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Abstract

In 1539, Johann Petreius published a book of masses in Nuremberg, the *Liber quindecim missarum*. He included masses by prominent composers such as Josquin des Prez, Heinrich Isaac, Antoine Brumel, Pierre de la Rue, and even Johannes Ockeghem, along with some lesser-known works, such as those by Wilhelm Breitengraser, Francesco Layolle, and Pierre Moulu. But Nuremberg had adopted Luther’s reformed church making the use of complex Catholic polyphony practically impossible. The City Council of Nuremberg had lifted the ban on polyphonic music in 1537 and Petreius, along with fellow Nuremberg printer Hans Ott, began publishing music by these composers at a feverish rate. This included Ott’s monumental *Novum et insigne opus musicum* of 1537-1538 and his *Missae tredecim* that, like Petreius’s collection, would also come out in 1539. Petreius was likely aware of Petrucci’s tradition of printing this music starting in 1501 with the *Misse Josquin* appearing a year later, and publications like this would have a strong influence on what Petreius included. In a city that adopted a religion wary of complex music that obscured the intention of the words, Petreius understood that his *Liber quindecim missarum* still served a strong purpose in the roles of education and in saving this music from obscurity. This thesis will also include a modern transcription of Breitengraser’s *Missa Dominicae*. 
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Introduction

In 1539 the *Liber quindecim missarum* was published in the city of Nuremberg during a time of enormous change. It was the first city to adhere to Luther’s religious philosophies, but because of this there was not much structure to the religion and no tradition to follow. Regardless of what role the music of the polyphonic masters like Josquin would play in the new church, printers like Johannes Petreius and Hans Ott believed it was important to preserve this music.1 Petreius also included in his *Liber* music of contemporaries that preserved their style for the same reason, but one unanswered question is where Petreius got his music. There was another printer in Nuremberg; Petreius also had a colleague in Lyon, but Petrucci’s prints seem to have been readily available to Petreius.

Nuremberg was the first city to declare an adherence to the Lutheran faith rather than the Catholic Church. However, Luther believed that each city that adopted his teachings should figure out what worked in their situation instead of Luther dictating to them how they should practice it. Since Nuremberg was the first city to reject Catholicism in favor of Luther’s reformed church, its citizens had no model to follow, and the government’s relationship with the Holy Roman Emperor meant strict consequences if it was discovered that Nuremberg had switched faiths. There were some religious camps in Nuremberg that wanted to eliminate completely the traditional polyphonic music because of the difficulty of performing and understanding it, but others fought to preserve this music through their own connections to the political hierarchy in Nuremberg. The need to keep up appearances and the work of a few powerful men in Nuremberg meant that polyphony would continue to have a place in the reformed liturgy.

---

When Petreius was compiling the music for his *Liber*, there seemed to be three different motivators for what he included: famous names that would help the publication sell, gaining music through personal connections, and including music that had some sort of compositional construct to it. Six out of fifteen masses in the *Liber* are by Josquin suggesting that Petreius knew what would sell and purposely selected many of his masses. He also included composers like Heinrich Isaac, Antoine Brumel, and Pierre de la Rue who would also have been well-known names to the right audience. But Petreius also demonstrated that his knowledge of this music went beyond name recognition in that several of the masses he included have some sort of constructivist device that would only be clear to someone looking at the music. This is why he included masses like Josquin’s *Missa L’homme armé super voces musicales* and *Missa La sol fa re mi*, Ockeghem’s *Missa Cuiusvis toni*, and others. Petreius also searched locally for masses to include and a potential local resource was Wilhelm Breintengraser, who was a teacher in Nuremberg and whose music had been published prior to the *Liber*.

The task then becomes to determine what sources Petreius used for his own publication. There were a number of people who were printing this music throughout Europe such as Jacques Moderne in Lyon, Andrea Antico and Luca-Antonio Giunta in Italy, and even Hans Ott who was located in Nuremberg and held the Emperor’s privilege to print music in that city. Even though Petrucci was no longer printing—having died in 1539—his music publications were still very respected for their beauty and accuracy as much during the sixteenth century as they are today.

Chapter 1 of this thesis looks at the social and religious context of Nuremberg in the 1520s and ‘30s that surround Petreius’s *Liber quindecim missarum*. Chapter 2 explores Petreius’s repertory selections and motivations by examining the internal evidence of the print as well as Petreius’s professional background, the reputations of the composers included, and the
compositional construction of the masses in the *Liber*. Chapter 3 explores the external evidence: previous prints that might have been available to Petreius that he might have copied from for his own publication. Many of Petrucci’s first editions play a large role in Petreius’s selection process. As an appendix to this document, I also have included a transcription of Wilhelm Breitengraser’s *Missa Dominicae*. 
Chapter 1: Wittenberg, Nuremberg and Questions of Liturgy

By the sixteenth century, Nuremberg had been a favorite city of the Holy Roman Emperors for almost 200 years, starting when Emperor Frederick II declared in 1219 “that every citizen of this city shall have no other liege than Us and Our successors, the Roman kings and Emperors.” Nevertheless, the influence of another German town, Wittenberg, was unmistakable. Martin Luther’s role as a teacher at the University of Wittenberg meant that his influence stretched into matters of politics, religion, and music in Nuremberg. An examination of the relationship between these two cities as well as the role of music during the time of transition between two religious confessions reveals a careful balance of elements of the old and new traditions and beliefs. Nuremberg converted to the reformed church less than ten years after Luther posted his Ninety-Five Theses in 1517, but many questions remained about the format this new church would take. Although these decisions took place almost twenty years before Petreius published his Liber quindecim missarum, they would affect a great deal of the liturgical problems that Nuremberg faced.

Luther had many reasons to want to reform the Catholic Church, the practice of selling indulgences being the most well known complaint. But in all of his voluminous theological writings, he never clearly stated in a stand-alone document the role he felt music should play. For example, in the process of giving general guidance on the structure of a new Mass, he might mention where one could sing a Sanctus if so desired, or where a hymn might be appropriate, but he never gave more direct instructions in the use of music than this. Primarily his friends and colleagues, such as Philipp Melanchthon and Georg Rhau, preserved his thoughts on the use of

---

music in the form of cursory quotations that are the most direct record of what Luther said. He also wrote prefaces to quite a few publications that added substance to the initial framework of his philosophy.3

Early on, Luther knew that music would have an important role in this reformed church. He was an accomplished lutenist, and most say he had a fine tenor voice. Like most boys during that time, he sang in the church choir and received his musical education from the church.4

Luther’s primary concern with the use of music in church was its intention, saying “If it [music] was performed merely in fulfillment of the demands of unreformed ecclesiastical law then it was to be condemned, but if it was performed in response to the gospel then it was to be commended.”5 Luther understood that the inclusion of music could add to any kind of worship service as long as the intention of the music was the glorification of God rather than the glorification of music. Combined with Luther’s admiration of the great composers of his day, this attitude toward the use of music in the liturgy makes it easy to assume that the music of these composers would have likely played a significant role in the reformed church.

Luther also worried that too much sudden change would frighten new congregants. “The first step is to let the old practice continue. . . but besides that, through the sermon keep the consciences free, so the congregation may learn that these things are done not because they have to be done that way or because it would be a heresy to do them differently, as the nonsensical laws of the pope insist.”6 Luther understood that with so much change happening at once,

---

3 Volume 53 of Luther’s Works contains Luther’s writings about the liturgy and hymns. It includes sections from his Formula missae of 1523 and Deutsche messe of 1526; he also wrote introductions to six hymnals printed between 1524 and 1545. A number of brief quotations about specific hymns are also preserved in this volume.
congregations and religious leaders could feel a little unsettled. Luther believed that the old traditions could continue for a while as long as the intention behind the ceremony remained focused on God and not the pomp of the ceremony. Indeed, Luther never wanted to create his own church: he wanted to reform the Catholic Church from within. However, his excommunication for his heretical statements proved that impossible.

He also believed that certain musical traditions of the Catholic Church would fit into the new version of the Mass because of the inherent praise of God in some of the hymns and parts of the Mass Ordinary. By 1530 Luther had a more established view of the role music would play in the Mass. He stated in *Concerning the Sacraments*:

> I believe that many hymns were included and retained in the Mass which deal with thanksgiving and praising [God] in a wonderful and excellent way, as for example, the Gloria in Excelsis, the Alleluia, the Creed, the Preface, the Sanctus, the Benedictus, and the Agnus Dei. In these various parts you find nothing about a sacrifice but only praise and thanks. Therefore, we have also kept them in our Mass. Particularly the Agnus Dei, above all songs, serves well for the sacrament, for it clearly sings about and praises Christ for having borne our sins and in beautiful, brief words powerfully and sweetly teaches the remembrance of Christ.\(^7\)

He understood that some of the old tradition had value in his new church. He appreciated the parts of the Mass that praised God, and most of the liturgical items listed above have strong musical elements, namely the Gloria, Sanctus, Benedictus, and Agnus Dei, which were all included in any Mass Ordinary setting. Luther’s continuous message from the early days of the Reformation to the 1530s was that music would have a place in the liturgy as long as the motivation behind the music was God’s glorification. He even stated later that certain parts of the Catholic Mass preserve the original intention of God’s glorification.

Luther had the good fortune to work at a university in a region where the ruler had a greater tolerance for new ideas than most of his contemporaries. Frederick the Wise, made the

\(^7\) Helmut Lehman, ed., *Concerning the Sacrament*, vol. 38 of *Luther’s Works* (St. Louis, MO: Concordia, 1955-1976), 123.
Duke of Saxony in 1486, held a position in the Holy Roman Empire second only the Emperor Maximilian I, his cousin. Frederick’s close relationship with the Emperor allowed him to serve as Maximilian’s court adviser for one year between 1496 and 1497; Frederick also stood in for Maximilian at an Imperial court proceeding in Augsburg in 1502. He followed Maximilian as the Imperial court traveled throughout the Holy Roman Empire, and he served the emperor in whatever further capacity Maximilian desired. Despite the kinship between these royals, Frederick believed that the power of the Holy Roman Emperor should be limited and this person should not have the power to rule as an absolute monarch, as had been the case for centuries. Normally someone in Frederick’s position would not have held such views, but they required him to act one way when serving the Emperor while keeping his true feelings to himself. When his service to the Emperor ended around the time he founded his university, Frederick had the freedom to retire to his duchy and establish a haven for academics sympathetic to reform.8

When Frederick established the University of Wittenberg in 1502, he did so with the intention of making it a model for education based on humanistic ideas. His initial choice of teachers would have a profound effect on the development of the university from its very beginning. His personal physician, Martin Polich von Mellerstadt, received his medical training in Leipzig and became a teacher at the university having been influenced by the humanistic movement already established in Leipzig; Johann von Staupitz came from a position at a religious establishment in Munich to teach.9 Though Staupitz remained faithful to the Catholic Church throughout his life, he voiced his call for reform within the Church and he served as Luther’s confessor. With the two earliest teachers at this university—as well as its founder—so amenable to humanistic ideas, more like-minded teachers gravitated toward Wittenberg as well.

9 Ibid., 53.
Some members of the faculty would greatly influence the evolution of a separate Lutheran faith within the confines of both Wittenberg and Nuremberg, such as law professor Christoph Scheurl and theology professor Philipp Melanchthon.

Frederick developed a reputation as a ruler with a deep appreciation for the arts. He communicated with composers Pierre de la Rue, Alexander Agricola, and Paul Hofhaimer; Adam Rener served as his court composer starting in 1507.¹⁰ Most of these composers had a connection to the Habsburg court: Pierre de la Rue served as the court composer at the Habsburg-Burgundian court for the majority of his life, Paul Hofhaimer as Maximilian’s court organist, and Adam Rener as a chorister for Maximilian’s court. During this time German courts tried to imitate the music that Maximilian’s musicians created. Frederick’s position as a ruler second only to Maximilian meant that much of the music and musicians at his court would imitate what he heard at the Imperial court. It further meant that residents of Wittenberg and teachers at the University would have experienced this music on a regular basis, possibly making someone like Luther less reluctant to separate from such a strong part of the religious tradition.

