

Nils Grosch

Musicology at the University of Salzburg
Muzikološki inštitut Univerze v Salzburgu

The Old German Folksongs philological: Tracing a Fake*

Staronemške ljudske pesmi s filološkega vidika: Sledenje ponaredkom

Prejeto: 2. september 2013
Sprejeto: 7. oktober 2013Received: 2nd September 2013
Accepted: 7th October 2013

Ključne besede: nemška ljudska pesem, tenorska pesem, Franz Magnus Böhme, Ludwig Erk, Thomas Stoltzer

Keywords: German folk song, Tenorlied, Franz Magnus Böhme, Ludwig Erk, Thomas Stoltzer

IZVLEČEK

Srednjeveške in zgodnje novoveške ljudske pesmi (*Volkslieder*), ki sta jih v publikaciji »Deutscher Liederhort« in drugih objavila Erk in Böhme, označujejo postopek izmišljene tradicije. Čeprav naj bi temeljile na znanstveni in jezikoslovni točnosti, so te zbirke vključevale potvarjanje virov in znatno ponarejena in zavajajoča izročila izvirnih pesmi.

ABSTRACT

The middle age and early modern *Volkslieder*, published by Erk and Böhme in "Deutscher Liederhort" etc., mark the process of an invented tradition. Though pretending to be founded on the basis of scholarly and philological accurateness, these editions included manipulations of sources and substantially falsifying and misleading renditions of the original songs.

In 1877 Franz Magnus Böhme complained that the German poet and folk material collector Ludwig Uhland had only revealed half of the picture of medieval folk singing because the tunes belonging to the lyrics, although extant, were excluded.¹ Intending to complete through reconstruction what Uhland's text-oriented collection and edition

* This is a reworked version of my paper "Die ‚Altdeutschen Volkslieder‘ des 19. Jahrhunderts: Auf den Spuren eines editorischen Konstrukts", in . ed. by John Eckhard and Widmaier Tobias (Trier: Wissenschaftlicher Verlag, 2010), 190–199. I owe many thanks to Daniel Müllensieffen, David Lewis, Tim Crawford, and Albrecht Classen for their help with the English version.

¹ Franz M. Böhme, *Altdeutsches Liederbuch: Volkslieder der Deutschen nach Wort und Weise aus dem 12. bis zum 17. Jahrhundert* (Leipzig: Breitkopf & Härtel, 1877), V.

of the *Volkslieder* already had offered, he now proposed as a musicologist's duty to "restore these folk songs approximately as they had existed in the *Volksmund* [popular oral tradition] and, by doing so, to give an approximate image of German folk music of the past"². Consequently, he informs the user of his *Altdeutsches Liederbuch*, as well as his *Deutscher Liederhort*, the latter published from Ludwig Erk's estate, that he "reproduced the melodies authentically from the sources [quellengetreu], so that the reader may be assured, that the old tunes have looked and sounded this and no other way"³.

This, for example, is how they looked:

744. Abschied im Winter.

Forster I, 1539. Pet. Schöffer 1537. Gerle 1532.

} Ent-lau-bet ist der Wal-de gen die-se-m Win-ter kalt. }
 } Be-rau-bet werd ich bal-de mein's Lieb's, das macht mich alt. }
 Daß ich die Schön muß mei-den, die mir ge-fal-len thut, bringt
 mir heim-li-ches Lei-den und macht mir schwe-ren Mutz.

* Ott 1544.

Forster 1549.

Gassenhauer 1535.

Spätere Choralform.

Ich dank dir, lieber Herr, (Morgenlied).

- | | |
|--|--|
| <p>1. Entlaubet ist der Walde
Gen diesem Winter kalt,
Beraubet werd ich balde
Meins Lieb's, das macht mich alt;
Daß ich die Schön muß meiden,
Die mir gefallen thut,
Bringt mir mannsfältig leiden,
Macht mir fast schweren Mut.</p> | <p>2. Was läßt du mir zur Lege,
Mein brauns schwarz Mägdelein,
Daß mich die Weil ergebe,
So ich von dir muß sein?
Hoffnung muß mich eruehren,
Nach dir so wüird ich krank:
Thu bald herwieder kehren,
Die Zeit wird mir zu lang!</p> |
|--|--|
3. So weiß, laß dich nit affen!
Der Kasser feind so viel;
Halt dich gen mir rechtschaffen!
Treulich dich warnen will;
Hilt dich vor falschen Zungen,
Darauf sei wol bedacht!
Sei dir, schön's Lieb gesungen
Zu tausend guter Nacht.

