, a music lover, built up a collection of music, and commissioned a fresco with musical themes for his castle. Although no prints explicitly state that they were printed at the Ronneburg, Peter Nieß, in a list of rooms of the castle to which he had found reference, included a “druckerei,” and Moser cited archival evidence – an invoice dated 26 November 1557 – for glasing the windows in the “druckerey.” It therefore appears certain that the count had set up a printery in his castle, the Ronneburg, by 1557; there is no evidence that the printery was active after the count’s death in 1560.

A total of nine printed items have been identified in the literature as being printed at the Ronneburg: the seven music prints, all in folio format; the title leaf of the count’s account books for 1557, which has an identical text typeface to the music prints, and a title page or ornament identical to that on the Senfl print; and a 1557 edition, in folio format, of the Confessio Augustana, which

---

125 Hochschul- und Landesbibliothek RheinMain, Wiesbaden [eom Hessische Landesbibliothek], Rara gr-2 Qs 31. I am grateful to Dr Martin Mayer who, upon my request to purchase a scan of the Senfl mass, instead had the entire volume of prints scanned at his library’s expense and uploaded to the library’s public website, thereby making this important source widely available.


128 With regard to the Senfl mass, the print is cited and briefly discussed in Edwin Löhrer, Die Messen von Ludwig Senfl: Stillkritischer Beitrag zur Geschichte des polyphonen Messordinariums um 1550, Lichtensteig, 1938, pp. 15f., and the motet and mass are analysed on pp. 39–40. It is cited as a source and variants are given in Senfl, SW I, p. 112 and pp. 117f.

129 It cannot be determined if this is the same document used by Nieß.

130 On the short history of printing at the Ronneburg, see Benzing, Buchdrucker (as in fn. 120), p. 391; and Reske, Buchdrucker (as in fn. 120), p. 788.

131 Moser, “Eine Musikaliendruckerei,” as in fn. 127, p. 99; it cannot be determined if this is the same document used by Nieß.

includes the same title page ornament (fol. A1'), the same motto “Armut. Vnd. Yberflus. || Gibt. Zeitlich. Betrübnus” and large capital letter “R” (fol. A1'), and the same coat of arms woodcut (fol. A2'), as the Senfl print (fol. A2', A2', and A2" respectively). This evidence supports the conclusion that all of these editions were printed at the Ronneburg and that the count was the publisher. But who was the printer?

Benzing’s examination of the text founts concluded that they came from Frankfurt. Drawing on the title page ornament also being found in work printed by Hermann Gülfferich (died 1554), and biographical details of Jost Gran, Benzing hypothesised that Gran may have been the printer. Little is known of Gran (sometimes spelled “Kran”). The first reference to him is of his marriage to Margarethe Gülfferich, the widow of the printer Hermann Gülfferich, on 12 February 1555. Gran, from Haltern, became a citizen of Frankfurt on 1 March 1555. Following the marriage, Gran began printing in the Gülfferich printery, signing six editions that year. It was not unusual for a printer to marry another printer’s widow; other examples included Georg Wachter marrying Hans Hergot’s widow, Kunegunde, and Dietrich Gerlach marrying Johann vom

134 Josef Benzing, Eine unbekannte Ausgabe der Confessio Augustana vom Jahre 1557, Wiesbaden, 1956, pp. 11, 13, and 15. The entry for VD16 C 4758 identifies the printery as “[Ronneburg: Druckerei des Grafen Anton von Isenburg-Büdingen].”

135 Josef Benzing, Eine unbekannte Ausgabe, pp. 14–16.


138 Ibid.

139 The six signed prints are: Schmidt, Die Bücher (as in fn. 136), p. 357, B 25 = [VD16 B 4280]; Schmidt, p. 385, E 17 (not in VD16); Schmidt, p. 403, G 17 = [VD16 G 3910]; Schmidt, p. 465, P 14 (not in VD16); Schmidt, p. 465, P 15 = [VD16 P 2370 (play)–P 2370 (lied)], online at urn:nbn:de:bvb:12-bsb0028436-3; Schmidt, p. 529, W 27 = [VD16 K 152], online at urn:nbn:de:gbv:3:1-171646.

Berg’s widow, Katharina,141 and so given that Gran signed books the year of his marriage, it is reasonable to assume that he was already a printer. As there is no record of him having his own printery, he would presumably have been an employee of a printing business.

