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The Body of Christ Divided: Reception of Josquin’s Missa Pange lingua in Reformation Germany

Abstract

by

ALANNA VICTORIA ROPCHOCK

In sixteenth-century Germany, Josquin des Prez’s Missa Pange lingua was performed by both Catholics and Lutherans, even though its model, the hymn Pange lingua, was associated with an exclusively Catholic doctrine. Pange lingua was composed for Corpus Christi, which Lutherans did not celebrate, and describes transubstantiation, a Eucharistic doctrine that Martin Luther rejected. Earlier sources of the mass belonged to Catholics and reflect its association with the Eucharist, while sources from the later sixteenth century are almost exclusively of Lutheran provenance and demonstrate a repurposing of the mass for the liturgical and pedagogical needs of the Lutheran church.

The earliest Missa Pange lingua sources were produced around the nominal beginning of the Reformation in 1517, and the early German copies of the mass were associated with prominent Catholics such as the Habsburg and Fugger families. Most German sources of the mass, however, belonged to Lutheran individuals or communities. The Missa Pange lingua changed confessional hands through a printed anthology of masses entitled Missae tredecim quatuor vocum, compiled by Johannes Ott and printed in Nuremberg in 1539. Because Nuremberg was attempting to demonstrate allegiance to the Catholic Empire and implement Lutheran reforms simultaneously, Ott intended Missae tredecim to be neutral in confession. Nevertheless, most extant exemplars of the print
with a traceable provenance belonged to Lutherans, and handwritten markings in the exemplars indicate their owners favored the Missa Pange lingua over other masses.

The Missa Pange lingua survives in several manuscripts that post-date the Missae tredecim print and belonged to Lutherans. Some of these manuscripts were copied directly from Missae tredecim. The Wittenberg printer Georg Rhau included sections of the Missa Pange lingua in his printed collection of pedagogical duets intended for Lutheran schools. Finally, the mass survives in a single print that was produced in the printshop of the Lutheran count Anthony von Isenburg. On the whole, the Germanic sources of the Missa Pange lingua indicate that the work acquired a Lutheran identity as the sixteenth century progressed. Therefore, the Missa Pange lingua should be considered a biconfessional work with both Catholic and Lutheran performance contexts.
Introduction: A Catholic Mass in Lutheran Sources

Musicologists typically laud the Missa Pange lingua as a beautiful, expressive work from Josquin’s late period as well as the climactic point in the evolution of the paraphrase mass. According to George Boyd in his study of the development of the paraphrase technique, “It is with the Missa Pange lingua that imitative paraphrase becomes the predominant structural device of the entire mass. In the finished shape given it by Josquin it would remain a popular compositional technique for a century to come.”¹ David Fallows describes the Missa Pange lingua as “...one of [Josquin’s] finest, most restrained and at the same time most expressive compositions....”² The mass is based on the Corpus Christi hymn Pange lingua, thus making its context appear to be rather obvious. As this dissertation will show, however, the context and reception of this work in the first century following its composition are much more complex and involve an institution that was in direct opposition to nearly everything associated with Pange lingua: the Lutheran church.

Despite multiple modern editions of the Missa Pange lingua and its ubiquity in music history textbooks, in-depth study of the context and reception of the mass is nearly non-existent.³ In addition to filling a void in Josquin scholarship, this project serves as a


² David Fallows, Josquin (Turnhout: Brepols, 2009), 320.

case study of a larger inquiry into the Lutheran use and reception of polyphonic Mass Ordinaries, which has the potential to alter current perceptions of the Renaissance compositions in this genre.\(^4\) I began my research on the *Missa Pange lingua* with the intention of using whatever methods necessary to determine who performed and distributed it in the sixteenth century, why they did so, and to what extent the pre-existing melodic material mattered.\(^5\)

The current secondary literature on the *Missa Pange lingua* gives the impression that its identity, based on performance context and the melodic model, is limited to the Catholic practices of Corpus Christi and Eucharistic devotion. The three most recent editions of the *Missa Pange lingua* by Thomas Warburton, Willem Elders, and Jaap van Benthem all address the *Pange lingua* hymn in the critical commentaries. In the words of Warburton, “…the historical and textual significance of the hymn melody itself associates this Mass with the rich liturgical heritage of the chant on which it is based.”\(^6\) He suggests a context of Corpus Christi or Good Friday based on the texts by Thomas Aquinas and Venantius Fortunatus. Willem Elders and Jaap van Benthem, editors of the *Missa Pange lingua* in the New Josquin edition and the Computerized Mensural Music

---

\(^4\) I intend to publish the results of this research project as a monograph.

\(^5\) The idea to focus my dissertation on a single piece was inspired—almost subconsciously—by Anne Robertson’s work on the *Missa Se la face ay pale* by Guillaume Du Fay. See Anne Walters Robertson, “The Man with the Pale Face, the Shroud, and Du Fay’s *Missa Se la face ay pale*,” *The Journal of Musicology* 27, no. 4 (Fall 2010): 377-434.

\(^6\) Warburton, 46.
Editing Project edition of the Occo Codex respectively, also describe the original Fortunatus text and the adaptation by Aquinas for Corpus Christi. Elders and Benthem both provide a general transmission analysis and some information on provenances of the sources with few conclusive thoughts pertaining to the performance contexts surrounding the extant sources and the probable relationships between one another.

In the chapter on masses based on plainchant in the *Josquin Companion*, Alejandro Planchart also describes how Josquin uses the melody from the *Pange lingua* hymn in his mass in a detailed analysis of the work. Planchart associates the *Missa Pange Lingua* with the feast of Corpus Christi and Eucharistic votive masses by citing the rubrics from the manuscripts JenaU 21 and VienNB 4809 as concrete evidence for this connection. Likewise, David Fallows’s recent monumental study of Josquin’s life and works devotes a section of the chapter on Josquin’s last years to the *Missa Pange lingua*. Both Fallows and Planchart offer analytical discussions of the mass, but do not delve further into liturgical or contextual matters. Earlier scholars also comment largely on the treatment of the hymn melody with minimal attention given to the context and reception of the *Missa Pange lingua*.

There are few studies dedicated exclusively to the *Missa Pange lingua* in the cascade of Josquin scholarship, but some do exist. Richard Sherr published a brief note in

---

7 Dumitrescu, “The Occo Codex”; NJE 4.3, 83.


9 Fallows, 320-323.

Early Music about the third Agnus Dei of the Missa Pange lingua.\textsuperscript{11} Sherr identifies a transcription error made by Otto Kade, the editor of the first modern edition. Kade’s misread ligature consequentially appeared in later scholarly editions of the mass. In “Beobachtungen über die Missa Pange lingua,” Juan Allende-Blin discusses various musical elements of the work such as rhythm, treatment of dissonance, and how the pre-existing chant melody is used. He also addresses the possible use of number symbolism, and points out a connection between the Pange lingua chant incitit and the symbol of the cross.\textsuperscript{12} Perhaps the most contextual writing on the Missa Pange lingua is found in Michael Long’s article on the Missa di dadi.\textsuperscript{13} Long finds several intriguing musical connections between the two masses, and speculates that Josquin may have looked back to the Missa di dadi while composing the Missa Pange lingua later in his life.\textsuperscript{14}


\textsuperscript{12} While Allende-Blin’s empirical data is present in the Missa Pange lingua, I find it difficult to concretely associate all of the numerical patterns with symbolic meaning. In any case, a more thorough study of numerical symbolism in the Missa Pange lingua is needed in addition to the mere three pages Allende-Blin devoted to symbolism. The symbolic relationship between the Missa Pange lingua and the cross of Christ is also addressed in the essay that accompanies Thomas Warburton’s edition of the mass. Warburton recognizes the significance of the chant melody in the mass, and devotes a considerable portion of his essay to the Pange lingua melody itself and the texts associated with it. In addition to the Pange lingua text from the Corpus Christi Vespers, Warburton brings to light an older chant that also begins with the words “Pange lingua”—a hymn by Venantius Fortunatus that describes Christ’s triumph on the cross. In the Roman Breviary, Pange lingua gloriosi Lauream certaminis is assigned to Passion Sunday and the subsequent daily Offices until Wednesday of Holy Week. The hymn is also used for feasts devoted to the Finding of the Holy Cross, the Exaltation of the Holy Cross, the Crown of Thorns, and the Five Wounds. The entire hymn is also sung during the adoration of the cross on Good Friday. Because of these two texts’ connection with the melody, Warburton suggests either a Holy Week or Corpus Christi context for the mass. See Hugh Henry, “Pange Lingua Gloriosi,” The Catholic Encyclopedia, http://www.newadvent.org.


\textsuperscript{14} One link between the two masses is the use of the number five, the number associated with the five wounds of Christ that resulted from his crucifixion. Long connects this number and its subsequent symbolism to the Elevation. While looking upon the consecrated Host, Christians were encouraged to contemplate Christ’s suffering and sacrifice on the cross. Long suggests that the connections with the Missa Pange lingua indicate that the Missa di dadi has a Eucharistic context and he also discusses the Elevation.
The existing literature on the *Missa Pange lingua* therefore addresses the context of the pre-existing material, but not the context of the mass itself. It is established that the mass has a connection to Corpus Christi, but to what extent did people during and immediately after Josquin’s lifetime associate the *Missa Pange lingua* with this feast or other acts of Eucharistic devotion? To answer this question, I turned to extant sources of the mass. There are currently twenty-seven known sources of the *Missa Pange lingua*. Some have complete or nearly-complete readings of the mass that would have been suitable for liturgical use, while others transmit only a couple of small sections in a variety of forms: duets known as bicinia most likely for pedagogical purposes, lute intabulations, and the Pleni sunt section appears in Heinrich Glarean’s *Dodecachordon* treatise. Thirteen—almost half—of the extant *Missa Pange lingua* sources were created and/or used in the German-speaking region. This number increases even more when the multiple exemplars of a print are considered. There are twenty-four extant or documented copies of *Missae tredecim quatuor vocum*, a collection of thirteen Mass Ordinary settings printed in Nuremberg in 1539. Although some exemplars have a more definitive provenance than others, only four of them are housed in libraries outside of present-day Germany and Austria. As we will see, the *Missae tredecim* is a pivotal source for the circulation of the *Missa Pange lingua* in Reformation Germany.

The Germanic sources of the *Missa Pange lingua* become all the more intriguing with a cursory survey of their provenances. LeipU 49/50, RegC 100, and RosU 49 were all copied in cities that had converted to Lutheranism several decades earlier. Brno 15/4 belonged to the German-speaking Lutheran community at the church of St. James in

---

and pertinent music and symbolism. Since the publication of Long’s study, Josquin’s authorship of the *Missa di dadi* has been doubted by several scholars. See Planchart, 152-59.
Brno. The *Missae tredecim quatuor vocum* was printed in the Lutheran city of Nuremberg and Georg Rhau’s collection of bicinia was printed in Wittenberg, the birthplace of the Lutheran Reformation. When the extant or documented exemplars of the *Missae tredecim quatuor vocum* are considered, the number of Lutheran *Missa Pange lingua* sources doubles. Considering the pre-existent melodic material in the *Missa Pange lingua*, this is highly unexpected due to the polemical role the Eucharist and the feast of Corpus Christi played in the Lutheran Reformation.

Examination of *Kirchenordnungen*, or church orders, written for newly formed Lutheran communities confirms that Latin polyphonic Mass Ordinary settings had a place in many Lutheran liturgies. *Kirchenordnungen* were considered to be legal documents and contain information on a variety of topics pertinent to a town or church that recently broke away from Rome such as tenants of basic governance, the organization and curriculum of schools, special rites such as baptism and marriage, and the structure of liturgical services.\(^{15}\) In many cases, the *Kirchenordnungen* prescribed bilingual services with texts sung or recited in Latin, German, or both. The texts of the Mass Ordinary, as opposed to the Mass Proper, did not change from week to week in the Catholic Mass. As a result of this practice, the Mass Ordinary texts were relatively familiar to churchgoers, and Lutheran *Kirchenordnungen* often prescribed the singing of these texts in Latin. Thus, polyphonic Mass Ordinary settings such as the *Missa Pange lingua* would have had a place in many Lutheran liturgies, particularly those held in courts and cities with sufficient resources for a trained choir able to sing the older Latin repertoire.

\(^{15}\) The most comprehensive collection of transcribed *Kirchenordnungen* is the series Emil Sehling began over a century ago: Emil Sehling, ed., *Die Evangelischen Kirchenordnungen des XVI. Jahrhunderts* (Leipzig: O.R. Reisland, 1902-).
The Missa Pange lingua sources covered in this dissertation were owned by a variety of individuals and institutions throughout Germany and other parts of Europe. The physical characteristics of the manuscripts and prints are also varied. Josquin’s mass appears in utilitarian partbooks both printed and hand-copied, ornate presentation manuscripts including one that was mysteriously left unfinished, and anthologies of duets extracted from larger works for pedagogical purposes. Moreover, the Germanic Missa Pange lingua sources have received a range of attention in musicological literature. The manuscripts from the workshop of Petrus Alamire have been heavily examined, whereas other sources—all of which are Lutheran—have received little to no attention from modern scholars. A study dedicated to Brno 15/4 (and a second manuscript from the same church containing similar repertoire) appeared in an international music periodical for the first time in November 2012. The unfinished manuscript MunBS 510 has been mentioned in previous scholarship but, given recent work on other choirbooks at the Bavarian State Library, is due for re-evaluation.

This dissertation is organized according to the chronological order of the sources. Consequently, it is also organized by confession. The earliest sources of the Missa Pange lingua belonged to Catholics while sources from the second half of the sixteenth century belonged to Lutheran individuals or communities. The Missae tredecim quatuor vocum was intended to be a confessionally neutral publication. This printed anthology of masses was published in 1539, right in between the approximate dates of the earlier Catholic sources and the later Lutheran sources. Most of the surviving Missae tredecim copies belonged to Lutherans, although two can be traced to Catholics.

---

The opening chapter provides historical and contextual information essential for understanding the reception of the *Missa Pange lingua* in the sixteenth century. It covers the origins of the feast of Corpus Christi and its liturgy, the use and popularity of *Pange lingua* in various Eucharistic rituals, polyphonic settings of this hymn, and finally the exceptionally strong devotion to the Eucharist and Corpus Christi present in medieval Germany. The purpose of this first chapter is to acquaint the reader with what sixteenth-century performers and listeners would have associated with *Pange lingua* and Josquin’s mass based on this hymn.

The earliest *Missa Pange lingua* sources are the topic of Chapter 2. In addition to manuscripts associated with Frederick the Wise, the Fugger family, and Cardinal Matthäus Lang von Wellenburg, other manuscripts from the Petrus Alamire workshop and the Vatican are included in order to present a hypothesis for the initial transmission of the *Missa Pange lingua* from Josquin himself to the Petrus Alamire workshop to courts and patrons throughout Europe such as the Medici and Habsburgs. These early manuscripts confirm that the mass was in the hands of the most powerful Catholics in Europe at the time of the Reformation. Moreover, illustrations and labeling of the *Missa Pange lingua* in several of these sources affirm an association of the mass with Corpus Christi and Eucharistic devotion.

In Chapter 3, the *Missa Pange lingua* reaches a confessional crossroads with *Missae tredecim quatuor vocum*, published by the Nuremberg bookseller Johannes Ott in 1539. The first part of this chapter examines the circumstances behind Ott’s effort to market *Missae tredecim* as well as his other printed collections of Latin polyphony as neither Catholic nor Lutheran. The second part proposes a couple hypotheses for Ott’s
sources of the *Missa Pange lingua* and the other masses in the print. Ott and his printer, Hieronymous Formschneider, would have needed to obtain exemplars of the masses from somewhere in order to produce their own printed edition. The final section of Chapter 3 focuses on the extant exemplars of *Missae tredecim*. Analysis of these exemplars and handwritten annotations therein reveals that Lutherans performed some of the *Missae tredecim* masses in both liturgical and pedagogical settings, and that the *Missa Pange lingua* was favored among the masses selected for performance and study.

The fourth chapter covers five manuscripts containing the *Missa Pange lingua* that are dated after the publication of *Missae tredecim* in 1539. All five can be traced to a Lutheran individual or community, and the *Missa Pange lingua* in three manuscripts appears to have been copied directly from the reading in the *Missae tredecim* print. However, the scribes did not mindlessly copy Josquin’s mass into their manuscripts just because it appeared in the print. The *Missa Pange lingua* is the sole *Missae tredecim* mass in three of the manuscripts, while the other two manuscripts contain only one additional mass from the print. Scribes selected the *Missa Pange lingua* over other masses in *Missae tredecim*, which resulted in further circulation of the *Missa Pange lingua* among Lutherans.

In the fifth and final chapter, the remaining Germanic *Missa Pange lingua* sources provide some answers to the fundamental questions surrounding the Lutheran reception of the mass: Did Lutherans associate the text of Thomas Aquinas’s Corpus Christi hymn with the *Missa Pange lingua*, and how did they approach the use of Latin polyphony with content that was theologically objectionable? The sources discussed in Chapter 5 are three collections of bicinia, including Georg Rhau’s well-known *Bicinia gallica, latina,*
Germanica (Wittenberg 1545), and a single print of the complete mass produced by a Lutheran count named Anthony von Isenburg in his castle printshop. This print has received little attention from scholars, but it is arguably the most intriguing Missa Pange lingua source in the dissertation.

At the opening session of the International Josquin Festival-Conference in 1971, an aging Friedrich Blume recalled how he and his students studied and performed Josquin’s Missa Pange lingua in 1927, when scholarly editions of fifteenth and sixteenth-century music were scarce. The work has come a long way since 1927 and even since 1971 in terms of scholarship and performance, but detailed study of the context and reception of the mass has yet to be undertaken. Jessie Ann Owens recognized the importance of contextual studies of Josquin in any genre or place:

It is all too easy to think of the contents of the modern edition of Josquin’s complete works as having been widely available during the composer’s lifetime as well as after his death. Yet the patterns of dissemination of his music and the records of the actual repertories performed in a given time and place reveal that the Josquin we know from the modern edition was not the Josquin experienced in various parts of Europe. To understand his place in history requires replacing the composite picture of modern historiography with a series of images specific to particular times and places.

My dissertation will illustrate how both Catholics and Lutherans living in sixteenth-century Germany experienced one of Josquin’s most famous works. This particular piece within the greater puzzle of Josquin scholarship will also serve as a case study of the

---


relationship between medieval ritual and religious culture and the revolutionary ideology of Martin Luther and his followers.
Chapter 1: The Origins and Use of *Pange lingua* from the Early Middle Ages to Reformation Germany

In order to understand how the *Missa Pange lingua* was used and received shortly after its genesis in the early sixteenth century, it is important to be familiar with the concepts and images that sixteenth-century listeners and performers would have associated with its model. This is an integral aspect of the contextual study of any polyphonic work that contains pre-existing material; Honey Meconi refers to borrowed musical material as “the very *fons et origo* of Western polyphony itself.” However, it is especially crucial for the *Missa Pange lingua* because the chant melody is heard so clearly throughout the work and would have been recognized by a congregation listening to the work, as well as by the singers performing it. The following chapter provides a brief contextual survey of the model for the *Missa Pange lingua*. It begins in the early Middle Ages and concludes in the Protestant Reformation of the sixteenth century, with an emphasis on the Germanic region. It discusses the origins and composition of the chant, along with its presence in monophonic and other polyphonic sources.

The objective of this chapter is to establish the liturgical meaning that the pre-existing melody in the *Missa Pange lingua* held for the sixteenth-century German Christians who experienced the work. Those who came in contact with early sources of the mass in the 1520s certainly would have been familiar with *Pange lingua* because the feast and rituals associated with the hymn were widely celebrated in Germany—they were actually celebrated too excessively, in the opinions of several church officials, as we shall see.

---

Fortunatus, Aquinas, and Corpus Christi

The story of the model for the Missa Pange lingua begins in the early Middle Ages, nearly a millennium before the Protestant Reformation. In 569, Emperor Justin II and Empress Sophia sent a piece of the True Cross from Constantinople to the Gallican city of Poitiers. Radagund, a queen-turned-deaconess, established a convent in Poitiers and requested relics from the rulers of Constantinople. The imperial couple obliged with the cross relic and other gifts. Radegund’s convent became known as Sainte-Croix.

Venantius Fortunatus (ca. 535-610), a preeminent hymn writer who later became bishop of Poitiers, composed two hymns to commemorate the arrival of the relic in Poitiers: Vexilla regis and Pange lingua.² Fortunatus’s Pange lingua, which begins “Pange lingua gloriosi proelium certaminis,” focuses on the cross and its role in Christ’s sacrifice for the redemption of the human race, with references to the tree from which Adam and Eve took the forbidden fruit and the life of Christ leading up to his crucifixion. The hymn is in trochaic tetrameter catalectic, the meter of Roman military marching chants.³ This trait made the hymn practical for use during processions with the relic. In time, Pange lingua attained a place in the Good Friday liturgy during the veneration of the cross.

Corpus Christi was a relatively late addition to the Roman Liturgical Calendar; it developed and flourished as an outgrowth of medieval Eucharistic theology and practices. Early Christians accepted that the bread was Christ’s body and treated it as such, but they


did not pursue a deeper theological explanation. Debates over Jesus’s historical body and his presence in the Eucharist were rare until the ninth century. The first notable discussion of the Eucharist took place during the first half of the ninth century at the monastery of Corbie between St. Paschasius Radbertus (d. 859), the abbot of the monastery, and Ratramnus (d. 868), a fellow monk.⁴ Both wrote treatises entitled *De Corpore et Sanguine Domini*, but they contained very different ideas. Paschasius, whose treatise was completed in 831 and expressed an extreme realist view of the Eucharist, believed there was no difference between Christ’s “Eucharistic” body and his historical body that was crucified.⁵ Ratramnus believed in a “figurative” presence of Christ in the Eucharist, one that was more symbolic than physical.⁶

The next major Eucharistic debate occurred in the eleventh century between the archdeacon Berengarius of Tours (d. 1088) and Lanfranc of Bec (d. 1089), who became the archbishop of Canterbury in 1070. Berengarius believed that the priest’s consecration at Mass had no effect on the nature of the bread and wine, but added an element of power that made them spiritual signs of Christ’s body and blood.⁷ Lanfranc, on the other hand, made a distinction between the appearance and essence of the bread and wine after the consecration. He believed that the visible reality (bread and wine) that remained after the

---

⁴ Paschasius’s and Ratramnus’s ideas differed, but it is uncertain whether Ratramnus was directly challenging Paschasius. See James T. O’Connor, *The Hidden Manna: A Theology of the Eucharist*, 2nd ed (San Francisco: Ignatius Press, 2005), 9.


⁶ O’Connor, 93. Mitchell observes that Ratramnus did, however, use some of the vocabulary of the future medieval scholasticism, when he spoke of Christ’s presence in the Eucharist as being “substantial.”

⁷ Ibid., 100.
consecration was different from the invisible (the body and blood of Christ). Lanfranc’s student, Guitmund, also subscribed to this theory and was one of the first to use the term “substance” (subiectum) in Eucharistic debates. Berengarius eventually lost the argument, and the synod of Rome forced him to take an oath saying that Christ was physically rather than merely sacramentally present in the Eucharist.

Unlike the earlier discourses at Corbie, the argument of Berengarius and Lanfranc caught the interest of others beyond their immediate circle. Clergy, scholars, and nobility throughout Europe began to take an interest in explaining Christ’s presence in the Eucharist, which led to many discussions and debates during the twelfth century. In November 1215, the Fourth Lateran Council declared Christ’s substantial presence in the Eucharist to be Church dogma by establishing the doctrine of transubstantiation, that is, the doctrine that the “matter and form” of the bread and wine are changed into the “matter and form” of the Body and Blood of Christ while the physical “accidents” of the bread and wine remain. The doctrine, along with the term transubstantiation, was endorsed in an attempt to reconcile the different perspectives on the topic. One theologian who participated in the ongoing Eucharist discussion was the Dominican monk Thomas Aquinas (1225-1274). Aquinas applied Aristotelian terminology to the concept of transubstantiation and articulated that the “matter and form” of the bread and wine are changed into the “matter and form” of the body and blood of Christ.

---


9 O’Connor, 109.

10 Ibid., 279. Aquinas addresses his view on the nature of the Eucharist in Summa Theologica III q. 75 a. 4.
As the Church’s teaching on the Eucharist became more concrete, Christians took a greater interest in the sacrament. The Elevation of the Host, when the priest lifted the Host up for the congregation to see after speaking the words of consecration, was introduced by the late twelfth century and eventually became the highlight of every Mass.\textsuperscript{11} About a century later, the feast of Corpus Christi was established. The idea of Corpus Christi was originally conceived by a holy woman from Liège named Juliana. Around the year 1208, she began having visions of a full moon with a dark blemish. Christ revealed to her that the moon symbolized the Church, and the dark spot was the absence of a feast that he wanted the Church to celebrate. Juliana described her vision and its meaning to her confessor, John of Lausanne, who relayed it to Robert of Turotte, the bishop of Liège. Robert made Corpus Christi an official feast in his diocese in 1246, but died later that year. Juliana died in 1258 but left behind a small group of supporters of her feast, including local Dominicans.\textsuperscript{12} In fact, it was a Dominican who introduced Corpus Christi to the Germanic region a few years before Juliana’s death. Hugh of St. Cher, the Cardinal-Legate to Germany, became familiar with the feast during an extended stay in Liège. He promoted the feast throughout his travels, and Corpus Christi was formally instituted in his Germanic territory on December 29, 1252.\textsuperscript{13}

Twelve years later, in 1264, Pope Urban IV made Corpus Christi a universal feast with his bull \textit{Transiturus}. However, Urban died a short time later and the bull was never circulated. After Urban’s death, the feast of Corpus Christi became popular in Germany.

\textsuperscript{11} For an overview of the development of the Elevation ritual, see Miri Rubin, \textit{Corpus Christi: The Eucharist in Late Medieval Culture} (Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 1991), 49-63.

\textsuperscript{12} Ibid., 174.

\textsuperscript{13} Ibid., 174-75.
and other regions, even though an official papal proclamation had not been formally disseminated there. Thirteenth-century liturgical books originating from the papal curia give no evidence of the feast, but church authorities in Rome took a renewed interest in Corpus Christi at the council of Vienne in the early years of the fourteenth century. The council met between October 1311 and May 1312, and the new canon law collection that was published following the council is known as the *Clementines*, after the presiding pope Clement V (1264-1314).

The *Clementines* collection was revised and published in October 1317 by Clement’s successor, John XXII. With the revisions, John incorporated Urban’s *Transiturus* into the collection under the heading *De reliquis et veneratione sanctorum* (on relics and the veneration of saints). The *Clementines* collection was approved and ready for circulation by November 1317, and thus officially instituted the feast of Corpus Christi for all of Christianity.\(^{14}\) What was John XXII’s motivation behind renewing *Transiturus*? Miri Rubin suggests that it could have been related to his fervent desire to preserve ecclesiastical power, the fact that he canonized Thomas Aquinas, and a growing pastoral need for the creation of an “orthodox” Eucharistic celebration.\(^{15}\) In 1389, Urban VI officially placed Corpus Christi on the same level of the four major feasts of the Church (Christmas, Easter, Pentecost, and the Assumption) by granting indulgences and suspending interdicts on the feast day. In 1429, Pope Martin V extended the same privileges to the Corpus Christi octave.\(^{16}\)

---

\(^{14}\) For more about the process of institution Corpus Christi between Urban IV’s death and the council of Vienne see Rubin, 176-85.

\(^{15}\) Ibid., 184-85.

With the formal institution of Corpus Christi, a formal liturgy was needed. There are three early versions of the Corpus Christi liturgy, each of which is known by its first antiphon at second Vespers. The first, *Animarum cibus*, was written by Juliana with the help of her confessor, John of Lausanne.\(^\text{17}\)*Animarum cibus* is a secular office with virtually no texts in common with the other two offices. The second, *Sapiencia [a]edificavit*, was probably hastily written by Thomas Aquinas at the request of Urban IV for a special celebration of Corpus Christi in August 1264.\(^\text{18}\)*The third office, *Sacerdos in [a]ternum*, became the official Roman office for Corpus Christi and was also written by Aquinas.\(^\text{19}\) Among the hymns that Aquinas wrote for Corpus Christi are *Sacris solemniis*, *Verbum supernum prodiens*, and *Pange lingua*. Unlike the earlier office, both of Aquinas’s Corpus Christi offices are scripture-based; the chant items in *Sapiencia [a]edificavit* contain direct quotations from the Bible, while the scriptural references in *Sacerdos in [a]ternum* are paraphrased.

Nearly seven centuries after the delivery of the cross relic to Poitiers, Thomas Aquinas (1225-1274) used the melody and incipit of Fortunatus’s *Pange lingua* to create a Vespers hymn for the new feast of Corpus Christi.\(^\text{20}\) Fortunatus begins his hymn with


\(^{19}\) Although questions have been raised in the past, Thomas Aquinas’s authorship of the two Corpus Christi offices is generally accepted among scholars today. See Rubin, 185-188, and Walters, 34-36.

\(^{20}\) Bruno Stäblein indexed the contents of over 360 hymnal sources in the first volume of *Monumenta Monodica Medii Aevi*, and to this date it is the most comprehensive resource on the topic of medieval hymn melodies. Stäblein identified a melody in the Phrygian mode that is labeled in his index as “56,” with slight variants noted as subscript numerals. This melody appears to have been sung throughout Europe, is associated with both *Pange lingua* texts, and it is the melody that Josquin used in the *Missa Pange lingua*. 
the line “Pange, lingua, gloriosi proelium certaminis,” which can be translated as “sing [tell] my tongue, of that engagement, that struggle glorious.” Aquinas borrowed the command “Pange, lingua” but continued “Pange lingua gloriosi corporis mysterium,” imploring the tongue to sing of “the sacrament of glorious body and precious blood.” Aquinas borrows the trochaic meter and also recounts the sequence of Christ’s earthly life in the middle stanzas. Evidence of Aquinas’s use of the Fortunatus Pange lingua as a melodic and textual model is found in the manuscript Paris BNL, lat. 1143, which dates from the late thirteenth or early fourteenth century and contains a complete version of the Corpus Christi Office. A useful and intriguing feature of this manuscript is the accompanying marginalia that provides the sources of the Corpus Christi Office items. Next to Pange lingua, a marginal note reads “Contra. Pange lingua gloriosi praellum certaminis, in Passione Domini.” The early association of Aquinas’s words with the Phrygian melody found in Josquin’s Missa Pange lingua is confirmed by the chant melodies accompanying the Pange lingua text in both BNF lat. 1143 and BNF lat. 15182. The latter is a thirteenth-century breviary that contains the Corpus Christi office. As Corpus Christi became a regular feast in the Roman Temporale, Aquinas’s chants for the mass and office were added to existing liturgical books. For this reason, scribes copied liturgical items from Corpus Christi onto blank pages usually at the end of

---

21 Translation from Peter G. Walsh with Christopher Husch, eds. and trans., One Hundred Latin Hymns: Ambrose to Aquinas (Cambridge: Harvard University Press, 2012), 96-97. The word “Pange” is translated as “sing” in Fortunatus’s Pange lingua and as “tell” in Aquinas’s (Husch, 362-63). The verb “pangere” can also mean to fasten, fix, agree upon, write, compose, celebrate, or record.

22 A complete chart of the Corpus Christi Office items and marginalia can be found in Thomas J. Mathiesen, “The Office of the New Feast of Corpus Christi in the Regimen Animarium at Brigham Young University,” The Journal of Musicology 2, no. 1 (Winter 1983), 24-25.
liturgical books rather than after the Trinity Sunday liturgy in the Temporale. The assimilation of this feast into the Roman Liturgical calendar was a gradual process that happened at various rates for different regions. According to Miri Rubin, the Corpus Christi liturgy was added to the books “early on and with comparative ease,” in northern Germany, most likely because Liège was in the archbishopric of Cologne and the efforts of Hugh of St. Cher would have hastened the propagation of Corpus Christi in the Germanic region.23

In the fifteenth century, the popularity of Corpus Christi increased in Germany and elsewhere in Europe, which prompted new liturgical and creative endeavors associated with the feast. Corpus Christi obtained a variety of associated images as the feast was entered into manuscripts and grew in popularity. Images of the Last Supper, Eucharistic processions, a chalice and paten, Christ as priest, and the Mass of St. Gregory are found in graduals, antiphonaries, Books of Hours, and other liturgical books. As Eucharistic votive masses and Benediction services became more common, the image of a monstrance on an altar was sometimes used. At the bottom of the opening Corpus Christi page of one ornate sixteenth-century missal from St. Gall, there is an image of God sprinkling manna from the heavens and the people gathering it in baskets.24 The missal was created in 1555 for the abbot of St. Gall, Diethelm Blarer (1530-1564). The manna from heaven scene is especially appropriate for Corpus Christi because multiple items in the liturgy reference the account in Exodus of God sending bread from heaven to feed the Israelites in the desert. The feast also inspired the composition of sermons, the

23 Rubin, 198. See pp. 196-99 for an overview of Corpus Christi’s entry into liturgical books.

establishment of confraternities, liturgical dramas, and processions with the consecrated Host, also known as the Blessed Sacrament.\textsuperscript{25}

The Corpus Christi procession was not part of the original festal liturgy, but by the sixteenth century it had become one of the most important aspects of the feast. The first documented Corpus Christi procession occurred between 1264 and 1278 at the church of St. Gereon in Cologne.\textsuperscript{26} Processions appear to be at least partially a German tradition, as they began appearing throughout that region even before the Council of Vienne. Following the procession at St. Gereon, there were processions in Klosterneuberg in 1288, Lüttich around 1300, Hildesheim and Augsburg in 1303, and the entire diocese of Cologne in 1308.\textsuperscript{27} The procession became a ritual that was civic as well as religious, and nearly every German town or church had some sort of Corpus Christi procession by the time Martin Luther began his career in the early sixteenth century.\textsuperscript{28}

Processions varied in size and nature throughout Germany (and the rest of Europe), but they did share some common features. The central, most important part of a Corpus Christi procession was a consecrated Host carried in a monstrance usually by the highest-ranking clergyman.\textsuperscript{29} Sometimes the Host was carried underneath an ornate

\footnotesize
\begin{itemize}
\item \textsuperscript{25} See Rubin, 204-43 and 271-87 for a general description of these developments.
\item \textsuperscript{26} For the text and analysis of this document, see T. Schnitzler, “Die erste Fronleichnamsprozession. Datum und Character,” \textit{Münchner theologische Zeitschrift} 24 (1973), 352-62. For an in-depth discussion of medieval Eucharistic devotion and Corpus Christi observance in Cologne, see Heather C. McCune Bruhn, “Late Gothic Architectural Monstrances in the Rhineland, c. 1380-1480: Objects in Context” (Ph.D. diss., Pennsylvania State University, 2006).
\item \textsuperscript{27} Josef Hofmann, “Die Fronleichnamsprozession in Aschaffenburg nach den Prozessionbüchern des 14. bis. 16 Jahrhunderts,” \textit{Würzburger Diözesangeschlechtsblätter} 26 (1964), 111.
\item \textsuperscript{28} For descriptions of Corpus Christi processions in multiple Bavarian cities, see Alois Mitterwieser, \textit{Geschichte der Fronleichnamsprozession in Bayern} (Munich: Verlag Knorr & Hirth, 1930).
\item \textsuperscript{29} It is plausible, at least in England, that the act of carrying the Blessed Sacrament in procession derived from the Palm Sunday procession. The Host—being Christ in one substance or another—was carried in the
\end{itemize}
canopy. Crucifixes, candles, banners, and reliquaries were also part of the procession. Participants in the procession included clergy of various ranks, religious orders, confraternities, guilds, community leaders, and students. Sometimes there would be instrumental musicians and children dressed as angels. The order of the Corpus Christi procession became of utmost importance, and in many cases the processional hierarchy became associated with a city’s secular politics.\(^{30}\)

Contemporary descriptions of medieval Corpus Christi processions depict the feast as a joyful summer holiday that required careful preparation. Cities and churches certainly held processions on the actual feast of Corpus Christi, but many communities organized additional processions on the Sunday after Corpus Christi and the Octave of the feast.\(^{31}\) Citywide processions often had a designated route that encircled the city and stopped at churches and other religious landmarks.\(^{32}\) Sometimes the procession would stop at bridges or other important civic structures. Processions with the Host were not limited to the Corpus Christi octave; they were held on other major feast days such as Christmas and the days of Holy Week. Host Processions were also held in the wake of plagues and other natural disasters, or when an important religious or political figure visited a city.\(^{33}\) Beginning in the fifteenth century, many places held Eucharistic processions to commemorate Christ’s triumphal entry into Jerusalem. See Rubin, 244-45; and Terence Bailey, *The Processions of Sarum and the Western Church* (Toronto: Pontifical Institute of Mediaeval Studies, 1971), 116-17.

\(^{30}\) See Rubin, 259-265.

\(^{31}\) Peter Browe, *Die Verehrung der Eucharistie im Mittelalter* (Munich: Max Hueber, 1933), 106.

\(^{32}\) For descriptions of German Corpus Christi processions and their routes with an emphasis on Cologne, see Bruhn 147-169. Zika provides a brief description of the 1381 Corpus Christi procession in Würzburg, see Zika, 38-39.

\(^{33}\) For more on Host processions outside of Corpus Christi, see Browe, 121-135; and Bruhn, 169-76.
processions on a monthly or even weekly basis. These regular processions usually occurred on Thursday, the day the Lord’s Supper was commemorated during Holy Week and the day of Corpus Christi.

In addition to the Elevation at Mass and the Corpus Christi procession, medieval Christians had several other opportunities to be in the presence of the Blessed Sacrament. There was an increase in Eucharistic adoration periods (during which the Host was displayed on the altar), Benediction services, and votive masses throughout Europe, but these practices were particularly popular in Germany. In 1456, Pope Calixtus III referred to the practice of Eucharistic exposition—particularly during Eucharistic votive masses—as a German custom in a letter to the Elector Frederick II of Saxony. These rituals, along with the procession itself, derived from the Elevation during the Mass, and were a means of extending that moment when people could gaze upon the real presence of Christ under the physical form of bread.

The custom of reserving or storing consecrated Hosts so that they could be given to the sick and dying who were unable to attend Mass, and the act of “visiting” those reserved Hosts can be traced back to early Christianity. Justin Martyr (ca. 150), for example, was familiar with such practices. Eucharistic adoration, the act of spending an extended amount of time in the presence of a consecrated Host, was a later development that increased in popularity during the fifteenth century due to the emphasis placed on the

34 Browe, 123.
35 Medieval Christians were overcome by a desire for visual contact with the Eucharist. Consuming the Host, a weekly occurrence for Catholics today, was an opportunity reserved for only the clergy, except on a few major feasts such as Christmas, Corpus Christi, and Easter.
36 Browe, 143.
37 Mitchell, 155-56.
Eucharist at Mass and during Corpus Christi. The faithful wanted more than just a glance at the Blessed Sacrament, and periods of adoration prolonged that moment when the priest held up the Host at Mass or walked by with it on the procession route. Another ritual that became customary after Masses and hours of the Divine Office was the Eucharistic Benediction with the monstrance. This silent blessing given by the priest holding a monstrance containing a Host derives at least partially from Corpus Christi processions; the procession would often pause at designated “stations” while the priest imparted blessings on that particular place while holding the Blessed Sacrament.\(^{38}\)

The final two verses of *Pange lingua*—*Tantum ergo* and *Genitori genitoque*—found a place in the liturgical service developed for Benedictions. The 1614 *Rituale Romanum* includes these two verses in its Benediction liturgy.\(^{39}\) By the end of the fifteenth century, most churches in the northern and eastern parts of Germany held an evening Benediction service with varying frequencies, and these services were held in Bavaria and Austria as well.\(^{40}\) In addition to the Benediction ritual, many German churches adopted what Peter Browe refers to as *Daueraussetzungen*, when the Eucharist is displayed on the altar or in the tabernacle for an extended period of time. According to Browe, this practice was limited to Germany and possibly parts of Sweden.\(^{41}\) In most cases, it is not known exactly how long these periods of Eucharistic adoration lasted.

---

\(^{38}\) The earliest written evidence of blessings being imparted at stations during the Corpus Christi procession comes from a Benedictine monastery in Hildesheim in 1301. During this particular procession, the parade would pause while the people sang an antiphon as the priest blessed them with the Host. Mitchell also claims that Benedictions are connected to the singing of *laude* at the conclusion of Vespers or Compline. See Mitchell, 172-74.

\(^{39}\) Mitchell, 195.

\(^{40}\) Browe, 161.

\(^{41}\) Ibid., 163.
Eucharistic votive masses originated in Germany in the early fourteenth century. The votive Mass in honor of the Eucharist developed from Eucharistic adoration periods—a time when the faithful prayed in the presence of a consecrated Host. A unique feature of these masses is that the Blessed Sacrament was displayed on the altar throughout the duration of the service. There is evidence of weekly Eucharistic votive masses being celebrated in Roher (Regensburg diocese) in 1320, the Königsberg cathedral in 1327, Ratibor in 1377, Liegnitz in 1385, and the Thomaskirche in Leipzig in 1392.\textsuperscript{42} Eucharistic votive masses were celebrated primarily in northern and eastern Germany for most of the fifteenth century, but the trend did spread south as the century progressed. They almost always occurred on Thursday at a side altar, and were usually endowed by the local Corpus Christi confraternity.\textsuperscript{43} By the turn of the sixteenth century, Eucharistic votive masses were celebrated in most of the German-speaking realm.\textsuperscript{44} Peter Browe refers to these votive masses both as \textit{Votivmessen de corpora Christi} and \textit{Aussetzungsmessen} (exposition masses).\textsuperscript{45}

Eucharistic votive masses have not been addressed in recent Corpus Christi studies by Miri Rubin and Barbara Walters, despite the fact that the Corpus Christi liturgy was used for these services. It appears that the Mass proper items for these votive masses were taken directly from the Corpus Christi liturgy; rubrics and additional items

\begin{itemize}
  \item \textsuperscript{42} Ibid., 142.
  \item \textsuperscript{43} Before the institution of weekly Corpus Christi votive masses, a votive mass for the Holy Spirit was typically celebrated on Thursday. See Peter Browe, \textit{Die Verehrung der Eucharistie im Mittelalter} (Munich: Max Hueber Verlag, 1933)
  \item \textsuperscript{44} Browe, 145.
  \item \textsuperscript{45} The labeling inconsistency indicates that it might have been unclear to him if the weekly Corpus Christi masses were associated with other medieval votive masses such as those for the Virgin Mary, if they stemmed from the practice of Eucharistic exposition, or if they were of other devotional significance.
\end{itemize}
(such as tracts for Lent) from several graduals and missals indicate that the Corpus Christi Proper items were also used at Eucharistic votive masses. The organization of some graduals even reflects how closely these votive masses were related to the feast of Corpus Christi. In the *Graduale Pataviense*, a 1511 gradual from the diocese of Passau, the Proper chants for Corpus Christi are placed in their usual spot in the Temporale after Trinity Sunday, along with rubrics and additional chants for votive masses. There are multiple Offertory and Communion chants, and a tract provided for Quadragesima within the Corpus Christi propers, and then a complete set of mass propers for Septuagesima follows. The rubric for this section reads *Infra Septuagesim[a]. De corpore Christi. Offitium.*  

Eucharistic votive masses can be found with other votive masses as well. A 1466 missal from Erfurt has a section with rubrics and liturgical items for votive masses for the Trinity, Holy Spirit, the angels, the cross, the Virgin Mary, patrons of an order or monastery, a *missa cot paganos*, and a *de venerabili sacramento missa votive*.  

**Pange lingua: Text, Usage, and Location in Liturgical Books**

Along with *Lauda Sion*, Aquinas’s Corpus Christi sequence, *Pange lingua* is considered to be a masterpiece of theology expressed through poetry. Rubin provides the following description of the hymn:

*Pange, lingua* combines mysticism with doctrine.... Moving between new and old, as in the *Lauda, syon* Thomas’ hymn thrives on oppositions, in a manner most suited for the exploration of the paradoxes in the eucharist: the incarnation of God in the word, and the word in the flesh. Yet behind the play there is a strong assertion of the truths of sacrifice and redemption.

---

46 Christian Väterlein, ed., *Graduale Pataviense (Wien 1511)*, Das Erbe Deutscher Musik 87 (Kassel: Bärenreiter, 1982). The Corpus Christi propers are found on ff. 101r-102r.

47 London, British Library Add. 10927. The votive mass section begins on f. 120v.
Table 1.1

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Pange lingua with English Translation&lt;sup&gt;48&lt;/sup&gt;</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1. Pange, lingua, gloriosi corporis mysterium, sanguinisque pretiosi quem in mundi pretium, fructus ventris generosi, rex effudit gentium.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1. Tell, my tongue, the sacrament of glorious body and precious blood poured out by the king of nations, by the fruit of a noble womb; by which means he paid the ransom to redeem the world from sin.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2. Nobis datus, nobis natus ex Maria virgine, et in mundo conversatus sparso verbi semine, sui moras incolatus miro clausit ordine.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2. To us given, for us begotten from the virgin Mary’s womb, and in the world’s confines abiding, having scattered the word’s seed, he his term of dwelling with us closed with wondrous ordering.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3. In supernae nocte cenae recumbens cum fratribus, observata lege plene cibis in legalibus, cibus turbae duodenae se dat suis manibus.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3. On the night of the last supper, with his brothers he reclined, and observed the law in fullness with foods by the law ordained; as food he to his band twelvefold gave himself with his own hands.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4. Verbum caro panem verum verbo carnem efficit, fitque sanguis Christi merum, et, si sensus deficit, ad firmandum cor sincerum sola fides sufficit.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4. Word-made-flesh transforms the true bread by the word into his flesh; wine is changed into the Christ’s blood; and, if sense fails to discern, faith alone is found sufficient to strengthen devoted hearts.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5. We this sacrament of greatness will revere on bended knee, and the observance of the ancients yield to a new form of rite. Let faith make its own addition to our senses’ failing powers.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>6. To the Father and Son likewise praise and exultation, faith, honor, and power also be, and benediction. To the one from both proceeding equal be laudation.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<sup>48</sup> Translation from Peter G. Walsh with Christopher Husch, eds. and trans., One Hundred Latin Hymns: Ambrose to Aquinas (Cambridge: Harvard University Press, 2012), 363-5. There are numerous translations of Pange lingua available, but I chose the translation in Walsh and Husch’s anthology because it is among the most recent and it provides the most accurate rendering of the original Latin, particularly in the fourth and final stanzas.
Following the borrowed phrase *Pange lingua*, the first verse is essentially a summary of both the content in the remaining verses and as well as the Christian salvation narrative. The word “mysterium” comes from a Greek word that is rendered as “sacramentum” in the Latin vulgate; Aquinas must have chosen the former to also refer to Christ’s mysterious presence in the Eucharist.\(^49\) The remainder of the verse outlines how Christ, after being born of a virgin, sacrificed his body and blood for the salvation of the world. Verses two and three expand upon the narrative of Christ’s life and accomplishments on earth. The second verse covers Christ’s birth and earthly ministry (“scattering the seed of the word”) up to the point of his Passion. The Last Supper is the primary topic for the third verse, an appropriate event to highlight in a hymn about the Eucharist. The third verse also contains references to the Jewish Law for celebrating the Passover, which is a reminder that the Last Supper was a Passover meal for Christ and his disciples.

The fourth verse is the most theologically significant in terms of Eucharistic theology. The translation of this verse was given extensive discussion in the *Pange lingua* entry of the Catholic Encyclopedia, and rightly so: it is the section that most explicitly describes the doctrine of transubstantiation.\(^50\) This verse would have been the most objectionable to Martin Luther and his followers, who rejected transubstantiation.\(^51\) The first two lines are especially difficult to translate in a poetic manner. A literal translation of “Verbum caro panem verum/Verbo carnem efficit” reads “The Word-(who is)-Flesh makes true bread into flesh by means of a word.” The second part of the verse could also

\(^49\) Walsh, 499.


be interpreted as a denial that the substance of the bread remains upon the priest’s words of consecration during Mass: what human senses see (and smell, touch, and taste) after that point may appear to be bread, but substantially it is the Body of Christ.\textsuperscript{52}

The final two verses of \textit{Pange lingua} were often sung at the Benediction services.\textsuperscript{53} The fifth, \textit{Tantum ergo}, describes the adoration of the Host as a new form of worship that replaced the rituals of the Old Testament. Walsh interprets the word \textit{documentum} as an “example serving as precedent,” and the word is listed in Latin dictionaries as meaning “example,” “model,” or “pattern.” The final lines of the verse convey the importance of faith when contemplating the mystery of the Blessed Sacrament, and may also allude to Aquinas’s Aristotelian explanation of Christ’s presence in a consecrated Host. The physical “accident” of the bread remains, and so the human senses cannot detect Christ in the Eucharist, only bread. Martin Luther rejected transubstantiation because he wanted Christians to rely on their faith that Christ was physically present in the Blessed Sacrament, rather than a philosophical explanation. Without reading the transubstantiation allusion into the fifth verse, Lutherans probably would have accepted the words to this verse, particularly the final lines about faith being the most important factor when seeking to understand the Eucharist.

\textit{Genitori genitoque} is the doxology that concludes \textit{Pange lingua}. Aquinas creates a doxology more unique than the commonly used \textit{Gloria patri}. He uses the words “genitori” and “genitoque” instead of “patri” and “filio” to refer to the Father and Son, probably because the former words can be interpreted as “begetter” and “begotten,”

\textsuperscript{52} I am grateful to Rev. Br. Peter Totleben, O.P. for his help with the translation and interpretation of this verse.

