
Title: Why Josquin? : The Society for Music History of the Netherlands (VNM) and the first Josquin Edition

Author(s): Eric Jas

Source: *Josquin-Bilder im langen 20. Jahrhundert*, ed. by Klaus Pietschmann in collaboration with Michael Custodis; Dresden, musiconn.publish 2024, (= troja. Jahrbuch für Renaissancemusik 19), p. 35–65.

DOI: <https://doi.org/10.25371/troja.v20213864>



Creative Commons license: CC BY-SA

Vorliegende Publikation wird unter obengenannter CC-Lizenz durch musiconn.publish im Open Access bereitgestellt.

musiconn.publish dient der kostenfreien elektronischen Publikation, dem Nachweis und der langfristigen Archivierung von musikwissenschaftlicher Fachliteratur. Auch Arbeiten aus der Musikpädagogik und der Künstlerischen Forschung mit Musikbezug sind willkommen. Außerdem bietet musiconn.publish die Möglichkeit zur digitalen Publikation von wissenschaftlichen Noteneditionen.

musiconn.publish ist ein Service des Fachinformationsdienstes Musikwissenschaft (musiconn – für vernetzte Musikwissenschaft), der von der Deutschen Forschungsgemeinschaft gefördert und gemeinschaftlich von der Sächsischen Landesbibliothek – Staats- und Universitätsbibliothek Dresden und der Bayerischen Staatsbibliothek München betrieben wird.

Weitere Informationen zu musiconn.publish finden Sie hier: <https://musiconn.qucosa.de/>

Eine Übersicht zu allen Services von musiconn finden Sie hier: <https://www.musiconn.de/>

Eric Jas

Why Josquin? The Society for Music History of the Netherlands (VNM) and the first Josquin edition*

Now that Josquin's oeuvre has been edited twice, numerous publications have been devoted to his life and his music, and a good deal of his works have been issued on CD, it may be the right time to pause and look back. In the context of this conference on ›Josquin-Bilder im langen 20. Jahrhundert‹, I was asked to explore the reasons why in 1919 the *Society for Music History of the Netherlands* decided to publish the works of a composer who came from the county of Hainaut. In order to do so, it may be helpful to first consider the VNM's foundation in a historical perspective.

The foundation of the VNM in 1868 emerged logically from a focus on the 15th- and 16th-century musical heritage of the Low Countries in the first half of the 19th century.¹ This focus, which first arose during a rather troubled period of Dutch history – the so called French period (1794–1814) – may be seen as the result of a certain type of cultural nationalism.² The flight of hereditary stadtholder William V to England in January 1795 had ended years of struggle between Orangists and Patriots. A seizure of power followed and from that moment on the Netherlands formed a republic following the French model with French military support. This support had to be paid, so this new Batavian republic was in fact a puppet state of France. Napoleon Bonaparte was not satisfied with the pace of reforms in the Netherlands, and he turned the republic in 1806 into a kingdom, appointing his brother Louis as king. This French period of Dutch history was highly influential culturally. The king tried to promote the Dutch arts and sciences

* Part of this paper was prepared at a time when, due to the Corona pandemic, archives were still closed. The author is grateful to the following persons for their generous assistance: Marlies van der Riet kindly shared a photograph of Smijers' postcard of 3 January 1918 and also allowed me access to her detailed inventory of the correspondence between Smijers and Scheurleer between 1919 and 1927. Petra van Langen was kind enough to send me a copy of Smijers' letter of 23 March 1919 and Philomeen Lelieveldt, the curator of the Nederlands Muziek Instituut, kindly photographed several letters from the archive of the Koninklijke Vereniging voor Nederlandse Muziekgeschiedenis. Finally, my heartfelt thanks go to Loes de Koning for her excellent transcription of Seiffert's letter of 12 March 1919 and to Benjamin Ory for his kind suggestions and corrections.

1 For a more detailed historical sketch of the foundation of the VNM, see Eduard Reeser, *De Vereniging voor Nederlandsche Muziekgeschiedenis 1868-1943: Gedenkboek* (Amsterdam, 1943), pp. 5–14.

2 On the topic of cultural nationalism in the Netherlands of the 19th century, see especially Jan T.M. Bank, *Het roemrijk vaderland. Cultureel nationalisme in Nederland in de negentiende eeuw* ('s-Gravenhage, 1990).

and did so, including by establishing a Royal Institute of Sciences and the Royal Library. He also initiated the relocation of the Rijksmuseum to Amsterdam, where in its early days it was housed in the Royal Palace on the Dam Square. After a turbulent period in which the Netherlands were annexed by the First French Empire, French troops were driven out of most of the Netherlands in November 1813. The territory became a sovereign principality that in 1815, together with present-day Belgium and Luxembourg, was recognised by the Congress of Vienna as the United Kingdom of the Netherlands. Unity with Belgium, however, was not based on mutual consent and therefore did not last very long. Unrest and opposition reached a peak at the end of the 1820s, and Belgium declared its independence on 4 October 1830.

This short historical sketch helps us understand why after the collapse of the 1815 United Kingdom of the Netherlands, a renewed interest arose in the pasts of both the Netherlands and Belgium. There was a search, in particular, for national heroes who could strengthen the sense of unity in the new countries. In Belgium, the focus was on medieval themes and figures: Jacob van Maerlant, Jan van Eijck, Godfried van Bouillon. In the Netherlands, on the other hand, the focus of attention was initially on the era of Rembrandt van Rijn, Joost van den Vondel, Michiel de Ruyter, and William of Orange.³ Eventually, interest in the history of music also increased; the first northern composer to be rediscovered was Jan Pieterszoon Sweelinck, whose life and work were studied with growing enthusiasm from around 1840.⁴

The study of still earlier music was encouraged by a competition first issued in 1824 by the Royal Dutch Institute of Sciences, Letters and Fine Arts. This institute, the predecessor of the present-day Royal Netherlands Academy of Arts and Sciences, was founded in 1808 by Louis Bonaparte as analogous to the French example of the *Institut National des Sciences et des Arts*. It was to become a central reservoir of Dutch scientific and artistic knowledge.⁵ This institution, which had continued to exist after the independence of the Netherlands, was divided into four ›classes‹, one of which was devoted to the ›fine arts‹ which included music. In its early years, the fourth class was virtually unknown,⁶ but in 1824

3 Ibid., pp. 7–22; Simon Groot, »Een zoektocht naar nationale helden. De VNM-collectie als onderdeel van de bibliotheek van de Maatschappij tot Bevordering der Toonkunst«, *Tijdschrift van de Koninklijke Vereniging voor Nederlandse Muziekgeschiedenis* 68 (2018), pp. 16–36: p. 17; see also Alphons Julianus Maria Asselbergs, *Dr. Jan Pieter Heije of De Kunst en het Leven* (Ph.D. diss., Utrecht University 1966), p. 317.

4 S. Groot, Een zoektocht (cf. note 3), p. 17.

5 Jeroen van Gessel, *Een vaderland van goede muziek. Een halve eeuw Maatschappij tot bevordering der toonkunst (1829–1879) en het Nederlandse muziekleven* (Utrecht, 2004), p. 25.

6 Ibid., pp. 25–29, for an overview of the musician members of the fourth class. Jeroen van Gessel,

its members felt the time was right to call attention to the musical past from the period before Sweelinck. Although knowledge of musical life from the period before 1600 was not particularly well developed in the Netherlands in the early 19th century,⁷ studies by English and German authors had shown that in days gone by, composers from the Low Countries had been among Europe's finest and leading musicians. By launching a competition, it was presumably hoped that it would result in a more detailed report on these musicians' merits and origins. The competition, launched at a time when the Kingdom of the Netherlands still comprised the entire territory of present-day Netherlands, Belgium and Luxembourg, was formulated as follows:

What merits did the Netherlanders obtain in the art of music especially in the 14th, 15th and 16th centuries; and to what extent can the Netherlandish artists of that time, who went to Italy, have had an influence on the music schools, which formed in Italy shortly afterwards?⁸

The question was undoubtedly prompted by music historical surveys from the late 18th century – such as those by Charles Burney and Johann Nicolaus Forkel – in which due attention was paid to composers from the Low Countries.⁹ In fact, the wording of the competition question directly relates to a passage from Forkel's *Allgemeine Litteratur der Musik*:

The most famous musical artists of the 16th century were Netherlanders, who in their time spread to all European countries just as the Italians did after them. Few writers of musical history have yet considered this fact. And yet it deserves special mention, because then it would perhaps emerge

»Om de kunst te ondersteunen en den smaak te zuiveren en te verfijnen«. Het Koninklijk Instituut en de muziek (1808–1851)«, *Tijdschrift van de Koninklijke Vereniging voor Nederlandse Muziek-geschiedenis* 49 (1999), pp. 69–97: 72–79, discusses the fourth class' activities regarding higher music education (especially the attempt to found a conservatoire) and its advice in other matters.

7 A.J.M. Asselbergs, Dr. Jan Pieter Heije (cf. note 3), p. 317; S. Groot, Een zoektocht (cf. note 3), p. 19.

8 J. van Gessel, Een vaderland (cf. note 5), pp. 36–37. The wording of the question as it is given here follows the version printed on the title pages of the two winning studies in 1829. For a slightly deviating version, see J. van Gessel, Een vaderland, p. 29. Apparently, the decision to include the 14th and 15th centuries in the wording of the question was made only at the final stage on the advice of Cornelius den Tex; see J. van Gessel, Om de kunst te ondersteunen (cf. note 6), note 73 and J. van Gessel, Een vaderland, p. 30.

9 See Charles Burney, *A General History of Music: From the Earliest Ages to the Present Period*, vol. 2 (London, 1782), Johann Nicolaus Forkel, *Allgemeine Litteratur der Musik öder Anleitung zur Kenntniß musikalischer Bücher, welche von den ältesten bis auf die neusten Zeiten bey den Griechen, Römern und den meisten neuern europäischen Nationen sind geschrieben worden* (Leipzig, 1792), and Johann Nicolaus Forkel, *Allgemeine Geschichte der Musik*, vol. 2 (Leipzig, 1801).

that it was not the Italians, as has always been believed up to now, but the Netherlanders who were the actual first musical teachers of the other European empires.¹⁰

The 1824 competition turned out to be a bit of a disappointment for it did not produce an essay of sufficient quality.¹¹ The re-submission of the same question two years later initially seemed equally unpromising, but eventually two essays were received and considered to be so excellent that both were awarded and published. The first prize went to Raphael Georg Kiesewetter, and the second to Francois Joseph Fétis. Kiesewetter and Fétis each argued in their own way that the merits of the Netherlandish composers from the 15th and 16th centuries had been great indeed and demonstrated this with extensive lists of composers and their works. As is commonly known, Kiesewetter was not too troubled to call composers ›Netherlandish‹. He even went as far to argue that while Palestrina was the most important figure from the Roman school, he had been taught by Goudimel, and that for this reason Palestrina could be listed ›unter den Männern der niederländischen Schule‹.¹²

In spite of the success of the competition, little research emerged for some time in this field;¹³ nonetheless, transcriptions of works by composers from the Low Countries were received several times, especially from Germany. In 1839 Siegfried Wilhelm Dehn asked the Institute for financial support to publish his edition of Orlandus Lassus' penitential Psalms. His request was denied, not only because of the lack of finances, but also for another reason:

10 J.N. Forkel, *Allgemeine Litteratur* (cf. note 9), p. 132; also cited in Rafael Georg Kiesewetter, *Die Verdienste der Niederländer um die Tonkunst. In Beantwortung der von der vierten Klasse des Königlichen Niederländischen Instituts, im Jahre 1826 ausgeschriebenen Frage: Welche Verdienste haben sich die Niederländer, namentlich des 14^{ten}, 15^{ten} und 16^{ten} Jahrhunderts, im Fache der Tonkunst erworben? Und in wie weit können die Niederländischen Tonkünstler dieser Zeit, welche sich nach Italien begeben, Einfluss auf die Musikschulen gehabt haben, welche kurz nachher dorten entstanden sind? Eine mit der goldenen Medaille gekrönte Preisschrift* (Amsterdam, 1829), p. 3, and in E. Reeser, *De Vereeniging* (cf. note 1), pp. 5–6.

