because of 'the applause and the approval that the other songs that I have edited far and wide have brought'. It is the expression of a composer's self-awareness and consciousness that could probably hardly have been imagined earlier in the century, leaving out of consideration Lasso's mature career. Just one year earlier, in 1595, Philippe Rogier claimed to be true to the age-old tradition of publishing with the intention of reaching immortality of one's name. According to the composer, dedicating the edition — to Alberto Acquaviva, Duke of Atri and possibly son of Giovanni Girolamo — enhanced this purpose.

It is my conviction that composers were attentive to the new possibilities of music printing and that they became ever more conscious of the power of this medium. Reading the dedications, one doesn't only come across extra bits and pieces of biographical and historical information. When reading between the lines, the liminary texts on the whole allow insight in the functioning of the dedicatory act, its aims and effect. While taking care not to over-interpret the words, one shouldn't be hesitant to interpret them either, for we can be certain that in the sixteenth century, just as now, one could read the lines but also read between the lines.
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2 Most studies of printing have, quite rightly, singled out the regular provision of title pages as the most significant new feature associated with the printed book format. Eisenstein, *The printing press*, I, 106. See also the excellent study by Margaret M. Smith, *The title-page. Its early development, 1460-1510*, (London-New Castle, Del.: British Library-Oak Knoll Press, 2000), pp. 25-34: 'With a few notable exceptions that will concern us later, manuscripts were not provided with title-pages' (p. 25). The standard work on dedications in music prints of the sixteenth century is Raimund Redeker, *Lateinische Widmungsvorreden zu Meß- und Motetendrucken der ersten Hälfte des 16. Jahrhunderts, Schriften zur Musikwissenschaft aus Münster*, 6 (Eisench: Wagner, 1995). However, aside from limiting himself to motet and mass prints and from failing to present the full text of the dedicatory texts he is examining (which severely limits the usefulness of his book), Redeker takes little notice of the current scholarship on paratexts. In his chapter on the thematic context of dedications (pp. 7-49), he concentrates on the function of the dedicatory letter as an essentially humanistic device of panegyric.
become clear below, musical sources (i.e. sources that are primarily devoted
to notated music, whether monophonic or polyphonic) played a special role
in this development — or, at the very least, they throw the functional
distinction which I postulate into higher relief than sources of verbal text.

Dedications are paratexts. The French literary theorist Gérard Genette
coincd this extremely useful term in 1987 to encompass all elements that
"surround and extend" the text as such (analogous to the meaning of
the Greek preposition "para-": "about", "alongside"): "the paratext is
what enables a text to become a book and to be offered as such to its
readers and, more generally, to the public. More than a boundary or a
sealed border, the paratext is, rather, a threshold, or [...] a "vestibule"
that offers the world at large the possibility of either stepping inside or
turning back. Genette first defines "peritexts" as elements that deter-
mine the book as a material object and situate it in time and place, and
ascribes these elements to the publisher: font, format, material, binding,
cover, imprint, title page, table of contents, index, colophon. "Peritexts"
proper, for Genette, are authorial: the name of the author himself, the
title, the dedication, the inscription (defined by Genette as that dedica-
tion which is not printed, but "inscribed" by the author or a later owner to the
person to whom the book is presented), the epigraph, prefaces and post-
faces (be they original, added later or by somebody else), intertitles and
notes. Genette also defines "epitexts" (i.e. reception documents such as
reviews), but these are of less interest in this context. It is immediately
obvious that not all of Genette's categories apply easily to fifteenth- and
sixteenth-century sources, and his distinction between publisher and
author is partly artificial in early prints and even more questionable in
manuscripts; but he does provide literary scholarship with an extremely
useful tool to classify and contemplate the texts "alongside" the text as
well as their potential uses. Indeed, a comparison of manuscripts and the
earliest prints in terms of how and to what extent they contain (or do not
contain) paratexts tells us a great deal about how these sources "work"
in their respective social contexts.

As all other paratexts, dedications are defined by content,
mode of presentation and — most importantly of all — function. Who is
supposed to read the dedication, who is the addressee, the "implied reader"?

There is of course the obvious answer to this question: the dedication —
most often in form of a stylised letter — is directed towards the dedica-
tee. However, as is well known, the matter is more complicated: the
process of communication involved in the dedication of a written or
printed source is by no means a one-way — or even a two-way — street,
and one could even argue that the dedicatee is not the real implied reader
at all. To be sure, the primary function of a dedication is to establish a
relationship between the two parties most directly involved: dedicator
and dedicatee. Both parties expect to gain from this relationship. The ded-
icator wants to attract the favourable attention of the dedicatee, possibly
with the hope of financial remuneration; or the dedication is the result of
such gain already achieved. There is also the "public relation" value of
being associated with a person of high rank or social status, with the pos-
sible benefit of achieving a higher standing in one's own professional
context or in society at large. The dedicatee receives a boost to his or her
self-esteem, and possibly also to his or her reputation as a patron of the
arts or of scholarship. In his/her own eyes, this gain — however imma-
terial — justifies the financial outlay.

But beyond the purely financial transaction which allowed the produc-
tion of the book to happen in the first place, all these "added values"
require the presence of a third party: a gain in "standing" or "reputation"
can only work in the desired manner if there is a "public", an "audience".
And it is really this public which is the actual "implied reader", not the
notional recipient or dedicatee. The latter did not need to see the book
to find out about the dedication which would have been arranged before-
hand, nor would he (or she) be likely to have read the text of the dedica-
tory letter for the first time when receiving the finished book. It is the pub-
lic which needs to see and read the dedication — otherwise, there is no
gain in status for either dedicator or dedicatee. The dedication — as all
other paratexts — explains to the readers "what the book is". It conveys
information which those directly involved in the production process
would have known anyway. Without the publicity achieved through the
prominent placement of a dedication at the beginning of a source, the
whole process would become pointless. In a sense, a dedication is a game

3 Gérard Genette, Paratexts. Thresholds of Interpretation, transl. Jane E. Lewin (Cam-
bridge: Cambridge University Press, 1997), pp. 1-2; original: Seuils [= Thresholds] (Paris:
Seuill, 1987).

4 Redeker also points to the very public nature of the dedicatory letter which transcends
5 See Carl Schottenloher, Die Widmungsvorrede im Buch des 16. Jahrhunderts, Refor-
— a game which does not necessarily look for a winner, but which requires three players (or maybe more accurately, two players and a group of spectators).