The musicians of Frederick’s chapel served two roles: as choristers for the Duke’s private chapel and as musicians in an official capacity for the university. To assure these musicians had the best compositions available to sing, Frederick began compiling masses and other sacred compositions from a number of different places. He commissioned a few of the manuscripts, received some from Maximilian as gifts (including through his familial relationship to Margaret of Austria, whose court scriptorium produced the books), and he personally commissioned some from the copyist Petrus Alamire.¹¹ This collection of manuscripts, known today as the Jena Choirbooks, has a number of masses in common with the Liber quindecim missarum including

¹⁰ Leaver, 35.
¹¹ Eric Jas, “Index of Composers and Compositions,” in The Treasury of Petrus Alamire: Music and Art in Flemish Court Manuscripts 1500-1535, ed. Herbert Kellman (Ghent: University of Chicago, 1999), 84.
five by Josquin des Prez and Pierre de la Rue’s *Missa Tous les Regrets*.\(^{12}\) While this is not to imply that Petreius copied from these choirbooks, it suggests that the musical taste in the regions of Wittenberg and Nuremberg favored traditional polyphony of Franco-Flemish origins, at least in the early years of the church.

The power and influence of Frederick’s position would also benefit Luther in 1521 after his formal excommunication at the Diet of Worms. Luther hid at Wartburg castle under the protection of Frederick for a year during which time he translated the Bible from Latin to German. But the call for reform was not silenced simply because Luther no longer served as the figurehead: other leaders from Wittenberg emerged to push forward these changes.

The more ardent teacher and theologian Andreas Bodenstein von Karlstadt, also based in Wittenberg, decided to publish his own ideas of what role music should have in religious services. His *De cantu gregoriano disputatio* of 1521 lists fifty-three theses criticizing the music of the liturgy. Among these he states that chants were created by “the church of which Gregory was the head” and “not by the church of which Christ is the head.”\(^{13}\) He further says about polyphonic music that “if, therefore, you wish chant to remain in the church, you should desire none except that which is one, so that there may be one God, one baptism, one faith, and one chant” (i.e., monophony only).\(^{14}\) Karlstadt believed in a uniform sound for worship and that the church as it had existed put the musical tradition of Gregory ahead of music meant to praise God. Under Luther’s tenets as well as Karlstadt’s, the proper motivation for music should be praise of God. But Karlstadt believed that the church needed a different kind of music separate from this Gregorian tradition to also remove any papal influence. However Luther hoped that by

---

\(^{12}\) Duffy, 251.
\(^{14}\) Ibid., 29.
redirecting the intention of the music back to worship, he could redeem its use for the new church.

Only after Karlstadt published his own views on the use of music did Luther start making more decisions about what role music would have in the liturgy. In 1523, he wrote his *Formula missae et communionis pro ecclesia Vuittembergensi [An Order of the Mass and Communion for the Church of Wittenberg]* in which he described services in Wittenberg as a guide for cities wanting a model for this new church. He did not make many changes and did not encourage other churches to change too quickly, “for I [Luther] have been hesitant and fearful, partly because of the weak in faith, who cannot suddenly exchange an old and accustomed order of worship for a new and unusual one, and more so because of the fickle and fastidious spirits . . . who delight only in novelty and tire of it as quickly, when it has worn off.”15 Luther encouraged slow change for anyone considering this new faith not only because to do otherwise might scare some worshippers, but also to convince the newly converted that the leadership had a vision and a plan for this faith beyond the immediate future. Luther further stated in his *Formula missae* that he approved of the temporary conversion of the Mass to the common language of German, but that perpetuation of this practice was not a wise course of action.16 Again Luther preferred to maintain the traditions of the Catholic Church rather than encourage radical reform. His mention of music within this context also suggests that his preference for keeping some traditions expanded into the realm of music.

Luther included further descriptions of the role music should play in reformed services in other writings. He provided the preface for the first Lutheran partbooks, the *Geystliche gesangk Buchleyn* or *Chorgesangbuch* published in 1524, in which he wrote “I would like to see all the

---

16 Ulrich Leupold, Introduction to vol. 53 of *Luther’s Works* (St Louis, MO: Concordia, 1955-1976), xvi.
arts, especially music, used in the service of Him who gave and made them."\(^{17}\) Luther emphasized his belief that the importance of music lay in the intentions of those making music: if the intention was to serve God, then music complements the worship, but if it served man, then the music distracted from the worship of God.

Luther had maintained a consistent message from the beginning, but when he finally put his beliefs into print it helped solidify the role he wanted music to have. This also gave more confidence to worshippers in regions that waited for more guidance before embracing the reforms for which Luther called.

The leaders of Nuremberg closely watched each event surrounding Luther and this new church with great interest. The City Council felt sympathetic toward the reforms that Luther was trying to enact but they had to keep up a policy of appearances that discouraged reformist thoughts because of the city’s close relationship with the Holy Roman Emperor.\(^{18}\) This policy meant that the Council could not be seen to participate in any way with the reforms, and instead left the religious changes to the city churches to implement. But there existed a period of eight years between the end of an attempt to keep up this policy, which occurred around the same time that Nuremberg banned the use of polyphony in 1525, and the city signing a confession of faith known as the Brandenburg-Nuremberg Church Order in 1533.\(^{19}\) During this time, Luther still had not decided the details of his new religion, so Nuremberg’s religious leaders created their own form of worship that discarded some old traditions but kept others.

Nuremberg had a governing structure unique for the cities of the Holy Roman Empire and indeed for Western Europe in general. It did not have a bishop’s seat or a secular ruler to

\(^{17}\) Helmut Lehman, ed., *Preface to the Wittenberg Hymnal*, vol. 53 of *Luther’s Works* (St. Louis, MO: Concordia: 1955-1986), 316.


\(^{19}\) Ibid., 78.
whom the city governors answered; they answered solely to the Emperor. All aspects of daily life in both sacred and secular matters were controlled by a city council. In its beginning, Council members could come from any level of the social hierarchy through a local election, but by the sixteenth century, membership on the Council was limited to citizens of the highest social rank. The Council had always leaned toward conservatism in matters of state and religion, but during the first half of the sixteenth century it became harder and harder to appease both the Emperor’s call for the quieting of reformers, and the people’s call for reform. Some would agree that Nuremberg took this conservative view toward all aspects of city life to please the Emperor, but Bartlett Butler states that “it is perhaps closer to the truth to see in its policies a calculated technique for survival in a rapidly changing, complex, and often hostile environment.”

Whatever the reason for the stance they took, it meant that members of the Council had to constantly say one thing to the Emperor while they did quite the opposite.

The control that this Council held over all matters extended into music, both sacred and secular. German Meistersingers had had a strong presence in Nuremberg going back to the fourteenth century. But with the acceleration of the reform movement, Meistersingers no longer were permitted to meet in the city and could no longer play an educational role in the Nuremberg schools according to the ruling of the Council in 1533. The ban on polyphony that the Council began in 1525 also demonstrates the power that this ruling body had over every aspect of worship and education.

Nuremberg had always maintained a close connection to Wittenberg because of the movement of prominent people between these two cities. Nuremberg did not have an institution of higher learning, so many of the wealthy families sent their sons to study either in Italy or at

\[\text{\footnotesize 20 Butler, 36.}\]
the University of Wittenberg. Since Luther began teaching in Wittenberg in 1512 and Nuremberg would convert to Lutheranism in 1525, some of his students may have risen to places of prominence within the governmental structure of the city. The education of Nuremberg’s upper class in Wittenberg may also explain the city’s tendency toward the new religion despite their allegiance to the Holy Roman Emperor. The humanistic philosophies championed by Duke Frederick the Wise, Luther, and his fellow teachers would be fresh in the minds of these Nuremberg elite who mixed it with a desire to implement these ideas in their own city.

Hector Pömer is one such example. In Nuremberg he served as a priest, a doctor of law, and a musician. He received his law degree in Wittenberg before returning to Nuremberg in 1521 and becoming a provost at St. Lorenz Church, one of two prominent churches in Nuremberg. During his time in Wittenberg and after he returned to Nuremberg, he kept in communication with many members of Luther’s circle including Luther himself, Philipp Melanchthon, and Luther’s primary publisher, Georg Rhau. Pömer had important Reformation connections and the proper position in Nuremberg during a crucial time in the city’s transition. It is easy to imagine the political and religious leaders of Nuremberg approaching Pömer to ask how Luther might interpret a question of liturgy during such an early period of the new church.

Some connections between Nuremberg and Wittenberg extend to a time before Luther posted his Ninety-Five Theses. Christoph Scheurl, one of Frederick’s original recruits for the University of Wittenberg, began serving as an advisor to the Nuremberg City Council as early as 1512. His association with the City Council would continue through their years of transition to Lutheranism until his death in 1542, and Scheurl had the responsibility of traveling to the court of Holy Roman Emperor Charles V to initially ask for the emperor’s protection from local

---

22 Gattuso, 286.
23 Butler, 64.
barons who wanted to use the resources of the city and its outlying lands to improve their own financial standing. But while he was there, members of the court forced him to answer questions about rumors that Nuremberg allowed anti-Catholic sentiment to spread throughout the city.\(^{24}\)

His careful interactions at the Imperial court gave Nuremberg time, if nothing else, to lay the groundwork for the Lutheran church and decide how to appease their terrestrial ruler while following their desire for a new form of worship of their heavenly ruler.

Nuremberg also drew its newest clergy from the ranks of Wittenberg’s finest theologians. Georg Pessler and Dominus Schleupner both became preachers and administrators at the most prestigious church in Nuremberg, St. Sebald, along with Hector Pömer at St. Lorenz. These new religious leaders came to Nuremberg in the early 1520s when the Reformation had just started; the Council’s conscious choice to recruit religious leaders and Luther’s former students from Wittenberg gave the impression that these leaders wanted to show their allegiance to Luther and other Reformation supporters through his former students and encourage the Reformation movement in their own city.

Andreas Osiander, while neither a graduate of the University of Wittenberg nor an associate of Luther, stirred up the fire for reform in Nuremberg in both his sermons and his publications. The City Council appointed him to St. Lorenz Church in 1522, one year after the appointment of Pömer as provost, knowing full well his sympathies to the reformation movement. He spoke with such passion on this topic that he almost served as an embarrassment to the Council because two more years would pass after his appointment during which the Council would continue this policy of appearances toward the Emperor.\(^{25}\) His writings on church reform showed his dedication to the idea that a Mass in German was the easiest way for a

\(^{24}\) Butler, 71.
\(^{25}\) Ibid., 101.
congregation to fully participate. Osiander went a step further than Luther by contending that Latin and Greek had no place in the reformed rituals and that saying the Mass in the vernacular would encourage more participation and understanding among the congregation. While Luther had the opinion that musical elements such as the Gloria and Agnus Dei could still play a part in the reformed Mass, Osiander thought differently. By reciting and singing in the vernacular instead of the language of the learned elite, he hoped it would induce more congregational participation. The initial years of the Nuremberg reform quickly became characterized by radical changes despite Luther’s urging for moderation, and despite the close connections between Council leaders in Nuremberg and Martin Luther and his associates in Wittenberg.

Luther did write something of a guide for worship at the insistence of a colleague in Zwickau. The *Formula missae* was published in December 1523, a mere year and three months before Nuremberg converted to Lutheranism. The document is quite short and readable in a few hours’ time—hardly enough space to lay out an entire theology—and it only described the practice as it existed in Wittenberg. Luther expressed that he did not want others simply to copy him, but to adopt practices that suited the local congregation: surely his colleague in Zwickau had hoped for some more substantial guidance. Luther explained that he wanted to wait a while before publishing his thoughts on the religion to allow for a period of adjustment between the traditional and new approaches. He also worried that too much change in the initial stages of worship would turn people away, so his approach to reform tended toward conservatism. Even though so many people in his circle called out for more guidance, Luther realized that he navigated unknown waters and wanted to take deliberate, strategic steps to guarantee the success

---

26 Ibid, 104.
of this new church. He was very hesitant to start a separate church because he thought that his call for reform might convince Church leaders in Rome to enact some of the changes for which he had been calling. This helps to explain why most of the ceremony did not deviate in the early years of the new church.

By October 1524, the Nuremberg Council could no longer keep up appearances. The first Lutheran mass was said, and a ban on celebrating Catholic mass came the following year. With the Lutheran movement growing and Nuremberg’s religious personnel so vocal in their support of Luther, it was impossible to pretend that Catholicism still had a strong standing in the city. But only Luther’s *Formula missae* gave any kind of guidance in establishing this new form of worship. Because Luther had left most of the formula of the mass up to the individual congregation, Nuremberg developed its own interpretation of Luther’s theology and tended toward a conservative interpretation. Despite the influence of Protestant leaders such as Osiander, Scheurl, and Pömer, the ultimate decisions regarding liturgy and music fell to the Council, which still tended toward conservatism.