11 Only one submission was received in response to the competition. This contribution, by the Antwerp notary and music lover Pierre-Jean (Jan-Pieter) Suremont (1762–1831), was rejected because it merely listed musicians, without a critical evaluation of their merits; see J. van Gessel, *Een vaderland* (cf. note 5), p. 30.

12 R.G. Kiesewetter, *Die Verdienste* (cf. note 10), p. 44; cf. Jeroen van Gessel, ›From Scholarship to Sensation. Dutch Music History in the Nineteenth Century‹, *Tijdschrift van de Koninklijke Vereniging voor Nederlandse Muziekgeschiedenis* 68 (2018), pp. 98–131: p. 101.

13 For some general historical works from the second half of the 19th century in which the period of the composers from the Low Countries was discussed with praise, see J. van Gessel, *Een vaderland* (cf. note 5), pp. 35–36.

Certainly, among the former Dutch musical artists – among whom, in earlier times, Hainauts were also included – there were more Belgians than Dutchmen, as the writings of Kiesewetter & Fetis had shown.¹⁴

Clearly, the essays of Kiesewetter and Fetis had lost something of their national significance and luster after the secession of Belgium.¹⁵ A new impetus came in 1842 from the Berlin organist and music scholar Franz Commer (1813–1887). Commer, who had been introduced to early music through the Berlin Singakademie and his acquaintance with Carl von Winterfeld,¹⁶ had just been appointed a corresponding member of the *Maatschappij tot Bevordering der Toonkunst* (Association for the Promotion of the Art of Music).¹⁷ In return, Commer unfolded the plan to compile and publish several volumes of musical masterpieces from the Low Countries in modern notation.¹⁸ In his accompanying letter to the Association he wrote that for some time now he had been committed to supplement to the best of one's ability the perceptible gap that is noticeable in Kiesewetter's work due to the omission of practical works from the Netherlands art school.¹⁹ The project would eventually culminate in the publication of twelve monumental music volumes issued from 1844 to 1859 under the title: *Collectio operum musicorum Batavorum*. These twelve volumes contain numerous pieces by

14 Ibid., p. 288.

15 And yet, two years later in the first biography of Orlandus Lassus, Florentius Cornelis Kist (1796–1863), a medical doctor who embarked on a career as a prolific writer on Dutch music history, argued that this famous composer could be seen as a ›Dutch composer because he had been born in a region of the Netherlands that at the time had been united with the other Low Countries under the reign of Charles V‹ (see J. van Gessel, *From Scholarship* (cf. note 12), p. 105). Fétis was quick to retaliate, however, and published in 1849 the first volume of his *Les musiciens belges*, which contains a portrait of Lassus in the center of a vignette illustrating six famous Belgian composers: Dufay, Willaert, Lassus, De Monte, Grétry, and Gossec; see *ibid.*, p. 107, and pp. 102–106 on Kist's Lassus biography.

16 A.J.M. Asselbergs, Dr. Jan Pieter Heije (cf. note 3), pp. 331–333 and Markus Rathey, »Commer, Franz Alois Theodor«, *Die Musik in Geschichte und Gegenwart, Personenteil 4* (Kassel etc. 2000), cols. 1437–1438.

17 The Association for the Promotion of the Art of Music was founded in 1829 with the purpose to ›promote the art of music in the Netherlands [...] to arouse the desire for the art of music [...] among the nation more and more and to spread good musical knowledge‹ (J. van Gessel, *Een vaderland* (cf. note 5), p. 179). The term ›Netherlands‹ was used from the start to refer mainly to the northern part of the Netherlands. The association focused strongly on music practice and music education, but did not completely lose sight of research into the history of music. Commer was appointed as a corresponding member of the Association on 8 September 1842; see A.J.M. Asselbergs, Dr. Jan Pieter Heije (cf. note 3), p. 333.

18 J. van Gessel, *Een vaderland* (cf. note 5), p. 286; S. Groot, *Een zoektocht* (cf. note 3), pp. 19–20.

19 E. Reeser, *De Vereeniging* (cf. note 1), p. 6; A.J.M. Asselbergs, Dr. Jan Pieter Heije (cf. note 3), pp. 319 and 333.

thirty-two Franco-Flemish composers (Table 1).²⁰ Despite Commer not wanting to be paid for his labor, it proved extremely difficult to get the series published.²¹ The Association first turned to the Fourth Class of the Royal Institute of Sciences asking if it would be interested to publish Commer's edition as a sequel to the Kiesewetter and Fétis treatises of 1829.²² However, the Fourth Class did not want to publish the collection because the composers selected by Commer might ›not be ranked among the foremost of their contemporaries‹ and belong more to ›those geographical areas, which used to be called the Netherlands (»Pays-Bas«), than those which are now included‹.²³ Moreover, they reported, there would be too little interest in such musical works, which are unmistakably important for the history of music; ›because of their simplicity [they] are so far removed from what people nowadays like to call classical music that no publisher would dare to print them‹.²⁴ That Commer's project could eventually be realized was probably largely due to the efforts of Jan Pieter Heije, a colorful figure in 19th-century Dutch musical life who was determined to uphold the Dutch musical past.²⁵ The series ultimately turned out to be more of a showpiece for the history of musical life in the Low Countries than a practical publication used in music circles.²⁶

The Association realised that the Dutch contribution to music history remained meagre,²⁷ and therefore in 1856 and 1864, it organised new competitions in

20 After the second set of four volumes (9–12), Commer had eight more volumes ready in manuscript and even material for volumes 21–30. However, these volumes never came to be published; cf. E. Reeser, *De Vereeniging* (cf. note 1), p. 7; S. Groot, *Een zoektocht* (cf. note 3), p. 23; Kailan R. Rubinoff, »Een ongeschreven boek, opgedragen aan het Nederlandsche volk« (An Unwritten Book, Dedicated to the Dutch People). *The Vereniging voor Nederlandse Muziekgeschiedenis and the Promotion of Early Music Performance*«, *Tijdschrift van de Koninklijke Vereniging voor Nederlandse Muziekgeschiedenis* 68 (2018), pp. 70–97: p. 74.

21 A.J.M. Asselbergs, Dr. Jan Pieter Heije (cf. note 3), pp. 333sq.

22 *Ibid.*, pp. 318–319.

23 *Ibid.*, p. 321; J. van Gessel, *Een vaderland* (cf. note 5), p. 289.

24 A.J.M. Asselbergs, Dr. Jan Pieter Heije (cf. note 3), p. 321.

25 Heije had been trained as a doctor and as such made a considerable career. Yet, his great loves were poetry and music. On his career and influence on Dutch musical life, see in particular A.J.M. Asselbergs, Dr. Jan Pieter Heije (cf. note 3); for a differentiation of the role Heije played, see esp. pp. 316–388, and also S. Groot, *Een zoektocht* (cf. note 3), pp. 21–22.

26 In a letter, the Society initially informed Commer that they would be prepared to help finance the publication in a modest way, but only if it would exclusively concern works by Northern Dutchmen (A.J.M. Asselbergs, Dr. Jan Pieter Heije (cf. note 3), p. 334). Commer immediately pointed out the impossibility of such a restriction: at that time it could not be determined who came from the North and who from the South of the Netherlands; *ibid.*, pp. 334–335; see also S. Groot, *Een zoektocht* (cf. note 3), p. 22. For a detailed overview of the genesis of the COMB, see Asselbergs, Dr. Jan Pieter Heije, pp. 318–321, 332–388, and Groot, *Een zoektocht*, pp. 19–23.

27 In essence, since 1829 this contribution had not gone much beyond translating German music historical works in which the position of the Netherlanders, from Ockeghem to Lassus, had been worked out in more detail. These included, for example Franz Brendel's *Geschichte der Musik in*

Table 1: Composers represented with three or more works in Franz Commer's *Collectio operum musicorum Batavorum saeculi XVI*

Jacobus Clemens non Papa	38 motets; <i>Souterliedekens</i> ; 4 chansons
Christian Hollander	26 motets
Jacobus Vaet	22 motets
Orlandus Lassus	17 motets; 1 chanson; 1 villanella
Josquin des Prés	11 motets; 3 chansons
Johannes Cleve	4 motets
Thomas Crecquillon	2 motets; 2 chansons
Adriaen Willaert	3 motets; 1 Magnificat
Dominique Phinot	3 motets; Lamentations
Nicolas Gombert	1 motet; 2 chansons
Jean Le Cocq (Joannes Gallus?)	3 chansons
Clément Janequin	3 chansons
Claudin de Sermisy	3 chansons

Total number of compositions in series:

128 Motets
 156 *Souterliedekens*
 1 set of Lamentations
 1 Magnificat
 1 Mass movement
 62 chansons

order to produce ›Historical sketches from the field of Dutch musical art in the 16th century, as building materials for an art history [...] in the spirit of Von Winterfeldt's *Beiträge zur Geschichte heiliger Tonkunst*.²⁸ The 1864 competition asked for a list of names of musicians who were born or had lived in the Northern Netherlands from the earliest times until the beginning of the 17th century and for a biography of Jan Pietersz. Sweelinck.²⁹ In 1868 Robert Eitner submitted his

Italien, Deutschland und Frankreich (Hinze, 1851) and Emil Naumann's *Illustrierte Musikgeschichte* (Berlin, 1880–1885); cf. J. van Gessel, From Scholarship (cf. note 12), p. 109.

28 J. van Gessel, Een vaderland (cf. note 5), p. 418. The competition of 1856 did not yield many submissions, but was also opened to foreigners in 1858 and finally had a prize winner in the figure of Otto Kade with a treatise on Mattheus le Maistre (*ibid.*, p. 419).

29 The competition had already been proposed in 1863, but had then been rejected by the board of the Association; cf. E. Reeser, De Vereeniging (cf. note 1), p. 9.

Holländisches Musik-Lexicon oder Biographisch-Bibliographisches Verzeichniss containing information about 161 Northern Dutch artists and writers on music.³⁰ It became increasingly clear that collecting materials relating to Dutch music history was becoming too large a task for the Association. For this reason it was finally proposed to set up a society with exactly this aim: the Society for Music History of the Netherlands.³¹ The proposal was accepted at the meeting of 23 June 1868 and the association would be established later that year.³²

The new society introduced itself on 19 November 1868 with the following programme: The aim of the society is

to trace and bring to light the almost unknown, and yet so glorious, history of Dutch Musical Art, and more specifically the rightful contribution of the Northern Netherlands to it. To this end, the Society will address in particular the periods that begin with Obrecht (1450) and end with Sweelinck (1621). Meanwhile, neither the preceding period, from Radboud onwards (900) – nor the remarkable period of decline, decay and initial revival (1650 to 1800) – will be lost sight of.³³

The main fields to be addressed included: biography, bibliography, criticism and aesthetics, instruments and instrumentation, organs and organists, church music, sacred and secular song, Dutch lyrical drama, and popular song. With regard to the editions of Obrecht and Josquin that the VNM would later publish, it is no-

30 The complete title of Eitner's dictionary runs as follows: *Holländisches Musik-Lexicon oder Biographisch-Bibliographisches Verzeichniss aller Tonkünstler und Schriftsteller über Musik, welche bis zum Anfange des XVIII. Jahrhunderts in dem nordlichen Theile der Niederlande (dem jetzigen Königreiche Holland) geboren sind oder daselbst gelebt haben. Nebst einem Anhang holländischer oder daselbst gedruckter geistlicher und weltlicher Liederbücher mit Melodien, und einem Verzeichnisse der Verleger und Buchdrucker*. E. Reeser, *De Vereeniging* (cf. note 1), p. 9; J. van Gessel, *Een vaderland* (cf. note 5), p. 419.

