

Critical notes

Text:

In mijnen sin hadde ick vercoren	In my thoughts I had chosen
Een maechdeken <so> jonck van daghen.	A virgin young in days.
<Noyt en was > Schoonder wijf [en was noyt] geboren	A more beautiful woman had never been born
Ter werelt wijt, na mijn behaghen.	in all the world to my pleasure.
Om haren wille so wil ick waghen	For her sake I want to risk
Beyde lijf ende daertoe goet;	both life and goods;
Mocht ic noch troost aen haer beiaeghen, (=enige hoop van haar verkrijgen)	if I could I arouse some hope from her,
So waer ic vro daer ic nu trueren moet.	I would be glad whereas I am now in distress.

You may find a more complete text and translation after Alexander Agricola's version of In mijnen sin on this site, <http://home.planet.nl/~teuli049/petrucciblad.html#agric>. The source is the so called Antwerps liedboek, issued Antwerp 1544, see <http://www.liederenbank.nl/liedpresentatie.php?zoek=1684&lan=en>, or <http://www.liederenbank.nl/liedpresentatie.php?zoek=1684&lan=nl>. The liederenbank does not give translations of the Middle Dutch texts.

I slightly corrected the text to fit the music of Busnois: Een maechdeken *so* jonck van daghen. *Noyt en was* schoonder wijf geboren. These corrections might apply to Agricola's music as well.

Note on the division of syllables: hadde ick: pronounce hadd' ick (line 1); wille (line 5, measure 12): the Superius, Contratenor and Bassus imply the pronunciation will', but the music of the Tenor in the best source, the Basevi Codex, permits wille; I adapted the three voices to the tenor according to the Basevi codex.

The same differences between the two sources occur in line 6 of the text, beyde; the Basevi codex has two notes in measure 15 Superius and 20/21 Bassus, where Canti C has one dotted semibrevis; Canti C has two notes in measure 19 Contratenor; I chose the reading with a semibrevis + a minima, adapting also the Tenor.

The explanation for these differences may be that the lines of Middle Dutch verse have three stressed syllables and a indefinite number of unstressed syllables. This makes the positioning of the text more complicated than, for instance, French verse, where every line normally contains the same number of syllables.

The number of syllables is different in the five stanzas of the song. Line 5 has more syllables in the 2nd stanza and less in the 3rd, 4th and 5th; dividing stressed and unstressed syllables as naturally as possible, stanza 1 and 2 are easier with a semibrevis and minima, and stanza 3, 4 and 5 with a dotted semibrevis. Line 6 has less syllables in the 2nd and 5th and more in the 4th stanza. I return to these points below. None of both sources of Busnois' piece provide a text, Dutch nor French.

There is a second source for the text in the Kamper liedboek, ca 1540. For details I refer to Peter Woetmann Christoffersen, *The restoration of Antoine Busnoys' four-part Flemish song "In mijnen sijn": An experiment in sound, imitation technique, and setting of a popular tune*, at: <http://www.pwch.dk/Publications/BusnoysInMijnen.html> (PDF, 1,3 Mb, consulted November 21st, 2009).

The Kamper liedboek gives a part of Henricus Isaac's version of this song, with a corrupt text. Isaac's version does not repeat the music of the first two lines, and so the lines 3 and 4 are missing. The rhyme scheme has been spoiled by giving a wrong end to line 2 and substituting the words "aen haer beiaghen" for "verwerven" from line 12 in the Antwerp version. Following the Dutch musicologist J.W. Bonda, *De meerstemmige Nederlandse liederen van de vijftiende en zestiende eeuw*, Hilversum 1996, p.77-80, Peter Woetmann proposes a text taking elements from the Kampen text into the Antwerp text, to fit the music, because he signalizes some places where music and Antwerp text do not fit. As a professional philologist I reject the method of both excellent musicologists to amalgamate these two versions in this way. One of the sources is evidently corrupt, the other is intrinsically logic, possibly except for the last stanza. For more than a century the philological method seeks the most reliable source and tries to make as few emendations as possible. It is not forbidden to use later sources making emendations, but one should not take them as a starting point. Though both sources in this case are nearly contemporary and we cannot be certain about the text Busnois had at his disposal, it seems indeed certain to me that the Busnois' text was much closer to the Antwerp version than to the Kampen one. A better source is likely to have a better and older predecessor and Busnois precedes Isaac by one generation. The Antwerp text does very well fit to Busnois' music after some minor corrections and taking into consideration the pronunciation of Dutch.

Woetmann rightly argues that the music in the Basevi codex is closer to a texted predecessor than the version of Canti C, which has been edited to facilitate instrumental performance. He also pointed out that ornamental notes of the Tenor cannot bear separate syllables. Bonda's and his edition choose the corrupt Isaac text, who has six syllables in line 6, because the tenor contains less notes than, for instance, the tenor of the version by Agricola. But two voices of the Basevi codex give enough notes to fit the first word bey-de; this may even be another indication that the Antwerp text is closer to the text used by Busnois than the Kampen one. There remains, however, a problem with -de of ende, if the c' which I placed above -de is to be considered as a transitional note. If this is a problem, I have no solution for it supported by the transmitted music.

There is also a painting by Cornelis Anthonisz, Banquet of the members of the Crossbow Guild, dated 1533, in the Amsterdam Historical Museum, representing the beginning of Busnois' piece, without repetition of the first lines, and with the corrupt Kampen text. Its head "discantus", is lacking in both the Basevi codex and Canti C. It may prove the existence of a version of Busnois's piece with abridged music and with the corrupt text. Isaac possibly took this one as his example. By the way, it is impossible for adult men to sing this discantus at its notated pitch.