\textsuperscript{53} Even after the Second Vatican Council, these two verses are still part of Benediction services, sometimes in the original Latin.
which provides a more meticulous expression of the relationship between those two members of the Trinity. The Holy Spirit is addressed in the final lines of the verse as “procedenti ab utroque,” or “the one who proceeds from both.” Aquinas is referring to what became known as the “Filioque” clause in the Nicene Creed, which states that the Holy Spirit proceeds from both the Father and the Son. This doctrine has caused much controversy between the eastern and western churches due to the Roman Church accepting it and most Greek and Orthodox churches rejecting it.\(^{54}\)

*Pange lingua* was originally composed as a hymn for the Corpus Christi Office, and so its original intended usage was in the context of a Vespers service. During Josquin’s lifetime, however, it would have been performed much more frequently than once a year on Corpus Christi due to the growing popularity of Eucharistic devotion. The original liturgy for the feast only contained music for the mass and office; it did not include an official liturgy for the procession or Benediction services. Chants from the mass and office—including *Pange lingua*—were used for these additional Eucharistic rituals throughout the year.

Since the intended function of *Pange lingua* was as a Vespers hymn, it is typically found with other office hymns in separate sections of breviaries, psalters, and antiphoners.\(^ {55}\) Germanic liturgical books from the thirteenth to the sixteenth centuries seem to adhere to that pattern.\(^ {56}\) Although *Pange lingua* was not typically written out in

---


\(^{56}\) Although an exhaustive index of primary sources that contain *Pange lingua* is beyond the scope of this study, the following are examples of Germanic office books and the folio where *Pange lingua* can be
its melodic and textual entirety in antiphoners, occasionally its presence was noted in these books. In the *Antiphonale Pataviense*, a 1519 office book from the diocese of Passau, the textual incipit is given for *Pange lingua* in the section for the Corpus Christi Vespers.\(^5^7\)

In her discussion of Corpus Christi processions, Miri Rubin notes that *Pange lingua* was commonly sung during the procession; the trochaic meter of the hymn made it particularly suited for this function.\(^5^8\) *Pange lingua* was one of several hymns sung throughout the duration of the processions. The citywide processions could get quite extensive with stops at several stations, and so a larger volume of repertoire was required. A fifteenth-century processional from the Aachen cathedral indicates that the complete “historia,” or office was sung during the procession.\(^5^9\) The presence of *Pange lingua* in processionals (as opposed to office books such as antiphoners) provides convincing evidence that this hymn was among those sung during the Corpus Christi procession. Many processionals only contained the text to *Pange lingua*, such as Graz 1459 and Cologne 1064.\(^6^0\) Rubrics that describe Corpus Christi processions also mention *Pange lingua*.

---

\(^{57}\) A facsimile edition of this source is available: Karlheinz Schlager, ed., *Antiphonale Pataviense (Wien 1519)*, Das Erbe Deutscher Musik 88 (Kassel: Bärenreiter, 1985). The *Pange lingua* incipit can be found on folio 126v.


\(^{59}\) Browe, 108.
lingua. A sixteenth-century processional from Cologne indicates that the fifth verse, *Tantum ergo*, was to be sung before the procession.\(^6^1\) Another Cologne processional from the sixteenth century mentions *Pange lingua* in a marginal note, although the edge of the page cuts off most of the sentence.\(^6^2\) The presence of *Pange lingua* in several Cologne processionals is important to note because the first documented Corpus Christi procession occurred there and every church in Cologne had their own procession by 1326.\(^6^3\) Cologne appears to have been a pathfinder for Corpus Christi processions; it is quite possible that other churches and cities looked to Cologne when developing their own Corpus Christi processions and sung *Pange lingua* (along with the other designated chants) in their communities as well.

In addition to the procession, *Pange lingua*—particularly the fifth verse, *Tantum ergo*—was among a number of chant items from the Corpus Christi liturgy sung during the periods of Eucharistic exposition and at the Eucharistic votive masses. A 1508 liturgical order from the city of Lorch indicates that the Blessed Sacrament was to be displayed for an hour on the feast of Corpus Christi, and that *Tantum ergo* was sung at the beginning and end of that exposition period.\(^6^4\) At the canons church of Gerresheim in the diocese of Mainz, a Benediction was given with the Vespers services on the day

---

\(^6^0\) Graz Universitätsbibliothek Ms 1459, 89r (16\(^{th}\) century, Abbey of St. Lambrecht in Austria); Cologne, Erzbischöfliche Diözesan-und Dombibliothek Ms 1064, 51v (15\(^{th}\) century, owned by St. Nicolas de Brauweiler).


\(^6^2\) Cologne, Erzbischöfliche Diözesan-und Dombibliothek Ms 1163, 48v. Margin note is in the upper left corner.

\(^6^3\) Bruhn, 147.

\(^6^4\) *Nota diligenter quod in festo corporis Christi habes consecrare magnam particulam, quam reponas ad consuetum reservatorium vulgariter monstrantz, quod in singulis horis exhibebitur populo in principio et fine cantando “Tantum ergo sacramentum” vel aliquid simile...* Browe, 107 n. 105.
before Corpus Christi and throughout the entire octave. *Tantum ergo* was sung as the priest imparted the blessing, and *Genitori genitoque* was sung as the Blessed Sacrament remained on the altar. Sometimes the role of *Pange lingua* during Eucharistic adoration rituals was even more specific. A 1493 document from Hildesheim provides rubrics for an evening Eucharistic adoration service held on the ten Thursdays following the Corpus Christi octave. Toward the conclusion of the service, *Tantum ergo* and *Genitori genitoque* are sung, and as the word “benedictio” is sung in the final verse, the priest performs the gesture of Benediction—making the sign of the cross with the Blessed Sacrament.

*Pange lingua* was among several chant items sung during Eucharistic adoration, including *O salutaris hostia* (a verse from *Sacris solemniis*), *Ave vivens hostia, Ave verum corpus, Homo quidam, Ave Jesu Christe, Discubuit Jesus, Ecce panis angelorum* (from *Lauda Sion*), and *Melchisedech*. The role of these pieces appears to have been functional as well as devotional. For example, the consecrated Host needed to be transported from the tabernacle to the altar where the votive mass (or Benediction) was being celebrated, and this miniature procession was often accompanied with the singing of the hymns and antiphons previously mentioned.

---

65 Browe, 162.

66 Ibid., 160-61.

67 For a few examples of rubrics that mention specific chants for the votive masses, see Browe, 149-51.
Polyphonic settings of office hymns flourished in the fifteenth century along with the rise of Corpus Christi and Eucharistic devotion. Pange lingua was among the most popular hymns to be set polyphonically during that time. In Tom Ward’s catalogue of polyphonic office hymns from 1400 to 1520, Pange lingua is second only to Ave Maris Stella in the number of polyphonic settings. Ward lists 61 polyphonic compositions with the text of Ave Maris Stella, and there are 50 settings of Pange lingua. The only other hymn in Ward’s index that comes close in number to Ave Maris Stella and Pange lingua is Veni Creator Spiritus with 47 settings.

Given the chronological range of Ward’s index, most of the 50 catalogued Pange lingua settings would have already been in circulation at the time the Missa Pange lingua was composed near the beginning of the sixteenth century. Polyphonic settings of Pange lingua were widely disseminated and available in various parts of Europe in the early years of the sixteenth century before the Reformation. They survive in manuscripts that come from Bohemia, Spain, France, Portugal, and various parts of Italy including Vatican churches. Well-known manuscripts that contain Pange lingua settings include the Codex Calixtinus and six of the “Trent Codices.”

In addition to the regions previously mentioned, polyphonic settings of Pange lingua survive in a number of German manuscripts. Information on the German Pange lingua settings and their sources are summarized in the Tables 1.2 and 1.3. The dates given are approximate, and “56” in the “Voices” column refers to melody 56 in Bruno

---


69 Trent Museo Provinciale d’Arte, Castello del Buonconsiglio 88, 89, 90, 91, 92; Trent Biblioteca Capitolare/Museo Diocesano 93
Stäblein’s catalogue. The pieces are labeled as “pre-Reformation” because many of them were composed before the nominal beginning of the Reformation in 1517, and all of the manuscripts were copied before the Lutheran liturgy began to crystallize in the later sixteenth century. Some of these manuscripts have connections to Missa Pange lingua sources, and will be addressed in greater detail in following chapters.

Table 1.2 (continued on next page)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th><strong>“Pre-Reformation” German Pange lingua Settings</strong></th>
<th><strong>Voices; Location of chant melody</strong></th>
<th><strong>Composer</strong></th>
<th><strong>Sources</strong></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>Pange lingua Stanzas Set</strong></td>
<td><strong>Missa Pange lingua</strong></td>
<td><strong>Source</strong></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Pange lingua</td>
<td>3; 56 in S</td>
<td>?</td>
<td>MunBS 14274</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Pange lingua</td>
<td>2; 56 in S</td>
<td>?</td>
<td>MunBS 14274</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Pange lingua</td>
<td>2; 56 in S</td>
<td>N. Merques</td>
<td>MunBS 14274</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Pange lingua</td>
<td>3; 56 in S</td>
<td>?</td>
<td>MunBS 14274</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Pange lingua</td>
<td>3; 56 in S</td>
<td>?</td>
<td>MunBS 14274</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Tantum ergo</td>
<td>3; 56 in S</td>
<td>?</td>
<td>MunBS 5023</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>[Intabulation]</td>
<td>4; 56 in S</td>
<td>Touront</td>
<td>MunBS 3725</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Pange lingua</td>
<td>4; 56 in S</td>
<td>?</td>
<td>MunBS 3225</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Tantum ergo</td>
<td>4; 56 in T and A</td>
<td>?</td>
<td>MunBS 3154</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Nobis natus in Berlin; two strophes of Salve mirae sanctitatis in Dresden; strophes 2, 6, 8 of Katherina collaudemus in Wroclaw</td>
<td>4; 56 in S</td>
<td>?</td>
<td>BerIGS 40021; DresSL 1/D/506; Wroclaw 1.F.428</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>All strophes</td>
<td>4; 56 in T</td>
<td>Adam von Fulda</td>
<td>LeipU 1494</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>No text</td>
<td>4; 56 in T</td>
<td>?</td>
<td>LeipU 1494</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>No text</td>
<td>4; 56 in T</td>
<td>?</td>
<td>LeipU 1494</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>No text</td>
<td>3; 56 migrates</td>
<td>?</td>
<td>LeipU 1494</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Pange lingua</td>
<td>5; 56 in T and B 1</td>
<td>?</td>
<td>RegC 120</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Pange lingua</td>
<td>4; 56 in T</td>
<td>Senfl</td>
<td>RegC 120</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Pange lingua</td>
<td>3; 56 in CT</td>
<td>?</td>
<td>Salzburg b.I.27</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Nobis natus</td>
<td>4; 56 in T</td>
<td>?</td>
<td>JenaU 34</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Verbum caro</td>
<td>4; 56 in T</td>
<td>?</td>
<td>JenaU 34</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Pange lingua and Tantum ergo</td>
<td>4; 56 in T</td>
<td>?</td>
<td>Augsburg 142a</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Pange lingua</td>
<td>5;?</td>
<td>?</td>
<td>Augsburg 142a</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Pange lingua, In suprême, Tantum ergo, Genitori</td>
<td>?; 56 in S</td>
<td>?</td>
<td>VienNB 4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Source</td>
<td>Date</td>
<td>Owner/Patron</td>
<td>Location</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>--------</td>
<td>------------</td>
<td>------------------------------------------------------------------------------</td>
<td>-----------------------------------</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>MunBS Clm. 14274 “Codex Sankt Emmeram”</td>
<td>1440-50</td>
<td>Original owner and compiler was clergyman Hermann Poetzlinger (d. 1469), who probably bequeathed it to St. Emmeram Benedictine monastery</td>
<td>Regensburg</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>MunBS Mus. 3225</td>
<td>1450-60</td>
<td>?</td>
<td>Bavaria</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>BerlGS 40021</td>
<td>1485-1500</td>
<td>?</td>
<td>Discovered at Halberstadt cathedral; possibly copied in Torgau or Leipzig</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>DresSL1/D/506</td>
<td>c. 1530</td>
<td>Church of St. Anne in Annaberg</td>
<td>Probably copied in Wittenberg</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Wroclaw 1.f.428</td>
<td>1510-30</td>
<td>?</td>
<td>Possibly copied in Frankfurt an der Oder or vicinity</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>LeipU 1494 “Apel Codex”</td>
<td>1490-1504</td>
<td>Nikolaus Apel (ca 1470-1537)</td>
<td>Bound in Leipzig; possibly copied there</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>RegC 120 “Pernner Codex”</td>
<td>Early 1520s</td>
<td>possible connections to imperial court chapel</td>
<td>Possibly Innsbruck or Augsburg</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Salzburg, Bibliothek des Benediktinerstifts St. Peter, Ms b.127</td>
<td>Early 16th century</td>
<td>?</td>
<td>?</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>JenaU 34</td>
<td>1500-20</td>
<td>All Saints “Castle” Church</td>
<td>Wittenberg</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Augsburg Staats- und Stadtbibliothek 142a</td>
<td>1505-14</td>
<td>once belonged to Johann Heinrich Herwart (1520-83)</td>
<td>Augsburg</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>MunBS Mus. 3725 “Buxheimer Orgelbuch”</td>
<td>Second half of 15th century</td>
<td>?</td>
<td>Southern Germany</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>MunBS Clm. 5023</td>
<td>1495</td>
<td>Copied by Johannes Greis, the &quot;rector scholarium&quot; at Benedictine monastery at Benediktbeuern</td>
<td>Southern Germany</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>-----------------</td>
<td>------</td>
<td>-----------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------</td>
<td>-----------------</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>MunBS Mus. 3154 “Leopold Codex”</td>
<td>c. 1466-1511</td>
<td>once owned by Nikolaus Leopold of Innsbruck</td>
<td>Probably copied in Innsbruck (and Augsburg?), possibly by scribes associated with the imperial court chapel</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Vienna, Erzbischöfliches Diözesanarchiv Ms. 4</td>
<td>c. 1450-75</td>
<td>(see footnote)</td>
<td>(see footnote)</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

The German *Pange lingua* settings provide evidence that the cantus prius factus in the Missa *Pange lingua* was a familiar melody in that region, and that it was commonly associated with Aquinas’s Corpus Christi hymn. All except one of the German *Pange lingua* settings use Stäblein’s melody 56, the same chant melody that is found in the earliest Corpus Christi offices as well as Josquin’s Missa *Pange lingua*. Melody 56 was used throughout Europe for both Aquinas’s *Pange lingua* and Fortunatus’s earlier *Pange lingua* hymn. It was a melody commonly associated with the *Pange lingua* hymns, but it was not the only one; the Fortunatus *Pange lingua* text was sung to about half a dozen other melodies in certain locales, and Aquinas’s *Pange lingua* was sung to multiple melodies as well. One of the more familiar alternative melodies is commonly referred to as *more hispano* (according to the Spanish custom). Juan de Urreda (fl. 1451-81) created

---

71 *The Pange lingua* setting in this manuscript is actually a fragment; the folia containing the motet were used as pastedowns to the boards of the binding of Vienna Ms 4 and presumably were part of a different manuscript. The music leaves bear a general resemblance to the Trent Codices, particularly Mss. Trent 88-91, but there is no evidence of any scribal concordances. The “host manuscript” for these fragmented leaves is a collection of theological writings by Nicolaus de Waldhausen, Nicolaus de Dinkelsbühl, and a number of other authors. The manuscript has strong connections to Vienna, although the exact owner or purpose is not known. See Peter Wright, “Polyphony for Corpus Christi in an Unknown Fragmentary Source from Mid-Fifteenth-Century Central Europe: An Interim Report,” in *Uno gentile et subtile ingenio: Studies in Renaissance Music in Honour of Bonnie J. Blackburn*, ed. Giola Filocamo and M. Jennifer Bloxam (Turnhout: Brepols, 2009), 271-282.
a polyphonic *Pange lingua* setting with this melody that probably began to circulate in Spain in the late fifteenth century, and beginning at the turn of the sixteenth century the *more hispano* melody became a popular model for Iberian composers.\(^{72}\)

By the fifteenth century, Corpus Christi had become a perpetual feast; the previously mentioned Eucharistic rituals such as the procession and exposition were occurring nearly every day; people did not have to wait until the next Mass or the Corpus Christi octave to view and venerate the Blessed Sacrament. Eucharistic practices moved beyond processions and veneration of the Host in churches. Blessing the air with the Host, or “weather blessings,” became common in the regions of South Germany, Austria, and Switzerland. The Host was also carried out to the fields so the crops could be blessed.\(^{73}\) The increasing frequency of existing Eucharistic rituals and the creation of questionable new ones were causes for concern among the church hierarchy. In 1452, the papal legate Nicholas of Cusa called a council in Cologne and demanded that exposition and Eucharistic processions be limited to the octave of Corpus Christi except for extraordinary circumstances permitted by a bishop.\(^{74}\) In 1496, the Dominican inquisitor Heinrich Krämer, also known as Institoris, published a treatise that was based on sermons he had preached in Augsburg.\(^{75}\) The treatise and the sermons were intended to clarify various beliefs and practices regarding the Eucharist, and defended the right of the


\(^{73}\) See Zika, 33-36

\(^{74}\) Mitchell, 172.

\(^{75}\) Institoris, *Tractatus varii cum sermonibus contra quattuor errores novissime exortos adversus divinissimum eucharistie sacramentum* (Nuremberg 1496)
faithful to venerate the Eucharist as well as the *wunderbarliches Gut*, a miraculous host located at the Heilig Kreuz church in Augsburg.\(^76\)

In the midst of increasing Eucharistic rituals and controversy in Germany, Martin Luther (1483-1546) came of age and joined the Augustinian monastic order.\(^77\) Several years after the nominal beginning of the Reformation in 1517 when Luther posted the 95 Thesis on the Castle Church door, he directly addressed the celebration of Corpus Christi in general, as well as in his community of Wittenberg. Upon his return from the Wartburg Castle in 1522, Luther criticized the Corpus Christi celebrations saying one would be better off praying an Our Father privately or giving money to the poor.\(^78\) The following year, Luther opted not to preach on Corpus Christi. One year later in 1524, Luther noted in a sermon that Corpus Christi was no longer observed in Wittenberg, and as a result nobody would become public sodomites.\(^79\) He also remarked that one (scripture) reading is better than ten feast days.\(^80\)

Martin Luther rejected the Catholic doctrine of transubstantiation and did not find the celebration of Corpus Christi necessary, but his beliefs on the Eucharist were closer to

---

\(^{76}\) Charles Zika believes that the clergy’s attacks and regulations on various Eucharistic devotional practices were part of a larger, more general movement within the clergy to control religious practices. For more on Institoris as well as the clergy regulating Eucharistic veneration in Germany, see Charles Zika, “Hosts, Processions, and Pilgrimages: Controlling the Sacred in Fifteenth-Century Germany,” *Past & Present* no. 118 (Feb 1988): 25-64.

\(^{77}\) Among the vast amount of literature on Martin Luther’s life and teaching, Martin Brecht’s three-volume biography of Martin Luther is the most comprehensive Luther biography in the English language. Martin Brecht, *Martin Luther*, trans. James Shaaf, 3 vols (Philadelphia: Fortress Press, 1985-93).

\(^{78}\) *Luthers Werke: Kritische Gesamtausgabe* 12 (Weimar: Böhlau, 1891), 581-82.

\(^{79}\) In Reformation Germany, the act of sodomy was associated with southern Italy, particularly Rome. It is possible that Luther aligned Corpus Christi with public sodomy so his audience would associate Corpus Christi with what, at that time, was considered a sinful act, and also the Catholic Church headquartered in Rome. See Helmut Puff, *Sodomy in Reformation Germany and Switzerland 1400-1600* (Chicago: The University of Chicago Press, 2003), especially 126-27, and 140-166.

\(^{80}\) In nostris civitatibus tantum effecimus, spero, quod nullus sit scortator publicus, occultos commendamus Deo. Vos celebrabitis corpus Christi, nos non nec opus est, imo una lectio melior est quam 10 feriae. *Luthers Werke: Kritische Gesamtausgabe* 15 (Weimar: Böhlau, 1899), 570.
Catholic doctrine than those of his fellow reformers, particularly Huldrych Zwingli.\textsuperscript{81} The Swiss Reformer denied any sort of physical presence of Christ in the Eucharist. He believed in a “spiritual” presence of Christ during Communion and saw the bread and wine as being symbols of the Last Supper and nothing more. As with other theological issues, Martin Luther turned to the Holy Scripture. He believed that Christ had to be physically present in the Eucharist because of his words at the Last Supper that were recorded in the Gospels. Luther repeatedly argued that since Christ gave the bread to his disciples saying, “this \textit{is} my body,” rather than “this \textit{represents} my body,” his presence in the Eucharist must be more than spiritual. However, Luther did not believe that the physicality of Christ’s body or its relationship to the consecrated bread and wine could be comprehended with the use of human sensibility and reason—as the Roman church said they could be with the doctrine of transubstantiation.

Martin Luther did not approve of the Corpus Christi rituals because he believed the Eucharist was too sacred to be ornately paraded around town and constantly on display. In his writing, \textit{Vom Anbeten des Sakraments des heiligen Leichnams Christi}, he referred to these practices as mocking and hypocritical.\textsuperscript{82} Although he held the Sacrament in great reverence, Luther was generally indifferent to the accessories used to make the Mass (and other Eucharistic rituals) ornate, such as bells, vestments, and images.\textsuperscript{83} As a

\textsuperscript{81} For a more extensive description of Luther’s beliefs about the Eucharist and its role in the Lutheran liturgy, see Lee Palmer Wandel, \textit{The Eucharist in the Reformation: Incarnation and Liturgy} (Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 2006), 94-138. For more information on Zwingli’s views and the Eucharist in the Reformed church, see Wandel, 139-207.

\textsuperscript{82} Erlanger Ausgabe XXVIII 406. “Zuvor sollt man abgethun die Sacramenthäuser und die Prozession auf des hl. Leichnams Tag, weil der keins noth noch nutz ist, und groß Heuchelei und Spott dem Sacrament widerfährt.”

\textsuperscript{83} “Confession Concerning Christ’s Supper, 1528,” p. 371. “Images, bells, eucharistic vestments, church ornaments, altar lights and the like I regard as things indifferent. Anyone who wishes may omit them.
result of Luther’s attitude toward Corpus Christi, Lutheran churches gradually removed that feast from their liturgical calendars.

The Lutheran Reformation and the demise of Corpus Christi in Protestant churches did not hinder the production and distribution of polyphonic *Pange lingua* settings; composers in the Holy Roman Empire continued to set the *Pange lingua* text to polyphony throughout the course of the sixteenth century. In fact, many *Pange lingua* motets were part of music collections that belonged to Lutherans. Table 1.4 provides a summary of selected sources from the later sixteenth century that contain at least one *Pange lingua* motet.

Table 1.4 (continued on next page)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Source</th>
<th>Provenance/Date</th>
<th>Scribe/Printer</th>
<th>Owner/Patron</th>
<th>No. of <em>Pange lingua</em> settings</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Augsburg, Staats-und Stadtbibliothek Tonkunst Schletterer 4</td>
<td>Bavaria; 1598</td>
<td>Johannes Dreher</td>
<td>monastery of Sts. Ulrich and Afra, Augsburg</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Augsburg, Staats-und Stadtbibliothek Tonkunst Schletterer 8</td>
<td>Augsburg; 1577</td>
<td>Johannes Dreher and Frater Johannes B (?)</td>
<td>monastery of Sts. Ulrich and Afra, Augsburg; on the title page coat of arms of Abbot Jacob Köpplin</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Augsburg, Staats-und Stadtbibliothek Tonkunst Schletterer 24</td>
<td>Augsburg; 1584-85</td>
<td>Johannes Dreher</td>
<td>monastery of Sts. Ulrich and Afra, Augsburg; on the title page coat of arms of Abbot Jacob Köpplin</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><em>Sacrorum hymnorum liber primus</em></td>
<td>Wittenberg; 1542</td>
<td>Georg Rhau</td>
<td>For use in Lutheran schools</td>
<td>9</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Universitätssbibliothek Erlangen-Nürnberg 473/4</td>
<td>Augsburg; 1540-41</td>
<td>Copied at the Cistercian monastery in Heilsbronn</td>
<td>?</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
| LeipU Ms Thomaskirche 49/50 | Leipzig; c. 1558 | Melchior Heger (?)(Thomaskirche cantor) | Thomaskirche | 1 + *Missa Pange lingua*

Image or pictures taken from the Scriptures and from good histories, however, I consider very useful yet indifferent and optional. I have no sympathy with the iconoclasts.”
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Location</th>
<th>Date/Context</th>
<th>Scribes</th>
<th>Purpose</th>
<th>Notes</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Lüneberg Ratsbücherei Mus. ant. pract. K. N. 150</td>
<td>Lüneburg; c. 1575-1620</td>
<td>41 scribes</td>
<td>For a society of amateur musicians</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Universitätsbibliothek Regensburg Freie Künste Musik 2</td>
<td>Mid-16th century</td>
<td>Possibly copied at Benedictine monastery in Neresheim</td>
<td>?</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>RegA.R. 844-848</td>
<td>Regensburg; 1573-77</td>
<td>possibly Erasmus Zollner</td>
<td>probably for use by choir of the Gymnasium Poeticum in local evangelical services.</td>
<td>4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>RegA.R. 863-870</td>
<td>Regensburg; 1572-79</td>
<td>Possibly Erasmus Zollner</td>
<td>probably Lutheran Gymnasium Poeticum</td>
<td>4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>RosU Mus. Saec. XVI-71/2</td>
<td>second half of 16th century</td>
<td>Probably copied in Rostock</td>
<td>?</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>RosU Mus. Saec. XVI-71/3</td>
<td>Second half of 16th century</td>
<td>Probably copied in Rostock</td>
<td>?</td>
<td>1 + Missa Pange lingua</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Stuttgart, Württembergische Landesbibliothek, Ms. musica I 21</td>
<td>Germany; 1558</td>
<td>?</td>
<td>?</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Ulm, Münster Bibliothek 236</td>
<td>Bavaria; Second half of 16th century</td>
<td>Multiple scribes</td>
<td>?</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Zwickau, Ratsschulbibliothek MS 81, 2</td>
<td>Mid-16th century</td>
<td>Copied in Wittenberg</td>
<td>?</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

A notable characteristic of these later *Pange lingua* settings is that many of them come with the text to various verses of *Pange lingua*, not just the first. In some cases, the text of multiple verses is provided. This is indicative that many of these polyphonic settings were intended to be performed in the alternatim style. The custom of setting only a designated number of verses—usually the even-numbered ones—and leaving the others to be sung to their original monophonic chant melody was often used in Magnificats, psalms, sequences, and hymns. The *Pange lingua* motets with just the text to *Tantum ergo* and/or *Genitori genitoque* were probably performed at Benediction services, when often only the final two verses of *Pange lingua* were sung. It is possible that some of these *Pange lingua* settings were performed in the alternatim style, which provides the
opportunity for performance of the actual monophonic chant melody. Even so, the *Pange lingua* melody lived on as a recognizable part of the polyphonic texture in the majority of these settings. Thus, the model for the *Missa Pange lingua* would have lived on in both Catholic and Lutheran churches through polyphonic settings of the hymn.

**Rhau’s *Sacrorum hymnorum liber primus***

A source from Table 1.4 that deserves special mention is a polyphonic music collection with *Pange lingua* settings entitled *Sacrorum hymnorum liber primus*. This print was published in sixteenth-century Germany, at the very heart of the Lutheran Reformation. Georg Rhau (1488-1548), a Lutheran publisher based in Wittenberg, compiled a substantial collection of *Pange lingua* settings and other polyphonic liturgical items for Corpus Christi in his *Sacrorum hymnorum liber primus* (Wittenberg, 1542).[^84] *Sacrorum hymnorum*, a collection of 134 hymns, is one of six volumes that Rhau compiled for Vespers services held at Lutheran schools.[^85] There are 39 pieces by Thomas Stoltzer and 22 by Heinrich Finck, the two composers with the most attributions in the collection. There are three pieces by Ludwig Senfl, and Adam Rener, Johann Walther, and Jacob Obrecht each have one piece in the print.[^86] The *Sacrorum hymnorum* is organized according to the liturgical calendar and contains settings of hymns for the major feasts and seasons. Most feasts have between two and four pieces, and the bigger, solemn feasts have more: there are a total of eight hymns for Christmas (including the


[^86]: In addition to the critical edition in *Das Erbe deutsche Musik*, an index of the *Sacrorum Hymnorum*’s contents can be found in Mattfeld, 186-191.
vigil and Christmas Day), ten for Easter (including the vigil), six for Pentecost, and six for the Assumption of Mary. Corpus Christi tops this list with thirteen items, nine of which are settings of various stanzas of *Pange lingua*.

Table 1.5

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Number</th>
<th>Title</th>
<th>Composer</th>
<th>Voices</th>
<th>Concordant Sources</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>63</td>
<td><em>Nobis natus</em></td>
<td>Thomas Stoltzer</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>None known</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>64</td>
<td><em>In supremae nocte cœnæ</em></td>
<td>Thomas Stoltzer</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>None known</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>65</td>
<td><em>Tantum ergo</em></td>
<td>Anonymous</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>RegA.R. 844/848 RegA.R. 863/870</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>66</td>
<td><em>Pange lingua</em></td>
<td>Ludwig Senfl</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>None known</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>67</td>
<td><em>Genitori Genitoque</em></td>
<td>Heinrich Finck</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>None known</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>68</td>
<td><em>Pange lingua</em></td>
<td>Ludwig Senfl</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>MunBS Mus. Ms. 52 Stuttgart Mus. Ms. 24 Budapest 22</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>69</td>
<td><em>Nobis natus</em></td>
<td>Thomas Stoltzer</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>None known</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>70</td>
<td><em>Nobis natus</em></td>
<td>Andreas Capellus</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>Bártfa 22</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>71</td>
<td><em>Jesus Christus nostra salus</em></td>
<td>Thomas Stoltzer</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>Bártfa 22</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>72</td>
<td><em>O quam sanctus panis iste</em></td>
<td>Heinrich Finck</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>DresSL Ms Mus. 1/D/505 Weimar B Gotha 98 BerlGS 40013</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>73</td>
<td><em>Jesus Christus, nostra salus</em></td>
<td>Anonymous</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>None known</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>74</td>
<td><em>Verbum supernum prodiens</em></td>
<td>Anonymous</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>None known</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Rhau’s hymn collection is “Catholic” in nature—in that he provides music for five Marian feasts and feasts of saints who are not mentioned in the Bible. The Corpus Christi section is particularly intriguing because the number of polyphonic items is rather large. Corpus Christi was a major feast along with the likes of Christmas, Easter, and
Pentecost, but it did not usually trump the other feasts in terms of liturgical items or artistic decoration in manuscripts. The polyphonic settings of various *Pange lingua* stanzas in this print demonstrate that the original *Pange lingua* chant melody had a presence in Lutheran repertoire in addition to the *Missa Pange lingua*.

The first Corpus Christi piece in *Sacrorum hymnorum* is a setting of *Pange lingua* attributed to Josquin; it is the only piece attributed to him in the collection. In the NJE critical commentary, Bonnie Blackburn observes that the chant paraphrase in breves that occurs in the superius is nothing like Josquin’s style, but it is quite common in other hymn settings in *Sacrorum hymnorum* of German provenance. The motet begins with an imitative texture of the four voices singing the first half of the chant incipit (“*Pange lingua*”) in breves. The chant melody is paraphrased in the discantus, while the other three voices contain more elaborate motives that vaguely resemble the chant.

The *Pange lingua* chant melody is present in the other eight settings as well, albeit in paraphrased form. Six of the eight settings begin in a similar fashion as the “Josquin” setting with an imitative presentation of the incipit motive. Numbers 65 and 66 do not begin with a four-voice exposition of the incipit, but the familiar half-step incipit motive is still present. Number 65 is an anonymous setting of *Tantum ergo* that begins with the familiar half-step incipit motive in the tenor, while the other voices enter with an altered form of the chant’s beginning. The familiar half-step that begins the motive—and

---

87 This piece is currently considered to be “almost certainly” not by Josquin, and an edition of the piece was not included in the New Josquin Edition. Although a music score is not included, there is still information about the piece in the NJE critical commentary. See Bonnie J. Blackburn, ed., *NJE*, vol. 22.2 8-10. Doubt about Josquin’s authorship of this motet can be traced back to the nineteenth century: August Wilhelm Ambros wrote that this work seems to have been composed by a respectable German composer such as Simon Cellarius (1500-1544), Hartzer (Balthasar Resinarius, c.1485-1544), and Balthasar Arthropius (d. 1534). See August Wilhelm Ambros, *Geschichte der Musik*, vol. 3 (Breslau 1868), 229: “Ein *Pange lingua* in Rhau’s Hymnensammlung scheint eher das Werk eines soliden deutschen Tonsetzers (etwa Cellarius, Hartzer, Arthropius u.s.w.)."
the chant—is replaced by a minor third in these voices. In Number 66, Ludwig Senfl uses
the older cantus-firmus technique in his setting of the first stanza; he places the
augmented but slightly paraphrased chant melody in the tenor while the other three
voices begin with a different ascending step-wise motive.

The *Pange lingua* settings in Rhau’s print provided an opportunity for Lutherans
to become familiar with the *Pange lingua* chant melody and associate it with the original
text by Aquinas. In a sense, *Sacrorum hymnorum* extended the original Corpus Christi
context of *Pange lingua* for Lutherans despite the fact that they no longer celebrated the
feast. There are seven extant copies of *Sacrorum hymnorum*. The geographical spread of
these copies indicates the print was not confined to Rhau’s immediate vicinity of Saxony.
*Sacrorum hymnorum* copies are held at libraries in Augsburg, Braunschweig, Jena,
Regensburg, Vienna, and Zwickau. Additionally, there is an exemplar that belonged to
the church of St. Aegidius in Bártfa (currently known as Bardejov in eastern Slovakia).

Some of the *Pange lingua* pieces in *Sacrorum hymnorum* were transmitted in a
number of other Lutheran sources. The “Josquin” setting of *Pange lingua* and the
anonymous *Tantum ergo* setting (Nr. 65) survive in two sources in addition to the Rhau
print: RegA.R. 844-848 and A.R. 863-870. Both were copied in Regensburg in the 1570s
and were probably used by the Gymnasium Poeticum choir for Protestant services.\(^{88}\)
Another example is Stuttgart Württembergische Landesbibliothek Mus. Ms. 24, which
was copied between 1542 and 1561 for the court chapels of Ulrich (1487-1550) and his
successor Christoph (1515-1568), both dukes of Württemberg.\(^{89}\) Ulrich converted to the
Lutheran faith following a defeat by the Swabian League in 1519, and introduced

---

\(^{88}\) CCM 3, 76-77 and 81-82.

\(^{89}\) CCM 3, 175-76.
Lutheran reforms upon regaining control of the Württemberg duchy in 1534. Ulrich’s son Christoph was also Lutheran, and introduced further reforms into schools and churches in 1559 despite maintaining a policy of neutrality in Imperial affairs.\footnote{P.G. Bietenholz and Thomas B. Deutscher, eds., \textit{Contemporaries of Erasmus: A Biographical Register of the Renaissance and Reformation}, vols. 1-3 (Toronto: University of Toronto Press, Scholarly Publishing Division, 2003), 464.}

It remains unclear why Josquin chose \textit{Pange lingua} as a model for a polyphonic mass. Nevertheless, understanding how Josquin and his patrons would have experienced \textit{Pange lingua} as chant or polyphony places the mass in a more detailed context, even in the absence of an intended place or patron. \textit{Pange lingua}—the chant and the various polyphonic works that use the text and/or melody—played a significant role in liturgical music in Germany from the beginnings of Corpus Christi in the thirteenth century to the later sixteenth century when Josquin’s mass and \textit{Pange lingua} motets were distributed throughout Germany. Indeed, the Corpus Christi hymn that was associated with medieval devotional practices survived the Lutheran Reformation and found a niche in sixteenth-century German polyphonic repertoire, through both motets and the \textit{Missa Pange lingua}.
Chapter 2: Rome, Petrus Alamire, and the Holy Roman Empire: Context and Transmission of the Early Missa Pange lingua Sources

There are multiple modern editions and studies of the Missa Pange lingua, in which the mass sources have been meticulously studied by multiple generations of scholars. At present, the primary question surrounding the early Missa Pange lingua sources is one of “ownership.” It is quite certain that Josquin wrote the mass in the later part of his life, and therefore that the work originated in Condé.1 Could a specific person or institution claim the Missa Pange lingua as their own, or did Josquin (or his singers) distribute the work to a number of locales immediately and simultaneously? Thomas Schmidt-Beste outlines the importance of this question:

This concept [ownership] goes far beyond physical possession. There is considerable evidence that at least some owners of manuscripts containing polyphonic music considered not only the books (as physical objects), but also the repertoire contained therein as ‘theirs’—in contrast to chant, which was, with few exceptions, ‘in the public domain.’ This sense of ‘ownership’ could take the shape of rulers prohibiting the proliferation of repertoire from ‘their’ chapel or ‘their’ manuscripts, as did Mary of Hungary with Thomas Stoltzer’s German psalms, it could take the shape of the Papal singers jealously guarding ‘their’ style and ‘their’ music; but it could also take the less exclusive shape of simple collector’s pride.2

The Missa Pange lingua does not initially evoke an obvious association with a particular locale or church; Mass Ordinary settings, devotion to the Eucharist, and repertoire

---

1 The main reason for the late dating is the absence of the mass in Petrucci’s three anthologies of Josquin masses. In the past, the Missa Pange lingua has been dated after 1514, the year the final Petrucci mass print was published. Although David Fallows questions the logic of this dating and speculates it was probably composed earlier than 1514, there is currently no reason to believe it was written prior to the release of Petrucci second book of Josquin masses in 1505. Also, Alejandro Planchart notes that the Missa Pange lingua shows the influence of two later Josquin masses: the Missa Sine nomine and Missa De beata Virgine. See Alejandro Planchart, “Masses on Plainsong Cantus Firmi,” in The Josquin Companion, ed. Richard Sherr (Oxford: Oxford University Press, 2000), 130-150; and Thomas Warburton, Missa Pange lingua: An Edition with Notes for Performance and Commentary (Chapel Hill: The University of North Carolina Press, 1977), 3.

composed by (or attributed to) Josquin were prevalent throughout Europe. Who, therefore, “owned” the Missa Pange lingua and then decided to share the work with others?

Very little is known about the origins of the Missa Pange lingua, aside from what we can deduce from the later years of Josquin’s life. The surviving sources provide convincing evidence that Josquin composed the mass, but they do not indicate whether the mass was written for a specific person or entity. The earliest manuscripts that contain the Missa Pange lingua make the origins of the mass all the more puzzling. This chapter explores the possible routes of transmission for the Missa Pange lingua by relying not only on source readings, but the people who owned those sources. Based on contextual and analytical studies of the earliest Missa Pange lingua sources, I propose that the Habsburg-Burgundian court at Mechelen was an original “owner” of the mass and was responsible for transmitting it to other cultural centers in Europe.

The Missa Pange lingua has typically been counted among Josquin’s last works because it was not included in Petrucci’s final book of Josquin masses, which was printed in 1514. David Fallows questioned this assumption due to a considerable number of Missa Pange lingua sources that have an approximate date of 1515 and originate from various locales, all far from Josquin’s residence in Condé. Fallows concludes that the mass was distributed very quickly to many parts of Europe, and that it could have been

---

3 In his discussion on the transmission of the Missa Allez Regretz, Murray Steib notes that the absence of the Missa Pange lingua in Petrucci’s prints could indicate that it was written after 1514. Steib also cautions against using the Petrucci mass prints as a definitive indicator of authenticity or lack thereof in the earlier work Missa Allez Regretz. See Murray Steib, “A Study in Style, or Josquin or Not Josquin: The Missa Allez regretz Question,” The Journal of Musicology 16, no. 4 (Autumn 1998): 523-24.
available in March 1514, when Petrucci’s third book of Josquin masses was published. He suggests a possible composition date of 1510. As for the absence of Missa Pange lingua in Petrucci’s third book, Fallows hypothesizes that the Italian printer had lost contact with Josquin several years prior and was simply unaware of the mass:

I have already noted that recent doubts about works in his second book suggest that Petrucci may have lost contact with Josquin as early as 1504, at which point they were living 1200 km apart; and after 1509 Petrucci moved a further 200 km south from one of the world’s great cosmopolitan centres to the tiny town of Fossombrone. There is no particular reason for him to have known what Josquin had been doing. Whether a mass was included in his 1514 book now seems much less relevant than it once did.

An earlier composition date, certainly before the nominal beginning of the Reformation in 1517, makes more sense given the wide geographical range of the early sources.

Josquin was most likely residing in Condé when he composed the Missa Pange lingua. He received his final payment at Ferrara on April 22, 1504, and arrived in Condé no later than September 5. A document from that date in 1504 indicates that Josquin was named a provost and canon at the church of Notre Dame in Condé and purchased a house there. It is likely that Josquin resided in Condé until his death in 1521. Along with the evidence of his real estate venture, Notre Dame had a strict policy against the absence of the canons and other ecclesiastical administrators. Josquin had a respectable choir at Condé—sixteen vicars and six boys—that was capable of performing the Missa Pange lingua.

---

4 Fallows and Jeffrey Dean also raise the possibility of the “third” Petrucci book actually being a second edition of an earlier volume published in Venice. David Fallows, Josquin (Turnhout: Brepols, 2009), 323.

5 Fallows, 322. For discussion of the Petrucci’s second book, see Fallows, 267-69.

6 For more detailed information on how Josquin received his position there, see Paul Merkley, “Josquin Desprez in Ferrara,” The Journal of Musicology 18, no. 4 (Fall 2001): 544-583.

7 The document refers to Josquin as “Maistre Josse des Prez, prevost et channone de l’eglise colegialle Notre Dame de Condé.” See Fallows, 376.

8 Ibid., 276.
lingua as well as his later works with more than four voices. The choir’s skills were apparently put to good use. An imperial deposition from 1523 states that in Condé the liturgy is “daily celebrated and carried out with much greater ceremony than in the other neighboring churches.”

Surviving documents from Josquin’s years at Condé are sparse. There is the September 1504 document regarding Josquin becoming provost and purchasing a house, along with the document produced while Josquin was on his deathbed in August 1521 requesting that he be registered as a foreigner in Condé. Between these records of his arrival in Condé and his death, only two other letters mentioning Josquin survive from his time there in the sixteenth century. Both are correspondence with Margaret of Austria. The first letter is from the dean and chapter of the collegiate church of Notre Dame in Condé to Margaret, evidently answering her (now lost) letter from May 20, 1508. It seems that Margaret thought the provost position in Condé had been recently vacated through death, and was recommending a candidate of her own to fill the position. In response, the dean and chapter of Notre Dame de Condé write that “nostre prevost est en tres bonne sancté appellé Josquin Desprez (our provost is in very good health and is called Josquin Desprez).” In another letter to Josquin dated August 20, 1519, Margaret recommended that Jehan Lommel, a singer at the court of Charles the V and also a canon

---

9 Ibid., 277.


at Condé be promoted to a recently vacated deanship.\textsuperscript{12} Josquin passed away on August 27, 1521.

**The Early Missa Pange lingua Sources: An Overview**

While discussing a possible date for the *Missa Pange lingua*, Fallows names seven “early” sources for the mass, all of which have an approximate date of 1515 (see Table 2.1). Along with *Pater noster-Ave Maria* and several of Josquin’s other late works, the *Missa Pange lingua* made its way to Italy relatively quickly. In the second decade of the sixteenth century, both the ecclesiastical corruption that irked Martin Luther and the *Missa Pange lingua* were quite prevalent in Rome. Sections of the *Missa Pange lingua* also appear in the Capirola Lute book, which was copied in Venice. The single non-Italian early source is MunBS 510, an unfinished presentation manuscript with a somewhat mysterious provenance.

Most of the Vatican manuscripts containing the *Missa Pange lingua* were created under the auspices of the Medici family. Giovanni di Lorenzo de’ Medici (1475-1521) became pope on March 9, 1513 and took the name Leo X. Six months later, on September 23, he made his first cousin Giulio Medici (later pope Clement VII) cardinal and director of papal policy. Leo X was a great music lover and a composer and lutenist himself. He was also committed to demonstrating outward papal majesty, with music playing a significant role in that majesty.\textsuperscript{13} The papal choir reached its largest number of

\textsuperscript{12} Fallows, 380.

members to date, eventually there were about thirty-one members. Leo X has been
criticized by contemporaries and historians as neglecting the growing problem of the

Table 2.1 (continued on next page)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Manuscript</th>
<th>Type</th>
<th>Date</th>
<th>Scribe</th>
<th>Patron</th>
<th>Contents</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Vatican CS 16</td>
<td>Choirbook with paper folios</td>
<td>1515-16</td>
<td>Copied by Claudio Gellandi in Rome</td>
<td>For use by the Capella Sistina</td>
<td>10 masses, 5 motets</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Vatican Pal. lat. 1980-81</td>
<td>2 paper partbooks (originally 4)</td>
<td>1513-23</td>
<td>Copied by a single scribe in Rome</td>
<td>Probably compiled for Giulio de' Medici</td>
<td>8 masses, 9 motets, 4 French secular pieces</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Vatican Pal. lat. 1982</td>
<td>1 paper partbook (originally 4)</td>
<td>1513-23</td>
<td>Copied by a single scribe (except last piece) in Rome</td>
<td>A member of Medici family</td>
<td>18 masses, 1 motet, 1 French secular piece</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Vatican CG XII.2</td>
<td>Choirbook with paper folios</td>
<td>1518-21</td>
<td>Copied in Rome by several scribes; Missa Pange lingua copied by Medici Scribe</td>
<td>For the Cappella Giulia</td>
<td>14 masses, 2 motets</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Vatican SMM 26 [JJ III 4]</td>
<td>Choirbook with paper folios</td>
<td>ca. 1520</td>
<td>Possibly for use at Santa Maria Maggiore</td>
<td>Copied in Rome by two scribes, with other scribes adding later material</td>
<td>16 Masses, 2 Credos, 1 Te Deum, 3 hymns, 1 motet</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>


15 The critical commentary of the New Josquin Edition lists these partbooks as being copied for Giulio de’ Medici, but Anthony M. Cummings points out that there is nothing in the Medici coat of arms on the partbooks connecting them to Giulio or any other member of the Medici family. See Anthony M. Cummings, “Giulio de Medici’s Music Books,” _Early Music History_ 10 (1991), 74-5.

16 In the critical commentary for the New Josquin Edition, Willem Elders gives 1516-1520 as the approximate date of Vatican SMM 26, but Barton Hudson has suggested that it was copied in 1520 at the very earliest. Moreover, there is no concrete indication of the date in the manuscript; these hypotheses of
Reformation in favor of building up the musical life at the Vatican—which is quite ironic, given that Martin Luther held music in such high esteem and had a deep appreciation for the composers whose music was performed at the papal chapel.  

The Missa Pange lingua is included in two manuscripts from Leo’s Sistine chapel scriptorium: VatS 16 and VatG XII.2. These manuscripts, like the others prepared at the Sistine Chapel, are composites of independent “booklets,” to borrow Jeffrey Dean’s term. Consequently, studying these manuscripts is a complex task because the booklets, with their varying scribes and production dates, were compiled into larger individual volumes. In fact, some of the pieces in VatS 16 contain blank first recto pages labeled with the title or composer, which attests to their existence as separate booklets.

---

17 The commonly-known date for the Capirola lute-book is 1517, but this assertion is based on very little evidence. See Fallows, 322-23, n.27.


20 Ibid., 19.
VatS 16 was copied by Claudius Gellandi (fl. ca. 1511-21), who worked at the Sistine Chapel during the papacy of Leo X (1513-21). In addition to VatS 16, Gellandi also copied parts of VatS 26, 45, 46, 55, AND VatG. XII. 2. The Missa Pange lingua is the third piece in VatS 16, and Jeffrey Dean estimates that Gellandi copied it between 1515 and 1516 with the title added ca. 1517-19. The Missa Pange lingua in VatG. XII.2 was copied by the primary copyist of the Medici Codex whose scribal skills were exceptional. Due to the supreme quality of his work and the small amount of surviving music copied by the “Medici Scribe,” Dean surmises that it is unlikely he was a member of the Sistine Chapel scriptorium. Dean gives the date of ca. 1518 for when the Medici Scribe copied the Missa Pange lingua and his other pieces into the Sistine choirbooks, but suggests that the talented copyist might have worked on VatG. XII.2 (and VatS 46) prior to the Medici Codex. Because the readings in VatS 16 and VatG.XII.2 are nearly identical, Jaap van Benthem believes that VatG.XII.2 was copied from VatS 16. In addition to the two manuscripts for the Vatican choirs, Cardinal Giulio de’Medici owned two sets of partbooks that contain the Missa Pange lingua. Both sets are now incomplete, and were copied in Rome before 1523.

21 For a list of pieces copied by Gellandi in these manuscripts, see Dean, “Scribes of the Sistine Chapel,” 80.

22 Ibid., 226-27.


25 Ibid., 119. Earlier scholars have suggested a variety of dates for this manuscript. For Dean’s summary of these varying dates, see pp. 134-35 of his dissertation.