Between the years 1524 and 1533, two forms of the Mass appeared in Nuremberg: one more traditional version that the Nuremberg provosts wanted to perform; and another that more closely followed Luther’s suggestions, and thus, made more changes to the Mass. However, both versions still deviated little from the Catholic Mass. In fact, the only musical element completely eliminated was the Offertory chant with some silent prayers also deleted in both versions of the early Nuremberg Mass. One insertion into the Lutheran Mass unique to the Nuremberg Reformation was a presentation in German explaining the meaning of the Lord’s Supper. Luther mentioned in his *Formula missae* that the clarification of these rituals was extremely
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30 Ibid., 167.
important so that the congregation understood the purpose of certain recitations.\textsuperscript{31} In including the history of the rituals, the purpose of the Mass clearly changed from one of mystery and sacrifice to education and celebration, a point that Luther heavily emphasized and concluded the Catholic Church had forgotten. The lack of radical modifications to the Mass structure ensured that people would follow the new church because of the similarity to the established ritual.

More decisive changes occurred in 1525 and would continue until the standardization of the religion in 1533. The first change concerned the number of Masses to be said during the week: Luther believed that Mass should only occur on Sundays and holy days; but Nuremberg gave two services per day, one in the early morning and one in the afternoon, until forced to abolish this practice in 1533.\textsuperscript{32} The sermon, which had been embedded in the afternoon Mass, was moved to its own separate Mass that occurred between the early morning and afternoon services.\textsuperscript{33} Consequently, more people attended the sermon Mass because of its use of the vernacular and singing chorales in which the congregation could participate. For those wanting reform and those wanting consistency, separate services seemed the perfect way to please both factions. Although the practice of separate services ended with the Church Order in 1533, it gave conservative congregations a chance to get accustomed to a different format, and it allowed the reformed congregation the opportunity to experiment with a new service to find a balance between traditional and “Lutheran” elements on which everyone could agree. This experimentation extended into the realm of music as much as any other part of the Mass.

Theologians based in Wittenberg approved the Brandenburg-Nuremberg Church Order (\textit{Kirchenordnung}) in 1533, and it finally provided a framework for how to practice this new

\textsuperscript{31} Helmut Lehman, ed., \textit{The German Mass and Order of Service}, vol. 53 of \textit{Luther’s Works} (St. Louis, MO: Concordia: 1955-1986), 64.
\textsuperscript{32} Butler, 169.
\textsuperscript{33} Ibid., 170.
But as other cities adopted Luther’s reformed church, each region could deviate from the rules to fit the needs of its own congregation, so determining the actual practice in any Lutheran city becomes quite difficult. Some mandates of worship appear in almost every church order, including those about the use of music during services. The list of requirements and degree of specificity in any church order varied from city to city, but in each they served as a guide to religious practice for that city and its outlying areas.

Some church orders even included the level of participation the choir would have. The role of the choir depended on many variables: the resources available to the church; whether the congregation preferred a Latin or German mass; and how often churches wanted to have daily mass instead of weekly, to name a few. It appears that each city chose whether to have services in Latin or German with no apparent reasoning. Some recited the traditional parts of the mass in Latin while others, such as the sermon, Lord’s Prayer, and the consecration, were in German so that everyone could understand the words. The choice of using Latin or German also impacted the extent to which a congregation needed a choir. Since the small amount of congregational music would have been simple enough for most people to sing, a highly skilled choir seemed excessive. But when church orders kept parts of the traditional Latin Mass, the choir needed to learn either the traditional chant and its notation, or even more complex polyphony. With the conservatism of the council, Nuremberg preferred Latin to German, although instances of both were used before the Church Order of 1533. The city’s preference for more traditional elements also suggests that the music at their services would have retained a nostalgic quality. Just four years after this, the ban on polyphony would be lifted in Nuremberg making way for the
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publication of Hans Ott’s multi-volume set of motets, Petreius’s collection of psalm settings, and the two mass prints by both men in 1539.

Each church made further decisions about their services based on the personnel available and the role that a particular church played in its community. This was true in large cities such as Nuremberg where there was a greater likelihood that mass would be recited daily instead of weekly. The increased musical demand meant that churches had to draw talent from the Latin schools of larger cities, a tradition that went back to the days of the Medieval church.  

Nuremberg was one of the larger cities in the German-speaking territories, and the conservative leaning of the Council would suggest that services would continue much as they had in the past. Boys studying at the Latin school in Nuremberg were required to study music and participate in the church choir a certain number of times per week, provided it did not interfere with the rest of their schoolwork. Consequently, the quality of music and the level of musicianship at such well-funded institutions would stand above what small, rural parishes could provide.

While Luther stressed the importance of participation by the congregation, the actual level of congregational involvement in musical aspects of worship varied. Joseph Herl has compiled a chart that summarizes how many church orders specified who should perform certain musical parts of the mass. A simplified version of Herl’s data appears in Table 1.  
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36 Herl, 38.
37 Herl, 55. The table on page 55 is an abbreviation of the data he presented in his Appendix 3.
Table 1. Number of orders specifying mode of performance

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Part of mass liturgy</th>
<th>Total orders(^{38})</th>
<th>Choral</th>
<th>Congregational</th>
<th>Either/both</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Introit</td>
<td>163</td>
<td>38</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>17</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Kyrie</td>
<td>138</td>
<td>24</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Gloria</td>
<td>137</td>
<td>25</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>14</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Gradual</td>
<td>125</td>
<td>26</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>8</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Sequence</td>
<td>67</td>
<td>14</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Creed</td>
<td>157</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>26</td>
<td>32</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Hymn before sermon</td>
<td>35</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Hymn after sermon</td>
<td>73</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>9</td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Sanctus</td>
<td>98</td>
<td>20</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Agnus Dei</td>
<td>104</td>
<td>19</td>
<td>11</td>
<td>5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Communion hymns</td>
<td>140</td>
<td>10</td>
<td>46</td>
<td>8</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Dismissal hymn</td>
<td>43</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Herl consulted a total of 169 original editions and reprints of church orders before 1600, and the totals represented in the “Total orders” include those church orders in which that specific part of the liturgy is included regardless of whether the original language was to be Latin, German or some combination of both. “Choral” indicates how many of the “Total orders” mandated that the choir should sing a specific part of the mass liturgy, whereas “Congregation” indicated that the congregation should sing. “Either/both” means that either the congregation or choir could sing; or the congregation and choir could sing together.

For the most part, church orders specified that choirs should sing the majority of the mass with congregational participation encouraged especially for the Creed and during most of the hymns. Luther said from his earliest publication, *Formula missae* of 1523, that more worshippers needed to participate in the Mass and one way to encourage participation was through singing hymns. Luther also asserted in his *Deutsche Messe* that the Creed constituted one of the most important parts of a Christian’s primary beliefs, along with the Ten Commandments and the
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\(^{38}\) The choral, congregational, and either/both columns do not equal the total because in many cases the desired format was not available or could not be determined.
Lord’s Prayer.\textsuperscript{39} Although the Creed, or Credo, typically appears with the “Ordinary of the Mass” (i.e., Kyrie, Gloria, Credo, Sanctus, Agnus Dei), when considering Luther’s emphasis on the importance of the Creed, it stands to reason that church orders would encourage congregations to participate in the recitation of their beliefs instead of having the choir simply sing the prescribed musical setting of the Credo. According to the table above, it seems that most cities adhered to Luther’s tendency toward consistency, rather than radical reform. The choir still sang all parts of the Ordinary of the Mass, except the Creed for the above reason.

The question of the role of polyphonic music in worship was moot between 1525 and 1533 because of the ban of its use or publication in Nuremberg, but that does not mean that this music did not have its champions. Religious leaders and teachers such as Sebald Heyden, Hieronymous Baumgartner, and Veit Dietrich used their positions in the city to further the performance of polyphony in the classroom and call for its reinstatement in the liturgy. Heyden served as the rector at Saint Sebald School and published three different manifestations of an educational treatise on polyphonic music.\textsuperscript{40} Heyden’s reasons for reinstating polyphony consisted of liturgical and educational arguments: Heyden agreed with Luther and other reformers that reciting or singing parts of the mass in Latin or Greek without understanding the language separated the worshippers from the meaning of the text. Heyden understood that unless people knew why the mass included the parts that it did, then one would question the inclusion of those parts. But Heyden was also a humanist and had a high appreciation for music, which he believed added beauty and solemnity to the Mass. So rather than eliminate polyphony from the Mass because some people may have found it too decorative and distracting, Heyden took it upon himself to write \textit{Musica stoicheiosis} in 1532 as a defense of and guide to polyphony.

\footnotesize{\textsuperscript{39} Lehman, ed., \textit{The German Mass and Order of Service}, vol. 53 of \textit{Luther’s Works}, 65. \textsuperscript{40} \textit{Musica Stoicheiosis}, 1532; \textit{Musicae}, 1537; \textit{De arte canendi}, 1540; all published by Petreius.}
Heyden’s purpose in writing *Musica Stoicheiosis* was to make polyphony easier for students to learn.\(^{41}\) He realized that learning this music took time that students could spend on other subjects, and thus justifying the reason for its exclusion to some, so Heyden wanted to lighten the burden for them. In 1537 and 1540 he wrote two more modified versions of this treatise, *Musicae* and *De arte canendi*, respectively. In both of the later editions he dedicated the work to Hieronymous Baumgartner, a Nuremberg patrician who worked hard to re-establish polyphony’s place in the reformed liturgy.

Heyden believed that church leaders wanted to remove polyphony partially because it seemed complicated and not many people understood how to read the notes and rhythms of the music of Obrecht and his generation. Heyden wrote in his preface of the 1540 edition “Therefore, we consider the use of [musical] signs so necessary that we contend nobody can truly understand the art of singing without investigating and observing them very diligently.”\(^{42}\) From this statement we can deduce that the ability of students to read musical notation had dwindled, since Heyden stresses that one cannot sing properly without this ability. Heyden continued, “These, then, are the things I wished especially to fulfill in our books. First, to make the art of singing as easy and expeditious as possible for young students. Second, to return the value and use of signs to definite proportional relationships, so that in any examination one may immediately understand their use and value.”\(^{43}\) Once again, Heyden states that his students find the performance of polyphony difficult, and he hopes that his treatises would make the task easier. But on a deeper level, he wanted to show that this music did have value and should not just be preserved but also performed as was its original intention.

\(^{41}\) Butler, 423.
\(^{42}\) Sebald Heyden, *De arte canendi*, translated by Clement Miller (S.l.: American Institute of Musicology, 1972), 21.
\(^{43}\) Ibid., 22.
Heyden had an ally on the City Council in his crusade to return polyphony to classrooms and choir lofts. Hieronymous Baumgartner was part of the Nuremberg patrician class as well as the dedicatee of Heyden’s treatise, but he also served as the city’s Kirchenpfleger, or church administrator, starting in 1533 when the Nuremberg church order took effect. This position held the responsibility of enforcing the rules of the Council, solving any problems and interacting directly with the religious personnel at each church, including people like Osiander who wanted less of the traditional polyphonic music. As with many other leaders in Nuremberg, Baumgartner studied with both Luther and Melanchthon at the University of Wittenberg and had a close friendship with these men. He shared the opinion of Melanchthon that polyphony did have a position in the new church, along with other humanistic and progressive ideas. Baumgartner began in his position as Kirchenpfleger the same year that the city’s Kirchenordnung took effect, but he was not in a position to institute dramatic change to the music of the liturgy despite his own beliefs. Instead he allied himself with people like Heyden and other Nuremberg religious leaders to resurrect polyphony in the churches and schools.

Religious support for polyphony also came from a recently installed preacher at St. Sebald in Nuremberg, Veit Dietrich. Martin Luther personally recommended him for the job, and Baumgartner undoubtedly used the influence of his position to secure Dietrich’s employment. Immediately upon being hired in 1535, Dietrich started instituting reform in churches throughout Nuremberg both in the liturgy and the music that accompanied it. He wrote a letter to Baumgartner within the first year of his employment about the state of music in the churches of Nuremberg and made a reference to the current status of music in Wittenberg as well:

But since the common people need such things as inducements, so to speak, to attend church regularly and since we can have no worthier reason for providing and preserving music than to use it for worship, I [Dietrich] think we can also
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succeed in using the organ for Mass on solemn feasts. . . . And at Wittenberg the organ is used not only on holy days but every Sunday. Since, then, there is no danger in this practice and since art music in its best form is honored as the most pleasing of all the arts, I think we can attempt this change without any complaint. Our rector [Sebald Heyden] has promised us his assistance and that of his school.45

We can deduce from this letter that the use of the organ during Mass had not disappeared in Wittenberg as it had in Nuremberg along with polyphony; and that religious leaders in Wittenberg also had a higher tolerance for polyphony in the city than did those of Nuremberg.

