

**Zeitschrift:** Basler Jahrbuch für historische Musikpraxis : eine Veröffentlichung der Schola Cantorum Basiliensis, Lehr- und Forschungsinstitut für Alte Musik an der Musik-Akademie der Stadt Basel

**Herausgeber:** Schola Cantorum Basiliensis

**Band:** 25 (2001)

**Artikel:** Did Petrucci's concern for accuracy include any concern with performance issues?

**Autor:** Boorman, Stanley

**DOI:** <https://doi.org/10.5169/seals-868987>

### **Nutzungsbedingungen**

Die ETH-Bibliothek ist die Anbieterin der digitalisierten Zeitschriften. Sie besitzt keine Urheberrechte an den Zeitschriften und ist nicht verantwortlich für deren Inhalte. Die Rechte liegen in der Regel bei den Herausgebern beziehungsweise den externen Rechteinhabern. [Siehe Rechtliche Hinweise.](#)

### **Conditions d'utilisation**

L'ETH Library est le fournisseur des revues numérisées. Elle ne détient aucun droit d'auteur sur les revues et n'est pas responsable de leur contenu. En règle générale, les droits sont détenus par les éditeurs ou les détenteurs de droits externes. [Voir Informations légales.](#)

### **Terms of use**

The ETH Library is the provider of the digitised journals. It does not own any copyrights to the journals and is not responsible for their content. The rights usually lie with the publishers or the external rights holders. [See Legal notice.](#)

**Download PDF:** 31.03.2025

**ETH-Bibliothek Zürich, E-Periodica, <https://www.e-periodica.ch>**

DID PETRUCCI'S CONCERN FOR ACCURACY INCLUDE  
ANY CONCERN WITH PERFORMANCE ISSUES?

by STANLEY BOORMAN

Clearly, a primary source of evidence for performing Petrucci's music lies in his editions. However much we must also rely on other sources, and on other types of evidence, the actual printed notes provide the pitches and durations, and usually the text to be sung to them. Sometimes, it is true, they do not seem to provide even that minimal information, as in the lack of text for the *Odhecaton* series, or the problem of some canonic settings – or, quite incidentally, with the incomplete survival of some of Pisano's Petrarch settings.

But these cases are relatively rare:<sup>1</sup> we can usually assume that Petrucci felt satisfied with his editions – that he felt that they contained enough information for an adequate performance. In other words, given performers with experience of the conventions, he believed that those editions would meet their needs. Further, given the patterns of in-house correction to be found in so many copies, we can assume that he and his type-setters strove to achieve a high level of accuracy in transmitting not only a reliable and trustworthy version of the musical and verbal text delivered to them, but also one sufficient for use.

I want to question these assumptions, at virtually all points, and on both pragmatic and technical counts, and I also question the often tacitly-made assumption that he himself chose the music he published. At the end, I expect only one assumption to remain, and that for what I might call the wrong reasons. I shall acknowledge that Petrucci's versions could provide the material for an acceptable rendition: but I acknowledge that much only because I believe in the vast spread of solutions subsumed under the term „acceptable“, a spread which allowed whole-sale deviation from the printed text, covering the whole spectrum of topics discussed under „performance practice“.

Perhaps my function here, as a bibliographer of Petrucci's work, is to free performance specialists from the need to find any special significance in the details of Petrucci's presentation: while performers must be interested in the notes and other signs of his editions, they should not believe that he himself saw particular significance in any of those signs. Indeed, as my title suggests, I believe that Petrucci shows not the slightest interest in how his music would be performed, and that *he*, as producer of the editions, made no efforts to assist the performer.

I start with a pragmatic argument, but one that we may not ignore. We have to remember that he was only concerned, like almost all printers or publishers of that or any other time, to provide accurate copies of his manuscript

<sup>1</sup> In fact, of course, the lack of text in the *Odhecaton* volumes is not so much an omission of essential performing information, but rather an indication of a specific approach to the repertoire.

exemplars: his sole responsibility was to fulfill the requirements of the supplier of those exemplars.

As far as I can tell, Petrucci was never a printer, at least while in Venice: he certainly deviated from normal practice in not declaring a profession in the book trades.<sup>2</sup> Therefore, for his editions, he employed other typesetters and printers, whom he would have required to be conventionally accurate. Indeed, he must have employed skilled craftsmen, given the visual quality of the results – and I stress the word „visual“. He therefore acted more in line with the practice of many early „publishers“, and not as a printer: but this need not imply that he assumed any responsibility for the repertoires printed, or for the quality of the readings sent to the type-setter.

Bonnie Blackburn has shown that Petrus Castellanus supplied the music for some of the earliest editions, and that he was probably drawing on a wide knowledge and an extensive collection:<sup>3</sup> indeed, there are almost 300 works in the *Canti* series alone. I can argue, in a number of ways, that almost all of Petrucci's editions, even to the end of his career, reflect specific suppliers, and it is probable that many of these suppliers actually commissioned their books. Among these promoters of volumes were a member of the court of Ferrara (in the cases of the Josquin and Ghiselin masses)<sup>4</sup> a composer or performer (in those of books by Dammonis, Dalza or Spinacino), or some now un-named collector or collectors (as with the first six of the frottola volumes).<sup>5</sup> I shall return to this later: but, in the present context, it has a significant implication: that Petrucci's responsibility was no greater than that of his craftsmen, to provide a conscientious, reliable and attractive edition of the commissioned material. He had none of the now conventionally-understood responsibilities of a publisher.