31 E. Reeser, *De Vereeniging* (cf. note 1), p. 11; J. van Gessel, *Een vaderland* (cf. note 5), pp. 419–420. One of the important initiators was again Jan Pieter Heije.

32 E. Reeser, *De Vereeniging* (cf. note 1), pp. 10–11. The following arguments were given to legitimise the foundation: (1) that research by Ambros had shown that the 15th and 16th centuries could rightly be called those of the Netherlanders and that their art was the basis of all European art schools; (2) that the Association had indeed published Commer's volumes, but that otherwise thorough knowledge of the period was lacking; (3) that in all kinds of archives there were still important documents concerning the history of Dutch musical art; (4) that writings of others contain a lot of information about Dutch music artists and should be collected; (5) that it would be useful to know in which collections and libraries which musical works of Dutch artists can be found; (6) that the research would be work for many people spread all over the country.

33 E. Reeser, *De Vereeniging* (cf. note 1), p. 13; see also K.R. Rubinoff, *Een ongeschreven boek* (cf. note 20), pp. 75–76, where another portion of the founding text is translated into English and where it is argued that the rhetoric of the text still resonated with the 'vaderlandcultus' (the cultivation of love for one's native country).

table that this document already stated that the Society would focus in particular on contributions from the *Northern* Netherlands. Indeed, five years later the Society itself decided to change its name to that of ›Society for Music History of the Northern-Netherlands‹. Jan Pieter Heije had already admitted in 1871 that the title of Commer's *Collectio operum musicorum Batavorum* should have read ›Belgicorum‹ instead of ›Batavorum‹.³⁴ The change of name was therefore obvious and it was justified by the board as follows:

It was partly out of respect for linguistic accuracy, and partly in order to be even more specific that we thought we should limit our investigations to the artists and works of art of the old Northern Netherlands (the present-day Kingdom); in order, without detracting in any way from the appreciation of our southern neighbours, to first and foremost, and above all, substantiate and ensure our legitimate share in the fame of the Dutch musical Arts alongside those Southern Netherlands (present-day Belgium).³⁵

The concentration on the Northern Netherlands was not only professed in writing, but also put into practice with publications of sources and literature as well as musical works.³⁶ The Society's very first music publication was Sweelinck's *Regina coeli* (1619), the only complete work by Sweelinck known at the time.³⁷ Sweelinck was the ideal composer for the society at that point in time: a composer of international repute, who had been born and had worked in the Northern Netherlands, and who had been of great influence on numerous later musicians.³⁸ More editions of his work and biographical studies followed and from 1885 onwards the board of the society considered publishing Sweelinck's complete

34 E. Reeser, *De Vereeniging* (cf. note 1), p. 8; J. van Gessel, *Een vaderland* (cf. note 5), p. 421.

35 E. Reeser, *De Vereeniging* (cf. note 1), p. 17. The concentration on the northern part of the Netherlands was confirmed in the articles of association of 1889: ›a. To trace and disseminate materials regarding the history of music in the northern Netherlands and everything connected with it. [...] c. To publish, or to promote the publication by others of, important musical works in the field indicated in a.‹ E. Reeser, *De Vereeniging* (cf. note 1), p. 31.

36 For a detailed overview of the Society's music publications and of the historical contributions in the three volumes of the *Bouwsteenen* and the *Tijdschrift* up to 1943, see E. Reeser, *De Vereeniging* (cf. note 1), pp. 82–99.

37 Uitgave I of 1869; E. Reeser, *De Vereeniging* (cf. note 1), p. 18. The edition was prepared by H.A. Viotta after a manuscript that was kept in the library of the Association for the Promotion of the Art of Music. The score was preceded by a biographical sketch by Hendrik Tiedeman, which was compiled based on data from the Antwerp musicologist Edouard Grégoir, among others; E. Reeser, *De Vereeniging* (cf. note 1), p. 15.

38 In the words of J.P. Heije, in his preface to the 1876 edition of a selection of six-voice psalms by Sweelinck: ›In his organ pieces Sweelinck created the basis for modern organ art, and in his psalms the basis for the independence of the melody, as the principle of life, from which the musical art of Bach to Beethoven has sprung‹; J. van Gessel, *Een vaderland* (cf. note 5), p. 421.

œuvre.³⁹ Such an undertaking was seen by the society's board as a duty ›of which the Netherlands should acquit itself as soon as possible‹.⁴⁰ When the preparations were advanced enough to proceed with the edition, the project was entrusted to Max Seiffert (1868–1948), who in 1891 had obtained a doctorate in Berlin with a dissertation on Sweelinck and his German pupils and who in the same year had been appointed an honorary member of the Society. It was not surprising that the Society turned to its eastern neighbours to find an editor, as their German colleagues had already gained considerable experience in publishing the complete works of composers such as Schütz, Bach, Händel and Beethoven.⁴¹ The Sweelinck edition would eventually cover 9 volumes, which were published in the period 1894–1901.⁴²

Obrecht

In 1898 the 30th anniversary of the Society was celebrated. On that occasion, and in the knowledge that the Sweelinck edition would soon be completed, chairman Daniël François Scheurleer (Plate 1) unfolded plans for the society's next project: ›The period before the 17th century must be investigated with more vigour than hitherto, and when the Sweelinck edition is completed, an attempt must be made

39 The Sweelinck studies made a great leap forward particularly thanks to Robert Eitner's efforts in the field of biography and bibliography; cf. E. Reeser, *De Vereeniging* (cf. note 1), p. 18. In addition, Eitner edited a number of works by Sweelinck for the VNM: *Uitgave III*: Seven organ pieces (after a manuscript from the library of the Franciscan convent (Graues Kloster) in Berlin (1871); *Uitgave VI*: Eight six-voice Psalm settings (1876); *Uitgave VII*: Chanson [*Bouche de coral précieux*] (1877); *Uitgave XII*: Six four-voice Psalm settings (1883); *Uitgave XV*: motet *Hodie Christus natus est* (1888).

40 E. Reeser, *De Vereeniging* (cf. note 1), p. 36.

41 The board specifically referred to this expertise of their German colleagues; see E. Reeser, *De Vereeniging* (cf. note 1), p. 36. In addition, since the competition won by Kiesewetter, members of the Association and later of the Society had been in regular contact with German researchers and musicians such as Commer, Eitner and others. Seiffert's dissertation was published in Leipzig in 1891; a summary of it was later published in *Tijdschrift der Vereeniging voor Noord-Nederlands Muziekgeschiedenis* 4 (1892). For mention of the honorary membership of Seiffert, see E. Reeser, *De Vereeniging* (cf. note 1), p. 80.

42 For more background information on this edition and on the role that J.C.M. van Riemsdijk played in its realisation, see Daniël François Scheurleer, »Het dertigjarig bestaan der Vereeniging voor Noord-Nederlands Muziekgeschiedenis«, *Tijdschrift der Vereeniging voor Noord-Nederlands Muziekgeschiedenis* 6 (1899), pp. 129–139: pp. 136–137; E. Reeser, *De Vereeniging* (cf. note 1), pp. 35–40; Willem Elders, »Sweelinck–Obrecht–Josquin, and the Koninklijke Vereniging voor Nederlandse Muziekgeschiedenis«, *Tijdschrift van de Koninklijke Vereniging voor Nederlandse Muziekgeschiedenis* 68 (2018), pp. 5–15: p. 5; and Rudolf Rasch, »The Canon of Sweelinck's Keyboard Music«, *Tijdschrift van de Koninklijke Vereniging voor Nederlandse Muziekgeschiedenis* 68 (2018), pp. 37–69: p. 40.



Plate 1: Daniël François Scheurleer (1855–1927) on 12 November 1926. The Hague, Nederlands Muziek Instituut, 008: Archief van D.F. Scheurleer, inv. no. 26.

forthwith to erect such a monument for Obrecht, that giant among giants!⁴³ The question is: why was Obrecht singled out? As very little of Obrecht's music was available in modern editions in the 19th century (see Table 2),⁴⁴ and the only 19th-century scholar who had devoted more than superficial attention to Obrecht's music was August Wilhelm Ambros,⁴⁵ one wonders why Scheurleer and his companions were so enthusiastic about this composer. Some of this

43 E. Reeser, *De Vereeniging* (cf. note 1), p. 42; D.F. Scheurleer, *Het dertigjarig bestaan* (cf. note 42), 138.

44 Interestingly enough, not a single work of Obrecht is found in Commer's *Collectio*. An explanation for this could well be that Commer mainly used German printed sources from the 16th century for his transcriptions, and that these sources contain very little sacred music by Obrecht.

45 See August Wilhelm Ambros, *Geschichte der Musik im Zeitalter der Renaissance bis zu Palestrina* (Breslau, 1868), pp. 179–184; Ambros based his assessment of Obrecht's music on his own transcriptions of a number of masses, motets and secular works. Hawkins, Burney, Forkel and Kiesewetter devoted only little attention to Obrecht; cf. John Hawkins, *A General History of the Science and Practice of Music*, vol. 2 (London, 1776), p. 470; C. Burney, *A General History* (cf. note 9), p. 525; J.N. Forkel, *Allgemeine Geschichte* (cf. note 9), pp. 520–521, 523, 526–527; Rafael Georg Kiesewetter, *Geschichte der europäisch-abendländischen oder unsrer heutigen Musik. Darstellung ihres Ursprunges, ihres Wachsthumes und ihrer stufenweisen Entwicklung* (Leipzig, 1834), p. 51.

Table 2: Works by (or ascribed to) Obrecht that were available in a modern edition in the 19th century.

Masses

Missa Fortuna desperata^a

Missa Fors seulement: Qui tollis & Sanctus^b

Missa Salve diva parens: Qui cum patre (*canon*)^c

Motets

Ave regina^d

Parce domine^c

Passio^c

Salve regina (3v)^d

Secular works^d

Fors seulement, Meisken es u, La tortorella, Se bien fait

a VNM Uitgave IX 1880

b *Glareani Dodecachordon, Basileae MDXLVII. Übersetzt und übertragen von Peter Bohn* (Leipzig, 1888)

c J.N. Forkel, *Allgemeine Geschichte* (cf. note 9) & R.G. Kiesewetter, *Die Verdienste* (cf. note 10)

d Otto Kade, *Geschichte der Musik von August Wilhelm Ambros [...] Fünfter Band: Beispielsammlung zum dritten Bande* (Leipzig, 1882)

e VNM Uitgave XVIII 1894

enthusiasm may probably be ascribed to the mass *Fortuna desperata*. Robert Eitner had transcribed the work and sent a copy of his score to the Society in 1869.⁴⁶ It would take eleven years for the mass to get published, but Eitner's enclosed praise of Obrecht and the *Fortuna* Mass was already published in the first yearbook of the Society of 1869:

He was not only the most important musician of Holland but the greatest master of his time [...] *Missa Fortuna desperata*. The most grandiose of Hobrecht's masses; especially the exposition of the first Kyrie and the Sanctus [are] of mighty grandeur.⁴⁷

46 E. Reeser, *De Vereeniging* (cf. note 1), p. 24.

47 *Bouwsteenen, Eerste Jaarboek der Vereeniging voor Nederlandsche Muziekgeschiedenis* (1869–1872), p. 26–27.

