PETRUCCI'S *CANTI* VOLUMES: SCOPE AND REPERTORY

by DAVID FALLOWS

Famously, Petrucci's *Harmonice musices Odhecaton A* of 1501 was the first collection of polyphonic music printed from moveable type. More importantly, but more seldom noted, it begins the commerce of music publishing, because Petrucci followed it with almost fifty similar volumes over the next eight years. That entirely changed the way polyphony was distributed, the way musicians lived, and the way composers became famous.

So it is as well to note at the outset that the accepted dates for this event may well be wrong. The only known copy of the first edition lacks, among much else,[1] its final page, where Petrucci normally put the date of publication. So the date given in almost all modern literature comes from the dedicatory letter at the beginning of the volume, namely 15 May 1501. Recently Leofranc Holford-Strevens noted that the date printed, „decimo octavo cal. iunias", does not exist, since anybody who knew enough Latin to write that florid letter would certainly know that 15 May was correctly rendered as „idibus maiis"; so he suggested that „iunias" may be a misprint for „iulias" and that the date of the letter was therefore 14 June.[2]

On the other hand, the date of the dedicatory letter is unlikely to have been the date of publication. It appears on the first pages of this very large volume, pages that were presumably set and printed first. Another twelve gatherings would need to be produced before the book was ready to be published. The dedicatory letter could have been postdated; but that seems unlikely. A different, and in my view more plausible, date of publication comes from viewing Petrucci's activities and rate of printing over the following months.

His next volume was the direct continuation of *Odhecaton A*, namely *Canti B numero Cinquanta*, published on 5 February 1502; and it seems almost inevitable that work on this would have started the moment the *Odhecaton* was completed. Table 1 lists the known publications of Petrucci's first years. It shows that *Motetti A* was done at the rate of 18 leaves a month and *Misse Josquin* at the rate of 17 leaves a month. Then the pace quickened, perhaps partly because the next book was in any case a reprint of the *Odhecaton* and partly because the system was becoming clearer. With the Brumel and Ghiselin volumes in the summer of 1503, the rate almost doubled; and this

[1] For an analysis of that copy (*I-Bc* Q 51), and the demonstration that only 51 of the original 104 leaves now survive, see Stanley Boorman, „The ‚first' edition of the *Odhecaton A*", *JAMS* 30 (1977) pp. 184–207.

[2] This is reported in Bonnie J. Blackburn, „Lorenzo de' Medici, a lost Isaac manuscript, and the Venetian ambassador", in: *Musica Franca: Essays in honor of Frank D'Accone*, ed. I. Alm, A. McLarmore, and C. Reardon (Stuyvesant, NY 1996), pp. 19–44, at p. 34.

is the time at which Stanley Boorman has shown that Petrucci moved from triple-impression to double-impression printing.[3]

TABLE 1

Date	Title	Months	Rate
?	*Odhecaton A*: 104ff	?	?
5 ii 1502	*Canti B*: 56ff	?	?
9 v 1502	*Motetti A* (texted): 56ff	3	18
27 ix 1502	*Misse Josquin* (partbooks): 76ff	4½	17
14 i 1503	(*Odhecaton A*, 2nd edn.): 104ff	3½	30
24 iii 1503	*Misse obreht* (partbooks): 76ff	2½	30
19 v 1503	*Motetti ... B* (choirbook): 72ff	2	36
17 vi 1503	*Brumel* (Masses): 64ff	1	64
15 vii 1503	*Joannes ghiselin* (Masses): 66ff	1	66
10 viii 1503	(*Canti B*, 2nd edn.): 56ff	1	56
31 x 1503	*Misse Petri de la Rue*: 56ff	2	28
10 ii 1504	*Canti C*: 168ff	3½	48
23 iii 1504	*Misse Alexandri Agricole*: 68ff	1½	45
25 v 1504	(*Odhecaton A*, 3rd edn.): 104ff	2	52

If we assume that *Canti B* was prepared at roughly the same speed as *Motetti A* (which had the additional problem of considerable text underlay) and *Misse Josquin* (which was in the innovatory form of partbooks), work would have started about three months before publication, namely early November 1501. Conversely, positing the same rate for preparation of the *Odhecaton*, but starting – not finishing – in May 1501, would again suggest a publication date of early November.

There are two possible objections to that scenario. First is the view expressed by Stanley Boorman that Petrucci would have waited after the first publication to see whether it had sufficient success to merit a successor.[4] I suggest that the very use of „A" in the title was a clear statement that others were to follow. As an astute businessman, Petrucci would have known that a client-base is not built on a single book. Besides, the extra few months would hardly be enough to make it clear whether the *Odhecaton A* had been a commercial success.

The second objection is that the first gathering contains an accurate index, so was perhaps, following documentable later practice, printed last. While that is certainly possible, I suggest that it would not have been at all difficult to

[3]   Stanley Boorman, „A case of work and turn: Half-sheet imposition in the early sixteenth century", *The Library*, 6th series, 8 (1986) pp. 301–21.