Quellen: Forster I, 1539, Nr. 61. (Daber Mel. und untergelegte Strophe.) Gassenhauerlin 1535 Nr. 1. Pet. Schöffer und Apianus, 65 teutscher Lieder 1537, Nr. 42. J. Dtt,

Table 1: Edition *Entlaubet ist der Walde, Böhme 1877, 549.*

² Ibid., XIII.

³ Ibid..

The publication claimed authenticity and philological correctness, and Erk's and Böhme's song editions were "meant for academic use"⁴. As Erk had done before, Böhme now distinguished his methods from the ones which had been applied in publications like those by Wilhelm von Zuccalmaglio: "None among the many German folk song collections had done more harm to the development of the authentic folk singing" than Zuccalmaglio's *Deutsche Volkslieder mit ihren Originalmelodien* von 1840, as Erk stated, "containing excessive corruptions", "song fakes" as well as "disfigurements".⁵

This conflict, which might be seen as an expert's dispute from a long time ago (into which even Johannes Brahms had intervened in order to defend Zuccalmaglio) turns out to be paradigmatic for folk song scholarship even today.

By 1928, Erich Seemann among others had already accused Böhme of having committed grave inaccuracies and "manipulations" in handling songs from oral transmission that led Seemann to fundamental doubts about the "reliability of the authentic edition of the songs"⁶. And already John Meier⁷ accused Böhme of "failing to preserve aesthetic value", "ludicrous prudery"⁸ and of "a childish lack of orientation", "unparalleled hastiness and inaccuracy", and even the "incapacity to transcribe and quote properly"⁹.

However, this criticism (that Brednich later tried to soften with factual arguments) was centered around philological deficiencies, most of them regarding the *Deutscher Liederhort*. The criticism, though, never focused on the fact that Böhme intentionally (and of course not accidentally) produced substantially falsifying and misleading renditions of the original songs. The purpose of this undertaking was obviously to lend legitimacy and authority to the image of the *Lied* genre (an image partly still persisting) and the corresponding terminology. This is the case despite the fact that most late-medieval and early-modern songs do not lend themselves to such an interpretation; the *Lied* is often thought of as a simple work comprising a melody and a multi-stanza text (usually limited in length), neither of which can be associated with a specific author. In the upper section of the edition, the musical sources are referred to in abbreviated form, which are then detailed in the apparatus: Prints, which can be identified with reference to the names of editors or printers, and which seem to indicate a stable unity of tune and text in the tradition of the respective songs as bimedial objects (i.e., consisting of text and melody). This suggests, that "these old songs, that once – without distinction – had been sung by princes and peasants, by bourgeois and nobles, clericals and profanes, minstrels and footpads, journeyman and country lasses etc." had been "transmitted orally over long periods until the present day", and "can still be heard in the lower classes in somewhat altered forms. They are songs from the folk's heart and mouth"¹⁰.

Indeed, only a few of the songs, which were exploited commercially in the early 16th century, are documented during the pre-Gutenberg era. Important sources are the exten-

⁴ Ibid., IX.

⁵ Ludwig Erk, "Rezensionen und Anzeigen", *Cäcilia (Mainz)* 27 (1848): 208–10, 220.

⁶ Erich Seemann, "Ein Musterbeispiel zu den Ungenauigkeiten Böhmes in seinem Deutschen Liederhort", *Jahrbuch für Volksliedforschung* 1 (1928): 185.

⁷ Rolf Wilhelm Brednich, [Review of "Deutscher Liederhort"], *Jahrbuch für Volksliedforschung* 10 (1965): 162–163.

⁸ Ibid., 163.

⁹ Ibid.

¹⁰ Franz M. Böhme, *Altdeutsches Liederbuch: Volkslieder der Deutschen nach Wort und Weise aus dem 12. bis zum 17. Jahrhundert* (Leipzig: Breitkopf & Härtel, 1877), XXII.

sive late-fifteenth-century song manuscripts, for example: ‘Der Wald hat sich entlaubet’ (from *Lochamer Liederbuch*), ‘Elslein, liebes Elselein’ and ‘Es liegt ein Schloss in Österreich’ (from *Glogauer Handschrift*), which later reappear in printed anthologies.