This makes sense: if Petrucci were the agent of a series of patrons or suppliers of music, or under contractual arrangements, he would be acting like virtually all printers, and many publishers – doing his job, supervising his

<sup>2</sup> Almost all printers or publishers stated their craft when making petition to the Senate or other body in Venice. They were „stampador“, „libraio“, or something similar. Petrucci merely designates himself as a citizen of Fossombrone. A few other supplicants did likewise: they were normally authors or translators, protecting what they were beginning to see as intellectual property. For details of this evidence and its implications, see my forthcoming *Ottaviano Petrucci: catalogue raisonnée*, New York 2002, chapter 2. Throughout this paper, when no source is cited, details will be found in that study.

<sup>3</sup> See Bonnie J. Blackburn, „Petrucci's Venetian editor: Petrus Castellanus and his musical garden“, *Musica Disciplina* 49 (1995) 15–45; reprinted in *Composition, printing and performance*, Aldershot 2000, ch.VI.

<sup>4</sup> See my „Developing a new repertoire and market for printed books: the case of music“, paper read at the 2000 annual conference of the Society for the History of Authorship, Reading and Publishing, held in Mainz, and also my „The 500th anniversary of the first music printing: a history of patronage and taste in the early years“, forthcoming in *Musikološki zbornik*. Full details can be found in Chapter 9 of my forthcoming study (see fn.2).

<sup>5</sup> See my „Printed music books of the Italian renaissance from the point of view of manuscript study“, *Revista de Musicologia* 16 (1993) 2587–2602.

craftsmen, and producing his product, without detailed regard for the character of the contents.<sup>6</sup>

As I say, this is a pragmatic argument: it puts Petrucci within the tradition of printers and publishers as they operated around 1500, a tradition in which Aldus Manutius or Formschneider or one or two other scholar-publishers were exceptions.<sup>7</sup> There is no evidence that Petrucci fitted into their most unusual position: indeed, there is much evidence in his editions to argue otherwise.

Of course, Petrucci *did* concentrate on music: and we are surely justified in thinking that he could read music and perform it. That is implied by the nature of his „invention“. But he was certainly not a full-time musician: such an artist would not have held the positions to which he was appointed as a citizen of Fossombrone, nor would he have petitioned for his original privilege in the terms which Petrucci used. Further: he was not a full-time publisher. Making all allowance for lost and even unknown editions, there were only a few brief periods when he could have kept a print-shop continuously busy.<sup>8</sup>

Yet he was evidently known as „the music publisher: people with music to publish did come to him, for he had the privilege, and he knew which craftsmen to employ. He also had the contacts for distribution and sale, if they were required.<sup>9</sup> But, as I say, he need have been no more than this, providing a reliable service to people who came to him.<sup>10</sup>

<sup>6</sup> The one case where this is most clearly demonstrable is unfortunately not one of his musical editions. It concerns the edition of the *Paulina, de recta Paschae*, of the local bishop, Paulus de Middelburgh.

<sup>7</sup> The extensive literature on Aldus Manutius demonstrates the extent to which most of his editions reflect a personal agenda, one associated with the special role he claimed for himself as supplier to his own group of scholar-friends, and as creator of a market for special, scholarly editions. See, for example, Nicholas Barker, *Aldus Manutius and the development of Greek script and type in the fifteenth century*, Sandy Hook 1985; 2nd edition, New York 1992; Martin Davies, *Aldus Manutius: printer and publisher of Renaissance Venice*, London 1995; Martin Lowry, *The World of Aldus Manutius: business and scholarship in Renaissance Venice*, Oxford 1979; Susy Marcon and Marino Zorzi, editors, *Aldo Manuzio e l'ambiente veneziano, 1494–1515*, Venice 1994; Giovanni Orlandi, editor, *Aldo Manuzio editore: dediche, prefazioni, note ai testi*, Milan [1975].

There is no such intensive study of the activities of Formschneider. However, see Royston Gustavson, *Hans Ott, Hieronymus Formschneider, and the Novum et insigne opus musicum (Nuremberg, 1537–1538)*, dissertation, University of Melbourne 1998, which outlines his biography and includes extensive references to earlier literature.

<sup>8</sup> These would include the summer of 1503, the early months of 1505, and parts of 1507. Unfortunately, although we know a fair amount about standard rates of work, the evidence from these periods does not yield solid guidance as to the size of the print-run for Petrucci's books.

<sup>9</sup> The need for reliable distributors of his editions was probably one of the reasons for his partnership with Ottaviano Scotto and Niccolo di Rafael.

<sup>10</sup> This is perhaps an over-simplification, for Petrucci (with his partners) will have taken responsibility for second and third editions of titles. In that particular respect, he seems to have been much more like the standard view of a publisher. Further, the situation may have changed somewhat during his later years, at Fossombrone.