[4]   Stanley Boorman, „The 500th anniversary of the first music printing: A history of patronage and taste in the early years", *Muzikološki zbornik* 37 (2001) pp. 33–49, at p. 39.

cast off the entire volume accurately from the start. No great skill was needed to see that certain pieces required not one but two openings (nos. 36–8, 69, 79, and 92–4); nor that others would take up only a single page and therefore needed to be put together in pairs (nos. 83–4, 86–7, 89–90) apart from the one that went on the last verso, to face the colophon. The kind of advance planning that was plainly necessary for all of Petrucci's volumes – most particularly the later volumes containing masses presented in partbooks – would make the prior preparation of the index easy and perhaps even necessary.

I do not insist on that last argument: given the necessary planning it would obviously have been possible to print the first gathering last. But until further evidence comes to light I suggest that the more plausible date of publication is indeed early November 1501.

<div align="center">★</div>

Whatever the truth of its date, the *Odhecaton* cannot be viewed alone. It belongs with Petrucci's two other song volumes, *Canti B* of early 1502 and *Canti C* of early 1504. The three books contain secular pieces by Franco-Flemish composers, presented mostly without texts, apparently for instrumental performance; all three seem to have drawn on the same group of exemplars. After May 1504, when he reprinted the *Odhecaton A* for the second and last time, Petrucci never came back to that repertory, except for some of the lute intabulations of Spinacino (1507) and perhaps in the lost tablature book of Giovan Maria (1508).[5] In every other respect he then turned to other materials: motets, masses, frottole.

That is the first surprise about Petrucci's output. One would have thought, as Petrucci evidently did, that the market was for large numbers of small secular pieces that were fairly easy to perform on instruments. That he so soon turned away from this repertory suggests that he was wrong: evidently there was a far better market in the ferociously difficult and extended masses of Josquin, Obrecht, Brumel, Ghiselin, La Rue, Agricola, and others. That in its turn seems to say that his market turned out to be collectors rather than performers.

The evidence lies in the shape of the books. Mass cycles and motets had never been presented in small oblong format, so far as we can tell. That format was established for the three *Canti* volumes. In fact it seems to have been new in western printing, and was extremely rare in western manuscripts. But there are earlier examples in music-books: the earliest known today is the *Glogauer Liederbuch* of around 1480, copied in Eastern Germany; and only four more

---

[5] See Howard Mayer Brown, *Instrumental music printed before 1600* (Cambridge, MA 1965), p. 14. Hernan Colón's description of it for his library catalogue states that the first piece was entitled „come feme", evidently one of the several pieces based on the tenor of the rondeau by Binchois, perhaps in fact the 3-voice setting by Agricola found in *Canti C*, no. 121.

survive among the Italian songbooks from the years between 1480 and 1500.[6] Given the difficulties that were involved in developing the typography for polyphonic music, it may seem additionally astonishing that Petrucci should have decided to use oblong format; but the explanation must surely be technical: that the extraordinary difficulties of aligning the notes accurately on the staff in separate runs through the press were slightly simplified by the use of a page in oblong format. But it happens that most music prints over the next half century were going to be in the oblong format so bizarrely pioneered by Petrucci; and music prints retained that shape even after Attaingnant's introduction of type-pieces that included notes on stave-sections, thus eliminating the need for multiple runs through the press.

Upright format music printing in those years is more or less confined to special efforts like Antico's *Liber quindecim missarum* of 1516. That elegant folio choirbook is the earliest book of printed polyphonic music that was not in oblong format; and the next was the Grimm & Wyrsung *Liber selectarum cantionum* of 1520. Both were done from woodcuts, thus again from a single run through the press, thereby making their upright format easier to handle. That those two volumes now survive in more copies than any other music book of the early 16th century may be explainable partly by their size, which makes them hard to lose; but the degree to which they were copied from seems to indicate that they were widely used. So they could well stand as evidence that Petrucci's oblong quarto format was a commercial mistake. Church choirs continued to use folio choirbooks for much of the 16th century; and it is very hard to imagine any ecclesiastical institution using Petrucci's little partbook editions of either masses or motets. In any case, it is clear that several institutions copied masses from Petrucci's printed partbooks into their own folio choirbooks.[7]

So the *Canti* volumes set the agenda on format, for better or more likely for worse. Petrucci retained that format even when he made the change to partbooks for the first book of Josquin masses in September 1502. His move to partbooks is even less easy to understand. Here the only surviving precedent on the continental mainland is again the *Glogauer Liederbuch*, though there are occasional examples of a single voice written out informally, and a few pictures that seem to suggest singing from part-sheets.[8] What is clear is that very soon after Petrucci's innovation the partbook became very popular throughout Europe – though mainly for secular songs, which is the one reper-

---

[6]   *I-Bc* Q 17, *I-Fn* Magl. XIX. 178, *I-MOe* Alpha F. 9.9, and *I-VEcap* 757. Perhaps I should also mention the Brussels basse-danse manuscript, *B-Br* 9085, still hard to date and in several other ways a highly unusual document. The case of the Escorial songbook from the 1430s, *E-E* V.III.24, is very special indeed: although it looks outwardly like a normal octavo songbook its music is written in „landscape" fashion across the pages; something similar is done on some pages of the manuscript *A-Wn* 5094.