As an example, ‘Schloss in Österreich’ until recently has been interpreted as a “paradigmatic model of a folk ballad”, because it experienced a “rich and continuous tradition extending from the 15th to the 20th century”, as Holzapfel¹¹ noted. However, a survey of all the extant sources for ‘Schloss in Österreich’¹² reveals that a coherent tradition does not begin before the early 17th century, distributed by broadsheets being the predominant medium.

A 17 stanza broadsheet version from 1606 does not prove provenance from the Middle Ages, even though this has been claimed repeatedly as evidence.¹³ The second part of Georg Forsters *Teusche Liedlein* from its second (1549) to its fourth edition (1565) had contained Caspar Othmayr’s four-part composition with the same incipit. Thus, this composition must have been reasonably widespread, and so this version alone might have inspired the later broadsheet version from 1606.

A connection between Othmayr’s version and the three-part compositions that appeared seven decades earlier in the *Glogauer Handschrift* seems rather unlikely. There are no obvious musical similarities, and the lyrics are reduced to the incipit „Es leit ein schloß in Österreich“, that is nothing more than a balladesque formula anyway. Nonetheless, Böhme/Erk along with later editors in their standard scholarly editions¹⁴ combined the discantus part of this early version with the later lyrics with the intention of suggesting a continuous tradition. The former even separated the discantus part as monophonic melody from the composition’s context without clearly annotating how scarce the evidence is for such an association.

At first sight, constructing a historiography in such a way seems easier in the case of the winter song ‘Entlaubet ist der Walde’, which is also documented in a fifteenth century manuscript (in *Lochamer-Liederbuch*), but its biggest push toward popularisation happened in the middle of the 16th century. The presence of an early exemplar made traditional scholars of the „Tenorlied“ focus on this song as paradigmatic for their considerations regarding the Tenorlied genre.¹⁵ This idea has to be corrected in some respects, particularly regarding the dating of the song as far back as to the middle of the 15th century. Again, the key to the sudden popularity of this song, which appeared in almost every important songbook of the 1530s, was a version identified in its 16th

¹¹ Otto Holzapfel, *Das große deutsche Volksballadenbuch* (Düsseldorf, Zürich: Artemis & Winkler, 2000), 507–508

¹² See the source list in John Meier, ed., *Deutsche Volkslieder mit ihren Melodien: Balladen 1*, ed. Deutsches Volksliedarchiv (Berlin, Leipzig: De Gruyter, 1935), 258–263.

¹³ As in: Ludwig Erk and Franz M. Böhme, *Deutscher Liederhort: Auswahl der vorzüglicheren deutschen Volkslieder* (Leipzig: Breitkopf & Härtel, 1893/94), vol. 1, 206–207; John Meier, ed., *Deutsche Volkslieder mit ihren Melodien: Balladen 1*, ed. Deutsches Volksliedarchiv (Berlin, Leipzig: De Gruyter, 1935), 252–253; Otto Holzapfel, *Das große deutsche Volksballadenbuch* (Düsseldorf, Zürich: Artemis & Winkler, 2000), 308–309.

¹⁴ Like Meier, *Deutsche Volkslieder ...*, 250 and Heribert Ringmann, ed., *Das Glogauer Liederbuch 1: Deutsche Lieder und Spielstücke* (Kassel: Bärenreiter, 1936), vol. 4, 16.

¹⁵ „Mit diesem und den anderen vier dreistimmigen Tenorliedern aus Lo [dem *Lochamer-Liederbuch*] beginnt die über 100 Jahre währende Blütezeit einer auf präexistenten oder im Hinblick auf die Bearbeitung geschaffenen Tenores basierenden mehrstimmigen, vorwiegend weltlichen deutschen Liedkunst.“ Kurt Gudewill, “Deutsche Volkslieder in mehrstimmigen Kompositionen aus der Zeit von ca. 1450 bis ca. 1630”, *Handbuch des Volksliedes*, eds. Rolf W. Brednich et al. (München: Fink, 1975), vol. 2, 439.