This, of course, is not a new insight, but it helps to be reminded of it in order to understand the fundamental difference between print dedications and manuscript dedications that is the topic of this paper. This difference does not essentially concern the identity (or indeed existence) of a dedicator and a dedicatee, although their relationship will usually be a different one in prints and in manuscripts; rather, it concerns the “implied public” to whom the dedication is factually, if not notionally, addressed. This public, for printed sources, is made up of the persons who buy the book. It is, in terms of marketing, a “target group”; the presentation and the contents of a book must be geared towards this target group by the author, editor and publisher. In our case, this target group are the potential buyers of polyphonic music. This group is not limitless since it is restricted to those individuals who could read mensural music (or music of any kind); in the sixteenth century, it can be narrowed down to the professional musical institutions plus the musically literate higher bourgeoisie and nobility. But even in the context of this clearly controllable market, print runs that range anywhere from an estimated 300 to 500 with Petrucci in the early sixteenth century up to 1,000 towards mid-century (when single-impression printing made polyphonic music quicker and easier to produce and thus more affordable) make this a rather large and potentially diverse group. This public is, to a certain degree, anonymous: at least in theory, anybody can buy a book. There is also a fairly clear demarcation between the production side (sponsor/patron/commissioner, author, editor, publisher, printer, bookseller) and the consumption side (dedicatee, buyer, owner, musician, listener). The only potentially overlapping element between the two camps is indeed the dedicatee who is likely to be involved in the production (as a sponsor or patron) and in the consumption of the book.

In any case, the dedicator — in the context of musical prints most often the composer, but possibly also the sponsor, compiler or editor — has no immediate control over his target group. Even if the buyer is known, the book can be passed along. The works contained therein are performed by a determinate number of singers and listened to by an even larger, even more indeterminate number of listeners. Hence, the consumer of a print — the “implied reader” of the print dedication — is to a certain degree an “outsider”, somebody who will be interested in music, but does not necessarily know much (or anything) about the composer, the dedicatee and their mutual relationship. Therefore, any information that the producer(deem(s) necessary or desirable for the recipient to have must be made explicit in the printed paratexts, either on the title page or indeed in the dedication or preface: the nature of the repertoire; the identity, rank and status of the composer, editor, publisher and printer (all of whom may be different persons or the same person, and any of whom, with the possible exception of the printer, may be the dedicator); the identity, rank and status of the dedicatee; the special relationship between the two as it is or as the dedicator wishes it to be; the specific reason, if there is one, for dedicating the specific object; etc. Print dedications, for this very reason, tend to be wordy, sometimes occupying two pages and more.

Hence, it does not come as a surprise that a number of even the earliest prints of polyphonic music contain substantial paratexts, often including a lengthy dedication or a preface. The first such publication of all, Ottaviano Petrucci’s *Harmonice Musices Odhecaton*, features not one, but two dedicatory letters: one by Petrucci to the dedicatee and patron, the Venetian nobleman Girolamo Donato, the other by a certain Bartolomeo Budrio — the person who apparently initiated the whole enterprise of polyphonic music printing — likewise to Donato. The two earliest German prints devoted exclusively to polyphonic music are also provided with paratexts beyond the title page: Gregor Mewes’ print of Obrecht’s


masses (Concentus harmonici quattuor missarum, peritissimi musico rum, Jacobi Obrecht, Basel [1507]) contains a humanistically-inspired pref ace ad lectores, and Erhard Oeglin’s Melopoeiae sive harmoniae tetracentiae of the same year, although not dedicated to a specific person but rather to the musiphili (the music-lovers), literally brims with paratexts. Most of these are from the pen of the patron and initiator of the “humanistic ode project”, Conrad Celtis and the Theorie eines Phänomens frühneuzeitlicher Kommunikation, edition "German humanism in general: ‘Wie auf so vielen Gebieten des humanistischen Geistes-
poems, and in much smaller format, but with a much more accurate musical text-obvi-
tousley directed at the singers and not at the scholars. Tritonio (1507) aile-
edition”.[3]

This set of paratexts — in a print whose function appears to be more that of a humanistic manifesto than that of a music print in the narrow sense — is rounded off with a congratulatory Sapphic ode by the humanist Benedictus Chelidonius (or Benedikt Schwalbe) from Nuremberg. Andrea Antico’s folio choirbook print Liber Quindecim Missarum (Rome, 1516) likewise contains a dedication by the editor to Pope Leo X. Admittedly, many other prints of the early years did not contain dedications or para-
texts of any kind, especially the simple German song prints[15] or Petrucci’s efforts subsequent to the Odhecaton A. Nevertheless, their numbers rise in the following decades, and dedications become the norm. This, in turn, is of course very helpful to today’s scholars — rarely are we left in the dark about dates, context and function of a given print, and in not a few cases, all the information we have about a composer is what we read in the dedication or dedications of his printed work or works.

10 See Birgitt Lodes, ‘An anderem Ort, auf andere Art: Petruccis und Meves’ Obrecht-
11 Schottenloher emphasises Celtis’ role as the pioneer of the dedicatory preface in German humanism in general: ‘Wie auf so vielen Gebieten des humanistischen Geistes-
lives in Deutschland hat auch für die Widmungsvorrede der ‘Erzhumanist’ Konrad Celtis
Weisung und Richtung gegeben.’ Schottenloher, Die Widmungsvorrede, p. 3.
13 This is corroborated by the fact that, in the same year, Oeglin published a “practical edition” of the same pieces, the Harmoniae Petri Tritonii, without the frontispiece and the poems, and in much smaller format, but with a much more accurate musical text — obvi-
ously directed at the singers and not at the scholars. See Vecchi, ‘Dalle “Melopoeiae”’, p. 108.
14 See Nicole Schmidt, ‘Zwischen Musikhandschrift und Notendruck: Paratexte in
den ersten deutschen Liederbüchern’, in Die Paraliterarisierung des Paratextes: Formen, Funk-

The “implied public” for a manuscript source, on the other hand, is quite different from that of a print. Manuscripts were not sold on an open
market — they were unique objects which were produced and changed hands (if they changed hands at all) within a small, controlled, closed
environment. As Margaret Smith writes:

As producer, the scribe, made one manuscript, usually on commission, for
a known purchaser. Once it was finished it would be bound up, or at least
it would pass into the ownership and care of the purchaser. There was no
need to store or to market it. The purchaser, having commissioned the book,
had no immediate need of a protective leaf, or of an identifying label,
because he knew its textual content.

Manuscripts almost invariably simply begin, without a title page, without
a preface, without a dedication, often even without a table of contents;
in short, without any explanation at all as to contents, function and per-
son or persons involved. The simple reason for that is that the person or
persons involved did not need any such explanations: everybody involved
in the production and/or consumption of a manuscript was an insider, did
not have to be told in writing. If manuscripts changed hands at all, they
were given directly from one person or institution to another. For all prac-
tical purposes, there is no anonymous “public” in manuscript culture, no
demarcation line between producer and consumer.