For some unknown reason, the six editions of 1555 are the only editions that he ever signed. His sudden disappearance has resulted in different hypotheses. Pallmann suggests that, as Margarethe reverted to the name Gülfferich after 1555, that it was because of a divorce.142 Klöss argues against the divorce hypothesis as there is no official record of it and there would surely be references to such an unusual event, but notes that he may have simply left his wife without divorcing her; however, his preferred hypothesis is that Gran died.143 However, no-one has found a record in Frankfurt of Gran’s death. Benzing suggests that Gran left his wife, took his printing materials, and went to the Ronneburg.144 However, if Gran did go to the Ronneburg, he may not have taken all (or any) of his printing materials, as Pallmann refers to the purchase in 1561 by Georg Rab from Margarethe Gülfferich’s stepson of a “Josten Fractur, sampt dem Kassten,” and a “Jost Granen Cursisch, sampt dem Kasten.”145

What has been missing in the literature is a discussion of the role of music typefaces. None of the bibliographical literature on Jost Gran has noted that he printed music, but there are five staves of music, printed in a single-impression white mensural music fount, in one of his prints.146 As the Ronneburg music prints are dated between 1558 and 1560, and Berz’s bibliography of music printed in Frankfurt am Main to ca. 1630 contains a gap between Egenolff’s last

142 Pallmann, Sigmund Feyerabend (as in fn. 136), p. 6.
144 Benzing, Confessio Augustana (as in fn. 134), p. 16.
145 Pallmann, Sigmund Feyerabend, p. 154.
known music print in 1553 and a print by Feyerabend in 1565, this Frankfurt print of 1555 provides additional evidence for Benzing’s hypothesis. The fount was presumably not from the printery of Hermann Gülfferich as his extensive output contains only two music prints, one extant and one cited, both editions of Veit Dietrich’s Agendbüchlein that were printed not from type but from blocks.¹⁴⁷

The typefaces in the Ronneburg music prints have not been examined as Moser’s seminal article stated that they were printed from woodcuts,¹⁴⁸ but the volume is in fact printed from type. What is immediately noticeable about this print is that which brings us full circle. The large folio format,¹⁴⁹ layout, and the music typeface bear an extraordinary resemblance to the Liber selectarum cantionum, edited by Senfl in 1520, which was surely the inspiration for this print; unfortunately the appearance is somewhat undermined by the mis-matched text typeface. Could not just Grimm and Wirsung’s typeface, but their actual fount have been used thirty years later in the Ronneburg? A careful examination of the typographical elements in the Liber selectarum cantionum and the Ronneburg music prints suggests that this is likely: not only the shape of the notes themselves and unusual shapes such as the double bar lines, but also the variant flat signs for B-flat and the erratic lengths of the C clefs. Could an Augsburg fount from 1520 end up at the Ronneburg in 1558? There is a possible route. Following the dissolution of the firm of Grimm and Wirsung in Augsburg in 1527, their printing materials were purchased by other Augsburg printers including Steiner and Ulhart.¹⁵⁰ When Steiner died in 1548 a majority of his printing

¹⁴⁷ One is cut in wood, the other from either wood or metal; see Berz, Notendrucker (as in fn. 136), pp. 21f., with the prints described on pp. 152f.
¹⁴⁸ Moser, “Eine Musikalendruckerei” (as in fn. 127), p. 97. This is analogous to the Liber selectarum cantionum which, although it is definitely printed from type, has been described in literature from the eighteenth to the twenty-first centuries as being printed from woodcuts; this literature includes such standard works as Johann Nicolaus Forkel, Allgemeine Geschichte der Musik, vol. 2, Leipzig, 1801, p. 705; Robert Eitner, Bibliographie der Musik-Sammelwerke des XVI. und XVII. Jahrhunderts, Berlin, 1877, p. 14; Theodor Wohnhaas, “Wirsung und Grimm,” in MGG, vol. 14, Kassel etc., 1968, col. 731; and Theodor Wohnhaas, “Grimm & Wirsung,” in New Grove, vol. 10, London, 2001, p. 425. However, another large folio, Antico’s Liber quindecim missarum, was in fact printed from woodblocks, as stated by Antico himself in his preface to the volume.
¹⁴⁹ The Liber selectarum cantionum measures, in the copy at GB-Lbl K. 9.a.24, ca. 43 x 28.5 cm; that at D-Rs 2° Liturg. 69 measures ca. 43.5 x 28.5 cm. Antico’s folio Liber quindecim missarum measures 42 x 28 cm (see Albino Zenatti, “Andrea Antico da Montona,” in Archivio storico per Trieste l’Istria e il Trentino 1 [1881–1882], pp. 167–199, esp. 182). The print under discussion is 46.3cm x 30.5 cm high.
equipment was sold to Egenolff in Frankfurt.¹⁵¹ Egenolff was one of the most famous music printers in the German-speaking area in the first half of the sixteenth century,¹⁵² but he always used his own single-impression music typeface, suitable for the seidecimo and octavo music prints that he issued; he never used a double-impression music typeface – especially one designed for folio prints, as none of his music prints was in quarto or folio format. Egenolff issued several music prints in the early 1550s, including five sets of partbooks,¹⁵³ and so was still well known as a music printer at the time of his death in 1555. Egenolff’s widow continued the business until 1572, issuing no prints containing music, but her step-sons published five editions of Ammon’s Gesangbuch between 1581 and 1591.¹⁵⁴ As Egenolff’s printery was overwhelmingly the best known music printery in Frankfurt in the 1550s, his printery would be the obvious one to contact if in search of a music typeface. Gran was living in Frankfurt at the time of Egenolff’s death, and the Ronneburg itself is only thirty-four kilometres from the Frankfurt Altstadt. If the Grimm and Wirsung fount was in Egenolff’s possession at the time of his death, his heirs would have had no reason to keep it – for exactly the same reasons why it was so appropriate for the Ronneburg.