We can also assert that Dietrich and Heyden collaborated in an attempt to bring back the use of polyphony in the churches. Since Baumgartner served as the final word on the use of music in the liturgy, Dietrich knew the importance of his approval. And given Baumgartner’s educational background and association with Luther and Melanchthon, Dietrich could safely assume that his request for Baumgartner’s approval on reinstituting organ music and more ornate vocal music would not go disappointed.

During the early sixteenth century, the leaders of Nuremberg spent a large amount of time trying to reconcile the city’s many contradictions. Despite its history as a favorite city of the Holy Roman Emperor, the Council chose to convert to Lutheranism but still wanted to convince the Emperor of their (false) Catholic devotion. Nuremberg church leaders had no more guidance than those of any other city, and Luther purposely provided few details on the structure of worship because he wanted each region to discover and practice whatever worked for their specific congregation. Concerning details of music within the service, he was even more vague. With the ban of polyphony in Nuremberg lifted in 1537, the range of possibilities in church

45 Translated by Butler, 435. Originally from MS Thom, no. 84.
music expanded, and printers including Ott and Petreius would both provide repertory and take advantage of this new source of revenue.
Chapter 2: Composer Reputations, Novelty in Writing, and a Printer’s Decisions

When the printer Johannes Petreius planned which composers he wanted to include in his *Liber quindecim missarum*, he had a number of things to consider. He decided upon those who his potential buyers would recognize, thus making the book more appealing to a larger number of people. Also his personal relationships with colleagues in Nuremberg and in the printing business would have made these ideal candidates for Petreius’ publication because of easy accessibility. His *Liber quindecim missarum* is also unusual in the chronological time span that he covers: he not only included works by his contemporaries, like Francesco Layolle, Wilhelm Breitengraser, and Pierre Moulu, but Petreius incorporated works by composers who experienced their greatest popularity earlier in the sixteenth century, like Heinrich Isaac and Josquin, for example. Petreius also included Ockeghem, who was two generations removed from the printer’s, and the *Liber* was the first printed edition in which his *Missa Cuiusvis toni* appeared. Petreius also demonstrated that his musical taste went beyond just name recognition in that a number of the masses he chose have some sort of compositional constructivist device such as a cantus firmus that ascends step-wise in each mass movement, or a mass that could be performed two different ways depending on whether one includes all notated rests. By considering Petreius’s role in the printing industry in Nuremberg, the reputations of the composers he included, and the printer’s choices in repertory we may better understand how Petreius assembled this collection.

Petreius had a strong background in humanistic ideas and counted among his associates and correspondents some of the leaders of the humanistic movement in Nuremberg. He attended the University of Basel, an institution that Heinrich Glarean would later attend, receiving his
master of arts in 1517.¹ A university education during this time meant a background in classical literature and veneration for the writings of those who had come before: ideas embraced by the humanistic movement. This foundation on the writings of classical scholars meant that Petreius could easily position himself as well-read when he established his own printing business.

Petreius received his professional experience from one of the most significant printing firms in Switzerland: the house of the Petri family to whom he was also related.² He worked as an editor there for at least four years before inheriting a printing business in Nuremberg from a friend in the 1520s.³ While Petreius was learning his craft in Basel, Petri was publishing writings by Luther and Melanchthon as well as other documents that showed sympathy for the Reformation movement. Petri also published a number of Glarean’s works including his later Dodecachordon in 1547.⁴ Petreius had surely gained quite a bit of knowledge on running his own printing house by the time he arrived in Nuremberg to take up his inherited business. His exposure to the Reformation movement in Basel as well as his university training in classical writings and literature made Nuremberg a comfortable fit for Petreius.

Once he settled in Nuremberg and became a citizen in 1523,⁵ he started associating with the literati of the city. He also corresponded with professors at the University of Wittenberg. Petreius counted among his associates Philipp Melanchthon, who took on the task of laying the foundation for a new church after Luther’s call for reforms to the old church; Melanchthon also

¹ Mariko Teramoto, *Die Psalmendrucke des Johannes Petrejus in Nürnberg (Gedruckt 1538-1542)* (Tutzing, Germany: Hans Schneider, 1983), 23.
⁵ Ibid., 25.
taught Petreius’ son. Georg Rhau, the primary music printer in Wittenberg and Reformation movement sympathizer, exchanged letters with Petreius. And despite their different opinions on the importance of music in the reformed church, Petreius corresponded with Andreas Osiander, a staunch supporter of the Reformation and a preacher at St. Lorenz church, the second-most important church in Nuremberg. Petreius also knew Georg Forster through their mutual teacher Martin Luther. Petreius and Forster would participate in discussions that Luther hosted in Wittenberg, and Forster wrote music (published by Rhau) that was considered acceptable for the Lutheran church. Petreius also published writings by Willibald Pirkheimer, who was a leading Humanist in Nuremberg. He was in frequent communication with fellow Humanists as well as some of the most important people in the Reformation movement. Each of these religious and intellectual leaders saw Petreius not only as a tradesman, but a colleague. They appreciated Petreius’s grasp of and belief in humanistic ideas. More importantly, his background in music printing would have given his publications a level of authority because his colleagues respected his expertise. When the ban on polyphony ended in 1537, he was perfectly poised to gather music that would appeal to traditionalists who wanted music from Josquin’s generation, and would recognize his own contemporaries who composed in this earlier style.

Some music publishers had a twofold mindset when it came to choosing which composers to print: to represent the compositional practices from the previous generation and preserve these works because of their artistic value. We cannot know whether Petreius had either of these intentions with the Liber quindecim missarum because the publication offers no
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information on this issue in the form of a preface, dedicatory letter, or any other writings of that nature. But of the nine composers that he included five came from a previous generation and, with the exception of Ockeghem’s Missa Cuiusvis Toni, Isaac’s Missa O Praeclara, and la Rue’s Missa Tous les regrets, these masses had all previously appeared in print. Table 2 gives the complete contents of the Liber quindecim missarum as well as prior printed sources.

Table 2. Contents of the Liber quindecim missarum, 1539

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Composer</th>
<th>Mass Title</th>
<th>Sources</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Josquin</td>
<td>Missa L’homme armé super voces musicales</td>
<td>J666 (1502); J667 (1514); J668 (1516); J669 (1526); 1539^2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Josquin</td>
<td>Missa La sol fa re mi</td>
<td>J666 (1502); J668 (1516); J669 (1526)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Josquin</td>
<td>Missa super Gaudeamus</td>
<td>same as La sol fa re mi</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Josquin</td>
<td>Missa super Fortuna desperata</td>
<td>same as L’homme armé</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Josquin</td>
<td>Missa de beata Virgine</td>
<td>J673 (1514); 1516^1; 1522; J675 (1526)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Antoine Brumel</td>
<td>Missa Festivale (Missa Je nay dueul)</td>
<td>B4643 (1503)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Heinrich Isaac</td>
<td>Missa O praeclara (Missa La mi la sol)</td>
<td>not published before 1539</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Lupi</td>
<td>Missa Hercules dux Ferrariae</td>
<td>1532^8</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Pierre de la Rue</td>
<td>Missa Tous les regrets</td>
<td>not published before 1539</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Francesco de Layolle</td>
<td>Missa Adieu mes amours</td>
<td>1532^8</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Josquin</td>
<td>Missa Ave maris stella</td>
<td>J670 (1505); J671 (1515); J672 (1526)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Wilhelm Breitengraser</td>
<td>Missa Dominicaele</td>
<td>not published before 1539</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Antoine Brumel</td>
<td>Missa A l’ombre d’ung buissonet</td>
<td>1516^1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Johannes Ockeghem</td>
<td>Missa Cuiusvis toni</td>
<td>not published before 1539</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Pierre Moulu</td>
<td>Missa Durum Facierum (Alma redemptoris mater)</td>
<td>1522</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

That a composition had been previously published suggests that it had a history of making money for the one who printed it because of the fame and esteem in which certain composers were held.
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^11 The mass titles that appear in parentheses are alternative titles.
Petreius’s inclusion six masses by Josquin surely helped make the *Liber* attractive to a wide range of buyers; and it seems that his popularity had barely waned since his death eighteen years earlier. But other composers from Josquin’s generation had strong followings as well.

The composers from this time period that Petreius included are Josquin (c. 1450-1521), Isaac (c. 1450-1517), la Rue (c. 1452-1518), and Brumel (c. 1460-1512/3). Despite the background that Jacob Obrecht shared with these composers, the popularity of his masses, and the appearance of his music in print in or around Nuremberg, none of his compositions are present in Petreius’s *Liber quindecim missarum*, making his absence something of a mystery. The composers mentioned above make up a legacy generation: for the first time in history, people looked back to examples of the past and picked out those who were worth following. Even though Josquin died in 1521, his music appeared in Petreius’s *Liber* almost two decades later. Petreius would not be the last to print Josquin’s music: Glarean’s *Dodechachordon* of 1547 holds Josquin’s music up as an example that composers and publishers should follow for success. The composers that Glarean chose also tells us who he and his contemporaries already held in high esteem and whose music was worthy of imitation.

One can find Josquin’s music among both Catholic and early Protestant repertories because of his reputation as one of the best composers of his age. Many reformers worried that the dense polyphonic music of the late fifteenth and sixteenth centuries obscured the words and distracted worshippers from the true purpose of celebrating Mass (i.e., religious devotion). Luther’s followers could only use Josquin’s psalm settings or contrafacted motets because Luther believed that only words from the Bible could be set to music. Marian devotion had quickly risen in popularity in the Catholic Church during the Renaissance and a large body of music
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developed around devotion to the mother of Jesus, but it was also a major point of contention between Luther and the Catholic Church, so motets and other music in praise of Mary were limited to the Catholic rite. But the ability of Josquin’s music to bridge the religious gap shows that both groups could and wanted to claim his music for their own. The acceptance of Josquin’s music by both Lutherans and Catholics would have been particularly significant in Nuremberg where their policy of appearances meant that they had to prove their Catholicism to higher authorities while instituting a new religion without incurring the Emperor’s anger.

A motet to Mary by Josquin, his *Ave Maria virgo serena*, even took pride of place in Petrucci’s first book of motets in 1501. The appearance of Josquin’s music in publications from the earliest years of the sixteenth century would only increase for the next fifty to sixty years. By the middle of the century, he had surpassed all of his contemporaries in the number of times his music had appeared in print. It began appearing in German publications as early as 1520 in the *Liber selectarum cantionum* but not until 1555 in any substantive way in French-speaking territories. These publishers looked not only to local manuscripts but also to Petrucci’s and others’ prints sold at book fairs taking place in Paris, Frankfurt, and other cities. Even Petreius frequently attended the book fairs in Frankfurt and could have potentially bought there some of his sources for his *Liber quindecim missarum*. Josquin had to his advantage not only his popularity, but also the wide distribution and multiple copies that music prints could have over manuscripts. Many more people in different locations could then collect and perform his music.
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14 Ibid., 88.
something new to this generation where printing made information much cheaper to reproduce
and distribute widely.

Sometimes called the “French Josquin,” Antoine Brumel’s employment at prominent
churches and courts in France and Italy made him another obvious choice for inclusion in the
Liber quindecim missarum. Brumel (c. 1460-1512/3) worked at the cathedral of Notre Dame in
Paris, which held much prestige because of the importance of the church itself, and also because
of its dedication to Mary and the popularity of Marian devotion mentioned above. Around 1500,
Brumel resigned from his position at Notre Dame possibly because his recommendation of
someone for a position at the church was ignored.17 The church council tried to appease Brumel
after he handed in his resignation, but he still left. His paper trail has him in Lyon five years
later. The church administration’s attempts to convince Brumel to stay would suggest that he
already had a reputation as a quality musician and composer who added to the prominence of the
church with him as a member of the faculty. And just a year after this incident, Petrucci would
publish a book of Brumel’s masses. His reputation would grow as he traveled south in search of
work.