As far as dedications are concerned: if any proof were needed that
dedications required that third party to “work”, this proof is found in
their almost complete absence in manuscripts (except sometimes in
those books produced in multiple copies by professional scriptoria as a
“precursor” to the market-driven print culture). Of course, there was in
many cases a sponsor, a patron, an addressee to whom the codex was
dedicated or at least destined — but as we will see, the means of com-
unication tended to be much less explicit, much more subtle than in the
printed book. There were no spectators; hence there was no game on, no
advertisement or self-promotion necessary, no added value or gain in
prestige or status to be had through the explanation of a “special relation-
ship” between dedicator and dedicatee. Such games, if they were played
at all, were played in private, and everybody knew the rules. If anything,

15 Smith, The title-page, p. 27.
16 ‘Wie die Handschriften des Mittelalters trotz einiger Beispiele aus dem Altertum
die Widmungsvorrede kaum kannte, so wandte sie auch der Druck nur selten an.’
the scribe added a brief incipit on the first notated page to allow the owner to identify the contents at a glance, and a colophon or explicit at the very end, identifying the author of the text, the copyist, the date of copying and maybe a brief comment on the purpose of the book — rarely indeed the person who had sponsored it and/or was to receive it.17

For musical manuscripts, this applies to an even greater extent than for literary manuscripts, simply because their context of production and use was even more restricted and "non-public". Texts like the Bible, university texts (especially in law and theology), literary texts and — increasingly in the fifteenth century — the classics of Latin antiquity and humanist texts enjoyed wide circulation and engendered a regular book industry, with stationers, professional scriptoria and "editions" or "publications" in multiple copies almost in the modern sense;18 for example, the Brethren of the Common Life (or devotio moderna) in the Low Countries maintained thriving scriptoria throughout the fifteenth century.19 Manuscripts of polyphonic music, on the other hand, are invariably unica, tied to a specific person, place, time and context.20 This has partly to do with the ephemeral nature of the polyphonic repertoire (very little polyphonic music was transmitted for more than a generation after its composition), partly again with the limited number of persons who might possibly be interested in it — i.e. persons who could read and perform music. Also, manuscripts of polyphonic music are very often not produced "in one piece" as a book, but are collections of fascicles or gatherings, not rarely by various scribes, bound together only at a later point in time. By their very nature, such codices bear no dedication since they were not originally conceived as a unit. To be sure, manuscripts of polyphonic music are not unique in this regard, but the share of such collections is much higher than in other genres because of the uniqueness of their contents and their limitation to a small group of users and a specific place or function.

Finally, the specific knowledge required to notate polyphonic music normally did not permit the "outsourcing" of the production to a scriptorium — because none existed that could supply the specialised skills. Hence, these sources were normally produced in-house — by the singer(s) or institution which needed or wanted them. Even in the one known case of what could be called a scriptorium of polyphonic music — the Alamire workshop active in the context of the Habsburg-Burgundian court from about 1495 to about 1535 — the method and pace of production differs markedly from the big text scriptorium.21 There was no systematic, much less speculative production "for a market" in this workshop; on the contrary, the work was apparently done ad hoc, with considerable breaks of activity (if the extant sources are any indication) and comparatively little effort to present a unified external appearance or a unified musical repertoire (except for some staples, such as the masses by Pierre de La Rue). Instead, external and internal characteristics were tailor-made to fit a specific purpose, commission and/or dedicatee. The quality and characteristics of the script vary as much as the size of the codices and the effort spent on decoration. The large number of different scribes who were active in the workshop from time to time — according to Flynn Warrington, up to twenty — argues for the same scenario.22 Alamire, who copied very little himself, was active as a manager rather than as the chief scribe, and drew on such personnel capable of writing polyphonic music (in all likelihood, singers from the Burgundian court chapel) as and when necessary


19 See Andrew Walther, "The production of books of liturgical polyphony", in *Book production and publishing in Britain 1375-1475*, pp. 143-161.


and available. There was no such thing as a professional scribe of polyphonic music at the time (in the sense of a person who was employed solely for that purpose), and the rate of production of the Alamire workshop (less than two per year even if one counts all the fragments as once having been complete manuscripts) is much lower than that of a true professional text scriptorium. Thus, even the Alamire codices, while part of a larger group, are unica in many ways as well.

Manuscripts with monophonic music are, as a rule, more "organised" and unified in their contents; this applies in particular to books with liturgical chant. While these, again, contain no dedications because they were almost invariably specific to the institution for which they were produced and either copied in-house or specifically commissioned, they do regularly contain incipits and colophons stating the name of the scribe and the year of copying. The fact that even these basic pieces of information are missing from most manuscripts of polyphonic music is of course a source of unending frustration to scholars who have to infer the persons involved, the place and the date indirectly or from secondary sources. If one is very lucky, at least the original owner (or one of the later owners) has put down his name and maybe a bit of additional information, as in the annotation to Pompeius Occo's book of music for the rite of the Heilige Stede in Amsterdam (Brussels, Koninklijke Bibliothek van België / Bibliothèque royale de Belgique, MS IV.922) from 1537, documenting the loan of this book to the Heilige Stede. This, however, was entered years after the production of the manuscript itself which again forms part of the output of the Alamire workshop; possible dates for the compilation of the particular source range from 1516 to 1534.

Broadly speaking, music manuscripts (as far as extant today) fall into three categories: personal collections, institutional collections and presentation sources or gifts. Private collections, by their very nature, did not require paratexts, much less dedications. Quite a number of these sources are extant from the late fifteenth and sixteenth centuries. Some were copied by the collectors themselves such as the Liederbücher by Hartmann Schedel,26 Fridolin Sicher,27 Aegidius Tschudi28 and others; some were produced on commission by a copyist for the collector, such as the aforementioned Occo Codex or the set of partbooks copied in 1542 for the Bruges merchant Zeghere van Male29; and some were compiled from many individual gatherings and fascicles for and/or by a collector, such as the Apel Codex (copied c. 1490-1504)30 or the Magister Nicolaus Leopold Codex (copied c. 1466-1511).31 There is no "public" for these sources, implied or otherwise, except for the hypothetical friend or visitor to whom the owner might show his book; here, dedications would serve no purpose whatsoever and consequently do not exist. Again, the exception proves the rule: a few of the more elaborate music books do contain paratexts whose purpose, however, seems to be to embellish rather than to impart information. One example of this is the so-called Chansonnier Cordiforme produced for Jean de Montchenu before 1477, which opens with a frontispiece depicting Amor and Fortuna, including a four-line allegorical Italian poem.32

The second category is that of the Gebrauchshandschriften — books produced by a courtly and/or sacred institution for the use of precisely that same institution, either in a sacred (liturgical music for the cappella) or in a courtly context (chansons and other secular genres). Most musical manuscripts from the fourteenth to sixteenth centuries fall in this category.

