

UDK 78.074:093

Stanley Boorman

Oddelek za glasbo, Univerza v New Yorku
Department of Music, New York University

The 500th anniversary of the first music printing: a history of patronage and taste in the early years

500. obletnica prvega glasbenega tiska: k zgodnji zgodovini mecenstva in okusa

Ključne besede: Ottaviano Petrucci, glasbeni tisk, glasbeno mecenstvo, Ferrara

Key words: Ottaviano Petrucci, music printing, music patronage, Ferrara

POVZETEK

Ottaviano Petrucci je izdal svojo prvo glasbeno knjigo, *Odhecaton A*, poleti 1501, torej pred 500 leti. Ker je šlo za prvo tovrstno publikacijo, se je Petrucci moral soočiti z vrsto problemov. Nekateri so bili finančni, saj ni mogel vedeti, koliko ljudi bo kupilo glasbeni tisk oziroma koliko izvodov. Razen tega je obstajala tudi nevarnost, da ne bo mogel prodati toliko knjig, da bi z njimi pokrili svoje stroške. Posebno vprašanje je bilo vprašanje izbora: ali bodo njegove natiske kupovali poklicni glasbeniki in njihove institucije, ali pa diletanti, dvorjani in amaterji? Ali se bodo chansoni bolje prodajali kot cerkvena glasba?

Petruccijevi odgovori na ta vprašanja so bili seveda odvisni od tega, ali bo založnik on sam, ali pa bo kak mecen ali glasbenik podprl in jamčil za izdajo. Z uporabo bibliografskih in biografskih podatkov razprava zastopa mnenje, da so bile nekatere Petruccijeve najzgodnejše izdaje tvegani podvigi, tako kar zadeva družabnike in njega samega, medtem ko je pri ostalih verjetno šlo za naročila zunanjih mecenov.

SUMMARY

Ottaviano Petrucci published his first book of music, the *Odhecaton A*, sometime in the summer of 1501, 500 years ago. Since it was the first, Petrucci faced a number of special problems. Some were financial, for he could not know how many people would buy printed music, or how many books they would want. Consequently, there was a danger that he might not sell as many books as he needed to cover his costs. A related set of problems concerned the choice of music to print: would his books be bought by professional musicians and their institutions, or by dilettantes, courtiers and amateurs? Could chansons be expected to sell better than church music?

Petrucci's answers to these problems would depend on whether he had to finance his editions himself, or whether some patron or musician would offer to underwrite an edition for him. Using bibliographical and biographical data, this paper argues that some of Petrucci's earliest editions were speculative ventures on the part of his partners and himself, while others were proba-

Kaže, da je Petrucci skozi vso svojo kariero našel ravnovesje med tveganji in naročili: trg pač še ni bil dovolj velik, da bi omogočal manj zanesljive posle. Prav tako gotovo ni dovoljeval več kot enega glasbenega izdajatelja. To stanje je bilo značilno še daleč v trideseta leta 16. stoletja, kajti v tem času še ni prišlo do razmaha amaterskega muziciranja.

bly commissioned from Petrucci by an outside patron.

Petrucci seems to have had to balance speculative with commissioned editions throughout his career: the market may not have been big enough to support only speculative editions. It was certainly not big enough to support more than one publisher of music. This situation seems to have continued well into the 1530s arguing that the big expansion in amateur musicians did not occur until then.

Five hundred years ago, in the early summer of 1501, Ottaviano Petrucci published the first complete book of polyphonic music ever printed. This book, the Harmonice Musices Odhecaton A, with its 96 three- and four-voiced songs, concentrated on works by France-Flemish composers, some of whom had never worked in, or probably even visited, Italy. Nonetheless, the book appeared in Venice, and was evidently aimed at an Italian market. It contained a dedicatory letter addressed to a leading Venetian citizen, and the French songs carried no text beyond a brief incipit. This was the book with which Petrucci launched a new printed repertoire, and began the process by which printed music, any sort of music, expanded in circulation throughout the following centuries. By the late 19th century, almost all the vast range of musical repertoires was being printed, individual works and repertoires were disseminated across the breadth of Europe and even to America, and many social classes were buying editions that were often produced in large print-runs.

But none of this was true in 1501: all music had circulated in manuscript, and each manuscript source had been commissioned with a particular owner and user in mind, the Duke of Ferrara, the Dean of Milan Cathedral, or the head of the Bavarian court chapel would have known exactly who would be using a manuscript when he ordered it from a musical copyist.¹ He could therefore select the types of compositions to be included (and sometimes specify individual works), and arrange for the manner of their preservation – with or without texts, perhaps transposed to a different pitch, and laid out in choirbook format or in part-books. All this was even more true for the private owner, who would know which specific pieces he wanted to add to his collection. As a result, as we know, each manuscript of polyphony could be seen as unique in construction, presentation and destination.

¹ There are surviving manuscripts commissioned by each of these patrons. They differ in content and style, and represent not merely the needs of their institutions, but also different artistic tastes and attitude to displays. For manuscripts apparently copied for the court institutions of Ferrara, see Lewis Lockwood, *Music in renaissance Ferrara, 1400-1505: the creation of a musical center in the fifteenth century* (Cambridge, MA: Harvard University Press, 1984), and the literature cited there, as well as RISM BIV/5; the manuscripts copied for Milan under Gaforius' leadership have been presented in facsimile, edited by Howard Mayer Brown, as volume xii of *Renaissance music in facsimile* (New York: Garland, 1987), and are also described in RISM BIV/5 (where references to earlier literature can be found); the manuscripts compiled for the Bavarian chapel are discussed and arranged in order in Martin Bente, *Neue Wege der Quellenkritik und die Biographie Ludwig Senfls* (Wiesbaden: Breitkopf und Härtel, 1968).

This is one way that the manuscript differs from the printed book: in intention, if not in practice, every copy of a printed edition was identical to all the others. Each purchaser would have to have been satisfied with the same selection of material, the same contents presented in the same order and in the same manner, and with the same types of musical variants. The publisher, therefore, had to arrange both the contents and their presentation as far as possible to maximise the potential number of purchasers.

This was a major change in the consumption of music, and it parallels similar changes found in other ranges of printed matter. Elisabeth Eisenstein, Lucien Febvre, Brian Richardson, Cynthia Brown, and (most recently) Adrian Johns have looked at the manners in which books and book preparers interacted with readers.² They have drawn on a wide range of evidence to show how readers' perceptions of the authority vested in a book gradually changed, and how authors and publishers reacted to that change; how the patronage and support of writers and scholars was altered by the existence of printing; and how publishers developed strategies to enlarge the market for books, and thus their own profits.