Another Vatican manuscript that contains the *Missa Pange lingua* is VatSM 26, also known as Vatican Ms. SMM JJ.III.4. This manuscript has received little scholarly attention over the years, possibly due to ink corrosion on some of the pages (most of the music, however, is still readable). The primary part of VatSM 26 was copied by two scribes. Barton Hudson concluded that the manuscript must have been completed as a continuous process, as “Scribe II” began his work with the Gloria of Josquin’s *Missa La sol fa re me*, rather than starting with a new piece. The manuscript contains Franco-Flemish repertoire by Josquin and his contemporaries. Hudson notes that two scribes of VatSM 26 were French and used a script that is very similar to the Alamire manuscripts, but with some Italian tendencies.\(^{27}\) There is also an intriguing note on a slip of paper attached to the back binding, which reads “Liber missarum in cantu figurato Jusquini.” Hudson suggests a few scenarios behind this note: the manuscript belonged to Josquin, Josquin was one of the copyists, or, most likely, the scribe mistakenly thought all of the music in the manuscript was composed by Josquin.\(^{28}\) The reading of this copy is heavily edited; under-third cadences are omitted, ligatures are resolved, and rhythmic substitutions are inserted.\(^{29}\)

The *Missa Pange lingua* could have been sung at the papal chapel on Corpus Christi. This was an important feast at the Vatican in the sixteenth century, and celebration of Vespers and Mass required the presence of the entire papal chapel, including the Pope.\(^{30}\) The Credo presented a logistical challenge at masses where the

\(^{27}\) Hudson, 169.

\(^{28}\) Ibid., 169-170.

\(^{29}\) Jaap van Benthem, et. al. (eds), “The Occo Codex.”
pope was present (even if the pope was not the celebrant; a cardinal actually celebrated mass on Corpus Christi and several other feasts). At the section beginning with the words Et incarnatus est, the celebrant had to kneel, listen for the pope to say the words, and bow toward the altar when the words were sung by the choir. The congregation also had to listen for the words to be sung and kneel at that point. The Et incarnatus section needed to be very clear for everyone to hear, and many Renaissance masses do have very clear breaks between the words descendit de caelis and Et incarnatus. In the Missa Pange lingua, Josquin provides a very clear cadential point at the words “descendit de caelis” and the Et incarnatus section in this mass is one of Josquin’s signature homophonic passages to emphasize an important phrase of text. Even if the Missa Pange lingua was not written explicitly for the papal chapel, the Credo would have been particularly useful there.

The final early Italian source under consideration is the Capirola lute book. This ornately decorated manuscript contains two transcribed sections from the Missa Pange lingua Gloria: the Et in terra and Qui tollis peccata sections. The Capirola lute book consists of intabulations by Vincenzo Capirola and other composers; the intabulations were copied on paper that was made in 1515 or earlier. The physical properties of the book—the paper, exterior decorations, and script—along with the spelling of certain

---


32 The Capirola lute book is digitized and available online at www.newberry.org/capirola-lute-manuscript.
words are indicative of Venetian origin.\textsuperscript{33} The purpose of the book is stated in the preface, which was written by its writer/owner, Vidal (Vitale). Vidal intended to preserve the compositions of his master, Vincenzo Capirola, and added decorations to the page so that even the musically ignorant might take an interest in his book.\textsuperscript{34} Based on the preceding evidence, Otto Gombosi dates the manuscript between 1515 and 1520, although Willem Elders believes a wider date range should be considered.\textsuperscript{35} The book contains 43 pieces from a variety of genres: mass sections, motets, chansons, frottole, dances, ricercari, paduane, one villancico, one balletto, and one unidentified piece labeled as “moteto” in the index.\textsuperscript{36} There is a mix of pieces by Capirola and other composers such as Josquin, Agricola, Brumel, and van Ghizeghem. Many of the vocal pieces by other composers also appear in Petrucci’s publications, which will not help us in establishing how Vidal came in contact with the Missa Pange lingua.\textsuperscript{37}

Alongside the early Italian manuscripts, there is one Germanic manuscript that Fallows mentions. \textit{MunBS 510} is a collection of eight polyphonic masses copied by a single scribe onto parchment folios.\textsuperscript{38} The manuscript was intended for Matthäus Lang von Wellenburg (1469-1540), a nobleman who became the archbishop of Salzburg in 1519 and was a close advisor to Maximilian I. Lang was the son of an Augsburg patrician family, an intellectual, and an apparent music connoisseur. The \textit{Liber Selectarum}

\begin{footnotesize}
\begin{itemize}
\item \textsuperscript{33} Otto Gombosi, ed., \textit{Vincenzo Capirola Lute Book (circa 1517)} (New York: Da Capo Press, 1983), xiii.
\item \textsuperscript{34} fol. 1v.
\item \textsuperscript{35} Gombosi., xxiii.
\item \textsuperscript{36} There are actually 42 numbered pieces in the book; No. 5 consists of two separate compositions, 5a and 5b.
\item \textsuperscript{37} Gombosi, XIII.
\item \textsuperscript{38} For a complete description of this manuscript, see CCM 4, 215.
\end{itemize}
\end{footnotesize}
Cantionum, printed in Augsburg in 1520 and edited by Ludwig Senfl, was dedicated to Lang as well. He served Maximilian as advisor and private secretary, and accompanied the Emperor to the Reichstag of 1500 in Augsburg. One year later, Lang became Provost of the Augsburg Cathedral, even though he had not received any Holy Orders.

Table 2.2

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Title</th>
<th>Composer</th>
<th>Folio</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Missa de Beata Virgine</td>
<td>Josquin</td>
<td>1v-23</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Missa Faisant regretz</td>
<td>Josquin</td>
<td>24v-41</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Missa Pange lingua</td>
<td>Josquin</td>
<td>42v-63</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Missa Tua est potential</td>
<td>Mouton</td>
<td>64v-86</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Missa Dites-moi toutes vos pensées</td>
<td>Mouton</td>
<td>87v-113</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Missa Adieu mes amours</td>
<td>Andreas de Silva</td>
<td>114v-137</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Missa Benedictus Dominus Deus meus</td>
<td>Mouton</td>
<td>138v-159</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Missa Fors seulement</td>
<td>Pipelare</td>
<td>160v-179</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

It is unlikely that Lang actually received this anthology of masses because it was never finished. The production date range given for this manuscript is typically 1513-19. The opening folios of the first mass, the Missa de Beata virgine, indicate that MunBS 510 was going to be a presentation manuscript for Lang. There are miniatures of the Annunciation, Lang himself, and Lang’s coat of arms. In the portrait of Lang, he mimics the Virgin Mary on the opposite page by kneeling and reading a book, presumably a book of Psalms. Lang’s coat of arms lacks the processional cross of an archbishop or papal

---


41 In 1976, Joshua Rifkin affirmed that it must have been made sometime before 1519. Joshua Rifkin, “Ein römisches Messenrepertoire am bayerischen Hof-Bemerkungen zum Wolfenbüttler Chorbuch A Aug. 2° und zu seinem Umkreis,” (paper read at colloquium “Formen und Probleme der Überlieferung mehrstimmiger Musik im Zeitalter Josquins Deprez,” held at Wolfenbüttel, September 14-17, 1976).
legate, which reiterates that MunBS 510 was made sometime before June 1519, when Lang was promoted to archbishop. Although the coat of arms is incomplete, there is no evidence that a processional cross was intended, as the cardinal’s hat is rather close to the shield, thus leaving little room for the prominent cross.42

MunBS 510 is thus something of an enigma, especially compared to the well-known Alamire manuscripts which will be discussed below. Joshua Rifkin connects MunBS 510 to two other manuscripts: MunBS 65 and WolfA A. These three manuscripts were copied either partially or entirely by the same scribe, and two of the manuscripts bear the signature “P SL Gwalther” at the beginning. The artwork in MunBS 510 and 65 was left unfinished, but WolfA A is elaborately decorated with initials, borders, Bavarian and Austrian coats of arms, and portraits of Albrecht IV, Wilhelm IV, both dukes of Bavaria, and the Emperors Maximilian I and Charles V. P SL Gwalther’s name appears inside of MunBS 65 as with MunBS 510, and WolfA A is associated with this signature through scribal concordances. Rifkin also noticed that the vast majority of the repertoire in the “Gwalther choirbooks” was not Germanic; most of the pieces came from France or the Low Countries.43 Martin Bente and Rifkin both concluded that MunBS 510 must have been copied for the Bavarian ducal chapel in Munich, but more recent studies have raised doubts about this claim. In Birgit Lodes’s study of the Munich choirbooks in which she re-evaluates the work done by Bente, she mentions the Gwalther choirbooks in passing.44 While describing Helmut Hell’s attempt to re-construct Ludwig Senfl’s scribal hand in

42 See Giselbrecht and Upper’s discussion on coats of arms, including Lang’s, throughout their essay.

43 Rifkin, “Ein römisches Messenrepertoire.”

44 See Martin Bente’s monograph, Neue Wege der Quellenkritik und die Biographie Ludwig Senfls (Wiesbaden: Breitkopf & Härtel, 1968).
the Munich sources, she notes that Hell believed the three Gwalther choirbooks
represented Senfl’s mature work as a scribe and states that, “in any event, [these sources]
were probably not prepared in Munich for the court chapel.”

With looming doubt over whether the Gwalther choirbooks were copied in
Munich for Wilhelm IV, I believe the other possible provenance for MunBS 510,
Maximilian’s Imperial court, is more plausible. The unfinished state of MunBS 510 and
65 provides convincing evidence that these choirbooks were commissioned by
Maximilian I. Throughout his political career, Maximilian sought to enhance his
reputation and legacy through the arts. He often dedicated these projects to family and
political colleagues. However, Maximilian never had a central headquarters for his court;
thus, the scribes and artists employed by Maximilian had no real place to congregate.
Many of Maximilian’s projects were what Larry Silver labels as “collaborative
combination[s] of authors and artists, of text and images.” David Rothenberg describes
the situation as follows: “The emperor possessed an extremely bold artistic vision and
often laid plans for grand projects, but he was consistently unable—whether for personal
or financial reasons—to bring them to completion.”

45 Birgit Lodes, “Ludwig Senfl and the Munich Choirbooks: The Emperor’s or the Dukes?,” in Die
Münchner Hofkapelle des 16. Jahrhunderts im europäischen Kontext, ed. Theodor Göllner, Bernhold
Schmid, and Severin Putz (München: Bayerische Akademie der Wissenschaften, 2006), 232. Also see
Helmut Hell, “Senfls Hand in den Chorbüchern der Bayerischen Staatsbibliothek,” Augsburger Jahrbuch
with Maximilian I is Ursula Becker in her article, “Zum historischen Hintergrund des Wolfenbütteler

46 Larry Silver, Marketing Maximilian: The Visual Ideology of a Holy Roman Emperor (Princeton and

47 David J. Rothenberg, “The Most Prudent Virgin and the Wise King: Isaac’s Virgo prudentissima
MunBS 510 fits both Silver’s and Rothenberg’s descriptions of Maximilian I’s artistic endeavors. The elaborate presentation manuscript was indeed copied by a single scribe, but close study of the lettering reveals a sense of urgency in the later pages, as if the scribe was hurrying to complete the book so it could be sent to the painter.\(^4\) The painter, who very well could have been working in a different city than the scribe, obviously did not finish the miniatures for whatever reason. Many of the projects commissioned by Maximilian remained unfinished at the time of his death, and the approximate date of this manuscript does coincide with the emperor’s death and the subsequent dissolution of the Imperial chapel choir (1520).

There is yet another aspect that connects MunBS 510 with Maximilian: Marian iconography and symbolism. Both WolfA A and MunBS 510 begin with the same piece, Josquin’s *Missa De beata virgine*, and the opening miniatures depict the same biblical event, the Annunciation. The illuminated miniatures next to the discantus voice in the Kyrie in both manuscripts are standard images of the Annunciation. The angel Gabriel swoops in on an unsuspecting Virgin Mary, who is quietly reading a book. However, the miniatures of the respective manuscript patrons on the opposite pages present an interesting contrast. In WolfA A, Duke Wilhelm IV gazes attentively in the direction of the Annunciation scene on the opposite page. His hands are folded in prayer and he clasps a set of prayer beads, possibly Rosary beads. In other music manuscripts and sacred imagery in which a patron or donor is depicted, they are usually depicted directing their attention to some sort of holy image and they appear to be in a state of prayer. In MunBS 510, an unfinished sketch of Cardinal Lang is on the opposite page of the Annunciation scene in the same location as Duke Wilhelm in WolfA A. In the sketch,

\(^{48}\) I owe this observation to Franz Körndlé.
Cardinal Lang faces the Annunciation scene, but does not seem to be paying too much attention to it. He is kneeling, and his gaze is directed down toward his book. Sometimes patrons are indeed seen with books of hours, but their gaze is typically directed to the sacred scene or figure.

The Annunciation depiction at the opening of MunBS 510 could contain a meaning beyond what appears to be a standard scene of a patron praying to a divine figure or scene. Rothenberg has studied three compositions connected to Maximilian’s court and written by his court composer Heinrich Isaac. These compositions “equate Maximilian with Mary by emphasizing that both she and he were sovereign monarchs, she of heaven, he of the Holy Roman Empire.” Likewise, Cardinal Lang, a close advisor of Maximilian, could be equated with the Virgin in the miniatures of the Missa De beata virgine in MunBS 510. In the Annunciation scene, Mary is sitting at home reading a book (likely the book of Psalms) when the angel Gabriel appeared to her and requested she undertake a task for the salvation of humankind. On the opposite page, Lang is also engrossed in some sort of devotional book, as if he is awaiting a divine request to take on a responsibility for the greater good of man—perhaps in the form of a new ecclesiastical or political appointment, such as the Archbishop of Salzburg, a promotion he would receive on June 8, 1520.

In discussion of a possible connection between the Missa Pange lingua and the Imperial chapel via MunBS 510, another piece of the Missa Pange lingua puzzle should be mentioned. In the critical commentary of the New Josquin Edition, Willem Elders

---

49 Rothenberg, 40. The three compositions he refers to are Isaac’s Virgo prudentissima, Missa Virgo prudentissima, and the introit Gaudeamus omnes. All three of these pieces are discussed in Rothenberg, “The Most Prudent Virgin and the Wise King.”
states that “no other Mass compositions based on the hymn *Pange lingua* are known.” However, there is one case that challenges Josquin’s monopoly on the use of *Pange lingua* in Renaissance mass settings. A 1544 inventory of the musical holdings of Pfalzgraf Ottheinrich known as the Neuberger Kapellinventar includes a “Missa pange Lingua Isaac” in the list of partbook repertoire. Unfortunately, the source containing this mass does not survive, so there is no way of seeing the mass itself. The inventory is the only indication of a *Missa Pange lingua* by Isaac, and Martin Staehelin has raised doubt about the Isaac attribution being authentic. He suggests it could have been a mistake, and that the mass in question might really have been Josquin’s *Missa Pange lingua*. If Staehelin’s theory is true—and a second *Missa Pange lingua* has not yet surfaced to debunk it—then someone, at some point, associated the Josquin *Missa Pange lingua* with Maximilian’s court composer Isaac.

With the probability of MunBS 510 originating at the Imperial court, Isaac is a potential conduit for an Italian-Imperial court transmission of the *Missa Pange lingua*. In the early years of the sixteenth century, Isaac worked for Maximilian I’s Imperial Hofkapelle while living in Florence. Archival research by Frank D’Accone has revealed that Isaac was quite influential in Florentine musical circles. Florence 232 contains eleven works by Isaac; it is one of multiple Italian sources for Isaac’s works during the

---

50 NJE, 4.3, 97. There are actually several masses based on *Pange lingua* (both the Phrygian melody and the *more hispano* melody) from the seventeenth century or later.

51 Heidelberg, Universitätsbibliothek, Ms. Pal. Germ. 318, fol. 68v


reign of Leo X.\textsuperscript{54} Isaac would have been well-established in both Florence and with the Imperial court and nearing the end of his life during the earliest possible years MunBS 510 and the Vatican manuscripts would have been copied. At that time, the Medici family was in control of the papacy and upper echelons of the Catholic Church. During his reign, Leo X cultivated what Garrett Mattingly described as “the Florentine-papal tandem,” a political and cultural interdependence between Florence and Rome.\textsuperscript{55}

Although Isaac resided in Florence from the summer of 1509 until his death on March 26, 1517, a journey to Vienna is recorded in early 1515, where Maximilian granted Isaac permission to live in Florence permanently, and the two settled on an annual allowance of one hundred fifty gulden on January 27.\textsuperscript{56}

\textit{Missa Pange lingua Sources from Petrus Alamire’s Workshop}

Along with the list of early \textit{Missa Pange lingua} sources that Fallows identifies, I believe that two manuscripts from the celebrated scribal workshop of Petrus Alamire should be added to the early source list and thus become a consideration in the early transmission of the mass.\textsuperscript{57} Alamire supervised a group of scribes associated with the


\textsuperscript{55} Garrett Mattingly, \textit{Renaissance Diplomacy} (Boston, 1971), 155. Also see Cummings, “A Florentine Sacred Repertory,” 267-68.

\textsuperscript{56} D’Accone, 474-75. For a recent documentary study of Isaac’s later years, see Giovanni Zanovello, “‘Master Arigo Ysach, Our Brother,’: New Light on Isaac in Florence, 1502-17,” \textit{The Journal of Musicology} 25, no. 3 (Summer 2008): 287-317.

\textsuperscript{57} The amount of secondary literature on the Alamire manuscripts is quite expansive; a number of studies have been done on individual manuscripts and Alamire’s collective output. Two of the most important resources are Herbert Kellman, ed., \textit{The Treasury of Petrus Alamire: Music and Art in Flemish Court Manuscripts 1500-1535} (Ghent, Amsterdam: Ludian [distributed by University of Chicago Press], 1999); and Bruno Bouckaert and Eugène Schreurs, eds., \textit{The Burgundian-Habsburg Court Complex of Music Manuscripts (1500-1535) and the Workshop of Petrus Alamire} (Leuven and Neerpelt: Alamire Music
Habsburg-Burgundian rulers Philip the Fair, Margaret of Austria, Charles V, and briefly Mary of Hungary. The surviving products of the Alamire workshop date from about 1495 until 1534. The extant Alamire collection consists of forty-five choirbooks, six sets of partbooks (some incomplete), and eleven fragments of manuscript leaves. The Missa *Pange lingua* appears in four Alamire manuscripts: JenaU 21, VienNB 4809, and the Occo Codex contain the entire mass, and VienNB 18832, a collection of bicinia, contains three extracted duet sections from the mass. All four manuscripts were owned by influential figures of the sixteenth century, and three of the four manuscripts were sent to Germany.

The Missa *Pange lingua* is part of a perplexing situation with the Alamire manuscripts and Habsburg-Burgundian court repertoire. After Pierre de la Rue, Josquin had the most individual pieces found in the Alamire manuscripts, and he was also second to La Rue in the amount of times those pieces were recopied in the manuscripts. The extensive representation of La Rue’s work is explained by the fact that La Rue actually worked for the court. In contrast, there is no evidence of any formal relationship between Josquin and the court, which makes it difficult to say exactly when, why, or how the Missa *Pange lingua* and other compositions by Josquin were transmitted to Petrus Alamire.

Given what we know about Josquin’s time in Condé, it is much easier to construct a scenario in which the Missa *Pange lingua* was initially transmitted to the Habsburg-

---

58 The Occo Codex is actually missing the three duets included in the bicinia collections, but for all intents and purposes the copy of the Missa *Pange lingua* in that codex could certainly be performed in a liturgical setting.
Burgundian court, rather than to the Vatican or Germany. Josquin appears to have had connections with a few of the court poets, and he may have come in direct contact with the court on more than one occasion. Only several weeks after Josquin arrived at Condé in 1504, the manuscript BrusBR 9126 was produced with three of Josquin’s recent masses (Missa Ave maris stella, Missa Malheur me bat, and Missa Hercules dux Ferrarie as Missa Philippus rex Castilie). The superior textual readings of these masses suggest that the masses were transmitted to the court scribe by Josquin himself.  

David Fallows believes that Josquin maintained ties with the Hapsburg-Burgundian court through Philip the Fair, and that professional connection continued with Margaret after Philip’s death. Fallows suggests that the previously mentioned 1508 letter to Margaret indicates that Margaret and Josquin were familiar with each other and the letter might have been penned by Josquin himself, given that Josquin is referred to as “Josquin Desprez” rather than “Maistre Josse Desprez,” as it is in formal documents. 

The Treaty of Calais was signed on December 21, 1507, a joyous occasion that was recorded by the court chronicler Jean Lemaire. The court’s primary composers such as La Rue would have been in Spain during the festivities surrounding the treaty, and so it is possible that Lemaire turned to Josquin for music. In contrast, the court songbook BrusBR 228 contains 58 pieces, and only four were by Josquin. Fallows interprets this as meaning that Josquin’s music was “less appreciated” at Margaret’s court, with the relationship possibly waning when the historian Lemaire left in 1511-12. If this were the case, then Margaret’s alleged disinterest had no effect on the distribution of Josquin’s

59 Fallows, Josquin, 281. See Fallows, Josquin, 279-282 for a description of BrusBR 9126.

60 Ibid., 306-7.

61 Ibid., 303. BrusBR 228 is typically dated around 1516.
sacred works by the scribal workshop. Indeed, his compositions were copied and re-
copied in Alamire manuscripts well into the 1520s. Honey Meconi identifies a possible
conduit between Josquin and the Habsburg-Burgundian court in the person of Jean
Braconnier. Meconi cites a discovery made by Paula Higgins in the manuscript BNF
lat. 9917, which reveals that Braconnier became a provost at Condé at the same time as
Josquin in May 1504. Braconnier joined the chapel choir of Philip the Fair in 1497,
where he gained a reputation as a relatively minor composer but a popular tenorist.

The Alamire copies of the Missa Pange lingua present an interesting case study in
the scribal naming of masses. In JenaU 21 and VienNB 4809, the Missa Pange lingua is
labeled as Missa de venerabili sacramento. In the Occo Codex, the mass is labeled as
many know it today: Missa Pange lingua. Hottinet Barra’s Missa Ecce panis angelorum
is actually given the venerabili sacramento label in the Occo Codex. Both labels fall
within the Alamire Mass Ordinary naming categories that Honey Meconi has outlined;
the mass is named in the Occo Codex according to its pre-existing material and its name
in the other two indicates liturgical function. It is clear that the venerabili sacramento
label was in fact for functional purposes and was not connected to the Missa Pange
lingua or any other mass. In yet another manuscript, MontsM 766, Barbireau’s Missa
Virgo parens Christi is the Missa di venerabili sacramento of that particular collection.
Meconi proposes that the multiple names of masses in various manuscripts demonstrate

---

University Press, 2003), 173. Meconi cites private communication with Paula Higgins in regards to this
theory.

63 For a brief biography of Braconnier, see Meconi, *Pierre de la Rue*, 68-70.

64 Honey Meconi, “Habsburg-Burgundian Manuscripts, Borrowed Material, and the Practice of Naming,” in
the flexibility of the works. In the case of the Missa Pange lingua, her assertion seems to hold true. JenaU 21 and VienNB 4809 both contain masses with a variety of borrowed material and liturgical functions. In these manuscripts, the Missa Pange lingua is distinguished from the others by its association with the Blessed Sacrament. The Occo Codex—by no accident—is full of compositions based on Eucharistic texts and chants. Therefore, the various masses must be distinguished in a different way.

The scribes who copied the Alamire Missa Pange lingua sources conveyed the work’s association with Corpus Christi and the Eucharist by labeling it “mass of the venerable sacrament,” and also through illustrations. All three of the manuscripts with complete copies of the mass contain imagery on the opening folios of the Kyrie that convey the liturgical context of the Missa Pange lingua. In the sparsely-decorated JenaU 21, an angel holding a monstrance kneels atop the opening initial of the Missa Pange lingua. The first folio of the Missa Pange lingua in VienNB 4809 contains an image of the Blessed Sacrament displayed in a monstrance on an altar. Even in the Occo Codex, where the Missa Pange lingua is not the opening mass and the liturgical context is obvious, there are small images of a monstrance and chalice near the opening Kyrie I initial. This iconography and the labeling of the mass in VienNB 4809 and JenaU 21 indicate that the mass was intended—by the scribes and artists, at least—to be performed at masses during the Corpus Christi celebrations as well as votive masses for the Blessed Sacrament.

Many of the Alamire manuscripts served as diplomatic gifts that were meant to reflect the power and cultural wealth of Margaret’s court. If Margaret wanted to give gifts that were not only ornate but useful, including the Missa Pange lingua (or other mass

---

65 Ibid., 115.  
settings based on Corpus Christi repertoire, such as La Rue’s Missa O Salutaris hostia) was a good bet. Eucharistic votive masses, discussed at length in the previous chapter, were quite popular in churches and private chapels in Germany and the Low Countries; most churches or courts would have had an appropriate liturgical use for it. Moreover, the people who acquired the three Alamire manuscripts with the Missa Pange lingua probably appreciated this particular mass not only for its functional value, but also for its aesthetic and technical superiority.

The manuscript BrusBR IV. 922, also known as the Occo Codex, was prepared by Alamire scribes and delivered to a patron in Amsterdam, unlike the other Alamire Missa Pange lingua manuscripts which were sent to Germany. The Occo Codex is one of only a dozen manuscripts created for patrons outside of the Burgundian-Habsburg dynasty—someone who was not involved with the royal court or had formal political contacts with it. The manuscript was commissioned by Pompeius Occo (1480-1537), a Dutch merchant and banker. He was a learned man with a deep interest in culture and literature. He amassed an impressive library, and was a proponent of the emerging humanistic thought. The manuscript is large and ornate enough to be considered a luxury presentation codex. In the words of Theodor Dumitrescu, “This was no mere liturgy book but a

---


67 For a description of the texts and coats of arms in the manuscript that directly link it to Pompeius Occo, see Bernard Huys, “An Unknown Alamire-Choirbook (“Occo Codex”) Recently Acquired by the Royal Library of Belgium,” Tijdschrift van de Vereniging voor Nederlandse Muziekgeschiedenis 24, no. 1 (1974): 3

68 Kellman, Cat. No. 6, in The Treasury of Petrus Alamire, 76.
semi-public devotional item, reflecting the interests cultivated by one patron during his ascent among the elite of his adopted city.”

The bulk of the Occo Codex repertoire is associated with the Eucharist (see Table 2.3). In addition to his other professional responsibilities, Pompeius Occo was church warden of the Heilige Stede, or Holy Place from 1513 to 1518. The chapel was dedicated on October 21, 1347 to commemorate a Eucharistic miracle that consisted of a preserved Host continually returning to that particular location. There is a note in the manuscript, which states that the Occo family loaned the manuscript to the chapel permanently, although the family would retain ownership of it. The note, dated shortly after Occo’s death on November 20, 1537, indicates it is most likely that Pompeius Occo was involved in making the decision to officially loan the manuscript to the chapel.

The Occo Codex was originally thought to have been produced between 1526 and Alamire’s retirement in 1534. This date was based on Alamire’s retirement and the ‘pie memorie’ after Anthonius Divitis’s name in the ascription of the Requiem. The note indicates that Divitis must have died shortly before the manuscript was copied, and he is believed to have died no earlier than 1526. Flynn Warmington has questioned this later dating and suggests that the Divitis ascription was a mechanical error due to the scribe misreading the name. In other sources, the Requiem mass is ascribed to Anthoine de Févin, and Warmington believes the scribe wrote “Anthonius diutis pie memorie +” instead of “Anthonius defeuin pie memorie +” (italics added here for emphasis).

---

69 Dumitrescu, “The Occo Codex.”


71 Ibid., 6.
Additionally, Dumitrescu points out that composers represented in the manuscripts for the Confraternity of Our Lady in ‘s-Hertogenbosch, copied around 1530-31, include Willaert, Bauldeweyn, Courtois, and Richafort. They come from a markedly later generation than the composers whose works are included in the Occo Codex.\textsuperscript{73}

Table 2.3

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Contents of the Occo Codex</th>
<th>Folios</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>Title</strong></td>
<td><strong>Composer</strong></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>O Salutaris hostia</td>
<td>Anonymous</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>O Salutaris hostia</td>
<td>[Weerbeke]</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>O Salutaris hostia</td>
<td>[La Rue]</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>O Salutaris hostia</td>
<td>Anonymous</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Tantum ergo</td>
<td>Anonymous</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>(Cibavit) Eos ex adipe frumenti</td>
<td>Anonymous</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>O Salutaris hostia</td>
<td>Anonymous</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Missa de Venerabili Sacramento</td>
<td>Hottinet Barra</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Missa Pange lingua</td>
<td>Josquin</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Missa Benedictus dominus</td>
<td>Mouton</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Missa Mijn herte alijt heft</td>
<td>Gascongne</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Missa L’oserai-je dire</td>
<td>Mouton</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Missa L’homme armé</td>
<td>Forestier/[Mouton]</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Kyrie Paschale (from Missa Paschalis- a6)</td>
<td>Isaac</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Kyrie Paschale</td>
<td>Laurentius Vorda</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Missa Paschale</td>
<td>[Isaac]</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Missa pro fidelibus defunctis (Sicut cerbus missing)</td>
<td>Divitis/[A. Févin]</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Warmington’s meticulous analysis of the scribal hands in the Occo Codex yields only more ambiguity and questions regarding the dating of the manuscript. “Scribe I,” the person who copied the Missa Pange lingua, has a very vague copying period of roughly the 1520s. Taking Warmington’s finding into consideration, Dumitrescu proposes that the Occo Codex was copied earlier than previously thought. He gives the manuscript an


\textsuperscript{73} We know that Petrus Alamire was in direct personal contact with Pompeius Occo in the summer of 1521, in the middle of Warmington’s and Dumitrescu’s proposed dates. Occo paid Alamire and another person from Mechelen to teach King Christian II of Denmark “the art of mining.” See O Nübel, Pompejus Occo 1483 bis 1537. Fuggerfaktor in Amsterdam, Studien zur Fuggergeschichte 24 (Tübingen, 1972), 109. Occo also played the role of mediator for Christian II within the Netherlands, and was in regular contact with Margaret of Austria. See “Occo Codex” website.
approximate date range of 1515-1525, and suggests 1515-1517 as a more precise date. In his catalogue entry for the Occo Codex, Kellman lists Huys’s and Warmington’s later dates but concedes that it is “quite possible” that the manuscript was made between 1517 and 1519. Dumitrescu’s revised dates fit better with Occo’s commissioning of the book. Occo was church warden of the Heilige Stede from 1513 until 1518, and 1515-25 was when he was actively involved with church donations and commissions.

Although Warmington suggests an earlier date range for the Occo Codex, she doubts that Alamire commissioned the manuscript specifically for the Heilige Stede chapel. After his tenure at the Heilige Stede, Occo served as warden of the more important Nieuwe Kerk from 1521 to 1526, and Warmington believes the manuscript could have been commissioned for the needs of that church. She also takes into consideration that there is no positive evidence that the manuscript was lent to the Heilige Stede before about 1530. Based on contextual evidence of the manuscript, I believe there are other scenarios that are far more likely. The manuscript was clearly made for Pompeius Occo the individual; his coat of arms, motto, and name on folio 13r are evidence of that. Both inscriptions indicate the manuscript belonged to Occo and it was being loaned to the Heilige Stede; no other institutions are mentioned. Pompeius Occo was a known bibliophile, but the readings of the pieces from the Occo Codex indicate that the manuscript was intended for performance; it was not a collector’s book that would merely remain on a shelf.


There are records of Occo paying singers in the summer of 1521 during Christian II’s sojourn in the Low Countries, but Occo did not have his own personal chapel choir like Frederick the Wise or Margaret of Austria. Furthermore, the Occo Codex is somewhat unusual among Alamire’s manuscript output. The majority of Alamire manuscripts, regardless of their intended patron or function, contain sacred works for a variety of liturgical occasions: repertoire for the Virgin Mary, various saints, even Missae feria for daily masses. The Eucharist-centered repertoire must have been specifically requested by Occo; he either wanted the manuscript to contain useful music for the Heilige Stede or he wanted his own copies of music for the Blessed Sacrament. It seems much more likely that Occo wanted the music for the Heilige Stede, especially since he did not have an ensemble at his own disposal. The motets and masses based on Corpus Christi texts would have been ideal for the Eucharist-centered services that occurred there. Moreover, Dumitrescu believes that the phrase “huius sacellj qui sacer locus appellatur” (“of this chapel, which is called the Heilige Stede”) in the loan inscription is an indication that the book was already located in the chapel at the time the inscription was written into the manuscript in 1537.

The rendering of the Missa Pange lingua in the Occo Codex also supports an argument for the manuscript being created during Occo’s tenure at Heilige Stede. The

---

77 The chapel was the site of regular processions, prayer services, and masses devoted to the miraculous Host. See Dumitrescu, “The Occo Codex” for a summary.

78 Dumitrescu, “The Occo Codex.” Extant documents regarding Pompeius Occo indicate that he was a very generous patron of the Heilige Stede during his time as churchwarden there. Alaard of Amsterdam singles out the Heilige Stede as a chapel that Occo enriched immensely. Occo’s patronage of the Heilige Stede could have continued after his tenure there, but there is no documentary evidence of this, and his wills indicate that he left donations to all of the major hospitals and religious institutions in Amsterdam without emphasizing a particular entity. Although he did leave donations for the hours and Eucharistic votive mass at the Nieuwe Kerk, these were existing services, not new foundations. Moreover, the Occo Codex is not directly connected to that donation, since it was loaned to the Heilige Stede and not the Nieuwe Kerk.
reading is very closely connected to the earliest sources of the mass, which were all produced before 1520. Nevertheless, the Occo Codex does contain a significant diversion. The original Benedictus is replaced by a three-voice Benedictus from Gascongne’s *Missa Es hat ein sin*, and the original Pleni sunt is replaced by an anonymous one. Additionally, the Agnus Dei II is completely omitted in the Occo Codex, which is not highly unusual in this manuscript, as five of the eight mass settings are missing sections.\(^7\) Given the contextual and source evidence, Dumitrescu’s earlier estimation of 1515-17 seems to be the most logical date for the Occo Codex.\(^8\)

A second Alamire manuscript containing the *Missa Pange lingua* and seven other mass settings was acquired by Frederick the Wise, elector of Saxony. The contents of JenaU 21 are summarized on Table 2.4. The *Missa Pange lingua* actually stands out in this collection because it is the only work that appears in other manuscripts from the Alamire workshop. In fact, JenaU 21 was the only extant source for some of the other masses before the discovery of the manuscript Brno 15/4.\(^8\) The *Missa Pange lingua* is also distinguished in JenaU 21 because it is the first piece in the collection and thus

---

\(^7\) Dumitrescu, “The Occo Codex.” These omissions could have been purely logistical decisions, especially considering that all omitted sections are for only two voices. Perhaps the duet sections posed problems for the copyists or eventual performers. More likely, the scribes were simply unable to properly fit the duet sections on the folios that were meant for four parts. The mixing and matching of separate mass parts, like in the Sanctus, was not as egregious in the sixteenth century as it is today, particularly if the scribes/performers had to make modifications in order to execute a liturgical performance.

\(^8\) In the brief section on the *Missa Pange lingua* in his introductory guide to Josquin, Willem Elders gives 1520-21 as the date for the Occo Codex and states that the manuscript was created at the request of Occo. Elders does not cite any sources or reasoning behind this date. Although it does not coincide with Occo’s tenure at the Heilige Stede (1513-18), it does fall within the years he was known for his church patronage. Furthermore, 1520-21 still falls within the earliest decade of *Missa Pange lingua* circulation and the relationships between the Occo Codex and other earlier manuscripts including JenaU 21 would not necessarily be impacted if the Occo Codex was indeed made a couple years later in 1520. See Willem Elders, *Josquin des Prez and His Musical Legacy: An Introductory Guide* (Leuven: Leuven University Press, 2013), 102-3.

\(^8\) Eric Jas, Cat. No. 20, in *The Treasury of Petrus Alamire*, 103.
receives the sole painted decoration: an angel holding a monstrance containing the Bless...
Catholic Church and its Pope, a loyalty that appears to have been both professionally and personally motivated. His advocacy for Martin Luther is just one of many testaments to Frederick’s extraordinary diplomatic ability. Additionally, he appears to have been a kind and benevolent ruler who was keenly interested in the arts and improving education.  

With the extensive research done on Frederick the Wise and his choirbooks, the liturgical context of the JenaU 21 Missa Pange lingua can be reconstructed to some extent. There are nineteen extant liturgical music manuscripts that were all associated with Frederick in some way. Eighteen are housed at the Jena Thüringer Universitäts-und Landesbibliothek and the final manuscript, Weimar A is located at the Thüringer Landesmusikarchiv. Zoe Saunders has expressed some skepticism toward JenaU 21 being definitively associated with Frederick since the manuscript does not contain his coat of arms or other identifying features, but the fact remains that the manuscript was housed in the Electoral Library that was later moved to the university library at Jena.  

---

83 For a more detailed picture of Frederick’s life, there are several useful resources available. An important primary resource is the biography written by Frederick’s secretary, Georg Spalatin, a year after Frederick’s death: Georg Spalatin, Friedrich des Wesien Leben und Zeitgeschichte, ed. Chr. Gotth. Neudecker and Ludwig Preller (Jena: Friedrich Mauke, 1851). Ludolphy’s biography of Frederick is a comprehensive and relatively recent study: Ingetraut Ludolphy, Friedrich der Weise (Göttingen: Vandenhoeck and Ruprecht, 1984). Another recent biography for a more general audience is Sam Wellman, Frederick the Wise: Seen and Unseen Lives of Martin Luther’s Protector (Charleston: Wild Centuries Press, 2011). For a brief overview (although more detailed than the biography given here), see Kathryn Pohlmann Duffy, “The Jena Choirbooks: Music and Liturgy at the Castle Church in Wittenberg Under Frederick the Wise, Elector of Saxony” (PhD diss., University of Maryland, 2010), 80-81. In 1547, the army of Frederick’s nephew, Elector Johann Friedrich, was defeated by Charles V’s army in the Schmalkaldic War. As part of the Wittenberg Capitulation that ended the war, Johann Friedrich lost the electoral title and most of the electoral territory, including Wittenberg. However, he was able to keep a small amount of land in Thuringia, along with the Electoral Library. Johann Friedrich moved the library to Jena, where he founded a Hohe Schule (which would later become the university) to replace his uncle’s beloved university in Wittenberg. Because the eighteen manuscripts were part of the original library holdings at Jena, it is evident that at one point they were also all together in the Electoral Library. See Zoe Saunders, “Anonymous Masses in the Alamire Manuscripts: Toward a New Understanding of a Repertoire, an Atelier, and a Renaissance Court” (PhD diss., University of Maryland, 2010), 80-81.
JenaU 21 and Frederick’s other choirbooks were used either at his Castle Church in Wittenberg or by his own court choir. Scholars have typically divided the nineteen manuscripts associated with Frederick into two groups.\textsuperscript{85} One group, commonly referred to as the “Alamire choirbooks” in specialized studies, consists of the eleven manuscripts which were made in Petrus Alamire’s workshop; Mass Ordinary settings dominate the contents of these manuscripts, and most of them are lavishly decorated. Some of the eleven were presented to Frederick as gifts from Emperor Maximilian I or his daughter Margaret, others were probably ordered directly from the workshop by Frederick himself, and a few may have been acquired by Frederick from another owner.\textsuperscript{86} The second group, referred to as the “Jena choirbooks,” is comprised of the remaining eight manuscripts, all of which were made between 1500 and 1520. These eight manuscripts were copied onto paper rather than vellum, and are modestly decorated in comparison to the eleven manuscripts in the previous group. Collectively, this group of manuscripts contains liturgical music for most of the Church Year; the music for Holy Week and the Sundays following Easter and Trinity Sunday are missing, which creates an unsettling situation for scholars of this repertoire.\textsuperscript{87} It appears that these eight manuscripts were primarily utilitarian, given their modest artwork and overall organization.\textsuperscript{88}

---

\textsuperscript{85} See Hannah Hutchens Mowrey, “The Alamire Manuscripts of Frederick the Wise: Intersections of Music, Art, and Theology” (PhD diss., Eastman School of Music, 2010); and Duffy, “Saxon Court.”

\textsuperscript{86} I will refer to these eleven manuscripts as the Alamire choirbooks and the second group as the Jena choirbooks.

\textsuperscript{87} Duffy, “The Jena Choirbooks,” 5.

\textsuperscript{88} Duffy speculates that they may have been prepared close to the place of their intended use, unlike the eleven Alamire choirbooks that were created at Alamire’s workshop at the Netherlands court. See Duffy, “The Jena Choirbooks,” 3.
The Jena and Alamire choirbooks that belonged to Frederick could have been used by either the choir at the All Saints Castle Church in Wittenberg, or Frederick’s personal court choir, the Hofkapelle. Frederick added singers to the Hofkapelle in 1491 in order to provide liturgical music at his court; Frederick’s father had employed a group of instrumentalists as early as 1482. Several of the Alamire choirbooks also contain personalized symbols of Frederick himself such as his motto (Tant que je puis), coat of arms (contains two red swords in the center), or in the case of Jena U 3, a modified version of Josquin’s Missa Hercules dux Ferrariae, which is entitled Missa Fridericus dux Saxsonie. Duffy reasons that the mottos, coats of arms, and other personal identifiers connected these manuscripts with Frederick himself, rather than the Castle Church.

Thus, the manuscripts most likely would have been with Frederick, who was rarely in residence at Wittenberg. If these manuscripts were actually with Frederick, they most likely would have been used by his Hofkapelle. Frederick spent the majority of his time at his residence at Torgau, but he traveled often. He had residences at a number of other Saxon towns, and he often had to journey beyond the borders of his territory to tend to political matters.

89 Originally, it was thought that these ensembles consisted of the same singers, but more recent research has revealed that the Hofkapelle and Castle Church choir were two distinct groups. See Karl Erich Roedgier, Die geistlichen Musikhandschriften der Universitäts-Bibliothek Jena (Jena: Fromman, Walter Biedermann, 1935); Jürgen Heidrich, Die Deutschen Chorbücher aus der Hofkapelle Friedrichs des Weisen: Ein Beitrag zur mitteldeutschen geistlichen Musikpraxis um 1500, Sammlung Musikwissenschaftlicher Abhandlungen 84 (Baden-Baden: Verlag Valentin Koerner, 1993); and Kathryn Pohlmann Duffy, “The Jena Choirbooks: Music and Liturgy at the Castle Church in Wittenberg Under Frederick the Wise, Elector of Saxony” (PhD diss., University of Chicago, 1995).

90 Duffy, “Saxon Court,” 220.

91 Ibid., 219. In this essay, Duffy also briefly discusses the liturgy of the Castle Church in comparison with the manuscripts’ contents when discussing which manuscripts could have been for the Castle Church.

92 See Duffy, “Saxon Court,” 220, for a list of Frederick’s other residences.
Due to a lack of personal indicators or fortuitous marginal notes, as well as the nature of its repertoire, JenaU 21 could easily have been used at the Castle Church or Frederick’s Hofkapelle. As with many churches and communities in sixteenth-century Germany, the Castle Church held Eucharistic votive masses and processions on a regular basis. Corpus Christi votive masses were part of a weekly votive mass cycle that consisted of St. Anne masses on Tuesday, Corpus Christi masses on Thursday, Holy Cross masses on Friday, and Blessed Virgin Mary masses on Saturday.\footnote{Duffy, “The Jena Choirbooks,” 394.} Among the many indulgences associated with Wittenberg, there was one granted in 1510 by Pope Julius II that required the faithful to participate in weekly “Eucharistic cult celebrations,” along with other festive masses and processions.\footnote{For a complete table of indulgences accumulated by the Castle Church between 1342 and 1516, see Duffy, “The Jena Choirbooks,” 76-78.} This particular indulgence appears to focus on the veneration of the Blessed Virgin and St. Anne, but it is an important indication of the legitimacy of Eucharistic devotion in Wittenberg.\footnote{Paul Kalkoff, Abläß und Reliquienverehrung an der Schloßkirche zu Wittenberg unter Friedrich dem Weisen (Gotha: Friedrich Andreas Perthes Aktiengesellschaft, 1907), 95-97.} The Castle Church held Corpus Christi processions in addition to the Corpus Christi votive masses, much to the annoyance of Martin Luther.\footnote{The Statut der Stiftkirchen Allerheiligen zu Wittenburgck, or Statutes of the Castle Church, were first written on November 20, 1509, and were revised approximately five years later. Both versions of the statutes mention a regularly held Corpus Christi procession in the context of clerical responsibilities; each clergyman is to be present at the Corpus Christi processions and special endowment Masses. Duffy interprets the Corpus Christi processions as being held on a daily basis, although it seems possible that the statues could be referring to a procession that was held weekly with the Eucharistic votive masses, or even annually with the feast of Corpus Christi itself. See Duffy, “The Jena Choirbooks,” 154. The Statut der Stiftkirchen Aller Heiligen zu Wittenburgck in the original German along with an English translation can be found in Duffy, “The Jena Choirbooks,” 615-633.}

If the Missa Pange lingua in JenaU 21 was intended to be used specifically for Eucharistic votive masses—and its title in the manuscript indicates that it was—there
were such services at the Castle Church in Wittenberg. Eucharistic votive masses were celebrated in the Castle Church following Luther’s release of the 95 theses and leading up to the years when JenaU 21 was produced. The Verzeichnis aller Chorlichen Ambt in Aller Heyligen Stiftkyrchen zw Wittenberg lists all the choral Masses and Offices throughout the Liturgical Year.97 It was most likely compiled around 1520, and it also lists a weekly Corpus Christi Mass that was celebrated every Thursday. Much less is known about the musical and liturgical scene at Frederick’s court, but Georg Spalatin recorded that Frederick heard Mass almost every day, and he took his Hofkapelle with him on at least some of his journeys. In the manuscript catalogue of The Treasury of Petrus Alamire, Eric Jas associates JenaU 21 with the other Alamire manuscripts and concludes that it must have been for the Hofkapelle, without going into further detail.98

When discussing Frederick’s personal religious life, previous studies of him have highlighted his devotion to the Virgin Mary, Saint Anne (a saint who was “in vogue” at the time), and Saint Elizabeth, along with his massive collection of relics.99 There is also evidence of Frederick’s devotion to the Blessed Sacrament. In April of 1490, Frederick issued an order to his subjects to hold “special processions and pilgrimages” to petition God for good weather.100 The processions in Frederick’s statement could refer to Corpus Christi processions with the Blessed Sacrament; throughout the Middle Ages,

97 Weimar Staatsarchiv, Ernstphinisches Gesamtarchiv Reg. O. 201 (Reg. O. pag. 91 AAa 41)
98 Jas, Cat. No. 20, in The Treasury of Petrus Alamire, 103.
99 Frederick was an avid collector of holy relics. In 1493 he made a pilgrimage to the Holy Land, and returned with St. Anne’s thumb. By 1520, he had amassed more than 19,000 relics. Frederick’s relic collecting clashed with Luther’s views particularly because one could gain indulgences by venerating the relics. See Georg Spalatin, Friedrich des Wesien Leben und Zeitgeschichte, ed. Chr. Goth. Neudecker and Ludwig Preller (Jena: Friedrich Mauke, 1851); Ingetraut Ludolphy, Friedrich der Weise (Göttingen: Vandenhoeck and Ruprecht, 1984); and Kathryn Pohlmann Duffy, “The Jena Choirbooks,” 30-62.
100 Hellman, 47.
communities held processions in which the Host was carried around town and into the fields with the hope that God would grant them good weather and a fruitful harvest. In June of that year, Frederick visited various shrines in Vogelgesang, Wittenberg, Magdeburg, and Angermuende, and he also made a pilgrimage to the Holy Blood shrine at Wilsnack in Brandenburg. That was actually Frederick’s second visit to the Holy Blood shrine; he first came to Wilsnack in 1484 with his father and brother after his mother died.101

Perhaps the most poignant indication of Frederick’s perception of the Eucharist came just before his death. Georg Spalatin, Frederick’s trusted secretary, published a biography of the elector with a moving account of the elector’s final hours.102 On his deathbed, Frederick took Communion under both forms: the bread and wine. Spalatin writes that Frederick received the bread and wine with such “devotion, earnestness, and intimacy” that all who were present started weeping.103 The laity’s reception of both Eucharistic elements was something Luther had vehemently fought for, and apparently it was a reform that Frederick did not want to partake of until he was on his deathbed.

In most Alamire scholarship, the given date range for JenaU 21 has been 1521-1525, based on the year of Frederick’s death, and on a cross next to the ascription, “Io. De pratis” on the opening page of Missa Allez regretz. The ascription was thought to refer to Josquin, although serious doubts have been raised in recent years regarding the authorship of the Missa Allez Regretz. The ascription was most likely not a Latinized

101 Ibid., 47-48.
102 Spalatin, 63-68.
103 “Darnach empfingen auch ihre Chf. G. das hochwürdige Sacrament des wahren Leibs und Bluts unsers lieben Herrn und Heilands vermöge seiner heiligen Einsatzung ganz und gar in beider Gestalt mit solcher Andacht, Ernst und Innigkeit, daß wir alle weinten, soviel unser darbei waren.”
form of Josquin’s name, but rather it was the standard abbreviation for Johannes.\textsuperscript{104} The questionable Josquin authorship and the questionable cross ascription does call for a re-evaluation of the dates for JenaU 21, as Saunders suggested.\textsuperscript{105} Most of the manuscript was copied by “Scribe D,” who was active between 1516 and 1520. Although the Missa Pange lingua was copied by another scribe, the reading in JenaU 21 has only one error, which indicates a close connection to the Occo Codex and also VatS 16. The 1520-25 date for JenaU 21 has been reinforced by past scholarship due to the physical similarities between JenaU 21 and a group of Alamire manuscripts known to have been copied during those five years: VienNB 4809, 4810, 11778, and SubA 248.\textsuperscript{106} Besides being slightly taller than the other manuscripts, the discrepancies between the Missa Pange lingua readings of the Missa Pange lingua in JenaU 21 and VienNB 4809 help to support the earlier date range for JenaU 21.