Given this situation, before we could believe that Petrucci himself selected the repertoires, that he actually cared for the detailed content of his books, or that he made musical decisions when preparing them, we would have to find concrete evidence of such an activity. Further, that evidence would have to be found spread across a number of editions, containing different types of repertoire. Without such a spread, we could not distinguish Petrucci's activities from those of an earlier owner (perhaps the supplier) of the music for any given edition.

Instead, however, we find evidence that, in practice, Petrucci took his material largely without musical thought, and presented it, not according to performing criteria, but according to his own technical criteria. When the music was edited before it came to him, his versions show evidence of the process;<sup>11</sup> when it was delivered haphazardly, they reveal that pattern also;<sup>12</sup> and when it presented technical problems, he solved them with an eye to technical issues, rather than those of the singer.

In presenting evidence for these statements, I am able to range more widely than merely over the field of performance practice. I can include any details that might make performance harder, especially if better solutions lay readily to hand. After all, with performance practice issues, it is difficult to tell whether the evidence of the edition always points to Petrucci's hand, or to that of his supplier. But other elements can be shown to point directly to Petrucci and his craftsmen. Therefore, I begin with situations where alternative solutions would have made the books easier to use.

There are several attractive and significant examples. One of the most obvious comes in the edition of Isaac's masses, of 1506: in the *Mass Comme femme*, the two tenor parts of the second Agnus are set back to back, on D3r and D3v, and therefore can not be sung from the book simultaneously. This seemingly implausible error is a direct result, I suspect, of setting largely four-voiced music in four part-books, and from separate parts. The type-setter worked conscientiously through the separate parts, necessarily changing the layout on the page, according to the space available in his normal six-stave arrangement. He need not therefore have noticed that the Tenor was divided at this point.

A simpler case of confusing the singer can be found in the first book of Lamentations, also of 1506. The „Aleph“. Quomodo verse of Ycart's setting is laid out as in Example One. There is nothing intrinsically wrong with this – and Petrucci did adopt a similarly complex solution at least once elsewhere in his repertoire.<sup>13</sup> But it does require of the singers of the lower voices a

<sup>11</sup> Evidence for this has already been advanced in earlier studies: see Stanley Boorman, „The ‚first‘ edition of the *Odhecaton A*“, *JAMS* 30 (1977) 183–207; and Willem Elders, „Le Problème de l'authenticité chez Josquin et les éditions de Petrucci: une investigation préliminaire“, *FAM* 36 (1989) 108–115.

<sup>12</sup> I suspect this can be argued for the second book of *Laude*, in which some compositions are repeated.

<sup>13</sup> The problem of laying out the two Tenor parts of the opening pieces in *III Motetti de la Corona* (1519) is solved in a particularly elegant manner.

heightened degree of attention, especially given the conventional choir-book layout of the earlier openings.

Example 1: *Lamentations I* (1506), folios A8v-B1r:

Stave	A8v		B1r
1	[Superius]	<i>Aleph ... Quomodo ...</i>	Altus <i>Quomodo ...</i>
2		<i>... Beth</i>	<i>... Beth</i>
3	Tenor	<i>Aleph ... Quomodo ...</i>	[blank stave]
4		<i>... Beth</i>	Bassus <i>Quomodo ...</i>
5	Altus	<i>Aleph</i>	<i>... Beth</i>
6	Bassus	<i>Aleph</i>	[blank stave]

I assume that this represents some aspect of the printer's exemplar, presumably a manuscript fascicle, with the „Aleph“ on the opening recto, and the „Quomodo“ on the first full opening. Perhaps in a similar manner, the layout of parts in Agricola's three-voiced setting in the same book may reflect an earlier source.<sup>14</sup> For this work alone, the Contra is set out below the Superius, with the Tenor on the facing recto. This is a pattern that Petrucci did not adopt elsewhere. I can think of no explanation for either of these cases, other than that they reflect the exemplars: if indeed they carry evidence of the layout of the printer's copy, then they argue that Petrucci and his men were more likely to copy what lay before them than to consider the convenience of the singer.<sup>15</sup> Much the same has to be said of the unusual appearance of additional frottola text at the end of a book, rather than on the musical opening.<sup>16</sup>

These are merely the most obvious cases in a general pattern of laying out essential information – a pattern in which the needs of the printer precede those of the user, or in which the practice of the exemplar is allowed to control the appearance of the new edition.<sup>17</sup> However confusing they may have been for the singer, none of these examples raises any problem for the modern editor, and they have therefore largely been ignored when considering Petrucci's editions. But there are other instances of apparent or potential neglect on Petrucci's part, some of which have interested the present-day scholar.

A number of these concern the presentation, or the lack, of text: the best-known lie in the *Odhecaton* and *Canti* volumes,<sup>18</sup> though it is notable that, even there, most latin texts are given in something approaching a full form. But there are also works in other Petrucci editions which lack significant

<sup>14</sup> This setting begins on folio B8v.

<sup>15</sup> This book would be another example of the presentation of a collection that was haphazardly organised when given to Petrucci.