25 See The Treasury of Petrus Alamire, pp. 76-77.
These sources — some simple, some elaborate — also exist in a closed context: that of the institution. Functionally and often actually, the Gebrauchshandschript did not change hands; there was no dedicator or dedicatee; all the actors and contexts were known to everybody involved. The repertoire was either predetermined by liturgical or ceremonial requirements or was selected by the patron/employer or the chapel members; and the scribes were either employed by the institution, pressed into service ad hoc if there were no professional music scribes available, or commissioned. Hence all the information usually imparted in print prefaces is superfluous. A potential “public” could conceivably have entered the picture in the form of the patron/employer — who at least notionally could be seen as the dedicatee of the sources — or possibly, in liturgical contexts, the congregation. But even if one accepts this concept of a limited public, the process of communication is entirely different from that of print publications. If at all, the congregation would not read from the book, but see it from afar as an object of beauty and reverence, similar to the celebrant’s vestments, the altar decorations and the fittings of the building in general, designed to inspire awe and impress the visitor both with the glory of the Creator and the financial capabilities of the patron. In this context, the most effective peritext would concern size and visual adornment — which is indeed the defining characteristic of the large choirbooks since the late fifteenth century. These visual peritexts are situated where they could actually be seen during the service while the music was performed: in the form of miniatures, calligraphic initials or adorned borders on the opening with the music itself. Frontispieces, title pages and verbal paratexts, on the other hand, would only have been visible to the “insiders”: the singers. Again, they are lacking almost without exception because they are superfluous for this particular category of readers.

There are some rare cases in which short paratexts exist even in this type of source, without apparent function, seemingly on a whim: some scribes, editors or composers were sufficiently proud of their achievement that they “dedicated” their work to the institution in which they were employed — or directly to their employer. One example of such a person is Federico Mario Perugino, chant scribe for Pope Paul III and the Papal Chapel from 1538 to 1547. In two of the three extant manuscripts he copied for his employer (an Antiphonarium de sanctis of 1538 and an Antiphonarium de tempore of 1545) — he adorns the colophon on the last page of each of the two codices with a short poem in elegiac couplets (see Appendices 6 and 7). These are not dedications in the proper sense of the word, but they serve a related function: the author of the poem — whether Perugino himself or another chapel member — can be assumed to speak for the Papal Chapel as an institution. In Capp. Sist. 11, he addresses himself explicitly to the reader (lector), extolling the virtues of the pontiff who has brought about and maintained peace; moreover, Paul has not only commissioned the two books in question, but has also provided the funds necessary for their lavish production from his own purse (aene suo). The laudatory language and content are entirely typical for sixteenth-century humanist-inspired dedications, and the practice of adorning the explicit or colophon with a short poem is a time-honoured medieval tradition. But the question remains: who could have seen it to whom this beneficence would actually have been news? Where is the “public relations” value of an inscription hidden away in the back of such a codex that was not only used exclusively by the Papal singers but whose content could only have been seen by them as the lectern on the singers’ balcony in the Sistine Chapel faces away from the congregation? For once, the process of communication is here indeed limited to the dedicator (the Papal Chapel as an institution) and the dedicatee (Pope Paul III, who is known to have taken a vivid interest in the workings of his private chapel and to whose papacy a vast number of new manuscripts can be dated). It is, in this context, probably not even important if the pope ever actually saw the dedication; it is a gesture through which the Papal Chapel affirmed its close relationship with the pontiff.

But similar gestures are rare in the extant body of music manuscripts destined for institutional use; indeed, I could trace no instances at all before the 1520s. A few more dedications can be found in the polyphonic codices of the Bavarian court chapel in Munich, significantly, another institution with a high degree of self-confidence, indeed self-importance. Ludwig Senff’s pair of motet codices (Munich, Bayerische Staatsbibliothek, MS 12 and 10), probably copied in the mid-1520s, proudly announce the

34 Biblioteca Apostolica Vaticana, MS Capp. Sist. 11.
35 Biblioteca Apostolica Vaticana, MS Capp. Sist. 9.
36 Wattenbach, Das Schriftwesen im Mittelalter, pp. 491ff.
fact that they were commissioned by Duke Wilhelm IV, composed by none other than the court composer Senfl and prepared with utmost diligence and obedience — summis et studia et obedientia (see Appendix 3 for the text of MS 10).\[^{38}\] The text of MS 10 obviously fulfills the double function of title page and dedication, opening the manuscript on fol. 1r and beginning by naming the musical contents of the book.\[^{39}\] This can be interpreted as a gesture both of subservience and of assertion by Senfl to his new ruler in a period when the Bavarian court chapel was profiting from the disbandment of Emperor Maximilian I’s chapel (which had brought Senfl and others to Munich in the first place) and was about to evolve into one of the foremost musical institutions in central Europe, not least through Senfl’s own efforts. The two books of motets were copied shortly after Senfl’s arrival and are the earliest codices of the Bavarian court chapel containing primarily contemporary repertoire of a chapel member and not older works (by Isaac, Josquin, La Rue, Brumel and others). It is extremely telling that precisely these two books — which first document Senfl as the central figure of the musical scene at the Bavarian court — also appear to be the first instances in polyphonic music manuscripts where the composer — and not the scribe, the institution, the publisher or the patron — dedicates the book, in a conscious act of personal self-affirmation. This act appears to be so blatantly addressed at an “audience” that Bente even speculated about the two manuscripts having been prepared with printed publication in mind.\[^{40}\]

\[^{38}\] Martin Bente, Neue Wege der Quellenkritik und die Biographie Ludwig Senfls. Ein Beitraeg zur Musikgeschichte des Reformationssatzellers (Wiesbaden: Breitkopf & Härtel, 1968), pp. 63-70; Bayerische Staatsbibliothek: Katalog der Musikhandschriften 1: Chor­bücher und Handschriften in chorbuchartiger Notierung, Kataloge Bayerischer Musiksammlungen, 5/1, eds. M. Bente – M. L. Gürler – H. Hell – B. Wackernagel (Munich: Hente, 1989), pp. 71-72. Bente assumed that the scribe who copied the bulk of the two codices (his ‘Schreiber A II’) was Lucas Wagenrieder, a colleague of Senfl’s in the chapel (Bente, Neue Wege der Quellenkritik, pp. 214-215; Katalog der Musikhandschriften, 35*-36*, 39*). New research by Joshua Rifkin and David Failows, however, has found that the scribe was in fact Bernhart Rem of Augsburg — apparently, the codices (or large parts thereof) were not produced in Munich at all, but on commission in the nearby Imperial city. See Joshua Rifkin, ‘Jean Michel and “Lucas Wagenrieder”. Some New Findings’, Tijdschrift van de Vereniging voor Nederlandse Muziekgeschiedenis, 55 (2005), 113-152; and David Failows, ‘The Copyist Formerly Known as Wagenrieder’, in Die Münchener Hofkapelle des 16. Jahrhunderts im europäischen Kontext (forthcoming).

\[^{39}\] In MS 12, the dedicatory inscription is on fol. 5r — at the beginning of a new fascicle by a different scribe (Bente’s scribe A II = Bernhart Rem); it was apparently conceived as a separate unit and combined with the first fascicle at a later date.

\[^{40}\] Bente, Neue Wege der Quellenkritik, pp. 65, 68-69.