VienNB 4809 contains masses composed by Josquin after 1500, and is indeed similar to JenaU 21; both are collections of polyphonic Mass Ordinary settings, and both manuscripts have similar binding and decorations. Unlike JenaU 21, VienNB 4809 provides evidence of its intended owner. Folios Iv and 2r of VienNB 4809 contain the Fugger family coat of arms, which indicates the manuscript was for a member of the Augsburg banking dynasty. Unfortunately, the empirical evidence stops there, since there are no initials accompanying the coat of arms to signify an individual for whom the manuscript was intended. Herbert Kellman surmises that VienNB 4809 belonged to Raimund Fugger the Elder (1489-1535), along with VienNB 18825 and 18832. Like

\textsuperscript{104}See Saunders, 82-83.

\textsuperscript{105}Ibid., 83.

\textsuperscript{106}See Saunders, 81-92. Also see Mowrey, 218-219.
VienNB 4809, these other two Alamire manuscripts contain the Fugger coat of arms without initials. However, a fourth Alamire manuscript for the Fuggers, VienNB 15941, does have Raimund the Elder’s specific coat of arms. Eric Jas also notes that Raimund is the only member of the Fugger family known to have collected music.107

Table 2.5

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Title</th>
<th>Composer</th>
<th>Folios</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Missa Pange lingua</td>
<td>Josquin</td>
<td>1v-22</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Missa De beata Virgine</td>
<td>Josquin/[La Rue]</td>
<td>23v-46</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Missa Hercules dux Ferrarie</td>
<td>[Josquin]</td>
<td>47v-65</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Missa Malheur me bat</td>
<td>Josquin</td>
<td>66v-89v</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Missa Faisant regretz</td>
<td>[Josquin]</td>
<td>90v-108</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Missa Sine nomine</td>
<td>Josquin</td>
<td>109v-122</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Missa Ave maris stella</td>
<td>Josquin</td>
<td>123v-141</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Although VienNB 4809 contains Josquin masses with concordances in many other Alamire manuscripts, the readings of these masses make this manuscript stand apart from the others. The Missa Pange lingua is no exception to this rule. The Missa Pange lingua reading in Vienna 4809 contains over two dozen rhythmic and notational variants that are not found in the other two Alamire sources, MunBS 510 and VatS 16, the earliest Missa Pange lingua source from Rome. Moreover, there are only two unique variants shared by all three Alamire manuscripts that are of little substance: a minim in place of two semiminims and a colored breve in place of a dotted semibreve. The manuscript contains different readings of the Missa Ave maris stella, Missa Malheur me bat, and the Missa Faisant regretz. Perhaps the purpose of VienNB 4809 is an explanation of the poor readings of these works. If Raimund Fugger merely wanted to “collect” the Josquin compositions, that is a different circumstance than a choir actually performing the masses

---

107 Jas, Cat. No. 40, in The Treasury of Petrus Alamire, 143.
for religious services. The Missa Pange lingua in VienNB 4809 exemplifies Saunders’s description of a gift manuscript not intended for practical performance purposes:

Simplification of cadential ornaments, like simplification of rhythms, may have been a way to make less work for the copyist, and may reflect a conscious effort on the part of the scribes, the editor, or both, to make manuscript preparation more efficient, saving time and money. It also suggests that completing a manuscript quickly was more important than transmitting a reading exhibiting the performing traditions of the home institution.108

Moreover, performance instructions and signa congruentiae are omitted in this manuscript, which provides even further evidence that VienNB 4809 was not a performance copy.

When considering the readings of the Missa Pange lingua in the Occo Codex, JenaU 21, and VienNB 4809, the latter presents a reading that is quite distinct from the other two and provides further support for the revised dating of JenaU 21. The proposed earlier dates for the Occo Codex and JenaU 21 have implications beyond the contexts of the individual manuscripts. With the earlier dates of these manuscripts, the Missa Pange lingua was placed in the category of repertoire from the “post-1520” Alamire repertoire that is not believed to have been part of Margaret’s court. If these manuscripts were in fact copied earlier than 1520, the possibility for the Missa Pange lingua being performed at Margaret’s court becomes stronger.

Herbert Kellman was the first to suggest that the Alamire manuscripts should be divided into two chronological groups, and Flynn Warmington and Zoe Saunders have since offered evidence to further support the division.109 The earlier manuscripts,

108 Saunders, 321.

109 See Kellman, “Book Production and Book Distribution at the Netherlands Court, 1495-1534,” in Formen und Probleme der Überlieferung mehrstimmiger Musik im Zeitalter Josquins Desprez, ed. Ludwig
dominated by court composer Pierre de la Rue, were a reflection of Margaret’s court liturgy and the later manuscripts generally contain a lot of repertoire from French composers who were not necessarily associated with the liturgical music of the court. In 1517, Petrus Alamire’s official employment by the Hapsburg-Burgundian court ended, and after that he began to travel widely, sometimes for diplomatic and espionage missions.\textsuperscript{110} He also probably received manuscript commissions during his travels; the Fuggers probably ordered their manuscripts directly from Alamire when he was in Augsburg. However, Alamire was not completely cut off from the court at this time. He continued his association with the scribal workshop and oversaw the production of manuscripts for numerous patrons before receiving a pension from Mary of Hungary in 1534.

The readings of the Missa Pange lingua in the Alamire manuscripts reinforce recent arguments for an earlier dating of the Occo Codex and JenaU 21, and the three Alamire copies of the mass certainly support Saunders’s observation that the “later” scribes rarely used the same exemplars as the “early” scribes.\textsuperscript{111} JenaU 21 and the Occo Codex are both fairly clear readings, while the VienNB 4809 copy contains plenty of variants. Given this transmission pattern among the three manuscripts, earlier dates for JenaU 21 and the Occo Codex make sense. These two manuscripts are also tied much more closely to VatS 16. JenaU 21 supports VatS 16 in 50 variants, the Occo Codex in

---

\textsuperscript{110} For more information on Alamire’s espionage adventures, see Eugeen Schreurs, “Petrus Alamire: Music Calligrapher, Musician, Composer, Spy,” in The Treasury of Petrus Alamire, 15-27.

\textsuperscript{111} Saunders, 299.
41, and VienNB 4809 shares only 15 common variants with VatS 16. The connection between VatS 16 and the two early Alamire copies of the *Missa Pange lingua* has probably been overlooked because these manuscripts were always assumed to be several years later than MunBS 510 and the Vatican manuscripts. The readings of the *Missa Pange lingua* in JenAU 21, the Occo Codex, MunBS 510 and VatS 16 do not present an obvious picture of their chronology or exact relationships to each other, but the sources are indeed related: they share similarities in ligatures, and notational and rhythmic variants not present in later *Missa Pange lingua* sources. Given the multiple other reasons have been brought forward for giving these two Alamire manuscripts earlier dates along with comparison of the *Missa Pange lingua* readings, JenAU 21 and the Occo Codex should be considered with the other earliest *Missa Pange lingua* sources when evaluating the origins, transmission and context of the mass.

In his discussion of the purpose behind several Alamire manuscripts, Stanley Boorman states that the intention of many presentation manuscripts—he singles out those for Frederick and the Fuggers—was to present not only the repertoire of Margaret’s court, but also precisely how it sounded. That is how Boorman accounts for additional performance notes in many of these presentation manuscripts. If this hypothesis is correct, that may explain the use of two exemplars for the *Missa Pange lingua.*

---

112 NJE, 4.3, 78.

113 “These manuscripts, especially the sets of manuscripts for Jena or for the Fuggers, were intended to carry her [Margaret’s] repertoire, certainly; but more significantly, they were carrying the representation of her ‘music,’ as it was performed and sounded.” Boorman, 114.

114 In the recent CMME edition of the Occo Codex, Jaap van Benthem provides a summary of the early transmission of the *Missa Pange lingua* based on scribal readings and variants. He believes the Alamire scriptorium had multiple exemplars of the mass; Jena 21 and the Occo Codex being copied from the same exemplar and VienNB 4809 from a later one. Van Benthem speculates that a singer at Condé might have copied the mass quickly and passed it on to the Alamire scribes, but he offers no concrete conclusions.
earlier exemplar with fewer errors and a strong connection to VatS 16, might have been the one used for performance at Margaret’s court.

If JenaU 21 and the Occo Codex were produced a few years earlier than originally thought—before the 1520 division—the possibility of the Missa Pange lingua being sung at the Habsburg-Burgundian court should be considered. The Habsburg-Burgundian court followed the use of Paris for its liturgical practices, although the complete explanation is not as simple. Barbara Haggh summarizes the liturgical situation with the following: “I conclude that the French and Burgundian courts did share the ‘usage of Paris,’ which was the use of Notre-Dame, supplemented with selected devotions also celebrated at the French royal court: royal obits and the dedication of the Sainte-Chapelle of Paris.”115 The court most likely held a Eucharistic votive mass at least once a week, since votive masses for the Blessed Sacrament—the ideal liturgical use for the Missa Pange lingua—were prevalent in both France and the Low Countries.116 Pierre de la Rue’s Missa O salutaris hostia is another mass that could have been performed at a votive mass for the Holy Sacrament at Margaret’s court.

In fact, a new liturgical practice was introduced in France at about the same time the Missa Pange lingua was probably composed. On June 15, 1512, the canons of Notre Dame received letters from King Louis XII. The letters requested that O Salutaris hostia

regarding the earliest performances of the Missa Pange lingua and how the work arrived at the Habsburg-Burgundian court. As for MunBS 510, he notes that it is quite similar to VatS 16 and also shares variants with JenaU 21


116 Honey Meconi concludes that since these masses were prevalent in the various Parisian liturgical uses, then the practice was most probably followed at Margaret’s Court. See Honey Meconi, Pierre de la Rue, 130; and Barbara Haggh, “Music, Liturgy, and Ceremony in Brussels, 1350-1500” (PhD diss., University of Illinois 1988), 383-394.
be sung at the cathedral and its dependency churches during the Elevation between the
*Pleni sunt caeli* and *Benedictus*. Other French churches such as the Chartres cathedral
adopted similar practices around the same time. Initially, *O Salutaris hostia* was sung at
Notre Dame as a brief monophonic antiphon. The antiphon was sung as a motet by at
least the seventeenth century, although it is not certain exactly when polyphony was
introduced to this ritual.\(^{117}\) Although the *Missa Pange lingua* circulated throughout
Germany in the early years of the Reformation, it was most likely written in France,
where Eucharistic devotional liturgies were also flourishing.

**Early Transmission of the *Missa Pange lingua***

In the list of early *Missa Pange lingua* sources, MunBS 510 stands out as the only
manuscript that was created in the Germanic region. Somehow, the mass traveled
between Germany, the Low Countries, and Rome within a couple of years. Along with
his observation that many of the pieces in the Gwalther choirbooks—including MunBS
510—were from the Low Countries, Joshua Rifkin noticed that compositions by
Constanzo Festa and Andreas de Silva were also transmitted in MunBS 510 and WolfA
A, and concluded that the repertoire from the Gwalther choirbooks must therefore have
come from Rome.

Presuming that MunBS 510 and these choirbooks were commissioned by
Maximilian and were copied somewhere other than Munich, it is easier to account for the
Low Countries repertoire and the Vatican repertoire. Maximilian had connections to
Rome through his political affairs and also Heinrich Isaac, and he and his daughter

\(^{117}\) Craig Wright, *Music and Ceremony at Notre Dame of Paris (500-1500)* (Cambridge: Cambridge
University Press, 1989), 119-120.
Margaret maintained a close relationship and often exchanged music manuscripts.\(^{118}\) Also, a member of Maximilian’s family actually visited Josquin’s place of residence around the time the *Missa Pange lingua* was copied into the earliest sources. Charles V visited Condé in May 1516; as provost, Josquin must have been part of the group who welcomed him there.\(^{119}\) There is also the matter of a “Joskin” mentioned in the 1520 annual accounts of Charles V. Two singers from Condé, one of whom was this Joskin, were compensated for some “chansons nouvelles” they had given to the emperor.\(^{120}\) It is far from a certainty that this document is referring to the Josquin des Prez—an age-old problem in Josquin scholarship—but it is at least feasible that Josquin and a companion could have delivered some music to the newly-crowned Charles V.\(^{121}\)

The Italian sources make an explanation for the origins of the *Missa Pange lingua* difficult. VatS 16 is one of the earliest *Missa Pange lingua* sources. Even when considering the revised earlier dates of the Alamire manuscripts, and a new point of origin for MunBS 510, the fact remains that the mass made its way down to Italy somehow. The person who might contribute to an answer is Pierre de la Rue, a composer

---

\(^{118}\) In early 1511, Maximilian paid Alamire for the production of two books of masses made of parchment. One was for Maximilian and the other was a New Year gift to Margaret. On March 7, 1511, Margaret wrote to her father and said that while she found Alamire’s book to be very beautiful, he should keep it or give it to someone else as a gift. The choirbook was returned to Maximilian by Alamire himself. Eugene Schreurs, “Petrus Alamire: Music Calligrapher, Musician, Composer, Spy,” in *The Treasury of Petrus Alamire*, 17. It should also be noted that Maximilian and his cousin, Frederick the Wise, had “ample opportunity” to exchange manuscripts, according to Michael Anderson. See Anderson, 104-110.

\(^{119}\) Fallows, *Josquin*, 341-42.

\(^{120}\) “A deux chantres de la ville de Condet don’t l’ung se nommoit Joskin, pour don que leur en avoit fait, par egale porcion, pour aucunes chansons nouvelles don’t ilz lui avoient fait present, pour les ayder a vivre et retourner en leur demourance: £37 10s. Transcription and English translation of document printed in Fallows, *Josquin*, 340.

\(^{121}\) See Fallows, *Josquin*, 340-42 for a discussion of this possibility.
whom Pope Leo X greatly admired.\textsuperscript{122} Leo X owned three Alamire manuscripts: VatS 34, 36, and 160. The Alamire manuscripts sent to Leo X contain no duplicate compositions, and Honey Meconi observed that the masses in these manuscripts had sacred models or at least sacred overtones (as in the case of the \textit{l’homme armé} masses), as opposed to works such as Fevin’s \textit{Missa Dictez moy toutes voz pensees} and other chanson-based masses.\textsuperscript{123}

The three Alamire manuscripts were possibly sent to Leo X as a thank-you gift for bestowing the Golden Rose on Charles.\textsuperscript{124} They were produced at a time when Leo was “getting cozy with the French,” in the words of Meconi.\textsuperscript{125} He made the effort to meet with Francis I and granted the title of apostolic notary to French court composer Jean Mouton.\textsuperscript{126} Nevertheless, the Alamire manuscripts for Leo X contain very little French repertoire; the court certainly had access to plenty of compositions by French composers, but these three manuscripts focus on the Habsburg-Burgundian court composer Pierre de la Rue. Meconi alludes to the choice of repertoire being politically motivated—the aim being to draw Leo’s attention to the empire—but perhaps the manuscripts were merely intended to share the works of a composer the court could claim as its own.

\begin{footnotes}
\item[122] See Meconi, \textit{Pierre de la Rue}, 189-191 for a discussion of La Rue’s music in Italian sources.
\item[123] Nevertheless, Leo X included such chanson masses in the manuscripts prepared at his scriptorium. Meconi, “Function of Manuscripts,” 120.
\item[125] Meconi, “Function of Manuscripts,” 121.
\item[126] Francis I and Leo X met in Bologna in 1515. At that meeting, Leo granted ecclesiastical favors to three composers associated with Francis’s court: Jean Richafort received a benefice in expectation, and Antoine de Longueval and Jean Mouton were both granted the position of protonotary of the Apostolic Chancery in Rome. Anthony Cummings suggests that is when the Italians could have acquired Mouton’s \textit{Per lignum salvi}, which appears in three sources made during Leo’s pontificate. One of these sources is the Medici Codex of 1518 (FlorenceL 666), so it is apparent that at least some of this French repertoire reached the hands of the Medici scribe, who copied the \textit{Missa Pange lingua} into Vatican CG XII.2. Cummings gives Florence 232 a \textit{terminus ante quem non} of 1515-16 based on the 1515 Bologna meeting; he obviously sees the event as quite significant in terms of musical repertoire exchange. See Cummings, “Florentine Sacred Repertory,” 275-295."
\end{footnotes}
In addition to Leo X’s Alamire manuscripts, La Rue’s music was copied by papal scribes into their own manuscripts. VatS 16, 26, and 45 were compiled at the time of Leo’s papacy and all three contain works by La Rue. His compositions are also found in the other *Missa Pange lingua* Vatican sources: VatG XII.2, VatP 1980-1, and VatP 1980-2. Just as Rifkin used the presence of repertoire by papal composers in the Gwalther choirbooks as evidence that at least some of the repertoire came from Rome to Germany, the presence of La Rue compositions in papal manuscripts suggest that his works and other compositions by composers in France and the Low Countries were transmitted to Rome via the Habsburg-Burgundian court. The *Missa Pange lingua* and other repertoire could have just as easily been transmitted to Maximilian’s musicians and scribes from Margaret’s court. If there was an exchange of repertoire between the papal scribes and the Gwalther books scribe, the *Missa Pange lingua* could have easily “belonged” to either camp.

With the transmission of La Rue’s music to Rome, the pattern is much easier to see because as with the papal composers, we know that La Rue was working for the Habsburg-Burgundian court and not for the papal choir. Since Josquin was not working for the Habsburg-Burgundians, another possibility is that his mass could have originated in Rome and then was transmitted to the Alamire scribes. In fact, Saunders found evidence that the scribes of VienNB 11778—a manuscript that shares codicological traits with VienNB 4809 and JenaU 21—must have used some exemplars from the papal chapel.¹²⁷ Still, if we are to accept the new earlier dates for JenaU 21 and the Occo Codex, that may not be relevant. Moreover, the *Missa Pange lingua* reading in VienNB 4809 is quite different from the VatS 16 and the other Alamire readings.

¹²⁷ Saunders, 302.
When geography and logistics are considered, the theory of the Habsburg-Burgundian court being the “starting point” for the early *Missa Pange lingua* transmission seems more likely. Although Josquin was not formally employed by the court, there are several documented instances where Josquin (or his singers at Condé) were likely to have had contact with the Habsburg-Burgundian musicians and scribes. On January 14, 1505, there was a vigil for the repose of the soul of Queen Isabella at the church of St. Gudule in Brussels. Her successor, Philip the Fair, presided over a procession, mass, and the displaying of relics, including a piece of the Holy Cross. The court chronicler Jean Molinet wrote a detailed account, as he deemed it a major event. Pierre de la Rue and Alexander Agricola would have been in attendance, and David Fallows believes it is quite certain that Josquin would have been there as well due to his position of recently-installed provost at Condé. The previously discussed correspondence between Josquin and Margaret also indicates Josquin was in somewhat frequent contact with her court. If the *Missa Pange lingua* did originate at Margaret’s court, it becomes rather easy to explain how copies of the mass ended up in Rome and Germany.

Concrete evidence for an exact path of the *Missa Pange lingua* may never surface. However, when new evidence concerning source dates and the personal connection between their owners are considered, the originally perplexing picture of the early *Missa Pange lingua* source distribution becomes logical and almost expected. The *Missa Pange lingua* circulated among the most powerful political institutions of Europe. Although they were geographically far away from each other, it has been well-established that these institutions exchanged music repertoire—the singers employed by these political figures

---

exchanged repertoire among themselves, presentation manuscripts containing music were exchanged as diplomatic gifts, and so on.

I believe it is most likely that the mass reached the Habsburg-Burgundian court from Condé, and proceeded to move from Margaret’s court to Rome and her father Maximilian’s court. As the political giants of Rome and the Habsburgs were exchanging the Missa Pange lingua and other repertoire, Martin Luther and his followers were mounting a revolution that would not only shake these institutions to their core, but also transmit and preserve the Missa Pange lingua and Josquin’s other compositions for generations to come
Chapter 3: The Missa Pange lingua, Johannes Ott’s Missae tredecim, and a Confessional Crossroads

Nearly two decades after Josquin’s death and the approximate dates of the earliest Missa Pange lingua sources, the mass resurfaced in the Lutheran city of Nuremberg. Johannes Ott, a bookseller who lived there, included the Missa Pange lingua in his anthology of thirteen Mass Ordinary settings entitled Missae tredecim quatuor vocum a praestantiss. artificib. compositae. The collection was printed by Hieronymous Formschneider (Latin name: Grapheus) and dedicated to the Nuremberg city council. In the dedicatory preface dated February 7, 1539, Ott explains that he created this collection of Mass Ordinary settings in an attempt to preserve the works of revered past composers. He accomplished this goal in Nuremberg and beyond: there are nineteen extant copies of Missae tredecim in libraries throughout Europe as well as four documented exemplars that are currently lost. The vast majority of exemplars with a traceable provenance belonged to Lutherans.

It would appear that the Missa Pange lingua crossed a confessional boundary of sorts with its inclusion in the Missae tredecim print following a period of circulation in Rome and among the Habsburgs. Several exemplars of the print demonstrate that the masses—including the Missa Pange lingua—were sung by Lutherans in pedagogical and liturgical settings. However, further examination of the early Lutheran years in Nuremberg and Johannes Ott’s possible motives behind the publication of Missae tredecim and his other collections of Latin polyphony presents a more complex confessional situation. Ott did not market Missae tredecim as a Lutheran print, and the repertoire did not reflect the current Lutheran liturgical practices in Nuremberg. A survey
of the provenance and usage of the known *Missae tredecim* exemplars reveals that the print was mostly—but not exclusively—owned by Lutherans in the second half of the sixteenth century. Over the course of this chapter and the next, I will argue that the *Missa Pange lingua* took on a Lutheran identity through the circulation of the *Missae tredecim* despite the calculated confessional neutrality of the print, and that in some cases Lutherans chose the mass over others for performance and study.

**Liturgy and Politics in Lutheran Nuremberg**

The first Lutheran services in Nuremberg were celebrated on June 5, 1524, at the churches of St. Lorenz and St. Sebald without the approval of the town council. The Reformation in Nuremberg was considered complete by March 16, 1525, when the celebration of the Catholic Mass was forbidden.¹ Nuremberg was indeed a Lutheran city when the *Missae tredecim* was published in 1539, but the transition away from Rome was particularly complicated for Nuremberg residents because of the unique ties between their city and the Holy Roman Emperor. Earlier emperors such as Heinrich III (1017-1056) are believed to have fostered the growth and development of Nuremberg in the early Middle Ages in order to use the town as a military bulwark in Franconia. From that time forward, Nuremberg enjoyed a preferred status in the empire, which came with political and economic privileges. The emperors Karl IV and Maximilian I were also frequent visitors of Nuremberg.² When the decision to embrace Lutheranism was made,

---

¹ Bartlett Butler, “Liturgical Music in Sixteenth-Century Nürnberg: A Socio-Musical Study” (PhD diss., University of Illinois at Urbana-Champaign, 1970), 78. Butler’s dissertation is an extremely thorough archival investigation of the history of Lutheran liturgy in Nuremberg from the early sixteenth century forward. Along with other musicologists who have studied sixteenth-century Nuremberg prints, I have relied heavily on his fine work.

² Ibid., 29.
the leaders of Nuremberg understandably approached the transition with much caution and calculation.

Due to the delicate situation with the Holy Roman Emperor, Nuremberg adopted what Bartlett Butler called a “policy of appearances” (the Nuremberg Council often used the word *Schein* when describing their actions).\(^3\) Essentially, the city and its Council attempted to appear loyal to the Catholic Holy Roman Empire while quietly allowing the Reformation to blossom. As an example of this approach, Butler cites an instance in February 1523 when several Nuremberg citizens requested that communion be distributed in both forms. The Council felt that change was too significant and referred the citizens to their bishop in Bamberg, who refused their request. At the same time, the Council did allow other Lutheran developments, such as the discontinuation of the medieval Passion Play.\(^4\) Ultimately, the policy of appearances was a failure. As early as October 1524, the Bishop of Bamberg placed a ban on the Nuremberg provosts. The Council’s approach then moved from cautious to defiant when they declared Nuremberg free from episcopal jurisdiction.\(^5\) With the Lutheran status in Nuremberg now public knowledge, the Council took a defensive, rather than deceptive approach to the policy of appearances, and sought to maintain good relations with the Empire despite subscribing to what was considered a heretical confession.

Johannes Ott first appears in extant records as a bookseller in Regensburg from 1516.\(^6\) He lost his Regensburg citizenship in 1524, when Cardinal Lorenzo Campeggio

---

\(^3\) Ibid., 79.

\(^4\) Ibid., 80.

\(^5\) Ibid., 88.
ordered the Regensburg town council to crack down on book publishers in the city in an attempt to stop the Reformation from spreading. Ott moved on to Nuremberg, where he worked as a bookseller on the Herrnmarkt from 1525 until his death in 1546. On January 7, 1533, Ott received a four-year imperial privilege for his music publications, which is displayed on 5 volumes between 1534 and 1544. A privilege was of vital importance because it prevented his material from being reprinted by anyone else in the Holy Roman Empire.

Table 3.1

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Music Publications of Johannes Ott</th>
<th>Date</th>
<th>Dedicatee</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><em>Hundert und ainundzweintzig newe Lieder</em></td>
<td>August 20, 1534</td>
<td>Arnold von Bruck (kappellmeister of King Ferdinand)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><em>Schöne auszerlesne Lieder</em></td>
<td>1536</td>
<td>-</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><em>Novum et insignie opus musicum</em></td>
<td>July 25, 1537</td>
<td>King Ferdinand</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><em>Magnificat octo tonorum</em></td>
<td>1537</td>
<td>-</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><em>Secundus tomus novi operis musici</em></td>
<td>October 15, 1538</td>
<td>King Ferdinand</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><em>Missae tredecim quatuor vocum</em></td>
<td>February 7, 1539</td>
<td>Nuremberg town council</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><em>Hundert und fünftzehn guter newer Liedlein</em></td>
<td>June 19, 1544</td>
<td>-</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><em>Choralis Constantinus</em> (only first volume printed)</td>
<td>announced in 1537, privilege in 1545</td>
<td>-</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>second book of masses (unrealized)</td>
<td>announced in 1539; privilege in 1545</td>
<td>-</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

The *Missae tredecim* anthology was part of a sudden and concentrated interest in the printing of Latin polyphony in Nuremberg between the years 1537 and 1539. After printing two collections of Lieder, Johannes Ott shifted his attention to Latin liturgical music originally intended for Catholic services. In less than two years, he released two

---

6 For more of what little information is known about Ott’s life, see Royston Gustavson, “Hans Ott, Hieronymus Formsneider, and the *Novum et insignie opus musicum* (Nuremberg, 1537-1538)” (PhD diss., The University of Melbourne, 1998), 3-5.

7 This privilege can be found in its original Latin form in the *Novum et insignie opus musicum*, and it is translated into German in Ott’s *Hundert und ainundzweintzig newe Lieder*.
volumes of motets, Ludwig Senfl’s *Magnificat octo tonorum*, and finally the collection of thirteen Mass Ordinary settings. Likewise, the Nuremberg printer Johannes Petreius suddenly turned from printing secular, instrumental anthologies and released several anthologies of Latin polyphony during those years. Petreius published a collection of psalms and psalm motets in 1538, followed by a collection of fifteen Mass Ordinary settings in 1539. The mass print, entitled *Liber quindecim missarum* was most likely published after Ott’s *Missae tredecim* was released in February 1539. Petreius proceeded to publish a second volume of psalm motets in 1539 as well.

Table 3.2

| title                                               | year; dedication | locations of extant exemplars
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><em>Tomus primus psalmorum selectarum</em></td>
<td>April 1538; Nuremberg Council</td>
<td>A-Wn; B-Br; D-BS, J, Rp, Z; I-Bc, Mc, PLn</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><em>Modulatones aliquot quatuor vocum selectissimae</em></td>
<td>end of summer 1538; no dedication</td>
<td>A-Wn; D-HAu, HB, J, Kl, Mbs, Rp; F-Sn; GB-Lbm; US-Wc</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><em>Liber quindecim missarum</em></td>
<td>1539; no dedication</td>
<td>A-Wn; D-HAu, Kl, Mbs, Mu, Rp, Z; GB-Lbm; US-Wc</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><em>Tomus secundus psalmorum selectorum quatuor et quinque vocum</em></td>
<td>1539; no dedication</td>
<td>A-Wn; B-Br; D-BS, J, Rp, Z; I-Mc</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

After 1539, the number of published Latin music anthologies in Nuremberg decreased greatly. The output of Ott and Petreius during those three years—two volumes of motets, a collection of Mass Ordinary settings, and a couple miscellaneous Latin anthologies—certainly points to a specific purpose or method driving the random onslaught of older polyphonic liturgical music. The sudden trend may have come out of the earliest stirrings of a liturgical revival among the Lutherans in Nuremberg. Although the city was attempting to appear loyal to the Catholic political powers, Latin polyphony

---

8 RISM library sigla are used.
had been phased out in favor of congregational hymns in the vernacular. When Nuremberg made the conversion to Lutheranism in 1524-25, the initial liturgical changes reduced the number of services and thus the amount of required liturgical polyphony. Problems with choral music and quality of the liturgy appear almost immediately following the liturgical revision of 1524. Butler attributes these problems to apathy among the deacons who were now Nuremberg citizens with permission to marry, the renewed emphasis on education (i.e. “book work” as opposed to music rehearsals), and simply the difficulty that comes with adjusting to a new approach to Christian liturgy and worship.9

Another reason for the decline of the Latin language in Nuremberg churches is that citizens had been spending considerable amounts of money on polyphony for special occasions such as weddings, and the music was regarded as a status symbol rather than a form of elevated worship.10 The preference for German congregational singing over the older Latin polyphony was backed by Andreas Osiander (1498-1552), an influential preacher in Nuremberg. Council documents from the late 1520s indicate that churches were having difficulty finding singers to perform polyphony and adjustments needed to be made. For example, on January 30, 1527, the Council proposed that vicars and deacons assist the rectors with the choral music, a task that was not previously required of them.11 Butler states that there is no direct evidence for the use of liturgical polyphony in Nuremberg between 1525 and 1535 in the liturgical and Council documents that he examined. There are no records of choirbooks being purchased or copied, and there are

9 Butler, 400-401.
10 Ibid., 106-107.
11 Ibid., 402.
no extant choirbooks from these years (or earlier). In 1530, Wittenberg law professor Christoph Scheurl, Jr. lamented the loss of the organ and “Musica” in the Nuremberg liturgy, and astutely cited the fact that Wittenberg retained organ music and Latin polyphony. The dominance of vernacular liturgical music in Nuremberg would not last for long—it could not, given the stance on Latin sacred music taken by both Martin Luther and Philipp Melanchthon. Luther personally enjoyed the High Renaissance style of polyphony very much, and felt that Latin, Hebrew, and Greek were vital to the education of children and ultimately the preservation of European civilization. Philipp Melanchthon had several connections to Nuremberg, and did not think that Latin polyphony should have been abandoned there. He said that if each person can propose his favorite tune then dissention will surely result. Just as Lutheran churches were acclimating to the vernacular congregational liturgical repertoire, a movement to restore the older Latin polyphony to church services began to stir. Hector Pömer, the provost at St. Lorenz, reported that his congregation no longer respected the modified vernacular liturgy. The structure of the Lutheran liturgy in Nuremberg crystallized between 1524

12 Ibid., 405.
13 Nuremberg Stadtbibliothek Merkel Hs. 2’. 129. “…unnd heutigs Tags, alls wol als die Orgel unnd Musica zu Wittenberg inn steten Ubung unndt brauch seyen…” Scheurl became a legal advisor for the Nuremberg council at the beginning of 1512. See Butler, 68, for a brief description of Scheurl and his Lutheran connections.
15 “Ich will auch hiemit die kunstlichen oder figurirten gesang nit verworfen haben…jetzt aber dieweil ein jeder eine besondere Weise vornimmt, und einem jeden sein Gesang am besten gefällt erheben sich zwietracht.” Philipp Melanchthon, Corpus Reformatorum: Philippi Melanchthonis Opera I, ed. Carolus G. Bretschneider and H.E. Bindseil (C.A. Schwetschke, 1834) col. 719.
16 Butler, 138.
and 1534, the time between the beginning of the Reformation in Nuremberg and the release of the Nuremberg-Ansbach *Kirchenordnung* of 1533.\(^\text{17}\)

It is quite possible that the catalysts for this sudden interest in printing Latin polyphony in Nuremberg were Veit Dietrich and Hieronymous Baumgartner Sr., both leaders of the church community in Nuremberg. Baumgartner (1498-1565) was elected the first Kirchenpfleger of Nuremberg in the spring of 1533, and for the next thirty years used this position to stabilize the liturgy in Nuremberg and cultivate appropriate music.\(^\text{18}\) Veit Dietrich (1506-1549) was a Nuremberg native who accepted a position as preacher at St. Sebald in December 1535. Both men had solid connections with Wittenberg: Baumgartner maintained a friendship with Philip Melanchthon, and Dietrich matriculated at Wittenberg in 1522 and served as Martin Luther’s secretary there. He returned to Nuremberg endorsed as an evangelical preacher by Martin Luther himself.\(^\text{19}\)

If Dietrich and Baumgartner were involved in the printing of Latin polyphony in Nuremberg and Ott’s prints were an attempt to restore this music in the now Lutheran churches, Ott remained mum about this in his prefaces and dedications. Nevertheless, his writings provide some insight into his motives for publishing these pieces as well as his cognizance of current political and religious affairs in Nuremberg. He dedicated both volumes of the renowned motet anthology *Novum et insigne opus musicum* to the Catholic monarch Ferdinand III, grandson of Maximilian I, while the dedication of

\(^{17}\) For the complete text of this church order, see EK 11, 140.

\(^{18}\) Upon the arrival of the Reformation, town councils rather than individuals were charged with the upkeep and administration of a church. The church administrator, or *Kirchenpfleger*, however, was responsible for carrying out policy, dealing with personnel, and handling any related problems as they arose.

\(^{19}\) Butler, 255-56.
Missae tredecim went to the Lutheran town council of Nuremberg. Royston Gustavson outlines purposes for the dedications and lengthy prefaces: to grovel with the dedicatees, to explain why the prints and their repertoire were exceptional, to comment on the composers and the pieces, and to express personal comments.

From both a marketing and diplomatic standpoint, Ott’s dedications of his Latin polyphony prints are a tour de force of calculated neutrality. Ott did not align his publications with a specific confession, although the fact that he was a citizen of the Lutheran city of Nuremberg probably implied some Lutheran bias that was beyond his control. It seems as though he purposely mixed and matched his publications and dedicatees in order to achieve a confessional ambiguity. The Catholic Ferdinand III received the dedication for both volumes of motets, some of which had textual alterations that made them more suitable for Lutherans. Ott dedicated his collection of Mass Ordinary settings to the Lutheran town council of Nuremberg, even though the cyclic mass genre probably carried with it associations of the Mass as a sacrifice, the practice of private votive masses, and objectionable devotions such as the Eucharist and non-Biblical saints. Ott makes several scriptural references in his dedications, but he also cites the ancient Greek philosophers when outlining the attributes of music.

Along with being careful not to align his publications with a specific confession, Ott is also vague about where he envisions his published pieces being performed. Not only could the masses and motets be sung during a church service, but they could also be

---

20 Ott dedicated his Hundert und ainundzweintzig neue Lieder to Arnold von Bruck, Ferdinand’s Kappelmeister. The dedication is dated August 20, 1534, but Ott did not release the collection until 1537. Butler believes that there must have been a particular reason why Ott waited three years, particularly when he had received the royal privilege from King Ferdinand even earlier in 1533.

21 Gustavson, 61-63.

22 For an overview of these alterations, see Gustavson, 253-261.
used in schools or during recreational singing. In the *Missae tredecim* preface, Ott writes that there is a saying among musicians that those who are unfamiliar with the polyphonic Mass settings of the Renaissance do not know true music. Therefore, he deemed it convenient to publish an anthology of masses so that the students would not be lacking anything among his publications.\(^{23}\) Ott uses a declension of the noun *studiosus* when referring to the audience of the *Missae tredecim* and his printed motets. The translation of the preface that appears in Gustavson’s dissertation renders *studiosus* as “the studious.”\(^{24}\) However, the word could also be translated as “students.” Given his word choice in this sentence, it seems as if Ott had known exactly who would use his mass print: students in the Lutheran Latin schools as well as the intellectual or “studious” members of society—people who enjoyed collecting and/or studying books and music.

When Ott addresses the polyphonic Mass Ordinary as a genre, he focuses on its artistic and technical attributes rather than any aspects concerning theology or liturgy. He states that the cyclic characteristic of the Mass Ordinary allows for exceptional compositional artistry—the economy of melodic material, the balance of unity and variety, symmetry, canons, proportions, and so on.\(^{25}\) He also states that the best music combines beauty and dignity, and expresses the meaning of the words. Nowhere, according to Ott, are these musical qualities better demonstrated than in polyphonic settings of the Mass Ordinary text.

\(^{23}\) *Cum enim vsitatum Musicorum verbum sit, qui Missas veterum artificum non norit, veram Musicam ignorare, commodifimum efe iudicau, post duos Tomos Mottetarum (ut vocant) etiam Missas edere, ne quid in nostra opera defyderarent huius artis studiosi.*

\(^{24}\) “Lest the studious had lacked something in our works.” Gustavson, 579.

\(^{25}\) Ott emphasizes the importance of varying the unifying melody in order to maintain a careful balance that unifies the mass movements and also avoids monotony. See Andrew Kirkman, *The Cultural Life of the Early Polyphonic Mass: Medieval Context to Modern Revival* (Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 2010), 34-35.
In the final words of the preface that address the Council personally, Ott does mention the liturgy and indirectly expresses his desire for Latin polyphony to return to the Nuremberg churches. He writes that he hopes the Council will embrace his current endeavor, as the pieces were appropriate not only for leisure activities but also for adorning the sacred. Ott implies that he had more to say about the liturgical use of this repertoire, and states that the matter would be discussed further in forthcoming volumes of masses (*Missari Tomos*). Ott could have been planning a second volume of Mass Ordinary settings but either he never had the opportunity or the print is completely lost. It is also possible, as Butler points out, that Ott could have been referring to the *Choralis Constantinus*, an anthology of Mass Proper settings. In the prefaces to both motet volumes, Ott refers to the “barbarous” act of removing Latin polyphony from the liturgy. The preface of the *Novum et insigne opus musicum* was the safer place to make comments like that, since Ott was writing the preface to a Catholic monarch rather than the Lutheran town council. These sporadic references to the liturgy do not brand the prints as solely intended for church services, but certainly hint to the potential of liturgical use and express Ott’s (and Dietrich’s and Baumgartner’s) desire to hear this repertoire in church once again.

**Thirteen Masses**

As the Latin title *Missae tredecim* indicates, there are thirteen mass settings in Ott’s anthology. The masses are built on a wide variety of pre-existent material: various

---

26 …*sed etiam ad sacra ornanda uti licet.*

27 The question of this possible second volume of masses is addressed in Chapter 4.

28 Butler, 466 n.184.
Gregorian chants, and monophonic and polyphonic “secular” melodies from all over Europe (see Table 3.3). In the dedicatory preface, Ott expresses his desire to preserve the following masses for posterity. But how did he select these thirteen masses?

*Liber quindecim missarum*, the collection of fifteen masses published by Petreius, is markedly different from *Missae tredecim* in terms of repertoire and sources, despite two masses—the *Missa l’homme armé* and *Missa Fortuna desperata*—appearing in both prints (see Table 3.4 for a complete list of masses). Stephanie Schlagel argues that Petreius relied primarily on printed sources when producing *Liber quindecim missarum*. The first four masses in the print appear in the same order as they did in Petrucci’s *Missa Josquin [Liber 1]*, and a total of eleven of the fifteen masses appear in earlier prints, particularly those by Antico, Giunta, and Moderne in addition to Petrucci. Schlagel notes that Ott, in contrast, “seems to have been unaware of, or lacked access to, or purposely eschewed earlier printed editions.” Only five of the thirteen masses in *Missae tredecim* appear in prints before 1539, two of which are the *Missa Fortuna desperata* and *Missa l’homme armé super voces musicales.*

---

29 An issue slightly beyond the scope of this discussion is the possibility that at least some of the seemingly secular melodic material in these masses could bear a double-meaning that is sacred or liturgical, and thus have further theological or confessional implications. See, for example, Craig Wright, *The Maze and the Warrior: Symbols in Architecture, Theology, and Music* (Harvard: Harvard University Press, 2004); and David J. Rothenberg, *The Flower of Paradise: Marian Devotion and Secular Song in Medieval and Renaissance Music* (New York: Oxford University Press, 2011).

30 Butler speculates that Petreius would not have purposely violated Ott’s Imperial privilege to print the repertoire, and that these two Josquin masses were already in print when the *Missae tredecim* collection was released, which provides further evidence that the *Liber quindecim missarum* postdates *Missae tredecim* in 1539. See Butler, 467.


32 Schlagel, “Fortune’s Fate,” 195.
Table 3.3  
Pre-Existent Material in the Missae tredecim Masses

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Mass</th>
<th>Composer</th>
<th>Material</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Missa Ave Regina</td>
<td>Obrecht</td>
<td>Walter Frye motet tenor</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Missa Fortuna desperata</td>
<td>Josquin</td>
<td>three-voice Italian song</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Missa Bon temps</td>
<td>Brumel</td>
<td>chanson</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Missa Salva nos</td>
<td>Isaac</td>
<td>antiphon for Sunday Compline³³</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Missa L’homme armé super voces musicales</td>
<td>Josquin</td>
<td>monophonic French song</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Missa Fröhlich wesen</td>
<td>Isaac</td>
<td>superius and tenor of three-voice Flemish chanson “Een vrolyc Wesen” by Jacobus Barbireau</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Missa Pange lingua</td>
<td>Josquin</td>
<td>Vespers hymn for Corpus Christi</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Missa Cum Iocunditate</td>
<td>La Rue</td>
<td>beginning of fifth antiphon at Second Vespers for the Nativity of the Virgin</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Missa Da pacem</td>
<td>Josquin (recte Bauldeweyn)</td>
<td>plainchant</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Missa Sub tuum praesidium</td>
<td>Josquin (recte La Rue)³⁴</td>
<td>Marian antiphon</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Missa O gloriosa</td>
<td>La Rue</td>
<td>hymn O gloriosa domina³⁵</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Missa Petrus Apostolus</td>
<td>Obrecht</td>
<td>antiphon for first and second vespers for the Octave Day of SS. Peter and Paul</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Missa de Sancto Antonio</td>
<td>La Rue</td>
<td>first antiphon for Vespers for the feast of St. Anthony in the Antiphonale Pataviense³⁶</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

³³ Some melodic sections are also found in the motet *Quis dabit*, which was probably written for the obsequies of Lorenzo the Magnificent in 1492.

³⁴ The Tenor, Discantus, and Bassus partbooks all attribute this mass to Josquin, but in the Contratenor book the composer is listed as “Petrus de la Rue.”

³⁵ The text for this hymn is found in a couple of sources associated with the Habsburg-Burgundians, including a Book of Hours owned by Philip the Handsome (London BL MS Add. 17280) for Lauds for the hours of the Blessed Virgin. In two Alamire sources (VatS 36 and MontsM 773) the title of the mass reads *Missa O gloriosa Margaretha*, which most likely refers to Margaret of Austria rather than St. Margaret. See La Rue, *Opera Omnia* V, XV-XVI.

³⁶ The exact cantus firmus cannot be identified, but the melody in this source is similar. See the commentary in La Rue *Opera Omnia* III, XXV.
Table 3.4

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Contents of Liber quindecim missarum</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Mass</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Missa L’homme armé super voces musicales</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Missa La sol fa re mi</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Missa Gaudeamus</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Missa Fortuna desperate</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Missa de Beata Virgine</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Missa Fesivale</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Missa O praecelara</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Missa Hercules dux Ferrariae</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Missa Tous les regres</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Missa Adiu mes amours</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Missa Ave maris stella</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Missa Dominicale</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Missa A lombre dung buissonet</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Missa Cuiusuis toni</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Missa Duarum facierum [Alma redemptoris mater]</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Another difference between the mass anthologies of Petreius and Ott is the number and variety of represented composers. Petreius chose fifteen masses by nine composers from varying regions and time periods, while Ott limits his collection to masses attributed to five composers: Josquin (ca. 1450/55-1521), La Rue (ca. 1452-1518), Isaac (ca. 1450/55-1517), Brumel (ca. 1460-?1512/13), and Obrecht (1457/8-1505). The composers represented in Missae tredecim were all born in approximately the same decade of 1450-60, hailed from the Franco-Flemish region, and were all deceased by 1521. Petreius also printed masses by Josquin, la Rue, Isaac, and Brumel, but expanded his chronological range to include Ockeghem (ca. 1410-1497) as well as composers who were still alive in 1539: Braitengraser (ca. 1495-1542), Layolle (1492-ca. 1540), and Moulu (?1484-ca. 1550).
Whereas Petreius likely relied on earlier printed sources for *Liber quindecim missarum*, a different pattern is evident in the repertoire of *Missae tredecim*: eleven of the thirteen masses are found in at least one manuscript from the workshop of Petrus Alamire, which was discussed at length above in Chapter 2. Ott most likely did not receive exemplars of the masses directly from Alamire—the renowned scribe received a pension beginning in 1534 and died in June 1536. Moreover, most of the Alamire manuscripts containing these masses were created and distributed to their various recipients years before Ott even considered a compilation of polyphonic Mass Ordinary settings. Close study of the source readings, such as that done by scholars preparing critical editions, reveals that most of the readings in *Missae tredecim* are indeed related to Alamire sources, albeit indirectly through unknown sources.

Two masses in *Missae tredecim* exist in only one other extant source each, which makes any sort of transmission analysis nearly impossible. The *Missa Ave Regina* is found in VatS 160, an Alamire manuscript prepared for Pope Leo X. Likewise, the *Missa Petrus apostolus* can only be found in *Missae tredecim* and SGall 461, which has a vague provenance as either the Low Countries or Italy. Stemmae created by modern editors for the masses that do have a considerable pool of extant sources indicate that the *Missae tredecim* reading is one or two sources removed from an Alamire copy.

---


38 The reading in VatS 160 appears to be corrupt in sections of the Credo, and so Barton Hudson relied more on *Missae tredecim* when creating an edition for the mass Jacob Obrecht *Collected Works* Volume 1 ed. Barton Hudson, XXVII.