<sup>16</sup> This occurs at the end of the ninth book of frottole, published on 22 January 1509.

<sup>17</sup> Another interesting example is the pattern of rests at the start of „Ochii mei frenati el pianto“ by „Peregrinus Cesena Veronensis“, as printed in *Frottole II*, on folios D1v 2r.

<sup>18</sup> This issue is discussed in other papers given at this conference, and earlier literature is cited there.

amounts of text: in the *Mottetti C*, the second parts of the anonymous *Si bona suscepimus* and Obrecht's *Requiem aeternam*, both lack text. In the same book, the Bassus of the second parts of the anonymous *Concede* is similarly untexted: and there are other instances elsewhere in Petrucci's output.

A strong argument can be made for saying that these examples are sometimes a product of lack of editorial interest in the printing-house (rather than a direct reflection of performing practice, or even of the transmission of individual works), especially when texting practices are studied across a whole volume, or group of volumes. An interesting case of the wide range of texting habits within a single book can be found in the *Missarum diversorum auctorum*, of 1508. The printed texting in this volume is very old-fashioned, often consisting of little more than the incipits of phrases or movements, and showing much less concern for accuracy than in earlier volumes. That this reflects the exemplars rather than the craftsmen is suggested by the variations in pattern.

Example Two gives the necessary data.<sup>19</sup> For each of the principal divisions of each mass, I have indicated the presence of additional texting, after the initial word or words. The figures for additional phrases of text are necessarily to some extent arbitrary: it is occasionally difficult to decide whether the phrases of text were set by the compositor in one process or two. But, for example, the use of „Pleni sunt“, rather than „Pleni“, has not been distinguished if the two words were set together. The numerals in the table therefore show the extent to which type-setters undertook separate and discrete actions to enter text.

Example 2: Additional texting in the works of the *Missarum diversorum auctorum I*

	1	2	3	4	5	6	7	8	9	10
Obrecht: <i>Missa Si dederò</i>										
Cantus	0	0	0	0	0	1	0	0	0	2
Tenor	0	0	0	0	0	1	0	0	0	1
Altus	0	0	0	0	0	0	–	0	–	1
Bassus	3	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	2
Basiron: <i>Missa de Franza</i>										
Cantus	0	7	9	6	8	4	1	1	2	3+4
Tenor	0	7	11	0	1	0	0	0	0	0
Altus	0	4	1	2	3	0	0	1	0	0
Bassus	0	4	1	2	3	1	0	1	0	0
Brumel: <i>Missa de Dringhs</i>										
Cantus	0	9	8	10	14	7	4	1	4	5
Tenor	0	8	12	0	1	0	0	0	0	0
Altus	0	2	1	2	10	3	2	0	0	0
Bassus	0	1	3	3	4	0	–	0	–	0

<sup>19</sup> The data are taken from the Bologna copy, though I find no differences in text presentation between the surviving copies.

Gaspar: *Missa Nactu pas*

Cantus	0	6	7	8	11	4	2	1	3	7
Tenor	0	8	12	0	1	0	0	0	0	0
Altus	0	0	0	7	6	1	1	0	1	3
Bassus	0	3	4	6	6	3	1	-	0	0

La Rue: *Missa S. Antonio*

Cantus	0	11	13	10	17	1	2	0	4	0
Tenor	1	3	4	6	9	0	-	0	2	0
Altus	0	9	3	8	11	0	2	0	4	0
Bassus	0	11	6	8	9	0	1	0	0	0

Key to the columns; 1 = Kyrie; 2 = Et in terra; 3 = Qui tollis; 4 = Patrem; 5 = Crucifixus; 6 = Sanctus; 7 = Pleni; 8 = Osanna; 9 = Benedictus; 10 Agnus. The numbers represent discrete words or phrases set separately on the page, after the textual incipit.

The absence of additional words in the Kyrie movements is not surprising; and it is no less acceptable to find few added words in the later parts of the Sanctus. But, in most sections of the Mass *Si dederò*, only the first word is given. In the other masses, phrases of text are regularly inserted within sections. For the last mass, there are nearly as many inserted phrases of text in the lower voices as in the Cantus, and the *Missa de Dringhs* has much additional text in the Tenor, for the Gloria, and in the Altus for the Credo. It is notable, too, how sparsely the Tenor of the middle three masses is texted for both parts of the Credo. To some extent, these patterns can be seen as reflecting traditions of texting in earlier sources of cyclic masses. But I wish to draw attention to the inconsistencies, to a pattern which seems to separate the first and last masses, in particular, from each other and from the other three. Other, purely bibliographical evidence does argue that the book was produced by two typesetters: but it shows that they divided the work along different lines, more by part-book:<sup>20</sup> the division does not correspond to the patterns of texting. It seems clear that Petrucci was content to let his craftsmen take whatever was in each exemplar, and put it down on the printed page, without concern for consistency across a whole volume, or for guidance for the performer.

It might seem that this was hardly a problem in settings of the Ordinary, for every professional singer will have had the text thoroughly memorised, with its grammatical and articulatory structures immediately available. But similar, though less extreme, examples can be found in other volumes, including the first of the *Motetti de la Corona*.<sup>21</sup> Here, certainly, singers would have needed more, and clearer, guidance than Petrucci's men gave them.