Written much in the same spirit, but even more elaborate is the dedicatory text of Senfl’s Opus musicum: his revision and completion of Heinrich Isaac’s Choralis Constantinus proper cycles in four volumes, completed in and dated 1531.\[^{41}\] Both halves (consisting of two volumes each) are prefaced by a full-page text praising both Isaac’s and Senfl’s contribution to the compositional effort as well as Emperor Maximilian’s and again Duke Wilhelm’s munificence in sponsoring the whole enterprise (one of the two — very similar — texts is reproduced as Appendix 5). Once more, there is nothing whatsoever unusual about content and wording — but also once more, everybody who was in any position to see these books would have known all that the text contains, and the effort seems wasted in a manuscript source for internal use only. The likelihood that these codices would have been shown to visitors is very slim indeed, as they were held in the chapel and not in the court.\[^{42}\] They are handsome books, certainly, but not the kind of hugely elaborate presentation codices that were the showpieces of many court libraries.

Again, the text itself offers at least a partial clue: the collection is called opus musicum, a ‘musical work’. One should resist the temptation to read too much into this term — this is not the emphatic concept that the nineteenth century had of the “work” and the “genius” who created it. Nevertheless, it is not a common term for music in the first half of the sixteenth century. Analogous to Nicolaus Listuinus’ famous ‘opus perfectum et absolutum’,\[^{43}\] it signifies a composition (or group of compositions) that is finished, polished, written down and ready for circulation in written form, thus reproducible and transcending the ephemeral nature of performed music — music as text instead of music as act.\[^{44}\] The dedicatory text reaffirms this essence of the opus musicum through its focus — again — on the composer, the auctor; first Isaac, then Senfl. It is surely no accident that

\[^{41}\] Munich, Bayerische Staatsbibliothek, Mus. Ms. 35, 36, 37, 38; see Katalog der Musikhandschriften, 145-57; Bente, Neue Wege der Quellenkritik, pp. 73-145.

\[^{42}\] Katalog der Musikhandschriften, 12*-13*, 54-59.

\[^{43}\] ‘[MUSICA] POETICA que neque rei cognitione neque solo exercitio contenta, sed aliquid post laborum reminiat operis, veluti cum a quopiam Musica, aut musicae carmen consecratur, cuius est opus consummatum et effectum. Consistit enim in faciendo sive fabricando, hoc est, in labore tali, qui post se etiam, artificis mortuo, opus perfectum et absolutum reliquit, Unde Poeticus musicus, qui in negotio aliquod resiliens versatur.’ Nicolaus Listuinus, Musica (Wittenberg: Rauh, 1537), fol. 32v.

dedications like this one (more frequently in print than in manuscript, to be sure) coincide with the “appearance” of the composer as a professional designation (none other than Isaac himself is one of the first musicians to be employed specifically by Maximilian I as a ‘componist’) and as a central topic in musical writings. In a sense, without the dedication the repertoire contained in the manuscripts Munich 35-38 would be no more than an enormous cycle of mass propers for use in the liturgy of the Bavarian court, arranged and written down like many other liturgical cycles in composed polyphony during that period (often even transmitted anonymously). Only the verbal explanation makes it unequivocally and emphatically clear that this is indeed an opus musicum by two of the greatest auctores of their time. This was apparently important enough to Senfl (who, as the compiler of the collection, is doubtlessly the author of the dedication as well) to insert the text even where few people would be likely to ever see it. Indeed, it is not implausible that the text was prepared already with the print publication of the Choralis Constantinus cycle in mind (which would have been the consummation of the opus idea), a publication which Hans Ott had already announced in the foreword to his Novum et insigne opus musicum in 1537. This would also explain the strong emphasis on the role of Wilhelm and the Bavarian court in the dedication, as if Senfl was hoping that the duke would sponsor this publication. In the event, the cycle did not appear in print until 1550/55, in a different form (including the parts of the cycle specific to Constance cathedral which had not been present in the opus musicum) and with a completely different set of dedicatory paratexts which make no mention of the Bavarian court at all.

This brings us to the last type of manuscripts: presentation sources. This is the one category of handwritten sources where one would most likely expect dedicatory texts: they did change hands; they were commissioned by and given to heads of states or other important figures; they were objects of high monetary value and often quite stunning beauty of which both dedicator and dedicatee had every reason to be proud; they were often held in the camera, not in the cappella, and were shown to visiting dignitaries instead of being put to any sort of practical use, hence they did achieve a sort of “publicity” in the sense described above; they, in short, fulfill every textual and contextual condition of a written-out dedication. At least a few of these presentation manuscripts do not disappoint in having exactly the kind of dedicatory text one might hope for. The earliest such instance is as spectacular as it is exceptional: it is the codex Modena, Biblioteca Estense a.F.9.9. The small oblong book (c. 16.6 x 11 cm) is an anthology of Italian strambotti, copied in 1496 in Padua. Possibly inspired by the humanist circles of the university, the patron and dedicator — a certain ‘Iohannes’ who is only identified as the Pierides magister (the ‘master of the muses’) — endowed his small treasure with no less than seven paratexts (see Appendix 1): an inscription, a lengthy quotation on the power of music from Isidor of Seville’s Sententiae de musica, an Italian sonnet echoing Isidor’s text, an aphorism from Pliny’s Natural History, another (anonymous) aphorism on the power of music, the dedication proper (to a certain ‘Francesco de Fa’), again in the form of a sonnet, and a final inscription panel which specifies Padua as the place of copying and the date as the fourth day before the Nones of October in the year of the 1314th Olympiad (written 3761 BC after the Jewish calendar), i.e. 4 October 1496. All this is typical of the mannered humanist learning that also characterised early humanist printed books from the same period — but the private character of the manuscript is emphasised by the fact that the two main participants are only named in passing, almost enigmatically. The dedicator and patron is only ‘Iohannes’, the recipient ‘Francesco de Fa’ (?). Where a print dedication, more often than not, would have specified full

45 See Rob C. Wegman, ‘From Maker to Composer: Improvisation and Musical Authorship in the Low Countries, 1450-1500’, Journal of the American Musicalological Society, 49 (1996), 409-479. In the records of the Imperial Court Chapel, Isaac is named specifically as ‘Hainrich Isac, componist’ (and not as ‘cantor’ or ‘capellanus’ or ‘musicus’ as would have been far more common); see Martin Staeelin, Die Messen Heinrich Isaacs, Publikationen der Schweizerischen Musikforschenden Gesellschaft, Serie II, vol. 28, I-III (Bern-Stuttgart: Haupt, 1977-78), II, 66-67.
47 The idea that Munich 35-38 might have been intended as a kind of Stichvorlage for Ott’s planned publication of the Choralis Constantinus equally goes back to Bente (ibid.), although he does not use the presence of the dedication as part of his argument. This was suggested to me by David Fallows in private conversation; I am most grateful to him for this.
50 It is unclear whether ‘de Fa’ is actually a proper name or an abbreviation, possibly of a toponym (‘de Faenza’); see Giuseppina La Face Bianconi, Gli strambotti del codice estense a.F.9.9, Studi e testi per la storia della musica, 8 (Firenze: Leo S. Olschki, 1990), p. 12; Jeppesen, La Frottola, p. 78.
name, rank, provenance and relationship between the two principals (after all, the readership/audience would want to know these things, and the principals would want to be known) the handwritten source once again presupposes inside knowledge of those involved. As the dedicatory sommet states, Johannes presents the small book to Francesco specifically for his personal use (sapi ben che 'n quel to solo harai l’uso per te), to return to its source — probably Ioannes' library — after Francesco's death. Beyond the two protagonists, only the small circle of friends alluded to in the first inscription (pro nostro amicorumque solatio) would have had access and presumably sung from it. The non-initiated are purposefully left in the dark.