39 In addition to the masses and stemmae listed on the table, for Brumel’s *Missa Bon temps*, Barton Hudson identifies *Missae tredecim*, Erlangen 473/4, and two Alamire manuscripts—JenaU 31 and Verona 756—as the major sources of Brumel’s Missa Bon temps, and notes that a complete transmission of the mass is also found in VatSM 26, the Santa Maria Maggiore manuscript that also contains the *Missa Pange lingua*. 
Table 3.5 (continued on next two pages)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Source</th>
<th>Year</th>
<th>Provenance</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Missa Ave Regina</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>VatS 160</td>
<td>1513-21</td>
<td>Alamire; gift to Leo X</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Missa Fortuna desperata</th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Miss Josquin 1502</td>
<td></td>
<td>Venice; Petrucci</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Uppsula 76b 1515</td>
<td></td>
<td>French</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Vienna 11778 1521-34</td>
<td></td>
<td>Alamire; Raimund Fugger</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>BarcOC 5 1490-1510</td>
<td></td>
<td>Italy with Spanish additions</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>ModE.M.1.2 c. 1505</td>
<td></td>
<td>Ferrara; d’Este family</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>MunBS 3154 1462-1511</td>
<td></td>
<td>Imperial Court/Innsbruck</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>VatS 41 1482-1507</td>
<td></td>
<td>Cappella Sistina</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Trium vocum carmina 1538</td>
<td></td>
<td>Nuremberg; Grapheus</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Liber primus Missarum Josquin 1526</td>
<td></td>
<td>Rome; Giunta, Pasoti, Dorico</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Liber primus Missarum Josquin 1516</td>
<td></td>
<td>Venice; Petrucci</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Missa Bon temps</th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>BerlinGS7 1537</td>
<td></td>
<td>Duke Albrecht of Prussia</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>VatSM26 1516-20</td>
<td></td>
<td>Rome; Santa Maria Maggiore</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>JenaU 31 1500-20</td>
<td></td>
<td>Frederick the Wise</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Verona 761 1500-25</td>
<td></td>
<td>Verona?</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Missa Salva nos</th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>BasU F.IX.55 c 1500-1510</td>
<td></td>
<td>Basel</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>VeronaBC 756 c. 1508?</td>
<td></td>
<td>Alamire; Italian recipient?</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>BerlGS 40634 first half 16th century</td>
<td></td>
<td>German? Stuttgart?</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Regensburg FK 76 1530-38</td>
<td></td>
<td>Saxony</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Cortona 95/96 1515-16</td>
<td></td>
<td>Florence/Medici</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Florence II.I. 232 1516-21</td>
<td></td>
<td>Florence</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>VatG XIII 27 1492-94</td>
<td></td>
<td>Florence/Medici</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Motetti de Passione 1503</td>
<td></td>
<td>Venice; Petrucci</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Symphoniae jacundae 1538</td>
<td></td>
<td>Wittenberg; Rhau</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Missa L’homme armé super voces musicales</th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Miss Josquin 1502</td>
<td></td>
<td>Venice; Petrucci</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Uppsula 76c c. 1530?</td>
<td></td>
<td>France?</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>VatG XII.2 1518-21</td>
<td></td>
<td>Cappella Giulia</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>VatS 197 1492-95</td>
<td></td>
<td>Cappella Sistina</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>VienNB 11778 1521-34</td>
<td></td>
<td>Alamire; Raimund Fugger</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>BarcOC 5 1490-1510</td>
<td></td>
<td>Italy</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>BolSP 31 1527</td>
<td></td>
<td>Bologna</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>FrankSU 2 1510-20</td>
<td></td>
<td>Belgium</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>JenaU 32 1500-20</td>
<td></td>
<td>Frederick the Wise</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>ModD 4 1520-30</td>
<td></td>
<td>Modena</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Hudson describes the reading in Missae tredecim as being “nearly identical” to the reading in Erlangen 473/4, a manuscript that was copied a year or two after Missae tredecim at the Cistercian monastery in Heilsbronn. See Hudson, ed., Brumel Opera Omnia II, XI and XII.
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Location</th>
<th>Date</th>
<th>Additional Information</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>ModE M.1.2</td>
<td>1505</td>
<td>Ferrara; d’Este family</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>BasU F.1X.25</td>
<td>sixteenth century</td>
<td>Netherlands</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Toledo BC 9</td>
<td>mid-sixteenth century</td>
<td>Toledo</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Liber primus Missarum Josquin</strong></td>
<td>1526</td>
<td>Rome; Giunta, Pasoti, Dorico</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Missa Josquin</strong></td>
<td>1502</td>
<td>Venice; Petrucci</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Liber primus Missarum Josquin</strong></td>
<td>1516</td>
<td>Venice; Petrucci</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

### Missa Fröhlich wesen

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Location</th>
<th>Date</th>
<th>Additional Information</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Verona BC 756</td>
<td>c. 1508?</td>
<td>Alamire; Italian recipient?</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>VienNB 18832</td>
<td>1515-34</td>
<td>Alamire; Raimund Fugger</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>BerlGS 40634</td>
<td>first half of 16th century</td>
<td>German? Stuttgart?</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Basel F. 1X.25</td>
<td>sixteenth century</td>
<td>Netherlands</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

### Missa Pange lingua

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Location</th>
<th>Date</th>
<th>Additional Information</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>VatS 16</td>
<td>1515-16</td>
<td>Cappella Sistina</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Vat Pal lat 1980-81</td>
<td>before 1519</td>
<td>probably for Giulio Medici</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Vat Pal lat 1982</td>
<td>1513-23</td>
<td>probably for Giulio Medici</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>VatG XII.2</td>
<td>1518-21</td>
<td>Cappella Giulia</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>VatSM 26</td>
<td>ca. 1520</td>
<td>Santa Maria Maggiore</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>MunBS 510</td>
<td>1513-19</td>
<td>workshop of Maximilian I?</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>JenaU 21</td>
<td>1515-1520</td>
<td>Alamire- Frederick the Wise</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>BrusBR IV. 922</td>
<td>1515-25</td>
<td>Alamire- Pompeius Occo</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Vienna NB 4809</td>
<td>1520-25</td>
<td>Alamire- Raimund Fugger</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Vienna NB 18832</td>
<td>1515-25</td>
<td>Alamire- Raimund Fugger</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

### Missa Cum iocunditate

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Location</th>
<th>Date</th>
<th>Additional Information</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Berlin GS 7</td>
<td>1537</td>
<td>Albrecht of Prussia</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>JenaU 22</td>
<td>ca. 1500-1505</td>
<td>Alamire; Frederick the Wise</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>s’HerAB 72b</td>
<td>1530-31</td>
<td>Alamire; ‘s-Hertogenbosch</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>SubA 248</td>
<td>probably 1521-34</td>
<td>Alamire</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>VienNB 1783</td>
<td>1500-05</td>
<td>Alamire; Manuel I of Port.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>MunBS 5</td>
<td>1523-31</td>
<td>Wilhelm IV</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>MunBS 65</td>
<td>ca. 1520</td>
<td>Wilhelm?</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>VatS 45</td>
<td>1511-14</td>
<td>Cappella Sistina</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>CoimbraU 2</td>
<td>after 1530</td>
<td>the Netherlands</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>MilanA 46</td>
<td>mid-16th century</td>
<td>probably copied in Italy</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

### Missa Da pacem

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Location</th>
<th>Date</th>
<th>Additional Information</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Berlin GS 7</td>
<td>1537</td>
<td>Albrecht of Prussia</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>MunBS 7</td>
<td>1512-30</td>
<td>Alamire; Wilhelm IV</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

### Missa Sub tuum praesidium

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Location</th>
<th>Date</th>
<th>Additional Information</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Brussels 9126</td>
<td>1505</td>
<td>Alamire; Philip the Fair</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>JenaU 12</td>
<td>1518-1520</td>
<td>Alamire; Frederick the Wise</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>VienNB 15496</td>
<td>1515-16</td>
<td>Alamire; Charles of Austria</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>FrankSU 2</td>
<td>1510-1520</td>
<td>Belgium</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Missae Antonii de Fevin...</td>
<td>1515</td>
<td>Fossombrone; Petrucci</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

### Missa O gloriosa

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Location</th>
<th>Date</th>
<th>Additional Information</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>JenaU 5</td>
<td>1512-25</td>
<td>Alamire; Frederick the Wise</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>MontsM 773</td>
<td>1516-34</td>
<td>Alamire; Charles V of Spain</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>SubA 248</td>
<td>probably 1521-34</td>
<td>Alamire</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Manuscript</td>
<td>Date</td>
<td>Composers/Commissioners</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>-------------</td>
<td>----------------</td>
<td>-----------------------------------------</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>VatS 36</td>
<td>1513-21</td>
<td>Alamire; Leo X</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>FrankSU 2</td>
<td>1510-1520</td>
<td>Belgium</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Missa Petrus apostolus</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>SGall 461</td>
<td>c. 1500</td>
<td>low countries/Italy</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Missa de Sancto Antonio</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>BrusBR 9126</td>
<td>ca. 1505</td>
<td>Alamire; Philip the Fair</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>JenaU 22</td>
<td>ca. 1500-1505</td>
<td>Alamire; Frederick the Wise</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Verona BC 756</td>
<td>ca. 1508?</td>
<td>Alamire; Italian recipient?</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>VienNB 1783</td>
<td>1500-1505</td>
<td>Alamire; Manuel I of Port.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Cambrai BM 18</td>
<td>ca. 1520</td>
<td>Cambrai cathedral</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Missarum diversorum auctorum liber primus</strong></td>
<td>1509</td>
<td>Venice; Petrucci</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Table 3.6

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Mass</th>
<th>Editor/Edition</th>
<th>Stemma</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Missa Cum iocunditate</td>
<td>J. Evan Kreider⁴⁰</td>
<td>α, β, ó&lt;br&gt;MunBS 5 + δ&lt;br&gt;MunBS 65 + MT + KonB 1740</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Missa O gloriosa</td>
<td>T. Herman Keahey ⁴¹</td>
<td>α, β&lt;br&gt;Fr2 + MT</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Missa Sub tuum praesidium</td>
<td>T. Herman Keahey</td>
<td>α, β&lt;br&gt;Fr 2 + MT</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Missa de Sancto Antonio</td>
<td>Evan Kreider⁴²</td>
<td>α, β&lt;br&gt;Missarum diversorum MT</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Missa Fortuna desperata</td>
<td>Barton Hudson⁴³</td>
<td>α, β&lt;br&gt;VatS 41 + BarcOC 5 + ú&lt;br&gt;MT + VienNB 11778</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Like the other masses in Missae tredecim, Ott’s exact source for the Missa Pange lingua cannot be definitively identified. In the critical commentary of the New Josquin

⁴⁰ Pierre da la Rue, Opera Omnia, Vol II, XXV. Kreider also raises an important question regarding the presence of this mass in Missae tredecim: why would Ott include a mass with a Credo for five voices in a collection of four-voice masses? He believes that Ott was surely aware of the fifth voice, although given Ott’s stated difficulty in obtaining sources for his Latin polyphony, it is certainly plausible that he was unable to obtain a copy of the fifth voice.

⁴¹ In both Missae tredecim and FrSU 2, the Missa O gloriosa is transposed down a perfect fifth and omissions in the Sanctus and Agnus Dei are present in both sources. The Missa O gloriosa reading in FrSU 2 only contains portions of the Credo, Sanctus and Agnus Dei, so it is not possible that Ott used this source exclusively. La Rue, Opera Omnia V, XVI.

⁴² In contrast to Schlagel’s claim that Ott did not rely on earlier prints for his edition, Evan Kreider believes that Ott’s rendering of the Missa de Sancto Antonio derived directly from a Petrucci print, the Missarum diversorum auctorum liber primus dated March 15, 1508. Kreider believes the reading of the mass in the Petrucci print came from an unknown earlier source related to the Alamire manuscripts and Cambrai Bibliothèque municipal, MS 18. See La Rue, Opera Omnia III, XXIV-XXIX

⁴³ NJE 8.2, 71.
Edition, Willem Elders notes that the *Missa Pange lingua* reading in *Missae tredecim* contains a large number of variants and contains seven pitch errors, but does not speculate from which sources the reading possibly derived.44 The online edition of the Occo Codex by Jaap van Benthelem also does not offer any speculations on the source for *Missae tredecim*.45 As discussed in the previous chapter, four early sources of the mass (MunBS 510, JenaU21, the Occo Codex, and VatS 16) are closely related to each other and another Alamire manuscript for the Fuggers (VienNB 4809) contains a relatively different reading.

The *Missae tredecim* reading does indeed contain the seven pitch errors pointed out by Elders, but most of the “variants” between the *Missae tredecim* and the earlier sources are not major and some could have been deliberate editorial decisions by Ott. There are primarily variations in ligatures and several cadences that are simplified in Ott’s print, as well as a few rhythmic variants. VatS16, the Occo Codex, and JenaU 21 have about the same number of variants at 117, 120, and 119 respectively. MunBS 510 contains several instances of a dotted minim being replaced by a colored breve, which is not found in any of the other earlier sources or in *Missae tredecim*. When those coloration variants are discounted, MunBS 510 actually contains the fewest variants with *Missae tredecim*: 108. Even when the variant totals are adjusted to accommodate the lack of the Pleni sunt and Benedictus duets in the Occo Codex, MunBS 510 still has the smallest number of variants. The total number of variants between these sources are still too close to definitively name MunBS 510 as a source related more closely than the others, but it affirms some sort of connection between *Missae tredecim* and the only early Missa

44 Elders, NJE 4.3, 78-79.

45 Jaap van Benthelem, “The Occo Codex.”
Pange lingua source with a Germanic origin. VienNB 4809 is markedly different from the other early Missa Pange lingua manuscripts, and so many of the variations between it and Missae tredecim are also different. VienNB 4809 has more variants than the earlier sources with Missae tredecim, including a few unique pitch and rhythmic variants. A common trait that this manuscript shares with the print is the simplification of a few cadential points throughout the mass.

The Missa Pange lingua falls into the transmission pattern set by several other masses in the print. It seems that Ott had a manuscript or manuscripts (or possibly a print, although it is unlikely) closely related to the extant Alamire sources—possibly even a lost source also from the Alamire scriptorium. In addition to the notes on the pages of Missae tredecim, it is also important to consider Johannes Ott and his professional network. He worked in the publishing and bookselling industry—he was not a singer at a church or political court where he had constant contact with other singers and composers. He was not a musician, and in Gustavson’s words, the prefaces and dedications that Ott wrote imply that he had “nothing…more than a rudimentary knowledge of music.”

In a source study of the Novum et insigne opus musicum repertoire, Stephanie Schlagel offers the following observation, which can be applicable to the Missae tredecim masses:

Not only must the quantity of the variants be taken into consideration, but also their nature. The resolution or use of minor color and ligatures can depend on the manufacture of appropriate pieces of type. The filling in of thirds with passing tones, matters of cadential ornamentation, and the splitting or joining of repeated notes could have easily been initiated by editors or typesetters. Producing a print is also more likely to introduce variants as compared to creating a manuscript copy, as the typesetter must first look at the exemplar, then find the correct pieces of type, and then load them on the stick. The simplification of semiminim under-third cadential ornaments, in addition to suggesting a more modern aesthetic,

46 Gustavson, 67.
would certainly ease the type-setting process, as fewer pieces of type are required for an unadorned cadence. Nevertheless, in no single composition does Ott (or his typesetters) globally remove or add such figures. Inconsistencies among such minor variants are not necessarily separative.47

Since the comparison of manuscript and print sources cannot always provide a full or definitive explanation for the transmission of a work, examining human connections and relationships in addition to relationships between notes on the pages provides additional information and a clearer image. In the case of Missae tredecim, there is one person who could have provided Ott with exemplars for some or all of the masses: the Bavarian Court composer Ludwig Senfl.

Stephanie Schlagel asserts that the Ott’s sources for the motets in the Novum et insigne opus musicum volumes can be “established or reasonably hypothesized.” She names Senfl’s Liber selectarum cantionum quas vulgo Mutetas appellant (Augsburg: Grymm and Wyrsung, 1520) and Antico’s Motetti libro primo (Rome: 1518, Venice 1521) along with sources that were “very closely” related to the Munich Hofkapelle as the sources Ott consulted for his motet prints.48 While the two prints contain motets instead of masses, it is reasonable to extend her claim of a Munich Hofkapelle connection to Ott’s acquisition of Mass Ordinary settings, especially since Ott released both the motet and mass prints within a couple of years.

The Missae tredecim contains two masses by Heinrich Isaac, who worked for Maximilian I and whose music would have been in the possession of Ludwig Senfl.49 The

---

47 Stephanie P. Schlagel, “A Credible (Mis)Attribution to Josquin in Hans Ott’s Novum et insigne opus musicum: Contemporary Perceptions, Modern Conceptions, and the Case of Veni sancte Spiritus,” Tijdschrift Van De Koninklike Vereniging Voor Nederlandse Muziekgeschiedenis (56), 105-106.

48 Schlagel,“Credible Misattribution,”104. She addresses Gustavson’s claim to the contrary on p. 105.
Missa Fortuna desperata also appears in the manuscript MunBS 3154, which was probably copied in Innsbruck, a place that Maximilian and his court frequented. The one copy of the Missa Pange lingua associated with the Imperial court, MunBS 510, is a presentation manuscript that was left unfinished. The scribe, wherever he was working at the time, had to have used another exemplar to create MunBS 510. Moreover, the Missae tredecim reading of La Rue’s Missa Cum Iocunditate is related to MunBS 65, another of the “Gwalther” manuscripts that I argue in Chapter 2 were associated with the court of Maximilian I. It is easy to imagine the Imperial court also owning copies of the other Missae tredecim masses given their composers and extant sources, namely the Alamire manuscripts from Maximilian’s daughter’s court.

The question of whether many of these choirbooks currently in the Bayerische Staatsbibliothek originated at the Bavarian ducal court in Munich or with Maximilian’s traveling Imperial court has been astutely raised by Birgit Lodes and future research may reveal even more fluctuation in the accepted provenance of these sources. However, for this present issue concerning Senfl and the printed repertoire in Munich, the original provenance of these choirbooks is moot providing their dating in the early decades of the sixteenth century holds: Senfl would have had access to them regardless of whether he

49 Ott’s source for the Missa Salva nos by Heinrich Isaac was also a manuscript or print that is currently unknown. The mass survives in its complete form in only three other sources: Verona MS 756 which is missing the tenor voice of the Benedictus-Osanna II, BerlGS 40634, and Basel MS F.IX.55. The Pleni sunt in the Missa Salva nos appears to be a revised version still closely related to the original found in the Alamire manuscript Verona 756. Isaac Opera Omnia ed. Edward R. Lerner VIII, XV

50 The Census-Catalogue entry states that this manuscript may have been copied by scribes associated with the Imperial court, and also notes that the penultimate piece mentions Cardinal Lang, a close advisor to Maximilian I. However, there is no definitive proof that this manuscript was in any way associated with the Imperial court. See CCM 2:225, and 4:444. Martin Just, “Bermerkungen zu den kleinen Folio-Handschriften deutscher Provenienz um 1500.” Quellenstudien zur Musik der Renaissance I: Formen und Probleme der Überlieferung mehrstimmiger Musik im Zeitalter Josquin Desprez, ed. Ludwig Finscher. Munich: Kraus International Publications, 1981. 25-45.

51 Birgit Lodes, “the Emperor’s or the Dukes?”
brought the music with him from the Imperial court or the choirbooks were copied in Munich during his tenure there.

How could music from the ducal court in Munich make it to Lutheran Nuremberg? Ludwig Senfl was a friend of the Nuremberg church administrator Hieronymous Baumgartner Sr, and we know from letters and documents that the exchange of music was a part of their relationship. Baumgartner made frequent trips to Munich for both business and to visit with humanist friends. He must have met and befriended Senfl during one of these trips sometime before 1530. In a letter dated October 1, 1530, Martin Luther asks Baumgartner if he would deliver a letter to Senfl, who apparently suggested Baumgartner as an intermediary since Senfl was employed at the Catholic Bavarian court. Baumgartner also played “go-between” for Senfl with another Lutheran, Duke Albrecht of Prussia. Senfl sent music to the duke over a period of years, and Baumgartner delivered a gift to Senfl from the duke on at least one occasion. Butler postulates that Baumgartner might have even convinced his friend Senfl to publish his Magnificats with Ott in Nuremberg. The Magnificat print also lacks a dedication, which could indicate a private undertaking rather than a project that Ott initiated independently. The mutual feelings of friendship and professional respect between Baumgartner and Senfl must have lasted through the 1530s, since the theorist Sebald


53 Luther’s letter to Senfl can be found in the Weimar Ausgabe Briefe V, 639.

54 Butler, 413-14.

55 Ibid., 451-52.

56 Ibid., 456.
Heyden mentions their relationship in the 1540 edition of his treatise entitled *De arte canendi*, published by Johannes Petreius.  

The network between Senfl, Nuremberg, and Wittenberg also raises the possibility of Ott obtaining music from colleagues in Wittenberg, especially since the Lutherans in Nuremberg did send music to Wittenberg. While Veit Dietrich was working as Luther’s secretary in Wittenberg, he wrote a letter to Baumgartner that hinted Baumgartner might be able to persuade Senfl to send his *Missa Nisi Dominus* to Luther. Apparently Senfl had promised to send Luther this mass, originally composed for Hans Jacob Fugger, but had not yet done so. Dietrich also supplied Martin Luther himself with music from Nuremberg. Richard Chartaris has uncovered a copy of Senfl’s *Magnificat Octo Tonorum* at the Bibliothèque Royale in Brussels that once belonged to Luther and is signed by Veit Dietrich.

Eight of the thirteen masses in *Missae tredecim* are preserved in sources from Wittenberg, including the *Missa Pange lingua* in JenaU 21 (see Table 3.5). Most of the extant sources are either Alamire or Jena choirbooks from the Electoral Library, but Isaac’s *Missa Salva nos* was printed in Georg Rhau’s *Symphoniae jacundae*. Rhau

---

57 Sebald Heyden was the rector of the school of St. Sebald from 1525 to 1561 and wrote a treatise titled *De arte canendi* that appeared in three editions in 1532, 1537, and 1540. For a discussion of why Heyden did not mention this fact in the first or second edition of his treatise, see Butler, 416-17. A facsimile edition of *De arte canendi* is available: *Monuments of Music and Music Literature in Facsimile* II/139 (New York: Broude Brothers, 1969). For an English translation of the treatise see Clement A. Miller, trans., *De arte canendi*, American Institute of Musicology Musicological Studies and Documents 26 (Dallas: American Institute of Musicology, 1972).

58 Senflius aliquando promisit Luthero missam ‘Nisi Dominus’ Fuccharo cuidam compositam. Sed promsit tantum, non misit, nescio an admonendus sit ea de re” (Dietrich to Baumgartner, April 18, 1533), Albrecht and Flemming, “Das sogenannte Manuscriptum Thomasianum,” *Archiv für Reformationsgeschichte* XII (1915), 245; as cited in Butler, 414, n 75.

evidently had access to an exemplar of that mass and others, including the *Missa Pange lingua*, which will be explored further in Chapter 5 with his printed bicinia collection. At present, it is important to note that if Rhau could access this repertoire, others in the Wittenberg circle probably could as well, including Veit Dietrich. Although there is no concrete proof of any personal relationship, Johannes Ott was very likely acquainted with Baumgartner and/or Dietrich. In the event that either of these church leaders received music and wanted it to be printed, they probably knew whom to turn to: Ott, Petreius, or the printer Hieronymous Formschneider. Dietrich was almost certainly involved with the production of *Novum et insigne opus musicum* in some capacity, as he received a copy immediately after publication and presented it to his deacons at St. Sebald.

Johannes Ott had planned to publish Isaac’s polyphonic Mass Propers but died before he was able to do so. He obtained an Imperial privilege to print the repertoire, which suggests that he had part or all of what became known as the *Choralis Constantinus* in his possession before his death. In his examination of the transmission of the *Choralis Constantinus* Royston Gustavson noted a third possible source for Ott’s Latin polyphony: Pfalzgraf Ottheinrich in Neuburg, whose chapel music holdings are

---

60 Butler, 453.

61 Ibid.

62 Ott received a new Imperial privilege in 1545, and after his early death the following year his widow Elsbet ran his business until 1554. Elsbet published the first volume of Heinrich Isaac’s *Choralis Constantinus* in 1550, and sold the manuscript of the other two volumes to the Augsburg bookseller Georg Willer.

63 The transmission of the Mass Propers originally composed by Isaac and completed by Senfl is an incredibly murky issue that is too complex to sufficiently address in a dissertation focused on the *Missa Pange lingua*, but in a very general sense these Mass Propers are like a shadow to the Josquin mass: like the *Missa Pange lingua*, they are found in Munich, in the possession of Johannes Ott, in the choirbooks of the Electoral Library in Saxony, and even among the holdings of a Lutheran church in Brno. Recent research on various aspects of Isaac and polyphonic Mass Propers can be found in David J. Burn and Stefan Gasch, eds., *Heinrich Isaac and Polyphony for the Proper of the Mass in the Late Middle Ages and Renaissance* (Turnhout: Brepols, 2011).
listed in the famous “Heidelberger Kappellinventar.”

Gustavson revisits the possibility—previously refuted by David Burn—that Ott obtained Isaac’s Mass Propers from the count.

Gustavson cites a letter to Ottheinrich from the Nuremberg city council regarding the printer Hieronymous Formschneider. It seems that Formschneider’s mouth had gotten him into trouble with the council members and Ottheinrich had interceded on his behalf. Gustavson believes that this action documented in the letter indicates “a significant direct or indirect relationship” between Ottheinrich and the printer that should be reexamined.

In terms of the Missae tredecim repertoire, inconsistencies in composer attribution for two masses work against the possibility of Ott acquiring them from Ottheinrich. The Missa da Pacem is attributed to Josquin in the Missae tredecim print and other later sources, but it is attributed to Noel Bauldeweyn in the Alamire manuscript MunBS 7 as well as the Neuberg chapel inventory for Palatine Count Ottheinrich, and Bauldeweyn is now the accepted composer of this mass. As discussed in the previous chapter, there is a Missa Pange lingua attributed to Isaac listed in the Neuberg court chapel inventory. The scenario of Ott acquiring a mass attributed to Isaac and then changing the composer name to Josquin would certainly add fuel to the fire of Josquin authenticity scholarship, but is

---


66 Gustavson, “Commercialising,” 228. A transcription and English translation of the letter is also printed on this page.

67 Composer misattributions make tracing the transmission of the Missa Da Pacem difficult. There are only two extant sources of the Missa da Pacem that predate Ott’s print: MunBS 7 and BerIgs 7. The mass is attributed to Mouton in BerIgs 7, there is a completely different version of the bass part in the Crucifixus and it contains only one section of the Agnus Dei. MunBS 7 is the only source with all three Agnus Dei sections, the Missae tredecim has two.
ultimately unlikely. The *Missa Sub tuum praesidium* reading in *Missae tredecim* wherein the mass is attributed to Josquin in the tenor partbook and La Rue in the other partbooks does raise the question of how much Ott actually knew about the composers and masses he was publishing.

Another curious transmission issue with the *Missa Pange lingua* and some of the other *Missae tredecim* masses is the occasional omission of Agnus Dei sections. The second Agnus Dei section of the *Missa Pange lingua*, a duet, is missing from the print. All five of the earlier manuscript sources previously discussed contain this section—even the Occo Codex, which replaces the Benedictus and Pleni sunt sections with those by different composers—contain the Agnus II duet. Two questions arise from this omission: Did Ott’s exemplar lack the second Agnus, or did he omit it on purpose? And if the latter is the case, why? At this point in the sixteenth century, if the Latin Agnus Dei was included in a Lutheran service, it was typically one of several pieces that could be sung during the distribution of Communion. Much like modern-day church services, the amount of music needed depended on the number of communicants present. There does not seem to be any liturgical reason to omit the middle Agnus section, and even so, Ott did not intend for *Missae tredecim* to be for exclusively liturgical use. All of the other movements and sub-sections of the *Missa Pange lingua* are present, including other duet sections such as the Pleni sunt and Benedictus, which are not strikingly more or less difficult to sing than the Agnus II duet.

Stephanie Schlagel believes that Ott simply lacked access to the missing mass sections, at least in the case of Josquin’s *Missa Fortuna desperata*. This mass is missing one of two Agnus Dei sections. According to Schlagel, Ott includes multiple Agnus
sections when as a whole they reveal various aspects of the mensural system or complete a musical narrative. While the second Agnus of the Missa Fortuna desperata is not essential to the musical narrative of the mass, it does contain some mensural manipulations, and Schlagel asserts that Ott would have included the section if he had access to it.68

The current hypotheses surrounding the sources for Johannes Ott’s printed music are not conclusive at this point. In general, the hypothesis that Ott acquired the Missa Pange lingua and some, if not all, of his repertoire via Ludwig Senfl in Munich seems to be most plausible and direct, but at this point the other possibilities outlined above cannot be discounted. Nevertheless, analysis of both the manuscripts and prints themselves and the people who owned them reveals a dynamic network through which Lutherans exchanged books, music, and other resources. Earlier manuscripts indicate that the Missa Pange lingua could have easily arrived in Nuremberg from either Wittenberg or Munich. Perhaps what is more important is the fact that a copy of the mass was indeed acquired by Johannes Ott, who deemed it worthy of being rescued from obscurity.

The Missae tredecim Exemplars

When the vast number of Josquin-era cyclic masses and the unimaginable number of lost sources are considered, it seems as though the Missa Pange lingua won a sixteenth-century lottery. An exemplar of the mass landed in the hands of a printer, and therefore it was able to be distributed in mass quantities throughout Europe. After the initial production of Missae tredecim, the interest in and circulation of the Missa Pange lingua becomes less accidental. Several of those who obtained a printed copy of the mass

68 Schlagel, “Fortune’s Fate,” 205-206.
anthology chose to perform or study the *Missa Pange lingua* over other masses in *Missae tredecim*. In another astute marketing and diplomatic decision, Ott did not attach a confessional label to his Mass Ordinary anthology. Nevertheless, the print appears to have been much more popular among Lutherans, and *Missae tredecim* essentially took on a Lutheran identity in its initial circulation. As the sixteenth century progressed and Lutheran communities and their liturgical practices became more stable, the Lutheran identity and circulation of the *Missa Pange lingua* becomes markedly more deliberate and apparent.

There are nineteen extant exemplars of *Missae tredecim*, along with four other documented exemplars that are currently lost. Music prints were generally produced in runs of 500 or 1000; Gustavson suggests, for example, that the *Novum et insigne opus musicum* volumes were printed in runs of 500.\(^69\) If the same number is assumed to apply to *Missae tredecim*, the reality of the source situation is that a very small percentage of the original print run survives or was documented at some point. Nevertheless, nineteen is a relatively large number of extant copies for a single print—enough to provide an idea of where the *Missae tredecim* circulated, who obtained copies of it, and how it was used. The extant *Missae tredecim* exemplars demonstrate that Johannes Ott accomplished his goal of preserving this repertoire for future generations. Copies of the print circulated throughout Germany and possibly into other parts of Europe.

As dedicatee of *Missae tredecim*, the Nuremberg council received a copy of the print sometime before February 28, 1539.\(^70\) Other than this initial mention of the print,

---

\(^{69}\) Gustavson, 310-12.

\(^{70}\) “12 fl Hannsen Ottel puchförer zur vererung, dass er eim erbarn rat vier gesangpüchlein, darin etlich mess, geschenckt hat” (Nuremberg, Bayerisches Staatsarchiv, Stadtrechnungen Nr. 183 [Jahresregister Nr.
the only trace of *Missae tredecim* currently in Nuremberg is a single copy that traveled elsewhere and did not return to Nuremberg until the twentieth century. In 1929, the Nuremberg Stadtbibliothek purchased a convolute containing the *Missae tredecim* and the *Novum et insigne opus musicum I* at the auction of Werner Wolffheim’s music collection. A bookplate in the bassus partbook indicates that the partbooks belonged to a member of the Schade family, a noble family from Thuringia. In the bassus part of the *Missa Cum Iocunditate* second Kyrie, there are two faint brown vertical lines near the beginning within the musical staff, but that is the only discernable handwritten mark in the discantus, contratenor, and bassus partbooks.

The list of extant *Missae tredecim* exemplars with their provenances and current locations show that the print reached nearly every region of Germany. Who were the people who obtained a copy of the print, and where did they perform the masses, if they did so at all? Examination of the extant copies themselves in conjunction with what contextual information is available indicates that many *Missae tredecim* copies served a dual liturgical-pedagogical purpose. Often, the institutions and individuals who owned a copy of *Missae tredecim* acquired other contemporaneous printed anthologies of Latin polyphony. Over half of the known *Missae tredecim* copies were bound with other prints (see Table 3.7). In most cases, they were bound with contemporary prints produced in Nuremberg or Wittenberg by the Lutheran printer Georg Rhau. In some cases, other Nuremberg Latin prints not bound with a *Missae tredecim* copy are also documented or

---

71] f. 68v, 28. February, 1539), as cited in Butler, 465, n. 179. Since no evidence exists to associate—or not associate—the description of the copy presented to the council with any of the other extant exemplars, I have chosen to omit this initial documented copy from my primary list of *Missae tredecim* exemplars.

71 Gustavson, 800-801.

72 When I visited the Nuremberg Stadtbibliothek in March 2014, the tenor partbook was unavailable for study due to excessive mold damage.
The surviving Missae tredecim copies of the print also reveal that the Missa Pange lingua was favored among those who did perform from the Missae tredecim partbooks.

Table 3.7

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Location</th>
<th>Missae tredecim in Bound Collections (convolutes)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Cambridge</td>
<td>-</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Den Haag</td>
<td>-</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Halle an der Saale</td>
<td>Novum et insigne opus musicum – Secundus tomus novi – Liber quindecim missarum – Modulationes aliquot quatuor vocum</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Heilbronn</td>
<td>Secundus tomus novi</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Jena</td>
<td>Trium vocum carmina – Secundus tomus novi – Modulationes aliquot quatuor vocum – Officia Paschalia (Rhaul 1539)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Kassel</td>
<td>Liber quindecim missarum – Opus decim missarum (Rhaul 1541)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Königsberg Stadt-und Universitätsbibliothek</td>
<td>Liber quindecim missarum – Officia Paschalia (Rhaul 1541) – Opus decim missarum (Rhaul 1541)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>KonigsbergU</td>
<td>?</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Kraków</td>
<td>handwritten masses – Officiorum de Nativitate (Rhaul 1545) - Opus decim missarum (Rhaul 1541) – Primus tomus coralis constantini (1550)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Leipzig Thomaskirche</td>
<td>?</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Munich</td>
<td>Magnificat octo tonorum – Liber quindecim missarum - Opus decim missarum (Rhaul 1541)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Nuremberg</td>
<td>Novum et insigne opus musicum</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Paris</td>
<td>-</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Regensburg (A.R. 92c)</td>
<td>-</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Regensburg (A.R. 91)</td>
<td>Liber quindecim missarum - Officia Paschalia (Rhaul 1539)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Regensburg (B 44)</td>
<td>-</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Regensburg (C 62a)</td>
<td>-</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Rostock</td>
<td>-</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Vienna</td>
<td>Liber quindecim missarum</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Weimar</td>
<td>Praestantissimore artificum lectissimae missae (Wittenberg, Schwertel 1568) – Tres missae (Utendal 1573) – manuscript material</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Zerbst</td>
<td>Secundus tomus novi</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Zwickau</td>
<td>Liber quindecim missarum</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>unknown location</td>
<td>Liber quindecim missarum</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Table 3.8 (continued on next page)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Library</th>
<th>Shelfmark</th>
<th>Partbooks</th>
<th>Markings</th>
<th>Provenance</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Cambridge University Library</td>
<td>MR220.d.50 .2</td>
<td>T</td>
<td>one</td>
<td>currently unknown; probably the exemplar listed in Rosenthal’s catalog</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Den Haag Nederlands Muziek Instituut</td>
<td>Kluis C 13 (1-3)</td>
<td>DCB</td>
<td>a few</td>
<td>Lutheran Saxony?</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Halle an der Saale Martin-Luther-Universität, Universitäts-und Landesbibliothek</td>
<td>Ed 1144 (1-4)</td>
<td>DCTB</td>
<td>none</td>
<td>possible Saxon-Anhalt provenance; nothing definite is known</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Heilbronn Stadtarchiv</td>
<td>MS LX-LXIV</td>
<td>DCTB</td>
<td>moderate</td>
<td>Heilbronn Council library by 1628; possibly Latin school prior to that</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Jena Thüringer Universitäts- und Landesbibliothek</td>
<td>4 Mus 6a-d</td>
<td>DCTB</td>
<td>a few</td>
<td>from the Electoral Library of Saxony, most likely acquired during the rule of Johann der Großmütige</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Kassel Gesamthochschul-Bibliothek Kassel, Landesbibliothek und Murhardsche Bibliothek der Stadt Kassel</td>
<td>4° Mus. 63 b</td>
<td>DCTB</td>
<td>a few</td>
<td>Hofkapelle of Phillip der Großmütige</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Königsberg Stadt-und Universitätsbibliothek</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>lost</td>
<td>?</td>
<td>?</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Konigsberg Universitätsbibliothek</td>
<td>13657 a-d (lost since WWII)</td>
<td>DCTB</td>
<td>?</td>
<td>Duke Albrecht of Prussia</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Kraków, Biblioteka Jagiellońska</td>
<td>Mus. MS 40175</td>
<td>DCB</td>
<td>?</td>
<td>dated 1550, probably of east German origin</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Leipzig Thomaskirche</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>lost</td>
<td>?</td>
<td>listed in Thomaskirche music inventories from 1551 and 1564</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Munich Bayerische Stadtbibliothek</td>
<td>4 Mus.pr. 159, Beibd. 1</td>
<td>DCTB</td>
<td>minimal</td>
<td>belonged to Hans Heinrich Herwart</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Nuremberg Stadtbibliothek</td>
<td>AMB. 2390.8°</td>
<td>DCTB</td>
<td>only one</td>
<td>belonged to the Shade family of Thuringia</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Location</td>
<td>Call Number</td>
<td>Shelf Mark</td>
<td>Number</td>
<td>Condition</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>-----------------------------------------------</td>
<td>-------------</td>
<td>------------</td>
<td>--------</td>
<td>-----------</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Paris Bibliothèque nationale de France, Département de la Musique</td>
<td>Rés 825</td>
<td>DCTB</td>
<td>?</td>
<td>from the private library of Franz Commer</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Regensburg Bischöfliche Zentralbibliothek</td>
<td>A.R. 92c</td>
<td>DCT</td>
<td>only one</td>
<td>Regensburg Gymnasium Poeticum</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Regensburg Bischöfliche Zentralbibliothek</td>
<td>A.R. 91</td>
<td>CTB</td>
<td>a few</td>
<td>Regensburg Gymnasium Poeticum</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Regensburg Bischöfliche Zentralbibliothek</td>
<td>B. 44</td>
<td>DCTB</td>
<td>only one</td>
<td>purchased from Augsburger Fidelis Butsch ca. 1840 by Carl Proske</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Regensburg Bischöfliche Zentralbibliothek</td>
<td>C. 62a</td>
<td>DCT</td>
<td>heavy</td>
<td>possibly purchased from Fidelis Butsch</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Rostock Universitätsbibliothek</td>
<td>Mus. Saec. XVI-41</td>
<td>DCTB</td>
<td>moderate</td>
<td>belonged to library of Duke Johann Albrecht I of Mecklenburg-Schwerin</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Vienna Österreichische Nationalbibliothek</td>
<td>S.A.76.C.14 Adl.</td>
<td>DCTB</td>
<td>tenor moderate; no markings in other partbooks</td>
<td>DCB partbooks contain the Fugger crest</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Weimar Hochschularchiv/Thüringisches Landesmusikarchiv</td>
<td>N. 31</td>
<td>DB</td>
<td>none</td>
<td>belonged to Matthäus Schwandrisius of Stettin, who was cantor at the Johanneskirche in Neustadt an der Orla from 1573-76; presumably donated to the church</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Zerbst Fracesceumsbibliothek</td>
<td>K 23a-b</td>
<td>DC</td>
<td>none</td>
<td>presumably in the Fracieum library since the mid-late 16th century; possibly added after the choir was founded in 1559</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Zwickau Ratsschulbibliothek</td>
<td>RSB Mus.91.(1)</td>
<td>DCTB</td>
<td>a few</td>
<td>possibly the Zwickau Gymnasium</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>unknown location</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>CB</td>
<td>?</td>
<td>Listed in the catalog of the Augsburg antiquarian Fidelis Butsch; no known library holding contains these two partbooks</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Johannes Ott might have left the confessional identity and intended purpose for *Missae tredecim* neutral and ambiguous, but *Missae tredecim* was primarily popular with Lutherans. Only two exemplars can be traced to Catholics, and both have connections to Augsburg. The exemplar currently held at the Bayerische Staatsbibliothek in Munich belonged to Hans Heinrich Herwart (1520-1583), an Augsburg patrician known for his extensive music collection. The other exemplar with a Catholic provenance is held at the Österreichische Nationalbibliothek. Three of the four partbooks at this library—the discantus, contratenor, and bassus—have the Fugger crest on the cover. The cover of the tenor partbook, however, has a completely different design with no trace of the Fugger coat of arms. It is difficult to ascertain exactly when the four partbooks became a unit. Perhaps a member of the Fugger family purchased it to complete their set of partbooks, but more likely the partbooks were united while they were part of the Hofbibliothek. Neither of these exemplars contains any handwritten markings or signs of heavy use, which is to be expected of music prints belonging to music collectors or bibliophiles.

The bulk of the *Missae tredecim* exemplars with known provenances belonged, at one time, to a Lutheran school, church, and/or individual. If a print was used at a Lutheran Gymnasium, its repertoire probably served a variety of purposes: students could have used the print during their music classes, when they provided music for liturgies, or

---

73 In 1585, two years following Herwart’s death, a catalogue of Herwart’s music collection was compiled at the request of Duke Wilhelm V by Wolfgang Prommer, the duke’s secretary Wilhelm purchased the library the following year, and eventually the ducal library became the basis for the Bayerische Staatsbibliothek. See JoAnn Taricani, “A Renaissance Bibliophile as Musical Patron: The Evidence of the Herwart Sketchbooks,” *Notes* 49, No. 4 (June 1993), 1363. For more on Herwart’s life and music collection, also see H. Colin Slim, “The Music Library of the Augsburg Patrician, Hans Heinrich Herwart (1520-1583),” *Annales musicologiques* 7 (1964-77): 67-109.

74 The three “Fugger” partbooks at the Österreichische Nationalbibliothek do not contain any markings. The tenor partbook does contain a few editorial markings, which indicates that it existed separately from the other three for a period of time.
even during recreational time. Several *Missae tredecim* exemplars can be traced to a Lutheran school with varying degrees of evidence. Two exemplars from the Regensburg Bischöfliche Zentralbibliothek and an exemplar from Zerbst have the most concrete connections to a Lutheran school. The discantus and contratenor partbooks of a *Missae tredecim* copy are still held today at the Francesceumsbibliothek in Zerbst. The Gymnasium Francesceum in Zerbst had a choir by 1559, and most of the prints from the Gymnasium date from around that time or later.\(^{75}\) The *Missae tredecim* is one of only four prints from the 1530s, all of which are from Nuremberg: the *Novum et insigne opus musicum II* and Petreius’s *Liber quindecim missarum* and *Modulationes aliquot quatuor vocum* are the other three.\(^{76}\) The *Missae tredecim* partbooks at Zerbst are devoid of handwritten markings. However, a single annotation in the *Novum et insigne opus musicum II*, which is bound together with *Missae tredecim*, reminds us that the partbooks did belong to Lutherans: In the Isaac motet *Christus filius Dei*, a contrafactum of his famous *Virgo prudentissima*: the words “sacro imperio pro Carolo caesare romano” are replaced with the more Lutheran-friendly phrase “sancta ecclesia fidelis gubernatione.”\(^{77}\)

It is likely that other *Missae tredecim* exemplars were used in Lutheran schools as well since they were once owned by a Lutheran church or person with connections to a school. The exemplar currently held at the Rostock Universitätsbibliothek bears the coat of arms of Duke Johann Albrecht I of Mecklenberg-Schwerin. The duke founded a school

---


\(^{76}\) For more information on the holdings of the Francesceum Bibliothek, see F. Münnich, “Aus der Bibliothek des Francisceums,” *Zerbster Jahrbuch* 21 (1936): 9.

\(^{77}\) Gustavson also notes that in the discantus part of Senfl’s *Anima mea liquefacta est*, there is a brown ink stain that completely covers a note stem. See Gustavson, 828.
in 1553, and a copy of Missae tredecim is listed in the 1573 inventory of his library. Like other exemplars, the handwritten markings in this copy appear in a few selected masses: the Missa Da pacem is marked in all four partbooks, the Missa Bon temps is marked in all partbooks except the discantus, and the discantus partbook contains mensuration lines in the Missa O gloriosa and a few notes that are scribbled out in the Missa Pange lingua. Overall, the nature of the markings in this exemplar are very practical and suggest that the book was used at least for pedagogical, if not liturgical purposes at the Schwerin Fürstenschule.

The Lutheran Johanneskirche at Neustadt an der Orla owned a copy of the Missae tredecim. The Reformation was solidified in Neustadt by 1527, and a Latin school and library were established there. The Johanneskirche parish archive holds two extant music prints that date from before 1553: the Missae tredecim and the first Novum et insigne opus musicum volume. A third print, Rhau’s Postremum Vespertini Officii opus (Wittenberg 1544) is listed in an inventory dated 1608-09 but is currently missing. An inscription from the discantus partbook of Missae tredecim indicates that the partbooks were donated to the collection by Matthäus Schwandrisius of Stetten, who served as cantor in Neustadt from Michaelmas 1573 until Michaelmas 1576. Only the discantus and basses partbooks survive, and neither partbook contains any distinct handwritten annotations.

A Missae tredecim copy survives in the Zwickau Ratsschulbibliothek bound with Petreius’s Liber quindecim missarum, and the year 1540 is stamped on the partbook.


79 Gustavson, 795.
covers. The convolute appears in a 1670 catalog for the library of Christian Daum (1612-1687), who was rector of the renowned Latin school in Zwickau from 1662 until his death in 1687.\textsuperscript{80} It is possible that the partbooks were used at the school—the Latin school choir also performed at the Marienkirche—and that Daum could have acquired the prints from an earlier schoolmaster, but any theories regarding the whereabouts of the exemplar before it entered Daum’s library are purely speculative.\textsuperscript{81} In addition to extant \textit{Missae tredecim} copies, we know from inventory records that the Thomaskirche in Leipzig possessed a copy of the print in the middle of the sixteenth century.\textsuperscript{82} Although this exemplar is currently lost, one can speculate that it was probably put to good use at the Thomasschule, and that at least some of the masses were performed at Lutheran services in the Thomaskirche, a church known for having a particularly Latin-oriented liturgy.

Other \textit{Missae tredecim} exemplars were probably not used by school children based on archival records, but these records do connect them to a Lutheran owner. As discussed in the above section, Hieronymous Baumgartner was in communication with the Lutheran Duke Albrecht of Prussia. It is possibly through this connection that the duke obtained one, or possibly two copies of \textit{Missae tredecim}, along with the two Novum

\textsuperscript{80} Zwickau, Ratsschulbibliothek Hs. 17.12.18, Abteilung „Libri Musici“, S. 739, Sp.b. I am grateful to Gregor Hermann of the Ratsschulbibliothek for bringing this catalog to my attention.

\textsuperscript{81} There are a few handwritten markings throughout the Petreius print, but the annotations in \textit{Missae tredecim} are minimal. However, one of the only signs of use comes from the Missa \textit{Pange lingua}, in the bass part of the Credo: mensuration signatures are added before the “et vitam venturi” section, and the custos at the end of that system is completed with a diagonal line in black ink.

\textsuperscript{82} A copy of the print is documented in the Thomaskirche music inventories of 1551 and 1564. Both inventories are transcribed in Wolfgang Orf, \textit{Die Musikhandschriften Thomaskirche Mss. 49/50 und 51 in der Universitätsbibliothek Leipzig} (Leipzig: VEB Deutscher Verlag für Musik, 1977). This exemplar is also discussed in Chapter 4 of this dissertation.
et insigne opus musicum volumes, the Magnificat octo tonorum, and Petreius’s Liber quindecim missarum and Trium vocum cantiones.\textsuperscript{83}

The Jena Thüringer Universitäts- und Landesbibliothek houses a Missae tredecim exemplar that was in all likelihood purchased for the library of Johann Friedrich der Grossmütige at Wittenberg, which eventually became the foundation for the university library at Jena in 1558. The Missae tredecim is bound with four other contemporary prints, and is identified in a catalog of the Electoral Library that dates from the first half of the sixteenth century.\textsuperscript{84} Another Missae tredecim exemplar currently held at the Landesbibliothek und Murhardsche Bibliothek in Kassel, is bound together with Petreius’s Liber quindecim missarum and Georg Rhau’s Opus decem missarum. These prints are listed in a 1613 inventory of the Hofkapelle repertoire of Philipp der Grossmütige.\textsuperscript{85} The letters V.D.M.I.E., short for “Verbum Dei Manet in Aeternum,” the motto of Elector Johann Friedrich, are on the cover of each partbook.

The Kassel Missae tredecim exemplar must have served a liturgical purpose. There are a few handwritten annotations throughout the partbooks that indicate some sort of use: In the final Agnus Dei of the Missa Pange lingua, the entire text is written by hand underneath the notes (see Figure 3.1), and a couple of notes are corrected in the cadence of the final Agnus of the Missa O gloriosa. A third and final annotation in the

\textsuperscript{83} J. Müller-Blattau, “Die musikalischen Schätze der Staats- und Universitätsbibliothek zu Königsberg i. Pr.,” Zeitschrift für Musikwissenschaft 6 (1924), 220-21. Another Missae tredecim exemplar, apparently bound on its own, existed at the Königlichen- und Universitäts-Bibliothek zu Königsberg, but were lost during World War II. Royston Gustavson attempted to track down the partbooks into Russia without success, but believes the partbooks are still extant somewhere, and will resurface upon further investigation. See Gustavson, 387 n36.

\textsuperscript{84} Jena Thüringer Universitäts- und Landesbibliothek, Ms. Appendix 22B (4D), olim App. Ms. f. 22, f. 4v

\textsuperscript{85} Ernst Zulauf, “Beträge zur Geschichte der Landgräflich-Hessischen Hofkapelle zu Cassel bis auf die zeit Moritz des Gelehrten,” Zeitschrift des Vereins für hessische Geschichte und Landeskunde New series 26 (1903), 103.
Kassel exemplar is indicative of liturgical use. In the Credo of the Missa Sub tuum praesidium, a caesura is added after the phrase “descendit de coelis” in each partbook (see Figure 3.2). In other Lutheran sources that contain Mass Ordinary sections, such as RegC 100 which will be discussed in the next chapter, the Credo movements sometimes end before the “et incarnatus” section. Liturgical instructions in multiple Lutheran Kirchenordnungen specify that during a Sunday service the creed would be sung first in Latin by the choir, and then the congregation would sing it in German, most likely in the form of the chorale Wir glauben all in einem Gott. The Kirchenordnungen do not necessarily specify that the Latin Credo was abbreviated, but such a decision would make sense given the length of the polyphonic Credos and the Lutherans’ flexible approach toward liturgy. The Rhau and Petreius mass prints bound together with the Kassel Missae tredecim exemplar contain annotations of a similar nature and quantity.