[7]   See Martin Staehelin's article in this volume.

[8]   See MGG², s.v. „Stimmbuch". There are signs that the tradition may have existed already in England, but that is unlikely to have been known to Petrucci.

tory where Petrucci only once used partbooks (in his very last publication). But that is peripheral to the present discussion except in that the odd format of the *Canti* volumes appears to have set the agenda for his entire musical output and for what followed over the next years.

Those three *Canti* books contain between them 286 compositions. The titles of the volumes proclaim them as containing respectively 100, 50 and 150 songs. In fact those figures are very approximate, though since the pieces were not numbered nobody but a bean counter need have noticed. But it is worth reflecting on why, after books of 96 and 51 songs he produced one containing no fewer than 139 in his *Canti C*. It was the largest volume Petrucci ever published, by a considerable margin, with 168 leaves. Most of his later publications had either 56 or 64 leaves. Perhaps he was determined to get rid of all that carefully assembled material so that he could move on to other things, such as the series of frottola books that he began nine months later. We shall see in due course that there is an additional explanation for this.

Canti C also seems not to have been a great success. That conclusion arises not from its surviving in only a single edition so much as from the very small number of later copies made from it: throughout Europe there are manuscript and printed copies done on the basis of the *Odhecaton* and *Canti B*; but there is virtually nothing copied from *Canti C* apart from eighteen pieces in the Munich manuscript 1516.[9] There is also a larger number of otherwise unknown pieces in *Canti C*. Those are just two indicators that the volume was far less successful than its two predecessors. And it could well be that this too has its explanation in the book's enormous size. It would surely have cost three times as much as the smaller volumes, and have come well above the level of what the industry today calls an impulse purchase.

All three volumes are laid out in the same broad manner, in several respects. First, they open with four-voice music; and three-voice music is confined to a separate section at the end. It is hard to think of a precedent for this except the Casanatense chansonnier 2856 in Rome and the Bologna manuscript Q 17; but both those cases the two halves are the other way round. On the other hand, it seems extremely likely that the scheme did have precedents, now lost. More surprisingly, the indexes of all three volumes give three-voice music a separate section in a way that all users must find extremely frustrating.

Second, in general they open with a sacred piece. This is a feature with a certain tradition through the songbooks of the 15th century, as though all good songbooks begin and end with a prayer, like all good meals.[10] As it happens, none of the Petrucci songbooks ends with a prayer: they simply end with a piece that can fit on a single page. That may be why his *Motetti A* (1502) ends oddly with a piece that cannot conceivably be considered either

---

[9] As demonstrated in Bruce A. Whisler, *Munich, Mus. Ms. 1516: A critical edition* (Ph.D. diss., University of Rochester 1974), vol. 1, pp. 20–23.

[10] Further discussed in David Fallows, „Walter Frye's *Ave regina celorum* and the Latin song style" (in press).

a motet or sacred, namely Josquin's three-voice canonic setting of „De tous biens plaine".

Third, in *Canti B* and *Canti C* the four-voice section ends with a group of canonic pieces. I have not encountered this elsewhere. *Canti C* also ends with a canon (Ockeghem's „Prenez sur moy"), something previously seen in the *Motetti A* of 1502, which both begins and ends with canons. In both cases that must have resulted from a search for a piece that could be contained on a single page.

But my main task here is to outline the repertory contained in these three volumes. There are various ways of looking at it.

One way would be by viewing the number of individual copies of their pieces that survive in manuscripts demonstrably earlier than Petrucci's prints. For the *Odhecaton* the figure is 263, that is, an average of three earlier copies for each song. By contrast, for *Canti B* the figure is only 20, or an average of 0.4 copies for each song.

That is to say that the *Odhecaton* contained a very large proportion of songs that were extremely popular in the preceding decades. In *Canti B* there is far less of this: many of the pieces were known, but they were not so famous.