During the year 1505 and part of 1506, Brumel worked as the court composer for the
Duke of Sora living in Lyon, a city that would become very important for music printing with
Moderne’s first music publication in 1532.18 The Duke of Ferrara, Alfonso, approached Brumel
about him becoming his next court composer. He gave Brumel a very generous initial offer but
Brumel negotiated with the Duke for a number of months on the salary and other contingencies
of his employment.19 Brumel’s demands for higher pay and better perks show that he knew his
own value for a prominent court like Ferrara, with its reputation for musical excellence. Since

18 No record exists that Moderne published any music by Brumel.
19 Biggle, 26.
Alfonso initially pursued Brumel and he accepted the terms that Brumel proposed, Alfonso knew the prestige Brumel would bring to his court was worth the higher price. However Alfonso did stipulate that Brumel’s employment would last for the rest of the composer’s life, indicating that the Duke meant to have a return on the large investment he had made. The Este court in Ferrara had already developed a reputation for employing the best composers, including Josquin and Obrecht, prior to Brumel’s appointment. To find Brumel worthy to fill such shoes certainly spoke to his ability and reputation during his lifetime as well as justification for preserving his music for the future.

Two of Brumel’s contemporaries, Pierre de la Rue and Heinrich Isaac, served two Habsburg family members. Pierre de la Rue worked at the Habsburg-Burgundian court of Margaret of Austria for most of his life, and the music he created while under its employ helped increase his reputation as a “legacy” composer. His official role was as a singer in the grand chapelle, which was an elite choral group in Margaret’s court, but he was also a highly productive composer. La Rue was not just one of many singers employed at the Burgundian court, he was one of the best. In his free time, he chose to write new music to contribute to the repertory of the court. He established a reputation as a musician whose ability seemed worth preserving and sharing, and Margaret surely enjoyed spreading his music to other European centers through music manuscripts such as those copied in her own scriptorium by Pierre Alamire. In fact, it is possible that la Rue was a favorite of Margaret as suggested by their similarities in musical taste and in the inclusion of so many of his compositions in her personal chansonniers. Margaret had received a solid musical education so she recognized good musicians and chose to reward those like la Rue, whose music particularly agreed with her.
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21 Meconi, 87.
Having such favor with a ruler also meant that his music would appear more frequently in written records, and thus was likely to spread to a larger audience as well. In fact, Meconi writes, “perhaps the most important factor in crediting la Rue with greater significance than his colleagues is his unquestioned dominance of the court manuscript repertoire. No one else even comes close in either the number of individual pieces included or the amount of times pieces were recopied.”

Like Josquin’s dominance in the world of music printing, la Rue dominated the repertory found in the Habsburg-Burgundian collection; therefore, la Rue’s compositions were more likely preserved and distributed. Margaret also gave these manuscripts as gifts, meaning she would include the music of her favorite composers, among them, la Rue. As a result, his compositions spread to courts all over Europe.

Another composer employed by the Habsburg family, namely Maximilian, was Heinrich Isaac. He started his career as a singer at the Medici court during the reign of Lorenzo de Medici where he stayed until Lorenzo’s death, and the rise of Savonarola compelled Isaac to leave Florence quickly. Isaac worked at one of the most important courts in Italy for a ruler who famously brought about a flowering of both visual and aural arts and was instrumental in the creation of the Italian Renaissance. That Isaac would be worthy enough to work at this court demonstrates his ability as a musician and his desirability as an employee. Four years after Lorenzo’s death, Isaac entered Maximilian’s court and he was appointed as the Imperial court composer—the first musician to hold this title. Under the Medicis, Isaac was one of many singers working for the Medici family. But with his appointment as the composer at the court of the Holy Roman Emperor, Maximilian bestowed on Isaac a great deal more prestige and he likely concluded that Isaac’s musical ability made him worthy of the position. Later in his life,
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Isaac received Maximilian’s permission to return to Florence for his retirement, but still collected a salary from Maximilian. Isaac had practically no obligations to Maximilian by this point, but the Emperor continued to include him on the payroll, suggesting that Maximilian still wanted to claim Isaac as an employee. After Isaac’s death, his music appeared in theoretical treatises and anthologies of music well into the second half of the sixteenth century. The Nuremberg printer Hans Ott began the process of creating the most important collection of Isaac’s sacred music, the *Choralis Constantinus* between 1550 and 1555. In Ott’s dedicatory letter he states that he wants to “save from destruction” music by Isaac and other composers associated with the imperial court of Maximilian. We can interpret Petreius’s actions as participating in this tradition through his inclusion of a mass by Isaac.

With the choice of composers partially resolved, Petreius now had to select which works of the legacy generation he would include. While publishing a book of masses limited the repertory, he still had many decisions to make about specific selections. Most of the compositions by the legacy generation that Petreius picked have particularly advanced structures underlying the music that make them stand out more than other compositions. These include masses by Josquin, Brumel, Isaac, Petreius’s contemporary Moulu, and Ockeghem.

Josquin’s compositional creativity within such a formal structure is best evident in two of his masses, *Missa L’homme armé super voces musicales* and *Missa Fortuna desperata*. He did not simply follow a pattern to create them, but he tried to do something different within such an unalterable structure. The *Missa L’homme armé SVM* has the traditional “L’homme armé” tune in the tenor voice, but it is unique in that each appearance of the “L’homme armé” tune comes on

---
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successive notes of the hexachord through all five mass movements while maintaining a modal center of D Dorian. The mass also has many points of complex rhythms, mensuration canons, augmentation and diminution: in spite of these manipulations, the composer maintains the integrity of the original tune.\(^{28}\) From the opening of the Kyrie to the final Agnus Dei Josquin wrote the mass in such a way that performers would have to draw from a number of different skills to perform it correctly. It also put Josquin in a league of his own when it came to composing. As early as 1502, printers and others who wrote about music recognized the genius of this piece. Petrucci placed it first in his 1502 publication of Josquin’s masses and Petreius shares five out of six of the same pieces as this early Petrucci print; music theorists would also write about this mass throughout the sixteenth century. The fame of this mass made it a natural candidate for the *Liber quindecim missarum* and the attention it received gave Petreius the confidence that it would help sell the collection.

The *Missa Fortuna desperata* has an ambitious form because of the way Josquin distributes the borrowed material during each movement of the mass.\(^{29}\) The tenor of the original three-voice canzona shows up in the Kyrie, Gloria, Credo, and Agnus III, the bass of the canzona is placed in the tenor of the Sanctus, and the superius provides the tenor melody of Agnus I.\(^{30}\) Josquin also creates the effect of acceleration because the time signatures become progressively faster as they change within each section of the first four mass movements. In the Agnus Dei the melody originally found in the superius voice is placed in the bassus voice, inverted, and is four times longer than in its original context as if the composer wanted to show a sudden change in


\(^{30}\) Ibid., 166.
fortune.\textsuperscript{31} This mass represents much more than a composer finding a tune from one source and using it in another composition. He created a number of effects through manipulations of the original canzona beyond just the cantus firmus: the time signatures become progressively faster through each movement to create a sense of acceleration and urgency, and he included unexpected changes in the melody of the voices which would have been clear to the listener. The many manipulations to the original musical material help make this mass one of Josquin’s most imaginative, and the many hidden compositional devices would have also made it perfect for inclusion with the other clever masses in the \textit{Liber}.

Another mass that takes its inspiration from previous material is Brumel’s \textit{Missa A l’ombre dung buissonet}. It is based on a chanson by Josquin and it shares both an overall structure and cadence pattern with its source material. As in Josquin’s chanson, Brumel’s mass is a four-voice double-canon, with the tenor and bass voices derived from one part and the superius and contratenor derived from another. Brumel wrote a mass that not only incorporates music from a famous composer’s chanson, but he also manipulates the music so that the entire mass works out as a double-canon and still has variety and is pleasant to listen to. One would only find this level of creativity in a composer who understood the rules of harmony and counterpoint as it existed in the Renaissance and in a composer whose talents lay above that of an ordinary musician.

Isaac’s own motet \textit{O Praeclara}, which has not survived, was probably the basis for his \textit{Missa O Praeclara} or \textit{Missa La mi la sol}. The chant “O praeclara” begins with the melodic motive “La mi la sol,” giving the mass its name.\textsuperscript{32} Throughout the mass, the sequence of notes “la mi la sol” shows up in every voice in different rhythmic values from semiminims to longs;

\begin{footnotes}
\item[31] Ibid., 167.
\end{footnotes}
sometimes the tune has neighboring or passing notes in the sequence, but it is still recognizable. The original four notes are frequently also paired with “la sol la mi,” which is not quite the retrograde version of the tune, but it does switch the placement of the whole step and the fourth. The structure of the mass has much in common with other masses from the same time period. Some of the appearances of the motive would have been audible, but to truly detect the pervasiveness of the motive, one would have to look at the music, a characteristic of other masses that Petreius included, such as Josquin’s *Missa La sol fa re mi*.

While the compositional technique of Isaac’s *Missa O proaeclara* is sometimes cleverly hidden, that of Josquin’s *Missa La sol fa re mi* is purposely obvious. Josquin had asked a favor of an influential person to which he said “laise faire moy,” or “leave it to me.” He then did everything in his power to avoid this obligation, leading Josquin to write his mass using the syllables “la sol fa re mi” to remind this person of their promise.33 If one believes the story behind the mass’s composition, then the repetition of this phrase helped reinforce his point. But other techniques in this mass make it another example of Josquin’s compositional prowess: the five-note motive, la sol fa re mi, plays the role of cantus firmus, subject, and motif. The nature of the soggetto means that there will be inherent tonal ambiguity, but this does not seem to faze the composer, and he was able to use the motive in any rhythmic value from the maxima to a semiminim, with the melody appearing in multiple voices at the same time.34 While the mass may be somewhat repetitive to listen to, the true appreciation of Josquin’s comes from a closer examination of the music. The reputation of it stands on the fact that it appears second in Petrucci’s first book of Josquin’s, and this likely weighed heavily in Petreius’s decision to include it with the other Josquin masses.
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33 Blackburn, 78.  
34 Ibid., 79.
Josquin wrote another mass based on a soggetto cavato, his *Missa Hercules dux Ferrariae*. While this is not included in the *Liber*, Petreius did include a mass with the same name by the composer “Lupi.” Bonnie Blackburn’s research on the so-called “the wolf pack” of composers uncovered three contemporaries with similar names who were often confused during their lifetimes and afterward. These include Johannes Lupi from Cambrai, Lupus Hellinck from Bruges, and a mysterious third Lupi that Blackburn indentified as Pietro Lupato, who worked at the Cathedral of St. Mark in Venice in the 1520s. It is this Lupi whose music appears in the *Liber*. Blackburn suggests that Lupato served as the chapelmaster at St. Mark’s for a short time before Willaert’s arrival as the new composer. No archival evidence for Lupato exists other than his name on a list of singers, and after Willaert’s arrival, his name disappears completely. His employment at such an important church meant that no composition of his would have strayed too far from the accepted traditions of the time. Petreius probably did not know this composer personally, but chose his mass based purely on the style that seemed in line with the rest of the masses. And the title of the mass *Missa Hercules dux Ferrariae* recalls Josquin’s mass of the same name.

The soggetto cavato of Josquin’s *Hercules* mass follows the words of the phrase: re-ut-re-ut-re-fa-mi-re, but this is not the case with Lupi’s mass: his has the phrase sol-fa-re-fa-re-mi-re-fa-fa-mi-re. We can deduce “Ferrariae” from re-fa-fa-mi-re, and sol-fa-re-fa can be equivalent to re-ut-re-ut for “Hercules dux” depending on how the pitches are solmized, but it does not account for the entire soggetto. Blackburn suggests that Moderne made a copying error when publishing this mass in his *Liber decem missarum* in 1532 by adding the note “mi.” She further says “Lupus clearly was not touched by the Italian trend toward clear declamation of the text. If
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any work of his indelibly stamps him as a Franco-Flemich composer, it is the present one. Contrapuntal techniques take precedence over good declamation.”38 This statement is consistent with Petreius’s seeming motivation to not only present the Flemish masters such as Josquin and Brumel, but also contemporaries who preserved this style.

The mass by Petreius’s contemporary Moulu, his *Missa duarum facierum* or *Missa Alma redemptoris mater*, has a special feature that helped make it his most famous piece. The mass exists simultaneously as a version performed with all of the notated rests and one performed by omitting rests larger than a minim. Chapman even claims that Moulu’s reputation may have rested predominantly on this mass,39 and this may help explain Petreius’s inclusion of it. Like Brumel’s mass created by means of a canon, the composer of such a work must have had a solid understanding of counterpoint and harmony. It could have presented a challenge or game to the singer, and required him to pay attention to which rests to sing and which rests to omit.