There are a few sporadic markings in the exemplar from the Electoral Library, although they do not provide much insight into where the masses might have been performed, if at all. Most of the markings appear to be editorial rather than performance-based. In the tenor partbook, the misattribution of the Missa Sub tuum praesidium is corrected with “petri de la rue” written in black ink, a vertical line crosses out an extra “i” in the word “tollis” in the discantus part of the Missa Salva nos Gloria, and there is a clef correction at the beginning of the first Agnus Dei of the Missa L’homme armé in the contratenor part. The most substantial annotations appear in the Missa de Sancto Antonio in two partbooks; both the discantus and the bassus partbooks have notational corrections in the Sanctus.
Figure 3.1 Agnus Dei III, *Missa Pange lingua*, Tenor partbook, 4° Mus. 63 b, kk2v
Universitätsbibliothek Kassel, Landesbibliothek und Murhardsche Bibliothek der Stadt Kassel

Figure 3.2 Credo, *Missa Sub tuum praesidium*, Tenor partbook, 4° Mus. 63 b, NN
Universitätsbibliothek Kassel, Landesbibliothek und Murhardsche Bibliothek der Stadt Kassel
The *Missae tredecim* exemplar from Heilbronn is an excellent example of how the print was used for both pedagogical and liturgical purposes in a Lutheran community. This copy of *Missae tredecim* is bound together with *Novum et insigne opus musicum II*. The covers of the partbooks reveal that the original owner probably had the initials I.S.S., and that the prints were bound in the year 1551. Royston Gustavson believes that the original owner of this convolute bequeathed it to the Heilbronn Latin school, and it was used by students to provide music for Lutheran services there.\(^86\) The Latin school was founded in 1431, and then in 1575, the Heilbronn Council established a library based on Lutheran ideals. This convolute is first identified in the 1628 catalogue of that library. A handwritten addition in a motet from the *Novum et insigne opus musicum*, reveals that the

---

86 Gustavson, 757.
partbooks were used sometime in the years between the founding of the Heilbronn Lutheran library and the 1628 cataloguing of materials. In Isaac’s *Christus filius Dei*, the prayer to Emperor Charles is replaced with Rudolpho, who reigned from 1576 until 1612 (see Figure 3.4).

Figure 3.4 *Christus filius dei*, Tenor partbook, Heilbronn Stadtarchiv

Figure 3.5 Preface insert in tenor partbook, Heilbronn Stadtarchiv
There are several indicators that the Heilbronn *Missae tredecim* convolute was used for the Lutheran liturgy. At the beginning of each partbook, there is a one-page insert with handwritten polyphonic responses to the Preface (see Figure 3.5). The Latin text, beginning with “et cum spiritu tuo,” is written above the German translation, which begins with “und mit deinem geist.” The handwritten annotations in the *Missae tredecim* print are rather practical, and suggest that the masses with these markings were indeed performed at least in some sort of informal or pedagogical music rehearsal at the school, if not during a Sunday church service. All of the masses that are annotated have written numbers above some groups of rests that indicate how many beats the singer should pause before beginning the next phrase. Other annotations include various vertical and horizontal lines above notes and syllables in the text. In addition to rest numbers in the *Missa Pange lingua*, mensuration signs are added near the end of the Credo, right before the “et vitam venturi” section. There is a pattern to the annotations that suggests only certain masses were performed in Heilbronn; a mass (or mass movement) will either have markings in all four partbooks or none at all. The *Missa Pange lingua*, *Missa Da pacem*, and the *Missa Sub tuum praesidium* have rest numbers and other markings throughout all five movements, there are annotations in the Agnus Dei of the *Missa l’homme armé*, and in the Credo of the *Missae O gloriosa*.

Unfortunately, there are several *Missae tredecim* exemplars with very little information on their original owners. The Nederlands Muziek Instituut at The Hague holds a set of three surviving *Missae tredecim* partbooks that belonged to banker and

---

87 There are also several handwritten markings in the *Novum et insigne opus musicum* II, which Gustavson discusses in great detail. See Gustavson, 756-57.
music historian Daniel F. Scheurleer (1855-1927). The exact original provenance of the partbook is unknown, but it is possible they originally came from a Lutheran school in Saxony. The Missae tredecim held at the Universitäts-und Landesbibliothek at Halle an der Saale is another exemplar with an elusive provenance. It is bound together with four other Nuremberg prints, and has no discernable handwritten annotations. Gustavson suggests a provenance of Saxony or Anhalt, but currently nothing definite is known about the partbooks until they reached the university library at Halle. Based on a previous shelfmark (Nd.22.I [1-4]), it can be assumed that the partbooks were in the university collection prior to when a catalogue with those shelfmarks was prepared by Otto Hartwig between 1876 and 1882.

A few Missae tredecim exemplars are listed in the records and catalogues of nineteenth-century book antiquarians, which sheds some light on their otherwise unknown provenances. The Augsburg bookseller Fidelis Butsch (1805-1879) apparently had several copies of Missae tredecim for sale. Around the year 1840, the Regensburg cleric Carl Proske (1794-1861) purchased at least one, if not two copies from Butsch which are held at the Regensburg Bischöfliche Zentralbibliothek. Proske was a passionate proponent of earlier liturgical music particularly chant, and put forth his time and money to restoring sacred medieval and Renaissance music in Regensburg liturgies. He amassed

---

88 The Missae tredecim partbooks contain a bookplate with Scheurleer’s initials that is found in his other music books. For more on Scheurleer and his other music books currently held at the Nederlands Muziek Instituut, see Gustavson, 738-740.

89 Gustavson cites a handwritten reference to Elector Augustus of Saxony in a Novum et insigne opus musicum exemplar from Scheurleer’s collection also housed at the Nederlands Muziek Instituut. There is no concrete connection between this exemplar and the Missae tredecim exemplar other than Scheurleer’s ownership, but Saxony is a reasonable guess due to the amount of other Missae tredecim copies from that region with similar handwritten annotations. Gustavson, 747.

90 Gustavson, 751.

91 Ibid., 750, n60.
a considerable collection of this music, which is now part of the diocesan library in Regensburg. The Proske exemplar with the shelfmark C. 62a is actually one of the most heavily annotated Missae tredecim copies. Seven of the thirteen masses, including the Missa Pange lingua, contain a variety of handwritten notes. In contrast, the other exemplar most likely purchased by Proske, shelfmark B.44, does not contain any pre-modern markings in the four surviving partbooks.

In addition to the two copies sold to Carl Proske, Fidelis Butsch had a third Missae tredecim exemplar for sale in 1846. In a catalog published during that year, Butsch listed the contratenor and bassus partbooks for sale, but no other trace of these partbooks have surfaced—there are no known exemplars that consist of only these two partbooks.92 There is yet another instance of a nineteenth-century antiquarian catalog entry, but with a more fruitful conclusion. The Munich antiquarian Jacques Rosenthal (1854-1937) lists a single tenor partbook of Missae tredecim in a catalog.93 He notes that the cover bears the year 1545, and that half of the page CC2 is torn off. In 1995, the Cambridge University Library acquired a tenor partbook of Missae tredecim with 1545 on the cover, and with that exact page torn.

Table 3.9 lists the number of times I found at least one distinct handwritten marking in each of the Missae tredecim mass in the seventeen exemplars I was able to examine.94 This raw data is far from flawless and the story it tells is incomplete: in many cases the exemplars are missing at least one partbook, and some markings more strongly


94 As of September 2014 I have seen all of the extant Missae tredecim exemplars except those in Paris and Krakow, either digitally or in person.
indicate performance and/or liturgical use, and the data given does not account for individual voice partbooks or mass movements. Nevertheless, this current sampling does show that the masses were given unequal attention in terms of marking up the music. The Missa Pange lingua was clearly favored, along with the Missa Bon temps and Missa Sub tuum praesidium. A few were only marked up in a single exemplar, and I was not able to find any distinct hand markings in the Missa Petrus apostolus.

Table 3.9

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Instances of Handwritten Markings in Missae tredecim Exemplars</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Missa Ave Regina</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Missa Fortuna desperata</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Missa Bon temps</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Missa Salva nos</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Missa L’homme armé super voces musicales</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Missa Fröhlich wesen</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Missa Pange lingua</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Missa Cum Iocunditate</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Missa Da pacem</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Missa Sub tuum praesidium</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Missa O gloriosa</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Missa Petrus Apostolus</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Missa de Sancto Antonio</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

The Missae tredecim copies from Heilbronn, Kassel, Rostock, Zwickau, two of the Regensburg exemplars (A.R. 91 and C 62a), and the tenor partbook from Vienna all have at least one discernable handwritten marking in the Missa Pange lingua. The annotations in this mass are similar to annotations found in other masses and suggest a practical, perhaps pedagogical use for the partbooks. Text is written into the final Agnus Dei in the copies from Kassel, Vienna, and RegC 62a. Other annotations include mensuration lines, numbers above rests to indicate the number of beats, and some slight

---

95 As described above, the tenor partbook held at the Österreichische Nationalbibliothek has a different cover from the other three partbooks there which lacks the Fugger coat of arms and suggests a provenance different from the Fugger library.
rhythmic and mensuration alterations near the end of the Credo. These are not heavy-duty additions to the mass, but they strongly suggest that the Missa Pange lingua was performed from the print somewhere by Lutherans, even if it was only in music classrooms. Even the extremely unlikely scenario of people marking up the music for their own silent study rather than performance is still an instance of intellectual engagement with the work.

If a Missae tredecim exemplar was not owned by a school or church, individuals could have used it for recreational purposes. Recreational singing, however, did not eliminate the possibility for written markings similar to those found in several exemplars. There is documented evidence of none other than Martin Luther himself annotating music partbooks by hand. The oft-cited account by his physician, Matthäus Ratzeberger, reads: “Luther was also accustomed immediately after the evening meal to fetch from his study his partbooks and with his table companions, who delighted in music, made music together with them.”96 Ratzeberger continues: “It is noteworthy that from time to time when he [Luther] found false notation in a new song [they were singing], he immediately took it away and saw that it was correctly set and rectified.”97

Johannes Ott claimed that he selected older mass settings for their artistic merit when assembling repertoire for Missae tredecim. While the Missa Pange lingua was arguably a technically and aesthetically exceptional work at the time, it is unlikely that

---

96 Matthäus Ratzeberger, Die handschriftliche Geschichte Ratzeberger’s über Luther und seine Zeit, ed. Christian Gotthold Neudecker (Jena: Druck und Verlag Friedrich Mauke, 1850), 59. English and the original German translations can be found in Chartaris, 41; and Leaver, Luther’s Liturgical Music, 47.

97 Ratzeberger, 59. Quoted and translated in Chartaris, 77, Leaver, 47, and Paul Nettl, Luther and Music, 61. Given this description, it is rather tempting to imagine Luther correcting the misspelling of “tollis” and adding La Rue’s name in the Missae tredecim exemplar from the Electoral Library in Wittenberg (now held in Jena). Of course, there is no evidence connecting the Jena Missae tredecim or any other extant copy to Luther.
Ott carefully selected the work (along with the twelve other masses) from hundreds of available mass settings. He could certainly imply that was the case when trying to market the print, but the reality of the situation is that he was a bookseller in a Lutheran city that was beginning a revival of liturgical Latin polyphony. He was not working for an influential political figure with an abundance of musical resources and connections. Ott also downplays the masses (and the pieces in his other prints) as liturgical music. He comments on current liturgical practices in a few sporadic places in the prefaces, but ultimately he is not advertising Missae tredecim as an essential book for Sunday morning services, Catholic or Lutheran. The pre-existing materials in the thirteen masses have a variety of origins and liturgical associations; if there was a symbolic pattern to the mass settings or their order in the print, it is not immediately evident.

There is also a confessional irony to this repertoire that was published and performed by Lutherans, particularly the masses in Missae tredecim. The two institutions that vehemently fought the spread of Lutheranism—the Holy Roman Empire and the Vatican—also inadvertently preserved and supplied music for the movement. The Missa Pange lingua, as well as the other contents of Missae tredecim, might have reminded Lutherans of objectionable practices and doctrines such as votive Masses, the Mass as a sacrifice, and excessive veneration of the Eucharist, Mary and the saints. However, it appears that Lutherans overlooked the polemical theological and cultural contexts of these masses and used them for liturgical, pedagogical, and even recreational purposes
Chapter 4: The Post-1550 Lutheran Missa Pange lingua

The many exemplars of the Missae tredecim print allowed the Missa Pange lingua—and the other masses in the anthology—to be disseminated throughout Lutheran Germany. The Lutheran use and transmission of the Missa Pange lingua, however, was not confined to the Missae tredecim print. The mass survives in five manuscripts that post-date Ott’s print and are firmly linked to Lutheran owners. Readings of the mass in three of these manuscripts indicate that their scribes consulted Missae tredecim when copying the Missa Pange lingua. In this chapter, I will argue that the Lutheran use of the Missa Pange lingua was not part of a transient phase in early years of the Reformation fueled solely by a single print. Rather, the compilers of these later manuscripts selected Josquin’s mass for the Blessed Sacrament for further circulation more often than other Renaissance masses available to them. Moreover, as with the Missae tredecim exemplars, the manuscripts are scattered geographically. Two come from the Mecklenburg-Schwerin region of north Germany, and the others were produced and/or used in Saxony, Bavaria, and Moravia. In addition to being evidence for the widespread Lutheran circulation of the Missa Pange lingua in the middle-to-late sixteenth century, the manuscripts discussed in this chapter also provide some insight into how Lutherans used the Missa Pange lingua and how they adapted this work and other Mass Ordinary settings from earlier Catholic sources.

In the critical commentary for the Missa Pange lingua in the New Josquin Edition, Willem Elders notes that this mass is the only Josquin mass for which there are multiple manuscripts that post-date a printed edition. In his discussion of the Missa
Pange lingua sources, Elders states that LeipU 49/50 and RosU 49 both “derive” from Missae tredecim, and that RegC 100 was “almost certainly” copied from that Nuremberg print.\footnote{NJE, 4.3, 78-79.} Jaap van Benthem names Missae tredecim as the model for LeipU 49/50, RegC 100, and RosU 71/3 in his critical commentary for the online edition of the Occo Codex repertoire.\footnote{Jaap van Benthem, Manrix van Berchum, Anna Dieleman, Theodor Dumitrescu, and Frans Wiering, eds., “The Occo Codex,” The Computer Mensural Music Editing Project, http://www.cmme.org. Van Benthem does not mention RosU 49 at all in his discussion of the Missa Pange lingua transmission, so it is possible that he mistakenly switched the two sources. Either way, this commentary does not discount the idea of RosU 49 deriving from the Missae tredecim.} My analysis of LeipU 49/50, RosU 49 and RegC 100 corroborates previous editorial commentaries stating that these manuscripts were copied from Missae tredecim. The other two manuscripts in this chapter, RosU 71/3 and Brno 15/4 have received much less attention. Analysis of these sources reveals a more indirect relationship between Missae tredecim. Furthermore, as I will show, RosU 71/3 has an apparent connection to RosU 49 that has not previously been investigated.

Leipzig and Albertine Saxony

LeipU 49/50, the earliest of the three Missae tredecim manuscripts, consists of discantus, alto, tenor, and bass partbooks bearing the call number 49, and a fifth vagans partbook with the call number 50. The partbooks were copied in 1558—the date appears on the covers of the first four partbooks—and several generations of scholars are in agreement that it was copied and used at the Thomaskirche in Leipzig, where Johann Sebastian Bach would serve as cantor a century and a half later.\footnote{Laura Youens’s dissertation is the most extensive study of the manuscript to date. For an overview of Leipzig 49/50 in earlier secondary sources, see Laura Youens, “Music for the Lutheran Mass in Leipzig, Universitätsbibliothek, MS. Thomaskirche 49/50 (PhD diss., Indiana University, 1978), 1-15.} The Thomaskirche was
a Lutheran church at the time LeipU 49/50 was produced, but recognition of the
Reformation in Leipzig was not a simple endeavor that happened overnight. Western
electoral Saxony was the cradle of the Reformation, whereas eastern ducal Saxony, where
Leipzig is located, embraced the Reformation only after a period of resistance. The
religious attitudes of the respective regions were shaped in large part by their rulers. At
the time of the Reformation, electoral Saxony was ruled by Frederick the Wise, who
protected Martin Luther and allowed the dissenting theological dialogues to continue at
the Wittenberg University without breaking his personal and professional ties to
Catholicism. Ducal Saxony was under the leadership of Duke Georg (1471-1539), who
was educated by a strict Catholic tutor and developed intolerance for any “dangerous”
“heretical” Bohemian movements. Beginning in 1524, Leipzig citizens had to travel to
towns in electoral Saxony to attend Lutheran services, and in the same year Georg issued
an order against the possession, reading, and sale of all Protestant publications.

When Georg died on April 17, 1539, his brother Heinrich inherited the duchy of
Saxony. Heinrich set the stage for change in Leipzig by issuing edicts that forbade the
persecution of both Lutherans and Catholic liturgies in Leipzig. Leipzig formally
embraced the Reformation through festivities that began on Friday, May 23, 1539, with
Martin Luther officiating at services throughout the weekend. However, this
proclamation did not end the religious controversies in Leipzig. The Town Council still

---

4 Saxony was once united and had been ruled by the Wettin house since 1425. In 1482, Ernest and Albert, the sons of Frederick II, inherited Saxony and Albert decided that the land should be divided between the two brothers. The physical separation came in 1485, with Ernest taking electoral Saxony and Albert taking ducal Saxony. Thus, electoral Saxony and ducal Saxony are sometimes referred to as Ernestine Saxony and Albertine Saxony, respectively.

5 Youens, 85.

6 Ibid., 88.
felt a bit uneasy for reasons that were political rather than theological; they were taken
aback that Heinrich did not consult with the aristocracy before converting the city, they
were concerned about the charge of “turn-coat” if they supported the new duke, and they
were worried about losing the privilege of buying Catholic properties that Duke Georg
had granted them.\footnote{Ibid., 88-89.}

The first \textit{Kirchenordnung} for ducal Saxony was produced later in 1539. This
\textit{Kirchenordnung}, along with its later revisions, indicates that the \textit{Missa Pange lingua} and
other Latin Mass Ordinary settings would have a place in the Lutheran liturgy at Leipzig.
The first \textit{Kirchenordnung} is entitled \textit{Kirchenordnung zum Anfang für die diener der
kirchen in Herzog Heinrichen zu Sachsen fürstenthum gestellet}.\footnote{EK. 1, teil 1 (Leipzig: O.R. Reisland, 1902), 264-281} The preface to the
\textit{Kirchenordnung} was dated September 19, 1539, and was signed by the following
members of a committee appointed by Duke Heinrich to assess the progress of
Lutheranism in his territory: Justus Jonas, Georg Spalatin, Caspar Cruciger, Friedrich
Myconius, Justus Menius, and Johannes Weler.

Instructions for the Sunday Communion service are found in the \textit{Kirchenordnung}
under a section labeled “Communio.”\footnote{Ibid., 271.} The Kyrie and Gloria are to be sung in their
original languages, the Credo is sung in German, and the Latin Sanctus and Agnus could
be used “at times, particularly for feasts.”\footnote{...zuzeiten, sonderlich auf die festa. Ibid., 271.} In contrast, the same \textit{Kirchenordnung} also
contained liturgical instructions for the “Dörfen,” or villages. The Sunday service for the
rural areas of the duchy were primarily in German, and several items such as the Kyrie
and Gloria are not mentioned at all. In the 1540 and 1555 revised editions of the (city) *Kirchenordnung*, the Latin Credo is added to the service, and it is to be followed by the German version. The revised editions also add Psalm 111 to the list of appropriate pieces during the distribution of Communion, along with the Sanctus and Agnus Dei.12

Table 4.1

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Leipzig Kirchenordnungen</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>Kirchenordnung</strong></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Kyrie</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Gloria</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Credo</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Sanctus</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Agnus Dei</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

The *Missa Pange lingua* is based on a hymn that was sung during various rituals for Corpus Christi, a feast that was eradicated by the vast majority of Lutheran communities. However, Leipzig (and the rest of ducal Saxony) actually came very close to retaining the feast through the Leipzig Interim. Dissatisfied with the Augsburg Interim, Moritz tasked Georg von Anhalt with writing an alternative, which became known as the


12 The section for Communion music in the 1539 order is as follows, with the addition of Psalm 111 to the 1540 and 1555 revision in brackets: ...las man darauf das volk singen, Jesus Christus unser heiland etc. oder got sei gelobet etc. Auch mag man zuzeiten, sonderlich auf die festa, die paraphrasim und vermanung dem volk forzulesen, nachlassen, und dafür die latinische prefation singen, darauf das latinische sanctus, nach dem selbigen das vater unser und die verba testament deudsch, und darauf unter der communio das agnus dei latinisch, sampt dem deudschen gesang, Jesus Christus, [man mag auch den 111. psalm singen] nach dem der communicaten viel oder wenig sein.
Leipzig Interim. Philipp Melanchthon was not pleased with a revised version of the
document. Ultimately, in the words of Youens, “politics as well as [Melanchthon’s]
procrastination” prevented the Leipzig Interim from being instituted. Over the course of
300 pages, the Interim retained many Catholic practices that could seem counterintuitive
to the Reformation, including the observance of Corpus Christi. It is important to
remember how close ducal Saxony came to retaining the feast not only because of the
implications within that territory, but also because the ducal Saxon Kirchenordnungen
was influential in other Lutheran communities throughout Germany.

LeipU 49/50 contains a total of 243 works from a variety of genres: settings of the
Mass Ordinary and Mass Propers, motets, Magnificats, office hymns, processional
hymns, Passion settings, German sacred pieces, Te Deums, Lamintation settings,
responses, a canticle, a set of textless canons (in LeipU 50 only), and 2 secular pieces
(one in Italian and one in German). The manuscript was copied by multiple scribes and
was not the most organized endeavor. In addition to the inconsistent ordering of the
pieces, several were copied into the partbooks twice. Nevertheless, some attempts at
organization are evident. Youens has identified thirteen series that consist of between

---

13 The Augsburg Interim was a decree made on May 15, 1548 following the Diet of Augsburg that contained directions for Lutheran worship. It was supposed to be a compromise between the Catholics and Lutherans, but was regarded as being overtly Catholic. Nevertheless, it allowed the marriage of priests, communion in both forms, and the right of the state to confiscate church property.

14 The text of the Leipzig Interim is printed in Carolus G. Bretschneider, ed., Philippi Melanthonis Opera quae supersunt omnia, Corpus Reformatorum vol. 7 (Halle: Schwetschke and Sons, 1840), 25-64.

15 Youens provides a complete catalog of the manuscript in her dissertation. A catalog of both LeipU 49/50 and LeipU 51 was published around the same time as her dissertation: Wolfgang Orf, Die Musikhandschriften Thomaskirche Mss. 49/50 und 51 in der Universitätsbibliothek Leipzig, Quellenkataloge zur Musikgeschichte 13 ed. Richard Schaal (Wilhelmshaven: Heinrichshofen’s Verlag, 1977). However, see Youens’s remarks in a review of the catalog: Laura Youens, review of Die Musikhandschriften Thomaskirche Mss. 49/50 und 51 in der Universitätsbibliothek Leipzig by Wolfgang Orf, Tijdschrift van de Vereniging voor Nederlandse Muziekgeschiedenis 29, no. 1 (1979): 59-62.

16 See Youens, 323-325 for a list.
four and fifty compositions that are somehow related.\textsuperscript{17} The \textit{Missa Pange lingua} is part of the first series, series II contains ten introits and Series III contains five sequences. In both of these series, the order of the liturgical calendar is mostly observed. The pieces in the fourth series share a common composer, Thomas Stoltzer. The polyphonic setting of \textit{Pange lingua} is found in Series IX, which is the largest series in the manuscript. It contains fifty motets that vary in length, number of voices, and textual source.

Elders and van Benthem both state that \textit{Missae tredecim} was the exemplar that the copyist of LeipU 49/50 consulted for the \textit{Missa Pange lingua}. My comparison of these two sources corroborates the two editorial commentaries and further emphasizes the haphazard production of LeipU 49/50. The readings of the mass are indeed similar.

Unlike the earlier \textit{Missa Pange lingua} manuscript sources discussed in the two previous chapters, the ligatures and the order of rests in LeipU 49/50 are almost completely consistent with the \textit{Missae tredecim} reading. LeipU 49/50 also copies a couple of errors that are found in \textit{Missae tredecim} but not in the Alamire sources, MunBS 510, or VatS 16. These variants include a scalar passage in the Credo of the discantus voice and an extra cadential motive at the end of the Sanctus.

The differences that do exist between the two \textit{Missa Pange lingua} readings seem to be the result of hurried or careless copying. In addition to a few stray variants on a single note, several brief passages are omitted in each voice. There is no pattern to the length of the omitted section—they vary from two notes to several measures of music—and the sections are not consistent with each voice part. For instance, there are omissions in at the end of the Gloria, the middle of the Pleni sunt, and near the end of the Hosanna sections of the Contratenor voice, while the Bassus voice has omissions near the end of

\textsuperscript{17} For a description of each series in LeipU 49, see Youens, 229-253.
the Kyrie I and the end of the Credo. Finally, a significant factor in the relationship of LeipU 49/50 to Missae tredecim is that both lack the Agnus II duet, which fundamentally discounts the possibility of LeipU 49/50 being copied from an earlier source that does contain all three Agnus Dei sections.

Two mid-sixteenth century music inventories from the Thomaskirche provide even further evidence of a connection between Missae tredecim and LeipU 49/50. Wolfgang Orf has identified the Missae tredecim print in the Thomaskirche music inventories of 1551 and 1564, which indicates that the church possessed a copy of the print while LeipU 49/50 was being produced.\textsuperscript{18} The 1551 inventory contains an entry that reads, “4 partes Roh, uneingebunden, gedruckt misse Tredeim 4 vocum,” and the 1564 inventory contains a similar entry with a description that is even more specific: “Vier partes Roh, vngebunden, gedruckt. Missae treecim quatuor Vocum. Seind in pergament eingehafft.”\textsuperscript{19}

\textsuperscript{18} The Leipzig exemplar is unfortunately lost.

\textsuperscript{19} Orf, 171, 173.
### Table 4.2

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Mass</th>
<th>Composer</th>
<th>Contents</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Missa Pange lingua</td>
<td>Josquin</td>
<td>Complete</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Missa Dung petit mot</td>
<td>Thomas Créquillone</td>
<td>Complete</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Missa Paschal</td>
<td>Forster/Walter/ Galliculus</td>
<td>Kyrie, Gloria, Sanctus</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Missa Hierusalem luge</td>
<td>Georg Nötel</td>
<td>Kyrie, Gloria, Credo</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Missa VI vocum farijs natalibus Domini Christi</td>
<td>Anonymous</td>
<td>Complete</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Missa Veni sancte spiritus</td>
<td>Josquin?</td>
<td>Complete</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Missa paschal</td>
<td>Anonymous</td>
<td>Kyrie, Gloria, Agnus</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Missa paschal</td>
<td>Thomas Pöpel</td>
<td>Kyrie, Gloria, Sanctus, Agnus</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Missa de beata Virgine</td>
<td>Josquin</td>
<td>Cum sancto spiritu</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Missa de profundis</td>
<td>Anonymous</td>
<td>Complete</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Missa Christ ist erstanden</td>
<td>Johannes Hähnel (Galliculus)</td>
<td>Kyrie, Gloria, Sanctus, Agnus</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Missa sine nomine I</td>
<td>Anonymous</td>
<td>Complete, with 4 Kyries</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Missa Tous les regres</td>
<td>Pierre de la Rue</td>
<td>Kyrie, Gloria</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Missa sine nomine II</td>
<td>Anonymous</td>
<td>Kyrie, Gloria</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Missa sine nomine III</td>
<td>Anonymous</td>
<td>Complete</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Missa Quam pulchra es</td>
<td>Dominique Phinot</td>
<td>Complete</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

In addition to LeipU 49/50, the repertoire from the manuscript LeipU 51 warrants consideration. LeipU 51 was copied around 1555 with a few slightly later additions, and was likely compiled under the direction of Melchior Heger, who was cantor at the Thomaskirche from 1553 until 1564. Both LeipU 49/50 and 51 were kept at the Thomaskirche until 1930 and then transferred to the Universitätsbibliothek in Leipzig. The manuscripts were also temporarily removed from the university library during World War II for safekeeping. All five hands that copied pieces into LeipU 51 are also found in LeipU 49/50. This evidence suggests that these two manuscripts shared a common provenance of the Leipzig Thomaskirche in the middle of the sixteenth century. Together, they provide an indication of which earlier polyphonic compositions were significant enough to be copied from other prints and manuscripts into new manuscripts. Only the tenor and bass partbooks of LeipU 51 survive, although an extensive reconstructive study

---

20 CCM 2, 33
of the manuscript was completed by Thomas Noblitt in 1981.\footnote{Thomas Noblitt, “A Reconstruction of Ms. Thomaskirche 51 of the Universitätsbibliothek Leipzig (olim III, A. α. 22-23),” Tijdschrift van de Vereniging voor Nederlandse Muziekgeschiedenis 31, no. 1 (1981): 16-72.} The manuscript contains 101 pieces almost exclusively in Latin, including sixty-two motets, twenty masses, and nineteen Latin pieces with classical meters.\footnote{There is one German sacred piece, \textit{Jauchzet dem Herrn, alle Welt}, and the text of the final piece in the manuscript was simply omitted.}

Noblitt found that seventy-four pieces—nearly three-fourths of the repertoire in LeipU 51—are concordant with various sixteenth-century prints. Three sections of the manuscript reproduce pieces from earlier prints; not every single piece from the prints was copied, but the pieces that were included in LeipU 51 follow the same order as the prints. Section III of LeipU 51 corresponds with \textit{Harmoniae poeticae Pauli Hofheimeri}, (Petreius 1539), Section IV with \textit{Symphoniae jucundae atque adeo breves 4 vocum} (Rhau 1538), \textit{Modulationes aliquot quatuor vocum selectissimae} (Petreius 1538), and \textit{Selectisimarum mutetarum partim quinque partim quatuor vocum tomus primus} (Petreius 1540), and finally Section V corresponds with \textit{Opus decem missarum quatuor vocum} (Rhau 1541).\footnote{See Noblitt, 19, for a list of exactly which pieces from these prints appear in LeipU 51.} Noblitt then turns to the first section of LeipU 51, which consists of 15 Mass Ordinary settings. The section in the manuscript ends with the phrase, “quindecim missarum finis,” which is typically found at the end of prints, and many of the masses have only one Agnus Dei when a second or third are known to exist—a common trait with the masses in Ott’s \textit{Missae tredecim}. The repertoire of Section I, like that of \textit{Missae tredecim}, is from a previous generation of composers.
Given this evidence, Noblitt suggests that Section I of LeipU 51 was copied from a second Mass Ordinary anthology printed by Johannes Ott. The sequel to *Missae tredecim* is mentioned in Ott’s application for an imperial publishing privilege in 1545 as a collection of masses for four, five, and six voices. Royston Gustavson raises several valid arguments against this hypothesis and believes that Ott’s intended second volume of...
masses was never actually produced.\textsuperscript{24} Ott died a year after receiving the privilege for the masses, and so it is quite likely he did not have enough time to print it. The privilege also specifies that the masses would be in four, five, or six voices, and twelve of the fifteen masses in Section I are known to be for four voices (it is impossible to determine the number of voices for the remaining masses since they are unica and only two partbooks of LeipU 51 survive). Also, there are no extant exemplars of this second book of masses, and no solid evidence of the print in any contemporary catalogs or inventories. That point is especially significant since so many copies of Missae tredecim survive, and there is evidence of even more institutions owning copies that are currently lost. If Ott’s first collection of masses was so popular, wouldn’t there be at least some concrete trace of his second collection, if it was indeed produced?

Whether or not Section I of LeipU 51 is a reproduction of a second volume of masses compiled by Ott, his first volume was certainly not copied into LeipU 51 or LeipU 49/50 in such a way. The Thomaskirche exemplar of Missae tredecim does not survive, so we cannot see if it was marked up in a similar manner to extant exemplars from other Lutheran schools and churches. However, the Missa Pange lingua is the only piece from Missae tredecim that appears in LeipU 49/50 or 51, so it seems that whoever compiled the repertoire for these manuscripts specifically selected the Missa Pange lingua from among all the masses in the print. The physical characteristics of LeipU 49/50 indicate that the partbooks served a practical purpose at the Thomaskirche—they were most likely used in the school and subsequently during services at the church. The borrowed melodic material and its polemic context was probably not first on the minds of

those who copied the *Missa Pange lingua* into LeipU 49/50; rather, the mass was probably perceived as a useful and aesthetically-pleasing teaching exercise by the great Josquin. Furthermore, the *Missa Pange lingua* (as with any of the Mass Ordinary settings) would be in accordance with the Latin-oriented liturgy that was in vogue at the Thomaskirche in the mid sixteenth century.

**The Missa Pange lingua and Duke Johann Albrecht I of Mecklenburg-Schwerin**

RosU 49 is another manuscript *Missa Pange lingua* source that Elders and van Benthem identify as being a direct descendent of the *Missae tredecim* print. This manuscript bears the title *Opus Musicum excellens et novum*, consists of six paper partbooks and has twenty-one pieces in common with LeipU 49/50, including the *Missa Pange lingua*. In fact, RosU 49 is the source with the most pieces in common with LeipU 49/50, following DresSL Grimma 59, which shares fifteen pieces.²⁵ A dedicatory inscription on the title page concretely establishes the basic information about the production and provenance of the manuscript. RosU 49 was compiled and copied by Jacob Praetorius in 1566. Jacob (c. 1530-1586) was the father of Hieronymus Praetorius, and moved to Hamburg after converting to the Lutheran faith.²⁶ He is recorded as being a clerk at the Jacobikirche and the chapel of St. Gertrud in 1550. In 1554 he became the assistant organist for both institutions, and served as the first organist from 1558 until his death in 1586.²⁷ Jacob Praetorius dedicated the manuscript to Duke Johann Albrecht I of

---

²⁵ Youens, 345.

²⁶ Unrelated to Michael Praetorius.

Mecklenburg-Schwerin (1525-1576). Lothar Hoffman-Erbrecht suggested that Praetorius might have worked as an organist in Mecklenburg before moving to Hamburg and the duke ordered the manuscript from him. Hoffman-Erbrecht believed it is more probable, however, that Praetorius created the manuscript on his own and dedicated and presented RosU 49 to the duke with the hope of receiving a monetary gift.\(^{28}\)

Duke Johann Albrecht I supported the spread of Lutheranism in Mecklenburg, and RosU 49 was intended to be a collection of Lutheran liturgical music. Hoffmann-Erbrecht even suggested that the repertoire in RosU 49 was representative of Lutheran music in Saxony and could have provided a foundation of liturgical music according to the Saxon liturgy for the duke.\(^{29}\) When the Reformation—along with ecclesiastical and political opposition—arrived in nearby towns such as Malchin, Güstrow, and Rostock, Mecklenburg was ruled by Duke Heinrich V and his brother Albrecht I. Albrecht regarded the Lutheran preachers with skepticism. On the other hand, Heinrich allowed them to preach in his realm, and the region soon converted to Lutheranism. *Kirchenordnungen* for the first Lutheran service in Mecklenburg were published on January 25, 1534 for Malchin.\(^{30}\) Duke Johann Albrecht I, a nephew of Heinrich, ruled alongside his uncle until Heinrich’s death in 1552. At first Johann Albrecht was the sole ruler of Mecklenburg, and then he was joined by his brother Ulrich.\(^{31}\) Similar to the situation in the previous generation, Johann Albrecht continued his uncle Heinrich’s

\(^{28}\) Ibid., 97.

\(^{29}\) Ibid.

\(^{30}\) Youens, 175.

\(^{31}\) EK 5,132.
effort to promote Lutheranism in his territory whereas Ulrich was against the
Reformation.\textsuperscript{32}

The first \textit{Kirchenordnung} for Mecklenburg was issued in 1540. It was a verbatim
copy of the Brandenburg-Nuremberg \textit{Kirchenordnung} of 1533 entitled \textit{Kerken
Ordeninghe, wo idth van den Evangelischen Predicanten und Kerken deners mit den
ceremonien und Gades densten, in dene Forstendome Meykelnborch geholden schal
warden}. It provides specific details about the liturgical music, including that the Mass
Ordinary texts were performed in both Latin and German. The Kyrie could be in Greek or
German, and there are several pages of Kyrie settings for various liturgical occasions.
The Gloria was sung in German, the Credo and Sanctus could be in either German or
Latin, and the Agnus Dei was in German. Johann Albrecht ordered a revised
\textit{Kirchenordnung} in 1552, which followed the trend of flexibility and inclusion of both
Latin and German.\textsuperscript{33} The Agnus Dei is listed only in Latin among other pieces that could
be sung during communion: \textit{Gott sei gelobt, Esaia dem proheten}, and if there were many
people receiving communion on a particular day, Psalm 111. At the conclusion of
communion, the German Agnus Dei, \textit{Christe du lam gottes}, was to be sung. This
\textit{Kirchenordnung} also included separate liturgical instructions for villages in which the
Sanctus is not mentioned at all and the other four Ordinary sections are in German.\textsuperscript{34}

\textsuperscript{32} Hoffman-Erbrecht, 97.

\textsuperscript{33} The entire \textit{Kirchenordnung} is included in EK 5 and is quite extensive. The description of the Sunday
liturgy is found on EK 5, 198-99.

\textsuperscript{34} EK 5, 202.
Table 4.4

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Kirchenordnungen for Mecklenburg</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>Mass Section</strong></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Kyrie</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Gloria</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Credo</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Sanctus</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Agnus Dei</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

RosU 49 contains 204 compositions, including twenty-five Mass Ordinaries, thirty-two Mass Propers, twenty-four Magnificats, twenty-three psalms, thirty-seven motets, and forty-three hymns, including a setting of *Pange lingua*. There are also Te Deums, a Passion, responses, and settings of *Benedicamus Domino*. Only 48 of the 204 pieces in RosU 49 are attributed to a composer—the rest are anonymous. RosU 49 was apparently the first of two volumes, the second of which is lost. In an overview of sources containing the works of Thomas Stoltzer, Hoffmann-Erbrecht postulated that Praetorius was familiar with LeipU 49/50, since the two manuscripts are so similar and contain types of pieces with the same liturgical functions. However, the contents of RosU are actually more organized than LeipU 49/50. The manuscript is divided into four series, which are further subdivided by genre.

---

35 For a complete index of Rostock 49, see Hoffmann-Ergrecht, 104-121.

36 In Format, in der Anlage nach liturgischen Gesichtspunkten und auch in der Auswahl der Werke lassen sich zwischen beiden Manuskripten Beziehungen nachweisen, so daß man annehmen muß, Praetorius habe die Leipziger Handschrift gekannt. Lothar Hoffmann-Erbrecht, *Thomas Stoltzer: Leben und Schaffen* (Kassel: Johann Philipp Hinnenthal-Verlag, 1964), 44.
Table 4.5

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Organization of RosU 49</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>Series I</strong></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>36 responsories, Te Deum settings, 19 introits</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Series II</strong></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>12 four-voice masses, 11 five-voice masses, 2 six-voice masses</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Series III</strong></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>15 alleluias with sequences, four responses, 7 Benedicamus settings</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Series IV</strong></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>23 psalms, 43 hymns, 24 Magnificats</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Unlike Johannes Ott, who wanted to preserve the works of revered composers from a previous generation in his *Missae tredecim*, Jacob Praetorius included masses by a variety of composers from Germany and the Low Countries. There does not seem to be a discernable pattern with these composers in terms of geographic region or place of employment. For instance, there are no masses by Pierre de la Rue, who worked at the court of Margaret of Austria. RosU 49 contains mostly mass settings with at least one subsection, i.e., each mass will have at least one Agnus Dei section, even if the composer actually wrote two or three. In LeipU 49/50, however, two masses in LeipU 49/50 consist of only the Kyrie and Gloria, and multiple mass settings are missing the Credo.

As with LeipU 49/50, the *Missa Pange lingua* is the only composition from *Missae tredecim* found in RosU 49, and the Agnus II duet is missing. Comparative analysis of *Missae tredecim*, LeipU 49/50, and RosU 49 reveals an exceptionally strong concordance between *Missae tredecim* and RosU 49, with the single variant occurring in the Credo. In the bassus voice, a semibreve in *Missae tredecim* is changed to a breve in RosU 49 at the beginning of the word “visibilium.” The only other noticeable deviation from the print in RosU 49 is the use of fermatas at the end of sections in the mass, such as the first Kyrie.\textsuperscript{37} The random passages that are missing in LeipU 49/50 are all present in RosU 49, which indicates that Jacob Praetorius did not use LeipU 49/50 as an exemplar.

\textsuperscript{37} Most of these fermatas are present in LeipU 49/50 as well, but there are so many other notational variants that separate LeipU and RosU 49 that they are not a significant factor in the comparison of the two manuscripts.
Nevertheless, he, like the scribes at the Thomaskirche, selected the *Missa Pange lingua* to appear in his manuscript for Duke Johann Albrecht I. Perhaps this was because Praetorius was modeling his collection after the Lutheran liturgy in Saxony and its associated music. It is also possible that Praetorius had his own reasons for ensuring that the duke had a copy of the *Missa Pange lingua*.

Table 4.6

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Mass</th>
<th>Composer</th>
<th>Contents</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><em>Missa Quem dicunt homines</em></td>
<td>Anonymous</td>
<td>Complete</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><em>Missa Pange lingua</em></td>
<td>Josquin</td>
<td>Complete</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><em>Missa Damours me plains</em></td>
<td>Cricquillon</td>
<td>Complete</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><em>Missa In me transierunt</em></td>
<td>Anonymous</td>
<td>Complete</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><em>Missa Bewar mich herr</em></td>
<td>Anonymous</td>
<td>Complete</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><em>Missa De beata virgine</em></td>
<td>Josquin</td>
<td>Complete</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><em>Missa Intemerata virgo</em></td>
<td>Lupus Helinck</td>
<td>Kyrie, Gloria, Credo, Sanctus</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><em>Missa Kain in der Welt so schon</em></td>
<td>Cricquillon</td>
<td>Complete</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><em>Missa Duarum facierum</em></td>
<td>Petrus Molu</td>
<td>Complete</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><em>Missa Dominical</em></td>
<td>Guilhelmus Braitengraser</td>
<td>Complete</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><em>Missa Dominical</em></td>
<td>Adam Rener</td>
<td>Complete</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><em>Kyrie Paschale</em></td>
<td>Joannes Galliculus</td>
<td>Kyrie, Gloria, Sanctus, Agnus</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><em>Missa Si bona suscepimus</em></td>
<td>Jachet</td>
<td>Complete</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><em>Missa Deus qui sedes</em></td>
<td>Antonius Scandellus</td>
<td>Complete</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><em>Missa Ecce quam bonum</em></td>
<td>Clemens non Papa</td>
<td>Complete</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><em>Missa Inviolata integra</em></td>
<td>Noel Baulduin</td>
<td>Complete</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><em>Missa Mort ma prive</em></td>
<td>Cricquillon</td>
<td>Complete</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><em>Missa In illo tempore</em></td>
<td>Tilemanus Susato</td>
<td>Complete</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><em>Missa In die tribulationis</em></td>
<td>Jachet</td>
<td>Complete</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><em>Missa Veni sancta spiritus</em></td>
<td>Josquin?</td>
<td>Complete</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><em>Missa Ave praeclara</em></td>
<td>Anonymous</td>
<td>Complete</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><em>Missa Forseulement</em></td>
<td>Gombert</td>
<td>Complete</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><em>Missa La fede non debet esse correolata</em></td>
<td>Jachet</td>
<td>Complete</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><em>Missa Praeter rerum seriem</em></td>
<td>Ludovicus Daser</td>
<td>Complete</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><em>Missa Epitaphium Mauritii Electoris Saxoniae</em></td>
<td>Antonius Scandellus</td>
<td>Complete</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
In addition to RosU 49, the Rostock Universitätsbibliothek holds a second, lesser-known manuscript copy of the Missa Pange lingua. Only the discantus and bass partbooks of RosU 71/3 survive, which makes it less useful to modern editors. RosU 71/3 contains five motets, three masses, and two hymns, including an anonymous Pange lingua setting. Musicological studies that mention this manuscript are scarce; both the New Josquin Edition and the Census Catalogue of Music Manuscripts list a 1940 article by Wilhelm Theodore Gaechtgens as the only secondary literature for Rostock 71/3.\textsuperscript{38} Currently, these sources also list a vague provenance for Rostock 71/3—that it was probably copied in Rostock in the middle of the sixteenth century.

In order to understand where Rostock 71/3 came from, it is important to be familiar with the other manuscripts with which it is grouped. There are four other manuscripts—all in the form of partbooks—at the Rostock Universitätsbibliothek with the shelfmark 71. These manuscripts must have survived together as a group, although various partbooks are missing and a few of the extant partbooks are likely missing folios. Like Rostock 71/3, the listed provenance of the other Rostock 71 manuscripts in source databases and critical commentaries is rather vague.

Duke Johann Albrecht I, a man interested in the humanities and learning, founded a Furstenschule in 1553. In the same year, he had a library constructed in the Schweriner Schloss. The first librarian, the mathematician and geographer Tilemann Stella, arrived in 1561.\textsuperscript{39} In 1573, the librarian and archivist Samuel Fabricius made a catalog of the ducal library holdings with about 6,000 titles. The catalog is in alphabetical order by author,


\textsuperscript{39} Nilüfer Krüger, \textit{Die Bibliothek Herzog Johann Albrechts I. von Mecklenburg (1525-1576)} (Wiesbaden: Harrassowitz Verlag, 2013), 1: II.
and includes the printer (if applicable), place, year, format, any key words on the cover, and the shelfmark.\footnote{Nilüfer Krüger, Die Bibliothek Herzog Johann Albrechts I. von Mecklenburg (1525-1576), 3 vols., (Wiesbaden: Harrassowitz Verlag, 2013).} Exactly 440 years later, Nilüfer Krüger published an edition of the catalog. Krüger describes the music holdings in the Duke’s library as 64 prints and 4 manuscripts.\footnote{Krüger, 1:56.} The four manuscripts that Krüger lists are Rostock 19, 20, 49, and 52. Rostock 19 and 20 were both copied by the Schwerin cantor Johannes Flamingus; Rostock 19 is entitled Opusculum cantionum and contains one mass and ten motets, and Rostock 20 is a portion of the Opusculum cantionum is entitled Missa nova, and contains one piece that is labeled Secundus cantus. RosU 52 is a collection of mostly motets and German sacred pieces. RosU 49, of course, is Jacob Praetorius’s Opus Musicum that contains the Missa Pange lingua.
Nearly a dozen years before Krüger’s edition of the library catalogue was published, Ole Kongsted published a brief study of the repertoire in Duke Johann Albrecht’s music collection.\(^{42}\) Kongsted lists twelve manuscripts that were purchased or created for use at the duke’s court. Rostock 71 is listed as a collective source and

described as five various manuscripts that consisted mostly of Latin motets. Despite exclusion from Krüger’s edition of the library catalog, an entry in the actual manuscript of the catalog indicates that the Rostock 71 manuscripts were indeed kept in Johann Albrecht’s library. There is an entry that describes a set of music manuscripts as follows: *Cantiones Ecclesiasticae, et aliae variae pluribus et diversis partibus olim conscriptiae à Nicolao Sartorio piae memoriae Cantore Swerinensi*. Below the entry title, a brief description of each manuscript follows. The chart below describes the individual manuscripts in the catalog, along with the coinciding Rostock 71 manuscript.

Table 4.8

| Suggested Correspondence of Johann Albrecht Inventory and RosU 71 MSS |
|---------------------------------|-----------------|-----------------|-----------------|
| **Manuscript (as ordered in the catalog)** | **Opening Piece** | **Partbooks** | **Corresponding Rostock 71 Manuscript** |
| First | “und mit deem Gaist” | D, A, T, B | 71/1? |
| Second | Et honor tibi sit | D, A, T, B, V | 71/2 |
| Third | “et cum spiritu tuo” | D, A, T, B | 71/1 or 71/3? |
| Fourth | Sit nomen domini beneditum | D, A, T, B | 71/4 |
| Fifth | Passion | D, A, T, B | [lost] |
| Sixth | Kyrie Eleison | D, A, T, B, Q | 71/3 or 71/5? |

A couple of the Rostock 71 manuscripts survive as fragments, and so it is difficult to determine exact matches with all of the manuscripts in the catalog entry. Rostock 71/5, which consists of only six folios, is particularly problematic. However, a correlation is more discernable with two of the other Rostock 71 manuscripts. When the modern shelfmarks of RosU 71/2 and 71/4 are applied to the order of the manuscript descriptions in the catalog, their opening pieces match the opening pieces of the second and fourth. Rostock 71/3 does begin with the Kyrie from *Missa Ecce quam bonum*, but must be
treated with caution because there is no concrete evidence of a fifth partbook and it is possible that 71/3 is a fragment as well and did not originally begin with that mass.

Rostock 71/1 begins with the Preface responses in both Latin and German. Since the German text is on top and the Latin is underneath, that could suggest a correspondence with the first manuscript in the catalog entry. Also, the fragmented state of the extant manuscripts makes it is easy to conceive that there was a sixth manuscript that is completely lost.

Given the two Rostock 71 manuscripts that can be matched with some certainty and the order of the manuscript descriptions in the catalog, it is also possible that the 71 manuscripts were listed in the library catalog in about the same order as their modern shelf marks. Rostock 71/2 and 71/4 are already in the correct order for that, and Rostock 71/1 could very well be the first manuscript described in the catalog. It is quite possible that Rostock 71/3 is a fragment, and therefore could have begun with the responses listed in the third catalog entry. Since only a few pages of one partbook survive from Rostock 71/5, it is impossible to determine an exact match with the catalog, but it could indeed match the fifth or sixth manuscripts described in the catalog. Additionally, the Rostock 71 manuscripts were copied by the same scribe who also copied many of the other manuscripts that Kongsted identifies as having belonged to Duke Johann Albrecht. The individual who copied RosU 71/1, 71/3, 71/5, and parts of 71/2 and 71/4 also copied RosU 35, 40, 46, and 60. A second scribe who contributed to RosU 71/4 also copied RosU 52.⁴³ Although it is difficult to ascertain the exact correspondence to the individual Rostock 71 manuscripts with the descriptions in the catalog, it is highly probable that the

⁴³ CCM 3, 126.
catalog entry refers to these manuscripts and that they were the property of the musicians at the duke’s court.