For *Canti C* the situation is more complicated: the bald figure is 104, that is, an average of 0.75 earlier copies for each song. But if we break *Canti C* down into sections the picture looks more intriguing. For nos. 1–62 there is only a single earlier copy of anything (this is the anonymous „L'amour de moy", found in the Paris manuscript f.fr. 1597, which some people in any case think well after 1500); for nos. 63–94 there are 29 earlier copies. Then there is a sudden change: for nos. 95–107 there are 59 earlier copies, which is to say an average of almost five earlier copies for each, even more than in the *Odhecaton*. That is, after a large body of apparently recent material the volume quite suddenly starts on a group of much earlier and very famous pieces, by Ockeghem, Caron, Busnoys and their generation. For the last 32 pieces in *Canti C*, nos. 108–139, there are 15 earlier copies, an average of 0.5 each.[11]

So that could suggest that *Canti B* and *Canti C* were mainly of more recent work but that at the last moment Petrucci ran out of new music and began drawing again on earlier repertory. But there could be a better explanation. Petrucci (or Petrus Castellanus) may have originally planned three volumes each containing 100 pieces but found that the difficulties of completing the *Odhecaton A* suggested that it would be more prudent to confine *Canti B* to a mere 50 pieces.[12] If so, perhaps the 50 pieces dropped from the original plan for *Canti B* eventually went into *Canti C*, done at a time when Petrucci had

[11]　In relation to Jeremy Noble's observations (elsewhere in this volume) on the lack of French music in Petrucci's early publications, it may be of interest to note that the three *Canti* volumes contain nothing found in either of the two most famous French chansonniers of the early 16th century, London, British Library, Harley 5242, and Cambridge, Magdalene College, Pepys 1760.

[12]　Those difficulties are amply documented in Boorman, „The ‚first' edition of the *Odhecaton A*".

sorted out his initial difficulties. Some support for that theory comes from another way of looking at the repertory.

We can look at the dates of the songs, as determined very approximately from the dates of their earliest known sources. Obviously that information, though again in solid numbers, is even harder to use correctly than the number of earlier copies: the accident of manuscript survival is hard to quantify; many songs could be much earlier than their first surviving copy; and some of the manuscript dates are still unclear. But the results are nevertheless indicative of general trends. Exactly half of the music in the *Odhecaton* was demonstrably in the repertory by 1490; the same is true of almost a quarter of the *Canti C* music, but for *Canti B* there are only 7 pieces demonstrably known by 1490.

	by 1470	by 1480	by 1490	total
Odhecaton A	4	18	26	48
Canti B	–	–	7	7
Canti C	5	7	20	32
total	9	25	53	87

So the three volumes differ in their spread of earlier repertory, and *Canti C* has differences within its own sections. But of the 286 pieces in all three volumes there are 9 demonstrably earlier than 1470 (3%), 25 demonstrably earlier than 1480 (9%), and 53 found earlier than 1490 (18%).

To put those figures into some kind of a context: three months ago, the Huddersfield Contemporary Music Festival programmed 141 dated compositions. 54 of them were new; and a further 49 were from the 1990s. But there were also 15 from the 1980s (10%), ten from the 1970s (7%), five from the 1960s (3%). In addition, there were three from the 1950s (by Scelsi, Berio and Ligeti) and four from the 1940s (one by Messiaen and three by Cage). So the Huddersfield Contemporary Music Festival in the year 2000 had almost exactly the same proportion of works over 20 and over 30 years old, just a slightly smaller proportion over ten years old, and a larger number of pieces more than 40 years old. Petrucci can sometimes look as though he was drawing on much older repertory in his first publications, but that picture is misleading.

Very few pieces indeed are by dead composers: eleven by Busnoys (d. 1492); eight by Hayne van Ghizeghem, who presumably died at about the same time; five by Ockeghem (d. 1497).[13] This is remarkable if we bear in mind the contents of some Flemish manuscripts of the time. The Chigi Codex, copied probably in 1505, contains almost all Ockeghem's known sacred music, plus a mass by Busnoys. The Florence *Conservatorio* manuscript 2439, perhaps from around 1508, also contains five works of Ockeghem. Later Petrucci was to print five motets of Regis (d. ca. 1495), three more works of Busnoys and

---

[13] See note 35 below for my firm view that Stokem was still alive when the volumes were printed.

– as the oldest choice of all – the Lamentations of Johannes de Quadris, which date from the first half of the 15th century. But these are a tiny proportion of what Petrucci printed. In general he printed the latest music.

That in turn leads to a theme that I must briefly resurrect. Recent literature continues to suggest that masses and motets are easier to date than songs. The large number of song manuscripts from the second half of the 15th century, most of them fairly closely datable, does in fact make it far easier to date songs than sacred music, for which precious few sources survive. Just as I have elsewhere argued that the style of the approximately datable songs can give hints at the dates of the sacred music,[14] I would argue now that the fairly full information about the dates of materials in the three *Canti* volumes of Petrucci should be used as a guide to the dating of the other music he published. I recently tried to show that the works in Petrucci's first book of Josquin masses were all composed within the preceding ten years;[15] and I am inclined to suggest that this should be the first hypothesis for some of his other volumes of sacred music. Petrucci was aware of setting a new agenda in several ways; repertory was one of them.

