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Competitive Strategy Dynamics in the German Music Publishing Industry 1530–1550

I. Introduction

The aim of the paper is to develop an understanding of the competitive dynamics in the music printing and publishing industry in Reformation Germany, a time of exciting growth and development in the industry coupled with danger and sectarianism. Publishers’ responses to the hunger for music, caused in part by the great emphasis which Martin Luther placed on it and in part by the reaction to the Reformation by Catholics, resulted in a ferment in which there was a rapid and, within the borders of the Holy Roman Empire, historically unprecedented rise in the music printing and publishing industry.

There have been numerous studies of early music printing, although many of the older studies are more bibliographic in nature, focusing on what was published and on the lives of the printers. Particularly influential in drawing attention to “context”- and “why”-questions has been the seminal work of Stanley Boorman. Studies of the business side of early music making have included those of John Kmetz.

---

1 This paper is based, as far as has been possible, on the first-hand examination of sixteenth-century prints as part of an ongoing study, of which this paper gives an overview. I am particularly indebted to the kindness of the following libraries and their staff during my visits: A-Wn, B-Br, CZ-HKm, D-As, B, Blm, Di, F, HAu, HB, Ju, Kl, Mbs, Mu, Ngm, Nlka, Nt, NA, Rp, Rs, ROu, W, Z, Zeo, GB-Lbl, H-Bn, I-Mc, NL-DHgm, S-Sk, Skma, Uu, US-We, and Wm; and to the many libraries that answered written requests for information. Reference is made to the VD16, the online version at www.vd16.de, of the Verzeichnis der im deutschen Sprachbereich erschienenen Drucke des XVI. Jahrhunderts, ed. Bayerische Staatsbibliothek München in Verbindung mit der Herzog-August-Bibliothek Wolfenbüttel.

2 For example, the excellent study of early Frankfurt printers, Ernst-Ludwig Berz, Die Notendrucker und ihre Verleger in Frankfurt am Main von den Anfängen bis etwa 1630, Kassel, etc. 1970 (Catalogus musicus 5).


The purpose of the printing of music is invariably to create value. This does not mean to make a profit. For example, if a Patron subsidised an edition with 250 Florins, it implies that the Patron believed that the value of the prestige to be gained was worth more than 250 Florins; if the Patron believes that the prestige was worth 350 Florins, then the Patron created and captured 100 Florins of value. For whom could value be created? In each instance, the aim was to create and capture value for each of the six key roles: the creator, the publisher, the editor (where one exists), the printer, the bookseller, and the public. The different roles created and received different types of value.  

1. The creator or creators are the person or people who wrote the music, the words to which the music was sung, or the theoretical treatise, and created value through the utility of this work. The creator received reputational value from the print, which presumably led to financial value through, for example, attracting students or patronage; the creator role did not directly receive financial value. 

2. The publisher decides to make the work public and commissions the printing. The publisher takes the financial risk: if the edition fails, the publisher will suffer loss of value; in some cases if the publisher becomes insolvent others will also suffer financially. The publisher may be assumed to act as the wholesaler. The publisher created value through making the work publicly available, and gains value through financial profit. 

3. The editor compiles an anthology of works of one or more authors, or edits the works for publication, for example, by correcting errors in the sources; the editor may sometimes be involved in the proof reading. This role does not always exist. The editor creates value through the quality of his or her editorial work, and may capture that value by charging the publisher for their editorial work. 

4. The printer undertakes the actual printing of the work, that is, the typesetting including page layout, the printing, and, when it occurred, usually the proofreading. The printer does not initiate the printing: the printer is asked by the publisher to print the work, just as today we go to a print shop. 

---


6 Each of these has its own “value chain.” Michael Porter, Competitive Advantage: Creating and Sustaining Superior Performance, New York 1985, p. 38, has written that “The value chain displays total value, and consists of value activities and margin. Value activities are the physically and technologically distinct activities a firm performs. These are the building blocks by which a firm creates a product valuable to its buyers. Margin is the difference between total value and the collective cost of performing the value activities.”
to get a document copied. The printer created value by producing multiple copies of the work in a physical format, and through either the quality of the printing and/or the cost effectiveness of the printing. The printer captures value through financial profit by charging the publisher for the printing.

5. The bookseller, “buchführer” in German, “bibliopola” in Latin, sells the books to the public. The bookseller creates value by making a selection of books, usually from a variety of publishers, available to the public for purchase, usually in a shop. Booksellers capture value through financial profit by selling the books for more than they paid for them.

6. The public is the end user. The public captures value as pleasure, that is, they receive more value from the pleasure that they gain from owning the print than the value that they receive from holding the cash that they exchanged for the print. The pleasure may be either from the performance of the music or the reading of the text or, for collectors, the physical ownership of the print.

It is essential to differentiate between these roles, including those many cases where one individual or firm plays multiple roles. To give three examples, the first two of which are discussed in more detail below. Firstly, the lutenist Hans Newsidler was the creator of his lute tablatures (role 1), he published them (role 2), and he sold them to the public (role 5); he created reputational value for himself through role 1, and he captured financial value through role 5. As he purchased the entire print run, he did not capture value in his role as a publisher, but as a bookseller. Secondly, the printer Johannes Petreius published (role 2), printed (role 4) and sold prints to the public (role 5), creating value in each of these roles; however, he captured that value through the wholesaling activities of his role as a publisher (role 2) and as a bookseller (role 5). Although Petreius signed a number of dedications, there is no proof that he actually edited any of his musical editions (role 3). Thirdly, Georg Forster edited a number of anthologies (role 3), some of which included his own works (role 1); 7 the earlier of these anthologies were printed, published and sold by Petreius. Forster created value through his role as editor and as composer, but it is not known whether he captured any financial value from his

7 Forster’s editions published by Petreius were: RISM 1539: Ein auszuzg guter alter und neu-er Teutscher Liedlein; RISM 1540: Selectissimarum mutetarum; RISM 1540: Der andr theil /Kurtzweiliger guter frischer Teutscher Liedlein; and RISM 1542: Tomus tertius psalmorum selecto- rum. The first, third and fourth of these include his own compositions; see Mariko Teramoto and Armin Brinzing, Katalog der Musikdrucke des Johannes Petreius in Nürnberg, Kassel, etc. 1993 (Catalogus musicus 14). From 1549 onwards his editions were printed and published by Berg & Neuber.
role as an editor, or whether he captured personal value through the pleasure of his editorial work (his profession was that of physician). 8

2. The publisher

2.1. Publishers who were not printers

Competitive strategy in the music printing industry in the German-speaking area between 1530 and 1550 mostly involved publishers. A majority of publishers were also printers, a majority of publishers were also booksellers, 9 and a small number of publishers were self-publishers (that is, they published their own works). That is, a majority of businesses involved in publishing were involved in vertically-linked value chains; 10 they printed, published, and sold to the public. However, there were those who were publishers and booksellers, or self-publishers, and these commissioned the printing from a printer. Commissioned printing is often signalled by the word “impensis,” “expensis,” or “verlegung” in the colophon. 11 In these instances, publishers outsourced the printing, usually because they did not publish enough to make it financially viable for them to set up a printery. In these cases, for the printer it was purely a financial transaction, and so these works fall outside the publication strategy of the printer.