Once the mass had been issued, bits of it appeared on the programs of Daniël de Lange's (1841-1918) professional vocal ensemble that specialised in early music, and these sections had made an enormous impression on listeners.⁴⁸ The decisive factor in the choice for Obrecht, however, seems to have been that simply it was believed that Obrecht originated from Utrecht and was therefore a genuine Dutch composer. Although some contemporary reference works left the option open that Obrecht came from Bruges, his Utrecht origins, prompted by Glareanus' anecdote that Erasmus was said to have sung as a choirboy in Utrecht under Obrecht,⁴⁹ were accepted as a fact by many others, including by late 19th-century Dutch reference works.⁵⁰ Obrecht's Dutch origins were seen as a legitimate reason for the VNM to publish his works as a fitting tribute to the glorious musical past of the northern Netherlands.⁵¹

48 For more information on the concerts of De Lange's ensemble and on the Obrecht sections that were sung, see J. van Gessel, *From Scholarship* (cf. note 12), pp. 113–131, and K.R. Rubinoff, *Een ongeschreven boek* (cf. note 20), pp. 78–84.

49 For a detailed discussion of this passage, see Rob C. Wegman, *Born for the Muses: The Life and Masses of Jacob Obrecht* (Oxford, 1994), pp. 76–79.

50 See, for example: Abraham Jacob van der Aa, *Biographisch woordenboek der Nederlanden, bevattende Levensbeschrijvingen van zoodanige Personen, die zich op eenigerlei wijze in ons Vaderland hebben vermaard gemaakt*, voortgezet door K.J.R. van Harderwijk, en Dr. G.D.J. Schotel, 14e deel (Haarlem, 1867), pp. 3–4; *Bouwsteenen, Eerste Jaarboek der Vereeniging voor Nederlandsche Muziekgeschiedenis* (1869–1872), 26–27; Hugo Rieman, *Musik-Lexikon* (Leipzig, 1882), p. 397 (see also the editions of 1884 and 1909); Anton Averkamp, »De verhouding van Noord tot Zuid op muzikaal gebied in de XVe en XVIe eeuw«, *Tijdschrift der Vereeniging voor Nederlandsche Muziekgeschiedenis* 9 (1914), pp. 213–223: p. 216. At the end of the 1920s, Obrecht's Utrecht origins were still taken for granted; see, for example, Philipp Christiaan Molhuysen, Petrus Johannes Blok, Friedrich Karl Heinrich Kossmann, *Nieuw Nederlandsch biografisch woordenboek*, vol. 7 (Leiden, 1927), p. 917; Anton Averkamp, *Grootmeesters der toonkunst, met 73 portretten* ('s-Gravenhage, 1930), p. 8. It was not until 1938 that attention was drawn to the fact that there was no evidence for Obrecht's provenance from Utrecht (Anny Piscaer, »Jacob Obrecht«, *Sinte Geertruydsbronnen* 15 (1938), pp. 1–15; see also Johannes du Saar, »Utrecht en Jacob Obrecht«, *Maandblad van »Oud Utrecht«*. *Vereeniging tot beoefening en tot verspreiding van de kennis der geschiedenis van Utrecht en omstreken* 18/7 (1943), pp. 50–55).

51 The Obrecht edition was published during the years 1908–1921 in 30 different fascicles under the editorship of yet another German musicologist: Johannes Wolf. For a concise overview of this edition, see W. Elders, *Sweelinck–Obrecht–Josquin* (cf. note 42), pp. 5–6. In addition to the details mentioned by Elders, it can be noted that initially Seiffert was selected as editor for the series and that he accepted the assignment. After collecting sources from Germany, the plan was to continue with Italian libraries, but then Seiffert fell ill. With the approval of the board, he transferred the task to Dr. Richard Münnich, who reported on his trip to Italy in Richard Münnich, »Auf Obrecht's Spuren«, *Tijdschrift der Vereeniging voor Noord-Nederlands Muziekgeschiedenis* 7 (1903), pp. 233–244. On 10 May 1904 Seiffert again attended a board meeting to draw up a plan for the edition on the basis of materials collected by him and Münnich. The project was to consist of three parts: masses, motets and secular works. In addition, an anthology was to be published for practical use. Münnich fell ill, however, and Friedrich Ludwig (Strasbourg) was asked to replace him. Ludwig withdrew, however, after only a few months. The board finally entrusted the task to Johannes Wolf,

Josquin

Well before the Obrecht edition had been completed, the VNM started pondering about a new publishing project. This was to be the Josquin edition by Smijers, but in order to understand the genesis of this project, we must first pay attention to what happened in the year 1911.

In January of that year, the Society took a remarkable step: the articles of association were amended. The board of the Society ›had come to the conviction that it is desirable not to limit the activities to music history of the *Northern* Netherlands. Why deliberately exclude the *Southern* Netherlands?‹⁵² The simple answer to that question would be: because the ›Southern Netherlands‹ refer to the territory that had been part of the Belgian kingdom since 1830. Of course, the Southern Netherlands had formed an inseparable whole with the Northern Netherlands for longer periods of its history, but the decision to reincorporate the area as a field of research seems to have been prompted by some opportunism. As Eduard Reeser put in in 1943: ›Without a doubt, it was more logical for a musicological institution, which was mainly concerned with the Netherlandish musical art of the 15th and 16th centuries, to extend its activities to the area known in those centuries as ›the Netherlands‹ than to limit itself to the state borders of the later ›Kingdom of the Netherlands‹, which were, after all, not definitively established until 1830.‹⁵³ The Society itself preferred to see it as a return to the old name and principles of the Society as it was founded in 1863, so that ›the barrier separating the Northern and Southern Netherlands could be lifted.‹⁵⁴ It was apparently

who, in consultation with Seiffert, was given overall responsibility for the project. Altogether, it still took some time before publication could begin, because Wolf had noticed that it was necessary to re-examine the sources in Italy due to the absence of source descriptions. The copies made by Münnich soon proved to be worthless (some of Wolf's scathing remarks are included in E. Reeser, *De Vereeniging* (cf. note 1), p. 46). Wolf's own research brought new pieces and new sources to light and it soon became clear that similar research had to be done in France, Belgium and England as well. In September 1908, a circulaire was finally distributed, from which it became clear that the edition would consist of about 30 instalments and would be completed in 7 to 8 years. This was quite a miscalculation, for this extremely costly project, for which financial support was obtained from the Association for the Promotion of the Art of Music, the Dutch government, the Utrecht provincial association, the Dutch St. Gregory society, and from private persons (among whom Scheurleer), was completed only in 1921. Cf. E. Reeser, *De Vereeniging* (cf. note 1), pp. 45–46.

52 See ›De statuten-wijziging onzer Vereeniging‹, *Tijdschrift der Vereeniging voor Nederlandsche Muziekgeschiedenis* 9 (1912), pp. 141–142. The matter had already been discussed in the meeting of the board on 28 November, 1810; see *Nederlands Muziek Instituut [NMI] 230: Archief van de Koninklijke Vereniging voor Nederlandse Muziekgeschiedenis*, inv. no. 1: *Notulenboek*, meeting of 28 November 1910, pp. 161–162.

53 E. Reeser, *De Vereeniging* (cf. note 1), p. 57.

54 Anton Averkamp, ›Adriaen Willaert‹, *Tijdschrift der Vereeniging voor Nederlandsche Muziekgeschiedenis* 10 (1915), pp. 13–29, p. 13.

forgotten for a moment that when the Society was founded in 1868, in spite of its neutral name which implied research in music history of the Netherlands, it had been noted that in particular ›the legitimate contribution of the Northern Netherlands‹ to the glorious history of Dutch music would be studied.⁵⁵

The result of the 1911 shift was that new research and publishing projects did not necessarily have to be limited to composers who had been active in the northern part of the Low Countries. The VNM could now also extend its attempts to obtain subventions for publications to Belgian territory, and indeed this was the path taken in 1912. Anton Averkamp was invited to speak at the ›Nederlandsch taal- en letterkundig congres‹ (Dutch language and literature congress) that was held at Antwerp. He talked about the musical relationship between the Northern and Southern Netherlands in the 15th and 16th centuries.⁵⁶ His paper was apparently well received, as evinced by the conclusion in this meeting's final session that as much financial and moral support as possible should be given to the VNM both by ›the national government in Brussels, as well as by regional and municipal governments and private individuals, in order to enable it to make the works of the great artists of the 15th and 16th centuries, who were born and worked in the Netherlands, accessible to everyone by means of printing.‹⁵⁷

In 1915 the first fruits of the change of the articles of association became visible in print. Averkamp had discovered that a collection of music manuscripts and prints was kept in the library of the Illustre Lieve Vrouwe Broederschap in 's-Hertogenbosch. Together with Scheurleer, he arranged for part of the codices to be photographed for the VNM.⁵⁸ When he started to transcribe music from one of these books during the Christmas holiday of 1914, he was immediately struck by the quality of the mass *Benedicta es* that was attributed to Adriaen Willaert in this manuscript.⁵⁹ As he put it to Scheurleer:

55 E. Reeser, *De Vereeniging* (cf. note 1), p. 13.

56 See Averkamp's letter to Scheurleer of 18 June 1912; NMI 008: Archief van D.F. Scheurleer, inv. no. 140G Correspondence 1882–1918; folder correspondence VNM 1908–1918, A–M: 42 letters from Averkamp to Scheurleer. Part of Averkamp's lecture was later published in the *Tijdschrift*, A. Averkamp, *De verhouding* (cf. note 50).

57 Letter from Averkamp to Scheurleer of 30 August 1912; *ibid.* (cf. note 56).

58 Averkamp first mentioned these music books in his letter to Scheurleer from 18 June 1912 (cf. note 56). Later letters from the same collection (dating from 30 August 1912, 1 October 1912, 15 March 1914, 29 September 1914, 11 October 1914 and 5 November 1914) contain details regarding the transport, insurance and photographing of the books.

59 This is the Alamire manuscript 's-HerAB 72A. Later it was discovered that the mass is attributed to Hesdin in other sources; see Albert Smijers, »Hesdin of Willaert«, *Tijdschrift der Vereeniging voor Nederlandsche Muziekgeschiedenis* 10 (1922), pp. 180–181. More information on the sources and attributions can be found in David M. Kidger, *Adrian Willaert: A Guide to Research* (New York & London, 2005), p. 200.

Now, however, I have asked Willaert's memory for forgiveness for the injustice done to him, because I have acquired a completely different opinion of him. This mass – it is the first from the collection, super *Benedicta* [...] is simply beautiful, at least the Kyrie – There is, however, I think, no reason to expect that the rest will not be just as beautiful.⁶⁰

Later that year, the mass was published by the VNM and the introduction to the edition makes it clear that this had been made possible by the events of 1911:

As the first result of this change [of the articles of association of the Society] now the *Missa super Benedicta es* of the Bruges composer Adriaen Willaert appears in print, from the nature of things a new presence under the masters whose works have been published by us.⁶¹

Let us now return to the genesis of the Josquin edition. On 3 January 1918, Albert Smijers, who had just returned from Vienna where he had completed his dissertation on Carl Luython with Guido Adler, wrote to Scheurleer that Adler had asked him to verify if the VNM had plans within the foreseeable future to publish the works of Josquin. If not, then Adler would be inclined to publish ›an edition of this composer‹ in the *Denkmäler der Tonkunst in Österreich*.⁶² Two days later, Anton Averkamp (Plate 2), vice-president of the VNM, wrote to Scheurleer asking him how he would feel about inviting Smijers to become a board member of the VNM.⁶³ Averkamp knew Smijers personally as he had been

60 Letter from Averkamp to Scheurleer from 1 January, 1915; *ibid.* (see note 56).

61 Uitgave XXXV: ›*Missa super Benedicta*‹ door Adriaen Willaert. Naar het handschrift in de bibliotheek van de Illustre Lieve Vrouwe Broederschap te 's-Hertogenbosch in partituur gebracht, voor praktisch gebruik ingericht en van een inleiding voorzien door Ant. Averkamp (Amsterdam & Leipzig, 1915). For the quotation, see A. Averkamp, Adriaen Willaert (cf. note 54), p. 13.