Music

I originally made two different editions of this piece by Busnois. One of them had been based upon **Cod. Florence BN 2439 Basevi** (ca 1505-1508), fo 29v -30. The other had been based upon **Petrucchi Canti C** (1503), fo 55v – 56. My present edition gives the transcription of the Basevi text with the different readings of Canti C in cue notes, with remarks.

In transcribing both sources I met with some problems for which I had no solution. I thank Thomas Holme, Århus, for bringing an article to my attention by Peter Woetmann Christoffersen <http://chansonniers.pwch.dk/CH/CH029.html> (lastly accessed November 21st 2009). I asked some other questions to Peter Woetmann, he was so kind to answer, and, besides, made an edition of the song himself. We had some extensive correspondance

afterwards, for which I am very grateful and from which I learned very much. I am convinced that his solution for the music is highly probable, but regret that we could not agree on the text. That is why I also retained my transcription of the music, with my own positioning of the text .

Peter Woetmann Christoffersen, *The restoration*, cited above, argued that both the Contratenor and the Bassus originally had no flat signatures. He took the Basevi text as his starting point. The key signature of the Contratenor should be equal to the Bassus (none, see below), and the signature of the Superius to the Tenor (one flat). He rightly preferred some readings from Canti C above those of the Basevi codex. He signaled some errors in my original texts, and I am grateful for his corrections. Besides he gave his permission to me to use his reconstruction of the music. I made, however, my own choices as to the readings required by my solutions of the text. As to the accidentals there are some differences in taste.

My music notation software does not allow me to write a flat signature on three staves and no signature on the fourth (i.e. the Bassus) and in the reconstruction of the second. I corrected this by systematically writing naturals in my score according to the both sources. I added a score of the Superius and Tenor and one of the Contratenor and Bassus. These provide the correct key signatures.

Cod. Florence BN 2439 Basevi, fo 29v -30.

Title: In myne zynn at Superius, Tenor and Bassus, In myne zin at Contra. Original clefs Superius G2, Contra C1, Tenor C3, Bassus F4.

Petrucchi Canti C, fo 55v – 56. Title: Le second Jour davril at Superius and Contra, Le second jour at Tenor and Bassus.

Original clefs: Superius G2, Contra C1, Tenor C3, Bassus F3.

The Codex Basevi is generally dated about 1505-1508, Canti C dates from 1503. Both editions are untexted except the first words.

Both sources 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.

The Superius of both editions has a flat before f". According to Peter Woetmann Christoffersen, Copenhagen, at <http://chansonniers.pwch.dk/CH/CH029.html> (lastly accessed November 21st 2009), "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)". It practically means that the e" should not be flattened.

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

Codex Basevi:

Bassus measure 24 1st beat: b flat;

Canti C:

Contratenor measure 5 3d beat: b natural;

Contratenor measure 7 1st beat: b flat;

Bassus measure 9 4th beat, measure 10 3th beat, measure 18 4th beat 2nd half, and measure 19 fourth beat: b natural

Superius measure 20 before first beat: CC gives a sharp on the g'-line. Peter Woetmann supposes that the sign should be placed one line up, indicating a b' natural, which makes a perfect sense.

Different notes:

Codex Basevi has the following colorated notes:

Bassus: measure 13 3d beat; Contratenor: 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, brevis a, CC 2x semibrevis a.

Superius measure 6 3d beat: Basevi semibrevis f', CC dotted minima f' + seminima e'.

Contratenor measure 7 2nd beat – 8 1st beat: Basevi: dotted minima a' + semiminima g' + 2 minimae f' and e'; CC: minima a' + semibrevis g' + 2 semiminimae f' and e'.

Tenor measure 8 4th beat – 9 1st beat: Basevi minima f' + 2 semiminimae e' d' + dotted minima c' + semiminima b, CC: dotted minima f' + 2 fusae e' d' + semibrevis c'.

Contratenor measure 12 3rd beat: Basevi b' flat, CC c''.

Tenor measure 12 3rd -4th beat: Basevi semibrevis f + 2 minimae f, CC dotted semibrevis f + minima f. I prefer to keep the Basevi version, because of the positioning of the text “wille”, line 5, see above. I adapted measure 13 of the Superius and 17 Contratenor en 19 Bassus in the same way, to fit the text and restore the canonic musical lines.

Superius measure 15 3rd -4th beat: Basevi semibrevis d'' + minima d'', CC dotted semibrevis d''. The same hesitation between both sources on the note value occurs in measure 19, Contratenor, and 20/21 Bassus. They bear the text of line 6, see above. I chose or adapted semibrevis + minima here and in Tenor measure 13, 4th beat - measure 14, 1st beat..

Contratenor measure 19 Basevi dotted semibrevis a', CC semibrevis a' + minim a'.

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

Bassus measure 20 3rd beat- 21 1st beat: Basevi: semibrevis a + minima a, CC: dotted semibrevis a.

Tenor measure 22 2nd -3rd beat: Basevi semiminima g + minima rest + minima c', CC minima g + minima rest + semibrevis c'.

Contratenor measure 28 1st -2nd beat: Basevi: minima a' + semibrevis b', CC: dotted minima a' + semiminima f' + minima b'.

Contratenor measure 29 Basevi 1st -3rd beat: Basevi: triple measure brevis g' + 2 minimae f' e' + semibrevis d' + minima c', CC: dotted semibrevis g' + 2 semiminimae f' e' + dotted minima d' + semiminima c'.

Superius measure 30 2nd -4th beat: Basevi: triple measure brevis c'' + 2 minimae b' a' + semibrevis b' + minima c'', CC: dotted semibrevis c'' + 2 semiminimae b' a' + dotted minima b' + semiminima c''.

Arnold den Teuling, Assen, The Netherlands, revised December 15th 2009.