In the musical notation, however, there is almost no evidence pointing either towards or away from a performing interest. This is hardly surprising,

<sup>20</sup> This evidence is not strong, but it suggests that one craftsman was responsible for the whole of the Superius, and one gathering of the Altus. The rest of the work was probably undertaken by a different man.

<sup>21</sup> See, in particular, the lower voices for Brumel's *Laudate Dominum*.



for notation of the time rarely provided for such evidence.<sup>22</sup> But we can probably say that Petrucci did not read his exemplars with an eye to performing problems. I am not speaking of „errors“ or stylistic lapses in the music – I will touch on their relevance in a moment. Here, I am referring to some details of the presentation, details which I suspect were copied from the exemplar, but which I would have expected any musical editor-of-copy to have spotted.

The best examples of this are the curious cases where a flat „key-signature“ is omitted from the beginnings of several consecutive staves; and an evident ambivalence over the proportions signs 3 and 0/3.<sup>23</sup> But there are others which do relate to house-editorial thinking: among them are the curious double *custodes* found in both *Canti C* and *Motetti C*,<sup>24</sup> and different patterns of handling accidentals in different books.

At this level, too, stop-press corrections show different hands at work. Some re-arrange the ends of lines of music so that they fall more often at the completion of a *tactus*, or at least of a whole *minima*.<sup>25</sup> Others do not. This seems not to represent decisions made and imposed by Petrucci, but more probably reflects the interest of a single type-setter, or just possibly the concerns of a promoter of an individual book, or the supplier of its music.

A different, and important feature of Petrucci's books, and one which continues to affect our view of performance practice, is his adoption of the small landscape format for choirbooks.<sup>26</sup> This in effect meant that even four people would have had problems in singing from the book, and a choir would have found

<sup>22</sup> I have found evidence of patterns in contemporary notation indicating concern for performance, primarily in the uses of ligatures and coloration: see my „Two aspects of performance practice in the Sistine Chapel of the early sixteenth century“. *Collectanea II: Studien zur Geschichte der päpstlichen Kapelle: Tagungsbericht Heidelberg 1989*, edited by Bernhard Janz, Città del Vaticano 1994, 575–609 (Capellae Apostolicae Sixtinaeque Collectanea, Acta, Monumenta, 4)

<sup>23</sup> The second of these is discussed in my „Petrucci's typesetters and the process of stemmatics“, *Formen und Probleme der Überlieferung mehrstimmiger Musik im Zeitalter Josquins Desprez*, edited by Ludwig Finscher, Munich 1981, 245–280 (Wolfenbütteler Forschungen, 6 = Quellenstudien zur Musik der Renaissance, 1).

<sup>24</sup> The pattern involves printing a single *custos*, then following it with a few additional notational symbols (notes or rests), and then a second *custos*. In *Canti C*, this pattern can be found whenever a) the music continues onto the next opening, and b) there is no bar-line, *corona* or *signum congruentiae*.

<sup>25</sup> This pattern can really only be detected when first and second editions are compared: it is particularly evident whenever the second edition spaces the music more attractively on the page, but there are also instances where only one or two notes were moved from the end of one line to the start of the next. In these cases, the only possible explanation must be that the change is a reflection of performers' preferences for line-ends – that they should fall at the end of a *tactus* (or, sometimes, at the end of a complete *semibreve*).

<sup>26</sup> This format was extremely rare at this date, though landscape format (usually in folio) was adopted for atlases and for collections of plates, such as the *Antiquae urbis Romae cum regionibus simulacrum* of F. Calvo, published in 1527. At the conference, Leofranc Holford-Strevens reported that he had come across a book in landscape format published in the early years of the century. Nonetheless, Petrucci's extensive use of the arrangement for music was certainly innovative.

it impossible. At first sight, Petrucci must either have been expecting every institution to copy the music into manuscripts (such as survive for parts of this particular repertoire, in Uppsala, Florence and elsewhere) or he must have been assuming that they would sing from memory. This necessarily puts a different complexion on the absence of text in the *Canti* series: but it is more critical for some of the volumes of sacred music, destined for choral institutions. Perhaps the first two motet books should also be seen as part of the *Canti* series, as Howard Mayer Brown suggested:<sup>27</sup> but that is hardly true for the books of Lamentations, also published in choir-book format. Even more critically, it is very probable that the two lost books of 1507, of Martini's hymns and of Magnificats, were also in choirbook format, for the Fugger copies were bound with the Lamentations.<sup>28</sup> These were repertoires intended to be sung by the same institutions that would have used Petrucci's editions of settings of the mass, all of which were published in part-books. Even if the Lamentations were sung from memory, that was not required of the other texts. Books of this size could not have been used for performance by any choral institution of the time. The bibliographer is reduced to assuming that Petrucci, or his patron, was more interested in the publication and appearance of the book, than in its use; and therefore, also that Petrucci's craftsmen were following the layout of the exemplar.