62 NMI 008: Archief Scheurleer, inv. no. 140G, folder H. Correspondence VNM editions 1918–1927 A. Smijers. See Marlies van der Riet, ›Daniël François Scheurleer, de laatste jaren van een Haags cultuurmecenas‹, *Tijdschrift van de Koninklijke Vereniging voor Nederlandse Muziekgeschiedenis* 64 (2014), pp. 144–175, where part of the note is illustrated on p. 154. In the same letter, Smijers also asked Scheurleer about the conditions for a VNM membership. Over a year later, in a letter of 13 February 1919 to Scheurleer, Smijers nuanced his statement by saying that Adler was considering publishing an anthology of Josquin's works; NMI 008: *ibid.*: ›Perhaps it would also be desirable to inform the board that Prof. Adler (at least last year) was considering publishing an anthology of Josquin's works; whether this plan will now be carried out due to the circumstances of the time, I do not know.‹

63 NMI 008: Archief Scheurleer, inv. no. 140G (Correspondence VNM 1908–1918), folder Averkamp 1908–1918. M. van der Riet, Daniël François Scheurleer (cf. note 62), p. 153; see also Petra van Langen, ›Anton Averkamp and Albert Smijers. Two Catholic Presidents‹, *Tijdschrift van de Koninklijke Vereniging voor Nederlandse Muziekgeschiedenis* 68 (2018), pp. 148–162: p. 151. Anton Averkamp had been on the board since 1897 and served as vice-chairman from 1913 until 1927. From 1927 until his death in 1934 he was president of the VNM; see E. Reeser, *De Vereeniging* (cf. note 1), p. 80.



Plate 2: Anton Averkamp (1861–1934).
Stadsarchief Amsterdam / Atelier J.
Merkelbach.

his music teacher from 1912 to 1914.⁶⁴ He suggested that Smijers, who was a modest but very clever man, could prove to be of great value:

Later, when we extend our protection to one of our Southern Netherlandish Brethren from the 16th or 17th century, he might be the man to do the job. And then we will no longer be dependent on foreign countries.

Averkamp added subtly:

His study about Luython with everything that is known about that composer will be included in the *Denkmäler deutscher Tonkunst*. What do you think of that? So the Austrians just bluntly annex this truly Southern Netherlandish master in their *Denkmäler*.⁶⁵

64 P. van Langen, Anton Averkamp (cf. note 63), p. 152.

65 What could be considered amusing is that this ›truly Southern Netherlandish masters‹, who was born in Antwerp, had been recruited as a chorister for the court of Emperor Maximilian II in Vienna at the age of 8 or 9 and spent virtually the rest of his life in the service of the Habsburg imperial chapel in Vienna and Prague; see Michael Zywiez, »Luython, Luiton, Luitton, Luthon, Luythonius, Luyton, Carl, Carolus, Charles, Karl«, *Die Musik in Geschichte und Gegenwart, Personenteil 11* (Kassel etc. 2004), cols. 663–666: cols. 663–664.

Averkamp clearly saw it as the task of a Dutch society to protect and publish the music of composers born in the Low Countries. The proposal to invite Smijers to become a board member appealed to Scheurleer, was submitted to the board on 9 March and was accepted with general approval.⁶⁶ An interesting aspect of the procedure is that in the board meeting of 9 March 1918, Averkamp described Smijers as someone ›who has been engaged in research about Josquin‹. This is remarkable, for there is no sign that Smijers had been working on Josquin prior to preparations for the edition. Within one month after his appointment as a board member on 18 January 1919,⁶⁷ Smijers received an invitation by Scheurleer for an important meeting:

I very much hope that you will be able to come to Amsterdam on Saturday 15 February, as I would like to bring up a very important decision. The Obrecht publication is nearing completion and it is time to decide which master should be dealt with next. In my opinion, the first candidates are Josquin and Adriaen Willaert. In a certain sense, the former appeals to me more, but that is only a superficial assessment. Of course, costs of preparation and execution will play a major role. Be so kind as to consider the issue. I think it is a real pleasure to be able to contribute to the revival of such great masters.

Smijers was unable to attend due to work at the seminary in Sint-Michielsgestel, but was naturally prepared to ponder the question. His first idea was that an edition of Willaert's music would be cheaper, but ›that a Josquin edition is more important than a Willaert edition at this moment; from Josquin's time much less has been published so far.‹⁶⁸

66 NMI 230: Archief KVMN, inv. no. 1: *Notulenboek*, meeting of 9 March 1919, p. 335.

67 The actual appointment of Smijers as a member of the VNM and his election as board member did not take place until 18 January 1919. The considerable time gap between the board meeting of March 1918 and the election in January 1919 was explained by Scheurleer in a letter of 12 January 1919. Apparently, the [post war?] circumstances had not been favourable for businessmen such as Scheurleer, to leave their time for ancillary activities. See Albert Smijers, ›Dr. Scheurleer al zeventig jaar!‹, *De vereenigde tijdschriften Caecilia maandblad voor muziek en Het muziekcollege* 83/13, no. 2 (16 November 1925), pp. 30–33: p. 30. For Smijers' joining the board at Averkamp's initiative, see E. Reeser, *De Vereeniging* (cf. note 1), p. 63, M. van der Riet, Daniël François Scheurleer (cf. note 62), p. 153, and P. van Langen, Anton Averkamp (cf. note 63), p. 151. The appointment and election are confirmed in the *Notulenboek* (NMI 230: Archief KVMN, inv. no. 1, pp. 337–338) and in a letter of 19 January by Ewaldus Daniël Pijzel, the secretary of the board, to Scheurleer, who was indisposed and unable to attend the meeting; NMI 008: Archief Scheurleer, inv. no. 140G, folder G. Correspondence VNM 1919–1927 Pijzel).

68 NMI 008: Archief Scheurleer, inv. no. 140G, folder H: Correspondence VNM editions 1918–1927 A. Smijers), letter of Smijers to Scheurleer, 13 February 1919.

But why at all the choice between Willaert and Josquin? Averkamp had edited the *Missa Benedicta es* in 1915 and had published a glowing report on the composer and the work in the *Tijdschrift* of the VNM,⁶⁹ citing numerous 16th- and 19th-century publications praising Willaert.⁷⁰ A certain preference for this composer is therefore understandable. But what about Josquin? Josquin was not an obvious candidate for the VNM at that time. The Society had not issued a single note of his music until then,⁷¹ and up to that point, neither the *Bouwsteenen* nor the *Tijdschrift* had reported on him or his music.

The lack of attention to Josquin's music in the VNM's publications was not typical of 19th-century research into music from the Renaissance. Josquin already occupied a prominent place in music-historical textbooks, and a large number of his works had been made available in modern printed editions. To start with the latter, Table 3 shows that in the 19th century many more works attributed to Josquin circulated in print than did works by Obrecht.⁷² While some of the editions appear to have been of local importance, others were widely available, especially the volumes of Commer's *Collectio* and the Josquin volume Commer prepared for Eitner's *Publikation älterer theoretischer und praktischer Musikwerke*.

With regard to music historiography,⁷³ one may argue that the Josquin renaissance started with Charles Burney, who in his *A General History of Music* made no secret of his admiration for the composer. After recounting anecdotes and praise

69 A. Averkamp, Adriaen Willaert (cf. note 54).

70 A letter of 25 March 1919 from E.D. Pijzel (the secretary of the board) to Scheurleer suggests that around 1914 more Willaert sources had been collected and photographed for future editions: ›Until now, I had assumed that Josquin would definitely be chosen for the new large edition, and that the Willaert material you had already reproduced photographically would be used for our regular editions, with Averkamp being put to work again.‹ NMI 008: Archief Scheurleer: inv. no. 140G, folder G: Correspondence VNM 1919–1927 Pijzel. See also M. van der Riet, Daniël François Scheurleer (cf. note 62), p. 155. The correspondence between Averkamp and Scheurleer does not mention other Willaert sources, so it would seem that Pijzel's remark was a mistake. Possibly, he simply was referring to the photographing of the manuscripts from 's-Hertogenbosch.

71 The polyphonic music from before the mid-16th century published by the VNM up to that point, apart from Obrecht, consisted of Dutch polyphonic songs and two masses: Uitgave XXIX (1908): *Het ierste Musyck Boexken van Tielman Susato*; Uitgave XXX (1910): *25 Driestemmige Oud-Nederlandsche Liederen uit het einde der vijftiende eeuw*; Uitgave XXXV (1915): *Missa super Benedicta* door Adriaen Willaert; Uitgave XXXVIII (1920): *Missa ad modulum Benedicta es* sex vocum auctore Philippo de Monte.

72 This table is the result of a first exploration of 19th-century editions of works by Josquin and should not be seen as a definitive research results.

73 On this topic, see also Barbara Eichner's contribution elsewhere in this volume, Jürg Stenzl, ››In das Reich der schönen Kunst ganz einzutreten, war ihm nicht beschieden‹. Zur Josquin-Rezeption im 19. Jahrhundert‹, *Josquin des Prés*. Musik-Konzepte 26/27 (München, 1982), pp. 85–101, and Friedhelm Krummacher, ››Wissenschaftsgeschichte und Werkrezeption. Die ›alten Niederländer‹ im 19. Jahrhundert‹, *Rezeptionsästhetik und Rezeptionsgeschichte in der Musikwissenschaft*, edd. Hermann Danuser & Friedhelm Krummacher (Laaber, 1991), pp. 205–22.

Table 3. Works by (or ascribed to) Josquin that were available in a modern edition before ca. 1915