The earliest music prints used a double-impression process, that is, each page has to be typeset and printed twice, once to print the staves and text, and once to print the notes. The process was expensive owing to the double printing of each page, and required an exactness of alignment to ensure that the notes were correctly aligned with the staves. In the 1520s, a single-impression process was developed, with the notes and staves together on the same piece of type. This single-impression music printing process was introduced into the German-speaking area by Christian Egenolff in 1532, and rapidly replaced double-impression music printing. The last major German music printer to use the double-impression process was Peter Schöffer the Younger, who issued his final music print in

---

¹⁵¹ Hans-Jörg Künast, “Getruckt zu Augspurg”: Buchdruck und Buchhandel in Augsburg zwischen 1468 und 1555, Tübingen, 1997 (Yearbook of the Alamire Foundation 2), pp. 465–477, were printed from woodcuts; and all Ulhart prints were printed from either woodcuts (all to 1537, and one broadsheet in 1548) or single-impression type. The large size of the Grimm and Wirsung type would not have been appropriate for any of the Steiner prints.


¹⁵³ A volume of polyphonic ode settings, RISM 1551⁷; and four volumes of Lieder, RISM [c.1535]⁷, [c.1535]⁸, [c.1535]⁹, and [1536] Rééd. sans titre, that were actually printed in 1552 (see Charteris, Georg von Werdenstein [as in fn. 29], p. 178).

¹⁵⁴ Berz, Notendrucker (as in fn. 130), pp. 22–24; for the prints, see DKL 1581⁷, 1583⁷, 1585⁷, 1586⁷, 1591⁷.
Although double-impression printing was far more aesthetically pleasing, as it resulted in smooth stave lines, its cost made it commercially unviable against the single-impression process. The Ronneburg prints, however, were clearly not intended to be commercially viable, but were prestigious objects which were surely printed not for sale, but for the Count and those to whom he gave them – the prestige being signalled not just by the printing process, but by the large folio format and spacious layout of all of the prints known to have issued from the press.

Benzing notes that the text fount in the *Confessio Augusta* is not found in Egenolff prints, but that the ornament on the title page is found in books printed in Frankfurt by David Zöpfel and Hermann Gülfferich. I have not been able to identify any of the other ornaments in the mass prints in any Egenolff or Gülfferich prints.

It has been known since Moser’s seminal article of 1935 that this mass was printed at the Ronneburg, to which Benzing added the hypothesis that the printer was Jost Gran. This chapter adds additional support to Benzing’s hypothesis by noting Gran’s (minor) activity as a music printer; and adds arguments that the mass was not printed from woodblocks but using Grimm and Wirsung’s double-impression music fount.

The final question to consider is: why did the Count have this Senfl mass printed? Anton of Ysenburg was Lutheran, and Birgit Lodes has written that both this mass and Senfl’s own motet, *Nisi dominus*, on which the mass is based, “received, as reflected in the sources, a vivid reception within German Protestant circles between the 1530s and 1550s.” Indeed, as noted by McDonald, “On 18 April 1533, Veit Dietrich reported to Baumgartner from Wittenberg that Senfl had promised to send Luther the *Missa Nisi dominus*, but had not yet done so; Dietrich therefore asked Baumgartner to remind Senfl to honour this promise.” These associations may explain why the Count opened his series of mass prints with this mass. The *Missa super Nisi Dominus* is the only mass by Senfl to have been published in the sixteenth century: first by Rhau in 1541, and again

---

1539. Although double-impression printing was far more aesthetically pleasing, as it resulted in smooth stave lines, its cost made it commercially unviable against the single-impression process. The Ronneburg prints, however, were clearly not intended to be commercially viable, but were prestigious objects which were surely printed not for sale, but for the Count and those to whom he gave them – the prestige being signalled not just by the printing process, but by the large folio format and spacious layout of all of the prints known to have issued from the press.

Benzing notes that the text fount in the *Confessio Augusta* is not found in Egenolff prints, but that the ornament on the title page is found in books printed in Frankfurt by David Zöpfel and Hermann Gülfferich. I have not been able to identify any of the other ornaments in the mass prints in any Egenolff or Gülfferich prints.