Choirbook layout also produces a number of instances where clarity of presentation and ease of use were sacrificed to economy in layout. There are many cases where one of the lower voices begins, not on the left with a clear indication, but in the middle of a line. Some of these are so cramped that one has to search for the beginning of an Altus part, barely indicated by a squeezed-in word after a double bar-line. This is particularly notable in some of the frottola volumes, where Petrucci apparently did not wish to go beyond the typical seven gatherings:<sup>29</sup> but it is also to be found in some layers of *Canti C*. Here, evidently, technical criteria were again more important than those of the consumer.

A major concern for students of Petrucci's editions must be the status of the stop-press and manuscript corrections that abound in his editions. Much of what I have said so far demonstrates that Petrucci followed his copy-text, in detail and in large-scale matters. A first-line argument therefore would be that the later in-house changes all reflect a careful reading of a printed copy against the exemplar. However, I think we have to make a general distinction

<sup>27</sup> Howard Mayer Brown, „The mirror of men's salvation: music in devotional life about 1500“, *Renaissance Quarterly* 43 (1990) 744–773.

<sup>28</sup> See Richard Schaal, „Die Musikbibliothek von Raimond Fugger“, *Acta Musicologica* 29 (1957) 126–137.

<sup>29</sup> I think this criterion, one of the total length of the volume (and therefore of the amount of paper to be used) was more important than the problem of the individual frottole extending beyond a single page. It appears that Petrucci had calculated the number of one-page, two-page, and four-page works that would fill a book, when accepting the music from his supplier. But he had then to stay within his calculation, even if it meant squeezing the music for some single-page compositions.

between stop-press changes, which must normally have resulted from reading an early copy against the exemplar, and manuscript in-house changes. The latter may in some cases have come from information supplied by people outside the printing shop, and therefore from performers: the former must represent someone sitting in the shop during press-work.

I have discussed elsewhere issues of Petrucci's corrections, and in particular the types of errors that he apparently felt most needed correction, and the whole topic will be examined again in my forthcoming bibliographical catalogue.<sup>30</sup> Here, I only want to stress one thing. Some books were scrupulously corrected, some were apparently done in great haste, and some were done only superficially. Some were corrected at once, in as many copies as possible, while others were given a haphazard series of later corrections, perhaps responding to comments from outside the shop. Among the most carefully corrected were the book of Agricola's masses and *Canti C*. The former shows evidence of two in-house correctors, presumably reflecting a need for haste. At the other extreme are parts of *Motetti Libro Quarto*, and some of the frottola volumes.

I am not commenting here on the accuracy of the text for performance, but only on the extent to which Petrucci required a careful reading and correction of the musical and verbal text. In practice, this requirement was probably not his, but enforced by the supplier of the music: that is the best explanation for the extent and subtlety of the corrections to Spinacino's lute book, which were plausibly done by the lutenist himself, as well as for the evidence suggesting a need for speed alongside attention to detail in correcting the book of Agricola's masses.

The implication of the range and type of corrections is that Petrucci was primarily concerned with two matters – trying to follow copy accurately, and presenting the books' physical make-up correctly. For the nature and details of the content, he relied on others.<sup>31</sup> The care with which that was presented therefore depended entirely on external factors – the interest shown by the supplier of the music or his agent. This is an implication that is supported by the care with which Petrucci's type-setters follow a first edition, with its manuscript corrections, when setting a second.

This leads to the critical point, which by now will seem obvious: that the readings and guidance which Petrucci presents to us are not his, but those of his supplier – and that contradictory, or even merely diverse, indications are not really contradictory. Instead, they represent different sets of traditions for presenting the music. These inconsistencies therefore deserve our attention, for they offer sets of alternative approaches to similar situations.

<sup>30</sup> See my *Petrucci at Fossombrone: a study of early music printing, with special reference to the Motetti de la Corona, 1514–1519*, dissertation, London University, 1976; and an extensive discussion in chapters 6 and 8 of the work cited in note 2.

<sup>31</sup> Some further support for this statement can be found in the repetition of some works in the second book of Laude. The rarer appearance of the same frottola in different volumes is probably not relevant here.

On occasion, they may even provide guidance on performance, and indicate local or institutional traditions. If they can, at the same time, be tied to a probable supplier of the music, we can begin to say where these traditions were to be found.

I suggested at the start of this paper that many of Petrucci's books were commissioned, by patrons, collectors or composers, and I now can argue that it was these people who controlled the details of the music. I do not mean to say that they always intended so to do, for some were apparently only concerned with having an edition produced, while others seem to have cared about the music in the edition. But the „patron“, the supplier, still controlled the character of the text, for this was a natural result of the status of Petrucci's craftsmen as printers following copy.<sup>32</sup> The issue of the identity of the „patron“ therefore becomes very important for evaluating not only the selection of works, but also the content, at the most detailed level.