Masses and Mass movements	Motets	Secular works
<i>Missa Ad fugam</i> Benedictus ^y	<i>Absalon fili mi</i> ^z	<i>Adieu mes amours</i> ^{s/x}
<i>Missa De beata virgine</i> Gloria, Agnus II ^y Cum sancto spiritu ^t	<i>Ave Christe immolate</i> ^{m/aa}	<i>Basiés moy a</i> 6 ^m
<i>Missa Faysant regretz</i> Osanna & Benedictus ^b Osanna ^{s/g}	<i>Ave Maria virgo serena</i> ^{r/v/y/aa} (only <i>Ave vera virginitas</i> ^{k/q})	<i>Coeurs desolez a</i> 4 ^v
<i>Missa Fortuna desperata</i> Sanctus ^p Agnus ^y Agnus I & II ^{hh}	<i>Ave verum a</i> 2-3 ^{v/aa/dd}	<i>De tous biens pleine</i> ^r
<i>Missa Gaudeamus</i> Kyrie-Christe ^{g/h} Benedictus ^y	<i>Beati quorum</i> ^m	<i>Douleur me bat</i> ^m
<i>Missa Hercules dux Ferrarie</i> Pleni & Agnus II ^y	<i>Benedicite omnia opera domini</i> ^m	<i>Entré je suis a</i> 4 ^y
<i>Missa L'homme armé sexti toni</i> Benedictus ^y	<i>Benedicta es: Per illud ave</i> ^r	<i>Guillaume se va chauffer</i> ^{r/v/y}
<i>Missa L'homme armé s.v.m.</i> ^v Pleni & Benedictus ^{b/c/g} Benedictus & Agnus II ^y Osanna & Agnus II ^p Agnus II ^{c/d}	<i>Cantate domino</i> ^m	<i>In te domine speravi</i> ^s
<i>Missa Malheur me bat</i> Agnus II ^y	<i>Celi enarrant</i> ^{r/m}	<i>Incessamment livré suis</i> ^s
<i>Missa Mater patris</i> Pleni ^{b/c/f/g} Pleni, Benedictus & Agnus II ^y Benedictus ^c	<i>Christus mortuus est</i> ^m	<i>J'ay bien cause</i> ^{s/z}
<i>Missa N'auray je jamais</i> Sanctus ^p	<i>De profundis clamavi</i> (low) ^{v/y}	<i>Je say bien dire</i> ^x
<i>Missa Pange lingua</i> ^x Et incarnatus est ^{r/l/o} Pleni ^{v/gg}	<i>Deus in nomine tuo</i> ^m	<i>La Bernardina</i> ^s
<i>Missa Sine nomine</i> Pleni ^y Agnus ^{b/f/g}	<i>Domine dominus noster</i> ^{m/a}	<i>L'homme armé</i>
	<i>Domine ne in furore</i> ^m	<i>Mille regretz</i> ^{r/v}
	<i>Domine non secundum</i> ^y	<i>N'esse pas un grand</i> ^t
	<i>Ecce tu pulchra es</i> ^p	<i>Nymphes des bois</i> ^{b/c/g/i/v/f}
	<i>In illo tempore / Et ecce</i>	<i>Nymphes nappées / Circumdedederunt</i> ^t
	<i>In nomine Jesu</i> ^r	<i>Petite camusette</i> ^{m/bb/gg}
	<i>Inviolata integra et casta es</i>	<i>Plus nulz regretz</i> ^t
	<i>Laudate pueri</i>	<i>Plusieurs regretz</i> ^{r/v}
	<i>Liber generationis</i>	<i>Scaramella</i> ^x
	<i>Magnus es tu</i> ^r	<i>Une mousse de Biscaye</i> ^{s/cc}
	<i>Miserere mei deus</i> ^{k/m/aa/dd}	<i>Vivrai je</i> ^t
	<i>Misericordias domini</i> ^{b/g/o}	
	<i>Missus est Gabriel</i>	
	<i>O Jesu fili David</i> [Comment peut avoir] ^{a/f/g/y}	
	<i>O virgo genitrix</i> [Plusieurs regretz]	
	<i>Planxit autem David</i>	
	<i>Qui habitat</i> (canon, fragment) ^r	
	<i>Sic deus dilexit</i> ^m	
	<i>Stabat mater</i> ^{r/w/x/cc/cc}	
	<i>Tribulatio et angustia</i> ^r	
	<i>Tu pauperum refugium</i> ^p	
	<i>Tu solus</i> ^{r/a}	
	<i>Veni sancte spiritus</i> (organ tabl.) ^r	
	<i>Victime paschali laudes</i> ^s	

- a J. Hawkins, *A General History of the Science and Practice of Music*, vol. 2 (London, 1776)
- b C. Burney, *A General History of Music. From the Earliest Ages to the Present Period*, vol. 2 (London, 1782)
- c J.N. Forkel, *Allgemeine Geschichte der Musik*, vol. 2 (Leipzig, 1801)
- d *Musica antiqua. A Selection of Music of this and other Countries from the Commencement of the Twelfth to the Beginning of the Eighteenth Century*, ed. J.S. Smith (London, 1812?)
- e *Stabat mater, motetto a cinque voci da capella, in contrapunto sopra il canto-fermo [...]* Publicato, coll'aggiunta d'una breve notizia della vita del detto autore da Aless. Steff. Choron (Paris, 1815)
- f T. Busby, *Allgemeine Geschichte der Musik* (Leipzig, 1821)
- g R.G. Kiesewetter, *Die Verdienste der Niederlaender um die Tonkunst* (Amsterdam, 1829)
- h R.G. Kiesewetter, *Geschichte der europäisch-abendländischen oder unsrer heutigen Musik* (Leipzig, 1834)
- i C.F. Becker, *Mehrstimmige Gesänge berühmter Componisten des sechzehnten Jahrhunderts* (Dresden, ca. 1840)
- j *Recueil des morceaux de musique ancienne*, vol. 5, No. 41 (Paris, 1843)
- k *Bibliothek (neue) für Kirchenmusik. Mehrstimmige Gesänge mit Orgelbegleitung* (Mainz, 1844)
- l J.J.Maier, *Classische Kirchenwerke alter Meister: für d. Männerchor gesetzt u. bearb.* (Bonn, 1845)
- m *Collectio operum musicorum Batavorum saeculi XVI*, vols. vi-viii, xii, ed. F. Commer (Amsterdam, 1848-1859)
- n M. Toeppler, *Gesänge für den Männerchor* (Bonn, 1850)
- o *Collection de morceaux de chant, tirés des maîtres qui ont le plus contribué aux progrès de la musique et qui occupent un rang distingué dans l'histoire de cet art*, ed. F. Rochlitz (1855)
- p A. de la Fage, *Extraits du catalogue critique et raisonné d'une petite bibliothèque musicale* (Rennes, 1857)
- q *Répertoire de musique d'église*, etc., no. 41 (Bruxelles, ca. 1860)
- r A. Reissmann, *Allgemeine Geschichte der Musik* (München, 1863)
- s A. de la Fage, *Essais de Diphthérogaphie musicale* (Paris, 1864)
- t *Trésor musical*, ed. R.J. van Maldeghem (Bruxelles, 1866-1886)
- u *Zeitschrift für katholische Kirchenmusik*, Beil. 11 & 12 zu Jg. 5 (Gmunden, 1872)
- v *Josquin Deprès, Iodocus Pratensis (1440 oder 50 bis 1521). Eine Sammlung ausgewählter Kompositionen zu 4, 5 und 6 Stimmen*. Publikation älterer praktischer und theoretischer Musikwerke, vol. VI, ed. F. Commer (Berlin, 1877)
- w M.L. Lawson, *Choral Music [...]*, No. 5. (1880)
- x *Geschichte der Musik von August Wilhelm Ambros [...]* Fünfter Band: Beispielsammlung, ed. O. Kade (Leipzig, 1882)
- y *Glareani Dodecachordon, Basileae MDXLVII. Übersetzt und übertragen von Peter Bohn* (Leipzig, 1888)
- z *Illustrationen zur Musikgeschichte I. Weltlicher mehrstimmiger Gesang im 13.-16. Jahrhundert* (Wiesbaden, 1893)
- aa *Anthologie des maîtres religieux primitifs des XVe, XVIe et XVIIe siècles*, ed. Ch. Bordes (ca. 1893-1895)
- bb *Arion. A Collection of Madrigals, Chansons, Part-Songs etc.*, vol. III, ed. L.S. Benson (London, 1899)
- cc *Répertoire profane des chanteurs de Saint-Gervais*, ed. Ch. Bordes (Paris, ca. 1900)
- dd Ed. F. Damrosch (Boston, ca. 1900)
- ee Leonard & Co.'s Part-Songs, No. 54 (London, 1903)
- ff *Collection de musique ancienne. Oeuvres vocales & instrumentales. Premier recueil de musique vocale (XVI et XVII siècles) Chœurs a quatre & cinq voix mixtes* (Paris, 1907?)
- gg *Répertoire populaire de la musique Renaissance* (Paris, 1912)
- hh *Alte Meister aus der Frühzeit des Orgelspiels*, ed. A. Schering (Leipzig, 1913)

from Josquin's contemporaries (both music theorists, writers and others), Burney examines a number of works and comes to the conclusion that Josquin may be seen as ›the father of modern harmony, and the inventor of almost every ingenious contexture of its constituent parts‹.⁷⁴ He then continued: ›As Euclid ranks first among ancient geometers, so Josquin, for the number, difficulty, and excellence of his Musical Canons, seems entitled to the first place among the old Composers [...] Indeed, I have never seen, among all his productions that I have scored, a single movement which is not stamped with some mark of the great master.‹⁷⁵ Many later authors followed suit. Historians such as Forkel,⁷⁶ Kieseewetter,⁷⁷ Schilling,⁷⁸ Fétis,⁷⁹ Brendel,⁸⁰ Ambros,⁸¹

74 C. Burney, *A General History* (cf. note 9), p. 485.

75 *Ibid.*, 509. For a survey of the works that Burney had transcribed to arrive at his judgment of the quality of the music – parts from 16 masses, 9 motets and 6 secular works – see Don Harrán, ›Burney and Ambros as Editors of Josquin's Music‹, *Josquin des Prés. Proceedings of the International Josquin Festival-Conference held at The Juilliard School at Lincoln Center in New York City, 21–25 June 1971*, ed. Edward E. Lowinsky in collaboration with Bonnie J. Blackburn (London etc., 1976), pp. 148–177: pp. 170–172.

76 J.N. Forkel, *Allgemeine Geschichte* (cf. note 9), p. 551: ›Nie hat sich wohl ein Componist einen allgemeinem Ruhm erworben, als dieser Josquinus. Alle alte Musiklehrer reden von seiner Kunst und Geschicklichkeit mit einer Art von Bewunderung.; Idem, 554: ›Ueberhaupt war Josquinus, wie sich aus allen Umständen, die von ihm erzählt werden, schließen läßt, ein wahres Genie, auch vielleicht bisweilen in derjenigen Bedeutung des Worts, die man ihm in unsern Zeiten gewöhnlich zu geben pflegt.‹

77 R.G. Kieseewetter, *Geschichte* (cf. note 45), p. 56: ›Josquin gehört ohne Zweifel unter die grössten musikalischen Genies aller Zeiten.‹

78 Gustav Schilling, *Geschichte der heutigen oder modernen Musik. In ihrem Zusammenhange mit der allgemeinen Welt- und Völkergeschichte* (Karlsruhe 1841), p. 163: ›Josquin des Prés (auch *Jodocus Pratensis* oder *a Prato*), dieser größte musikalische Genius seiner Zeit [...].‹

79 François-Joseph Fétis, *Biographie universelle des musiciens et bibliographie générale de la musique*, deuxième édition, tome deuxième (Paris, 1861), p. 471: ›Depres ou Despres (Josquin), fut un des plus grands musiciens de la fin du quinzième siècle, et celui dont la réputation eut le plus d'éclat. [...] Les Allemands, les Italiens, les Français, les Anglais‹ l'ont unanimement proclamé le plus grand compositeur de son temps [...].‹

80 Franz Brendel, *Geschichte der Musik in Italien, Deutschland und Frankreich. Von den ersten christlichen Zeiten bis auf die Gegenwart. Fünfundzwanzig Vorlesungen gehalten zu Leipzig* (Leipzig, 1867), p. 27: ›Ockenheim's grösster Schüler, Josquin de Prés, oder Jodocus Pratensis, oder a Prato genannt, geb. zu Cambray oder nach andern Angaben zu Condé vor dem Jahre 1455, war der erste jener Niederländer, in dem die Kunst sich unter den bezeichneten Einflüssen von der früheren, bis dahin herrschenden Steifheit, Schwerfälligkeit und Härte einigermaassen befreite; er wurde der Hauptrepräsentant der nun folgenden Epoche, und zu seiner Zeit war es namentlich, wo seine Landsleute sich der unbedingtesten musikalischen Herrschaft in Europa erfreuten.‹

81 Ambros' detailed portrait of Josquin, in the third volume of his *Geschichte der Musik*, may be perhaps be seen as the starting point of modern Josquin scholarship (cf. Helmuth Osthoff, *Josquin Desprez*, vol. 1 (Tutzing, 1962), p. 95). For this portrait, Ambros transcribed 19 complete masses, over 50 motets and more than 20 secular works; for a listing of these scores, which are kept in the music collection of the Österreichische Nationalbibliothek in Vienna, see Don Harrán, Burney and Ambros (cf. note 75), pp. 172–177. As Harrán summarizes, for Ambros Josquin

and Wagner⁸² all lavishly praised Josquin.