It has been known since Moser’s seminal article of 1935 that this mass was printed at the Ronneburg, to which Benzing added the hypothesis that the printer was Jost Gran. This chapter adds additional support to Benzing’s hypothesis by noting Gran’s (minor) activity as a music printer; and adds arguments that the mass was not printed from woodblocks but using Grimm and Wirsung’s double-impression music fount.

The final question to consider is: why did the Count have this Senfl mass printed? Anton of Ysenburg was Lutheran, and Birgit Lodes has written that both this mass and Senfl’s own motet, *Nisi dominus*, on which the mass is based, “received, as reflected in the sources, a vivid reception within German Protestant circles between the 1530s and 1550s.” Indeed, as noted by McDonald, “On 18 April 1533, Veit Dietrich reported to Baumgartner from Wittenberg that Senfl had promised to send Luther the *Missa Nisi dominus*, but had not yet done so; Dietrich therefore asked Baumgartner to remind Senfl to honour this promise.” These associations may explain why the Count opened his series of mass prints with this mass. The *Missa super Nisi Dominus* is the only mass by Senfl to have been published in the sixteenth century: first by Rhau in 1541, and again

---

159. McDonald, “The Metrical Harmoniae” (as in fn. 73), p. 95, with the references to primary sources in his fn. 69.
in this print in 1558, but the two printed sources are not closely related;\textsuperscript{160} Senfl’s six other masses exist only in manuscript choirbooks, five of them only in choirbooks for the Munich Hofkapelle.

Other insights are given by consideration of the other prints in the volume, each of which contains one mass, each by a composer who was dead at the time that the mass was printed: Févin (d. 1512), Josquin (d. 1521), Mouton (d. 1522), Richafort (d. ca. 1550), and Jannequin (d. 1558). This was a series of historical masses, each printed as an Einzeldruck. The series may have continued were it not for the death of the Count in 1560. The decision to print as an Einzeldruck was driven not by the work being by Senfl, but because it was one in a series of Einzeldrucke.

CONCLUSION

Although the initial list of thirteen Einzeldrucke has been reduced to eleven, this is still a comparatively large number of Einzeldrucke for a composer in the first half of the sixteenth century: by comparison, Johann Walther has sixteen (including seven editions of the Geystliche gsangk Buchleyn), Josquin has fourteen, Carpentras, Isaac, Mouton, and Othmayr have four, Tritonius has three, Obrecht and Richafort have two, and Hofhaimer, Moulu, and Ockeghem have none.\textsuperscript{161} Composers of popular French and Italian secular works could have particularly high numbers of Einzeldrucke; for example, RISM lists twenty for Jannequin and, although most were technically anthologies, eighty-three for Arcadelt. The situation was very different in the German-speaking area where, until the 1560s, publication of polyphonic music prints containing more than one composition (or one “set” of compositions) tended to be in multi-composer anthologies.

Unlike Carpentras, who commissioned the printing of his four Einzeldrucke, the only occasion on which Senfl was directly involved in the publication of his own music is the early Liber selectarum cantionum, which is not an Einzeldruck but an anthology. By contrast, the Einzeldrucke testify to the interest in Senfl’s music and its dissemination on the part of humanists such as Minervius, pedagogues such as Heyden and Rivius, and music lovers such as Anton of Ysenburg. What is even more obvious, however, is what is – or to be more specific what isn’t – in these eleven Einzeldrucke. Six of them contain only a single work, and another

\textsuperscript{160} See Senfl, SW I, p. 112 for concordances and a discussion of their interrelationships; additional concordances are given in www.senflonline.com.

\textsuperscript{161} All numbers are drawn from RISM A/1. Hofhaimer is included as he is referred to above as the composer who has the third-highest number of compositions in Petreius prints.
three contain only a set of two ode settings that are not the focus of the print, but supplement it. The two Einzeldrucke of substantial size were both printed by Hieronymus Formschneider, one an anthology of three-quarters of Senfl’s odes, the other a set of magnificats. As such, ten of the eleven prints contain either one composition or one set of compositions, and so effectively by default are Einzeldrucke. Only one of the eleven is a single-author collection of works brought together by an editor, and so there is only one print in which there was a considered decision to produce a Senfl Einzeldruck. But this is skirting around the core of Senfl’s work. What is totally missing is the genre in which Senfl was most prolific: the polyphonic Lied. Although initially surprising, this must be placed in historical context: of the 64 editions containing Tenorlieder published up to 1560 listed in Böker-Heil et al., the only Einzeldrucke containing only Lieder are seven editions of Lieder by Johann Walther, three editions each containing a single Lied, and one edition of Lieder by Othmayr (1549). Although the lack of an Einzeldruck of Senfl Tenorlieder is still unexpected, it is not unusual. His massive output of motets is represented only by the three cross broadsheets, which are in essence curiosities. For our understanding of Senfl, although the Einzeldrucke add some important details, especially the odes and magnificats, they are very much, in my opinion, of secondary importance to the great Lied and motet anthologies of Hans Ott that lie at the heart of Senfl in Print.