The bookseller Rynmann in Augsburg commissioned the printing of many books, 12 including, as we know from their colophons, a 1505 missal with mu-

8 On Forster, see: Rebecca Wagner Oettinger, “Forster, Georg,” in MGG 3, Personenteil vol. 6, Kassel, etc. 2001, col. 1501–1505.
9 The standard work on German publishers of this period is Heinrich Grimm, “Die Buchführer des deutschen Kulturbereichs und ihre Niederlassungsorte in der Zeitspanne 1490 bis um 1550,” in Archiv für Geschichte des Buchwesens 7 (1967), col. 154–1772.
10 That is, they controlled multiple independent roles which were part of the chain from creation (role 1) to the public (role 6). We can view printing as one separate, free-standing activity, publishing as another separate, free-standing activity, and bookselling as yet another separate, free-standing activity. Either can be undertaken profitably without the other. If one firm does all three, then it captures the value from all three activities rather than sharing it with others, and also controls all activities directly. Each of these activities also has its own value chain with opportunity for vertical integration; for example, it will be discussed later that a printer may purchase a paper mill to supply the paper for the printing, either for reasons of cost or to ensure supply of paper, an essential input into the printing process.
12 Hans-Jörg Künast und Brigitte Schürmann, “Johannes Rynmann, Wolfgang Prünlein und
sical notation from Stuchs in Nuremberg, and in 1507 the folio edition of the Tritonius odes from Oeglin. Hans Ott, the famous Nuremberg bookseller, commissioned his music printing from firstly Hieronymus Formschneider, and later Berg & Neuber; it appears that the commissions were so substantial that they made it worth while for Formschneider cutting and Berg & Neuber acquiring a single impression music fount.

The lutenist Hans Newsidler was a self-publisher. The title page of his first lutebook reads: Getruckt zu Nurnberg bey Johan Petreio / durch angebung und || verlegung / Hansen Newsidler Lutiniisten…. On 30 April 1538, Petreius wrote to the famous book collector Stephan Roth of Zwickau that the Newsidler lutebook which he was sending was “very expensive” because, although Petreius had printed it, Newsidler had purchased all of the copies for one Florin each and was selling them for two Florins each. Newsidler also published an advertisement in all
of his later books, stating that he had published other lutebooks and that they were available for purchase directly from him. The advertisement differed from book to book. One would state: if this music is too easy for you, I have more advanced books for sale; the more advanced books state that if the performer finds them too difficult, he has more elementary books for sale. Further, the same woodblock for the lute illustration is used in editions published by four different printers (D-Ngm Poštinc. M. 261), implying that Newsidler owned it. This is not unusual. A careful side-by-side comparison of the four editions of Cochlaeus’ De musica / Tetrachordum musices in the British Library shows that they were printed from the same ever-deteriorating woodcuts, even though by different printers in different cities. Woodcuts were expensive to produce, and an author’s possession of the blocks would give him a financial advantage over anyone else should a second edition appear, as he did not have to bear the cost of cutting the blocks for the second edition.

2.2. The privilege
A key document for understanding publishing is the privilege. Copyright protection was not automatic: it had to be sought from the Imperial Chancellery and payment made, and so was usually not applied for. Where a privilege was held, the length of the privilege would be stated on the title page of the print – this was usually between four and six years from the date of printing although in extraordinary cases could be ten years. It was common practice to print the entire text of a privilege at the beginning of a book, for example, Ott’s imperial privilege.
was printed in full in German translation in his *Hundert und ainhundzwetzig neue Lieder,*\(^{21}\) and in full in the original Latin in his *Novum et insigne opus musicum,*\(^{22}\) in addition to, in both instances, a reference to the privilege on the title page. Just because a privilege was claimed does not mean that it actually existed; according to Schottenloher, whenever the text of the privilege is not printed, then the claim may be false.\(^{23}\) For our purposes, however, whether or the privilege actually existed is irrelevant: it is the claim of privilege, and who claimed to hold the privilege, that is important. A privilege is usually held by the publisher, for example it was Salminger, not Krisstein;\(^{24}\) Ott (and probably Gerle), not Formscheider;\(^{25}\) and Newsidler, not his various printers,\(^ {26}\) who held the privilege for their editions. 

In each of these cases (except for Gerle) the claimed privilege was printed in full, so we know this. When a privilege referred to on the title page is not printed in full, we do not know who held it, as is the case, for example, with the privileges for Nachtgall’s 1536 *Musurgia*\(^ {27}\) or Heyden’s 1537 *De arte canendi.*\(^ {28}\) 

For each of these publishers, be they individuals or small booksellers, the publication carried a significant financial risk. Egenolff, on the other hand, had a major business in which music played only a very small part.\(^ {29}\) One complete copy of the 1535 *Reutterliedlin*, for example, only required 7.5 sheets of paper,\(^ {30}\) and if
piracy undercut his sales it would not be disastrous for him: he could afford to take the risk. Egenolff received Imperial privileges on 8 July 1536\footnote{Schottenloher, "Druckprivilgien" (as in fn. 20), p. 93.} and in 1542, in neither case including music. The only book of notated music published by the major firm of Berg & Neuber to carry a privilege is the 1564 \textit{Thesaurus musices};\footnote{For a discussion of early music copyright, see Pohlmann, \textit{Chri

Another breach of privilege case is in 1549, Berg & Neuber announced their forthcoming publication of the \textit{Choralis Constantinus}.\footnote{For a discussion of early music copyright, see Pohlmann, \textit{Chri

of paper. The Tenor consists of 48 leaves (3 sheets), and the DAB of 24 leaves each (1.5 sheets per volume), a total of 7.5 sheets per set. The ATB volumes examined are at D-Z, 69.2.14=16 (Vollhardt, p. 66, entry 28; the former shelfmark was LXXXII, 2). The information on the D volume is taken from the description of CH-Bu F X 22–24 in John Knetz, \textit{Die Handschriften der Universitätssbibliothek Basel. Katalog der Musikhandschriften des 16. Jahrhunderts: Quellenkritische und historische Untersuchung}, Basel 1988, p. 311.}
Formschneider. If the printing was commissioned, rather than being done by the printing arm of the publisher, there was always the risk that the printer would run off some extra copies to sell for a quick profit; a privilege may have protected a publisher from their printer. Indeed, we see that a large proportion of the privileges for music were held by people who commissioned printing.

Some privilege claims were false and so could not be legally enforced, but may have acted as a deterrent. However, the effort and expense to acquire a privilege implied that you believed that you had something that was so good that it needed protecting. This implication of value would be perceived by the purchaser. I would suggest that privileges were also used as a marketing tool.

3. The editor

Sometimes we know the editor of a work; for example, Sigmund Salmbinger edited the _Selecitissimae necon familiarissimae_; Georg Forster edited a series of Lied anthologies published by, initially, Petreius; and Simon Minervius edited the 1534 Senfl odes. These editors are identifiable from various sources including privileges, dedications, prefaces, and other material such as letters.