The status that Josquin had acquired in the historiography of the 19th century was confirmed by others in musical practice. This brings us back to Anton Averkamp, who as a board member of the VNM had advocated the publication of Josquin's music. Averkamp's plea for Josquin was in fact based on personal experiences with the music itself. He had studied in Amsterdam, Berlin and Munich, and in 1890, following the example of two illustrious predecessors in the Netherlands,⁸³ Averkamp founded a vocal ensemble with which he performed music from Dufay to Diepenbrock. The choir created a furor with programmes featuring Renaissance music.⁸⁴ By 1915 Averkamp had already performed the works by Josquin listed in Table 4,⁸⁵ which had made a huge impression on him. In 1901 he described his experiences with Josquin as follows:

The *Missa Pange lingua* has sections of extraordinary beauty. The *Stabat Mater* is a superb piece of work, a true masterpiece of expression and declamation, despite the long sustained notes of the ›cantus firmus‹ and – I have been able to convince myself of this several times – it does not fail to make a deep impression on the listener. The five-part *O virgo genitrix* is a jewel of voice leading and sound beauty [...] It would be desirable to have Josquin's works published in full; then one could more easily get an overview of his fruitful labour and then his compositions would be sung more often.⁸⁶

marks ›the first appearance in music history of a composer that strikes one, predominantly, with the impression of genius‹ (p. 148). On the topic of Josquin reception in the 19th century and on ›genius‹ as an important aspect of it, see: J. Stenzl, In das Reich (cf. note 73) and F. Krummacher, Wissenschaftsgeschichte (cf. note 73).

82 Peter Wagner, *Geschichte der Messe I. Teil: Bis 1600*. Kleine Handbücher der Musikgeschichte nach Gattungen XI (Leipzig, 1913), 165: ›Die Herausgabe möglichst vieler Josquinscher Messen in einer der neuern Denkmälersammlungen ist eine der Aufgaben, deren Erledigung reichsten Lohn verspricht, nicht nur für die Würdigung des in allem seinem Schaffen interessanten Künstlers, sondern auch für das Verständnis der künstlerischen Ideale seiner Zeit.‹ For more references to Josquin in older literature, see especially Carlo Fiore, ›Josquin Before 1919. Sources for a Reception History‹, *Josquin and the Sublime: Proceedings of the International Josquin Symposium at Roosevelt Academy, Middelburg, 12–15 July, 2009*, edd. Albert Clement & Eric Jas (Turnhout, 2011), pp. 215–240.

83 His predecessors being Daniel de Lange and Johan Cornelis Marius van Riemsdijk; see J. van Gessel, From Scholarship (cf. note 12), and K.R. Rubinoff, Een ongeschreven boek (cf. note 20).

84 For more on Averkamp, see Guido van Oorschot, ›Averkamp, Antonius (Josephus), Anton‹, *Die Musik in Geschichte und Gegenwart, Personenteil 1* (Kassel etc., 1999), cols. 1206–1207 and P. van Langen, Anton Averkamp (cf. note 63), pp. 148–151.

85 See Anton Averkamp, ›Gedenkschrift van het ›Klein-Koor A Cappella‹, 1890–1900‹, *Tijdschrift der Vereeniging voor Noord-Nederlands Muziekgeschiedenis* 7 (1901), pp. 43–70: pp. 51 & 54; and Anton Averkamp, *Gedenkschrift Amsterdamsch A Cappella-koor 1890–1915* (Amsterdam, 1915), pp. 13 & 17.

86 Anton Averkamp, *Gedenkschrift 1901* (cf. note 85), p. 59.

Table 4. Works by Josquin that were performed by Anton Averkamp and his Amsterdamsch A Cappella-Koor.

Mass

Missa Pange lingua (4v)

Motets

Miserere mei deus (5v)

O virgo genitrix (contrafact of *Plusieurs regretz*) (5v)

Stabat Mater (5v)

Tu pauperum refugium (2a pars of *Magnus es tu*) (4v)

Chansons

Douleur me bat (5v)

J'ai bien cause de lamenter (6v)

Petite camusette (6v)

Fifteen years later, he formulated it similarly:

As a great, impressive figure, Josquin des Prés stands at the top. No one has exerted more influence on posterity than Josquin. [...] But it is only with Josquin that one comes to realise that the music will work its way up to the height which its sister arts had long reached. Josquin knows how to move, like no composer before him. His *Stabat Mater* is a work full of noble thoughts; no less so his *Miserere*, despite the long notes of the cantus firmus. But in his smaller motets, as for instance in his five-part *O virgo genitrix*, he is already far ahead of his time and already suggests the Palestrina style [...] It is a pity, a great pity, that Josquin's works have not yet been published in full. May this happen soon and I am sure that we will be in for a surprise.⁸⁷

Averkamp regretted that Josquin's work had not yet been issued, both in 1901 and again in 1915. He was not the only one who wished to see Josquin's music published.⁸⁸ Indeed, Franz Commer had already indicated in 1847 that he was

87 Anton Averkamp, *Gedenkschrift 1915* (cf. note 85), pp. 31–32.

88 Averkamp did not miss many opportunities to share his enthusiasm about Josquin with others, as the following two quotations show: (1) 'The greatest master before Palestrina has undeniably been Josquin de Prés (1450–1521) [...] One is accustomed to regard Palestrina as the first musical genius the world has produced. In Palestrina, then, everything that existed before him should be united. He represents, as it were, his forerunners, he takes them in, perfects their work and, as a result, produces his own creations, which have earned him the title of »Princeps musicae«. However, if one were able to examine the period of the 15th century, so important for our musical history, with the

thinking of publishing Josquin's complete works,⁸⁹ and, apparently Adler was considering to publish at least some of Josquin's music in the Austrian *Denkmäler* series.

For Averkamp, it must therefore have been a foregone conclusion that Josquin's work should and could be published. He was well aware that Josquin was probably born in or near Condé, but that was no longer a problem as the 1911 amendment of the articles of association had made the whole area of the Low Countries a valid area for research.⁹⁰

Let us now return to the meeting of 15 February 1919. It should be pointed out at this stage that the following sequence of events had to be reconstructed as not all correspondence on the genesis of the Josquin edition has been preserved. It seems clear, however, that Scheurleer had also put the question regarding which composer should be edited next to both Seiffert and Wolf, and their advice was to proceed with Willaert.⁹¹ During the board meeting, the choice between Josquin and Willaert was discussed at length and Josquin was generally considered preferable.⁹² There can be little doubt that Averkamp was instrumental in reaching this decision. Smijers, who had been unable to attend the meeting, was

utmost accuracy, one would certainly have to conclude that Josquin's works possess such brilliant qualities, qualities that already make one sense in advance the later works of a Palestrina – that one may easily include him among the few chosen and gifted geniuses. And what gives Josquin's art such an extraordinary strength is its versatility. Not only in the field of mass or motet composition, but also in the field of song we have true little masterpieces by Josquin and they can be so naughty that one would hardly have expected this from the venerable provost. It is true that numerous works by Josquin can be found scattered in collections; for example in the great work of Commer, in the »Publikationen Werke älterer Meister« etc. etc. But is it not high time that we finally have him completely in front of us and that the injustice done to him by Baini, the well known Palestrina-biographer – who always wants to diminish his merit in order to praise *his* hero more – is completely erased?« (A. Averkamp, *De verhouding* (cf. note 50), pp. 216–217). (2) »Willaert's immediate predecessor is Josquin de Prés. So it is only natural to compare the works of both composers. It must be admitted that Josquin is more brilliant than Willaert. His inspiration is of a nobler quality, his fantasy is richer, he knows how to touch one's soul more deeply and one is more impressed by a true artistic expression. On the other hand, there is a certain naive awkwardness, the repeated use of two-voice phrases and not infrequently a stiffness in the treatment of the voice, which indicate that the development of music is still in its infancy.« (A. Averkamp, *Adriaen Willaert* (cf. note 54), p. 25)

89 A. J. M. Asselbergs, Dr. Jan Pieter Heije (cf. note 3), p. 343.

90 A. Averkamp, *De verhouding* (cf. note 50), p. 216: »He is Hainaut by birth, presumably Condé is his place of birth.« Josquin's region of birth had been known since the mid-19th century; see also, for example, F.-J. Fétis, *Biographie universelle* (cf. note 79), p. 472.

91 Unfortunately, a letter confirming this advice was not saved among Scheurleer's or the VNM's correspondence. Seiffert's letter of 12 March 1919, however, refers to an earlier advice: »The reasons that led us to propose Willaert in particular for another major edition after Obrecht were not based on an underestimation or even rejection of Josquin.« The rest of Seiffert's letter of 12 March aimed to explain this choice and proposed an alternative plan. NMI 230: *Archief KVNM*, inv. no. 255 (letters received in 1919).

92 See Smijers' report in A. Smijers, Dr. Scheurleer (cf. note 67), p. 31.

invited two days later by Scheurleer to come to The Hague to discuss the important decisions that had been taken.⁹³ No doubt Seiffert and Wolf were informed of the board's position after 15 February and on 12 March, Seiffert replied to Scheurleer to explain his and Wolf's choice and to suggest a compromise. In this letter, Seiffert first states that Willaert would be a good candidate because he was a major figure from the period between Obrecht and Sweelinck, whereas Josquin was in Obrecht's generation. As he put it to Scheurleer: ›As a good wine connoisseur, you know that you don't always treat your guests to just one type of wine, but rather change the taste.‹ He then continues with an argument favouring Josquin: ›One reason, however, which nevertheless speaks very strongly in favour of Josquin, is the known intention of the Austrians to draw Josquin into the work plan of their *Denkmäler* and thereby disturb the clearly present circles of the Society. It is impossible for the Society to allow this national task to be taken out of its hands.‹ For these two reasons Seiffert and Wolf now suggested to publish the works of Willaert and Josquin simultaneously. Sources for both composers could be collected together and as many ›Originalausgaben‹ were available for both composers, publication of the first volumes would not need to wait until all manuscript sources had been collected.⁹⁴ For the supervision of these two editions, Seiffert proposed forming a commission of five: Scheurleer could act as chairman, and Smijers, Averkamp, Wolf and Seiffert would serve as its members. The actual preparation of the volumes could be assigned to three or four employees.⁹⁵ Scheurleer was actually enthusiastic about Seiffert's proposal. It did place him, however, in a slightly awkward position, as the board had already expressed a clear preference to proceed with Josquin. It would seem that Seiffert's reply with an alternative scenario was not expected. On 20 March 1919 Scheurleer forwarded Seiffert's letter to Smijers with the request to add his views and have them circulate it among the members of the board.⁹⁶ Smijers complied with this

93 Letter of Smijers to Scheurleer of 18 February 1919; NMI 008: Archief Scheurleer, inv. no. 140G, folder H: Correspondence VNM editions 1918–1927 A. Smijers.

94 It would seem that with ›Originalausgaben‹ Seiffert refers to printed editions of works by one composer, that were issued during this composer's lifetime; possibly, with the suggestion of some sort of authorial permission.

95 In a letter from 3 April 1919, Johannes Wolf summarized his and Seiffert's considerations as follows: ›The Society has two major tasks to fulfil: the publication of the complete works of Josquin and Willaert. Both are milestones of development. Willaert is the source of the most lively inspiration in all areas of music; instrumental and vocal art are most deeply indebted to him. The Renaissance movement is inconceivable without him, and the rise of modern music is intimately linked to his work. Josquin, the idol of Italy, should by no means be forgotten. But we thought to tackle him only after Willaert, because his great contemporary Jacob Obrecht has just been treated.‹ NMI 008: Archief Scheurleer, inv. no. 140G, folder H. Correspondence VNM editions 1905–1922 Joh. Wolf.