While many of the arguments advanced by these writers can be usefully applied to the special case of the dissemination of music during the 16th-century, little of the actual evidence relates directly to Petrucci or his successors. In Petrucci's case, this is because he was the first – for music at least. As such, he can have had little idea how many people would even have been willing to buy printed music; nor can he have known in detail which types of music these people would want to purchase.

For a publisher, these would be serious problems. Once a book was printed it had to be sold, for it represented a significant investment of capital. The cost of paper made up a very large proportion of the cost of a printed book: it may have been as high as 50% in many cases, though probably rather lower for Petrucci, with his multiple-impression process. Once it was used (printed on), this paper would only yield a return when the books were distributed and paid for. The first book produced by any printer or publisher presented this problem in its most acute form, for there would be no earlier books bringing in a return on earlier capital investment, and thus keeping the enterprise alive. For Petrucci, the problem was compounded by the complete lack of previous evidence for the field of music. He must have had some reason for believing that the first books of music to be printed would not spell financial disaster for himself or his backers.

Why, then, did Petrucci risk printing polyphonic music? It was certainly a minority interest in 1501, for relatively few people could even read musical notation. Further, why did he choose to print Franco-Flemish chansons? Even though, as we know, some cen-

² See Eisenstein, Elizabeth, *The printing press as an agent of change* (Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 1979); Lucien Paul Victor Febvre and Henri-Jean Martin, *L'Apparition du Livre* (Paris: Michel, 1958); Brian Richardson, *Print culture in Renaissance Italy: the editor and the vernacular text, 1470-1600*, Cambridge studies in publishing and printing history (Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 1994); Cynthia J. Brown, *Poets, patrons, and printers: crisis of authority in late medieval France* (Ithaca: Cornell University Press, 1995); Adrian Johns, *The Nature of the book: print and knowledge in the making* (Chicago: University of Chicago Press, 1998). Two recent important studies of specific issues are Adrian Armstrong, *Technique and technology: scripts, print and poetics in France, 1470-1550* (Oxford: Oxford University Press, 2000) and Gary Marker, *Publishing, printing, and the origins of intellectual life in Russia, 1700-1800* (Princeton: Princeton University Press, 1985).

tres and circles cultivated the chanson,³ Venetian printers and their public were increasingly interested in Italian and classical authors⁴

These are important questions for the history of music, just as much as for that of music publishing. Any answers will throw light on one of the most important and intractable issues in the study of 16th-century music – how many people had access to music, and who were they? In Petrucci's case, this can be expressed in terms of the size of his edition – the number of copies printed – and the destination of those copies: and the best evidence we have for either is to be found in a consideration of the reasons for printing each book.

* * *

Ottaviano Petrucci was probably in his mid-thirties when he published the *Odhecaton A*.⁵ He had been born in Fossombrone, a small town in the Marche, and part of the Duchy of Urbino. As such, apart from being a site of considerable strategic importance during the wars of the early 16th century, it was also within a rich cultural orbit. However, there are now few traces of a significant musical culture, so that we can not tell how Petrucci came by his musical expertise.

He had moved to Venice by 1498, three years before his first book, because that year he applied for, and was granted, a privilege giving him the exclusive right to publish music of any kind. Yet he was not a printer: he was not even a bookseller. Privilege applications from such craftsmen regularly stated their profession, as "stampador", "libraio", or "mercadante di libri". Petrucci merely calls himself "fossombronese" – from Fossombrone – thereby clearly admitting that he had no professional training, and no business base.⁶ Although he took business partners from the trade,⁷ he himself lacked the expertise with which to judge the size and interests of a market for printed books, as well as the skill to produce them.

This is an important point: if he were to make a success of music publishing, he would have to act like an author – providing the text (and music) to be printed, but relying on the judgement of some-one else, the printer and publisher, for many technical decisions and details.

³ The classic study of Italian interest in the chanson in the years up to 1500 remains Allan Atlas, *The Cappella Giulia chansonnier* (Rome, Biblioteca Apostolica Vaticana, C. G. XIII. 27), *Musicological studies*, xxvii (New York: Institute of Medieval Music, 1975). It should be supplemented by a number of more recent studies (which also cover later years), including the same author's *Music at the Aragonese court of Naples* (Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 1985); Lawrence Bernstein, "La Couronne et fleur des chansons a troys: a mirror of the French chanson in Italy in the years between Ottaviano Petrucci and Antonio Gardano", *Journal of the American Musicological Society*, xxvi (1973), 1–68; and his "A Florentine chansonnier of the early sixteenth century: Florence, Biblioteca Nazionale Centrale, MS Magliabechi 117", *Early Music History*, vi (1986), 1–107; Howard Mayer Brown, *A Florentine chansonnier from the time of Lorenzo the Magnificent, Monuments of Renaissance Music*, vii (Chicago: University of Chicago Press, 1983); and the bibliographical citations in David Fallows, *A Catalogue of polyphonic songs, 1415–1480* (Oxford: Oxford University Press, 1999).

⁴ It is interesting to see the surge in pamphlets of popular frottole texts in the years before Petrucci began work.

⁵ The standard biography of Petrucci has long been Augusto Vernarecci, *Ottaviano de' Petrucci da Fossombrone, inventore dei tipi mobili metallici fusi della musica nel secolo XV*. (2nd edition, Bologna: Romagnoli, 1882; reprinted in 1884, and Bologna: Forni, 1971). A re-evaluation with some new documents will appear in my *Ottaviano Petrucci: catalogue raisonné* (forthcoming).

⁶ These petitions are preserved in the Archivio di Stato in Venice, in the notarial registers pertaining to either the Collegio or the Capi of the Consiglio de' Dieci. The wording of Petrucci's and other privilege applications is discussed in my book cited in note 5. That volume will also contain expanded discussion of a number of points made here.

⁷ These were Amadeo Scotto (a leading member of the distinguished publishing house) and Niccolò di Raphael (who was probably a bookseller).

Yet Petrucci was also not an author, nor a composer. At least, we know of no compositions with his name, while he consistently published music by many other people, including minor musicians in Venice and the surrounding areas.

How then did he decide what to publish, how many copies to print, and where to sell them?