Another mass that would have challenged the singer, but for entirely different reasons, was Ockeghem’s *Missa Cuiusvis toni*. It fascinated literati and musicians who wrote about it even after it appeared in Petreius’s *Liber* and many years after the composer’s death. In the *Dodecachordon* Glarean claims that one could sing this mass in “three tones only, corresponding to the three fourth-species.”40 While Glarean discounts the possibility of singing the mass in all twelve modes, the fact that he still writes about it potentially a century after its composition means that it still held significance for either the puzzle it presents or the continued high regard of the composer. Ockeghem may have written this mass as an exercise in sightreading and

38 Ibid., 121.
transposing for the composer’s more advanced students.\textsuperscript{41} With the constantly changing combinations of half steps and whole steps and mutations between hard, natural, and soft hexachords, the mass would stand as a formidable challenge especially to students learning music theory as it existed in the sixteenth century. Therein could lay Petreius’s decision to publish the \textit{Missa Cuiusvis toni}. A well-rounded humanistic education in music during this time and in this location would have included study of the great composers of the past and admirable contemporaries who imitated that style. Sebald Heyden wrote his \textit{De arte canendi} for the purpose of giving students a guide to learning this very music. Ockeghem’s role as the teacher to the best composers of that time and the didactic potential that presented itself in the \textit{Missa Cuiusvis toni} would have given Petreius two very strong reasons for preserving this older work.

Later German printers would continue to include Ockeghem’s music in anthologies and theoretical treatises into the mid-sixteenth century. Adrian Petit Coclico gave Ockeghem something of a backhanded compliment when he wrote in 1552 that Ockeghem, Obrecht, and Agricola made up a founding triumvirate of music but “they were only theorists.”\textsuperscript{42} However, the music of these three composers circulated much more than other composers that Coclico categorized as theorists,\textsuperscript{43} and this reinforces Ockeghem’s popularity, even though it may not have suited the taste of Coclico. The presence of Ockeghem’s music in print so long after his death suggests that his name and music still carried weight and a certain kind of reverence especially in a city that had introduced his \textit{Missa Cuiusvis toni} to a larger audience.

\textsuperscript{41} Johannes Ockeghem, \textit{Missa Cuiusvis Toni in Its Original Notation and Edited in All the Modes}, introduction by George Houle (Bloomington: Indiana University Press, 1992), 7.
\textsuperscript{42} Lawrence Bernstein, “‘Singende Seele’ or ‘unsingbar’? Forkel, Ambros and the Forces Behind the Ockeghem Reception During the Late Eighteenth and Nineteenth Centuries,” \textit{Journal of Musicology} 23 (Winter, 2006): 47.
\textsuperscript{43} Bernstein, 48.
The generation that would come after Ockeghem, the legacy generation along with printers like Petreius, saw an importance in this music and recognized how important it was to preserve it. When Hans Ott, another Nuremberg music printer, applied for a new imperial printing privilege in 1545, he said he wanted to publish this music so that it had a greater chance of surviving into the future.\footnote{Schlagel, “Fortune’s Fate,” 198.} Again, people looked back to previous generations for a guide, in this case, in musical composition. Ott and many others saw Josquin and his contemporaries as the greatest musicians and this new method of reproducing music meant that it was easier to save more music. Schlagel also states that between 1537 and 1539 Ott and Petreius published several collections of sacred music with most compositions coming from the previous forty to fifty years.\footnote{Ibid., 192.} This time span would include all members of the Josquin generation and Ockeghem. Although we cannot know what motivation led Petreius to publish the Liber quindecim missarum, this book and his other musical publications put him in line with a greater movement happening in Nuremberg and German lands. There was a sense that the music of these composers deserved to be preserved because of their artistic merit and part of the role of a publisher was to make it available to a wide audience of people.

In addition to older repertory, Petreius included music by four composers who were alive at the time of the publication of the Liber quindecim missarum in 1539: Wilhelm Breitengraser (c. 1495-1542), Francesco Layolle (1492-c. 1540), Pierre Moulu (1484-c. 1550), and potentially Lupi. Breitengraser seemed to move in the same circles as Petreius and other prominent humanists of Nuremberg. One citizen of this city associated with Breitengraser was Sebald Heyden,\footnote{Rudolf Wagner, “Wilhelm Breitengraser und die Nürnburger Kirchen- und Schulmusik seiner Zeit,” Die Musikforschung 2 (1949): 144.} whose De arte canendi (and earlier versions; see Chapter 1), a treatise that praised the
polyphony of the Josquin generation, was published by Petreius. Each version of Heyden’s
treatise is full of examples of the best music by composers like Brumel, Josquin, Isaac,
Ockeghem, and la Rue. The composer also corresponded with Veit Dietrich, a prominent
religious leader of Nuremberg. What these two people—Heyden and Dietrich—also have in
common is their admiration for polyphonic music like that found in the Liber. Dietrich worked
with Hermann Baumann of the Nuremberg Council to reinstate polyphonic music in the city
citing its use in Wittenberg. Breitengraser was well positioned with the educated members of
Nuremberg to justify his place in Petreius’s Liber. In the transcription of his Missa Dominica
(see Appendix), one can see that he has studied the rules of composition as they existed at that
time, but his music lacks the constructivist devices of the great composers like Josquin or Isaac
that make their compositions particularly admirable. At some points in the Missa Dominica, his
music seems to lack direction; however other parts of the mass show a careful adherence to the
text. The other Nuremberg printer Hans Ott published sixteen of Breitengraser’s Lieder in Der
erste Teil hundert und ainundzweintzig neue Lieder (1534).

Petreius likely had a professional connection to Francesco de Layolle through the latter’s
work as an editor at Moderne’s printing house in Lyon. Layolle’s early music training, acquired
in Florence, would have made him an ideal candidate to edit music for Moderne’s first book of
music. Layolle had to leave Florence because of his anti-Medici sentiments during a time when
the republic was highly unstable. Layolle received his musical education and employment in
Florence. He and other refugees from Florence set up their own academic circle in Lyon
positioning this composer among the educated members of the city’s society. But primarily,
Layolle’s work as Jacques Moderne’s editor and proof-reader meant that he was invaluable as

47 Wagner, 147.
48 David Sutherland, Francesco de Layolle (1492-1540): Life and Secular Works (PhD diss., University of
Michigan, 1968), iii.
Moderne ventured into music publishing for the first time, and it gave Layolle a means to publish his own music. The appearance of his music in so many of Moderne’s publications also gave it wide distribution and high accessibility to publishers in other regions.

Layolle was probably a professional colleague of Petreius, but his musical style also leads one to classify his compositions as imitating Josquin’s. In Layolle’s Missa Adieu mes amours (first published in Moderne’s 1532 Liber decem missarum), one can easily see his indebtedness to Josquin. The five-note ostinato in the tenor part provides the structure for the entire mass and is thus similar to the structure of Josquin’s Missa La sol fa re mi. Layolle includes other melodic material in the tenor voice and the texture is expanded to five voices from four through a canon in the alto voice. These characteristics of better-known composers demonstrate that Layolle had a solid education in the compositional technique of his predecessors, and for a printer like Petreius looking to preserve the style of the old masters Layolle would be an ideal contemporary imitator.

Another contemporary of Petreius, Pierre Moulu, helped keep alive the musical tradition of the legacy generation. Chapman states that Moulu and Richafort were responsible for continuing the Netherlandish style into the sixteenth century. Moulu’s music even had the honor of appearing in the Medici Codex. Other composers who appeared in this important manuscript include Adrian Willaert, Josquin, Brumel, Jean Mouton and Andreas de Silva; Josquin and Brumel’s music also appear in the Liber quindecim missarum. For Moulu’s music to be preserved with such company speaks to the high esteem with which it was held. Although
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Moulu was born a generation after Josquin and Brumel, he represented the best of the inheritors of that style, and he is sometimes called a “disciple of Josquin.”  

Petreius gathered music together for his *Liber quindecim missarum* from a number of places and for multiple reasons. He recognized the importance of not only the “legacy generation,” but also that this style continued into his own time and went back beyond Josquin. Certain masses also show a higher level of creative thought than others in using such devices as mensural, modal, motivic, and cantus firmus manipulations. But sometimes Petreius simply grabbed what was available: Breitengraser’s mass seemed an obvious choice for inclusion considering his standing in Nuremberg and his proximity, and Layolle was both a colleague and composer who had the perfect route for the proliferation of his own music. With the wide distribution of much of Petreius’s selections in publications by Moderne, Petrucci, and others, the next step is to determine whether or not he may have used the earlier prints as his source.
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Chapter 3: The Roads That Led to the *Liber* of 1539

Johannes Petreius had a number of ways of accessing music for his *Liber quindecim missarum* including acquiring masses from local composers, purchasing earlier music publications, and using his professional connections in the printing business. It has not yet been determined exactly what sources Petreius might have used, but the majority of masses were printed before Petreius’ *Liber* and many of these publications were by Petrucci, whose prints had spread far and wide even forty years after he produced the *Odhecaton*. Other publishers like Nuremberg’s own Hans Ott, the French printer Jacques Moderne situated in Lyon, and the Italians Giunta and Antico also figure in as possible sources from which Petreius could draw. This chapter will show the significant role that Petrucci’s prints played in the creation of the *Liber* and also, despite the geographical proximity between Petreius and Ott, the different sources that each printer turned to. In the case of masses surviving only in manuscripts this question will remain unanswered here because of scope of this examination.

Asserting the existence of a relationship between Petrucci’s and Petreius’s prints can be furthered by stemmatic filiation. Researchers commonly apply this technique because it establishes a hierarchy of differences between sources and can help methodically lead to an original source preferably created under the supervision of the composer. James Grier mentions two kinds of errors that help determine filiation between source: conjunctive and separative.¹ Conjunctive errors occur when two printers or scribes reproduce the same error from the same source rather than both making the same mistake independently. This suggests that the two versions came from the same source that contained the mistake; it establishes a relationship
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between those manifestations of the music that share a particular error. Separative errors show that a particular ancestry is impossible. Just as two sources with the same mistakes suggest a relationship between them, the absence of the same separates a third source from the other two and creates a different line of development that it must have followed. It is by tracing the errors in copying rather than making assumptions from the lack thereof that one can establish connections between sources.

Variants between sources do not carry as much analytical weight as errors when determining their filiation, but they can still provide useful information in the absence of clear errors, and as music printing surpassed the production of manuscripts, the importance of major and minor variants increases. Since printing created the ability to produce a larger number of copies that looked exactly the same in a relatively short amount of time, the potential for errors decreased dramatically as compared to producing manuscripts, each as its own unique version of the same material. More importantly, an aggregate of variants can provide clues on the filiation of sources, especially in printed sources where errors have diminished. By establishing patterns between variants, researchers can collate publications with the same variants and build something of a family tree of the development of a particular publishing tradition. Therefore variants such as cadential characteristics or passing tones as opposed to an interval of a third or fifth become more significant when considered as part of a larger trend in one set of sources compared to another.

The creation of an authoritative collection void of as many errors as possible was what Hans Ott, Petreius’s contemporary and colleague, sought to provide when he published his
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3 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 Koninklijke Vereniging voor Nederlandse Muziekgeschiedenis* 56 (2006): 105-6.
Novum et insigne opus musicum in 1537 and its second volume in 1538. Ott along with fellow humanist Sebald Heyden praised the technology of their modern world as a way to preserve the music of Josquin and his generation from obsolescence, especially in Nuremberg where certain members of the church were campaigning to have this music removed. The printer made a conscious effort, in the wake of so many false musical attributions to Josquin, to present in his two large volumes only music that could strongly be associated with Josquin. Reformers in Nuremberg encouraged a discontinuation of the performance of this music because of its connection to the Catholic Church, but Ott and Petreius saw a value and potential in this music and sought to provide accurate manifestations of the music of the masters. They enthusiastically began publishing this music when the ban on polyphony was lifted in 1537.