---

38 22 July 1528: “Iheronimus, formschneidern, und Sebald Behem, malern, soll man verpieten, nichts der proportionen halben ausgeen zu lassen, pis das exemplar, vom Dürer gemacht, ausgannen unnd gefertigt ißt, bey straff eins erbern rats, die man gegen tren leib und gütern furnemen würd.” As transcribed in Theodor Hampe, _Nürnberger Ratsverlässe über Kunt und Künstler im Zeitalter der Spätgotik und Renaissance, Vol. 1: (1449) 1474–1570_, Vienna 1904 (Quellenschriften für Kunstgeschichte und Kunstechnik des Mittelalters und der Neuzeit, Neue Folge 11), p. 243, #1621. The work in question was a book on the proportions of the horse, in which it was believed that the material on the proportions of the rider were to be taken from the Dürer book. David Landau and Peter Parshall, _The Renaissance Print_, New Haven, p. 218, write that “It is noteworthy that he seems not to have been entranced with more of Dürer’s finer woodcuts, perhaps because the artist was too alert to turn over his work to an opportunist of such ambition and occasional unscrupulousness!”

39 RISM 1540. We know this from the preliminaries in the Tenor partbook. He held the privilege printed on fol. 2v–3r; on 3v–4r wrote “SIGISMVNDVS SALBLINGER || Augufanus, ad Mufices studiofos. ||” and on fol. 4, in “Sigmund Salblinger zu Augsburg/ || zu den liebhabenden der Muſic. ||” he tells us that he has brought the pieces together in this book “…vnd den Text/mit befonndern hohem fleiß/ den Noten formlich vnndergeſetzt vnd inngetailt/ ||” (A-Wn S.A.78.F.32). See also Birgit Lodes, “Sigmund Salmingers _Selecitissimae cantiones_ (Augsburg 1540) als musikalischer Geschenkdruck für Königin Maria von Ungarn”, in _Gutenberg-Jahrbuch 83_ (2008), pp. 93–106.

40 See the prefaces to RISM 1539**: _Ein außzug guter alter und neuer Teutscher Liedlein_ and RISM 1540**, _der ander theil / Kuntzweiliger guter frischer Teutscher Liedlein_, reproduced in Teramoto and Brinzing, _Katalog_ (as in fn. 7), pp. 156–157 and 162.

Where an editor is not identifiable, we simply cannot assume, as has been done so often in the past, that the editor was the printer or publisher. Christian Egenolff ran a large business which at its peak included a papermill, typefoundry, printery and bookshop. Music was only a very small proportion of his output; indeed, there is more typesetting in a complete copy of the 1534 Luther Bible than in a complete copy of his entire known musical output.42 There is no evidence whatsoever to suggest that he was involved in music editing. The same applied to Petreius, even though he signed the prefaces of a number of the prints from the late 1530s.43 That he signed them doesn’t even imply that he wrote them. He was the owner-manager of a substantial business; few CEOs write material themselves: their assistants write it and the CEO’s name is then put to it. I have demonstrated elsewhere that Hieronymus Formschneider played no role as an editor, and that although a preface written in Latin was signed by him, he could not in fact read Latin.44 Nevertheless, there is evidence to suggest that some printers were actively involved. Georg Rhaw wrote a music theory treatise that went through many editions, and it appears that Johann vom Berg was actively involved in the compilation of his anthologies;45 indeed, Berg & Neuber became, after 1550, arguably the first German music printing firm, as opposed to printing firms which included music among their many activities. As Hans Ott published almost exclusively music, and indeed during his principal period of activity published only music, he may have been involved in the editing of his anthologies.

42 Guastavon, “Egenolff” (as in fn. 29).
43 For example, the Tomus primus psalmorum selectorum (RISM 1538), with the dedication to the Senate of Nuremberg signed by Petreius on Tenor partbook, fol. aii (see the facsimile in Teramoto and Brinzing, Katalog [as in fn. 7], pp. 142–147); the Modulationes aliquot quatuor vocum selectissimae (RISM 1538), Tenor partbook, fol. aii, “STVDIOSO MVISCAE LECTORI || Johannes Petreius S. ||” (see the facsimile in Teramoto and Brinzing, Katalog, p. 148); the Liber quindecim missarum (RISM 1539), Tenor partbook, fol. aii2 “SYNCREO MVISCAE AMATORI || Johannes Petreius S. ||” (see the facsimile in Teramoto and Brinzing, Katalog, p. 150); and the Responsoria, fol. A1, “IOH.PETREIVS TYPOGRA || phus candidis Iuuenibus S. P. D. ||” (not in RISM; VD16: R. 1199; see the facsimile in Teramoto and Brinzing, Katalog, p. 184, where to the list of copies should be added GB-Lbl K.8.b.2).
44 Guastavon, Hans Ott, Hieronymus Formschneider (as in fn. 11), pp. 131–134.
45 Berg described compiling his 3-volume edition of the Novum et insigne opus musicum (RISM 1558, 1559...) in his dedication to the first volume; see the translation in Howard Mayer Brown, “Introdučion,” Novum et insigne opus musicum ... Nuremberg, Johann Berg and Ulrich Neuber, 1558–1559, vol. 1, New York 1986 (Renaissance Music in Facsimile 27–29), pp. v–xxii, esp. vi–viii. Jackson, Berg and Neuber (as in fn. 32), p. 129 notes that “In both contemporary and later sources, Berg is repeatedly referred to as a musician.”
4. The printer

4.1. Printers and music

The publisher chose the printer. Music printing from woodcuts could be undertaken by any printer, but music printing from type was a specialised task undertaken by few printers. A characteristic of German music printing before 1550 is that there were no printers who focused on music; even for the most important music printers, music represented only a small proportion of their work:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Printer</th>
<th>Printing Dates</th>
<th>Total Editions</th>
<th>Music Editions</th>
<th>Percentage</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Schöffer</td>
<td>1512–1542</td>
<td>139*</td>
<td>17</td>
<td>12</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Steiner</td>
<td>1522–1548</td>
<td>886</td>
<td>20</td>
<td>02</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Klug</td>
<td>1523–1550</td>
<td>523</td>
<td>14</td>
<td>03</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Petreius</td>
<td>1523–1550</td>
<td>614</td>
<td>32</td>
<td>05</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Ulhart</td>
<td>1523–1550</td>
<td>635</td>
<td>16</td>
<td>03</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Formschneider</td>
<td>1525–1550</td>
<td>073*</td>
<td>17</td>
<td>23</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Lotter, M. d.J.</td>
<td>1525–1550</td>
<td>472</td>
<td>18</td>
<td>04</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Rhaw</td>
<td>1525–1548</td>
<td>604</td>
<td>75</td>
<td>12</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Egenolff</td>
<td>1528–1555</td>
<td>623*</td>
<td>18</td>
<td>03</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Kriesstein</td>
<td>1540–1550</td>
<td>058</td>
<td>08</td>
<td>14</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Berg &amp; Neuber</td>
<td>1542–1550</td>
<td>197</td>
<td>35</td>
<td>18</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Table 1: The role of music in printers’ output

Formschneider is unusual in that although he had a high percentage of music prints, they were all commissioned: by the booksellers Hans Ott, his widow, Elspeth, or Georg Willer; by the author, Hans Gerle; or by the editor, Simon Minervius. Further, Formschneider was only active part-time as a printer for almost all of his


47 The table includes all prints of the printer within the specified date ranges, not just those printed between 1530 and 1550. Data on total editions, except that for printers indicated* where data is taken from MGG, is compiled from the online catalogue, www.vd16.de, as at January 2007; it is acknowledged that there are inaccuracies in this data, and that it is incomplete in not including editions for which there are no known copies in the German-speaking area, but it serves to give an overview. Data on the number of music editions is taken from the author’s database on German music prints 1501–1550 which includes Latin-texted liturgica and known lost editions, neither of which is included in RISM.
career. Some famous music printers, such as Grimm & Wirsung in Augsburg⁴⁸ or Faber in Leipzig,⁴⁹ printed only a single music title.