Analysis of the *Missa Pange lingua* reading in RosU 71/3 indicates a possible indirect relationship with the *Missae tredecim* print. There is no Agnus II in the discantus partbook, but the Agnus I is missing from both partbooks as well. A *Missae tredecim* variant of a scalar passage in the discantus part of the Credo at the word “secula” is copied exactly into RosU 71/3, as with the Credo readings in RosU 49 and LeipU 49/50. Another discernable *Missae tredecim* variant, the extended ending of the Sanctus, is not found in the RosU 71/3 Sanctus. It is possible that some of the many variants in RosU 1/3 were either intentional or unintentional alterations by the scribe of that manuscript. Most of the mensuration signs were changed to Cut-C, which could have been an effort to make the mass easier to sing. There are also several pitch and other notational variants that could have been copying errors, but the multiple other inconsistencies with color, ligatures, and rests suggest that these partbooks were copied from a ghost exemplar related to *Missae tredecim*.

Evidence from the ducal library catalog and the sources themselves suggests that there were three copies of the *Missa Pange lingua* in the possession of Johann Albrecht and his court musicians. RosU 49 was a gift manuscript from Jacob Praetorius, and although it does not include elaborate illuminations like other presentation manuscripts, it could have been treated as such. RosU 71/3 is a worn, utilitarian paper partbook that was most likely used at school and/or church services. The “et cum spiritum tuo/und mit deinem Gaiste” responses in the other Rostock 71 partbooks are evidence that someone used these partbooks for Lutheran church services. Clemens Meyer identifies the
musicians at Johann Albrecht’s court as the earliest forerunner of the later Mecklenburg Hofkapelle.\textsuperscript{44} At this time, the musicians performed vocal music almost exclusively, although instrumental music was performed once in a while, probably for special occasions. According to Meyer, Johann Albrecht was an enthusiastic supporter of both Lutheranism and music, and made a special effort to ensure that his court had high-quality church music, which is evidenced by the number of foreign musicians he employed.\textsuperscript{45}

The third Missa Pange lingua source, the Missae tredecim exemplar, contains various markings such as handwritten text additions and vertical mensuration lines that suggest the partbooks could have been used for both liturgical and pedagogical purposes at the duke’s Furstenschule.\textsuperscript{46} The multiple sources of the Missa Pange lingua from Duke Johann Albrecht I’s court reinforce that the mass was indeed heard at his court. While it may seem that three copies of Missa Pange lingua from one location is an anomaly, this source situation is probably indicative of the music holdings in other churches and courts: prints were purchased, presentation choirbooks were given, and utilitarian partbooks were copied, but only fragmented evidence of these actions survive today in the form of extant prints and manuscripts. We know that the Thomaskirche possessed at least two copies of the mass (Missae tredecim and LeipU 49/50). The Missa Pange lingua sources associated with Johann Albrecht serve as a reminder of the innumerable “ghost exemplars” of the Missa Pange lingua and other contemporary works. They also demonstrate that Josquin’s

\textsuperscript{44} Clemens Meyer, Geschichte der Mecklenburg-Schweriner Hofkapelle (Schwerin: Verlag von Ludwig Davids, 1913), 3.

\textsuperscript{45} Meyer, 20. Meyer also cites a letter that the duke wrote to the Margrave Friedrich von Brandenburg on February 18, 1549 in which he mentions a youth from Winterfeld who could sing very well. No further information about the source is given.

\textsuperscript{46} More information on this exemplar can be found in Chapter 3 of this dissertation, Table 3.8
mass reached northern Germany by the middle of the sixteenth century, and, at least in the case of Duke Johann Albrecht I, was valued by Lutherans there.

**Johannes Buechmayer and Regensburg C 100**

A Lutheran community in Bavaria also preserved the *Missa Pange lingua* in a manuscript that post-dates *Missae tredecim*. Like RosU 49, RegC 100 has a dedicatory preface that provides a concrete provenance. It was copied in 1559-60 by the cantor at the Regensburg Gymnasium Poeticum, Johannes Buechmayer, who dedicated the manuscript to the Regensburg town council. According to the dedication at the beginning of the book, it was presented to the town council on Christmas Eve of 1560. Regensburg officially became Lutheran on the weekend of October 14, 1542, and the earliest *Kirchenordnung* was written that same year. The section on the “form, weise und ordnung, wie dises hochlöblich sacrament und abentmal des Herrn” indicates that all five sections of the Mass Ordinary were included in the service and sung in Latin. The 1542 *Kirchenordnung* also clarifies that the schoolmaster and his pupils (“der schulmaister sambt seinen knaben”) were charged with performing the Mass Ordinary settings during the service. The schoolmaster is mentioned with each of the five movements in the document, such as this description of the Gloria: “Nach disem [Kyrie] singet der priester das Gloria in excelsis Deo und der schulmaister darauf das Et in terra.” A year later in 1543, Dr. Hieronymus Noppe produced his own *Kirchenordnung*, with a briefer

---


48 The *Kirchenordnung* is found in EK13, 389-393.
description of the Sunday service. Noppe calls for the Credo to be sung in German, but leaves the other Ordinary sections in their original languages.49

The conversion to Lutheranism in Regensburg was not without consequences. One month after the town council made the announcement, the Catholic Bavarian dukes issued an economic blockade of Regensburg, and forbade their subjects to visit or live in the city. Regensburg then became an occupied city from the beginning of the Reichstag in 1546 until the end of the Schmalkaldic War. Both peace and the Augsburg Interim arrived in Regensburg in 1548. Due to the Interim, however, the Lutheran churches in Regensburg were closed and no Lutheran liturgies or ceremonies were celebrated in the city.50 The Interim was in effect until 1552, and then another Kirchenordnung was written for Regensburg by Justus Jonas, one of the authors of the Albertine Saxony Kirchenordnung. Jonas’s 1553 document retains the Latin for all of the Mass Ordinary movements except the Credo.51 For the Credo, he specifies that the priest sings the incipit in Latin, and the choir continues with the German chorale Wir glauben all in einen Gott. A later Kirchenordnung from sometime between 1555 and 1567 provides more flexibility to the Mass Ordinary.52 There is no mention of the Agnus Dei; Jesus Christus unser Heiland, Gott sei gelobet, and Psalm 111 are the recommended hymns for communion. Given the uncertain date of this Kirchenordnung, it is difficult to say exactly which

49 Nobbe’s actual Kirchenordnung is found in EK13, 406-411. His additional “Ordnung des herrenabendmals und der vesper, bei doctor Noppe gehalten,” which contains instructions for the actual liturgy, is found on EK13, 412-13.

50 There are few extant Regensburg documents from this time. For a more detailed summary of the political situation and the documents that did survive, see Kristin Elyss Sorensen Zapalac, In His Image and Likeness: Political Iconography and Religious Change in Regensburg, 1500-1600 (Cornell: Cornell University Press, 1990), 92-94.

51 EK 13, 419-427

52 EK 13, 452-489.
liturgical orders were in effect when RegC 100 was copied. The only Mass Ordinary section that was really effected in terms of Latin usage was the Credo, so it was not as if a new body of Latin repertoire was needed.

Table 4.9

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Kirchenordnung for Regensburg</th>
<th>Dr. Noppe 1543(?) Kirchenordnung</th>
<th>1553 Justus Jonas Kirchenordnung</th>
<th>Kirchenordnung for the new parishes 1555-1567?</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1542 Kirchenordnung</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Kyrie- Greek</td>
<td>Kyrie- Greek</td>
<td>Kyrie- Greek</td>
<td>Kyrie- Greek</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Gloria- Latin</td>
<td>Gloria- Latin</td>
<td>Gloria- Latin</td>
<td>Gloria- Latin or German with Latin intonation</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Credo- Latin</td>
<td>Credo- German</td>
<td>Credo- Latin intonation then German</td>
<td>Credo- Latin or German with Latin intonation</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Sanctus- Latin</td>
<td>Sanctus- Latin</td>
<td>Sanctus- Latin</td>
<td>Sanctus- Latin or German</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Agnus Dei- Latin</td>
<td>Agnus Dei- Latin</td>
<td>Agnus Dei- Latin</td>
<td>Agnus Dei- none</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

RegC 100 is a large manuscript in choirbook format containing 12 Mass Ordinary settings and 8 Mass Proper settings. James Haar states that the two Nuremberg mass prints of 1539 were “doubtless” known to Buechmayer, who took the post as cantor of the Protestant Gymnasium in Regensburg in 1556. Buechmayer actually came to Regensburg after having lived in Nuremberg. He worked as cantor at the Heilige Geist school in Nuremberg for a couple of years beginning in 1548, and it is possible that he grew up in Nuremberg as well. In addition to the Missa Pange lingua, RegC 100 contains Josquin’s Missa L’homme armé super voces musicales. This mass also appears

---

53 Haar, 180. “Quid est Resolutio? Resolutio, est abstrusioris Notularum valoris, in vugatiorem aliquam formam, transcriptio.”

54 The most detailed account of Buechmayer’s life can be found in Wilfried Brennecke, Die Handschrift A.R. 940/41 der Proske-Bibliothek zu Regensburg (Kassel: Bärenreiter Verlag, 1953), 104-114. Brennecke notes that in 1525 a Hans Puchmeyer married an Elisabeth Schneiderin in Nuremberg, and suggested that they could be Johannes Buechmayer’s parents.
in both the Missae tredecim and Petreius’s Liber quindecim missarum. The other RegC 100 masses from the Liber quindecim missarum are the Missa Duarum facierum, Missa La sol fa re mi, and Missa O praecella. The Isaac introits found in the manuscript (Viri galilaei and two settings of Benedicta sit sancta trinitas) came from the Choralis Constantinus which was published in Nuremberg in 1550 and 1555. In addition to his own compositions, it appears that Buechmayer relied heavily on the Nuremberg print repertoire when compiling RegC 100.

Johannes Buechmayer is described by Haar as being “provincial” and “less gifted,” in comparison to his contemporary Orlando di Lasso. Both Friedhelm Brusniak and Haar noted that Buechmayer altered the mass settings that were written by composers other than himself. Buechmayer indicated in both the preface and the index that the mass settings by Moulu, Isaac, and Josquin all contained his own “resoluta.” The term resoluta comes from the work of Sebald Heyden, a fellow Nuremberg resident. Heyden defines resoluta in his 1540 treatise De Arte Canendi as the transcription of complex note values into another colloquial, more familiar form. Buechmayer did not follow Heyden’s resoluta specifications exactly, but he was essentially making this older style of polyphony technically accessible to a more recent generation of singers who may or may not have been of the same caliber as Josquin’s choir at Condé, or Isaac’s Imperial court choir. He adds thirds to cadences to produce a more current sonority, and he inserts additional final notes to phrases he feels are inconclusive. Although the Missa Pange

55 For a brief overview of the remainder of the repertoire in RegC 100, see Haar, 181-82.

56 Haar, 179.

57 De Arte Canendi II, vii, p. 18.

58 See Haar’s essay for specific examples of how Buechmayer altered these masses.
lingua reading in RegC 100 can be described as heavily edited, it is apparent that Beuchmayer’s deviations from Missae tredecim were deliberate—they do not seem to be copying errors or variants that crept in from an exemplar once or twice removed from Missae tredecim. Along with other sources discussed in this chapter, RegC 100 retains the extended Sanctus ending and the “secula” variant in the Credo of the discantus voice.

Another curious characteristic of the mass settings in RegC 100 is that several are incomplete. Incomplete Mass Ordinary settings in Lutheran sources are not uncommon, but with it is particularly evident that there is no logical pattern to the completeness of the masses. A possible explanation for missing mass movements in a given source is that the compiler of the source simply did not have access to them. Certainly this is the case with the Missa Pange lingua sources copied from Missae tredecim. Johannes Ott did not print the Agnus II duet, and so the mass readings that derived from the print are missing this section. It would stand to reason that Beuchmayer’s own masses would be complete in RegC 100, but not all of them are. Two of his masses are complete, but the others are not. The Gloria and Credo of the Missa Dum transisset sabbatum are incomplete; the Gloria ends with the phrase “filius patris,” and the Credo ends with “et homo factus est,” the phrase right before the “et incarnatus” section. Buechmayer’s Missa Virtute magna reddebant is missing the Hosanna section of the Sanctus, contains only one Agnus Dei section, and the Credo concludes with “descendit de caelis.” The Gloria of his Missa Angelus Domini ends with “filius patris,” there is one Agnus Dei section, and the Credo is completely missing.
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Mass</th>
<th>Composer</th>
<th>Contents</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Missa Duarum facierum</td>
<td>Moulu</td>
<td>Complete (3 Agnus)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Missa Sancti spiritus</td>
<td>Georg Vogelhuber</td>
<td>Credo ends at “Crucifixus;” no Hosanna; 1 Agnus</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Missa Bewahr mich Herr</td>
<td>Buechmayer</td>
<td>Complete (3 Agnus)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Missa Caro mea vere</td>
<td>Clemens non Papa</td>
<td>No Hosanna; no Pleni sunt; 2 Agnus</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Missa La sol fa re mi</td>
<td>Josquin</td>
<td>Complete- 2 Agnus</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Missa O praeclara</td>
<td>Isaac</td>
<td>Complete- 1 Agnus</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Missa Pange lingua</td>
<td>Josquin</td>
<td>No Hosanna; 2 Agnus</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Missa L’homme armé super voces musicales</td>
<td>Josquin</td>
<td>Complete- 3 Agnus</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Missa Dum transisset sabbatum</td>
<td>Buechmayer</td>
<td>Gloria ends with “filius patris;” Credo ends with et homo factus est”</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Missa Maria Magdalena</td>
<td>Buechmayer</td>
<td>Complete- 1 Agnus</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Missa Virtute magna reddabant</td>
<td>Buechmayer</td>
<td>Credo ends with “descendit de caelis;” no Hosanna; 1 Agnus</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Missa Angelus Domini</td>
<td>Buechmayer</td>
<td>Gloria ends with “filius patris;” no Credo; 1 Agnus</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

It is impossible that Buechmayer simply did not have access to these entire masses, since it was he who composed them. It seems probable, therefore, that Buechmayer’s masses in RegC 100 are indeed in their complete form, and he did not set the entire Gloria and Credo texts to music. The incomplete mass sections in RegC 100 and other Lutheran liturgical music sources could indicate that the Latin Ordinary texts were not always heard in their complete form at Lutheran services. It would make sense to abridge the Credo in particular, since it is the longest text of the Mass Ordinary, and some Kirchenordnungen call for the Credo to be sung first in Latin by the choir and then in German by everyone. Martin Luther stressed flexibility with liturgical practices, and so cutting short the longer Latin Ordinary text would have been acceptable. Beyond Buechmayer’s own compositions in RegC 100, there is still no pattern to the mass contents. The Missa Pange lingua is missing the second Agnus, most likely due to
Buechmayer’s use of the *Missae tredecim* print, but it is also missing the Hosanna section of the Sanctus. Why would Buechmayer omit the Hosanna section when it was presumably available? The *Missa Pange lingua* is one of four masses in RegC 100 that are missing the Hosanna. The *Missa Caro mea vere*—another mass setting with a model from the Corpus Christi liturgy—is missing the Pleni sunt as well as the Hosanna section.

In Lutheran liturgies, the Latin Sanctus was either performed during the prayers before Communion (the prayers that replaced the Canon of the Mass in Catholic masses) or it was one of several pieces sung during the distribution of communion. If the Sanctus was sung as part of the liturgy and not as “background music,” then perhaps it would make sense to abridge the movement. In the case of the *Missa Pange lingua*, it is interesting that Buechmayer omitted the Hosanna but retained the Pleni sunt and Benedictus. Both are duet sections that would have been just as difficult—if not more so—to perform than the Hosanna.

Of all the *Missa Pange lingua* manuscripts that were copied from *Missae tredecim*, RegC 100 is perhaps the most significant because it preserved the composition for a second generation of Lutheran worshippers. Johannes Buechmayer actually engages with the work and attempts to make it accessible to musicians who may not have been as gifted as those who sang the *Missa Pange lingua* earlier in the sixteenth century. Buechmayer’s “resoluta” in RegC 100 is an indication that he expected the pieces to be performed, rather than exist only as silent notes on the parchment pages of a large choirbook that was dedicated to the Regensburg town council.
**Brno 15/4 and a Lutheran Community in Moravia**

Brno 15/4 is one of two choirbooks containing Latin polyphony that belonged to the German-speaking Lutheran community at the parish church of St. James in the Moravian city of Brno. Today, these manuscripts are held at the Archiv města Brno.  

Brno 14/5, the second manuscript, contains a Mass Ordinary items and a substantial number of polyphonic Mass Propers, many of which are from the *Choralis Constantinus II*. Brno 15/4 contains two Credos and twenty-six Mass Ordinary settings, including the *Missa Pange lingua*. The paper pastedown at the beginning of the manuscript is damaged, but the second half of a year reads “50.” Horyna and Maňas conclude the full year must have been 1550. There is also an initial and coat of arms of presumably a donor of the manuscript who has yet to be identified.

The masses in Brno 15/4 come from a variety of Germanic and Franco-Flemish composers. Josquin is the composer with the most pieces in the manuscript. The bulk of this repertoire is also found in sources from Saxony, particularly Leipzig and the Electoral Library. In fact, the only other extant source of Pipelare’s *Missa Mi mi* is Jena U 21, the *Missa Pange lingua* source that belonged to Frederick the Wise. The La Rue mass interspersed with other repertoire from the Alamire workshop alongside German composers such as Heinrich Finck and Thomas Stoltzer suggest the exemplars used for Brno 15/4 came from an institute in or around the Saxon region.

---

59 The manuscripts were recently introduced to the international musicological community in Martin Horyna and Vladimír Maňas, “Two Mid-16th-Century Manuscripts of Polyphonic Music from Brno,” *Early Music* 9, no. 4 (November 2012): 552-575. Also see Stanislav Petr’s catalog of manuscripts from St. James’s parish: S. Petr. Soupis rukopisů knihovny při farním kostele svatého Jakuba v Brně (Prague, 2007), 123-4. Horyna and Maňas note that the description of the manuscripts in this catalog are superficial and inaccurate. See footnote 6 in their article.

60 Horyna and Maňas, 562-3.

61 Ibid., 556-7.
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Mass</th>
<th>Composer</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Missa Hercules dux Ferrarie</td>
<td>Josquin</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Missa Faisens Regretz</td>
<td>Josquin</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Missa Mi mi</td>
<td>Pipelare (att. Josquin)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Missa L’homme arme</td>
<td>Pierre de la Rue</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Missa Dominicalis</td>
<td>Brumel</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Missa Salva nos</td>
<td>Isaac</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Missa Dictes moy</td>
<td>Mouton</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Missa Malheur me bat</td>
<td>Josquin</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Missa Pange lingua</td>
<td>Josquin</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Missa L’homme arme sexti toni</td>
<td>Josquin</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Missa Ave Maria</td>
<td>A. Févin</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Missa Te Deum laudamus</td>
<td>Finck</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Missa Fa ut</td>
<td>Finck</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Missa Dominicalis</td>
<td>Stoltzer</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Missa Le vilayn ialovs</td>
<td>Robert Févin</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Missa Carminum</td>
<td>Dionisi Prioris</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Missa Paschale</td>
<td>Wolfgang Grefinger</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Missa Solemne</td>
<td>Wolfgang Grefinger</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Missa Benedicta</td>
<td>Willaert</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Missa In te Domine speravi</td>
<td>Hellinck</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Missa Mille Regres</td>
<td>Morales</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Missa Sine nomine (6v)</td>
<td>Brumel</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Missa Domini est terra</td>
<td>Sermisy</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Missa Sine nomine</td>
<td>Matthew Parthenius?</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Missa Helas ye suis mari</td>
<td>A. Févin</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Missa De Beata virgine</td>
<td>Stoltzer</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Missa Patrem solenne</td>
<td>Isaac</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Missa Lami badichon</td>
<td>Josquin</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Heinrich Isaac’s *Missa Salva nos* is the only work other than the *Missa Pange lingua* from *Missae tredecim* in this manuscript. The *Missa Pange lingua* transmission in Brno 15/4 lacks the Agnus II duet, but the connection to the Nuremberg print seems to end there. The Brno reading contains multiple variants in all voice parts that are not shared by the print or any of the four manuscripts previously discussed. These variants include slight changes to pitches and rhythms as well as a couple of ornamented
cadences. Moreover, the Brno reading does not transmit the variants found in Missae tredecim and the four later manuscripts. The Sanctus ending is shortened, the proportion of the Kyrie II is not diminished, and the variant passages in the Credo and Agnus Dei conform to earlier Missa Pange lingua sources rather than Missae tredecim and the later manuscripts. The Missa Pange lingua in Brno 15/4 also contains the omitted passages in the Leipzig 49/50 reading, which eliminates that source as the sole exemplar for Brno 15/4.

There is an interesting textual variant in the Credo of the Missa Pange lingua and other masses in Brno 15/4. The Latin word “catholicam” (one of the four marks of the Church in the final section) begins with a k rather than a c. Both the German and Czech words for catholic begin with k, but most other Germanic and Franco-Flemish manuscript scribes spell catholicam with a c in the Credo. The spelling with a k could be a regional variant of liturgical Latin that indicates the manuscript was copied in Moravia as opposed to Germany or somewhere else. Regarding a possible exemplar for the Missa Pange lingua in Brno 15/4, it seems that the reading derives from an earlier source that may be distantly related to Missae tredecim, if it is related at all. When more minute variants including the placement of rests and accidentals, the Brno reading shares a lot of variants with the four early sources that are closely related: JenaU 21, MunBS 510, the Occo Codex, and VatS 16. The Brno Missa Pange lingua also shares a few variants unique to VienNB 4809 and Missae tredecim. If the Brno reading descended from an earlier manuscript source, it is likely that earlier source contained the second section of the Agnus Dei—which most of the early manuscripts did. Brno 15/4 lacks this duet like the Missae tredecim source group, but overall the reading from this manuscript indicates a
relationship to an earlier manuscript.\textsuperscript{62} In sum, the \textit{Missa Pange lingua} exemplar for Brno 15/4 was probably a copy that was made after the earliest “Catholic” sources but not directly descended from \textit{Missae tredecim}.

Brno 15/4 extends the Lutheran transmission of the \textit{Missa Pange lingua} outside of the Germanic region into Moravia. The manuscript appears to have been created for liturgical use at the parish church of St. James, as opposed to pedagogical use in a school. Apparently even Lutherans outside of the Germanic lands found the Latin repertoire in Brno 15/4 and 14/5 to be appropriate for their liturgies.\textsuperscript{63}

**Lutheran Manuscript Transmission of the Missae tredecim Repertoire**

The five sources in this chapter indicate that the \textit{Missa Pange lingua} was copied from the \textit{Missae tredecim} print into Lutheran manuscripts in the second half of the sixteenth century. It is apparent that Josquin’s Blessed Sacrament mass was selected to appear in these particular manuscripts from most—if not all—of the other masses in the print: the \textit{Missa Pange lingua} is either the only \textit{Missae tredecim} mass in a given

\textsuperscript{62} The reasoning behind the transmission or omission of certain Mass Ordinary sections in Lutheran sources is a larger issue that cannot be sufficiently addressed here, but is a topic for future research on the entire Mass Ordinary genre in the sixteenth century.

\textsuperscript{63} Another \textit{Missa Pange lingua} source that deserves mention in this section is Bárta 8, a set of manuscript partbooks held at the Országos Széchényi Könyvtár (National Széchényi Library) in Budapest. The partbooks come from the Lutheran church of St. Aedgidi in the city presently known as Bardejov in eastern Slovakia and contain, among other Latin polyphonic repertoire, many of Heinrich Isaac’s Mass Propers. Kata Huncik suggests the partbooks were copied in southern Germany based solely on the common pieces between them and Nuremberg prints, namely the \textit{Choralis Constantinus}, but I believe an alternative provenance should be considered based on the wide distribution of the Nuremberg prints. An extensive study of the Czecho-Slovak reception of the \textit{Missa Pange lingua} and accompanying Latin repertoire seemed beyond the scope of this present study of the German reception of the mass, but I intend to address this topic in future research. Two English-language studies that address Bárta 8 and other manuscripts from St. Aedgidi are Mary Bertha Fox, “A Liturgical-Repertorial Study of Renaissance Polyphony in Bárta 8” (PhD diss., University of Illinois at Urbana-Champaign, 1977); and Kata Huncik, “A Liturgical-Repertorial Study of 16th-Century Polyphonic Music in Bárta MS 8 (Master’s Thesis, University of Ottawa, 2005).
manuscript or it appears with only one other mass from the print. When evaluating the presence of the *Missa Pange lingua*—or any Josquin-attributed mass—in Lutheran sources, the connection between Martin Luther and Josquin must be considered. Did the mass survive in so many Lutheran prints and manuscripts because it was composed by one of Luther’s most beloved composers? A look at the Josquin repertoire in the 1539 Nuremberg Mass prints and the Lutheran manuscript sources of the *Missa Pange lingua* reveals that is not the case.

Table 4.12

| Josquin Masses in the "Missae tredecim" Manuscripts and Related Manuscripts |
|-----------------------------|--------------------------|
| Mass                        | Attribution in Ms        |
| LeipU 49/50                 |                          |
| Missa Pange lingua          | Josquin                  |
| Missa Veni sancta spiritus  | (anonymous)              |
| Missa De beata virgine      | (anonymous)              |
| LeipU 51                    |                          |
| Missa Malheur me bat        | Josquin                  |
| Missa Moneur phaisair       | Josquin                  |
| Missa l’homme armé sexti toni | Josquin               |
| RosU 49                     |                          |
| Missa Pange lingua          | Josquin                  |
| Missa Veni sancta spiritus  | Josquin                  |
| Missa De beata virgine      | Josquin                  |
| RegC 100                    |                          |
| Missa Pange lingua          | Josquin                  |
| Missa l’homme armé super voces musicales | Josquin |
| Missa La sol fa re me       | Josquin                  |

The *Missae tredecim* print contains five masses that were attributed to Josquin: the *Missa Fortuna desperata, Missa l’homme armé super voces musicales, Missa Pange lingua, Missa Da pacem* (recte Bauldeweyn), and the *Missa sub tuum praesidium* (recte la Rue). The three *Missa Pange lingua* manuscripts whose scribes most likely copied the mass from Ott’s print were obviously not interested in copying most of the other Josquin-
attributed masses in the print, as Table 4.12 indicates. The Missa Pange lingua is the only mass in LeipU 49/50 that is actually attributed to Josquin. Moreover, the Missa l’homme armé super voces musicales is the only Josquin mass other than the Missa Pange lingua to appear in both Missae tredecim and at least one of the four later manuscripts in Table 4.12.

The three Josquin masses in RegC 100 all appear in the 1539 Nuremberg prints: the Missa Pange lingua from Missae tredecim, the Missa La sol fa re mi from Liber quindecim, and the Missa l’homme armé super voces musicales from both collections. Considering Johannes Buechmayer’s connection to Nuremberg, this is almost to be expected. The Missa l’homme armé can be found in another Regensburg manuscript that was probably intended for the Gymnasium Poeticum, RegB 878-82. This manuscript is dated 1569-72, a few years later than RegC 100.

It is clear from this brief survey of Mass Ordinary settings in Missa Pange lingua manuscripts that the compilers of these Lutheran manuscripts in Leipzig, Mecklenburg, and Regensburg chose the mass to be part of their repertory. They did not have an agenda to pass on all of the repertoire from Ott’s print, or even the majority of it. They also did not make the preservation of Josquin’s masses an utmost priority. Johannes Buechmayer was the only compiler who chose to copy a second Josquin mass from the Missae tredecim in addition to the Missa Pange lingua, and even so there were three other masses attributed to Josquin that he did not copy. Modern scholars have concluded that the compilers and scribes of these mid-sixteenth century music anthologies must have copied multiple pieces directly from earlier prints. LeipU 51, discussed earlier, is an

---

64 It should also be noted that the Missa Pange lingua is the only Josquin work in the Rostock 71 partbooks, although at least one of those sources is incomplete.
example of how several pieces in a later source are in the same order as an earlier print. Stephanie Schlagel has observed that Petreius most likely copied the first four masses in *Liber quindecim* from Petrucci’s *Misse Josquin* [*Liber I*] since they appear in the same order in both prints.\(^{65}\) This is not the case with the *Missae tredecim* repertoire and the *Missa Pange lingua* manuscripts. Only two masses from the *Missae tredecim* even made it into these manuscripts, and so the possibility of finding the same sequence of masses is not even a question.

The manuscripts from Leipzig, Regensburg, Brno, and Mecklenburg provide a picture of how the *Missa Pange lingua* and the other masses from Ott’s print were—or were not—transmitted into later handwritten Lutheran music collections. Were there similar situations of these masses appearing in later Lutheran manuscripts in other locations? The extant cognate sources of the *Missae tredecim* masses reveal a few similar instances of this repertoire being copied into Lutheran manuscripts after the print was published in Nuremberg. The manuscript Erlangen 473/4 contains the *Missa Bon temps* and was copied ca. 1540-41 at the Cistercian monastery in Heilsbronn, and Franz Krautwurst identifies the repertoire in this manuscript as Lutheran.\(^{66}\) The *Missa da Pace* was found DresSL Pirna IV, which was copied in 1554 for the Lutheran Stadtkirche St. Marien in Pirna and is currently missing.\(^{67}\)

---

\(^{65}\) Schlagel, “Fortune’s Fate,” 195.


\(^{67}\) CCM 1, 197. This manuscript is mentioned in Hoffmann-Erbrecht, Lothar: 'Die Chorbücher der Stadtkirche zu Pirna' *Acta Musicologica* 27 (1955), 121-37, 127
Masses from *Missae tredecim* were included in several manuscripts that were produced for the court chapel of Ulrich, duke of Wurttemberg (1487). Ulrich was a fellow Catholic ally of Maximilian I but later converted to Lutheranism. He joined the Schmalkalden League in 1536 and made a particular effort to spread Lutheranism and the teachings of Zwingli within his domain. The following table lists the duke’s manuscripts and the *Missae tredecim* masses they contain. One or two of the manuscripts were probably copied too early for the scribes to have used *Missae tredecim* as a source. Nevertheless, the manuscripts of Duke Ulrich’s court are an example of this repertoire being used by Lutherans in the middle of the sixteenth century.

**Table 4.13**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Manuscript</th>
<th>Date</th>
<th>Missae tredecim Repertoire</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>StuttL HB 26</td>
<td>c. 1538</td>
<td><em>Missa Fortuna desperata, Missa Bon temps</em></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>StuttL 38</td>
<td>1549</td>
<td><em>Missa Cum iocunditate</em></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>StuttL 46</td>
<td>1539</td>
<td><em>Missa da Pacem</em></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

There are a few surviving mid-sixteenth century Germanic cognate sources of the *Missae tredecim* masses with more uncertain provenances, so it is difficult to say for sure whether or not they were used by Lutherans. The manuscript BerlGS 7 (olim Königsberg 1740) actually contains three masses from the print: the *Missa Bon tems, Missa Cum iocunditate*, and *Missa da Pacem*. HerdF 9821 is probably of German origin and contains the *Missa Sub tuum praesidium*. Isaac’s *Missa Salva nos* is found in MunU 326 and VienNB 15500, which are dated 1543 and 1544, respectively.
Table 4.14

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Mass</th>
<th>Manuscript(s)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Missa Fortuna desperata</td>
<td>StuttL HB 26</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Missa Bon temps</td>
<td>Erlangen 473/4, StuttL HB 26, BerlGS 7</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Missa Salva nos</td>
<td>Brno 15/4, MunU 326, VienNB 15500</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Missa L’homme armé</td>
<td>RegC 100, RegB 878-82</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Missa Pange lingua</td>
<td>Brno 15/4, LeipU 49/50, RosU 49, RosU 71/3, RegC 100</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Missa Cum iocunditate</td>
<td>StuttL 38, BerlGS 7</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Missa Da pacem</td>
<td>DresSL Pirna IV, StuttL 46, BerlGS 7</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Missa Sub tuum praesidium</td>
<td>HerdF 9821</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

There is no discernable pattern based on the pre-existing melodies and their liturgical connotations. Four of the five masses that were not transmitted contain material that could be construed as Catholic. There is a Marian mass and another mass based on chant material from the liturgy of St. Anthony of Egypt, a non-Biblical saint. The model of Missa O gloriosa has a double meaning and could refer to Mary, St. Margaret, or Maximilian’s daughter, Margaret of Austria. None of these figures really coincided with Lutheran worship sentiments. The Missa Petrus apostolus is an interesting case that could be taken either way: the chant melody comes from the feast of Sts. Peter and Paul, two saints mentioned in the Bible and therefore acceptable to Lutherans. The title of the mass, however, could be construed as referring to solely St. Peter, the first pope. The Missa Sub tuum praesidium, another mass with a Marian model, appears in only one manuscript with an unclear provenance.

Any theory of Lutherans favoring masses with “Lutheran-friendly” models is debunked by the Missa Pange lingua. This mass dominates the list with five extant Lutheran manuscripts, at least three of which were copied directly from the Missae tredecim, despite Martin Luther’s explicit disapproval of Corpus Christi, excessive
Eucharistic veneration, and the doctrine of transubstantiation. The pattern from the surviving manuscripts indicates that some Missae tredecim masses were copied into later liturgical manuscripts, while others were ignored. And even if more manuscripts with any of these masses did exist, the fact still remains that the Missa Pange lingua was copied into a number of manuscripts with an established Lutheran provenance after Ott’s mass anthology was printed and circulated.

In the early years of the Reformation, vernacular language and congregational singing were emphasized, but in the middle of the sixteenth century the novelty of congregations singing German hymns faded and the Latin repertoire experienced resurgence in the Lutheran liturgy. At least parts of the liturgy could be performed in the vernacular, but Lutheran leaders still recognized the value of Latin in the education of children, and there was probably a desire to preserve the repertoire of Renaissance polyphony that Martin Luther himself loved so much. Certainly the circulation of the Nuremberg print collections of Latin repertoire as well as Georg Rhau’s music publications from Wittenberg played a catalytic role. The Lutheran manuscripts containing the Missa Pange lingua were produced during this period when Latin choral singing was in vogue in the Lutheran churches. Friedrich Blume even suggests that during the 1550s and 1560s an effort had to be made to reestablish and reorganize congregational hymn singing due to the dominance of this Latin repertoire.\(^{68}\)

The extant Missa Pange lingua manuscript sources from the second half of the sixteenth-century indicate that this mass was part of a revival of Latin repertoire in the Lutheran church. However, when copying polyphonic masses into manuscripts,

---

Lutherans did not mindlessly write down every mass that was available to them in printed collections. The five Lutheran manuscripts are evidence of a considered effort to preserve and circulate the *Missa Pange lingua* beyond its initial Lutheran presence in various copies of the *Missae tredecim* print. Moreover, these manuscripts show how Lutherans adapted the *Missa Pange lingua* and other masses for their own needs by omitting certain movements or sections and sometimes simplifying passages with complex melodic figures or mensurations. This is significant because it shows that Lutherans did not re-copy the *Missa Pange lingua* into manuscripts simply for posterity; rather, they transformed the mass into a work they deemed suitable for their pedagogical and liturgical needs.
Chapter 5: Duets, The Agnus Dei, and Some Answers

The remaining Germanic Missa Pange lingua sources consist of three collections of bicinia—two manuscripts and one print—and one complete printed transmission of the mass. A unifying characteristic of this diverse group of sources (identified in Table 5.1) is the occurrence of the second Agnus Dei section. The presence or absence of this section comes more from issues of transmission and circulation than confession and performance context. The complete transmissions of the mass that lack the Agnus II duet—RosU 49 and 71/3, LeipU 49, RegC 100, and Brno 15/4—are certainly viable in terms of liturgical function in a Catholic or Lutheran service. This first repetition of the Agnus Dei text could be sung as plainchant in contrast to the other two polyphonic sections, the first Agnus could be repeated, or an Agnus Dei section from a completely different mass setting could be substituted.¹

Table 5.1

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Source</th>
<th>Date</th>
<th>Provenance</th>
<th>Sections</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>VienNB 18832</td>
<td>1521-25</td>
<td>Petrus Alamire workshop; copied for Fugger family</td>
<td>Pleni sunt, Benedictus, Agnus II</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>MunBS 260</td>
<td>ca. 1539-50</td>
<td>possibly belonged to Hans Heinrich Herwart of Augsburg</td>
<td>Pleni sunt, Benedictus, Agnus II</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Bicinia gallica, latina, germanica</td>
<td>1545</td>
<td>printed by Georg Rhau in Wittenberg</td>
<td>Pleni sunt, Agnus II</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Missa super Pange lingua</td>
<td>1559</td>
<td>printed at the Ronneburg castle for Anthony von Isenburg</td>
<td>complete transmission</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

¹ Lutherans were particularly flexible with their use of the Agnus Dei movement. Often, the Agnus Dei was sung along with other pieces during the distribution of communion, and the amount of communion music depended on how many people were present to receive it. If the second Agnus was present in a source used at Lutheran services, it was usually simply another piece of music to have on hand to sing during communion. Evidence for the practice of “mixing and matching” sections from different Mass Ordinary settings is found in the Missa Pange lingua reading in the Occo Codex, in which the original Pleni sunt and Benedictus sections are replaced by an unidentified Pleni sunt and the Benedictus from Gascongne’s Missa Es hat ein sin. See Chapter 2 for a more extensive discussion of these substitutions in the Occo Codex.
The three bicinia collections, MunBS 260, VienNB 18832, and *Bicinia gallica, latina, germanica*, contain duet sections mostly extracted from Mass Ordinary settings and other larger pieces. Although these sources are incomplete transmissions of the *Missa Pange lingua* suitable primarily—if not exclusively—for pedagogical use, they cannot be ignored in transmission study because at least one of them ultimately derived from a complete reading of the mass. They also affirm the pedagogical performance contexts of the *Missa Pange lingua* alongside its liturgical use in Catholic and Lutheran services. MunBS 260 and VienNB 18832 were used in Bavaria and most likely stem from the “Catholic” *Missa Pange lingua* tradition.²

A third bicinia collection entitled *Bicinia gallica, latina, germanica*, printed in Wittenberg in 1545 by Georg Rhau and therefore distinctly Lutheran, also contains duet sections of the *Missa Pange lingua*. Along with a 1559 print of the entire *Missa Pange lingua*, Rhau’s *Bicinia gallica* print makes a significant contribution toward the primary questions surrounding the Lutheran use of the *Missa Pange lingua*: did Lutherans associate the text of Thomas Aquinas’s Corpus Christi hymn with the *Missa Pange lingua*, and how did they approach the use of Latin polyphony with content that was theoretically objectionable? Based on the evidence surrounding these two sources, it seems that Lutherans were aware of polemical Catholic aspects of *Missa Pange lingua*. Nevertheless, the *Missa Pange lingua* acquired an additional purpose and contextual identity, namely as a pedagogical aid in Lutheran schools.

The earliest bicinia collection containing *Missa Pange lingua* excerpts comes from the Petrus Alamire workshop. VienNB 18832 is a set of two paper partbooks that contains 89 bicinia mostly from Mass Ordinary settings. Most of the pieces lack a title, composer attribution, and text. The sole decoration—the Fugger coat of arms at the beginning of each partbook—indicates that VienNB 18832 was prepared for a member of the Fugger family. As with VienNB 4809 and related manuscripts, Herbert Kellman believes this bicinia collection went to Raimund Fugger the Elder and was created ca. 1521-25. It is likely that VienNB 18832 served a pedagogical purpose given its physical appearance and the lack of text and composer attribution. Wayne Sheley has suggested that the manuscript was intended to be a collection of instructional duets for Raimund Fugger’s children, who would perform them on instruments.

Table 5.2

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Piece</th>
<th>Composer</th>
<th>folio</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Benedictus <em>- Missa Malheur me bat</em></td>
<td>[Agricola]</td>
<td>7v-8v</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Pleni sunt – <em>Missa Pange lingua</em></td>
<td>[Josquin]</td>
<td>8v-9v</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Agnus II <em>- Missa Pange lingua</em></td>
<td>[Josquin]</td>
<td>9v-10v</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Agnus II <em>- Missa La sol fa re mi</em></td>
<td>[Josquin]</td>
<td>10v-11v</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Agnus II <em>- Missa Gaudeamus</em></td>
<td>[Josquin]</td>
<td>11v-12v</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Benedictus <em>- Missa Pange lingua</em></td>
<td>[Josquin]</td>
<td>11v-12v</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>In nomine <em>- Missa Gaudeamus</em></td>
<td>[Josquin]</td>
<td>11v-12v</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Benedictus <em>- Missa Gaudeamus</em></td>
<td>[Josquin]</td>
<td>11v-12v</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Et resurrexit <em>- Missa Malheur me bat</em></td>
<td>[Agricola]</td>
<td>12-12v</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

VienNB 18832 contains the Pleni sunt celi, Benedictus, and Agnus II duets from the *Missa Pange lingua*. These duets appear near the beginning of the manuscript along

---


with duets from Agricola’s *Missa Malheur me bat* and Josquin’s *Missa Gaudeamus*. VienNB 18832 is closely related to VienNB 4809 in terms of provenance and approximate dating, but a comparison of the *Missa Pange lingua* sections in VienNB 18832 with VienNB 4809 as well as the other two sources of the mass from the Alamire workshop does not reveal any evident relationships.

Another bicinia collection containing sections of the *Missa Pange lingua* is MunBS 260, an anthology of 105 bicinia in the form of a single manuscript. A library stamp indicates that it was part of the Munich Hofbibliothek in 1618. As for the original provenance of the manuscript, it was possibly part of Hans Heinrich Herwart’s library, which passed to the Munich library in 1585. Bruce Bellingham and Edward Evans noted in the preface to their edition of MunBS 260 that it was related to VienNB 18832: the two manuscripts share twenty-three of the first seventy-four pieces in MunBS 260, and over half of the pieces numbered 44-74 in MunBS 260 are also found in VienNB 18832. However, there is no concrete evidence that MunBS 260 was copied from VienNB 18832. The two manuscripts have many pieces in common, but those pieces do not appear in the same order. The Pleni sunt, Benedictus, and Agnus II from the *Missa Pange lingua* are located in the opening folios of VienNB 18832, while they are numbers 20-22 in MunBS 260. Most of the duets from a given Mass Ordinary setting appear consecutively in MunBS 260, unlike the contents of VienNB 18832.

The readings of the *Missa Pange lingua* sections in MunBS 260 also do not confirm a relationship with VienNB 18832 or any of the other earlier *Missa Pange lingua* sources. The Agnus II in MunBS 260 shares a couple of ligature variants with VienNB

---

5 In the preface to the modern edition of this manuscript, the editors cite Dr. Marie Louise Göllner for suggesting the possibility that MunBS 260 was part of the Herwart collection. For more information on Hans Heinrich Herwart’s music collection, see Chapter 3 of this dissertation.
18832, but there are a couple of other minor variants in VienNB 18832 that MunBS 260 does not share. Overall, the readings of the Pleni sunt, Benedictus, and Agnus II in both manuscripts are relatively similar—similar enough that they are not useful in determining source relationships.

Table 5.3

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Mass</th>
<th>Composer</th>
<th>Manuscript</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Missa Malheur me bat</td>
<td>Agricola</td>
<td>VienNB + MunBS</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Missa Pange lingua</td>
<td>Josquin</td>
<td>VienNB + MunBS</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Missa La sol fa re mi</td>
<td>Josquin</td>
<td>VienNB</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Missa Gaudeamus</td>
<td>Josquin</td>
<td>VienNB</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Missa Ista est speciose</td>
<td>La Rue</td>
<td>VienNB</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Missa de Feria</td>
<td>La Rue</td>
<td>VienNB</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Missa Salve diva parents</td>
<td>Obrecht</td>
<td>VienNB</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Missa Mente tota</td>
<td>Fevin</td>
<td>VienNB + MunBS</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Missa Ad placitum</td>
<td>Fevin</td>
<td>VienNB</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Missa In mynen zyn</td>
<td>Agricola</td>
<td>VienNB</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Missa De feria</td>
<td>Fevin</td>
<td>VienNB</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Missa Fors seullement</td>
<td>Obrecht</td>
<td>VienNB</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Missa Je n’ay seray</td>
<td>Obrecht?</td>
<td>VienNB</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Missa Ein frölich wesen</td>
<td>Isaac</td>
<td>VienNB</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Missa Je nay deul</td>
<td>Brumel</td>
<td>VienNB</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Missa Sancta trinitas</td>
<td>Fevin/Mouton</td>
<td>VienNB + MunBS</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Missa Pourquoy non</td>
<td>Gascongne</td>
<td>VienNB</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Missa Adiutorium meum</td>
<td>?</td>
<td>VienNB</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Missa Wohlauf</td>
<td>Isaac</td>
<td>VienNB</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Missa Sine nomine</td>
<td>Brumel</td>
<td>VienNB</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Missa Si dedero</td>
<td>Divitis</td>
<td>VienNB</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Missa Malheur me bat</td>
<td>Josquin</td>
<td>VienNB + MunBS</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Missa Domine Intemerata Virgo</td>
<td>?</td>
<td>MunBS</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Missa de venerabili sacramento</td>
<td>Prioris</td>
<td>MunBS</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Missa Verbnum bonum</td>
<td>Mouton</td>
<td>MunBS</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Missa Alma redemptoris mater</td>
<td>Mouton</td>
<td>MunBS</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Missa Es hat ein Sin</td>
<td>Gascogne</td>
<td>MunBS</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Missa Super Si dedero</td>
<td>Divitis</td>
<td>MunBS</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Missa de sanctissima virgina maria</td>
<td>La Rue</td>
<td>MunBS</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Both bicinia collections contain Mass Ordinary settings by an earlier generation of Franco-Flemish composers, but the Missa Pange lingua is one of only five mass
settings that appear in both MunBS 260 and VienNB 18832. These two manuscripts do not contribute anything significant toward a more precise understanding of the transmission of the *Missa Pange lingua*, but they are early evidence of sections of the mass being used for pedagogical purposes. Although the use of bicinia for pedagogical purposes in Lutheran schools became a well-known tradition due to printed duet collections such as Georg Rhau’s *Bicinia gallica, latina, germanica* and Erasmus Rotenbacher’s *Diphona amoena et florida* (Nuremberg: Berg and Neuber, 1549), MunBS 260 and VienNB 18832 serve as evidence that bicinia were not limited to the print medium in Lutheran Germany; at least one, if not both manuscripts were associated with Catholics from Bavaria.\(^6\) These two sources demonstrate that while bicinia collections are typically regarded as a Lutheran pedagogical item, they were used by Catholics outside of a school setting.

**Georg Rhau’s *Bicinia gallica, latina, germanica***

Annotations in multiple copies of Johannes Ott’s *Missae tredecim* indicate that the *Missa Pange lingua* was occasionally used as an educational tool.\(^7\) In addition to the complete transmission of the mass in *Missae tredecim* that found its way into Lutheran Gymnasiums (discussed above in Chapter 3), excerpts from the *Missa Pange lingua* appear in one printed collection of bicinia that was distinctly Lutheran: Georg Rhau’s *Bicinia gallica, latina, germanica*.\(^8\) The print contains 96 duets from various French, German, and Italian sources.

---

\(^6\) For more on the educational use of bicinia with an emphasis on Rhau’s print, see Bruce Bellingham, “The *Bicinium* in the Lutheran Latin Schools,” (PhD diss., University of Toronto, 1971).

\(^7\) The *Missae tredecim* print is discussed in more detail in Chapter 3.

\(^8\) RISM 1545\(^6\). There is also a modern edition of this print: Bruce Bellingham, ed., *Bicinia gallica, latina, germanica*, Musikdrucke aus den Jahren 1538-1545 in praktischer Neuausgabe 6 (Saint Louis: Concordia Publishing House, 1980).
Latin, and German sources, as the title indicates. Rhau (1488-1548) includes only two sections from the *Missa Pange lingua*, the Pleni sunt and the Agnus II. These two duets appear in Rhau’s first volume of bicinia as contrafacta (see Table 5.4 for text and translation): the Pleni sunt section contains text from Romans 8:35; 38-39, and the Agnus II text comes from Psalm 26 (verses 7, 9, 11, 14).

Georg Rhau earned his B.A. at the University of Wittenberg in 1514 and spent the following four years in Wittenberg working for his uncle, the printer Johann Rhau-Grunenberg. After brief stints in Leipzig, Eisleben, and Hildburghausen, Rhau returned to Wittenberg in 1522-23 to set up his own printing business. He remained in Wittenberg until his death on August 6, 1548.\(^9\) What sources could Rhau have possibly consulted for the contrafacta of Mass Ordinary settings in *Bicinia gallica*? The masses represented in this collection are markedly different from the two Bavarian bicinia collections with a few common works, for example the *Missa Pange lingua* and Fevin’s *Missa de Feria*.