* * *

Given the lack of archival information (for Petrucci, as for most printers of the period), we turn to the obvious starting point: the repertoire of music itself. I do not believe that any printer or publisher sat down one evening and said to himself and his employees that it would be nice to experiment with a new repertoire – music, or maps, or books in Hebrew. The publisher needed to have either a patron, or else clear evidence of a strong demand. With music, this was a problem, more serious than that for most verbal texts. As with texts in Greek or Cyrillic, the symbols are different: to begin with, a publisher would need to know that enough people could even read the notation. And for music this was less clear than for Greek, where Aldus Manutius and others had been selling books to scholars and literati, the aristocrats and the intelligentsia for some years.⁸ There, a publisher could look at the production of his potential rivals, and have a clear idea of the size of the market – the number of people who might buy his books – and therefore of the best size for his print-run.

But, for music, the market would have to be defined for the first time. It was almost certainly seen as made up of two very different components, one of which was much harder to measure than the other. On one hand, there were the professional musicians: they were largely employed by courts and cathedrals, and their repertoire was defined by the needs of their employers. It consisted of church music – masses, motets, settings of Lamentations, etc. – or courtly music in French or Italian.⁹ This part of the market could be easily measured, for the numbers of institutions and their musicians will have been known. Even though many will already have owned musical manuscripts, an astute publisher could soon find out which would be interested in acquiring printed music to add to their collections.

⁸ For recent studies of Greek printing and publishing in Italy, see Manoussos Manoussakas and K. Staikos, *The Publishing activity of the Greeks during the Italian renaissance (1469-1523)* (Athens: Greek Ministry of Culture, 1987); and Nicolas Barker, *Aldus Manutius and the development of Greek script and type in the fifteenth century* (Sandy Hook: Chiswick Book Shop, 1985; 2nd edition, New York: Fordham University Press, 1992). Aldus Manutius himself has been the subject of many studies: recent work (with references to earlier, still central studies) includes Martin Lowry, *The World of Aldus Manutius: business and scholarship in renaissance Venice* (Oxford: Blackwell, 1979); George Fletcher, *New Aldine studies* (San Francisco: Rosenthal, 1988); Paul G. Naiditch, editor, *A Catalogue of the Ahmanson-Murphy Aldine collection at UCLA* (Los Angeles: Department of Special Collections, University Research Library, University of California, Los Angeles, 1989-1994); Susy Marcon and Marino Zorzi, editors, *Aldo Manuzio e l'ambiente veneziano, 1494-1515* (Venice: il Cardo, 1994); and Martin Davies, *Aldus Manutius: printer and publisher of Renaissance Venice* (London: British Library, 1995). In addition, reference should be made to the still-classic work by Victor Scholderer, "Printers and readers in Italy in the fifteenth century", *Proceedings of the British Academy*, xxxv (1949), 25-47; as well as to Martin Lowry, *Nicholas Jenson and the rise of Venetian publishing in the Renaissance* (Oxford: Oxford University Press, 1991).

⁹ I recognise that this is an over-simplification. All institutions collected music across a range of categories, so that the chapter at Verona Cathedral apparently owned the secular I-VEcap, DCCLVII (for which see RISM BIV/5, pp. 562-565); and Howard Mayer Brown, Verona, *Biblioteca Capitolare, MS DCCLVII, Renaissance Music in Facsimile*, xxiv (New York: Garland, 1987); while many courts had a need for manuscripts of religious and liturgical music.

The second part of the market, however, was almost impossible to measure: it included amateur musicians, poor lute players and incompetent singers; it included the leisured classes and merchants trying to imitate them; and it included members of confraternities and academies needing something to sing. Evidently, this was a diffuse and ill-defined group.

It might have seemed sensible, therefore, to start a music-publishing venture with the first group, and publish as one's first titles the music needed in cathedrals and churches. Publishers knew these institutions, for they had been acquiring editions of chant and other liturgical books, and a publisher could find out exactly what they might be willing to buy. There might not be a large number of such purchasers, but a smaller print-run could still be profitable.

Despite this, Petrucci started with chansons: the market for these certainly should have included the courts of Naples, Florence, and northern Italy, though it must have been unclear how many courtiers would buy a book of printed music – an anthology where the choice of pieces had been made by some-one else. To many publishers in Venice at the time, the decision to build this anthology around French chansons must have seemed a risky one, likely to have reduced the number of centres in Italy where the book would sell well.

The reasons for Petrucci's decision are made apparent in the second dedicatory letter to the *Odhecaton A*, which makes reference to Petrus Castellanus.¹⁰ This Dominican friar, resident in Venice, is known to have been an avid collector of music. Recent research shows that he had contacts with musicians in other parts of Italy, and that there was an active exchange of music between them.¹¹ According to the dedicatory letter, Castellanus supplied the music for Petrucci's first edition. He must surely have gone further, and persuaded Petrucci that the book would sell: indeed, he may have insisted that it would only sell if it were elegant and well-presented, thus matching to some extent the quality of manuscripts used by prospective purchasers. The book was indeed unusual in the quality of its presentation: it was in landscape format, then very rare on booksellers' shelves; it was extravagantly printed, on good paper, with many wood-block initials, and much white space on the page. Any prospective buyer, already impressed by the pretentious title, would find what was effectively a luxury product. The book was also expensive,¹² on a level with the de-luxe editions published by Aldus Manutius, and was

¹⁰ This epistle has been edited a number of times, most importantly in Claudio Sartori, *Bibliografia delle opere musicali stampate da Ottaviano Petrucci*, Biblioteca di bibliografia italiana, xviii (Florence: Olschki, 1948), pp.39-45. See also the articles cited in the next note.

¹¹ See Bonnie J. Blackburn, "Petrucci's Venetian editor: Petrus Castellanus and his musical garden", *Musica Disciplina*, xlix (1995), 15-45; reprinted in *Composition, printing and performance* (Aldershot: Ashgate, 2000), ch.VI; and her "Lorenzo de'Medici, a lost Isaac manuscript, and the Venetian ambassador", *Musica Franca: essays in honor of Frank A. D'Accone*, edited by Irene Alm, Alyson McLamore and Colleen Reardon (Stuyvesant, NY: Pendragon, 1996), 19-44; reprinted in *Composition, printing and performance* (Aldershot: Ashgate, 2000), ch.V.