Returning, though, to the composers in the *Canti* volumes, the names best represented there make a slightly unexpected list. At the top is Loyset Compère, with 28 works, which makes it all the odder that Petrucci never printed a collection devoted to Compère's music (unless his sacred music was mostly old, which is what is in fact currently believed). Second is Alexander Agricola, with 21 works; and Petrucci's very next project after *Canti C* was a volume of Agricola's masses. Only then comes Josquin des Prez, with 19 works; and the same number are by Johannes Japart, on whom more later.

But the main way of assessing the scope of the three *Canti* volumes must be in terms of stylistic genre. And the point this is leading to is that there are very few pieces indeed that do not fall surprisingly easily into one of a small number of categories.

In the commentary to her edition of the *Odhecaton* Helen Hewitt offered an immensely complex taxonomy of the styles found there, and her study remains most informative.[16] But sixty years later, with far more information on the dates of the surrounding sources, on the composers, and on the styles, the picture begins to look a lot simpler.

We can begin by putting aside the two smallest groups. One of these is movements extracted from mass cycles. Given that most manuscript songbooks of

---

[14] David Fallows, „Ockeghem as a song composer: Hints towards a chronology", in: *Johannes Ockeghem: Actes du XLe Colloque international d'études humanistes*, ed. Philippe Vendrix (Paris 1998), pp. 301–316; Fallows, „‚Trained and immersed in all musical delights': Towards a new picture of Busnoys", in: *Antoine Busnoys: Method, meaning, and context in late medieval music*, ed. Paula Higgins (Oxford 1999), pp. 21–50.

[15] David Fallows, „Approaching a new chronology for Josquin: An interim report", *Schweizer Jahrbuch für Musikwissenschaft*, Neue Folge 19 (2000) pp. 131–150.

[16] Helen Hewitt, ed., *Petrucci: Harmonice Musices Odhecaton A* (Cambridge, MA 1942), pp. 60–104.

the 1490s and later contain a fair number of pieces extracted in this way, it is a little surprising that only two examples have so far been identified among the 286 works in the three volumes. One is the ubiquitous Benedictus from Isaac's mass *Quant j'ay au cuer*, found in the *Odhecaton* (no. 76). And the other is the first Osanna of Obrecht's mass *Cela sans plus*, in *Canti B* (no. 13) with the heading „Obreht In missa". Petrucci's avoidance of mass sections may have been partly because he had already planned to print volumes of masses.

The other small genre is the motet. As Julie Cumming's recent book shows,[17] Latin texted music of the 15th century comes in many different forms, and since there are only ten examples among the *Canti* volumes there is little point in trying to divide them up.[18] It is enough to say that the *Odhecaton* opens with De Orto's otherwise unknown „Ave Maria" and later includes Brumel's extremely popular „Mater Patris"; that *Canti B* should have opened with Compere's „Virgo celesti" (though in fact Josquin's little „L'homme armé" setting fills the first page and the Compère piece comes second), opening its three-voice section with Brumel's „Ave ancilla Trinitatis"; and that *Canti C* opens with Obrecht's otherwise unknown „Ave regina celorum", opens its three-voice section with the anonymous „Alma Redemptoris mater" (known as early as the manuscript Trent 91 from the 1470s) and has four other Latin-texted pieces that are all fairly odd (two of them by Crispinus van Stappen). There would be profit in spending a little time exploring these last four pieces to see where they fit into the broader stylistic picture, but this is not the time to do so.

With those two tiny categories out of the way, the next smallest is canonic pieces – using the word in its modern sense of one voice derived directly from another (since there are many examples here of the strict medieval usage of a voice subjected to verbal instructions). Many of these pieces look as though they should have texts, but their musical design is dictated primarily by the canonic structure: often they turn out in practice to be very hard to text, and in any case they stand well apart from the remaining songs stylistically and formally. As noted earlier, the four-voice section of *Canti B* ends with a group of four canonic works, interrupted by just one song of Obrecht.[19] Similarly in *Canti C*, with a group of no fewer than seven, again interrupted by a single imitative chanson.[20] *Canti C* ends with Ockeghem's three-out-of-one canonic chanson „Prenez sur moy". Most of these canons are of two basic types: the four-out-of-two type at the fourth and the four-out-of-three type with just the two upper voices in canon, again at the fourth; both types appear to have been initiated by Josquin in the years around 1480.[21] It is perhaps merely intriguing that Petrucci did not include any in the *Odhecaton*; but the whole

---

[17] Julie E. Cumming, *The motet in the age of Du Fay* (Cambridge 1999).

[18] They are: *Odh*, nos. 1, 62; *Canti B*, nos. 2, 39; *Canti C*, nos. 1, 13, 32, 66, 113, 124.

[19] Nos. 34, 36–8.