Identification is easy for the first books published by Petrucci. Bonnie Blackburn has pointed up the role of Castellanus in those editions: and I accept that he provided the music for *Odhecaton A*, *Canti B*, *Motetti A*, *Motetti de passione B*, and probably *Canti C*. On the other hand, I have argued elsewhere that a member of the Ferrarese court was directly responsible for the first editions of Josquin's first book and Ghiselin's book, and that both represent a politico-cultural act.<sup>33</sup> The special nature of Josquin's first edition is reinforced by its spacious presentation, abandoned for a more compact use of paper with the second edition of 1506, first described by Jeremy Noble.<sup>34</sup>

A completely different individual was responsible for the first three books of frottole, published within a period of ten weeks in 1504–5. This person shows a clear desire to provide a collection of music by composers of Veneto provenance, initially Veronese, and also Venetian and Paduan. Wherever those composers were being employed at the time of the editions, their names are supplemented with an adjective such as „Veronese“. This supplier apparently exhausted much of his collection by the end of book three. He was certainly not the person who provided the music for the fourth, fifth and sixth books, probably also one individual. These next three books, published in late 1505 and 1506, seem to belong together, for they came out as a group, and they contain some of the rare evidence for the existence of someone connected with

<sup>32</sup> I am using the word „patron“ for this supplier of the music. In effect, that is his role as far as the music was concerned, for he (or his agent) chose the individual works, and will therefore have provided the musical version to be printed. I recognise that the financial arrangements may not conform to the pattern we associate with a patron, whereby he would have paid for the edition in advance, undertaken to meet the costs, or promised to take enough copies to ensure a profit for the craftsmen.

<sup>33</sup> See the articles cited in notes 3 and 4, above.

<sup>34</sup> Jeremy Noble, „Ottaviano Petrucci: his Josquin editions and some others“, *Essays presented to Myron P. Gilmore*, edited by Sergio Bertelli and Gloria Ramakus, Florence 1978, ii, 433–445.

Petrucci and caring about performing style. Book Four contains the well-known *Tavola* which separates the works according to their genres – Strambotto, Sonnet, Ode, etc, and the book also contains demonstration examples for singing sonnets and latin verses. In Book Five, the first works of gatherings A and B also have their genre noted in the headline, as does one in the last gathering. Book Six contains the few three-voiced *giustiniane* on its first folios, and James Haar has reasonably argued that these works represent an idealised view of fifteenth-century practice.<sup>35</sup> This trio of books shows a unified approach, not carried through very consistently, but suggesting that this particular supplier was interested in the traditional patterns of performing secular Italian verse. They certainly betray an interest that can not be found in Castellanus' editions, or indeed in the first three books of frottole.

Here, then, we already have four different suppliers of music, each apparently with a specific „agenda“ – motivation for publishing or for choosing the works to publish. Each agenda is reflected in many aspects of the relevant books, including the treatment of performance practice. These four people account for 21 of the first 26 items published by Petrucci. The exceptions are *Motetti C*, *Motetti Libro Quarto*, a book of masses by de Orto and a second by Josquin, and the *Fragmenta Missarum*. I suspect the de Orto book, the *Fragmenta Missarum* and the two books of motets came from Castellanus, but the Josquin more plausibly came directly from Ferrara.

The remaining editions published while Petrucci was in Venice present a more chequered image. Castellanus may have provided the books of Lamentations, and, less probably, the later, lost, hymns and Magnificats, and the *Missarum diversorum auctorum*: but his contribution will certainly have stopped by then. Instead we have a series of volumes that suggest that Petrucci was accepting, perhaps even looking for, music from elsewhere – from Dammonis, from the lutenists, and from other unknown people. I am confident that none of these people should be equated with Castellanus. Further, I am convinced that the composer/lutenists (Dalza, Alemannus and Spinacino) themselves pushed for their editions: the evidence lies in a number of the production details, but mostly in the extreme care with which these books have been revised and corrected by a single hand, one prepared to ensure the most elegant appearance for his emendations.<sup>36</sup>

Throughout the Venetian period, then, we see groups of editions, each produced for different reasons and with different artistic criteria. The practice and purposes of the earliest group are fairly consistent. But once other suppliers appear, certainly with the frottole, and almost certainly with the first book of Josquin's masses, new criteria emerge, and we can see new sorts of

<sup>35</sup> James Haar, „Petrucci's Justiniane revisited“, *JAMS* 52 (1999) 1–38. The detailed arguments for distinguishing the suppliers of these frottola volumes will also appear in my forthcoming study.

<sup>36</sup> The single exception may be that of the books by Spinacino, in 1507. Petrucci may have been looking for some lute music to publish, in response to Marco dall'Aquila's privilege of 1505.

approaches to providing guidance on all levels. Sometimes the provided copy-texts seem to have been of high quality: sometimes they can hardly have been. Some compositions even appear more than once in the same title, the second book of *Laude*.

Once Petrucci began to publish in Fossombrone, the pattern is slightly different, for here the evidence points to him having been a jobbing printer, responding to any individual commission.<sup>37</sup> This explains the very different patterns of sources for the music – including Rome, and later Florence, and perhaps the court at Urbino and the Strozzi. Once again, therefore we seem to have a series of suppliers with their own interests and requirements, and more significantly, their own blind-spots.