Appendix

THE PRINTS

1. LIBER SELECTARUM CANTIONUM.
   Removed from list of Einzeldrucke; it is an anthology.

2. QUINQUE SALUTATIONES.
   Removed from list of Einzeldrucke; it is a “ghost.”

3. VARIA CARMINUM GENERA.

Title pages of other partbooks:
CANTVS PRIMVS || [flower] || [flower] MEDIA VOX [flower] || [flower] || [flower] BASSA VOX [flower] || [flower] ||

Errata: Cantus secundus, fol. d8v (errata for all four partbooks)
Format: oblong octavo
Collation: 136 leaves, Cantus primus, Media Vox, Bassa Vox each 32 leaves, a–d; Cantus secundus, 40 leaves, π′a–d′
Signatures: Cantus primus $\S5$ (–A1) signed in Roman lowercase italic with Roman italic numerals [misprinting Cv as C5]; Cantus secundus $\S5$ (–Π1, A1) signed, π in arabic numerals, a–d in Roman caps and Roman italic Ro-

---

a The music typefaces are identified by their number in Krummel, “Early German Partbook Type Faces” (as in fn. 109). The library locations for prints 6 and 7, excluding those in D-NLk and GB-Ob, have been compiled from the VD16 and from online library catalogues; for information on the print in D-NLk I am grateful to Gerhard Beck, Kirchenbibliothek St. Georg (email dated 16 April 2013), and for information on the print in GB-Ob, I am grateful to Peter Ward Jones, Music Section, GB-Ob (email dated 14 July 2007).
Royston Gustavson

man numerals [misprinting A v as A V and C v as C 5 ]; Media Vox $5 (-A 1 ) signed in Fraktur caps with lowercase Fraktur Roman numerals (a–c) and lowercase Roman italic Roman numerals (d); Bassa Vox $5 (-A 1 ) signed in Fraktur lowercase and Fraktur lowercase Roman numerals (a–c) and Roman lowercase italic Roman numerals.

Exemplars: D-Ju Mus.Nr. 15 (Cantus primus only); D-Mbs 8° Mus.pr. 35, Beibd. 2; GB-Gu Sp. Coll. R.c.22; PL-Kj Mus.ant.pract. S 1045 (Media Vox only)

Music: printed throughout in white mensural notation using the Formschneider single-impression typeface (Krummel Typeface 2)

Music edition of this source: Senfl, SW VI, pp. 71–87, commentary and transcription of dedication at pp. 113–122

Notes: RISM S 2806; VD16 ZV 26802; digital scan online at urn:nbn:de:bvb:12-bsb00082623-1

4. MAGNIFICAT OCTO TONORUM.


Title pages of other partbooks:
[flower] DISCANTVS [flower] || [flourish] ||
CONTRATE= || [flower] NOR [flower] || [flourish] ||
[flower] BASSVS [flower] || [flourish] ||

Colophon [Tenor, fol. C4]: Impreffum Nureberge apud Hieronimum || Formciohneyder. Anno .M.D.xxxvij. || [flower] || [flourish] ||

Format: oblong quartvo

Collation: 56 leaves, Discantus, 14 leaves, a–b c ë ; Contratenor, 16 leaves, d–g’; Tenor, 12 leaves, A–C’; Bassus, 14 leaves, h–i’k’

Signatures: Discantus, $3 (−a1 +c4) signed in Roman lowercase and Arabic numerals; Contratenor, $3 (−d1) signed in Roman lowercase and Arabic numerals; Tenor, $3 (−A1) signed [misprinting C by inverting the letter] in Roman caps and Arabic numerals; Bassus, $3 (−h1, +k4) signed in Roman lowercase and Arabic numerals

Exemplars: A-Wn S.A.78.C.36 (slim A.N.35.F.90); B-Br Fétis 1783 A L.P. (B missing); D-Kl 4° 117° (D incomplete, A missing); D-Mbs 4° Mus.pr. 159, Beibd. 3; D-Nla Fen. IV 405–409 (T missing); D-ROu Mus.Saec. XVI, 46;
PL-Kj Mus.ant.pract. S 1050; exemplars no longer extant or which cannot be traced: D-Ddkk (B missing), burned 1945;b Library of Duke Albrecht of Prussia;c that formerly bound with the exemplar of RISM 1537‘ in GB-Lbl (see fn. 86).