Table 3 provides a list of all the masses in the Liber quindecim missarum and printed sources in which they appeared prior to the Liber.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Composer and Mass</th>
<th>Possible Sources</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Josquin \textit{L’homme armé super voces musicales}</td>
<td>\textit{Misse Josquin} (Petrucci, 1502) RISM: J666 \textit{Liber primus missarum Josquin} (Petrucci, 1516) RISM: J668 \textit{Liber primus missarum Josquin} (Giunta, 1526) RISM: J669 \textit{Missae tredecim quatuor vocum} (Graphaeus, 1539) RISM: 1539$^2$</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Josquin \textit{La sol fa re mi}</td>
<td>\textit{Misse Josquin} (Petrucci, 1502) RISM: J666 \textit{Liber primus missarum Josquin} (Petrucci, 1516) RISM: J668 \textit{Liber primus missarum Josquin} (Giunta, 1526) RISM: J669</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Josquin \textit{Super gaudeamus}</td>
<td>\textit{Misse Josquin} (Petrucci, 1502) RISM: J666 \textit{Liber primus missarum Josquin} (Petrucci, 1516) RISM: J668</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

\footnotesize{$^2$ Ibid., 103.}
\footnotesize{$^5$ Ibid., 103.}
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Composer</th>
<th>Work</th>
<th>Edition</th>
<th>RISM Code</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Josquin</td>
<td><em>Fortuna desperata</em></td>
<td><em>Misse Josquin</em> (Petrucci, 1502)</td>
<td>J666</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td><em>Liber primus missarum Josquin</em> (Petrucci, 1516)</td>
<td>J668</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td><em>Liber primus missarum Josquin</em> (Giunta, 1526)</td>
<td>J669</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td><em>Missae tredecim quatuor vocum</em> (Grapheus, 1539)</td>
<td>1539²</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Josquin</td>
<td><em>Missa de beata virgine</em></td>
<td><em>Missarum Josquin tertius</em> (Petrucci, 1514)</td>
<td>J673</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td><em>Liber quindecim missarum</em> (Antico, 1516)</td>
<td>1516¹</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td><em>Missarum decem a clarissimis musicis. Liber primus</em> (Giunta, 1522)</td>
<td>1522</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td><em>Missarum Josquin tertius</em> (Giunta, 1526)</td>
<td>J675</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Brumel</td>
<td><em>Je nay dueul</em> [Festivale]</td>
<td><em>Misse Brumel</em> (Petrucci, 1503)</td>
<td>B4643</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Isaac</td>
<td><em>O praeclara [La mi la sol]</em></td>
<td>Not printed before Petreius’ publication</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Lupi</td>
<td><em>Hercules dux Ferrariae</em></td>
<td><em>Liber decem missarum</em> (Moderne, 1532)</td>
<td>1532⁸</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>La Rue</td>
<td><em>Tous les regrets</em></td>
<td>Not printed before Petreius’ publication</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Layolle</td>
<td><em>Adieu mes amours</em></td>
<td><em>Liber decem missarum</em> (Moderne, 1532)</td>
<td>1532⁸</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Josquin</td>
<td><em>Ave maris stella</em></td>
<td><em>Missarum Josquin liber secundus</em> (Petrucci, 1505; 1515)</td>
<td>J670; J671</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td><em>Libri secundi missarum Josquin</em> (Giunta, 1526)</td>
<td>J672</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Breitengraser</td>
<td><em>Dominicale</em></td>
<td>Not printed before Petreius’ publication</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Brumel</td>
<td><em>A l’ombre d’ung buissonet</em></td>
<td><em>Liber quindecim missarum</em> (Antico, 1516)</td>
<td>1516¹</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Ockeghem</td>
<td><em>Cuiusvis toni</em></td>
<td>Not printed before Petreius’ publication</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Moulu</td>
<td><em>Duarum facierum [Alma redemptoris mater]</em></td>
<td><em>Missarum decem a clarissimis musicis. Liber primus</em> (Rome: Giunta, 1522)</td>
<td>1522</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Since the masses by Breitengraser, Ockeghem, la Rue, and Isaac were not printed prior to Petreius’ publication of them, a discussion of the sources for these masses will not be included.
From looking at Table 3, one sees the potential for Petrucci’s prints to play a large role in Petreius’s possible sources. The four Josquin masses at the beginning of the Liber were printed in Petrucci’s 1502 publication in the same order and were reprinted in 1516. The similarities between the Petreius 1539 print and the two versions of Petrucci’s first Josquin publication make the appearance of minor variants all the more important since no major differences appear.

The strongest correlation between the 1539 Liber and the 1502 Petrucci appears when looking at the Missa fortuna desperata. Hudson asserts that Petreius’s redaction comes from Petrucci’s 1502 publication based on “the fact that, with a single exception at Sanctus 4-5 T, [the 1502 and 1539] ligatures [appear] at the same places, and only there; those which were added or dissolved in subsequent Petrucci issues (i.e., Petrucci’s 1516 Liber primus misasrum Josquin) are not reflected.”6 The only differences between the two versions are in the placement of one ligature. All of the notes are the same as well as cadential patterns and rhythmic ornamentations. Other researchers have reached the same conclusion, but to a lesser degree, about the Missa La sol fa re mi7 and Super gaudeamus.8 While research has yet to be done regarding Petreius’s source for Josquin’s Missa L’homme armé super voces musicales, the principle of Ockham’s razor would suggest that Petreius copied all four masses from an interation of Petrucci 1502 that was easily accessible to him. Schlagel states that Ott’s edition of the Missa L’homme armé is almost identical to Petrucci’s Misse Josquin9 but stops short of claiming that Ott derived his copy from the earlier edition.

---

Petreius likely used Petrucci’s 1505 publication for another Josquin mass in the Liber: *Ave maris stella*. As with Petrucci’s 1502 print, his *Missarum Josquin liber secundus* was published twice: once in 1505 and again 1515, making it something of a challenge to determine which version might have been available to Petreius. Elders states that Petreius “is in close agreement with Petrucci, 1505.”\(^{10}\) They share some of the same errors, but the former [Petreius] must have had a corrected copy because he does not repeat other mistakes that appear in the Benedictus.\(^{11}\) The dependence of the Liber on Petrucci’s prints is not surprising given the wide distribution of these collections and the respect that Petrucci’s work had among his colleagues and collectors.

This use of Petrucci’s prints likely applies to Petreius’s inclusion of Brumel’s mass *Jenay dueul*, which appears in Petrucci’s 1503 publication. Only minor variants exist between the two. Common variants include a difference in the notation of a rhythm. For example: in the second phrase of the “Sanctus” in the tenor voice Petrucci’s version has a dotted minim followed by a semibreve while Petreius notates two even minims. Another occurrence appears in the first Agnus Dei of the tenor voice as well as an instance in the bassus voice in the phrase “secundum scripturas” in the Credo. Petrucci has notated a dotted semibreve followed by a minim while Petreius’s Liber contains a semibreve and two minims. In the Credo of the contratenor voice in the phrase “Confiteor unum baptisma in remissionem peccatorum,” the Liber has a breve followed by a semibreve while Petrucci simply notates a dotted breve. In the discantus voice in the phrase “qui tollis peccata mundi” of the Gloria Petreius has notated two semibreves while Petrucci indicated a breve. Another minor variant manifests itself in the phrase “Tu solus altissimus, Jesu Christe” of the tenor voice. The Liber has a breve with a fermata over it as the


\(^{11}\) Ibid., 24.
fifth-to-last note while Petrucci’s print has a longa instead. Given Petreius’s apparent predilection for Petrucci publications, the existence of only minor variants between the two versions, and the fact that this mass appears in no other printed collection, it is likely that Petreius drew from Petrucci’s 1503 print.

Antico’s 1516 Liber quindecim missarum provided Petreius with his version of Josquin’s Missa de Beata Virgine and Brumel’s Missa A l’ombre d’ung buissonet. The Missa de Beata Virgine also appeared in Giunta’s Missarum decem of 1522 and this publisher also used Antico as his source. Elders has determined that Petreius copied from Antico because he repeats all of the latter’s mistakes as well as adding some of his own, but Petreius does not include the errors that appear in Giunta’s publication.12 This is a perfect example of Grier’s method in practice. By realizing that Petreius has perpetuated the mistakes of Antico’s earlier publication, but not the errors found in and created by Giunta’s 1522 edition, we can determine that Petreius copied from the earlier source rather than that produced closer to his own time. The assertion that Petreius drew from Antico’s Liber quindecim missarum for the Missa de Beata Virgine further strengthens the suggestion that Brumel’s Missa A l’ombre d’ung buissonet also came from the 1516 print, especially given Petreius’s habit of using prints as opposed to manuscripts and Antico’s print being the only one that published this mass prior to 1539. Unfortunately, we do not know whether Petreius chose Antico’s print because of better quality or because the Giunta 1522 collection was not available to him. Despite the concordances, there is no evidence that Petreius used any Giunta prints when preparing his Liber.

Moderne’s Liber decem missarum of 1532 shares two masses with Petreius’ 1539 Liber: the Missa Adieu mes amours by Francesco de Layolle and the Missa Hercules dux Ferrariae by

---

“Lupi.” Between the Moderne and Petreius versions of Layolle’s mass almost no variants exist; the only one is in the discantus voice in the phrase “Confiteor unum baptisma” of the Credo. While Moderne indicates a string of five notes on B-flat, Petreius indicates the same rhythm but has B-flat, A, 2 B-flats, and another A in the same phrase. Other than this section, both versions are the same. The only difference between the two manifestations of Lupi’s mass is Moderne’s use of minor color versus Petreius’s use of a dotted semiminim to indicate the same rhythmic value.

Grier is adamant in pointing out that the absence of errors proves nothing.13 We cannot determine a relationship between the two sources or lack thereof based on what they have in common; rather we must look to their differences for our evidence. We also cannot draw conclusions without analyzing both manuscript and printed sources of all fifteen masses, and that level of analysis has not occurred in the case of Moderne’s prints or any other prints discussed here. But other factors such as the similar professions of Petreius, Moderne, and Layolle, the fact that the 1532 and 1539 Liber have two masses in common, and that these masses have not survived in any sources other that these two publications make Moderne’s print a strong contender as Petreius’ source.

Two publications, Giunta’s Missarum decem of 1522 and Ott’s Missae tredecim of 1539, appear in Table 3 as prints concordant with the Liber. Ott’s Missae tredecim contains Josquin’s Missa L’homme armé and Fortuna desperata, similar to Petreius. Giunta’s 1522 print shares Missa Duarum facierum and Missa de Beata Virgine with Petreius’s Liber. While both prints are almost certainly not sources for Petreius, an explanation is still necessary as to why this is not the case, especially concerning Ott because of the chronological and geographic proximity to Petreius.

13 Grier, “Musical Sources and Stemmatic Filiation,” 89.
Hans Ott published a book of thirteen masses the same year that Petreius published his. The two books have two masses in common: Josquin’s *Missa fortuna desperata* and *L’homme armé super voces musicales*. Schlagel states that the presence of these two masses in Petreius’s and Ott’s books attests to the popularity and respect that these compositions held at the time.\(^\text{14}\)

One first notices differences in presentation between these prints. While the beginning of each mass in Petreius’s print has decorated woodcut letters, Ott’s publication is not decorative and rather more plain. Below are Petreius’s and Ott’s editions of the tenor voices Josquin’s *Missa L’homme armé* and *Missa Fortuna desperata*.

Example 1: Tenor Voice of Josquin’s *Missa L’homme armé super voces musicales*, Kyrie, in Petreius, 1539, Excerpt

Example 2: Tenor Voice of Josquin’s *L’homme armé svm*, Kyrie, in Ott, 1539, Excerpt

---

\(^{14}\) Schlagel, “Fortune’s Fate,” 194-195.
Example 3: Tenor Voice of Josquin’s Missa Fortuna desperata, Kyrie, in Petreius, 1539, Excerpt

Example 4: Tenor Voice of Josquin’s Missa Fortuna desperata, Kyrie, in Ott, 1539, Excerpt

Since the L’homme armé mass is the first selection in Petreius’s Liber, it would have obviously received a highly decorative setting, but the care that Petreius took in the presentation of the music is apparent throughout the publication. In contrast, it almost looks like Ott hastily assembled his book and presentation was not as important as availability and function. The date of Ott’s dedication, February 1539,\(^\text{15}\) suggests that his publication came out before Petreius’s Liber and further leads to the idea that Ott felt a need to have his print available before anyone else, so an attention to presentation may not have been as important. The detail shown in Petreius’s version of the Missa L’homme armé may be atypical because it is the first work in the Liber, but the decoration found in Petreius’s version of the Missa fortuna desperata is greater than what is found in Ott’s Missae tredecim.