96 Note of 20 March 1919 from Scheurleer to Smijers; NMI 230: Archief KVNMM, inv. no. 255: Letters received in 1919, letter no. 972.

request, but had in the meantime already designed a work plan to proceed with an edition of Josquin's works and that plan had been put to the members of the board. In an official advice of the expert members of the board of 21 March, Averkamp responds as follows:

Dr Smijers' work plan seems plausible to me; it shows a practical view of things. If we stand by our decision to first publish Josquin, then I would suggest that we ask Mr Smijers to make a budget. This will probably be difficult and more or less a shot in the dark. But is this not the case with all such budgets?

It is certainly strange that Mr Seiffert and Mr Wolf want to deal with Willaert first. However, as long as they do not give sufficient reasons why, I see no reason to change my preference for Josquin. In any case, I think it is to be welcomed that – as our chairman said at our last meeting – a fellow countryman will be commissioned to publish our society's major publication.⁹⁷

Julius Röntgen and Simon van Milligen concurred with Averkamp's advice.⁹⁸ But now that Seiffert's explanation of his preference for Willaert had come after all, it needed to be handled. In a long letter, written and forwarded to the secretary of the board on 23 March, Smijers explained why in his opinion Seiffert's and Wolf's proposal was unwise.⁹⁹ The arguments Smijers put forward in his letter are mediocre at best. In fact, only at the beginning of his letter does he argue why it would be better to publish Josquin's music first, and only then publish Willaert's:

Now that the Obrecht-edition will soon be completed, Josquin comes first chronologically; moreover, Josquin is Willaert's teacher, and only by publishing the works of both of them one after the other, will it be possible to determine the proper significance of both composers. Willaert, after all,

97 Amsterdam, 21 March 1919: Advice of board members at Amsterdam; NMI 230: Archief KVNMI, inv. no. 255: Letters received in 1919, letter no. 886. The opinion of these board members was supported by the secretary of the board, Pijzel, in a letter to Scheurleer of 24 March; NMI 008: Archief Scheurleer, inv. no. 140G, folder G. Correspondentie VNM 1919–1927 Pijzel. This letter contains an amusing detail regarding the edition of Josquin's chansons. Apparently, Scheurleer originally had the idea to ask Adler to prepare the secular works of Josquin, because some of them might have texts that would be inappropriate for a priest (such as Smijers) to edit.

98 Van Milligen's consent is dated 23 March.

99 E. Reeser, *De Vereeniging* (cf. note 1), p. 63; P. van Langen, Anton Averkamp (cf. note 63), pp. 154–155; NMI 230, inv. no. 255: Letters received in 1919, letter no. 888. In accordance with Scheurleer's request, Smijers forwarded his letter to secretary Pijzel, who then made sure that the remaining board members all read Seiffert's letter and Smijers' response.

is certainly dependent on Josquin; for example, Willaert's *Missa super Benedicta* was written in response to a motet by Josquin; how will it be possible to assess the value of this mass when one does not know what in it is taken from Josquin and what in it is originally from Willaert?

That Willaert was in some respects indebted to Josquin may be true, and that the ›proper significance‹ of both composers could only be determined after both their *œuvres* had been published is obvious, but why this should be a legitimate reason for chronology with regard to the publication of their works is not clear. Perhaps Smijers sensed that this argument would not be sufficiently convincing, and this would explain why, in the remainder of the letter, he addressed the sensitive issue of finances. The Obrecht-edition had been a costly project, and had required longer trips, especially to Italy, to uncover and copy source materials.¹⁰⁰ Smijers argued that the costs for an edition of Josquin's work would be less because of Wolf's meticulous preparatory work for the Obrecht edition that had enabled him to correct details of Eitner's *Quellen-Lexikon* and to add new ones that also concerned Josquin. Collecting sources for Josquin's music would also be straightforward, as catalogues had already been compiled of early music available in various Austrian and German libraries, and because photography could be used to bring source materials back to the Netherlands.¹⁰¹ According to Smijers, in the absence of an Italian catalogue of early music, collecting sources for Willaert's works would make more sense a few years later:

As far as I know, this method has not yet been used in Italy, but I think I can assume that in the course of a few years, this idea will also be considered there, so that the rummaging through all the libraries will not be necessary in Italy either. If we now start with Josquin, and can wait a few years with Willaert, then we have every chance of achieving a much more affordable Willaert edition.

In hindsight, one has to conclude that an Italian catalogue of early music never materialised, and that one may reasonably wonder if Wolf's work for the Obrecht edition in the end really saved Smijers that much time in tracing Italian Josquin sources. Smijers' assumption that locating Italian sources for Willaert's music would take far more time than collecting Italian Josquin sources is also unlikely. Actually, only three Italian libraries preserve (a handful of) motets by Willaert

100 Cf. note 51.

101 Averkamp and Scheurleer had already experimented with the photographing of the 's-Hertogenbosch manuscripts prior to 1915 (cf. note 58). It seems likely, therefore, that the idea of photographing sources in foreign libraries was suggested to Smijers by Averkamp and/or Scheurleer.

and contain no music by Josquin.¹⁰² Collecting sources for Josquin's music also took more time than anticipated, as there was far more material than expected.¹⁰³

Smijers also questioned Seiffert's plan to appoint a committee of five to oversee the editions:

Finally, I would like to urge the Board to ensure unity of the editorial staff; in my opinion, this will be impossible if, according to Professor Seiffert's proposal, we surround ourselves with a whole staff of contributors. The fewer people who lead this publication, the better. Of course, the Board of the Society always has the right to veto disputes about the publication. For the editing of the *Editio Vaticana*, for example, a commission was appointed by the Pope, consisting of several members; however, the work did not proceed smoothly in this way, and the end result was that the Pope sent all members home, except Dom Pothier, and charged him alone with the further execution of the work.

Clearly, Smijers was not too keen about having two, or more, captains on one ship. The comment that the board could always veto certain issues was in a sense a sham because, with the exception of Averkamp, not a single member of the board was really knowledgeable about preparing a scholarly edition of the works of a composer such as Josquin, which was, of course, the main reason why the board had had to rely upon the Germans Seiffert and Wolf for the Sweelinck and Obrecht editions.

In hindsight, little in Smijers' letter can be taken as a solid argument for Josquin and against Willaert. It was enough, however, to convince the board, and this, in itself, is not strange. Averkamp had already convinced the board that proceeding with Josquin would be the best option, so all that was needed were a few arguments from the one person who had been elected to the board precisely because of his specialist knowledge in this area.¹⁰⁴

102 In comparing the Willaert source list in D.M. Kidger, *Adrian Willaert* (cf. note 59), pp. 119–196 with the Josquin list of sources in *New Josquin Edition, vol. 1: The Sources*, edd. Willem Elders & Eric Jas (Utrecht, 2013), 102–173 I found only three libraries that preserve manuscripts with music by Willaert but not by Josquin: Lucca, Biblioteca Statale, MS 775; Rome, Biblioteca Musicale Governativa del Conservatorio di Musica Santa Cecilia, MSS G. 792–795; Turin, Biblioteca Nazionale Universitaria. MS Riserva musicale IV.45 (*olim* Regia Biblioteca dell'Università, q^m VI. 86).

103 See Smijers' letter of 11 September 1919 to Scheurleer (NMI 008: Archief Scheurleer, inv. no. 140G. Folder Correspondence VNM 1919–1927, Smijers).

104 As Bottenheim, a fellow board member of the VNM put it in his *In Memoriam* for Averkamp (Salomon Bottenheim, »Ant. Averkamp (18 Februari 1861 – 1 Juni 1934)«, in: *Tijdschrift der Vereniging voor Nederlandsche Muziekgeschiedenis* 14/3 [1935], pp. 129–131: p. 130): »The fact that the edition of Josquin des Prés could be undertaken by a Dutchman and delivered

At its 27 June 1919 meeting, the decision was made to publish Josquin's work and Smijers was chosen as the editor for the series.¹⁰⁵ Apparently the board's deliberations had led to some sort of compromise, as the minutes of the meeting also mention:

If possible, he will also conduct an investigation into what can be found of Willaert's works in various libraries, which can then be used for a later complete edition, or, in view of the time the Josquin edition will require, first for one or more smaller editions.

This compromise, which may have been reached out of respect for Seiffert and Wolf, never materialised. When Smijers started preparing his first journeys to collect sources for the Josquin edition, he did indeed ask Scheurleer whether he should also photograph sources for Willaert's works, but it seems that that plan was soon abandoned.¹⁰⁶ In the summer that same year, Smijers travelled to Vienna, Italy, Switzerland and Germany, trips that eventually led to an impressive archive of 5000 photos of sources of works by Josquin.¹⁰⁷ Three years later, four hundred and one years after the death of Josquin, the first volume of the edition appeared in print.

In conclusion, let me summarise the considerations and actions that ultimately led to the publication of Josquin's music by the VNM. First it should be noted that for the VNM as well as for someone like Max Seiffert it was obvious that the works of a composer who was born in the Low Countries should be published by an institution from that geographical area. On the other hand, there was clear awareness that almost all composers from the Low Countries were born outside the borders of the 1830 Kingdom of the Netherlands. In 1911 the articles of association of the VNM were amended so that its exploration of 15th- and 16th-century music could continue. This appealed so much to the imagination of the VNM, because 19th-century publications had made it abundantly clear that

in a scholarly manner was in no small measure due to Averkamp's drive and policy. In 1919 the board of the VNM consisted of the following persons: dr. D. F. Scheurleer (chairman), dr. E.D. Pijzel (secretary), Mr. A. de Stoppelaar (treasurer), A. Averkamp (vice-chairman), S. Bottenheim (librarian), S. van Milligen, J.H. Sikemeijer, dr. A. Smijers, and the composer J. Röntgen; see E. Reeser, *De Vereeniging* (cf. note 1), pp. 80–81; M. van der Riet, Daniël François Scheurleer (cf. note 62), p. 153, footnote 36.

105 NMI 230: Archief KVMN, inv. no. 1: *Notulenboek*, meeting of 9 March 1919, p. 340; E. Reeser, *De Vereeniging* (cf. note 1), p. 63.

106 See Smijers's letter of 29 July 1919 to Scheurleer (NMI 008: Archief Scheurleer, inv. no. 140G. Folder Correspondence VNM 1919–1927, Smijers). Later letters from Smijers to Scheurleer in the same collection no longer mention the intention of collecting Willaert sources.

107 See the report on these trips in Albert Smijers, »De uitgave der werken van Josquin des Prés«, *Tijdschrift der Vereeniging voor Nederlandsche Muziekgeschiedenis* 10 (1922), pp. 164–179.

in no other period of the history of the Netherlands or the Low Countries had composers risen to such heights and been so influential throughout Europe. The change in the articles of association may have been somewhat opportunistic, but it should not be forgotten that at the time, there were no publishers in Belgium or France who were equipped to undertake projects such as the Obrecht and Josquin editions.¹⁰⁸

The driving force behind the publication of Josquin's music was Anton Averkamp, a musician and a senior board member with more than twenty years of administrative experience in the VNM. Averkamp had come under the spell of Josquin's works by performing some of them with his vocal ensemble and had argued already in 1901 that the lack of a Josquin edition was a deficiency that needed to be addressed. When the prospect of that possibility became a reality with the approaching completion of the Obrecht edition, Averkamp suggested admitting Smijers to the board with the specific aim of making him the first Dutchman to be in charge of a major VNM edition. The fact that he introduced Smijers as someone who had been engaged in Josquin research—be it true, slightly exaggerated, or plainly false—was no coincidence. There is no record of the meeting in which the board chose between Willaert and Josquin, but one can easily imagine that Averkamp put all his experience and knowledge into ensuring the choice was Josquin. Once that choice was made, it was effectively a done deal. And what about Smijers? Well, he arrived on the scene just in time to support Averkamp's ideas and become the first Dutch scholar to prepare a large-scale edition for the VNM.

108 The Société française de musicologie did not start its early music series until 1925 and the Société Belge de Musicologie was not founded until 1946.