¹² The only evidence we have for the cost of Petrucci's books lies in the records kept by Cristoforo Colon, the Spanish bibliophile. For the musical books, see Catherine Weeks Chapman, "Printed collections of polyphonic music owned by Ferdinand Columbus", *Journal of the American Musicological Society*, xxi (1968), 34-84; Higinio Anglés, "La musica conservada en la Biblioteca Colombina y en la Catedral de Sevilla". *Anuario musical*, ii (1947), 3-39; and Dragan Plamenac, "Excerpta Colombina: items of musical interest in Fernando Colon's Regestrum", *Miscelanea en homenaje a Monsenor Higinio Anglés* (Barcelona: Consejo superior de investigaciones científicas, 1958-1961), ii, 663-687.

apparently aimed at much the same market. This makes sense: many of the purchasers of Aldus's editions would have regarded basic musical skills as part of their education – as Castiglione implies – and would also have had access to professional performers to coach or support them. So Petrus Castellanus must have persuaded Petrucci and his partners that such a book presented in this luxurious manner, would not incur a financial loss for them.

We do not know who bore the actual costs of producing the Odhecaton A, but it was probably not a straight commission, paid for in advance. After it, Petrucci published nothing else for nearly nine months, apparently waiting to see how well this first book would sell. Evidently, it must have covered his costs, for he then prepared a second book, on basically the same pattern – shorter, but containing a closely related repertoire, laid out in precisely the same manner, and with a similar title-page, the Canti B of 5. 2. 1502.¹³

Both these books almost certainly had small print-runs. The business of music publishing was still at an experimental stage, and Petrucci would prefer not to print too many copies for the size of the market. It would be better to print a second edition, if one were needed. Indeed, the first book went to its second edition after only twenty months, and the second book after a mere eighteen months.¹⁴

During this period, before the second edition of Canti B, Petrucci published two books labelled "Motetti". Despite the title, these continued the repertoire of the first books. There was no place in them for the large-scale compositions sung in cathedrals and courtly chapels. Instead, the books are full of short (often chanson-like) settings of devotional texts in honour of the Virgin Mary, or meditations on the Passion or the Cross. These would be sung at home, in a confraternity, or by court musicians extending the repertoire of short light pieces to entertain their master. In other words, the intended market was the same one that had been discovered with the two books of chansons.¹⁵

Over a period of two years, therefore, Petrucci had produced four closely-related books, visually attractive and in a distinctive format, and aimed at the same general market. This does not represent a full-time career: it presents a picture of a cautious publisher, unsure of the size and location of his market, and waiting to see how well his books would sell. If Petrucci and his partners needed to wait in this manner, they must have had a financial stake in the success of the books: they were not prepared to invest in the second and later titles until the first had been proved successful. It is unlikely, therefore, that the supplier of the music, Castellanus, or indeed any-one else, commissioned and paid for the books. All four represent a strictly speculative venture.

* * *

Late in 1502, even before the Motetti B, Petrucci launched out in a new direction, producing the first of what would become a series of books containing music for the Ordinary of the Mass. These books were radically different from the earlier volumes, not only in their repertoire and presumed purchasers, but also in presentation. In contrast to

¹³ A summary table of all Petrucci's editions discussed here is given at the end of this paper.

¹⁴ The relevant dates are given in the table at the end of this paper.

¹⁵ This idea was first developed by Howard Mayer Brown, in his "The mirror of men's salvation: music in devotional life about 1500", *Renaissance Quarterly*, xliii (1990), 744-773.

the earlier choir-book layout, the music was printed in separate part-books. The immediate result was that each singer needed to hold his own part, and had even less idea than before of what the others would be singing at the same time. This seems to imply a higher level of performing skill, a view confirmed by the music itself. Mass compositions in these early volumes are *tours de force*, at the peak of the repertoire, full of learned devices and sophisticated musical effects, and relatively very long and challenging. They were the province of international-level skilled professional singers, working in wealthy institutions, serving princes and clerics of high standing.

As I have already remarked, the market for such music was potentially smaller, with likely purchasers scattered across Italy and central Europe. The room for financial profit was therefore much more limited. There must have been some reason for Petrucci to leave his hard-earned position as a supplier of music for domestic and social consumption, and venture into this completely different area of music.

I believe that these first mass books were commissioned, that they represent the earliest examples of what became an important (and lucrative) part of Venetian music publishing throughout the century. Some-one came to Petrucci and said "I want you to publish this collection of music, and I will underwrite it, meet all the costs". This person was, in all probability, a member of the court of Ferrara.¹⁶

The first of these mass editions, containing music by Josquin des Pres, appeared in September 1502. At that very time, the court at Ferrara was undergoing one of its internal policy battles, this time over the appointment of a new *maestro da capella*¹⁷ One faction at court, supported by Alfonso (the ducal heir-apparent), favoured Josquin, the greatest composer of the time. Another faction had a rival candidate, the brilliant and more fluent Heinrich Isaac. I believe that someone within Alfonso's faction arranged to have Petrucci's book of Josquin's masses published, as a weapon in the dispute. It could be given to courtiers and musicians as part of a campaign to demonstrate Josquin's potential, and also sent to other courts as evidence of the high calibre of the musicians sought by Ferrara.

This argument may seem entirely speculative, but there is one very convincing piece of evidence, to be found not in this book, but in the timing and technical details of the third and fourth of Petrucci's series of mass books, those containing music by Brumel and Ghiselin.

Until the presentation of the book by Brumel, that is for his first seven editions, Petrucci had used a triple-impression process. The musical staff was printed at one impression, the text at another, and the music itself at a third, though the order could vary depending on circumstances. Petrucci followed the same process for about half of the Brumel volume, However, in the middle of work on that book, he abandoned both the

¹⁶ Many details surrounding the following argument will be laid out in my forthcoming book, cited in footnote 5. Some other implications are pursued in my forthcoming paper, "Did Petrucci's concern for accuracy include any concern with performance issues?", read at the Petrucci conference held in Basel in January 2001.

¹⁷ Much of the detail of this argument can be followed in Lewis Lockwood, *Music in Renaissance Ferrara, 1400-1505: the creation of a musical center in the fifteenth century* (Cambridge, MA: Harvard University Press, 1984), and his "Josquin at Ferrara: new documents and letters", *Josquin des Pres: Proceedings of the International Josquin Festival-Conference held at the Julliard School at Lincoln Center in New York City, 21-25 June 1971*, ed. Edward E. Lowinsky, with Bonnie J. Blackburn (London: Oxford University Press, 1976), 103-136.

book and the process. He experimented with a process of only two impressons, putting the words and the staves together in one forme: and he tried it out, not on the next gatherings of the Brumel, but with the first sheets of a new book, containing music by Ghiselin. Once the experiment was successful, he did something quite unusual, perhaps unique in his career: he proceeded with both books simultaneously.¹⁸

Evidently, Petrucci was under pressure to finish the Ghiselin edition, and get it published, a pressure that he did not feel for the edition of Brumel's music. Since this pressure caused him to disrupt his normal processes, in the middle of the earlier book, it can only have come from outside the press. This implies a powerful patron, one who was meeting the costs of the Ghiselin book, and could impose his wishes on the publisher. We must therefore assume that these decisions relate to the choice of the music in the Ghiselin book, that is, to some factor in the composer's biography.