4.2. Where was music printed?
The geographical spread of music printing in Germany from 1501 to 1550 (see Table 2) makes it clear that it was centred in the reformation cities, and above all Nuremberg and Wittenberg. The great ecclesiastical centres of Mainz and Cologne, with their Elector Archbishops, although important for non-music printing, ceased to be of significance in music printing after 1518. This implies that there may be a limited international market for German prints, even those for Latin-texted music, for music printed during this period. As such, the strategy would be focused on competition in the domestic market, rather than the international market enjoyed by printers such as Gardano and Scotto in Venice⁵⁰.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>City</th>
<th>No. of editions</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Nuremberg</td>
<td>162</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Wittenberg</td>
<td>104</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Augsburg</td>
<td>068</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Straßburg</td>
<td>049</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Leipzig</td>
<td>041</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Erfurt</td>
<td>029</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Frankfurt am Main</td>
<td>026</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Table 2: Principal German cities for music printing 1501–1550. Source: author’s database.

4.3. Printers and strategy
The printer was important for the publisher, as different printers had different styles which meant different marketing positions. The two basic business strategies are low-cost, that is, producing and so pricing under your competitors; or to follow a differentiation strategy, that is, to aim for high quality and additional features for which customers will pay a price premium. In music printing, this revolves around the printing method, the paper, the format, and the accuracy of the print (especially whether or not it was proofread and corrections made as necessary).

⁴⁸ Royston Guiastavson, “Grimm & Wirsung,” in MGG², Personenteil vol. 8, Kassel, etc. 2002, col. 43–44.
⁴⁹ Armin Brinzing, “Faber, Nicolaus (I),” in MGG², Personenteil vol. 6, Kassel, etc. 2001, col. 620–621.
⁵⁰ See the article by John Kmetz published in this volume.
4.3.1. Printing method

Only a small number of printers were actively involved in printing music other than from woodcuts, and in the period to 1540 most of these were also typcutters and typefounders: Schöffer, Egenolff, Formschneider, and Petreius. Indeed, Formschneider cut a text Fraktur which is regarded by typographical scholars as the greatest of all Frakturs, and Schöffer retired from printing to concentrate solely on typcutting. Type is a key input into the printing process, and either moving from typcutting forward into printing, or from printing backward into typcutting, is an example of vertical integration: typefounders are suppliers to printers, and printers are customers of typefounders.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Printer</th>
<th>Triple</th>
<th>Double</th>
<th>Single nested</th>
<th>Single non-nested</th>
<th>Woodcut</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Schöffer</td>
<td>Y</td>
<td>Y*</td>
<td>–</td>
<td>–</td>
<td>–</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Egenolff</td>
<td>–</td>
<td>–</td>
<td>–</td>
<td>Y</td>
<td>–</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Formschneider</td>
<td>–</td>
<td>–</td>
<td>–</td>
<td>Y*</td>
<td>Y</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Petreius</td>
<td>–</td>
<td>–</td>
<td>Y</td>
<td>–</td>
<td>–</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Lotter, M. d.J.</td>
<td>–</td>
<td>–</td>
<td>–</td>
<td>–</td>
<td>Y</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Table 3: Printing method of selected music printers from Table 1

When printing from type, the greater the number of impressions, the better the final product, but the greater the cost. I have seen only a single German print which I believe to be a triple, Schöffer’s Responsoria Moguntina, the printing of which was commissioned. Schöffer positioned himself at the top of the market visually with multiple impression printing, continuing to use it right up to his last music print in 1539 (Cantiones sv. Mutetarum liber I = RISM 1539), long after single impression type had become standard. As a typcutter he could easily have produced a single impression type if he so wished; that he didn’t was a strategic decision, differentiating himself from his competitors as a high-quality printer.

51 Where a printer employed more than one printing method, an asterisk indicates their usual method. The only Schöffer triple impression is the 1518 Responsoria Moguntina. The only Formschneider woodcut is the mensural music in the 1532 Gerle lutebook; he printed from type from 1534 onwards.

52 D-Z 31.4.28 (Vollhardt, p. 116, entry 199). The music is printed on four staff lines, the second of which is printed in red, as are the capital letters at the beginning of each piece. One impression was for the staff lines, another for the notes (the order of these two impressions cannot be determined), and the third for the red, which is clearly printed over the black notes and some black initial letters.
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Petreius used a nested fount\(^{54}\) which usually gave a better visual appearance, especially with regard to line junctures, than non-nested founts,\(^{55}\) although Formschneider’s non-nested fount was an exception. Kriesstein used Petreius’ nested fount but wrote in a postscript that:

“DJeweil der Gefangentruck /günstige Lefer/meer müe vnd fleifs bedarff/ dann || anners trucken / will ich eüch freündtlich gebetten haben / difen meinen erften || truck /zum beften bedencken/ …”.

Even within single impression non-nested typefaces, the typeface itself can send a signal. Egenolf’s small fount allowed more music per page than did any other German fount, reducing the amount of paper needed to print, and it was non-nested, allowing for faster typesetting. Each of these lowers the cost of the volume. Egenolf followed a cost-leadership strategy. Formschneider’s fount sent out a message of its own: Donald W. Krummel has noted that “his type was to become distinctly associated with Martin Luther, as it spread throughout Northern and central Germany in particular;” users of his typeface included Georg Rhaw (Wittenberg), Gimel Bergen (Dresden), Johan Eichhorn (Frankfurt an der Oder), Georg Nigrin (=Jiří Černý, Prague), and Nicholas Knorr (Altdorf).\(^{57}\)

Generally, music printed from type had a better appearance than that from woodcut; Formschneider only used woodcuts in his first music print, and then moved exclusively to type. However there are exceptions: the cuts (which look more like metal than wood) in Michael Blum’s GB-Lbl 785.a.47 are so outstanding that on first glance they appear to be from double impression type. Michael Lotter’s magnificent bilingual Cantiones / Kirchengesenge

---

\(^{54}\) The term was introduced in Donald W. Krummel, *English Music Printing 1553–1700*, London 1975, pp. 49–50, where he describes it as follows: “The sorts […] contained only four staff lines, occasionally three or only two. The bottom or top lines were intended to be filled in by the compositor with longer segments of rule, extending the length of several of the shorter pieces. The longer segments […] minimize the break at the juncture of two segments of the five-line staff which results when two successive pieces of type fit together imperfectly”. He notes that Petreius was the first printer to use a nested fount, dating its introduction to his 1537 edition of Heyden’s *De arte canendi*.

\(^{55}\) See for example the digital facsimile of the D-MbS, Mus. pr. 11#Beibd. 3 exemplar of the *Thesauri musicorum quattuor* (Nuremberg: Berg and Neuber, 1564) online at http://mdz10.bib-bvb.de/dl/bib0002448/images/index.html (10.08.2009).