century print by a composers' name: the four-part composition by Thomas Stoltzer. It was first published in a tablature for strings in Hans Gerle's didactic work *Musica Teusch* (Nürnberg 1532)¹⁶, in this instance without Stoltzer's name. In 1535 Christian Egenolff in Frankfurt printed the first version in mensural notation – as the first song in his popular *Gassenhawerlin*¹⁷. The initials H.H. were printed along with it, and as early as 1927 Moser suspected that this designated the Hessian court composer Johann (Hans) Heugel. Immediately afterwards, three printed anthologies borrowed Stoltzer's composition.¹⁸

It is impossible to assume a continuous and homogeneous tradition of the song that began in the middle 15th century and led to the song practice in the middle of the 16th century. The only existing musical version, which preceded the commercialization in print, is the three part *Lochamer* composition. And this one, with respect to its music, lyrics, and other features, is clearly dissimilar from its successor a century later. If we compare the *Lochamer* version to the existing records of the lyrics from before 1530, we will find, however, that a good number of elements contained in the *Lochamer*-version are preserved into the early 16th century:

Two broadsheets printed in Ulm around 1496 and in Erfurt in 1529, testify¹⁹, a vast literal adoption of the first two stanzas' lyrics, as given in the *Lochamer Liederbuch*²⁰. But thereafter a completely new continuation begins. Such a phenomenon can certainly not be explained through the processes of oral variation. This is specifically contradicted by the almost exact copying of the songs at the beginning. On the other hand, personal decisions of scribes or editors might perfectly explain this phenomenon.

From the 1530s on, the tradition of the song turns out to be very stable. Firstly, this is true, regarding the lyrics. The general characteristics that mark a second strand of this song's tradition, that was obviously much more influenced by its publication in music prints than in broadsheets can be summarised: a slight but eye-catching modification of the opening phrase from „Der Wald hat sich entlaubet“ into „Entlaubet ist der Walde“ and the reduction to only three stanzas while retaining the text motifs²¹, the metrical structure and the rhyming scheme, and the general contents of the poem. Its typical form can be recognised by the altered initial phrase and the re-shaped second and third stanza.

As soon as this form emerged, the older one that originated in the 15th century, practically disappeared. In contrast, the three-stanza version can be found in four-part settings, firstly in the Southwest of Germany (1535 with Egenolff in Frankfurt, ca. 1536 with Schöffler/Apiarius in Straßburg), later as well in the Nuremberg music prints.²² This version established also a musically stable strand that turned out to be canonic for the tradition to follow. For example, Heinrich Knaust's contrafactum, which was published

¹⁶ Howard Mayer Brown, *Instrumental Music printed before 1600: A Bibliography* (Cambridge, Mass.: Harvard University Press, 1965), 1532.

¹⁷ RISM 1535¹⁰; Moser, ed., 1927.

¹⁸ The Schoeffer/Apiarius Songbook [1536]⁸ (cf.); Newsidler: Brown 1965: 1536_g; Forster: RISM: 1539²⁷. In the following, the high index numbers refer to RISM (Lésure, ed., 1960), the low index numbers refer to Brown 1965.

¹⁹ As shown by the synopsis in Christoph Petzsch and Walter Salmen, eds., *Das Lochamer-Liederbuch: Denkmäler der Tonkunst in Bayern* (Wiesbaden: Breitkopf & Härtel, 1972), vol. 2, 52–53.

²⁰ Ibid.

²¹ Notably the so called „Winterlied“-Konzept, that goes back to Neidhardt and already had become an often-repeated pattern; cf. Classen, 37–38.

²² Cf. Forster's first volume of *Liedlein* by Petreius (1539²⁷), later prints by Berg und Neuber and Hans Ott (1544²⁰).

in his 1571 'Gassenhawer, Reuter und Bergliedlin' and which was probably based on Egenolff's 1535 *Gassenhawerlin* edition (both the 1535 and 1571 *Gassenhawer* editions came from Egenolff's press in Frankfurt), referred explicitly to that second, three-stanza version of the song.