A much more public — and correspondingly more famous and flamboyant — example of manuscript dedication once again originated in Munich, namely the so-called Prachthandschriften or luxury codices, one containing Lasso's Penitential Psalms and the other motets by Cipriano de Rore, together representing the two most famous composers of the Munich court chapel in the middle of the sixteenth century. Copied by the court scribe Jean Pollet, they contain lavish miniatures by the court painter Hans Mielich — among them portraits of count Albrecht, his wife Anna and their respective courts as well as portraits of Lasso, Rore, the court chapel and of course Mielich himself. The humanist scholar Samuel Quickelberg (or Quicchelberg) added copious commentaries in separate volumes. Last but not least, the back page of the Lasso volume and the front page of the Rore volume again display a lengthy dedication to Albrecht. Appendix 8 reproduces that from the Lasso volume — on the page, the composer himself is depicted to the left of the inscription and Mielich to the right. All this, of course, is pure display and, in terms of imparting information, actually quite redundant: neither the dedication nor anything else tells any of the persons involved anything they did not know or had not seen. Nor does the dedication, in this case, place particular emphasis on the musical works contained in the codex — or really, on the composer himself. The first person named in the text is Duke Albrecht; Lasso and Mielich are mentioned later on as the most excellent representatives of their art, but their importance is only emphasised in relationship to the glory and munificence of the ruler. Mention of the compositions is only made in passing — 'amongst many other things, Lasso also composed the psalms found here'. The function of this dedication is that of representation and particularly that of memoria, to let both visiting contemporaries and later generations know what the court looked like and what it was capable of, in terms of artistry, scholarship, musicianship and sheer financial prowess. Significantly, these manuscripts were not kept in the chapel with the other choirbooks, but in the ducal chamber. The dedication itself is an artificial gesture as dedica- tor and dedicatee are really one and the same: Albrecht himself.

Other, more straightforward manuscripts do follow the "normal" rules of dedicator and dedicatee. One example is the exemplar of Elzéar Genet’s (alias Carpentras) Lamentations of Jeremiah which the composer had specially produced to be presented to his patron and employer, Pope Clement VII, in 1525 (Appendix 4). Here, we have the typical, humanistically-inspired constellation often found in prints as well: a coat of arms of the dedicatee, an inscription naming the involved parties and specifying their mutual relationship (Clement of course, as the pontiff, and Carpentras as the former magister capellae), and a laudatory poem in classical metre (in this case, elegiac couplets). Also not unexpectedly, the text is a mixture of subservience and assertion.

Dedications like these, however, are not the rule even in presentation manuscripts. In the majority of the cases where a presentation manuscript did change hands — that is, where it was produced or commissioned by one institution or individual and given to another — all participants were well-acquainted with one another. The purpose of the gift was to give or receive a favour — be it monetary, dynastic or just to obtain or retain good graces — and was clear to all parties. In particular, it was clear to the implied public: the courtly, civic or institutional environment. All persons who would ever be able to see such a presentation manuscript, and to whom it ever had to mean something, were members of an in-group, a closed or at the very least very circumscribed circle. The dedicatory ritual or game, therefore, could be played without an explicitly formulated

51 See La Face Bianconi, Gli strambotti, pp. 13-14.
52 Munich, Bayerische Staatsbibliothek, Mus. Ms. A (Lasso, Penitential Psalms) and Mus. Ms. B (Rore, Motets); Katalog der Musikhandschriften, 54-58.
55 Katalog der Musikhandschriften, 12*.
56 Biblioteca Apostolica Vaticana, MS Capp. Sist. 163.
text. This applies even to the lavish manuscripts of the Alamire workshop, which were commissioned by the Habsburg-Burgundian court in Mecelenen as presentation gifts. These books travelled long distances — to Spain, Italy, Germany, and England — and were given to the great political rulers of the time. They were copied on the finest parchment and lavishly decorated — but again, not a single one contains a dedication or even an inscription, an incipit or a colophon. The high and mighty of Europe were apparently a sufficiently close-knit group to require no such explanation.

Henry VIII, Leo X, Frederick the Wise and Philip the Fair knew what they had in front of him and from whom it came without having to have it spelled out for them.

Hence, the much more frequent method of dedicating a presentation manuscript of polyphonic music — and the much more frustrating way to modern scholars — was not explicit but implicit, aimed precisely at this kind of “in-group”. Both donor and dedicatee are indicated through a variety of means which would have been meaningful only to the initiates; again, a game is played, but a game whose rules were known to only a few. Within that context, the degree to which a dedication is concealed varies greatly. Sometimes a dedicatory inscription is hidden in a banner or somewhere within the manuscript, as in Johannes Tinctoris’ chansonnier for Beatrice of Aragon in Naples where the nineteenth of fifty-seven pieces — Tinctoris’ own O virgo miserere mei — bears the inscription Beatusse virgini domine Beatrici de Aragonia. Another fairly blatant method is the use of heraldry: in many manuscripts, the coats of arms of the donor and/or the dedicatee are displayed prominently, usually on the first opening of the book. An example for this from the Alamire sources is the manuscript London, British Library, MS Royal 8 G.vii: the first opening displays the heraldic emblems of King Henry VIII of England combined with those of his first wife, Catherine of Aragon — it is thus quite clear that the manuscript was prepared for that couple. However, any further information that could have been gleaned from a dedicatory text — most importantly, date and occasion — are not forthcoming.

Of course, it would have had to be compiled during the time of their marriage, but that lasted from 1509 to 1532; modern scholarship has suggested the date of the manuscript to range anywhere from 1513 to 1525.

Even more difficult to put into the right context today is pictorial evidence: many presentation manuscripts contain portraits, either next to the heraldic imagery or separate from them, often themselves forming part of the large illuminated initials on the first opening. Again in the Alamire corpus, the manuscript Jena, Thüringer Universitäts- und Landesbibliothek, MS 3, contains a portrait of the recipient of the manuscript: Frederick the Wise, the elector of Saxony. He is rather clearly identified by his regalia and his motto Tant que je puis on a banner above it.