Notes: RISM S 2807; VD16 ZV 26537; digital scan online at urn:nbn:de:bsb:12-bsb00074414-6

5. HEYDEN. CATECHISTICA.

Title: CATECHI || STICA SVMMV= || LA FIDEI CHRI= || ftianæ, digepta per || Seb. Heyd. ||

Colophon: [fol. A1r] Norimberge apud Io.Petreü. || anno M. D. XXXVIII. ||

Format: upright octavo

Collation: 16 leaves, a–b'

Signatures: signed in lowercase Roman letters and Arabic numerals, $5 (-A1)

Exemplars: D-NBsb B.W. 433; D-Rs Past.173; D-TRs Mu 202 8° (2); GB-Lbl 698.a.41(7); PL-WRu 458208;d US-CA C 1012.2*; exemplars no longer extant or which cannot be traced:e Albertus-Universität Königsberg

Music: printed on fol. b5‘–b8' in white mensural notation using the Petreius Small single-impression typeface (Krummel Typeface 3)

Music edition of this source: McDonald, “The Metrical Harmoniae” (as in fn. 73), pp. 122–124

Notes: RISM S 2808; VD16 ZV 7913; digital scan online at scans 34 to 66 of urn:nbn:de:bsb:12-bsb11108679-9


c Müller-Blattau, “Die musikalischen Schätze” (as in fn. 26), p. 221; and Tondel, Eruditio et prudentia (as in fn. 26), p. 135.

d I am grateful to Miroslaw Osowski, Oddział Zbiórów Muzycznych, Biblioteka Uniwersytecka we Wrocławiu for this information (e-mail dated 23 May 2013).

e Location cited in Kosel, Schall Heyden (as in fn. 94), p. 39.
6. RIVIUS. LIBELLUS DE RATIONE DOCENDI.

Title: IOANNIS || RIVII ATTHEN= || DORIENSIS LIBEL= || lus, de ratione 
do= || cendi. || ADDITA SVNT ET ALIA || eiufdem argumenti opuscula, 
omni= || bus tam magistris quam dici= || pulis lectu utillima. || I. [italic] De 
ratione studij epistola Ro= || dolphi Agricoles. || [Roman] II. [italic] D. 
Erafni Roterodami aliquot || eiufdem argumenti libelli. || [Roman] III. 
[italic] Ratio colligendi locos com= || munes. || [Roman] IIII. [italic] Ano-
nymi admonitio de ratione || dicendi &c. ||

Colophon: [fol. X7v] AVGVSTÆ RHETICÆ || [italic] Philippus Vlhardus, in 
platea || Templaria, D.Huldrichi, || excudebat . || [rule] || M. D. LXXVIII. ||

Printer’s device: Ulhart’s printer’s device is 
on the last page before the index, fol. 
S8’; and on the last page of the print, fol. X8’

Format: upright octavo

Collation: 168 leaves, A–X’

Signatures: signed in uppercase Roman letters and Arabic numerals, $5 (-A1 [title 
page], -E5 [title page of I], -H5 [title page of II], N5 misprinted as N3)

Pagination: 336 pages numbered in Arabic numerals (-1, 72–74, 121, 158, 159, 
283–336) [mis-printing 213 as 113]

Exemplars: A-Su 78113 I Rarum; CH-Fcu A 931; D-As Phil 3122; D-Au 
o2/V.2.8.137angeb.2; D-FRu B 2207 3 an: Riuvis: Dialectica libri VI [miss-
ing title page]; D-Mbs Ph.sp. 723#Beibd.2; D-Mbs Enc.196 [missing leaves 
F8, G1–8, H1–H4]; D-NLk B 89/3; GB-Ob Tenbury f. 16 [missing gatherings 
T-X]; H-Bn Ant. 7986 (3); S-Sk 116 A Rivius, J., De dialectica libri VI.; US-
Cn Case 3A 341; US-PRu 6179.77.328

Music: printed on pp. 282–[287], i.e. fol. S5’–S8’ in white mensural notation us-
ing the Petreius Small single-impression typeface (Krummel Typeface 3)

Music edition of this source: none

Notes: RISM S 2805; VD16 R 2644; a reprint of the odes in no. 5 above; digital 
scan online at urn:nbn:de:bvb:12-bsb10175684-7; the digital scan online at 
urn:nbn:de:bvb:12-bsb10192135-4 is faulty

7. RIVIUS. INSTITUTIONUM GRAMMATICARUM LIBRI OCTO.

Title: INSTITV= || TIONVM GRAMMA- || TICARVM IOANNIS RIVII 
AT- || thendoriensis libri octo. Cum li- || bello eiudem, de ratione docendi, || 
& cum vitilbus quibufdam addi- || tamenis de Orthographia Ger- || manica, 
de Augufranæ scholæ in- || tuatione. Item alius libel- || lus Anonymi de 
docen- || di dicendiq, ra- || tione. || [ornament] ||