From the 1540s, the song was transmitted in abundance. The transmission was partly oral as indicated by the entries in private song manuscripts, including the *Darfelder Liederhandschrift* (titled here: „Untlovet is der walde“²³). But it was transmitted in many popular printed anthologies as, for instance, the so-called *Frankfurt Songbooks* from the last third of the century.²⁴ The form of the song's transmission here reveals the influence of the three-stanza design, introduced along with the Stoltzer version, that had been published in music books and lute tablatures. In the course of the century, this version established itself as a kind of 'standard form' of *Entlaubet*.

Also in musical terms, a stable and established form of the song seems to have been invented by the Stoltzer version. The distribution of this form was enhanced by the possibility of successful mass production of music prints which in turn depended on the invention of the single-phase impression technology introduced in the 1530s. It first appeared during the 1530s²⁵ in a tablature for strings (Gerle 1532), two mensural prints (Schoeffer/Apiarius 1536 and Forster 1539) and one lute book (Newsidler 1536).

By the same token, the four-part version by Heugel (in Egenolff 1535) contains much more of Stoltzer's version than the mere tenor melody. In fact, the similarities affect all parts of the composition, as a short comparison may show: of special importance is the common disposition of pitches in the beginning of the piece, as well as in the further course of the composition, for instance, very prominently, in the parts with greater importance for the building of the cadences. Many of the modifications in the discantus, altus and bassus can be regarded as fundamental techniques of embellishment and diminution, that are, indeed, not covered in didactic prints before the second half of the 16th century. But, as Wulf Arlt has argued, these techniques must have been in use for centuries.²⁶ The comparison of these two versions (Heugel-Stoltzer), thus shows that they can hardly be recognized as two "works" by different "composers," nor as different arrangements of a pre-existing combination of tenor melody and lyrics. Rather they represent two different social and medial functions of the same musical substance, resulting from different communicative perspectives. Gerle and Forster (Stoltzer) present the piece as a didactic example for amateur string players. On the other hand, Heugel, the professional court musician, and along with him the Frankfurt printer and editor Christian Egenolff, already based on a 'potential' performance situation that would require a musical text, like the one provided by Gerle or Forster, as basis of departure. Hence, the Heugel version should not be interpreted primarily as a material for musical performance, but rather as the result of performance or as an attempt to translate it into a written form.

²³ Cf. Brednich, Rolf Wilhelm, ed., *Die Darfelder Liederhandschrift, 1546–1565* (Münster: Aschendorff, 1976), nr. 32: 219–20.

²⁴ Cf. Wolfgang Suppan, *Deutsches Liedleben zwischen Renaissance und Barock* (Tutzing: Schneider, 1973), 64–65; Joseph Bergmann, ed., *Das Ambraser Liederbuch vom Jahre 1582* (Stuttgart: Literar. Verein, 1845).

²⁵ Brown 1965: 1536_o, 1544₁, 1544₂ und 1547₁.

²⁶ Wulf Arlt, "Einleitung/Zwischen ‚Improvisation‘ und ‚Komposition‘", in Richard Erig, ed., *Italienische Diminutionen: Die zwischen 1553 und 1638 mehrmals bearbeiteten Sätze* (Zürich: Amadeus, 1979): 9–21.

An important indicator of the popularity of the song is the reference made to the melody (*Tonangaben*) indicating that other lyrics are to be sung with it, as we find in broadsheets. Broadsheets from before 1530 that name the incipit 'Der wald hat sich entlaubet', refer to other melodies as tune references. So, we can exclude the possibility that the song had been as popular before this time. Nevertheless, from the 1530s on, we find references to the *Entlaubet* melody itself in numerous broadsheet songs, and, we can consider that a clear indication, not only of the popularity of the song from now on, but as well of the fact, that the popularity of the music resulted from of the music prints. Obviously, broadsheet printers and editors tried to commercially exploit the success, which the song already had gained in music books, particularly in the *Gassenhaverlin*.

The popularity of the song determine the shape of the four part song, its lyrics and its musical configuration, as well as its commercial distribution in different forms in music books, tablatures or broadsheets. The chronological coincidence of the public invention of a musical shape that was from now on obligatory (in the songs' reception), is therefore no accident. It is not possible to reconstruct with certainty through what oral or other performative instances of mediation the song was transmitted - starting from the Egenolff prints - leading it to attain such public attention. But the decisive aspect that combined the well known poem with a new musical configuration (which means more than just a "tune") and converted it into an object of popular culture, was clearly the commercialisation by the early modern music industry.