\(^{57}\) Donald W. Krummel, “Early German Partbook Type Faces,” in *Gutenberg-Jahrbuch* 60 (1985), pp. 80–98, esp. 82.
of 1545 (DKL 154548; GB-Lbl K.4.h.8), printed on 390 leaves of folio, is from woodcut. Musical examples in treatises and editions of monophonic \textit{Kirchenlieder} were usually printed from woodcuts, and the same blocks were used again and again over many editions. The same blocks used by Steiner in 1520 for his edition of Galliculus were used by Rauh in 1546;58 and Rauh printed his own treatises from the same ever-deteriorating blocks from 1531 to 1546, replacing two lines with type in the 1546 edition of one of them presumably as the blocks had been damaged or lo\textit{s}.59 For works such as treatises for school use which were expected to appear in many editions, and for which low cost was important, woodcuts tended to be used throughout this period.

4.3.2. \textit{Paper}

The major cost in printing was the paper, and so the quality of the paper had a major impact on the cost of the music. Schöffer tended to use average to high-quality paper. His \textit{Fünf und sechzig teutischer Lieder} uses a wonderful Venetian demy,60 which contrasts starkly with the paper in Egenolf\’s reprints.61 Indeed, late in his life Christian Egenolf owned a paper mill. The \textit{Psalter} of Burckhard Waldis (DKL 155369), with 150 melodies, is printed on 2 papers: a better quality unwatermarked paper in the first few gatherings, and a poorer quality paper from Egenolf\’s mill – the music is Egenolf\’s \textit{printers\’ mark}62 – in the rest of the print.63 This is.

58 \“ISAGOGE || IOANNIS || GALICIV= || LI DE || COMPO= || SICIONE || CANTVS : : ||
Lipfiz, apud Valenti= || num Schumanni An. || Chrifti. M.D.XX. || || \[woodcut border\]\” (GB-Lbl K.8.c.2), and \“LIBELLVS DE || COMPOSITIONE || CANTVS. || IOANNIS GALICIVLII. ||
VITEBERGAE || apud Georgium || Rhau. || Anno M. D. XLVI. ||\” (GB-Lbl K.8.c.7), except that fol. C1\’ stave 1 of the 1520 edition has been recut for fol. B3\’ stave 1 of the 1546 edition; the item on the beginning on the ligature of the sixth-lait to the fourth-lait notes of fol. B4\’ of the 1520 edition is missing on fol. B2\’ in the 1546 edition; and the SEPTIMA example on fol. B3\’ of the 1520 edition is missing on fol. D2\’ of the 1546 edition.

1531 (GB-Lbl k.8.c.3) was reprinted using the same woodcuts in 1532 (GB-Lbl k.8.c.4); 1536 (GB-Lbl k.8.c.5), 1538 (GB-Lbl k.8.c.6), and 1546 (GB-Lbl k.8.c.7). \“ENCHI= || RIDION || MVSIACÆ || MENV= || RALIS. || ANNO. XXXI. ||\” of
1533 (GB-Lbl k.8.c.2) was reprinted using the same woodcuts in 1532 (GB-Lbl k.8.c.4); 1536, except the last stave on fol. A6\’ and fol. C3\’ has been recut (GB-Lbl k.8.c.5); 1538, except that fol. d4\’, line 2, notes 11–14 are now appearing as semiminimas instead of minimas, presumably because of wear (GB-Lbl k.8.c.6); and 1546, except that fol. c7\’ (now fol. K1\’), as it is in an anthology, last stave, and fol. c8\’ (now fol. K2\’), first stave, are reset in single impression type (GB-Lbl k.8.c.7).

60 Copies examined: D-Mbs, Mus. pr. 39#Beibd.2; D-Z 69.1.40 (Vollhardt, \[as in fn. 30], p. 66, entry 59, former shelfmark LXXXIV, l); and GB-Lbl K.8.i.9. The mark is similar to that discussed in fn. 66.

61 RISM 1536\’, copy at D-Mbs, Mus. pr. 46.

62 See the facsimile in Gustavson, \“Egenolf\” (as in fn. 29), col. 99, for the printer\’s mark.

63 The first 5 gatherings are unwatermarked, and the next 29 are watermarked in GB-Lbl 3436.
another example of backward integration: paper is an expensive, major input into the printing process, so a large printer may purchase or set up a paper mill to supply his own paper needs, thereby lessening his costs by removing the profit made by the paper maker and ensuring continuity of supply.

### 4.3.3 Perceived format

The size (format) of a printed book sends a signal to the market. I use perceived size, rather than actual. For example, Schöffer’s *Fünf vnd sechzig teutscher Lieder* is signed and gathered in groups of six leaves, has a print area the same as that of his sefstos of 1537, and indeed is trimmed to the same size and bound with two of them in Munich. However, the chain lines are vertical, not horizontal, and an examination of the watermark reveals that the paper is an oversized Venetian paper, which I have seen in a non-music folio with a sheet size of 38.5 x 53.0 cm. Approximately half of the gatherings have a watermark. The print is in fact a duodecimo, but it would be perceived as a seisto.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Printer</th>
<th>16º</th>
<th>8º</th>
<th>6º</th>
<th>4º</th>
<th>2º</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Schöffer</td>
<td>–</td>
<td>–</td>
<td>Y*</td>
<td>Y</td>
<td>Y</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Egenolff</td>
<td>Y</td>
<td>Y*</td>
<td>–</td>
<td>–</td>
<td>–</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Formschneider</td>
<td>–</td>
<td>Y</td>
<td>–</td>
<td>Y*</td>
<td>–</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Petreius</td>
<td>–</td>
<td>Y</td>
<td>–</td>
<td>Y*</td>
<td>–</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Lotter, M. d.J.</td>
<td>?(1)</td>
<td>Y</td>
<td>–</td>
<td>–</td>
<td>Y</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Table 4: Perceived format of editions of selected music printers from Table 1

f. 32; and the first 6 gatherings are unwatermarked, and the next 28 are watermarked in D-Z 29.4.25 (Vollhardt, p. 81, entry 100).

64 RISM [1536], copy at D-Mbs, Mus. pr. 39#Beibd. 2.

65 Sixt Dietrich, *Magnificat oltu tonorum*, D-Mbs, Mus. pr. 39; and Wittenbergische Gangbuchli, D-Mbs, Mus. pr. 39#Beibd.1.


67 This is not the only such example: Schöffer’s *Responsoria*, which looks like an upright quarteto, is in octavo. The page size is 183 mm high by c. 120 mm wide (D-Z 31.4.28, not in RISM; the only other known copy is in US-NYpm, which I have not seen), but the chain lines are vertical, not horizontal as would be expected in an upright quarto. It is printed on oversized paper, Regelformat, as identified from the watermark, which is of the type Gerhard Piccard, *Wasserzeichen Anker*, Stuttgart 1578 (Die Wasserzeichenkartei Piccard im Hauptsitaatsarchiv Stuttgart Findbuch 6), p. 242, Abteilung VI, nos. 41–42.

68 An asterisk indicates the predominant perceived format used by the printer.
It is interesting that there is no overlap at all in the formats used by Schöffer and Egenolff. The larger the page size of the volume, the more prestigious it was. A folio has quite a different positioning to an upright octavo: folio-format prints were often luxurious gifts; upright octavos were often schoolbooks or used for private devotion in the home.