Colophon: [fol. A1v] AVGVSTÆ VINDELICO- || rum Michael Manger ex- || 
cudebat. || [rule] || M. D. LXXVIII. ||
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Format: upright octavo
Collation: 400 leaves, A–Z'à–zÀa–DDë
Signatures: signed in three consecutive series, uppercase Roman letters, then lowercase Roman letters, then upper and lower-case Roman letters, each with Roman numerals, $5 (-A1, A5, G5, V4, V5, X5, k4, u4, Aa3) [mis-signing A2 as Aii, Aa5 as S5]
Exemplars: D-As Aug 1924; D-As Aug 1924a; D-As Aug Rar 14 [=Aug 1924b]; D-Mbs L.lat. 717; D-OB 999/W-1.100 [see online catalogue D-Au]; D-Rs 999/Ling.280; D-Sl Phil.oct.2116; FIN-Hy H MD.96. VIII.14; I-Vlb C.001 003 019
Music: printed on pp. [736]–[741], that is, fol. Aa5”–Aa8’ in white mensural notation using the Petreius Small single-impression typeface (Krummel Face 3)
Music edition of this source: none
Notes: not in RISM; VD16 R.2617; a reprint of the odes in no. 6 above; digital scan online at urn:nbn:de:bvb:12-bsb10185576-2

8. CRUX FIDELIS.

Title: Quatuor vocü. Lud.Senfl. Canon || Mifericordia & Veritas obuiauerüt fi, || Iusticia & Pax osculatae sunt. || [CRux fidelis]
Colophon: none [Nuremberg: J. Petreius, 1538]
Format: broadsheet
Collation: 1 leaf
Signatures: unsigned
Exemplar (unicum): D-Mbs 2 Mus.pr. 156/4
Music: printed on one side of the sheet in white mensural notation using the Petreius Large single impression-typeface (Krummel Face 4)
Notes: RISM S 2809; not in VD16; digital scan online at urn:nbn:de:bvb:12-bsb00061775-8

9. ECCE LIGNUM CRUCIS.

Title: Quatuor vocü. Lud.Senfl. Canon || Mifericordia & Veritas obuiauerüt fi, || Iusticia & Pax osculatae sunt. || [Ecce lignum Crucis]
Colophon: none [Nuremberg: Petreius, 1538]
Format: broadsheet
Collation: 1 leaf
Signatures: unsigned
Exemplar (unicum): D-Dl Musica B. 262, 33u (incomplete, destroyed 1945).
Music: printed on one side of the sheet in single-impression white mensural notation [using the Petreius Large single impression-typeface (Krummel Typeface 4)]
Music edition of this source: none
Notes: not in RISM or VD16. Robert Eitner, “Mittheilungen,” in MfM 9 (1877), p. 122, gives such a detailed description that there can be no doubt that this print is part of a set with 8 above and 10 below. The description includes the full title (which is the same as for 8 and 10), music incipit (“Discantstimme beginnt mit den Noten: f f e d e f e d c, Pause. Die Tenorstimme: c d c d b c g c a d c a b g a c etc.”), motet text, notes the “Christus am Kreuze” on the left-hand side of the sheet, states that the music is printed in a single impression process with staves, in a cross format, of 37.25 cm for the Tenor and 27 cm for the Discantus, and that there is a blank space where the staves cross. The print is included in Robert Eitner and Otto Kade, Katalog der Musik-Sammlung der Kgl. öffentlichen Bibliothek zu Dresden (im japanischen Palais), Leipzig, 1890 (Beilage zu den MfM), p. 108; the description includes a stave line for each voice with the clef and, for the Tenor, key signature. Unexpectedly, it was included in Eitner’s Quellen-Lexikon, vol. 9 (1903), p. 141, in the section on manuscripts as “Mss. in B. Dresd. 4 lat. Mot, und 1 Canon im Druck.” After this, the print appears to have completely disappeared from the literature, even though it was extant until 1945. As at the time of writing, D-Dl is attempting to confirm that the print was destroyed in 1945.

10. O CRUX AVE SPES.

Title: Quatuor vocū. Lud.Senfl. Canon || Mifericordia & Veritas obuiauerūt fibi, || Iusticia & Pax osfuscate sunt. || [O Crux aue fpes]
Colophon: none [Nuremberg: J. Petreius, 1538]
Format: broadsheet
Collation: 1 leaf
Signatures: unsigned
Exemplar (unicum): f A-Wn SA. 87.D.8 Mus 32

Kroyer’s reference, in Ludwig Senfls Werke (as in fn. 12), p. XII, to a print in D-B is incorrect. I am grateful to Marina Gordienko, D-B, for the following information (email dated 16 December 2011): D-B Mus.ms. 20742, in the hand of Friedrich August Grasnick, is a single leaf with the title Quatuor
Senfl in Print: The Einzeldrucke

Music: printed on one side of the sheet in white mensural notation using the Petreius Large single-impression typeface (Krummel Typeface 4)