In this case, we are lucky because the motto is present and the pictorial evidence is equally clear through the use of regalia. More often than not, however, one is confronted with portraits that presumably represent some actual person but provide little or no clue as to who that person is. The lack of explicit text sometimes makes this type of pictorial evidence hard to pinpoint even where we do know what persons are meant. In Jena, Thüringer Universitäts- und Landesbibliothek, MS 4, for example, no less than fifteen portraits are found: of members of the English crown as well as of various branches of the Habsburgs plus several popes — but not that of Frederick the Wise who ended up with the book. Here again, we are lacking the inside knowledge that would have tied all this information together in a meaningful and unequivocal fashion. Information — or non-information — such as this has resulted in a great deal of speculation among musicologists and others dealing with similar sources. The proportion of manuscript sources of polyphonic music from the fifteenth and sixteenth centuries in which even the most basic information about place, time and people involved is lacking or ambiguous remains worryingly high, higher than in any other type of manuscript.

To make matters even more confusing, some manuscripts changed dedicatee, either during the course of production or later on. To remain in the Alamire context: it was apparently only decided at the last moment that the codex Brussels, Koninklijke Bibliotheek van België / Bibliothèque royale de Belgique, MS 15075 was to be presented to John II of Portugal and his wife Catherine of Austria — the relevant miniatures appear

57 For a description of the corpus, with approximate dates of copying and destination see The Treasury of Petrus Alamire.
60 The Treasury of Petrus Alamire, p. 111.
61 A reproduction of the page is in The Treasury of Petrus Alamire, p. 89.
62 The Treasury of Petrus Alamire, pp. 90-93.
to be added a long time after the codex itself was copied. Another example is famous *Chigi Codex* (Biblioteca Apostolica Vaticana, MS Chigi C.VIII.234) where the original miniatures and coats of arms relating to the first owner, Philippe Bouton, were painted over with those of the later owners, the Cordova family of Spain.64

Finally, even in cases where there is no "hard evidence" — textual or pictorial — at all, attempts have been made to infer a "hidden dedication" through the repertoire contained in what appear to be presentation manuscripts. As hardly any of them were destined for actual liturgical use, the donor was — at least in theory — free to select and arrange the pieces to suit the dedicatory purpose. Some manuscripts where the repertoire corroborates other evidence show that this is not a far-fetched assumption. In the Habsburg-Burgundian manuscript Brussels, Koninklijke Bibliotheek van België / Bibliothèque royale de Belgique, MS 9126, for Philip the Fair and Juana of Castile, not only a great deal of heraldic evidence points towards the two dedicatees, but also the title of Josquin's *Hercules Dux Ferrariae* mass which appears changed to *Philippus Rex Castiliae*.65 Similar strategies are found in many other sources; but wherever such corroborating evidence is lacking, the identification of dedicator and dedicatee purely through repertoire is by necessity speculative. Examples of this approach abound.

Moreover, the implicit or semi-explicit dedications described above almost invariably identify the destination of the manuscript, not its origin: only in those cases where the source was commissioned for a certain person or institution by that same person or institution (such as the two chansonniers which Marguerite of Austria had commissioned for her uncle, Philip and the cathedral of St. Peter's, respectively) can the donor or sponsor of the manuscript also be identified. More frequently, the dedicator remains in the dark. In the case of the Alamire manuscripts, we are fortunate enough to know that they originated in the context of Marguerite of Austria’s Habsburg-Burgundian court in Mechelen, but in many other cases this information is lacking. A famous case where this has led to wrong conclusions is the so-called *Medici Codex* (Florence, Biblioteca Medicea-Laurenziana, Acquisto e doni 666), copied in 1518.66 The information about the dedicatee and the occasion is unequivocal, with a dedicatory poem in elegiac couplets and the acrostic ‘VIVAT SEMPER INVICTUS LAURENTIUS MEDICES DVX VRBINI’ in the table of contents (Appendix 2): Duke Lorenzo II of Medici married Madeleine de la Tour d’Auvergne on 2 May 1518. However, there is no apparent information about the dedicator. The original editor of the manuscript, Edward Lowinsky, argued in favour of a French provenance, on the basis of a French script, predominantly French repertoire and the close links between the French court and the Medici family.67 However, Joshua Rifkin, Jeffrey Dean and others were able to show that, on the contrary, the manuscript was commissioned by Lorenzo’s uncle, Pope Leo X, and produced at the Papal court.68 Again, repertoire provides a partial clue — next to music by the many French composers favoured by Leo X, there are a number of pieces by musicians active at the Papal court. But the decisive argument is external: the main scribe of the *Medici Codex* — whose name we do not know — also copied manuscripts for the Papal Chapel and was quite possibly employed at that institution.

An even less clear-cut case is that of the so-called *Rusconi Codex* (Bologna, Civico museo bibliografico musicale, MS Q19), dated 1518.69 Neither dedicator nor dedicatee is made explicit — the only clue is a silhouette of a stag under a tree and the inscription ‘D. P.’. On the basis of repertoire, watermarks and scribal characteristics, no less than three hypotheses have been put forward. Lowinsky again favours a connection to the French court, with ‘Diane de Poitiers’ as dedicatee;70 Rainer Heyink proposes a dedication of the codex to the Gonzaga court, specifically to ‘Divus Pirro [Gonzaga]’ in Mantua;71 Robert Nosow links it to the cathedral of Padua with ‘Domus Petrus [Renaldus]’ as the compiler and most frequently represented composer.72 The discussion is far from

---

63 *The Treasury of Petrus Alamire*, pp. 74-75.
64 *The Treasury of Petrus Alamire*, pp. 125-127.
70 *The Medici Codex of 1518*, 3, Commentary, pp. 52-60.
over (except that it is now commonly accepted that the characteristics of script, material and repertoire place the source in Northern Italy); but it is clear that the information contained in the manuscript as such is far from sufficient to allow any outsider (and that includes modern-day musicologists) to draw unequivocal conclusions.

This essay has been more about paratexts which do not exist than about those which do. Nevertheless, I think that their lack tells us at least as much about the production, function and indeed the very nature of manuscripts containing polyphonic music than their presence would have done, and the very few examples that I was able to give are each telling in the way in which they contravene the conventions of non-dedication. A next step would be a comparison with dedications in text manuscripts — which likewise have not nearly been studied in such depth as their printed siblings have been. In any case, I hope to have made clear the very basic distinctions between a print dedication and a manuscript dedication — the former by nature explicit, informative, “public” — the latter implicit, elliptical, “private”. This intimacy makes the study of manuscripts certainly more intriguing, but it can also make it infinitely more frustrating.
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APPENDIX
DEDICATIONS AND INSCRIPTIONS IN MUSIC MANUSCRIPTS OF THE SIXTEENTH CENTURY

All transcriptions were made from the original sources. Original spelling and punctuation have been retained except for the standardisation of “u” and “v” according to modern Latin spelling and the conversion of square capital script in inscriptions to modern uppercase/lowercase. Abbreviations have been tacitly resolved for better legibility.

1v

Pro nostro amicorumque solatio

2v

Quid possit Musica.