[20] Nos. 105–6 and 108–12; other canons in *Canti C* are nos. 13, 43, 57–8, 61, 139.

[21] Fallows, „Approaching a new chronology for Josquin", p. 138.

genre was to become popular later, with both Antico and Attaingnant devoting prominent volumes early in their careers to such canons.[22]

Anyway, those three smaller categories of music in the *Canti* volumes now clear the way for the three main categories, which we can call the forme-fixe chanson, the free form song, and the fantasia.

The forme-fixe chansons are easy to identify since most of them are found in manuscripts from the 1490s and earlier. Many survive elsewhere with their complete texts, either rondeaux or virelais; the texts are courtly and almost always in French, with lines of 8 or 10 syllables. Quite when the genre died out is not yet clear, but most of those with a full fixed-form text were composed by about 1490. Generally they were in three voices, though Petrucci often added an extra voice, in most cases unique to his prints so perhaps specially composed.[23] Against the 33 examples in the *Odhecaton* there are 11 in *Canti B* and only 13 among the 139 songs of *Canti C*.[24]

Two subcategories of the forme-fixe chanson are again almost too small to note. The combinative chanson, normally in four voices with popular song material in one of the lower voices (never in the top voice), belongs to a tradition that may have begun with Ockeghem in the early 1460s.[25] And the motet-chanson, again apparently always with a forme-fixe poem in the top voice but with a Latin-texted cantus firmus normally in the bass,[26] has a tradition that may go back to Compère in the 1470s. Both categories are found in the *Odhecaton* and in *Canti C* but not in the smaller *Canti B*.

For all these forme-fixe songs, the tradition of presenting them with only a text incipit goes back in Italian sources to the Casanatense chansonnier, perhaps of around 1480. Helen Hewitt mounted a powerful argument to suggest that Petrucci presented them without text simply because the texts could be taken from elsewhere and it would have been too hard technically for him to add them in his prints.[27] Well: he managed well enough in the *Motetti* volumes, starting in 1502, so that problem had been long solved by the time he got to

---

[22] Namely Antico's *Motetti novi et chanzoni franciose a quatro sopra doi* (RISM 1520³) and Attaingnant's *Chansons et Motetz en Canon a quatre parties sur deux* (RISM [c.1528]¹⁰); on the discovery of the first known complete copy of the latter, in the private library of Graf Schweinitz (on loan to *D*:W), see Ludwig Finscher, „Attaingnantdrucke aus einer schlesischen Adelsbibliothek", in: *Festschrift Klaus Hortschansky zum 60. Geburtstag*, ed. Axel Beer and Laurenz Lütteken (Tutzing 1995), pp. 33–42.

[23] Various reasons have been suggested for the inclusion of those added voices, among them that the musicians of Petrucci's time preferred a four-voice texture; but all three volumes include a substantial section devoted to three-voice songs. More plausible would be the suggestion that these pieces were all so well known that potential buyers of the Petrucci prints would probably already have owned copies: the new voices added novelty to the volumes.

[24] Those with an added voice in Petrucci have an asterisk here. *Odh*, nos. 2*, 4*, 8*, 9*, 12*, 13*, 20*, 38, 42, 43, 45, 52–5, 57–60, 65–6, 68, 71, 77, 82–3, 85–9, 91, 93; *Canti B*, nos. 16*, 20*, 43–8, 50; *Canti C*, nos. 72, 77*, 79*, 92, 93*, 95*, 96*, 97*, 98, 101*, 132, 135–6.

[25] *Odh*, nos. 3 (5vv), 16–17, 31; *Canti C*, nos. 70, 81–2, 87–8, 99.

[26] *Odh*, nos. 46, 67, 81, 84; *Canti C*, nos. 75, 80, 133.

[27] Hewitt, *Petrucci: Harmonice Musices Odhecaton A*, pp. 31–42.

printing *Canti C*. As Louise Litterick argued twenty years ago, it is hard to resist the view that there was a thriving tradition of textless performance of this repertory in Italy, starting in the early 1480s.[28] Even the most fully texted song manuscripts from Italy of the years around 1490, like Florence 229 or the slightly earlier Pixérécourt chansonnier (*F-Pn* f.fr. 15123), tend to give only a single stanza, which is plainly insufficient for a proper sung performance; that those texts are heavily garbled by scribes with insufficient knowledge of French is in that context a secondary detail, though it supports the case. Plainly these songs were used in Italy by Italian musicians as instrumental pieces, whether or not that seems an adequate musical response to works of such delicacy. Petrucci was just continuing an established pattern.