Notes: RISM S 2810; not in VD16

11. AIN NEW LIED ZU EEREN . . . CAROLI DES FÜNFFTEN [1547].


Colophon: [fol. Ai] [Fraktur] Zu Friburg im Breißgaw || [Roman] 1547/ ||

Format: upright quarto

Collation: 4 leaves, A'

Signatures: Aii signed in Roman italic uppercase and Roman italic numerals

Exemplar (unicum): D-Mbs 2 L.impr.c.n.mss 1003#Beibd.3

Music: two staves printed on fol. A2' in white mensural notation using the Petreius Small single-impression typeface (Krummel Typeface 3)

Music edition of this source: none

Notes: RISM SS 2808a; VD16 N 1315; digital scan online at urn:nbn:de:bvb:12-bsb00031490-7. The two editions have minor differences on the title page, including a space before the period in line 2 (D-Mbs) versus no space (D-Dl); “Mayeftat” (D-Mbs) versus “Maieftat” (D-Dl) in line 2; “est” (D-Mbs) versus “efi” (D-Dl) in line 16; a space after the comma before “iußeq,” (D-Mbs) versus no spaced (D-Dl), and a colophon in Arabic numerals (D-Mbs) versus Roman numerals (D-Dl).

vocum. Ludw. Senfl. Canon Misericordia & Veritas obviaverunt sibi, Justicia & Pax osculatae sunt. It contains Ocrux are spes in cross form, and to the left of the cross are the words: “Hier: (Die Darstellung des Erlösers am Kreuz in einem Holzschnitt).” Therefore, the source to which Kroyer refers is not a print but a diplomatic manuscript copy of Ocrux are spes.
12. *Ain New Lied zu eeren… Caroli des fünfftten [MDXLVII]*.


**Colophon:** [fol. A 1'] [Fraktur] Zu Friburg im Breiſgaw. || [Roman] M. D. XLVII. ||

**Format:** upright quarto

**Collation:** 4 leaves, A'

**Signatures:** Aii signed in Roman italic uppercase and Roman italic numerals

**Exemplar (unicum):** D-Dl Hist.Germ.B.134, misc. 10

**Music:** two staves printed on fol. A 2' in white mensural notation using the Petreius Small single-impression typeface (Krummel Typeface 3)

**Music edition of this source:** none

**Notes:** not in RISM; VD16 ZV 11638; digital scan online at http://digital.slub-dresden.de/id353980452. The two editions have minor differences on the title page, including a space before the period in line 2 (D-Mbs) versus no space (D-Dl); “Mayeſtat” (D-Mbs) versus “Maieſtat” (D-Dl) in line 2; “est” (D-Mbs) versus “eft” (D-Dl) in line 16; a space after the comma before “iuſtæq̣” (D-Mbs) versus no space (D-Dl), and a colophon in Arabic numerals (D-Mbs) versus Roman numerals (D-Dl).


**Colophon:** none [Ronneburg: Printery of Count Anton of Isenburg-Büdingen, 1558]

**Format:** upright folio

**Collation [implied by signatures]:** 24 leaves, A–F'

**Signatures:** signed in Fraktur typeface with uppercase letters and lowercase Roman numerals, $3 (-A1?, C3)

**Exemplar (unicum):** D-Wil Rara gr-2° Qt 31
Senfl in Print: The Einzeldrucke

Music: printed on fol. A₃–F₄ in white mensural notation using the double-impression typeface of Grimm and Wirsung, used in the Liber selectarum cantionum; see the discussion of this print for the possibility that it is in fact the same font.

Music edition of this source: the print is cited as a source and variants given in Senfl, SWI, pp. 112, 117f.

Notes: RISM S 2811; not in VD16; digital scan online at http://dokumentserver.hlb-wiesbaden.de/Chorbuch/chorbuch.pdf

Abstract

Most of Senfl’s music that was published during the sixteenth century appeared in anthologies, above all in those edited by Hans Ott, but there is a small number of prints in which all of the music is by Senfl. This paper begins with a list of thirteen Einzeldrucke that have been identified in the literature, but notes that one is in fact an anthology and, after extensive analysis, demonstrates that one is a “ghost.” Of the eleven confirmed Einzeldrucke, RISM identifies the printer of only three, and gives a date, or in one case a postulated date, for only six. Evidence in this chapter identifies the printer of each of the prints, and gives a postulated date (or revised postulated date) for each of the undated prints. It is argued that the publication of none of the Einzeldrucke was initiated by Senfl, but a consideration of each print allows conclusions to be drawn about why it was published as an Einzeldruck, and its role in the early reception of Senfl’s works. The chapter concludes with brief comments on the nature of Einzeldrucke, and on why Senfl Einzeldrucke focus on the genres other than those for which Senfl is best known.
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