In Venice at the beginning, Castellanus had shown himself to be a musical editor, providing works that pleased him, and undertaking a certain basic level of editing. This is revealed in features that we may ascribe to performing taste – patterns of treating cadences, false relations and rhythmic interaction between voices, as well as in the level of the musical text sent to the printer. But consistency in these features is not to be found as a regular feature of other titles: they show a wide variation from work to work, or book to book (in the manners I have discussed), and therefore seem to reflect patterns of suppliers and exemplars.

Thus we can see, in different volumes, echoes of Ferrarese, Roman or Florentine, even Venetian traditions, indicated, as was normal, by the scribal processes involved in preparing Petrucci's exemplars, and to a small extent adapted by the modifications of scribal processes required by technical aspects of the printing process. What we cannot see, from volume to volume, even (in many cases) from piece to piece, is a consistent voice, offering a unified view of performance activity, or even concerned to make the performer's use of the book as easy as possible. We are forced to infer that Petrucci's evident interest in accurately copying the exemplar was not matched by an equivalent interest in questions of how the music might be performed.

We need to ask therefore whether Petrucci's editions pose different problems for the performer than those presented by manuscripts of the period: and, more generally, whether printed editions and manuscript sources of the Italian renaissance should be approached with different issues in mind. I think the answer is not very complex, though our expectations (and perhaps the answer) should change, depending on the date of the material we are examining.

The performer should expect to ask of all sources, whether printed or manuscript, and whether from 1510 or 1570, the same series of questions – concerning accuracy and relevance of the material on the page, evidence of

<sup>37</sup> Note that here I use the word „printer“. This may still not be justified, but it is difficult to believe that he would have been able to draw widely on a large group of skilled craftsmen to prepare his editions: it seems more likely that he hired a group of men who stayed with him for a period. The need to keep such men busy would explain the need to print Castiglione's edition in 1513, and the many hidden editions of the years after the 1516 edition of Josquin's first book of masses. It also helps to explain the curious history of his activities after 1519.

performing conventions, and so on. These are questions without which we can not build on the evidence of the source. But, whether facing printed editions, this performer should expect completely different sets of answers, especially once music publishing had become an industry, early in the 1540s. By then, the publisher had learned a great deal about his market, knew which types of pieces (and which composers) would sell easily, and which needed subsidy. More importantly, he recognized that every edition, while it had a primary market (choral institutions for masses, amateurs for villanelle, or some parts of the peninsula for French texts), also had to reach many other purchasers. This was the only way that any edition, whatever the contents, could be a financial success. The result was a series of compromises in presentation: in particular, many decisions were made as if the edition was destined for less skilled performers. It is for this reason that editions gradually show much more careful text placement, and frequent divisions of words into individual, separated syllables. Similar conclusions can be drawn from an increased care over the supply of accidentals, or the decline in ligatures (not exclusively a result of either the technical issues of printing or the increased use of smaller note-values).

Given such changes, the modern user of the books can still ask what the evidence tells us about performance practices and problems. But the answers will be different, simply because the evidence will have been focussed in different ways. Once editions were designed for the largest possible sale, the contents were aimed at the needs of the greatest number of performers, and this means generalizations of all sorts – more consistent readings, clearer underlay, modal arrangements of pieces,<sup>38</sup> and less in the way of ornamental figures.<sup>39</sup> All these are features of use to a wider range of users, indeed to a range that could not be clearly defined, either in ability or in specific interests.

We do not look at manuscripts in this way, for we assume that they had a specific destination, and therefore contain specifically selected information about the music and its performance. Therefore, most editions from the second half of the century will yield different answers to the questions posed by the modern performer.

The earliest years, however, were different. I believe that Petrucci's editions (and probably those of Antico, as well) should be treated as if they were manuscripts – in this respect, at least. We can not believe that he had any subtle understanding of the different groups of people that might buy his editions: such knowledge can only have come over time, with many editions and outlets in many cities. We also can not believe that he, or Castellanus

<sup>38</sup> I suspect that modal arrangement, in editions where it served no useful liturgical function, was more likely to have been planned to be of use to an inexperienced performer: it would provide patterns of cadences and *musica ficta* that were consistent for small groups of pieces. This possibility also would help to explain some of the anomalies in ordering.

<sup>39</sup> I recognise that this last, in particular, is a reflection of both new compositional styles and increasing authorial authority on the part of composers. But it also reflects the desire for consistent readings, and the general growth in numbers of amateur performers.

and other suppliers, were even thinking in terms of an overlap in the various purchasing groups: they probably thought that the most likely sale for any repertoire was among exactly the same groups that would own manuscript copies: the evidence of multiple re-editions argues for that, in suggesting that the actual market was bigger than they expected. Finally, we can not believe that Petrucci's editing processes (or, often, the lack of them) demonstrate an active tailoring of the music to the market.

For these reasons, Petrucci's editions will respond to the modern performer's questions in exactly the manner that a contemporary manuscript would. They answer the same questions, and leave the same issues unresolved: and they expect the same alertness to local and individual solutions. They are, in effect, manuscripts, reflections of their manuscript exemplars: they are also manifestations of Petrucci's concern for the beauty of the finished product – the book, not the performance.