Sed et quicquid loquimur vel intrinsecus venarum pulsibus commovemur per musicos ritmos. armoniae virtutibus probatur esse sociatum. Haec Sanctus Isidorus hispalensis episcopus libro etymologiarum [3, 17].

3r

Quid possit musica

Grande e la forca e grandi son li effetti

Che se ritiene la musica soave

Che sanza questa mai alcun non have

L’altra sorelle con gli soi sogetti

Questa e quella che move i nostri affetti

In habito diversi con sue chiave

Et fane prompti alle fatiche grave

Sanza altra stima e sanza altri sospetti

73 Transcriptions after La Face Bianconi, Gli strombotti, pp. 8-9 and 12-13.
Cum sta armonia il ciel vasse girando
E'l mondo anchor di questa fo composto
Saul si sanò pur armonizando
Gli serpi con gli uceli e'l delphin posto
In un e l'altro mar fottan passando
Vengono al son di questa tosto tosto

6r

6v
Quantam igitur prae se dignitatem ferat musica satis ea docet ratio quod deos habeat auctores

7r
Pierides Magister Johannes ad Franciscum de Fa[?] Alumnus salutem
Perche non fosti a reverime Iento
Ne al sacro nostro fonte in fargli honore
Anci tu prompto (ancor sul primo errore)
Volesti a! culto nostro esser intento
Eccoti, 
Del gravoso pensiero e del sudore,
Dei passi sparsi el tempo e tutte l'horre
Spendesti in visitame a pioggia e vento
Questo sacrato libro or piglierai
Con le temprate note in verdi colli
E tra rive nel tuo nome odito
Ma sapi ben chen que! tu solo harai
L'uso per te e poscia in ciel tu volli
Libero tornarassi onde fo uscito

7v
Patavii III nonas octobres a prima elementorum concordia olimpiade MCCCXXXIII.

2. Florence, Biblioteca Medicea-Laurenziana, Nuovi acquisti 666 (Medici Codex), fol. Iv-1r [1518]

Perge liber propria ventoque citatior omni
Ad faustum fausto sidere tende ducem
Excipiet manibus laetis vultuque sereno
Gaudebitque tuo munere posse frui
Quum te respiciet letus tecumque loquetur
Tum iubeo ut domini sis memm ipse tui

5. Munich, Bayerische Staatsbibliothek (D-Mbs). Mus. Ms. 38, fol. 1r [1531]

EN Opus Musicum festorum dierum hyemalium, cuius cantum choralem gravis vox habeat a laudatissimo musicae artis auctore Domino Henrico Yzac. Divi Maximiilian Caesaris a lucubrationibus Musices, foelicter et magni misu coeptum, sed cogenitibus alio fatis, imperfectione maxima ex parte reflectum, postea a gratissimo ipsius discipulo Domino Ludovico Sennphi, eiusdem Caesareae [sic] maiestatis iuditio in defuncti praeceptoris locum adoptato, nunc vero apud Illustissimum Boiorum Principem Gulielmum, Comitem Rheni Palatinum, utriusque Boiariae duce et Patrem patriae optimo meritum, Musico intonatore facile celebririmo, magna cura ac vigilius singulari arte et industria ad extremam (quod dictur) manum Musis omnibus faventibus percutum, Optimoque Principi Gulielmo, incomparabilii Musarum Mecoenati, iure optimo sacrum et dicatum, Aano a Christo nato M.D.XXXI.

5. Munich, Bayerische Staatsbibliothek (D-Mbs). Mus. Ms. 38, fol. 1r [1531]

Ad Lectorem
Si te forte movent Lector speciesque decorque
Scire quis hunc librum lusserit aere suo
Exscribi, et pingi, minima haec, ne noscere cures
Orsa sed ingentes maxima cerne animi.
Italie pacem sanctissima foedera Regum
In Turcas classem, iustaque bella feros
Et Vaticana moles, et suspice Templar
Qui facit aeterna haec: haecque caduca iubet.
Sedente PAVLO III. Pontifice Maximo Optimo / Kalendis Aprilis M.D.xxxii Completum. / Federicus Marius Perusinus scribebat.

7. Biblioteca Apostolica Vaticana, MS Capp. Sist. 9, fol. 110v [1545]
Liminius Iani clausis clementia Pauli
Pontificis iussit thura cremanda Iovi.
Præbeat ut castis facilest concentibus aures
Dum veniam placido postimus ore Deum,
Idque ut commodius fieri per secula possit
Hunc scribi Librum iussit: et aere suo.

Deo Optimo Maximo Sacrum. Aeternaeque memoriae illustrissimi principis Alberti Bavariae ducis, qui dum a gubernanda amplissima regione sua, et sacro imperio consiliis indefesse iussit interdum respiraret, quo erat erga omnia liberalissima studia, tum vero maxime erga musicam et picturam animo, benignum admodum apud se fovebat audiebatque, celeberrimum per Europam musicum Orlandum de Lassus, multorum ibi cantionum et horum quoque psalmorum compositorum. Et Ioannis Muehchii Monachiis pictoris bibliarum imaginum praesentium unici collectoris architecti et inventoris operibus contemplandis, memorandique sacris historiis, tum his, tum aliis omnibus, illustrissimo exemplo divine penitus vacabat. Tomus primus hoc loco absolvitur.

"TO THE BENEVOLENT READER..."
DEDICATIONS ATTACHED TO EDITIONS OF NEO-LATIN PLAYS IN THE NETHERLANDS OF THE 16TH AND THE 17TH CENTURY — FORMS, FUNCTIONS AND RELIGIOUS STANDPOINTS"

JAN BLOEMENDAL

Introduction

Theatre is a specific medium. This also holds true for the sixteenth and seventeenth centuries. Most of the plays written are meant to be staged at a particular event, at a particular place for a particular audience. In the sixteenth century Latin comedies were staged by Latin schoolmasters and their pupils for their fellow pupils and others, e.g. parents and the city council. By writing these plays the rectores imitated the comedies of the Roman playwrights Plautus and Terence, but they often used biblical subjects instead of the pagan and morally damaging themes they saw in their Roman models. In this period the Low Countries were involved in religious quarrels that ended in a recatholisation of the Southern Provinces and a further Reformation of the Northern regions, especially because of the migration of intellectuals and artisans from Flanders and Brabant and from the German countries. The biblical plays of this period often implicitly reflect these two reformations.

In the seventeenth century the writing of drama for educational purposes continued, but there was a paradigm shift. While in the sixteenth century most of the drama performed and written were comedies meant to be read and staged at the Latin schools, in the seventeenth century tragedy in the style of the Roman philosopher and tragedian Seneca prevailed.

* This paper is written as a corollary to the Vidi-project 'Latin and Vernacular Cultures. Theatre and Public Opinion in the Netherlands (ca. 1510-1625)', subsidized by the Netherlands Organisation for Scientific Research (NWO), dossiernr. 276-49-001. It is meant to be a first introduction in the field of the dedications of early modern Latin plays. I wish to thank Gerard Huijing for correcting my English.