I have briefly discussed the records of transmission and reception of the song *Entlaubet ist der Walde* in an attempt to clarify the process of its popularisation. In a paradigmatic sense, this example shows that during the period of the emergence of early modern songs we find hardly any evidence for popular oral transmission. But, of course, we can identify documents proving concrete fixation of the song in written sources, which by themselves might indicate traces of non-textual, artificial, oral music practices. Nevertheless, in the varying versions the intertextual influence of the written model always leaves its traces in the rewritten versions. Here, the impact of the printed media on the popular tradition becomes obvious - media that were distributed by a free market and were accessible to a wide audience.²⁷ The commercial success on the one hand, which is indicated by number of reissues and re-editions of songs in printed songbooks and broadsheets, and the wide demand and reception of these songs on the other, are obviously interrelated: the process of popularising the song lyrics coincides with the availability of letter printing (in broadsheets). The popularisation of the music (indirectly indicated also by tune references in broadsheets) coincides with the invention of music type. And the re-issuing of a song within a new composition reveals to be not a "polyphonic arrangement" of a "popular pre-existing melody" (the hypothesis of the pre-existence of tunes can neither be proved nor disproved), but a process of appropriation in performing a polyphonic model. These polyphonic works are often signed with their composers' names. Popular, unwritten, even monophonic transmis-

²⁷ Cf. Werner Faulstich, *Medien zwischen Herrschaft und Revolte: die Medienkultur der frühen Neuzeit 1400–1700* (Göttingen: Vandenhoeck & Ruprecht, 1998); Flood, John L. „Das Lied im Verlagsprogramm deutscher Drucker des 16. Jahrhunderts“, in Cyril Edwards et. al., eds. *Lied im deutschen Mittelalter: Überlieferung, Typen, Gebrauch* (Tübingen: Niemeyer, 1996), 335–350.

sion thus is not a *pre-condition*, but in fact the *result* of the new forms of distribution that did not exist before the early modern media revolution. Only in this way could a popular oral tradition emerge that was no longer primarily controlled by social adjustment factors like membership to a certain social class or alphabetization, and that could as well disappear rapidly.

Böhme and Erk scarcely mentioned in their edition of the *Alte Lieder*, that these were in most cases part of polyphonic compositions (whose composers originally even had been identified in numerous sources). This is also true for instances where the editor altered the structure of the composition, sometimes without annotating it. Similarly, the unproved hypothesis was never seriously scrutinised, that the *cantus firmi* of the polyphonic versions originated from pre-existing folk-tunes. Hence, Böhme's attempts to reconstruct these 'folk-tunes', turn out to be aesthetically motivated constructions. This includes even intentional fakes that were inspired by "fantasy" and "forgery", just like the ones of the criticized Zuccalmaglio. However, more strikingly and with severe consequences: as they claimed their edition to be the result of serious philological study and a striving for authenticity, they influenced the enduring picture of the early modern song as "folksong". This proved to be all the more significant, because the sources Böhme had used were not published in modern editions (let alone reprints or facsimiles). Therefore, the academic world has not been able to bypass this construct without consulting the original sources which often were rarely accessible at all. Thus, music history scholars (such as Robert Eitner) even when they started to treat this repertory with the methods of critical philology did not question this image of the "old German folksongs" that had been introduced so powerfully and efficiently.

The so-called „Tenorliedtheorie“²⁸ offered a way out of this problem: The polyphonic compositions were no longer considered "folksongs", but represented their primary sources, as Gudewill²⁹ argued later. The hypothesis of pre-existence was to be kept free from criticism by developing this argumentative circular statement, and Böhme's method remained intact from criticism to the present day.³⁰ In 1969, Wilhelm Seidel critically commented on Böhme's folksong achievements: "This enterprise, that originates from the 19th century's folksong enthusiasm, promptly exhibits a lack of appreciation for artificial polyphony. The fact that – to date – melodies, particularly folk tunes, or later also *Hofweisen*, are analyzed in an isolated manner, without considering their function in a composition, is due to this position in history."³¹

Nevertheless, Seidel adheres to the idea, that a considerable part of the repertoire are "folksong-settings" (*Volksliedsätze*). This assignment to the "Volkslied" genre has persisted since August Wilhelm Ambros.³² However, any musicological criticism of song scholarship that limits itself, as Seidel does, to the artificial polyphonic structure of the composition and fails to question the folksong category itself, is invalid.