When comparing both versions of the Missa Fortuna desperata there are not many differences between the sources; these are mostly minor variations in pitches and differences in

divisions of certain notes. In the final Kyrie of the tenor voice, Petreius’s version has notated D, B-flat, B-flat, while Ott has printed D, C, B-flat, filling in the third. In the bassus voice in the opening phrase of the Gloria there is a combination of melodic and rhythmic variants. While Petreius’s edition has D, B-flat, G notated with equal minims, Ott has the same phrase notated with a dotted minim followed by a semiminim and a final minim, and Ott has the notes D, C, A which is quite different than what Petreius has.

Another minor variant appears in the tenor and contratenor voices of the Missa fortuna desperata. In Ott’s version of the Sanctus in the tenor voice, he indicates that the “Pleni sunt” section should be “tacet,” but in Petreius, he has the tenor voice notated. Petreius further indicates in his contratenor voice that “Pleni sunt” is “tacet,” while Ott has included music in his contratenor “Pleni” section. When Petreius prepared his Liber for publication, he caught that these two “Pleni” parts needed to be switched. The music that Ott includes for the “Pleni” should appear in his tenor voice and not his contratenor voice. Hudson writes “a peculiarity of [Ott’s potential source] is that the page positions of the contratenor and tenor throughout the Sanctus and Agnus Dei are reversed,”16 but I did not find this to be entirely the case in my analysis of Ott’s printing of this mass. I found that the “Sanctus” and “Osanna” were in the correct placement, but the “Pleni,” “Benedictus,” and entire “Agnus Dei” were indeed switched. Without comparing Ott’s print to his supposed source, I cannot say if Ott’s potential source introduced these variants and he simply reproduced them, or if he himself created these variants. Despite the proximity in time and geography, it is impossible that Petreius copied from Ott for the Missa fortuna desperata, and was, in fact, working from different sources.

The Missarum decem printed by Giunta in 1522 also shares two masses with Petreius’s Liber: Josquin’s Missa de Beata virgine and Moulu’s Missa Duarum facierum, the second of

---

16 Ibid., 72.
which had never appeared in print before 1522. It was stated previously that Petreius likely copied from Antico and not Giunta for the Josquin mass, and it is clear that Petreius did not copy the Moulu mass from Giunta either. In the tenor voice, there is a combination of notes missing from passages in Giunta; this redaction also contains rhythmic variants and more decorative cadences that do not exist in Petreius. The most definitive difference comes in the second Agnus Dei of the tenor voice. A transcription of both versions is seen below.

Example 5: Transcription of Tenor Voice of Moulu’s Missa Duarum facierum, Sanctus, Giunta 1522, Excerpt

Example 6: Transcription of Tenor Voice of Moulu’s Missa Duarum facierum, Sanctus, Petreius 1539, Excerpt

The four measures that are bracketed in example 5 occur in Giunta’s version but do not appear in Petreius’s Liber. The other three voices of this source do not have these four additional measures, thus misaligning all four voices when they were sung together. In the phrases that both versions share, one can see slight differences in rhythm such as Giunta’s seventh measure and
Petreius’s third. But the *Liber* has a rhythmic variant in the penultimate measure that does not appear in Giunta’s *Missarum decem*. While the example above is the most extreme found when comparing the two versions, variants—especially in the case of cadential decorations—appear throughout Giunta’s version and do not appear in the *Liber*. The frequency of these cadences along with the number of incorrect pitches in Giunta makes it likely that Petreius used a different printed source that has not survived, or manuscript source that is outside the scope of this project.

After comparing the masses in Petreius’s *Liber* to sources that appeared before 1539, it seems that his indebtedness to Petrucci is quite significant. Six of the fifteen masses likely came from Petrucci prints with a seeming partiality toward the earlier versions rather than later ones. Whether Petreius chose to use the earlier versions or whether it was all that was available to him we will never know. But it does indicate that music printed by Petrucci and at least one other Italian printer, Antico, had made it north of the Alps into the hands of German literati eager for this music. However, the role that Giunta played in this tradition seems rather small given that he issued the same repertory as Antico and Petrucci, and it appears that Petreius did not use them. Petreius did, however, have relatively quick access to Moderne’s music books, from which he derived masses by lesser-known composers. This music would have caught a customer’s attention and contributed to the overall salability of the *Liber*. He also seemed to have drawn on many different sources including acquiring repertory from people he knew through personal connections, and music that had a reputation of selling well in the past.
Conclusion

Petreius had a number of methods of acquiring music by both contemporary and past composers, including getting music from local colleagues and turning to other professionals publishing similar repertories. The indebtedness to Petrucci, however, overpowers these other methods with six of the fifteen masses seemingly coming from this Italian’s prints. Whether through a conscious decision or using sources that were available to him, Petreius’s Liber is enriched because he drew from some of the finest publications of polyphonic music.

When Petreius was initially compiling the Liber, he had many composers to consider for inclusion, but his decisions seem to have been based on three things: the popularity of the composer, any personal connection between the composer and Petreius, and masses that had some sort of constructivist device or puzzle. Including names like Josquin and Heinrich Isaac would surely help sell a large number of copies, but the presence of music by local musician Wilhelm Breitengraser would appeal to potential customers who might have also known this composer. For those buyers who had a strong grasp on the nuances of this music, Petreius included masses like the Cuiusvis toni of Johannes Ockeghem that had an intellectual appeal as well as a beautiful sound. These same kinds of compositional devices appear in Josquin’s Missa L’homme armé super voces musicales and La sol fa re mi and have made these masses continuously popular since their creation.

To fill out his Liber Petreius drew from sources other than Petrucci’s earliest publications. He also took masses from Jacques Moderne’s Liber decem missarum and Andrea Antico’s Liber quindecim missarum, although Giunta’s publicaiton seems to be entirely non-represented. Despite using music by local composers like Nuremberg resident Wilhelm Breitengraser, Petreius does not seem to have collaborated or borrowed from Nuremberg printer
Hans Ott, evidenced by the differences in appearance and accuracy of Josquin’s *Missa fortuna desperata* and *L'homme armé super voces musicales* in the *Liber quindecim missarum* and the *Missae tredecim*.

A strong motivator of the *Liber* and other collections that included Catholic music of the legacy generation was Nuremberg’s unique situation in history and its status within the Holy Roman Empire. Its allegiance to the Emperor but also its desire to freely practice a different religion meant that the city’s citizens had to play a careful game of keeping up appearances. But throughout the many changes that this city saw in such a small amount of time, polyphonic music by the Renaissance masters always had its champions, allowing the music to survive.
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Editor’s Notes

Credo

Measure 46 of the contratenor voice indicates a C, but was corrected to indicate an E. This edition has notated the E.

Measure 96 of the discantus originally notated G, but it did not work with the harmonies around it so it was changed to F.

Measure 152 of the contratenor originally indicated a fusa and minim together. This version corrects that error with two fusae.

Sanctus

The “Benedictus” section of the tenor voice has two different time signatures: \( \frac{\text{C}}{\text{C}} \) and \( \frac{\text{C}}{\text{C}} \). The different signatures along with a fermata halfway through suggests that there might be a way to notate this section using both. Petreius has not provided instructions as to this section’s resolution and the editor was not able to come up with a viable option. However, this particular section is still complete having left the puzzle unresolved.
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di subscipe deprecationem nostram. Qui sedes
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Venus, tu solus Dominus, tu solus.

Tu solus Dominus.

Tu solus.

Altissimus, Altissimus, Altissimus, [Altissimus, Jesus Christus.] Je

Jesus Christus.
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um De - i u - ni - gen - i - tum.

um De - i u - ni - gen - i - tum.
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Et ex Patre natum ante omni-a

Et ex Patre natum ante omni-a saecula.

Deum de Deo, Deum de Deo,
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quem omni-a facta sunt.
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T
lis. Et in - car - na - tus

B
lis. Et in - car - na - tus est,

D
63
car - na - tus est de Spi - ri -

Ct
in - car - na - tus est de Spi - ri -

T
est de Spi - ri -

B
et in - car - na - tus est de Spi - ri -
D

\[ \text{tu Sancto} \]

Ct

\[ \text{ex Maria Virgine} \]

T

\[ \text{ne: Et} \]

B

\[ \text{ho mo fact us est, ho mo fac} \]
fac-tus est. Cru-ci-fix-us, cruci-

Ct

- tus est. Cru-ci-fix-us, cruci-

T

est.

B

- tus est. Cru-ci-fix-us e-ti-am,

D

fix-us e-ti-am pro no-bis:

Ct

- fix-us e-ti-um

T

Cru-ci-fix-us e-ti-

B

cru-ci-fix-us e-ti-
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D

sub Pon-ti-o Pi-la-

Ct

pro no-bis: sub Pon-ti-o Pi-la-

T

am pro no-bis: sub Pon-ti-o Pi-la-to pas-

B

am pro no-bis:
Et resurrectit tertiam diem.

Resurrectit tertiam diem secundum Scripturas.
Et

Et ascendit in caelum:

Et ascendit in caelum: sedet ad dexteram

Et ascendit in caelum: sedet ad dexteram

Et ascendit in caelum: sedet ad dexteram

Et ascendit in caelum: sedet ad dexteram

Et ascendit in caelum: sedet ad dexteram

Et ascendit in caelum: sedet ad dexteram

Et ascendit in caelum: sedet ad dexteram

Et ascendit in caelum: sedet ad dexteram

Et ascendit in caelum: sedet ad dexteram

Et ascendit in caelum: sedet ad dexteram
V

D 118
tris. Et i-ter-um, et i-ter-um ven-tu-rus

Ct 118
tris. Et i-ter-um ven-tu-rus est cum

T 119
Et i-ter-um ven-tu-rus

B 119
tris. Et i-ter-um ven-tu-rus est cum

D 119
est cum glo-ri-a, iu-di-ca-re

Ct 119
glo-ri-a, cum glo-ri-a iu-di-ca-re

T 119
est cum glo-ri-a, iu-di-ca-re

B 119
glo-ri-a, iu-di-ca-re, iu-di-ca-re

D 123
vi-vos et mor-tu-tu-ros:

Ct 123
re vi-vos et mor-tu-tu-ros, mor-tu-

T 123
vi-vos et mor-tu-tu-ros:

B 123
re vi-vos et mor-tu-ros:
Cu - ius re - gni non er - it

os Cu - ius re - gni non er - it

Cu - ius re - gni

Cu - ius re - gni non

fi - nis, non er - it fi - nis.
fi - nis.
non er - it fi - nis.
er - it fi - nis.

Et in Spi - ri - tum, Spi -
Et in Spi - ri - tum, in Spi - ri -
Et in Spi - ri - tum, Spi - ri -
D 148

Fi - li - o si - mul a - do - ra - tur, et con - glo - ri -

Ct 8

o - si - mul a - do - ra - tur, et con -

T 8

Fi - li - o si - mul a - do - ra - tur, et con - glo -

B 8

o si - mul a - do - ra - tur, et con - glo - ri -

D 151

-- fi - ca - - - - tur: Qui lo - cu - tus

Ct 8
glo - ri - fi - ca - - - - tur: Qui lo - cu - tus

T 8

ri - fi - ca - - - tur:

B 8

fi - ca - - - - tur: Qui lo - cu - tus

D 154

est per Pro -phe - tas. Et un - - - am

Ct 8

est per Pro -phe - tas. Et un - - - am

T 8

Qui lo - cu - tus est per Pro -phe - tas. Et un -

B 8

est, qui lo - cu - tus est per Pro -phe - tas. Et
sanctam catholicam et

am sanctam catholicam et a-

am sanctam catholicam et a-

am sanctam catholicam et

apoleticam Ecclesi-iam. Confiteor

cam Ecclesi-iam. Conf-

cam Ecclesi-iam. Conf-

apoleticam Ecclesi-iam. Confiteor

umnum baptism- in rem-

Confiteor unum baptism-

Confiteor unum baptism-

Confiteor unum baptism-

fi-

fi-
Missa Dominicale: Sanctus

Wilhelm Breitengraser

Discantus

Contratenor

Tenor

Bassus
V V V

\[ \text{D} \]

mi - ni, in no - mi - ne

\[ \text{Ct} \]

no - mi - ne, in no - mi - ne Do - mi - ni, in

\[ \text{T} \]

ni, in no - mi - ne

\[ \text{B} \]

in no - mi - ne Do - mi - ni,

\[ 105 \]

\[ \text{D} \]

O san

\[ \text{Ct} \]

sa

\[ \text{T} \]

na, [O -

\[ \text{B} \]

na, in ex - cel
In excellis, [ex-cel-]
Missa Dominicale: Agnus Dei
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D

Ct

T

B

Agnus

Agnus, [a

Agnus, [a

Agnus, [a

Agnus, [a

A