Ghiselin was then employed in northern Europe, but had just been hired to sing in Italy, by the Ferrara court. In April, he had already reached Lyons in France, on his way to Ferrara, and Petrucci had already begun work on the Brumel edition. Given the timing of the interruption in Petrucci's work, and the change to a book of music by Ghiselin, it seems very likely that the new composer's imminent arrival in Italy was the stimulus for the change of plan. This surely puts the patronage behind the publication of Ghiselin's book in the court of Ferrara, proud to show off its new singer. Here is a case where a specific patron seems to have commissioned a book of music, and also to have required it to be finished as soon as possible. Presumably, this patron also met the costs of the volume.

The parallels with the plan to hire Josquin, and the concurrent publication of Petrucci's first mass book, are appealing. We seem to have a picture of one of Alfonso's favourites using the Josquin edition for a political motive, to gain support for hiring Josquin: the same patron then decided to follow his triumph with music by other composers popular at Ferrara. This was certainly true of Obrecht and Brumel, represented in Petrucci's second and third books of mass music: and Ghiselin was, as I say, expected to take up a position there.

The two series of books, secular and mass-music, continued concurrently. While Petrucci was working with Castellanus to provide the first series, he was also being commissioned to publish the mass volumes. For the first series, he apparently needed to make a profit from sales and new editions: for the second, it appears that he was paid directly, by someone at the Ferrarese court.

Already, then, we have examples of the two types of financial arrangement that would dominate music publishing for much of the rest of the century. On one hand, publisher and music-supplier worked together to produce a volume that they thought, and hoped, would sell enough copies to make a profit: with luck, it might even do well enough to require a second edition. On the other hand, some external patron came to the publisher, with a book ready-made, asked to have it printed and published, and probably bore all the costs of production.

¹⁸ The technical details supporting this argument are presented in my "A case of work and turn half-sheet imposition in the sixteenth century", *The Library*, Ser.6, viii (1986), 301-321.

* * *

The evidence is rarely as clear and convincing as it is for these first editions by Petrucci. In most cases, we can not really tell which of the two possibilities actually applied. Certainly, some other cases are equally clear-cut: a decision, in the 1570s, to print yet another edition of Arcadelt's first book of madrigals, some forty years after the first edition, was almost certainly a speculative venture, although hardly a risky one. The printer and publisher would have been fairly confident that they could make a sure profit, and would not have expected to find some outside patron. On the other hand, an edition of sacred music by the organist of a remote town perhaps in the Marche, with a dedication to the local bishop, can hardly have been seen as a certain money-maker. Here, the composer himself is most likely to have paid for the edition, believing that his return would not be financial, but would lie in an improvement of his career prospects.¹⁹

These instances are, as I say, easy to describe, and we can detect a number, of both types, throughout the century. But, in most cases, we can not tell whether a specific volume conforms to either type. For an example of the more normal situation, where bibliographical or repertorial evidence is all we have, we turn to the next group of books published by Petrucci, the first in the long series of volumes of frottole and related genres.

These represent another break in repertoire and market: at first sight, they might look like Petrucci's first editions – secular music, printed in a choir-book format. But there are real differences. The most obvious is a result of the different language: Italian frottole genres were primarily poetic (not musical) and were popular with the rapidly increasing number of devotees of both the Tuscan language and its lighter musical manifestations. Clearly, a full text would be very important to the success of books of frottole. Petrucci therefore will have known that the new books had to carry all the text, with additional strophes printed below the music.²⁰ Indeed, the complete text was so important that its presence required a minor change of printing technique on Petrucci's part.²¹ All of these factors, coupled with the presence of a new group of composers, imply that the books were intended for a different range of purchasers.

It is interesting, therefore, to note the speed with which the first three books of frottole were produced. This time, there was no hesitation, no waiting to see if the first book sold well: instead, all three volumes appeared within ten weeks. Petrucci was evidently confident that he would not make a loss on the series, even though it contained almost 180 compositions. Either he was again commissioned to publish the set, or someone knew a great deal about the size and enthusiasm of the intended group of purchasers. In either case, the lack of any delay between the volumes argues that they were planned and published as a set.

There is some internal evidence, as well, that the three books were conceived as a set, although they do not use the letters "A", "B", and "C" that had characterised the earlier

¹⁹ This argument has serious implications for the size of the print-run in such editions, and they are briefly examined in my "Thoughts on the popularity of printed music in 16th-century Italy", to appear in *Fontes artis musicae* for 2001.

²⁰ In a few cases, some verses had to be printed at the end of the whole book.

²¹ It appears that the additional verses of text were printed in the same impression as the musical notation, instead of with the staves, as was the underlaid text.

sequences of chanson and motet books. This lies in a pattern of arranging the contents of the three according to what must have been a pre-determined plan.²² The first book has a preponderance of composers who are called "veronensis", from Verona in the Veneto. This is true even of those composers, such as Cara and Tromboncino, who might have been born there, but who had become famous not because of Verona, but through their association with other musical centres, primarily Mantua and Ferrara. Apparently, the collector of the music in this volume wished to supply a collection that would be representative of a "Veronese School" of composition. Similarly, Book Two regularly asserts connections with Venice or Padua, apparently indicative of another geographical association, and perhaps of a slightly different manner of composition – though such a difference is hardly visible today. Book Three also starts out as carefully organised, though the arrangement gradually degenerates into a mixture of styles and composers.

This suggestion of preparing three volumes to reflect an over-all picture of patterns in the repertoire increases the significance of the speed with which the books were produced. It appears that the three represent one supplier's collection of music. We have no idea who he might have been, but this supplier apparently came to Petrucci with the music for three volumes, representing the bulk of his own collection. This was arranged according to an agenda that highlighted the cultural strength of cities in the Veneto – perhaps to contrast with the emphases of Petrucci's earlier books. The supplier evidently asked Petrucci to print the whole collection: this is why the third book ceases to seem as well organised – for it represents the miscellaneous works that always remain after one has sorted and ordered a large collection.