²⁸ For this term see Stephen Keyl, "Tenorlied, Discantlied, Polyphonic Lied: Voices and Instruments in German Secular Polyphony of the Renaissance", *Early Music* 20 (1992): 434–442.

²⁹ Kurt Gudewill, "Deutsche Volkslieder in mehrstimmigen Kompositionen aus der Zeit von ca. 1450 bis ca. 1630", *Handbuch des Volksliedes*, eds. Rolf W. Brednich et al. (München: Fink, 1975), vol. 2, 445.

³⁰ *Ibid.*, 453.

³¹ Wilhelm Seidel, *Die Lieder Ludwig Senfls* (Bern: Francke, 1969), 11.

³² August Wilhelm Ambros, *Geschichte der Musik im Zeitalter der Renaissance bis zu Palestrina*. Geschichte der Musik 3. (Breslau: Leuckart, 1868), 399.

The association with the “Volslied” genre that already has persisted since August Wilhelm Ambros³³ can not be questioned seriously by any musicological criticism that only accuses song scholarship to respect insufficiently the artificial-polyphonic structure of the composition as initial point of their analysis, like Seidel does, but at the same time leaves the folksong category per se unquestioned. The ideologically forced search for the folksong that, as Böhme³⁴ had put it, “was from the earliest time the Teuton’s dear friend and loyal companion through the life”, had directed historically-oriented folksong collectors toward a repertoire that they connected closely to an aesthetically- and ideologically-charged cultural practice of their present.

Their editions, manipulated and deliberately faked as they were, not only constitute a pseudo-academic key to a narrow focus upon the past, but also influence heavily a second tradition of reception of these songs *as* monophonic folksongs. As a result, the medially controlled intervention with the existing material contributed greatly to its modern standardisation and homogenisation that was similar in scale compared to the way their predecessors had treated the musical material four hundred years earlier.

Bibliography

Ambros, August Wilhelm. *Geschichte der Musik im Zeitalter der Renaissance bis zu Palestrina*. Geschichte der Musik 3. Breslau: Leuckart, 1868.

Arlt, Wulf. “Einleitung/Zwischen ‚Improvisation‘ und ‚Komposition“”. Ed. by Erig, Richard. *Italienische Diminutionen. Die zwischen 1553 und 1638 mehrmals bearbeiteten Sätze*. Zürich: Amadeus, 1979: 9–21.

Bergmann, Joseph, ed. *Das Ambraser Liederbuch vom Jahre 1582*. Stuttgart: Literar. Verein, 1845.

Böhme, Franz M. *Altdeutsches Liederbuch. Volkslieder der Deutschen nach Wort und Weise aus dem 12. bis zum 17. Jahrhundert*. Leipzig: Breitkopf & Härtel, 1877.

Brednich, Rolf Wilhelm. [Review of “Deutscher Liederhort”]. *Jahrbuch für Volksliedforschung* 10 (1965): 162–163.

—, ed. *Die Darfelder Liederhandschrift, 1546–1565*. Münster: Aschendorff, 1976.

Brown, Howard Mayer. *Instrumental Music printed before 1600: A Bibliography*. Cambridge, Mass.: Harvard University Press, 1965.

Classen, Albrecht. *Deutsche Liederbücher des 15. und 16. Jahrhunderts*. Volksliedstudien 1. Münster u.a.: Waxmann, 2001.

Erk, Ludwig. “Rezensionen und Anzeigen”. *Cäcilia (Mainz)* 27 (1848): 208–221.

Erk, Ludwig and Franz M. Böhme. *Deutscher Liederhort. Auswahl der vorzüglicheren deutschen Volkslieder*. Leipzig: Breitkopf & Härtel, 1893/94.

Faulstich, Werner. *Medien zwischen Herrschaft und Revolte: die Medienkultur der frühen Neuzeit 1400–1700*. Göttingen: Vandenhoeck & Ruprecht, 1998 (Die Geschichte der Medien 3).

³³ Ibid.

³⁴ Böhme, *Altdeutsches Liederbuch* ..., XXI.

