

Critical notes

I made two different editions of this piece by Busnois. One of them has been based upon **Cod. Florence BN 2439 Basevi** (ca 1480), fo 29v -30. Title: In myne zynn at Superius, Tenor and Bassus, In myne zin at Contra. Original clefs (chiavette): Superius G2, Contra C1, Tenor C3, Bassus F4.

The other has been based upon **Petrucchi Canti C** (1503), fo 55v – 56. Title: Le second Jour davril at Superius and Contra, Le second jour at Tenor and Bassus. Original clefs (chiavette): Superius G2, Contra C1, Tenor C3, Bassus F3.

The Codex Basevi is generally dated in the last quarter of the 15th century, Canti C dates from 1503.

Both versions have one flat as signature in the Superius, Contra and Tenor. Canti C also has one flat in the Bassus, but Codex Basevi has none. The differences in the accidentals of both editions do prove that none of the two has to be regarded as an error. Moreover, they seem partially to compensate the differences between the two versions. A Bassus with or without flat makes a great difference. There remain a number of conflicting cases in the Bassus, and I could not decide which of the two versions should be preferred, because a' may be re and b' natural mi, or a' may be mi, and b' flat fa. The melody of the Contra in measure 1 and the Superius in measure 4 gives b' flat, but the Bassus in measure 4 in Basevi and the contra in measure 5 of Canti C give b' natural. That's why I made two editions of this piece.

Besides, the Superius of both editions have a flat before f'. According to Peter Woetmann Christoffersen, Copenhagen, at <http://chansonniers.pwch.dk/CH/CH029.html>, "this last flat indicates that a high tessitura is used in the upper voice with a fictive (ficta or falsa) hexachord on c", and that one can expect a sound characterized by high E-naturals (mi)". (I thank Thomas Holme, Århus, for bringing this article to my attention and Peter Woetmann Christoffersen for referring me to the relevant literature). It practically means that the e" should not be flattened.

The high clefs or chiavette normally indicate that the piece should be played a fifth or a fourth down. A piece with a b-flat signature is normally to be transposed down by a fourth, but in this case I transposed it down a fifth because of the missing signature in the Bassus. Transposing down a fourth would result in a signature f-sharp in the Bassus staff, which is, as far as I am aware, never found in 15-th century scores. Transposing down a fifth gives a result with a signature of two flats, which does rather frequently occur. It is remarkable that the other versions of this piece on this website, by Josquin des Prez, Alexander Agricola and Henricus Isaac, all have normal clefs with the Tenor voice at the pitch notated in Busnois's original, but put their Superius down by a fourth.

It is, however, not generally accepted that the use of chiavette did exist in this period and in this genre. I think that it is plausible as to the motets and secular works of Pierre de la Rue, half a generation later. A. Johnstone, 'High' clefs in composition and performance, in: *Early Music* 34 (2006) pp. 29-53 cites an instance from a mass by Josquin.

Other differences in accidentals between Codex Basevi and Petrucci, Canti C:
Codex Basevi:

Bassus measure 24 1st beat: b flat;

Canti C:

Contra measure 5 3d beat: b natural;

Bassus measure 9 4th beat: b natural;

Bassus measure 18 4th beat 2nd half: b natural;

Superius measure 20 before first beat: CC gives a sharp on the g'-line. As there is no g' in this section until after the next rest, it should mean that the g' is to be taken as mi, and that, accordingly, the hexachord in this section would begin at e' flat=ut, and the a' and b' should be read as fa = a' flat and sol = b'-flat. The flattened e' in the same measure of the Superius would make, however, a diminished fifth with the A of the Bassus, which is impossible in this position. A mi-sign on the g'-line could also mean that the absent g' should be sharpened, indicating that the b'-s and the e' should be natural: the hexachord begins at e'=ut and b'=sol. In that case however the first c''=la should be sharpened, which is impossible too. So the mi-sign on the g'-line must be an error. Peter Woetmann Christoffersen suggested to me that the sign should be placed one line up, indicating a b' natural, which makes a perfect sense. The Codex Basevi gives no mi-sign in measure 20-21 and so does not help.

Because the accidentals in the two versions apparently supplement each other, I mention these differences in this score edition of the notated pitch, "come stà". My music software does not allow me to write a flat signature on three staves and no signature on the fourth (i.e. the Bassus). I corrected this by systematically writing naturals.

Different notes:

Codex Basevi has the following colorated notes:

Bassus: measure 13 3d beat; Contra: measure 29, numbers 3 on the first line and under the first line; Superius: measure 30 2nd-4th beat, number 3 on the first line of the the staff.

Bassus measure 4 1st-2nd beat: Basevi, semibrevis a, CC 2x minima a;

Contra measure 12 3d beat: Basevi b' flat, CC c'';

Tenor measure 12 3d-4th beat: Basevi dotted semibrevis f + minima f, CC semibrevis f + 2x minima f.

Superius measure 15 3d-4th beat: Basevi dotted semibrevis d'', CC semibrevis + minim d'';

Superius measure 20 2nd beat: Basevi c'', CC a'.

Arnold den Teuling, Assen, The Netherlands, 2009.