Again, given the speed with which these three books appeared, Petrucci had no fear of making a loss on them. I believe that the supplier of the music commissioned all three books, required that they show the complete texts, and guaranteed the costs. In effect, he acted as a patron.

This represents a modified means of meeting the costs of a book. It is true that, as with the Josquin volume, a specific person had apparently come to Petrucci and sponsored the three titles. But, in the case of the frottola books, that person seems to have had no commercial agenda, and no motive of personal ambition or of enhancing the reputation of an individual composer or institution. The possible reason for publishing the three books can only have been to ensure a wider circulation of a range of music, as representative of a genre or school of composition.

In that sense, this is a different approach to publishing, one that is more clearly disinterested, even though financial considerations must have existed. Similar later instances may perhaps be found in those editions of canzoni francese or villanelle alla napoletana which include the works of several composers, or the Venetian publication of Jannequin's chansons, during the 1530s.

* * *

²² This is discussed in my "Printed music books of the Italian renaissance from the point of view of manuscript study". Actas del XV Congreso de la Sociedad Internacional de Musicología: "Culturas Musicales del Mediterraneo y sus Ramificaciones", Madrid, 3-1 O/IV/ 1992 (Madrid: Sociedad Internacional de Musicología, 1993), 2587-2602. This paper advances some other instances in which bibliographical evidence reveals something about why and how a book was prepared and published.

Throughout his career, Petrucci must have tried to balance speculative editions (those without subsidy) with commissioned editions. For later publishers, this was a relatively easy task: I have mentioned the sure success of Arcadelt editions, and there must have been other similar titles – not only the duos by Jhan Gero, but also madrigals by Ruffo and Rore, and the later villanelle of Marenzio. For music publishers working after the middle of the century, the market and its taste had become better defined, so that their decisions were better informed, and the risk of loss must have seemed less serious.

For Petrucci, however, the problems continued to be real, and the decisions would remain difficult, throughout his twenty-year career. Part of the reason for this assertion is that Petrucci seems never to have had a full-time publishing career. None of his most productive years, 1503, 1505 and 1507, produced as many as a dozen editions (though the first two did have some additional partial printings, involving replacement sheets or cancels). This would not have been enough work to keep a single team of printers busy throughout the year: indeed, one of his least productive years, 1504, saw only six editions.

Another reason why I believe that he had difficulty in assessing his market lies in the number of second and third editions that he put out. Two of the nine editions of 1503, and two of the eleven in 1507 were second editions of earlier titles. This tends to argue that Petrucci printed fewer copies than the market could bear, especially of the early chanson volumes and of the frottole. The early mass books are not relevant here, if I am right in believing that they were sponsored by affluent noble patrons. In that case, the question of selling and profit may not have arisen: and it is notable that (with the exception of the books of Josquin's masses) few of these volumes seem to have gone to second editions.²³

A third reason can be found in the cautious way Petrucci launched into lute music. Although this repertoire had been covered in his original privilege of 1498, he published no lute music until 1507. When he did, the composer, Francesco Spinacino, was a fellow-citizen of his home town, and presumably a personal friend or acquaintance. Petrucci was again uncertain of the success of the volume, for he waited fifteen months before publishing any more lute music.

But the most useful measure of whether the market for printed music was noticeably getting stronger and more visible would lie in the presence of rivals seeking to compete with Petrucci. A successful rival would confirm for us that the market existed, and even suggest that at least one of Petrucci's contemporaries thought that it was getting larger.

In fact, few other people printed music during Petrucci's active career, from 1501 to 1520. This is significant, for at the same time other repertoires were being explored competitively, often by several printers at the same time. The records of privileges granted by the Venetian authorities are the most comprehensive documentation of the extent of competition between printers and publishers.²⁴ But modern catalogues, of

²³ It is also notable that the second edition of Josquin's first book, undated but printed in 1505, was prepared in a much more economical manner than had been the first of 1502: this suggests that the first was certainly a promoted book, while the second may have been a commercial venture. The second edition was first described in Jeremy Noble, "Ottaviano Petrucci: his Josquin editions and some others", *Essays presented to Myron P. Gilmore*, edited by Sergio Bertelli and Gloria Ramakus (Florence: La Nuova Italia, 1978), ii, 433-445.

²⁴ Many of these privileges have been listed or transcribed elsewhere, in R. Fulin's "Documenti per servire alla storia della tipografia veneziana", *Archivio Veneto*, xxiii (1882), 84-212; and his "Nuovi documenti per servire alla storia della tipografia veneziana". *Archivio Veneto*, xxiii (1882), 390-405. See also the various discussions in Horatio Brown, *The Venetian printing press: an historical study based upon documents for the most part hitherto unpublished* (New York: Putnam, 1891).

individual libraries as well as the national union catalogues, make it clear that the principal authors of classical antiquity, the leading writers of poetry and the principal repertoires of church chant (among other subjects) were frequently printed, and often in competing editions. This does not happen for music. There is only one instance of a publisher trying to compete with Petrucci, and another of someone re-printing one of his books. This latter is the edition of Petrucci's Canti B, put out by Schöffer of Mainz, apparently to meet an interest in that repertoire in centres north of the Alps.²⁵ That interest can not have been very extensive, for Schöffer only produced one other music book at that time, an edition of lute settings by Judenkünig.

The rival, attempting to compete with Petrucci, was Andrea Antico, a native of Istria, and a scribe in Rome. He certainly tried to compete, in the sense that he acquired papal privileges which specifically mentioned Petrucci, and which limited the latter's freedom.²⁶ However, some at least of Antico's books seem to have been promoted by a patron. One of his collections of frottole has a Medici device, and what may have been meant to be a portrait of Giuliano de' Medici.²⁷ Another book, the famous Liber quindecim Missarum of 1516, is a splendid large-folio choir-book, cut in fine woodblocks, and dedicated to Pope Leo X, with his portrait receiving the book from Antico. The music in the book comes from the repertoire of the Papal chapel under Leo: and Antico claims that it took him three years to cut all the wood-blocks and prepare the book. For all these reasons, I am sure that the book was proposed to him, and subsidised. It would have been started soon after Leo was crowned, and would have occupied much of Antico's time (and earning potential): it was finally published during the Lateran Council, attended by prelates from all over the Catholic world, each with his own court and chaplains. I am sure that Antico's patron had this in mind as a means of circulating the book and its music. Therefore, this book, like much of Petrucci's output, seems to represent a special commission or an unusual opportunity.