4.3.4. Correction

The accuracy of prints was important to readers, and quality printers ensured that their prints were corrected by proofreading. For example, the editor of the 1534 edition of Senfl’s odes stated in a letter that he would send the first copy to Senfl to be proofread.69 After proofreading, the printer could make corrections in a number of ways: if an error was picked up during the printing process a stop-press correction could be made;70 other correction options were printing a cancel (which was very unusual),71 printing a pastedown,72 printing a list of errata, either as a separate sheet or at the end of a volume or end of the preliminaries,73 or ma-

69 “Mittit promissa carmina a Ludovico intonata et expolita. Cum avus [Minervius] ea publicatus sit, petit ut anteliminarem epistolum praefigat et Ludovico primum exemplar castigandummittat.” Important for an understanding of the publication of these partbooks is a series of eight letters from the editor, Minervius, to the Nuremberg patrician, Hieronymus Bauemgartner. As these letters were private communications they are more candid than the preface. Five letters are extant; summaries of the other three exist in a sixteenth-century index to the letters prepared by Baumgartner’s nephew, Joh. Ölhafen. Ölhafen’s brief summaries were first published in Dr. van Hout, “Zum Briefwechsel des älteren Hieronymus Baumgartner,” in Programm des Königlichen Gymnasiums zu Bonn: Schulfahr 1876–77, ed. August Waldeyer, Bonn 1877, pp. 21–22, #187–#194; five of the letters (#187, #189–#192) were transcribed from the originals in D-Dl in Otto Clemen, “Kleine Beiträge zur Musikgeschichte der Reformationzeit,” in MfZ (1949), pp. 221–224.

70 For a discussion of Hieronymus Formschneider’s use of stop-press correction, see Gustavson, Hans Ott, Hieronymus Formschneider (as in fn. 11), pp. 303–305.

71 For example, gathering E of the Discantus partbook of Hans Ott’s Novum et insigne opus musicum (RISM 1534–1535) has a cancel of fol. E1 and E2 uniquely in the exemplar D-Nla Fen. IV 405–409 (this cancel is not found in the copies in A-Wn, B-Br, D-As, B, F, HAu, HB, Ju, Kl, Mu, Nü, NA, RP (2 copies), ROu, GB-Lbl, H-Bn, I-Mc, or NL-DHgm; I have not checked the recently acquired exemplar in D-Mbs).

72 For example, the Montanus and Neuber “[Red] L I B E R || CANTICOR VM, || QUAE VVLGO RESPON= || foria uocantur, …”, fol. K8’, stave 6 (not in RISM, VD16: ZV13102, GB-Lbl Hirsch III.894).

73 For example there is an inserted bifolium after the colophon (fol. Dd4’) of the first book, the Cantiones, of the Cantiones / Kirchengesenge (DKL 1545–1546, copy of GB-Lbl C.36.1.3), on which there is a list of 12 errata on the first page of the bifolium, fol. **1’; the other three pages of the bifolium (fol. **2–**4) are blank. This bifolium and the list of errata are missing in another state of the Cantiones (DKL 1545–1546, copy of GB-Lbl K.4.h.8) in which most of the corrections have been made post-presswork by ink and erasure. The difference can be seen in the collation; K copy: [*]A–T’V–X–Z’Aa–Cc’D’d’DrE’Ee’ || [**] a–Z’aa–ll; C copy: [*]A–Z’Aa–Cc’D’d’[**] || [**]a–Z’aa–ll. Not all errors are listed in the errata: for example, in the K copy, fol. 74 (signed 77), the last line of music, which is woodcut, has been inserted and printed upside down, an
Royton Guittavson

king post-presswork inhouse corrections to the sheets by ink and erasure. The best form of correction, making post-presswork corrections by hand on every sheet, is expensive. I have not seen inhouse corrections to any Egenolff music print, reinforcing that they were aimed at a price-sensitive market segment.

4.3.5. Positioning
Schöffer positioned himself in method, paper, and format as a top-end printer: a differentiator who could charge more for his books, but who would therefore sell fewer copies. Egenolff was a successful cost leader: he printed as cheaply as possible and aimed to sell a high volume. He was extremely financially successful. When he died, he left a fortune of 16,000 Gulden, including, in addition to the printing business, a paper mill and 16 houses. Indeed, he was as far as I have been able to determine, the most financially successful of any German music printer of his time. Perhaps it is not coincidental that he also controlled almost the entire value chain, from the production of his own paper and printing types, to printing, to publishing, to selling both wholesale and directly to the public. Petreius and Formschneider fit somewhere in between. Lotter printed one volume that stands out from his others, the folio Cantiones referred to earlier. What was its purpose? Perhaps it was intended to sit on a lectern; and it would also have made an impressive gift.

5. The market, 1530–1550
The market for printed music in post-Reformation Germany may be divided into four groups; there are far more editions for each of the first two than for each of the last two:

1. Pedagogical works such as treatises and odes, and music in plays, primarily for use in the Lateinschulen. Indeed, an examination of RISM B VI/1–2 shows that from 1530 to 1550 Germany produced more theoretical works than any other country. This genre was driven by the Reformation edu-

error physically corrected in the C copy rather than including it in the errata. However, rather than inserting a sheet, errata may be printed at the end of the book or at the end of the preliminaries. For example, there are printed lists of errata for all four partbooks in Ludwig Senfl, Vāria carminum genera, Cantus secundus, on fol. d8v (D-Mbs, 8° Mus. pr. 35#BeiB 2), but in Hans Ott’s 121 neue Lieder (RISM 15347), copies of D-Z 69.1.66–69.1.70 [Vollhardt, p. 66, entry 56] and D-Mbs, 8° Mus. pr. 35), also printed by Formschneider in 1534, the errata are printed at the end of each partbook: Discantus, fol. m6v (9 lines); Contratenor, fol. n1v (11 lines); Tenor, fol. N7v (10 lines); Bassus, fol. LL7v (9 lines); and Vagans, fol. ddd6v (2 lines + 2 lines Discantus).

74 The extent of his fortune is actually unknown, but in the year following his death his widow paid taxes on assets of 16,000 Gulden. Grotefend, Christian Egenolff (as in fn. 37), p. 22.
cational system. The odes were usually printed from type, but the musical examples in treatises were usually printed from woodcuts which could be used through many editions.

2. Music for home or social use by the amateur, including most editions of Kirchenlieder, polyphonic instrumental works such as the anthologies of tricinia that began appearing from 1538, and lute tablatures. The Kirchenlieder were usually printed from woodcuts, but were sometimes printed from type; the tricinia and tablatures were printed from type.

3. Contrapuntal vocal polyphony. These works had a variety of uses, depending on the texts, including use in church and for social singing by trained musicians. From 1530–1550 in the German-speaking area these were exclusively produced from type and generally contain many more leaves, that is, are much bigger sets of partbooks, than their French or Italian counterparts.

4. Music for institutional use, such as the many editions of the Deutsche Messe.

We see different types of strategy being used in each of these. Some publishers printed across genres, such as Egenolff, but other were focused: for example, Georg Wachter published only Lieder that were, with a single exception, monophonic. This paper will focus on two examples: ode settings and polyphonic anthologies of the 1530s.