With that in mind, it would be as well to continue to the genre we can call fantasies. These are works that surely never had a text. The „fantasies on a *cantus prius factus*" normally take one of their voices from a well known earlier chanson: „J'ay pris amours" and „De tous biens plaine", among the most widely disseminated songs of the 1460s, repeatedly contribute a single line to these fantasies. Often they are in longer note-values than the remaining voices; sometimes they are inverted or reversed. While these lines do come from forme-fixe chansons it is hard to imagine the music of these arrangements being subjected to the repetition patterns that the forme-fixe makes necessary if you are to sing the whole text. It seems only rational to conclude that in general these pieces were intended to be performed once through, without any repeats, and probably on instruments. This is a very large genre, accounting for 12 pieces in the *Odhecaton*, 4 in *Canti B*, and 37 in *Canti C* – almost one-fifth of the repertory in the three books.[29]

Slightly more controversial is the category one might call „Free fantasies". It accounts for only 17 pieces across the three books, but it is an important one.[30] These often look a little like forme-fixe chansons but have none of the line-divisions that are essential to any song. It is a genre that seems to go back to the works of Johannes Martini in the 1470s: at least, among the 44 known secular works of Martini there is not a single text incipit that can be matched with any of the known poetry collections of the time unless the music is also borrowed from a known forme-fixe chanson (as in the preceding category). Those by other composers often have fanciful names like „La Bernardina" or „La stangetta". Some have sacred titles: „Si dedero", „Si sumpsero". What does seem clear is that they never had texts, and that they do indeed lie at the root of the imitative fantasy in the 16th century. There should be no need to apologize for using that title.

It must be added, though, that the use of the word „controversial" arises because these pieces are in many ways indistinguishable from certain motets

---

[28] Louise Litterick, „Performing Franco-Netherlandish secular music of the late 15th century: Texted and untexted parts in the sources", *Early Music* 8 (1980) pp. 474–485.
[29] *Odh*, nos. 6, 21–2, 34, 39, 47–8, 69, 73, 78, 80, 95; *Canti B*, nos. 3, 24, 30, 42; *Canti C*, nos. 2–3, 12, 14–15, 23–25, 33, 35–6, 38, 50, 55–6, 59–60, 63, 67–8, 78, 83, 85, 114–22, 125–7, 137–8.
[30] *Odh*, nos. 44, 49–50, 56, 63, 74; *Canti B* nos. 40, 49; *Canti C*, nos. 51, 54, 69, 89, 123, 128–31.

and mass movements: the famous Isaac Benedictus, mentioned earlier, would have gone straight into that category if it hadn't been noticed that it in fact comes from one of his masses; and several of the motets could well have done the same. Only the sheer quantity of such pieces by Martini inspires confidence that the category existed at all.

This leaves only the free-form songs, which are for the most part instantly distinguishable from the rest. Normally they are in four voices and imitative; towards the end there are repeated notes and usually a short section in contrasting triple time. The text incipits in Petrucci nearly always have a light and popular tone, quite unlike the courtly tone of the forme-fixe chansons; and when the texts can be recovered their lines tend to be of 6 or 7 syllables as against the 8 or 10 syllables of the forme-fixe chanson. Those texts are more likely to be found in the little printed chapbooks of French popular verse now published in new editions by Brian Jeffery,[31] whereas the texts of the forme-fixe chanson tend to be in larger collections devoted to rondeaux and virelais. There is very little indeed in this free-form repertory that can be dated before about 1490; and most of it must have been composed in the ten years leading up to *Canti C*. This accounts for some 70 songs across the three volumes, and there is almost never any difficulty in distinguishing it from the forme-fixe genres.[32]

Perhaps a subdivision of that category is the basically homophonic free-form song. Many of these are in three voices, but in most other respects they resemble the main group of imitative free-form songs. There are fewer than 20 across the three books.[33]

Subgenres aside, then, and forgetting the tiny number of motets, mass movements and canons, there are just three main categories of music that account for almost everything in those three volumes: the forme-fixe chanson, the abstract fantasy, surely instrumental, and the free-form song. There were fewer than thirty pieces that did not instantly fall into one of those categories. It may be that more careful thought or analysis would answer the remaining questions: but in the case of Josquin's „Cela sans plus" and „La plus des plus", for example, I could not feel confident in saying whether they were forme-fixe chansons or abstract fantasies. It is my strong instinct that they are indeed abstract fantasies; and their surrounding pieces in the *Odhecaton* would seem to support that view. But the case looked far less watertight than with the other works in that category, and caution suggested leaving them unclassified. The same was the case with Josquin's „Adieu mes amours": some scholars believe this is a combinative chanson, others that it is an abstract fantasy on a borrowed popular melody; it seemed better kept out of a pigeon-hole.

---

[31] Brian Jeffery, ed., *Chanson verse of the early Renaissance*, 2 vols. (London 1971–1976).
[32] *Odh*, nos. 7, 19, 23, 28–30, 32–3, 36, 41, 70 (3vv), 75 (3vv), 92, 94, 96; *Canti B*, nos. 3–7, 9–12, 14–15, 17–18, 21–3, 27, 29, 33, 35, 41 (3vv); *Canti C*, nos. 5–7, 9–11, 16–21, 26, 29–31, 34, 37, 40–42, 44–7, 49, 52–3, 71, 76, 86, 100, 102, 107, 134.
[33] *Odh*, nos. 18, 25–6, 34, 37, 40, 72, 79, 90; *Canti B*, nos. 25, 51; *Canti C*, nos. 22, 27–8, 62, 64, 103–4.