But, apart from Antico, and the unusual case of an edition from Schöffer's press in Mainz, there is virtually no attempt at competing with Petrucci, or even of independent music publishing.²⁸ Even the few privileges that were taken out during Petrucci's working lifetime seem not to have been successful: none of those issued in Venice – that of Marco

²⁵ For this book, see David Fallows, *A Catalogue of polyphonic songs, 1415-1480* (Oxford: Oxford University Press, 1999), p.9; and Walter Senn, "Das Sammelwerk 'Quinquagena Carminum' aus der Offizin Peter Schöffers d. J. ", *Acta Musicologica*, xxxv (1964), 183-185.

²⁶ The standard study of Antico remains Catherine Weeks Chapman, *Andrea Antico* (Ph.D. dissertation, Harvard University, 1964). See also Francesco Luisi, *Il secondo libro di frottole di Andrea Antico, Musica rinascimentale in Italia*, iii (Rome: Pro musica studium, 1976); Martin Picker, "The motet anthologies of Andrea Antico", *A musical offering: essays in honor of Martin Bernstein*, edited by Edward Clinkscale and Claire Brook (New York: Pendragon Press, 1977), 211-237; Beth L. Miller, "Antico, Andrea", *Music Printing and Publishing*, edited by D.W. Krummel and Stanley Sadie, *Grove Handbooks in Music* (London: Macmillan, 1990), 143-147; Koraljka Kos, "Bossinensis, Antico i instrumentalna glazba njihova vremena", *Muzičke večeri u Donatu* (Zagreb: Music Information Centre, 1983), 37-53; reprinted in *Istra: Časopis za kulturu*, xxx (1993).

²⁷ See Stanley Boorman, "Early music printing: an indirect contact with the Raphael circle", *Renaissance studies in honor of Craig Hugh Smyth*, edited by Andrew Morrogh et al. (Florence: Barbèra, 1985), 533-550.

²⁸ One example concerns the publishing of an edition of Obrecht's masses, by Gregor Mewes of Basel, sometime before 1510. According to Birgit Lodes, this represents a direct contact between printer and composer, and not an attempt at emulating Petrucci. See Birgit Lodes, "An anderem Ort, auf andere Art: Petruccis und Mewes' Obrecht-Drucke", to be published in the proceedings of the Petrucci conference held in Basel, January 2001. Another is the book of frottole and related music published in Siena by Sambonetto in 1515. This very ugly book contains a local repertoire, with a number of very popular works added, and seems to have been intended for local sale, rather than as competition for Petrucci and Antico. For this book, see most recently Frank A. D'Accone, *The Civic Muse: Music and musicians in Siena during the Middle Ages and Renaissance* (Chicago: Chicago University Press, 1997).

dall'Aquila (11 . 3. 1505), that of Giacomo 9 Ungaro (26. 9. 1513), or that awarded to the composer Tromboncino in 1521 for his own works – seems to have resulted in published music. Indeed, I argue elsewhere that they represent different sorts of activity altogether.²⁹ The privilege awarded in Florence in 1515 also does not appear to have led to any publishing activity, and may merely have been an attempt at a monopoly on selling Antico's or Petrucci's editions within Tuscany.³⁰ In other words, the dearth of editions from other presses, as well as the absence of results from grants of privilege, argues that there was still not an active taste for printed music, and that only a commission or a patronage situation could encourage some other printer to enter the field temporarily.

This pattern continues during much of the 1520s. The few editions that appear from various (mostly Roman) presses are notable mostly for the reprints of Petrucci's titles put out by Pasoti and Dorico in Rome.³¹ Again, these imply I that only one successful printer could operate in the Italian peninsula at a time, at least before the late 1530s. They (and particularly the late reprints) also tell us that Petrucci and his suppliers had made astute decisions about repertoire, that their music continued to sell, better than that offered by other printers, and perhaps also, therefore, that taste in the peninsula remained largely conservative, at least among the public that bought printed books.³²

While there was, therefore, still only a small market for printed music, this had an effect on those printers who did dare to venture into music at all. Few of them could have expected to make money from musical editions, supporting the evidence that published music was a temporary activity in each case, and the conclusion that it reflected special circumstances. These special circumstances often seem to be reflected in the extent to which such publishers and printers attempted only to meet local needs, rather than competing across the peninsula. In the 1530s, the distinguished humanist printer in Venice, Francesco Marcolini, launched into a series of editions of the local composer, Adrian Willaert – quite probably at the composer's instigation. Later the Ferrarese printer of local documents and poetry, Francesco de' Rossi, printed two books of music, both by local composers. The pattern can be followed throughout the century, especially in cities

²⁹ This will appear in the book mentioned in footnote 5 above. Other discussions of these privileges can be found in Richard Agee, *The privilege and Venetian music printing in the sixteenth century* (Ph.D. dissertation, Princeton University, 1982); and Mary Kay Duggan, *Italian music incunabula: printers and typefonts* (Ph.D. dissertation, University of California at Berkeley, 1981).

³⁰ This document is discussed in Martin Picker, "A Florentine document of 1515 concerning music printing". *Quadrivium*, xii (1971), 283-290 (with references to earlier literature); and mentioned in Tim Carter, "Music-printing in late sixteenth- and early seventeenth-century Florence: Giorgio Marescotti, Cristofano Marescotti and Zanobi Pignoni", *Early music history*, ix (1990), 27-73; reprinted in *Music, Patronage and Printing in late medieval Florence* (Aldershot: Ashgate, 2000), ch.XI.

³¹ These books, with the rest of Dorico's musical activity, are discussed in Suzanne Cusick, *Valerio Dorico: music printer in sixteenth-century Rome* (Ann Arbor: UMI Research Press, 1981). See also Francesco Barberi, "I Dorico, tipografi a Roma nel cinquecento", *La Bibliofilia*, lxxvii (1965), 221-261; reprinted in *Tipografi romani del Cinquecento*: Guillery, Ginnasio Mediceo, Calvo, Dorico, Cartolari, *Biblioteconomia e bibliografia: Saggi e studi*, xvii (Florence: Olschki, 1983), 99-146. For the other Roman printers of the time, see discussions in Chapman's dissertation, mentioned in footnote 21, above, and in Iain Fenlon and James Haar, *The Italian madrigal in the early sixteenth century: sources and interpretation* (Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 1988).

³² We know that a taste for the new madrigal developed during the 1520s, not only in Florence, but also in Rome and among Venetians; that the frottola largely disappeared from circulation; and that a new generation of composers of liturgical music surfaced during the 1520s. But these developments may have been local, and have been reflected principally among musicians who preferred manuscript sources: alongside these new composers, there was evidently still a market for Josquin and his generation, reflected in Dorico's editions.

such as Milano and Napoli, but also in more local centres such as Brescia or Verona. In each of these cases, some local interest must have arranged for the publishing of only one or two books, to be sold locally. The publisher was responding to something like a commission: and he could then set the price high enough to protect his own financial interests.