5.1. Ode settings

Notated music was not only musical in nature: it was also used for the teaching of Latin and Greek metre. We find short musical examples in Grammar books; for example, Braubach produced a Melanchthon Greek Grammar which includes 2 lines of music. This is not, in marketing terms, a music print. More ambiguous are the prints of ode settings which, after an auspicious start by Oeglin in 1507, saw editions printed by Egenolff in 1532, Faber in 1533, Formschneider in

77 RISM T1251.
78 RISM 15331. Melodiae prudentianae et in Virgilius…. This title has two editions, one with “Aprilii” on the title page (GB-Lbl Hirsch I.167 and GB-Lbl k.8.b.14), the other with “Oクトょり” (GB-Lbl k.8.b.13 and GB-Lbl k.1.f.15). The October edition corrects a number of typographical errors, including two on the title page: “uirrutis” to “uirutitis” and “pflallat” to “pflallat”.
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1534, and Petreius in 1539, to name but four. They are all, with the single exception of the Formschneider, printed in upright octavo format (the Faber is in choirbook format, the others in partbooks) which, together with material in the dedications and prefatory material, makes it clear that these were primarily intended as grammar books, not music prints, even though they look like music prints. The Egenolff was dedicated to Gerhardus Noviomagus, Professor for Rhetoric in Marburg. The Faber, settings of texts by Prudentius, probably arose in relationship with the Prudentius Lectures of the Leipzig University Professor Kaspar Borner. The Petreius was edited by Johannes Stomius, who founded a Poetenschule in Salzburg, and dedicated to his patron, Cardinal Lang.

The printing of the Formschneider was overseen by the humanist Simon Minervius. Formschneider printed no textbooks at all, and may simply have used the same format that he used for the lied anthology (RISM) that he printed at about the same time; although the dedication by Minervius focuses on the musical settings by Senfl, this may be related to his statement that he and Senfl were close friends.

Instructive is the Egenolff edition of 1532. It appears in two issues, one begins O D A R V M Horatij Concentus (GB-Lbl Hirsch III.1129), the other begins MELODIAE in Odas Horatij (GB-Lbl K.1.e.19). A side by side comparison of these two issues shows that they are, with the exception of the first two lines of text on the title page, from the same setting of type. Egenolff stopped the press part way through the print run and changed the first two lines of the title in the Tenor. Surely the former was aimed at the grammar market and the latter at the

79 RISM S2806. Ludwig Senfl, Varia carminum genera. D-Mbs, 8° Mus. pr. 35#Behld. 2.
80 RISM 1539n. Harmoniae poeetice Pauli Hoffheimeri. GB-Lbl 1070c.c.12.
81 Donald W. Krummel, "Oblong Format in Early Music Books," in The Library, series V, 26 (1971), pp. 312–324, esp. 313, has written that "In the sixteenth century upright format (usually octavo) had also been typical of those musical editions closely allied to the book trade, hymnals and instruction books in particular, and such music as was occasionally published by printers whose main concern was literary texts, especially in Germany."
83 Brinzing, "Faber" (as in fn. 49), col. 620.
84 Christian Thomas Leitmeir, "Stomius, Johannes," in MGG, Personenteil vol. 15, Kassel, etc. 2006, col. 1556–1557.
85 See the dedicatory letter, reproduced in facsimile and English translation, in Guðavson, Hans Oth, Hieronymus Formschneider (as in fn. 11), pp. 589–599.
86 See the dedication, fol. 75v.
87 In addition to the copies listed in RISM, there is a fragment of the Tenor partbook at D-Z, Mus. 139.6 (three bifolia: A1+8, A2+7, B2+3).
88 Part of the border of the illustration on the title page was also removed, either deliberately or accidentally.
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music market: the product is packaged in two different ways for two different markets.

The deliberate nature of the change for marketing purposes is also found in another Egenolff print, the 1550 *Hymni ecclesiastici duodecim* (DKL 1550(0–1)), a Latin translation by Reinhard Lorichius of Spangenberg's *Zwölff Chrißliche Lobgesenge* (DKL 1545(1)). The *Hymni* appears in 3 issues; again, it appears that the body of the print is exactly the same, with the variants appearing only on the title page. One print is the *Hymni* by itself, which may be perceived as musical in nature.90 The title page of the second issue continues with the title of another work by the same author, which was coupled with the *Hymni*; it is not a music book, but liturgical.91 The title page of the third issue has the *Hymni* as the second of two items, the first liturgical.92 Each of the books has its own series of signatures

89 The literature is unclear on this print, and so it is described here. It is 60 unnumbered leaves, A-G8, 8(5) (that is, the first five leaves in each gathering) signed in Roman caps and Arabic numerals, -A1, -H3, -H4. The date is given on fol. [H2]' of GB-Lbl but missing in A-Wn), and so leaf H4 is not counted in the number of leaves in DKL, which gives 59 leaves. The first two issues are conflated in DKL as 1550(0) (and as such the title given for A-Wn in DKL is incorrect), the third is given as DKL 1550(1). VD16 gives two editions for 1550: S8097 is correctly the 1550 edition. However, S8098, although dated [1550?], is actually a reprint, without musical notation, by the heirs of Christian Egenolf (Günter Richter, “Chrißtian Egenolff Erben 1555–1607,” in *Archiv für Geschichte des Buchwesens* 7 [1967], col. 449–1130, esp. 960–961, cat. no. 314); see Wolfgang Schmieder, *Musik: Alte Drucke bis etwa 1750*, Frankfurt a.M. 1967 (Kataloge der Herzog-August-Bibliothek Wolfenbüttel, new series, 12), p. 459, cat. no. 678.

90 “H Y M N I || ECCLESIASTICI DVODECIM, SVM= || mis Fe-

91 “H Y M N I || ECCLESIASTICI DVODECIM, SVM= || mis Fe-

92 This is transcribed from DKL 1550(1); I have not seen this issue. "DE FESTIS | PRAECIPVIS, EVAN- | GELIA, ITEM, HYMNI ECCLESIA- | itici, Summis feliitutatibus ab Ecclesia so-


beginning with A and, in the case of the non-*Hymni* title, separate foliation (the *Hymni* is not foliated). Egenolff has packaged this product in three different ways, one of which was music.

5.2. *Polyphonic anthologies in the 1530s*

The decade 1511–1520 saw the magnificent achievements of Oeglin, Schöffer, and Grimm & Wysung in printing polyphonic music, a genre which went into stark decline in the following decade, with 2 editions of Johann Walter’s *Geyßliche gsangk Buchleyn* (Wittenberg, 1524, and Worms: Schöffer, 1525) being the only editions of importance. Schöffer being forced to leave Mainz in 1518 because of his support of the Reformation, the deaths of Wyrsung in 1521 and Oeglin in 1522, and the bankruptcy of Grimm in 1527 all contributed to this decline.

Despite the ode editions of Egenolff 1532 and Faber 1533 mentioned earlier, the key figure in the revival of the printing of polyphonic music in Germany in the 1530s was Hans Ott who had, from the first, a clear publication programme in mind. The title of his first publication, in 1534 (RISM 1534”), begins with the words “The first part”, immediately signalling his intention to publish at least one more volume of *Lieder*. In the dedication to this volume, he states that he also has selected Latin works which he intends to publish. The Latin works, all published or announced for publication within a period of eighteen months between August 1537 and February 1539, covered a wide but balanced range of liturgical forms: two volumes each of motets and mass ordinaries, and cycle of mass propers for the entire year. In the dedication to the first volume of masses, Ott announced his intention to publish a second; this never eventuated. There is such a sudden end to Ott’s publishing activities in 1539 that it raises the question of what happened to cause it.