Flood, John L. "Das Lied im Verlagsprogramm deutscher Drucker des 16. Jahrhunderts". Ed. by Edwards, Cyril, et. al. *Lied im deutschen Mittelalter: Überlieferung, Typen, Gebrauch*. Tübingen: Niemeyer, 1996, 335–50.

Forster, Georg. *Ein Aufszug guter alter und neuer teutscher Liedlein* (1539). Ed. by Gudewill, Kurt et al., ed. *Erbe deutscher Musik* 20. Wolfenbüttel: Kallmeyer, 1942.

Gudewill, Kurt. "Deutsche Volkslieder in mehrstimmigen Kompositionen aus der Zeit von ca. 1450 bis ca. 1630". *Handbuch des Volksliedes*. Eds. Brednich, Rolf Wilhelm et al. München: Fink, 1975, Vol. 2, 439–490.

Hobsbawm, Eric. "Inventing Traditions (Introduction)". *The invention of tradition*. Ed. by Hobsbawm, Eric et al. Cambridge: Cambridge Univ. Press, 1999: 1–14.

Holzappel, Otto: *Das große deutsche Volksballadenbuch*. Düsseldorf, Zürich: Artemis & Winkler, 2000.

Keyl, Stephen. "Tenorlied, Discantlied, Polyphonic Lied: Voices and Instruments in German Secular Polyphony of the Renaissance". *Early Music* 20 (1992): 434–442.

Knaust, Heinrich. *Gassenhawer, Reuter und Bergliedlin*. Frankfurt a.M.: Egenolffs Erben, 1571.

Lésure, François, ed. *Recueils imprimés, XVIe - XVIIe si cles* (Répertoire international des sources musicales B, I). München: G. Henle, 1960 (RISM).

Meier, John, ed. *Deutsche Volkslieder mit ihren Melodien: Balladen 1*. Deutsches Volksliedarchiv, ed. Berlin, Leipzig: De Gruyter, 1935.

Moser, Hans Joachim, ed. *Gassenhawerlin und Reutterliedlin: Zu Franckenfurt am Meyn bei Christian Egenolf 1535*. Faksimileausgabe. Augsburg: Filser, 1927.

Petzsch, Christoph and Walter Salmen, eds. *Das Lochamer-Liederbuch*. Denkmäler der Tonkunst in Bayern, Vol. 2 (NF Sb.). Wiesbaden: Breitkopf & Härtel, 1972.

Ringmann, Heribert ed. *Das Glogauer Liederbuch 1: Deutsche Lieder und Spielstücke*. *Erbe Deutscher Musik* 4. Kassel: Bärenreiter, 1936.

Seemann, Erich. "Ein Musterbeispiel zu den Ungenauigkeiten Böhmes in seinem Deutschen Liederhort". *Jahrbuch für Volksliedforschung* 1 (1928): 183–185.

Seidel, Wilhelm. *Die Lieder Ludwig Senfls*. Neue Heidelberger Studien zur Musikwissenschaft 2. Bern: Francke, 1969.

Suppan, Wolfgang. *Deutsches Liedleben zwischen Renaissance und Barock*. Mainzer Studien zur Musikwissenschaft 4. Tutzing: Schneider, 1973.

POVZETEK

Nemške zbirke ljudskih pesmih iz 19. stoletja so sledile nareku Johanna Gottlieba Herderja, da morajo biti avtentične ljudske pesmi stare. Ker pa srednjeveški in zgodnjenovoveški viri dejansko niso posredovali jasnih ljudskih pesmi, ampak večglasne umetne pesmi, so ti viri zgodnje glasbe morali čez postopek reinterpretacije in re-»konstrukcije«, posledica tega pa je bila izmišljena

tradicija staronemške ljudske pesmi. Ta postopek je kljub temu, da naj bi temeljil na znanstveni in jezikoslovni točnosti, vključeval potvarjanje virov in znatno ponarejena in zavajajoča izročila izvirnih pesmi. Kljub temu pa so se staronemške ljudske pesmi, ki sta jih izdala Ludwig Erk in Franz Magnus Böhme v zbornikih »Altdeutsches Liederbuch« in »Deutscher Liederhort«, izkazale kot najvplivnejši vir za preučevanje pesmi in ljudskih pesmi ter so sprejete kot del repertoarja ljudskih pesmi.