All this says more about musical taste in Italy of the early sixteenth century than we might have thought possible: and it breaks away from the traditional study of special groups of people, where often the evidence is more interesting, but also where the music cultivated may have taken some time to reach the rest of the region.³³ It is apparent that relatively few people bought printed music – whatever the size of the print-run – and that they did not always favour the newest styles: no-one printed madrigals with any consistency before the mid 1530s, despite the manuscript evidence of an earlier cultivation of the genre. It is also apparent that a few patrons encouraged music publishing, at least for specific volumes. These patrons seem to have seen the printed book in the same light as those who favoured printed editions of legal documents, of liturgical texts, and of papal indulgences, whereby many copies of a text could be prepared and disseminated relatively quickly. This will have been one reason for the Ferrarese interest in Petrucci, and also for Antico's edition of the *Liber quindecim Missarum*. I would argue that it probably explains the great majority of editions of music before the mid-century, for others (as I have suggested) also seem to show the influence of a patron.

Throughout the first twenty to thirty years of printed music, therefore, the patron or promoter was paramount. Few books (other than second or later reprintings) seem to have been prepared as speculative ventures, while most point towards some special occasion or opportunity. Beside this, manuscript music continued to be cultivated, and indeed to cover a much larger range of repertoires, even including keyboard music (in the manuscripts at Castell' Arquato, for example).³⁴ If we can assume that a promoter sponsored a majority of musical editions, then those editions tell us less about the taste of the mass market for music: rather, they reflect the interests of their promoters. As a result, potential purchasers would be faced in the bookshop with editions reflecting musical decisions made by other people, people who were working to their own agendas. No doubt, those editions also helped to form taste, and to influence early decisions about speculative editions of music. Yet it is significant that, once Antico persuades Scotto to publish his wood-blocks in the 1530s, and once Scotto and Gardano begin serious music publishing at the end of that decade, it takes very little time for other repertoires to appear.

There is, therefore, a divide in the history of music's dissemination, a divide which falls somewhere in the mid 1530s. On the later side of the divide are greatly increased numbers of editions, the presence of two competing publishers (with implications for the numbers of purchasers necessary to make both successful), and a spread in the sorts

³³ I am thinking here of the fascinating case built up by Martha Feldman, in her *City culture and the madrigal at Venice* (Berkeley: University of California Press, 1995): and the same can be said for later studies of music at the courts of Ferrara and Mantua, though by then a much larger cross-section of the musical public was interested in knowing about the avant-garde.

³⁴ I am aware of the few keyboard editions of 1513 and later: but these do remain exceptional, and each seems to fit more easily into the pattern of a book promoted by someone outside the publishing field, for his or her own reasons.

of repertoires being printed. On the other, before (perhaps) 1533, only one printer could survive at a time, and he had to reflect the taste, not of a "general public", but of those who were willing to bring music to him to publish, or to subsidise an edition for some special purpose of their own.

These first three decades or so of the new century represent an experimental period in music printing and publishing, one in which the rich patron or the committed music collector could take advantage of an opportunity to disseminate his choice of music. There might or might not be enough purchasers ready to buy an edition, but print-runs were probably small. After this period, we begin to enter a time when music publishing was one of the principal drivers of musical taste, and the average purchaser and performer of music had to rely on printed sources. This is the first major transition in the history of musical dissemination, and effectively establishes a pattern that survives even into the twentieth century. While Petrucci lies on the earlier, more restrictive side of the divide, it remains obvious that his editions were the initial stimulus for the later expansion of interest, for they encouraged more musicians to use, and then seek out, printed copies of music.

Ottaviano Petrucci:
his earliest editions

Ottaviano Petrucci: Venezia, 1501–1509; Fossombrone (Marche), 1511–1520.

Date	Edition	Folios	Contents
<u>In Choirbook format:</u>			
[5. 1501]	<i>Harmonice Musices Odhecaton A</i>	104	96 chansons, etc.
5. 2. 1502	<i>Canti B numero cinquanta</i>	56	51 chansons, etc.
9. 5. 1502	<i>Motetti A numero trentatre</i>	56	35 devotional texts
14. 1. 1503	² <i>Harmonice Musices Odhecaton A</i>		
10. 5. 1503	<i>Motetti de passione . . . B</i>	72	34 devotional texts
4. 8. 1503	² <i>Canti B numero cinquanta</i>		
10. 2. 1504	<i>Canti C numero cento Cinquanta</i>	168	139 chansons, etc.
25. 5. 1504	³ <i>Harmonice Musices Odhecaton A</i>		
13. 2. 1505	² <i>Motetti A numero trentatre</i>		

In Part-book format:

27. 9. 1502	<i>Misse Josquin</i>	76	5 polyphonic masses
24. 3. 1503	<i>Misse Obrecht</i>	66	5 polyphonic masses
17. 6. 1503	[Misse] <i>Brumel</i>	66	5 polyphonic masses
15. 7. 1503	[Misse] <i>Joannes Ghiselin</i>	66	5 polyphonic masses
31. 10. 1503	<i>Misse Petri de la Rue</i>	56	5 polyphonic masses
23. 3. 1504	<i>Misse Agricola</i>	68	5 polyphonic masses

MUZIKOLOŠKI ZBORNIK • MUSICOLOGICAL ANNUAL XXXVII

15.	9.	1504	<i>Motetti C</i>	130	42 motets
22.	3.	1505	<i>Misse De Orto</i>	70	5 polyphonic masses
4.	6.	1505	<i>Motetti Libro Quarto</i>	126	45 motets
30.	6.	1505	<i>Missarum Josquin Liber secundus</i>	60	6 polyphonic masses
31.	10.	1505	<i>Fragmenta Missarum</i>	72	27 mass sections

In Choirbook format:

28.	11.	1504	<i>Frottole libro primo</i>	56	62 italian songs
8.	1.	1505	<i>Frottole libro secondo</i>	56	53 italian songs
6.	2.	1505	<i>Frottole libro tertio</i>	64	62 italian songs
[8.	1505]		<i>Strambotti, ode, frottole, libro quarto</i>	56	91 italian songs
23.	12.	1505	<i>Frottole Libro quinto</i>	56	61 italian songs

[etc.]