When Ott issued his first collection of *Lieder* in 1534, it had been nine years since the previous collection of *Tenorlieder* had been published. It may be assumed to have been a success, as he planned and published a second volume long enough after the first so that the market response could be judged, and any changes suggested by this response implemented; it would also have given him time to replenish his funds. In 1534, Schöffer and Apiarius published a revised edition of Walter’s *Wittenbergische Gsangbüchli*; as a sacred collection, it was not in direct

---


94 Tenor, fol. 5*: “Dann ich vorhabe gar außerleſner lateinſ- || cher gefanck Compoſicion/ mit dem schierften fo mir Yffel meuglich/ auch in || dem Truck aufgehun zu laffen.” Transcribed from D-Mbs 8° Mus.pr.35.

95 “Liturgical forms” should not be taken to imply “liturgical use.”
competition with Ott’s primarily secular anthology. But the following year, 1535, Egenolff issued the Gassenhauerlin (RISM 1535\(^{96}\)) and Reutterliedlin (RISM 1535\(^{96}\)), the latter reprinted in 1536 (not in RISM, CH-Zz, Z. Mus. 908); at about this time Schöffer and Apiarius issued the Fünff vnd sechzig teutsche Lieder (RISM [1536]). It was into this well-supplied market that Ott issued his second anthology of lieder, the Schöne auszerlesne Lieder des hoch berümpten Heinrici Finckens (RISM [1536]). It was to be eight years before Ott’s third lied anthology (RISM 1544\(^{98}\)) would follow.

Ott now turned his attention to the publication of sacred music, which he had announced in 1534. His Novum et insigne opus musicum (RISM 1537\(^{97}\)) was the first anthology of motets published in the German-speaking area in seventeen years. Given the need for music for the fast-growing Lutheran church, Ott’s anthology, with a Protestant bias evident in both the choice of some texts and in the “Protestantisation” of others, could be expected to sell very well; it was the only motet anthology published in the German-speaking area in 1537.\(^{97}\) The following year, he published another volume of motets, the Secundus tomus novi operis musici (RISM 1538\(^{97}\)), writing in the preface of the pieces in the first volume that “These were received with great approval by the best people and we were subsequently urged to prepare a second volume with the same care and enthusiasm.”\(^{98}\) The success of the first volume surely reached the attention of other publishers, and in 1539 the Nuremberg printer Johannes Petreius, best known as the printer of Copernicus’ De revolutionibus, entered the market with two anthologies of motets, the Tomus primus psalmorum selectorum (RISM 1538\(^{97}\)) and the Modulationes aliquot quatuor vocum (RISM 1538\(^{97}\)). The title and preface of the former made it clear that Petreius intended to publish a second volume, which appeared the following year (RISM 1540\(^{97}\)) and 1542 (RISM 1542\(^{97}\)). Georg Rhaw in Wittenberg also entered the market in 1538, with his Symphoniae iucundae (RISM 1538\(^{97}\)). Schöffer in Strasbourg published his first motet collection, the Cantiones quinque vocum (RISM 1539\(^{97}\)) the following year.

Ott’s Missae tredecim (RISM 1539\(^{97}\)) was the first anthology of mass ordinaries published in the German-speaking area.\(^{99}\) He announced the publication of the

\(^{96}\) RISM 1536\(^{96}\). The assignment of Ott as editor, and this as his second book of lieder, was demonstrated in Gustavson, Hans Ott, Hieronymus Formschneider (as in fn. 11), pp. 10–16.

\(^{97}\) The attribution of RISM [1537]\(^{97}\) to Petreius is in error; the print is actually the Discantus, Altus, and Bassus of Ott’s Novum et insigne opus musicum.


\(^{99}\) The Nuremberg council had received a copy by 28 February 1539. "12 fl Hannsen Ottel puchförer zur vererung, dass er eim erbarn rat vier gesangpüchlein, darin etlich mess, geschenckt
second volume of masses in the dedication: purchasers of the first volume of masses could reasonably be expected to purchase a second, as had been the case with the motets. However, Petreius – probably within weeks of this – published his Liber quindecim missarum (RISM 1539). The impact of Petreius’ book of masses is evident from an examination of the extant copies of the Ott and Petreius mass volumes. Of the twelve extant copies of the Petreius mass book, six are in sixteenth-century bindings bound together with the Ott volume, and the copies of both volumes in the library of Duke Albrecht of Prussia and in an 1846 Butsch sales catalogue were also bound together: the place which Ott had created for his second volume had been taken by Petreius. Rthaw entered the market in 1539 with his Officia paschalia (RISM 1539), a collection of mass ordinaries and propers for liturgical use; his first volume devoted solely to mass ordinaries, the Opus decem missarum (RISM 1541), appeared two years later. Rthaw also included portrait medallions of Luther and Melanchthon on the title page of some of his Latin anthologies, making their denominational use clear. The changes to the market wrought by this comparative explosion in the printing of Latin-
texted sacred music, as a result of competitive strategy dynamics, would have been felt by Ott in 1539, and it is presumably this which resulted in his withdrawal from the market, putting on hold indefinitely his announced publication of his second book of masses. Georg Rhaw appears to have been an exception, as he appears to have continued with his publication program regardless of the actions of his competitors.

Although the great Nuremberg printing house of Berg & Neuber began publishing music in 1542, it was not until 1553 that they began publishing the great series of anthologies for which they are best known and which cemented their place as the most important German music printing and publishing dynasty of the second half of the sixteenth century. Why did they wait so long? Surely it was because their competitors had exited, literally: Ott died in 1540, Schöffer in 1547, Rhaw in 1548, Petreius in 1550, Egenolff in 1555, and Formschneider in 1556.

We can see similar competitive patterns if we look at other genres such as bicionia or tricinia.

6. Conclusion

Music printing was not a philanthropic activity: its purpose was to create value. Even when a publisher had something that we know that he or she wanted to publish, as we know from the case of Ott, the publisher would not proceed with the edition unless it was believed that the market wanted the edition and that the demand would not be filled by the publisher’s competitors before the edition could be brought to market. Publishers closely watched the market, and moved quickly when they saw demand. Some publishers positioned themselves clearly: Schöffer and Grimm & Wyrsung were differentiators with high quality products; Egenolff and Wachtter clearly positioned themselves as low-price publishers following a cost-leadership strategy. The majority of publishers, including Ott, Petreius, and Rhaw, were somewhere in the middle, producing standard quality editions diffe-

104 The standard work on this is Kim Warren, *Competitive Strategy Dynamics*, Chichester 2002.
105 The publication of the *Choralis constatantinus* was announced in the dedication of RISM 1537 (Tenor partbook, fol. A3) but was delayed for other reasons. See Royéton Gustavson, “Commercialising the *Choralis Constantinus*: The printing and publishing of the first edition (1550–1555),” unpublished paper, *Polyphony for the Proper of the Mass in the Late Middle Ages and Renaissance*, Leuven, Belgium 17 January 2009.
rontiated by their content. Although musicology has historically tended to focus on early music printing, it is clear that from a strategic and marketing perspective we need to focus on early music publishing.
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