Here are the pieces that do not fall easily into one of those categories:

Odh:

5	Brunette (Stokem)
7	Nenciozza mia (Japart)
10	Bergerette savoyene (Josquin)
14	Adieu mes amours (Josquin)
15	Por quoy non (La Rue)
24	Cela sans plus [Japart]
27	Tmeiskin [?Japart]
51	Se mieulx (Compere)
61	Cela sans plus (Josquin)
64	La plus des plus (Josquin)

Canti B:

1	L'omme armé (Josquin)
8	L'autrier qui passa (Busnoys)
19	Coment peult haver joye (Josquin)
26	Una moza falle yo [anon.]
28	Fors seulement/[Du tout plongiet] (La Rue)
31	Je cuide/De tous biens (Japart)
32	Franch cor qu'as tu/Fortuna (De Vigne)

Canti C:

4	Tant que nostre argent durra (Obrecht)
39	Le second jour [=In mijnen sin] [Busnoys]
48	Je sey bien dire (Josquin)
65	Quant vostre ymage [anon.]
73	Je ne suis mort [anon.]
74	Vray dieu d'amours/Sancte Jovanes (Japart)
84	Vilana che sa tu far [anon.]
90	Questa se chiama (Japart)
91	Serviteur soye (Stokem)
94	Je sui d'alemagne (Stokem)

The important point is that several names keep turning up in this list of unclassified pieces. Josquin seven times. There are those who think of the songs in three and four voices as the least original part of his output; but none of these pieces fits easily into the received patterns of the time, and each seems to say something new and individual. The much-maligned Johannes Japart appears six times: I mentioned earlier that he is one of the best represented composers in the *Canti* volumes, coming after only Compère and Agricola. His music is well represented in other sources, both earlier and later, but he is less acknowledged today, partly because he composed no masses or motets.

The picture here seems to say that he, too, is a song composer of some individuality.

Finally there is the similarly little known composer Johannes Stokem, who appears three times in this list. He has recently come to some prominence as the man who appeared in the papal choir under the name Johannes de Pratis and was therefore confused with Josquin.[34] But interest in his music has not gone much further than that. The seven works by him in the *Canti* volumes all declare him to be a composer of considerable individuality who rarely followed the trends. And there is one further point to be made about Stokem: I refuse to accept the view that he died in October 1487; this is based on a still unpublished supplication located by Adalbert Roth.[35] But everything about the style and sources of all his songs declares him to be a composer active in the years after 1490. Not just that, but he is a figure of the most enormous musical interest.

Those few songs that cannot easily be classified merit special attention. But the broader issue is about the conclusions that can be offered about how Petrucci's *Canti* volumes can be used in an academy for the performance of early music. One must conclude that the volumes were printed with the intention that they be used for textless performance, presumably by instruments, despite the arguments against this from Helen Hewitt and despite the admirable caution of Howard Mayer Brown who listed only eight of the 286 pieces in his catalogue of *Instrumental Music Printed before 1600*. To play any of the pieces on instruments must be historically correct, in the sense that it plainly happened. On a more subjective and aesthetic front, however, it is clear that both the forme-fixe chansons and the free-form songs were originally intended to carry texts and derive much of their musical design and impact from those texts. Where the texts can be recovered, they should be sung; where texts cannot be found, it may just be better to leave the music unperformed. But there still remains a large repertory, the works here called fantasies, that was surely intended for an instrumental ensemble. These include some of the most haunting music of their time and I urge their intensive further exploration.

---

[34] Pamela F. Starr, „Josquin, Rome, and a case of mistaken identity", *JM* 15 (1997) pp. 43–65.

[35] Starr, „Josquin, Rome, and a case of mistaken identity", at p. 54, note 24. The supplication, dated 4 October 1487, is for a benefice at the cathedral of Erlau, Hungary, made vacant by the death of „Johannes de Prato, alias Stokem". Very often such supplications were made on the basis of misinformation; since Stokem was paid as a member of the papal choir to the end of September 1487, somebody must have moved very quickly indeed to secure the benefice so suddenly vacated. If Stokem survived past 1487, as I am convinced he did, it would be easier to suggest him as the composer of the Mass „Allez regretz", ascribed in Jena Ms. 21 to „Jo. de pratis+" (printed in *Werken van Josquin des Prés: Missen*, no. 20). In his commentary to the New Josquin Edition, vol. 7 (1997), Thomas Noblitt mounts an extended argument to show why the work cannot be by Josquin des Prez.