\(^9\) For more information on Rhau’s biography and output as a printer, see Carl Schalk, *Music in Early Lutheranism: Shaping the Tradition* (1524-1672), Chapter 3 (St. Louis: Concordia Academic Press, 2001). Also see Mattfeld, Chapter 5 for more on Rhau’s life.
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Mass Section</th>
<th>Latin</th>
<th>English</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Pleni sunt</td>
<td>Quis separabit nos a caritate Dei, tributatio? an angustia, an fames, an nuditas, an periculum, an persecution, an gladius? Certus sum enim quod neque mors neque vita neque angeli neque principatus neque virtutes neque instantia neque futura neque alitudo neque profunditas neque creatura alia poterit nos separare a caritate Dei quae est in Christo Iesu Domino nostro, que est in Christo Iesu Domino nostro</td>
<td>Who then shall separate us from the love of Christ? Shall tribulation? or distress? or famine? or nakedness? or danger? or persecution? or the sword? For I am sure that neither death, nor life, nor angels, nor principalities, nor powers, nor things present, nor things to come, nor might, nor height, nor depth, nor any other creature, shall be able to separate us from the love of God, which is in Christ Jesus our Lord</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Angus II</td>
<td>Exaudi Domine vocem meam qua clamavi ad te miserere mei, adiutor meus esto, ne derelinquas me, neque despici as me Deus Salutaris meus, Legem pone mihi Domine, in via tua, dirige in semita recta propter inimicos meos, Expecta Dominum, virile ter age et confortetur cor tuum, et sustine Dominum</td>
<td>Hear, O Lord, my voice, with which I have cried to thee: have mercy on me and hear me. Turn not away thy face from me; decline not in thy wrath from thy servant. Be thou my helper, forsake me not; do not thou despise me, O God my Saviour. Set me, O Lord, a law in thy way, and guide me in the right path, because of my enemies. Expect the Lord, do manfully, and let thy heart take courage, and wait thou for the Lord.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

The variants of the Pleni sunt and Agnus II sections in *Bicinia gallica* are too minute to point to a specific exemplar that Rhau could have consulted. In the Agnus II, the vast majority of the variants are related to rhythm and text underlay. By its nature, the contrafacta text *Quis separabit nos* has more words than the Agnus Dei text. When necessary, a single note such as a breve is split into two notes of half value such as semibreves to accommodate the extra syllables. The only other variants in the Agnus II are a flatted B in the upper voice and two instances in the lower voice where two
semibreves are not written as ligatures. The Pleni sunt reading contains similar rhythmic variants in which a dot is replaced by a note of a similar value. The only other variants found in this section are colored semibreves in place of dotted minims.

The closest extant Missa Pange lingua source that warrants consideration for a possible connection to Georg Rhau is JenaU 21, the Alamire manuscript that was acquired by Frederick the Wise. The Pleni sunt and Agnus II readings in the Rhau print do not share any unique variants with JenaU 21, but other early sources such as VatS 16 and VienNB 4809 have a few minute variants in these sections that neither the Rhau print nor JenaU 21 share. The Pleni sunt and the Agnus II (as well as the Benedictus section present in the two bicinia manuscripts) are among the most consistent sections of the Missa Pange lingua across the sources and are not the best to consult for comparison. However, evidence for a relationship between JenaU 21 and Bicinia gallica exists beyond the notes, rests, and text.

JenaU 21, along with Frederick’s other Alamire choirbooks and the paper “Jena choirbooks” were originally part of the Electoral Library in Wittenberg.10 In 1547, the Protestant Schmalkaldic League was defeated by imperial forces and their allies, including Moritz, Duke of Albertine Saxony. Following this defeat, Johann Frederick, nephew of Frederick the Wise, was stripped of his title of Elector of Saxony and his land around Wittenberg and Torgau. Johann Frederick was, however, allowed to keep the holdings of the Electoral Library. To compensate for the loss of the University of Wittenberg, Johann Frederick founded a university in Jena, and the Electoral Library

---

10 See Chapter 2 for more information on these manuscripts.
contents became the foundation for the Jena university library.\textsuperscript{11} All of this happened after 1547, which means JenaU 21 and the other choirbooks would still have been in the Electoral Library at Wittenberg in the early 1540s when Rhau was editing his printed music collections. Kathryn Duffy makes the important point that some of the Alamire and Jena choirbooks may not have been used at the Castle Church, but rather at the court of Frederick the Wise, who maintained a residence in Torgau and tended to travel.\textsuperscript{12} Frederick died on May 5, 1525, and his brother and successor Johann the Steadfast disbanded both the Castle Church chapter and Frederick’s Hofkapelle. The choirbooks used by both ensembles were then retired to the Electoral Library.\textsuperscript{13} Thus, Georg Rhau would have had access to JenaU 21 and the other manuscripts belonging to Frederick and the Castle Church at the Electoral Library in Wittenberg.

The other Mass Ordinary sections that appear as contrafacta in \textit{Bicinia gallica} support the hypothesis that Rhau consulted the contents of the Electoral Library when preparing this print. As Table 5.5 illustrates, all of the \textit{Bicinia gallica} masses except four appear in at least one manuscript from the Electoral Library. Two of the four exceptions, the \textit{Missa Baisez moi} and \textit{Missa Es solt ein Magdlein holen wein}, are works of relatively obscure composers. Rhau published complete versions of these masses in his earlier mass anthology entitled \textit{Opus decem missarum}. The other two masses were composed by

\textsuperscript{11} Kathryn Pohlmann Duffy, “Netherlands Manuscripts at a Saxon Court,” in \textit{The Burgundian-Habsburg Court Complex}, 218-19.

\textsuperscript{12} Duffy, Saxon Court, particularly 219-220.

\textsuperscript{13} Duffy, Saxon Court, 222.
Gascongne and Brumel, two composers whose repertoire was known to both the Alamire workshop and Maximilian’s imperial court.\(^\text{14}\)

Table 5.5

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Mass Ordinary Settings from Bicina Gallica</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Mass</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Missa de Feria</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Missa Mente tota</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Missa Es hat ein Sin</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Missa Pange lingua</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Missa Conceptio tua</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Missa Es solt ein Magdlein holen wein</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Missa de Beata Virgine</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Missa sine nomine</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Missa Ave Maria</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Missa Baisez moi</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Missa de Beata Virgine</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Missa Tue est potentIa</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Missa Incessament</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Missa Hercules Dux Ferrariae</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Missa Sancti Dei Genitrix</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Missa Ave sanctissima</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Missa Ave maris stella</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Four years before publishing his bicina collection, Georg Rhau released a printed anthology of ten complete masses entitled *Opus decem missarum.*\(^\text{15}\) Rhau’s collection of ten masses was intended for use in Lutheran schools and probably also liturgical services.\(^\text{16}\) Extant copies of this print are held at the Österreichische Nationalbibliothek, Kassel Landesbibliothek, Bayerische Staatsbibliothek, and the British Library. The

\(^{14}\) The Benedictus of Gascongne’s *Missa Es hat ein Sin* is inserted within the *Missa Pange lingua* in the Occo Codex. MunBS F is an Alamire manuscript that contains the coat of arms of Henry VIII of England and his wife Catherine of Aragon that was acquired at some point by the Bavarian ducal court, possibly during the time of Wilhelm IV (r.1508-1550). See Kellman, *Treasury*, 119. MunBS 65 is one of the “Gwalther” manuscripts discussed in Chapter 2.

\(^{15}\) RISM 1541\(^1\)

Kassel exemplar is actually bound together with Johannes Ott’s *Missae tredecim quatuor vocum*. Unlike the confessionally ambiguous mass prints from Nuremberg published in 1539, there is no mistaking *Opus decem missarum* as anything other than a Lutheran print given the printer and city of publication. The repertoire in Rhau’s mass anthology is different from the Nuremberg mass prints and also the Mass Ordinary contrafacta of *Bicinia gallica*. The Sampson and Roselli masses appear in both, and the Credo from Brumel’s *Missa De beata Virgine* is inserted into Adam Rener’s *Missa Dominicalis*.

The majority of the masses in *Opus decem missarum* are by composers associated with Maximilian I’s Hofkapelle: Heinrich Isaac, Ludwig Senfl, and Adam Rener. Johannes Stahel may have been the son of a Johann Stahel, who also sang at the court of Maximilian I.\(^{17}\) Louise Cuyler speculates that Petrus Roselli may have been father or uncle of a Francesco Roselli, who worked at various churches in Rome in the later sixteenth century.\(^{18}\) The composer named Sampson, whose mass appears in both *Opus decem missarum* and *Bicinia gallica*, is even more obscure.\(^{19}\) Matthaeus Pipelare was active in Antwerp and many of his compositions appear in Alamire manuscripts, including the *Missa De feria* from this collection. It is found in JenaU 21, along with the *Missa Pange lingua*. Extant sources associating these works with the Electoral Library do not exist for all of the masses—Isaac’s *Missa Carminum* is found in JenaU 36 and the Pipelare mass is in JenaU 21—but given Rener’s employment history with first the


\(^{18}\) Cuyler, Georg Rhaw, 72.

\(^{19}\) The *Grove Music* article for a sixteenth-century English composer named Sampson notes that this is a different composer whose work appears in the Rhau publications. Cuyler cites a passage in Eitner’s *Quellenlexikon* that described a Sampson as “ein niederländischer Komponist aus der ersten Hälfte des 16. Jahrhunderts, über dessen Leben wir nichts wissen.” Cuyler, Georg Rhaw, 72.
Imperial court of Maximilian and then the court of Frederick the Wise, it is easy to imagine Rhau having access to this repertoire assuming Rener brought some of it with him to Saxony.\textsuperscript{20} From 1507, Rener was a singer and composer at the court of Frederick the Wise in Torgau.

Table 5.6

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Contents of Rhau’s Opus decem missarum</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Mass</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Missa Adieu mes amours</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Missa Nisi Dominus</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Missa Es solt ein Megdlin holen wein</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Missa Une musicque de Biscay</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Missa Octavi toni</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Missa Baisez moy</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Missa Carminum</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Missa Brevis Uuinkenghy sot grone</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Missa Dominicalis</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Missa de Feria</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Cuyler notes that several masses in Opus decem missarum are based on secular models.\textsuperscript{22} It is entirely plausible that these secular models could contain sacred or liturgical symbolism. Nevertheless, it is still noteworthy that the complete masses Rhau published in Opus decem Missarum seem to come from a different repertory than the masses disguised as contrafacta in Bicinia gallica. In general, the Bicinia gallica masses have preexisting material that is primarily liturgical and could be considered objectionable by Lutheran standards. There are a number of Marian masses and of course


\textsuperscript{21} The Credo in this Mass is actually from Brumel’s Missa De beata Virgine.

\textsuperscript{22} Cuyler, Georg Rhau, 72.
the Missa Pange lingua. Was Rhau aware of the overtly Catholic associations these masses carried with their pre-existing material and earlier performance contexts?

Georg Rhau offers some thoughts on objectionable Catholic music in yet another publication of Latin polyphony intended for Lutheran schools. In 1542, Rhau compiled a substantial collection of 134 hymns for Vespers services held at Lutheran schools entitled Sacrorum hymnorum liber primus. This print was one of six volumes of repertoire for Lutheran Vespers. Rhau’s hymn collection is organized according to the liturgical calendar, with hymns from the Proper of the Time followed by hymns for the Proper of the Saints. Most feasts have between two and four pieces, and the bigger, solemn feasts have more: there are a total of eight hymns for Christmas (including the vigil and Christmas Day), ten for Easter (including the vigil), six for Pentecost, and six for the Assumption of Mary. Corpus Christi tops this list with thirteen items, and nine of these items are settings of various stanzas of Pange lingua. The chant melody is paraphrased in all nine polyphonic settings of Pange lingua in Sacrorum hymnorum.

---


24 There are 39 pieces by Thomas Stoltzer and 22 by Heinrich Finck, the two composers with the most attributions in the collection. Ludwig Senfl, Adam Rener, Johann Walther, and Jacob Obrecht are also represented in the collection. In addition to the critical edition in Das Erbe deutsche Musik, an index of the Sacrorum Hymnorum’s contents can be found in Mattfeld, 186-191.

25 General characteristics of the Pange lingua settings in this print are addressed in Chapter 1.
Table 5.7

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Number</th>
<th>Title</th>
<th>Composer</th>
<th>Voices</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>62</td>
<td>Pange lingua</td>
<td>Attr. Josquin</td>
<td>4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>63</td>
<td>Nobis natus</td>
<td>Thomas Stoltzer</td>
<td>4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>64</td>
<td>In supremae nocte cenae</td>
<td>Thomas Stoltzer</td>
<td>4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>65</td>
<td>Tantum ergo</td>
<td>Anonymous</td>
<td>4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>66</td>
<td>Pange lingua</td>
<td>Ludwig Senfl</td>
<td>4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>67</td>
<td>Genitori Genitoque</td>
<td>Heinrich Finck</td>
<td>4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>68</td>
<td>Pange lingua</td>
<td>Ludwig Senfl</td>
<td>5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>69</td>
<td>Nobis natus</td>
<td>Thomas Stoltzer</td>
<td>5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>70</td>
<td>Nobis natus</td>
<td>Andreas Capellus</td>
<td>5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>71</td>
<td>Jesus Christus nostra salus</td>
<td>Thomas Stoltzer</td>
<td>4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>72</td>
<td>O quam sanctus panis iste</td>
<td>Heinrich Finck</td>
<td>4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>73</td>
<td>Jesus Christus, nostra salus</td>
<td>Anonymous</td>
<td>5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>74</td>
<td>Verbum supernum prodiens</td>
<td>Anonymous</td>
<td>4</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Rhau’s hymn collection is “Catholic” in nature—he provides music for five Marian feasts and feasts of saints who are not mentioned in the Bible. The Corpus Christi section is particularly intriguing because the number of polyphonic items is so large. Corpus Christi was a major feast along with the likes of Christmas, Easter, and Pentecost, but it did not usually trump the other feasts in terms of liturgical items or artistic decoration in earlier Catholic sources. Rhau certainly was aware that some of the hymns in Sacrorum hymnorum conflicted with Lutheran beliefs and liturgical practices. In both the preface to the reader and the dedication to the town of Joachimsthal, he states that he realized some of the hymn texts contained false doctrine. He explains that he included the questionable hymns in his collection because of their aesthetic and educational value:

Si qui igitur in hoc opere sunt Hymni de Sanctis ab harmonia sacrae scripturae dissonantes, eos meminerit Lector, suavis concentus et iuventutis in cantu...

---

26 Georg Rhau, Sacrorum Hymnorum Liber Primus (Wittenberg 1542), preface.
If, therefore, in this work there are any Hymns of the Saints that are dissonant from the harmony of sacred scripture, the reader should recall [these hymns] and the sweet harmony of youth in song…

Georg Rhau does not mention Corpus Christi specifically, but his sentiments are applicable to the feast. The amount of Corpus Christi liturgical music included in *Sacrorum hymnorum* most likely would have prompted Rhau to consider the status of the feast in Lutheran churches compared to its popularity prior to the Reformation. Given that *Sacrorum hymnorum* was published in 1542, one year after *Opus quindecim missarum* and three years before *Bicinia gallica*, it is reasonable to believe that Rhau held this attitude toward similar pieces with controversial text and implications from publications right before and after *Sacrorum hymnorum*.

Although Rhau does not speak for the entire Lutheran liturgical-musical community, he was an influential music publisher working in Wittenberg, the cradle of the Lutheran Reformation. Rhau’s approach toward this Latin repertoire most likely extended to Lutheran music educators in other places. After all, there are multiple exemplars of *Missae tredecim* with handwritten markings that appear to be pedagogical in selected mass movements and sections, including the *Missa Pange lingua*. In the consideration of the *Missa Pange lingua* as a pedagogical tool, an interesting omission exists in this realm. Many of the Mass Ordinary settings transmitted alongside the *Missa Pange lingua* appear in musical treatises and instructional books, whereas the *Missa Pange lingua* appears in only one: Heinrich Glarean’s *Dodecachordon*.27 The Pleni sunt section from the *Missa Pange lingua* is included in Glarean’s 1547 treatise as an example

---

27 There are numerous extant copies of the *Dodecachordon*, see RISM B-VI, p.366 for a list of libraries. There is also a facsimile, critical edition and commentary on the treatise: Heinrich Glarean, *Dodecachordon (1547)*, translated, transcribed, and edited by Clement A. Miller, Musicological Studies and Documents 6 (American Institute of Musicology, 1965).
of the Hypoaeolian mode. The Dodecachordon and the three bicinia collections containing sections from the Missa Pange lingua are a testament to the pedagogical value ascribed to this work by both Catholics and Lutherans.

The Ronneburg Missa Pange lingua

There is one more Missa Pange lingua source produced in the later sixteenth century but unrelated to Missae tredecim and the subsequent manuscripts lacking the Agnus II. This source—perhaps the most intriguing of all extant Missa Pange lingua sources—is a single print that has long been labeled in source catalogs and editions as coming from an unknown publisher. It is one of seven single prints of four-voice Mass Ordinary settings that are bound together and held today at the Hochschul-und Landesbibliothek RheinMain in Wiesbaden (see Table 5.8). The prints are all in choirbook format and no printer or publisher is indicated. However, they do contain the coat of arms and motto of Anthony von Isenburg, count of Büdingen (1501-1560). Unlike Johannes Ott’s Missae tredecim, these prints do not seem to have a commercial purpose. Rather, they were intended for private use by the count and anyone to whom he gave the prints as gifts.

---

28 A translation of this section can be found in Miller, vol. II, 259-60.
29 RISM J676
30 Sig. gr. 2 Qt 31. Secondary literature on this group of prints is scarce. The most significant study on the group of prints as a whole is Hans Joachim Moser, “Eine Musikaliendruckerei auf einer deutschen Ritterburg,” Zeitschrift für Musikwissenschaft 17 (1935), 97-102. The prints were recently addressed in Royston Gustavson, “Senfl in Print: The Einzeldrucke,” in Senfl-Studien 2, ed. Stefan Gasch and Sonja Tröster, Wiener Forum für Ältere Musikgeschichte 7 (Tutzing: Hans Schneider, 2013), 290-297.
Anthony von Isenburg embraced Lutheranism as early as 1529 and in 1535 he exchanged letters with Philipp Melanchthon in order to obtain a tutor for his son.\textsuperscript{31} At some point, Isenburg set up a print shop in his castle, known as the Ronneburg. Peter Nieß lists a “druckerei” among an inventory of rooms in the castle from the sixteenth century, and Moser identified an invoice dated November 26, 1557 for glazing the windows in the print shop.\textsuperscript{32} Along with the seven Mass Ordinary prints, two other items were apparently produced in the count’s print shop: the title page of his account books for 1557 and an edition of the \textit{Confessio Augustana} (Augsburg Confession) also from 1557.\textsuperscript{33} Both items have a similar title page ornament to the mass prints and the \textit{Confessio Augustana} bears Isenburg’s coat of arms and motto: “Armut und Uberflus gibt zeitlich Betrübnis (poverty and abundance give timely sorrow).”

The Ronneburg \textit{Missa Pange lingua} print is separated from the other “complete” transmissions of the mass from the second half of the sixteenth century because it includes the Agnus II duet. It is extremely unlikely that the printer at the Ronneburg

\begin{table}[h]
\centering
\caption{Mass Ordinary Prints of Anthony von Isenburg}
\begin{tabular}{|l|l|l|}
\hline
Mass & Composer & Year \\
\hline
\textit{Missa Nisi Dominus} & Senfl & 1557/58 \\
\textit{Missa Pange lingua} & Josquin & 1559 \\
\textit{Missa Quem dicunt homines} & Mouton & 1559 \\
\textit{Missa L’homme armé sexti toni} & Josquin & 1560 \\
\textit{Missa Mente tota} & Fevin & 1560 \\
\textit{Missa La Bataille} & Janequin & 1560 \\
\textit{Missa Veni sponsa} & Richafort & 1560 \\
\hline
\end{tabular}
\end{table}

\textsuperscript{31} Moser, 99. According to Moser, these letters are extant in the Büdingen archive.


\textsuperscript{33} For more on the count’s \textit{Confessio Augustana} edition, see Josef Benzing, \textit{Eine unbekannte Ausgabe der Confessio Augustana vom Jahre 1557} (Wiesbaden: F. Steiner, 1956).
would have supplemented an exemplar lacking the second Agnus with a bicinia collection in order to ensure that their edition of the mass was truly complete. In the critical commentary of the New Josquin Edition, Willem Elders observes that Isenburg’s print provides a “remarkably faithful transmission,” but does not commit to any relationships between the print and other *Missa Pange lingua* sources.\(^{34}\) Theodor Dumetriscu postulates that the print could have descended from an earlier source because it shares variants with JenaU 21 and Munich 510, despite being “slightly edited.”\(^{35}\)

The Ronneburg print is indeed more closely related to the earliest *Missa Pange lingua* sources than to *Missae tredecim* and VienNB 4809, but it is difficult to identify a distinct relationship between the Ronneburg reading and the four earliest manuscripts discussed in earlier chapters (VatS 16, MunBS 510, the Occo Codex, and JenaU 21). The print does not share a consistent number of unique variants with any of these four sources, and it contains a few of its own unique rhythmic and notational variants not found in any other *Missa Pange lingua* reading. There are also differences in color and ligatures between the Ronneburg print and the earlier sources, but there is no consistent pattern with either. MunBS 510 has a tendency to substitute a colored semibreve for dotted minims. The Ronneburg print tends to contain more of these colored semibreves than the other sources, but again there is no discernable pattern.

The readings of the *Missa Pange lingua* do not reveal an exact or even closely related exemplar that the Ronneburg printers might have consulted, but the transmission analysis suggests that the print descended from the earlier pool of *Missa Pange lingua* sources rather than sources derived from the *Missae tredecim* reading. Although the

\(^{34}\) NJE 4.3, 79.

\(^{35}\) Dumetriscu, “The Occo Codex.”
Ronneburg Missa Pange lingua is actually a single print rather than a collected anthology of pieces, there are six other prints closely related to this source. In the final years before his death, Anthony von Isenburg had seven masses printed. It is possible that he could have given away other prints to friends and colleagues that are now lost. We also do not know if Isenburg would have printed more music had he not died in 1560. When attempting to trace the path of the Missa Pange lingua to Isenburg’s castle, however, the six other mass settings are the most closely related sources in terms of provenance and production.

The seven masses printed at the Ronneburg create an eclectic collection of works by Franco-Flemish composers along with Ludwig Senfl, who was active in Bavaria. Some masses such as those by Josquin and Senfl’s Missa Nisi Dominus circulated widely throughout Germany and were probably relatively easy to obtain. Other masses seem to have been more obscure. The Missa La Bataille is one of two masses written by Clément Janequin (1485-after 1558). Janequin never worked for a cathedral or court, and his genre of choice was the chanson. The Missa La Bataille is actually based on his well-known chanson with onomatopoetic war sounds entitled La Bataille. Likewise, the Missa Veni sponsa Christi is one of only two known Mass Ordinary settings by Jean Richafort (1480-1547), a Franco-Flemish composer.

When attempting to trace the path of the Missa Pange lingua to Isenburg’s castle, the six other mass prints are the most closely related sources in terms of provenance and production.

---

production. Table 5.9 shows the concordant sources of the Ronneburg masses that are related in terms of provenance, and there are a few discernable patterns. Four of the masses are found in manuscripts that originated at the Thomaskirche in Leipzig and the Electoral Library in Wittenberg. The two Josquin masses also appear in Brno 15/4, which contains a considerable amount of eastern German repertoire and may have some association with that region. The remaining three Ronneburg masses are found in the two editions of a French print entitled *Liber decem missarum a praeclaris musicis* (Lyon: Moderne, 1532 and 1540).  

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Mass</th>
<th>Composer</th>
<th>Sources</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><em>Missa Nisi Dominus</em></td>
<td>Senfl</td>
<td>LeipU 51</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><em>Missa Pange lingua</em></td>
<td>Josquin</td>
<td>Brno 15/4; JenaU 21; LeipU 49/50; VatS 16;</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>VatG XII 2; VienNB 4809</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><em>Missa Quem dicunt homines</em></td>
<td>Mouton</td>
<td>RISM 1532; RISM 1540; VatS 13</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><em>Missa L'homme armé sexti toni</em></td>
<td>Josquin</td>
<td>Brno 15/4; JenaU 31; LeipU 51; VienNB 11778; VatS 41</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><em>Missa Mente tota</em></td>
<td>Févin</td>
<td>JenaU 3; VatG XII 2; VatS 16; VienNB 15495</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><em>Missa La Bataille</em></td>
<td>Janequin</td>
<td>RISM 1532; RISM 1540</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><em>Missa Veni sponsa</em></td>
<td>Richafort</td>
<td>RISM 1532; RISM 1540</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

It is quite possible that Isenburg possessed a copy of *Liber decem missarum* and obtained exemplars of the other masses from a source or sources from eastern Germany.

Another possibility regarding the masses by Senfl and the Franco-Flemish composers involves an Augsburg printer from the earlier part of the sixteenth century. In his study of single prints of Ludwig Senfl compositions, Royston Gustavson affirms an earlier hypothesis by Josef Benzing that the printer of the seven masses and other items at the

37 There are relatively few extant exemplars of either edition of this print. The three surviving copies of the 1532 edition are currently in the Museo internazionale e biblioteca della musica in Bologna, the Biblioteca Nazionale Centrale in Florence, and the London British Library. The three copies of the 1540 edition can be found at the Österreichische Nationalbibliothek in Vienna, the Zentral-und Hochschulbibliothek in Luzern (Switzerland), and the Vatican Library.
Ronneburg was Jost Gran, who was living in Frankfurt in the 1550s.\footnote{Gustavson, Senfl, 296. Also see Benzing, 14-16.} Gustavson also makes the case that the masses were printed from type rather than woodcuts, and the format and music typeface of the Ronneburg masses strongly resemble the well-known *Liber selectarum cantionum*, which was printed in Augsburg in 1520. He outlines a possible explanation for how the music font made its way from the Augsburg printers Grimm and Wirsung to the Frankfurt music printer Christian Egenolff. Egenolff died in 1555, right before the first masses were printed at the Ronneburg. Gustavson hypothesizes that Gran, also living in Frankfurt, could have obtained the typeface from Egenolff’s heirs.\footnote{Gustavson, Senfl, 294-95.}

If Grimm and Wirsung’s music font made its way from Augsburg to the Ronneburg, it is possible that some exemplars of Mass Ordinary settings could have accompanied it. A few of the Ronneburg masses are found in manuscripts belonging to the Fugger family, but the comparison between the *Missa Pange lingua* readings in the Ronneburg print and VienNB 4809 discounts a relationship between the two sources. Music by Senfl, Josquin, Mouton, and Févin was certainly known in both Bavaria and eastern Germany. Gustavson relates an exchange between the Nuremberg church leaders Veit Dietrich (working in Wittenberg at the time) and Hieronymous Baumgartner in which Dietrich asked Baumgartner to remind Senfl to send his *Missa Nisi Dominus* to Martin Luther as promised.\footnote{Ibid., 296.}

Someone indeed brought the *Missa Nisi Dominus* to Lutheran Saxony, as it survives in several sources from the region. It is printed in Rhau’s *Opus decem missarum*...
and it was included in a manuscript from the Leipzig Thomaskirche that dates from the 1550s. The realm of lost, unknown sources from this period makes for endless speculation as to how repertoire traveled from place to place, but there are plenty of extant sources for the Senfl and Franco-Flemish masses from the Saxon region, which makes the possibility that the Ronneburg exemplars originated in that area slightly stronger. Moreover, the extant correspondence between Isenburg and Melanchthon provides concrete evidence that the count had contact with the Lutheran community in Wittenberg.

Four of the masses were printed in 1560, the year of Isenburg’s death. There is no indication that the print shop at his castle continued production after he died—we have no idea how many more, if any, music prints he planned to publish. Given the number of manuscripts from the earlier part of the sixteenth century that contain exactly seven Mass Ordinary settings (BrusBR 6428, 15075, JenaU 2, JenaU7, MunBS 7 are only a few examples from the Alamire workshop), it is very tempting to entertain the idea that the seven masses printed at the Ronneburg came from a single manuscript. It is also possible that the exemplar manuscript could have contained 8 or more masses (JenaU 21 is an example) and the entire manuscript was not realized in prints due to the count’s death.

Several questions remain regarding the creation of the Ronneburg Missa Pange lingua print, but this source makes a significant contribution to one of the primary questions concerning the Lutheran use of Missa Pange lingua: to what extent did Lutherans associate this polyphonic mass with Eucharistic devotion and the monophonic hymn penned by Thomas Aquinas? Many of the other Lutheran Missa Pange lingua

41 Gustavson notes that the Ronneburg Missa Nisi dominus reading is not related to the reading in the Rhau print. See Gustavson, Senfl, 297. Also see http://www.senflonline.com for an up-to-date list of concordant sources of the mass.
sources have discernable provenances and, in the case of several Missae tredecim exemplars, concrete signs of use. However, there are no clues as to whether their users were aware of its medieval, overtly Catholic allusions. The Ronneburg print contains text and images not found in any other Missa Pange lingua source—Catholic or Lutheran—that indicates a strong connection to the pre-existing material of the mass.

The opening Kyrie pages of each printed Ronneburg mass contain two simple engraved images: one next to the discantus voice and the other adjacent to the bassus voice at the bottom of the same page. Isenburg’s coat of arms is always next to the discantus voice in the upper left corner, and the lower image varies. For instance, there is a snap pea next to the bassus voice of Mouton’s Missa Quem dicunt homines (see Figure 5.1) and a scythe in Janequin’s Missa La Bataille. On the opening page of the Missa Pange lingua, the coat of arms is next to the discantus and a family of waterfowl is next to the bassus voice (see Figure 5.2).

Figure 5.1 Missa Quem dicunt homines, beginning of Bassus. Wiesbaden, Hochschul- und Landesbibliothek RheinMain, Sig. gr. 2 Qt 31.
Figure 5.2 Opening Page of *Missa Pange lingua*, Wiesbaden, Hochschul- und Landesbibliothek RheinMain, Sig. gr. 2 Qt 31.
The rendering of the birds is not minutely detailed, but it is clear that they have long necks and two of the birds are young. The mother’s head and beak give the appearance of a swan. In the rich lore of medieval animal symbolism, the swan held multiple meanings. Classical authors including Philostratus, Cicero, and Pliny wrote of the beautiful song a swan would sing before dying. As a result, the swan came to be associated with death, and the praise of God through song before death.\textsuperscript{42} The swan also had a negative connotation; due to the contrast between its white plumage and underlying black flesh, it could also symbolize hypocrisy.\textsuperscript{43}

The pelican is another possible identity of the birds on the Missa Pange lingua print. Although pelicans have much longer beaks than the birds in the print, pelicans have been depicted in medieval and Renaissance art as having shorter beaks like a swan or a goose.\textsuperscript{44} One such example is a sculpture in the north aisle of the Magdeburg cathedral (see Figure 5.3).\textsuperscript{45}

In terms of iconography, the pelican is a bird intrinsically relevant to the Missa Pange lingua. The pelican, particularly when depicted with its young, is symbolic of Christ’s sacrifice on the Cross and in turn the sacrament of the Eucharist. The symbolism of Christ as the pelican is also supported by Psalm 101:7 (102:6 in modern

\begin{flushright}
\textsuperscript{42}Simona Cohen, \textit{Animals Disguised as Symbols in Renaissance Art} (Leiden: Brill, 2008), 48.


\textsuperscript{44}It should be noted that pelicans do not live anywhere near Germany, which could account for any inaccurate depictions of pelicans by artists.

\textsuperscript{45}Two further examples of pelicans with short beaks can be found in Francesco Mezzalira, \textit{Beasts and Bestiaries: The Representation of Animals from Prehistory to the Renaissance} (Turin: Umberto Allemandi & C, 2002), plates 12 and 69.
\end{flushright}
translations)—“I am like a pelican of the wilderness.” The association of the pelican with Christ and the Eucharist comes from a legend about how the pelican is the animal with the greatest love for its offspring because it will pierce its breast to feed its young with its own blood. An extended version of this legend reads that when pelicans are born, they peck at their parents’ faces and the parents peck back, killing their young.\textsuperscript{47} After three days of mourning, the mother tears open her breast to draw blood, and the dripping blood revives the young pelicans. The \textit{Physiologus}, a Greek collection of animal stories written sometime in the third century, describes this pelican legend and makes the connection between the wound in the mother pelican’s breast and the wound in Christ’s side at the crucifixion.\textsuperscript{48}

Figure 5.3 Pelican in her Piety, north aisle of the Magdeburg cathedral\textsuperscript{49}

\begin{figure}[h]
    \centering
    \includegraphics[width=0.3\textwidth]{pelican.png}
    \caption{Pelican in her Piety, north aisle of the Magdeburg cathedral}
\end{figure}

\footnotesize
\textsuperscript{46} \textit{Similis factus sum pelicano solitudinis} (Psalm 101: 7, the Vulgate); English translation from the Douay Rheims Bible. See George Ferguson, \textit{Signs and Symbols in Christian Art} (New York: Oxford University Press, 1954), 23; and Gertrud Schiller, \textit{Iconography of Christian Art}, trans. Janet Seligman, Vol. 2 (Greenwich, CT: New York Graphic Society Ltd, 1972), 136-37. The images in the other six masses will certainly need to be investigated for possible symbolic connections between the given illustration and the mass.

\textsuperscript{47} For more information and literature on the pelican legend and the Eucharist, see Miri Rubin, \textit{Corpus Christi}, 310-12.

\textsuperscript{48} For more on the popularity of the \textit{Physiologus} and other bestiaries in medieval and Renaissance Europe, see Cohen, 3-22.
The pelican image on the *Missa Pange lingua* print is also interesting because it has a background and seems to have been cropped from a larger scene, while the images on the other masses are isolated objects. It is possible that the bird imagery was a priority in the *Missa Pange lingua* print and that particular engraving was the only available image, particularly since the bird engraving looks different from the engravings on the other six masses. If the birds were meant to be swans, perhaps Count Isenburg (or his editor/printer) placed them with the *Missa Pange lingua* as an allusion to the hypocrisy of Corpus Christi celebrations and excessive Eucharistic veneration, which is how Martin Luther described them. In terms of the pelican reading, Count Isenburg (and probably his editor/printer) would have been aware of its association with the Eucharist in the context of a sacrifice, and the fact that it was entirely out of line with Lutheran theology regarding the Eucharist and the Mass as a sacrifice.

There is yet another allusion to the earlier context of the *Missa Pange lingua* in the Ronneburg print that is much more concrete and deliberate. In the discantus voice of the final Agnus Dei, the text of the first verse of *Pange lingua*—Aquinas’s version—is printed above the standard Agnus Dei text (see Figures 5.4-5.6). This is not found in any of the other *Missa Pange lingua* sources or in any of the other Ronneburg mass prints. On the opening folios of *Missa Pange lingua* in two Alamire manuscripts, JenaU 21 and VienNB 4809, the incipit “Pange lingua” is written in red ink alongside the Kyrie text of each voice part. This was probably done to identify the pre-existing material; the red

---

49 Reproduced from R. Hamann and F. Rosenfeld, *Der Magdeburger Dom* (Berlin, 1910), 113.

50 The word Luther used is “Heuchelei.” Johann Konrad Irmischer, ed., *Dr. Martin Luthers sämtliche Werke* vol. 28 (Erlangen-Frankfurter Ausgabe), 406. “Zuvor sollt man abgethun die Sacramenthäuser und die Prozession auf des hl. Leichnams Tag, weil der keins noth noch nutz ist, und groß Heuchelei und Spott dem Sacrament widerfährt.”
incipit is not found in the Occo Codex (BrusBR IV.922), but in that case the mass is actually labeled “Missa Pange lingua” whereas its title in JenaU 21 and VienNB 4809 is “Missa de venerabili sacramento.”

The polytextual rendering of the Agnus Dei in the Ronneburg Missa Pange lingua is unusual because the chant text is in the highest voice. There is a precedent for polytextual Mass Ordinary settings that dates from the generation of Dufay and Dunstable, but in most cases the text of the pre-existing material is in the tenor.51 In the case of the Missa Pange lingua, the chant text placement makes sense because Josquin placed a long-note paraphrase of the Pange lingua melody in the superius voice while the lower voices provide a supporting texture. Given the presence of cantus firmus texts in earlier masses such as the Ecce ancilla Domini masses by Dufay, Regis, and Ockeghem, it is plausible that the Pange lingua text in the Ronneburg print was copied from an earlier, non-extant Missa Pange lingua source.52

In purely musical terms, the added Pange lingua text in the final Agnus Dei is relatively simple to explain. This section of Mass Ordinary settings typically contains some sort of unique feature that unifies the entire work or provides some sort of contextual commentary. When the liturgical context of the Agnus Dei is considered, the added text becomes exceptionally appropriate for a Catholic Mass and exceptionally inappropriate for Lutherans. In the Catholic Mass, the Agnus Dei was sung at the


conclusion of the *Pax Domini* and coincided with the fraction, which is the breaking of the consecrated Host by the priest. The fraction was originally an Eastern practice that symbolized the Passion and death of Christ, and it took on that meaning in the Western church as well.\(^{53}\) The prominent mention of a (sacrificial) lamb in the Agnus Dei text reinforces the idea that the Mass itself was a sacrifice, which was abhorrent to Luther and his followers.

While the Agnus Dei text and its placement in the Catholic liturgy emphasize the sacrificial aspect of the Mass, the added cantus firmus text in the *Missa Pange lingua* highlights another function of the Agnus Dei also objectionable to Lutherans. Charles Riepe explains:

> In the interval between consecration and Communion [the Agnus Dei] represents a reverential and, at the same time, humble greeting of Him who has been made present under the form of bread. We might compare it to what occurred some five hundred years later when, under the impulse of a new wave of Eucharistic devotion, the silence of the consecration and the elevation of the bread was broken by the introduction of hymns which were engendered not only by their Latin genius but by a new attitude towards the Sacrament—hymns like *Ave verum corpus* and *O Salutaris hostia*.\(^{54}\)

As explained in Chapter 1, *Pange lingua* was originally written for the feast of Corpus Christi and was performed during other Eucharistic rituals throughout the year. Even though the first stanza of the hymn does not explicitly reference the polemical doctrine of transubstantiation, the text still carries a strong association with practices that Martin Luther and his fellow Reformers regarded with sentiments ranging from indifference to


\(^{54}\) Jungmann, rev. Riepe, 486.
Despite the widespread Lutheran use of the *Missa Pange lingua*—even the final Agnus Dei—it seems likely that this was an earlier, i.e. Catholic characteristic of this *Missa Pange lingua* reading.

Figure 5.4 Superius voice of Agnus Dei III, *Missa Pange lingua*, Wiesbaden, Hochschul- und Landesbibliothek RheinMain Sig. gr. 2 Qt 31.

Figure 5.5 Superius voice of Agnus Dei III (continued), *Missa Pange lingua*, Wiesbaden, Hochschul- und Landesbibliothek RheinMain Sig. gr. 2 Qt 31.
It is also possible, but less likely, that the printer or Isenburg himself prompted the insertion of the *Pange lingua* text. If this was the case, then why was this done with the *Missa Pange lingua* and none of the other masses? Also, the issue of confessional context is a factor. While there is an earlier tradition of polytextual masses that were performed in pre-Reformation services in full communion with Rome, I am not aware of such precedence among Mass Ordinary settings in Lutheran sources. At this point, the Ronneburg *Missa Pange lingua* print is an anomaly among Lutheran polyphonic mass settings. If Isenburg or another Lutheran were to add text to a Mass Ordinary setting, they would have the choice to add text in Latin or the vernacular. This reading of the *Missa Pange lingua* cannot be definitively tied to a specific earlier source. In terms of
geographic location and transmission analysis, MunBS 510 and the Alamire manuscripts seem to be related, but their readings do not provide an ideal, concrete match with the Ronneburg print. A possible scenario is that Isenburg’s printer consulted a now-lost source—probably an earlier manuscript that presented *Missa Pange lingua* as a votive mass for the Eucharist—that had the *Pange lingua* text in the discantus of the final Agnus Dei, and possibly even the pelican iconography as well. If that family of birds is indeed pelicans alluding to the sacrifice of Christ and the Eucharist, it seems unlikely that a Lutheran in the later sixteenth century would “re-attach” this image to the mass.

Regardless of the source behind the hymn text in the Agnus Dei, the fact remains that someone allowed it to be included. It was either added by someone involved with the production of the print, or it was copied from another exemplar instead of being omitted. The image of the family of waterfowl in the opening Kyrie is less concrete than the text, but the pelican in Christian iconography strengthens the case that this image was added as a deliberate symbol of the Eucharist. Whether it was first added at the Ronneburg or in an earlier exemplar, we may never know.

The three bicinia collections and the Ronneburg print illustrate the dual context that the *Missa Pange lingua* attained in the sixteenth century. It was valued as a respectable composition from the past that could be used in Lutheran music classrooms, but at the same time it was still the mass by Josquin that was probably intended to be sung on Corpus Christi or during a Eucharistic votive mass. Both of these rituals were rejected by Martin Luther, but the prints from Georg Rhau and Anthony von Isenburg illustrate that Lutherans still held these and other objectionable doctrines and rituals in their memories. Rhau felt the need to address the music containing “false doctrine” and,
somehow, the text of the *Pange lingua* hymn made it into a print for a Lutheran count. The period of ambiguity and transition in Reformation Germany is particularly resonant in these particular sources of the *Missa Pange lingua.*
Conclusion: Text, Context, and Identity

The manuscripts and prints discussed in the final three chapters of this dissertation confirm that the Missa Pange lingua was a relatively popular mass among Lutherans. Upon acquiring copies of Johannes Ott’s Missae tredecim for their schools and churches, the Missa Pange lingua was among the masses from that anthology that Lutherans performed and studied. In several instances, scribes compiling handwritten collections of Lutheran liturgical music included the Missa Pange lingua in their manuscripts when they almost certainly had other Latin Mass Ordinary settings from which to choose. Lutherans also adapted the Missa Pange lingua for their own church services and pedagogical needs, as evidenced by the editing work of Johannes Buechmayer in his Regensburg choirbook and the bicinia collection of Georg Rhau. The Lutheran circulation of the Missa Pange lingua even spread to the Czech and Slovak lands along with other Latin repertoire popular in the Germanic region. Why did Lutherans choose to study, perform, print, copy, and circulate this particular mass, when there were so many others with less polemical melodic material?

One could propose that the Missa Pange lingua was a superior musical work, and that Lutherans included it in their repertoires for reasons that were purely aesthetic. I would argue, however, that a case made for the display of Josquin’s compositional mastery in the Missa Pange lingua is also a case for the conspicuity of the Pange lingua hymn in the polyphonic texture. Josquin uses all six stanzas of the hymn in each voice throughout the entire mass. The main sections of the mass begin with the familiar E-E-F-E incipit prominently displayed in an imitative texture. In the final Agnus Dei, Josquin places the chant melody in long notes in the superius voice, which makes it nearly
impossible to miss. Moreover, it would not be feasible to meticulously trace the subjective musical tastes of every Lutheran who might have distributed or performed the Missa Pange lingua in the sixteenth century.

As Andrew Kirkman states in his book, The Cultural Life of the Early Polyphonic Mass, “to build a Mass setting around a borrowed melody is to unlock the potential of that melody for symbolic and emblematic significance.”\(^1\) In the case of the Missa Pange lingua, that symbolic and emblematic significance revolves around the Eucharist and the feast of Corpus Christi. Martin Luther felt the rituals associated with Corpus Christi and the Eucharist were hypocritical and mocking rather than reverent. Lutherans were most likely conscious of the Pange lingua hymn and its connotations when they heard Josquin’s mass, but to what extent did it matter? As with aesthetic considerations, it is impossible to make a generalization for the entire Lutheran community. People who were around the same age as Martin Luther would all have experienced lavish Corpus Christi processions before the Reformation. They would have heard Pange lingua on Corpus Christi and during other rituals centered on the consecrated Host. The young boys who sang all or part of the Missa Pange lingua in the third quarter of the sixteenth century may or may not have been to a Corpus Christi procession—they were eradicated in most Lutheran towns, but Catholic communities, particularly in Bavaria, still held them.

I propose that while Luther and his followers aimed to silence the context of Pange lingua—Corpus Christi processions, votive masses, and other forms of Eucharistic adoration—they did not necessarily silence its text. At face value, the majority of the hymn text is not in direct conflict with Lutheran beliefs. The first three stanzas describe

\(^1\) Andrew Kirkman, The Cultural Life of the Early Polyphonic Mass: Medieval Context to Modern Revival (Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 2010), 56.
Christ’s life from his birth to the events at the Last Supper. The final stanza, a doxology, contains a reference to the Filioque clause in the Nicene Creed, which was not a divisive issue between Martin Luther and the Roman Church.

The fourth stanza of *Pange lingua*, beginning with “Verbum caro panem verum,” was the stanza most likely to be problematic for Lutherans due to its reference to transubstantiation in the first lines. Even so, that stanza along with the well-known fifth stanza that begins with “Tantum ergo” both contain lines that Martin Luther would have appreciated. Unlike fellow reformers such as Huldrych Zwingli who rejected any physical presence of Christ in the Eucharist, Martin Luther argued in favor of a physical presence. However, Luther taught that this physical presence must be accepted based on faith alone, as opposed to a logic-based explanation such as transubstantiation. The fourth and fifth stanzas of *Pange lingua* remind the audience—regardless of their confession—that faith alone is indeed sufficient. Immediately after the transubstantiation reference in the fourth stanza, Aquinas writes (emphasis mine), “et, si sensus deficit, ad firmandum cor sincerum, sola fides sufficit (and if sense fails to discern, faith alone is found sufficient to strengthen devoted hearts).” Likewise, the fifth stanza concludes with “Praestet fides supplementum, sensuum defectui (let faith make its own addition to our senses’ failing powers).” When the context of *Pange lingua* is removed, the hymn itself seems to highlight the similarities between Catholic and Lutheran Eucharistic theology rather than the differences.

The *Missa Pange lingua* might have been prevalent in Lutheran sources of the later sixteenth century, but the work seems to disappear from the Catholic liturgical repertoire following the publication of *Missae tredecim* in 1539. Catholics in Germany
certainly did not waver in their devotion to the Blessed Sacrament. According to Alexander Fisher, “by the late sixteenth century, the Eucharist was arguably the most powerful and controversial symbol in the Catholic arsenal.”

Corpus Christi processions became even more expansive in the sixteenth century, particularly in Bavaria, the Germanic stronghold of the Counter-Reformation. Why, then, did the Missa Pange lingua essentially disappear from Catholic repertoire? This omission, along with a thorough investigation of Catholic repertoires of the later sixteenth century is beyond the scope of the present study. There does appear to be a very general trend of Catholic communities using recently composed liturgical music, some of which bears influence of Italian musical characteristics. One such Catholic community is that of Augsburg, which used the music of contemporary composers Jacobus de Kerle, Johannes de Cleve, and Christian Erbach. Meanwhile, the Missa Pange lingua and other older Latin Mass Ordinaries and motets found alongside it in manuscripts and prints were kept in use and circulation by Lutherans.

I close by returning to the significance of a borrowed melody in a polyphonic work, the Pange lingua hymn is an inextricable aspect of the reception of the Missa Pange lingua. However, monstrances, Corpus Christi processions, and votive masses are only part of the contextual history of this work. As the sixteenth century progressed, the Missa Pange lingua became part of the Lutheran Latin repertory throughout Germany and central Europe. It should therefore be associated not only with Corpus Christi, but

---


3 For more details on these processions, see Fisher, 249-66.

4 For more on the music of Counter-Reformation Augsburg, see Alexander J. Fisher, Music and Religious Identity in Counter-Reformation Augsburg, 1580-1630 (Burlington, VT: Ashgate, 2004).
with Lutheran schools and liturgical services as well. If both Catholics and Lutherans valued a mass with such polemical symbolism, a re-evaluation of other compositions and liturgical practices during this transitional time is in order.
## Appendix: Quick Guide to *Missa Pange lingua* Sources

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Source</th>
<th>Confession</th>
<th>Notes</th>
<th>Chapter</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>VatS 16</td>
<td>Catholic</td>
<td>among the earliest MPL sources; associated with Pope Leo x</td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>JenaU 21</td>
<td>Catholic (with Lutheran sympathies)</td>
<td>from the Alamire workshop; acquired by Frederick the Wise</td>
<td>2 and 5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>VienNB 4809</td>
<td>Catholic</td>
<td>from the Alamire workshop; belonged to Raimund Fugger</td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Occo Codex</td>
<td>Catholic</td>
<td>from the Alamire workshop; belonged to Pompeius Occo; contains mainly pieces assoc. with the Eucharist</td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>MunBS 510</td>
<td>Catholic</td>
<td>unfinished; intended for Matthäus Lang, probably commissioned by Maximilian I</td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Missae tredecim</td>
<td>neutral</td>
<td>printed by Johannes Ott; circulated primarily among Lutherans</td>
<td>3 and 4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>LeipU 49/50</td>
<td>Lutheran</td>
<td>from Johanneskirche in Leipzig; MPL copied from <em>Missae tredecim</em></td>
<td>4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>RosU 49</td>
<td>Lutheran</td>
<td>dedicated to Duke Johann Albrecht I; MPL copied from <em>Missae tredecim</em></td>
<td>4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>RegC 100</td>
<td>Lutheran</td>
<td>dedicated to Regensburg town council; MPL copied from <em>Missae tredecim</em></td>
<td>4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>RosU 71/3</td>
<td>Lutheran</td>
<td>used at the court of Duke Johann Albrecht I</td>
<td>4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Brno 15/4</td>
<td>Lutheran</td>
<td>used at the Church of St. James in Brno</td>
<td>4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>MunBS 260</td>
<td>Catholic (?)</td>
<td>bicinia collection possibly owned by Hans Heinrich Herwart</td>
<td>5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>---------</td>
<td>-------------</td>
<td>-------------------------------------------------------------</td>
<td>---</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>VienNB 18832</td>
<td>Catholic</td>
<td>Bicinia collection from the Alamire workshop; owned by Raimund Fugger</td>
<td>5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><em>Bicinia gallica, latina, germanica</em></td>
<td>Lutheran</td>
<td>Bicinia collection printed by Georg Rhau in Wittenberg</td>
<td>5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><em>Missa Super pange lingua</em></td>
<td>Lutheran</td>
<td>printed at the Ronneburg castle; contains hymn text and “pelican” image</td>
<td>5</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
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