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The transcriptions in this volume — twenty-eight in all — are intended to provide a faithful and accurate rendering of Baldwin's copy, in a presentation intelligible to modern readers. Accordingly, the text is reproduced exactly, but its arrangement is designed to facilitate appreciation of its features.

The separate parts provided by the Christ Church books are placed above each other, as in a score, so that Baldwin's copy may be assessed with reference to part-writing — this arrangement is, of course, present in much of R.M.24.d.2, and in the case of its unica is simply transferred from there straight to this volume. In order to facilitate reading, pieces without bar-lines (all of ChCh 979-83 and some of R.M.24.d.2) are provided with them; the parts are transposed into modern clefs for the same purpose, and the position of note-stems and rests has been modernized as well. Sharp signs are rendered as natural signs in the relevant contexts, and preplacement is dispensed with. The syllables of the text underlay are hyphenated, in order to make their position clear.

Within this modern framework, however, the text which Baldwin copied is preserved, both in the music itself and in the spelling, distribution and placement of underlay.

'Unica' from R.M.24.d.2

These pieces form part of the section of R.M.24.d.2 which is copied in score. Baldwin's text is reproduced exactly, including errors of alignment, which are also noted separately. It should be borne in mind, however, that the precise function and effect of the accidentals and key/stave signatures used by Baldwin and his contemporaries have not yet been defined with certainty. Therefore it should not be automatically assumed that an accidental will apply throughout a bar, as would be the case in a modern score.
As far as Baldwin's barred pieces are concerned, a basic time signature is provided in square brackets where Baldwin's distribution of beats throughout the bars is completely or mainly constant. In pieces where the number of beats per bar varies frequently, no time signature is provided. Many of the transcriptions place three minims regularly within the bar (see discussion of this in Chapter 4).

'Unica' from Christ Church 979-83

The transcriptions of these Christ Church pieces include a blank stave, which represents the missing Tenor part-book.

The commonest type of error in the Christ Church unica readings concerns 'rest sections' (or units of rests, as opposed to single rest signs), many of which are too long or too short. R.M.24.d.2 does not share this problem, partly because of its bar-lines, and partly because it only transmits extracts from the large multi-section pieces in which such errors are likely to occur. If these books were used in performance, the singers would have had to rely more on each other than on their manuscript parts, for their entries. The imposition of bar-lines on these transcriptions is an important means of showing clearly where and how these mistakes occur, but the possibility remains that if bar-lines had been used in the original, Baldwin would have been alerted to these errors and might well not have made them. Therefore, rather than preserve them at the expense of subsequent part-writing, they are simply recorded in parenthesis. Barring errors in the R.M.24.d.2 unica, however, are preserved in transcription, to show that Baldwin could make an error of this kind.

Accidentals and key/stave signatures should be treated with the same caution as in the R.M.24.d.2 transcriptions.

Pieces shared by ChCh 979-83 and R.M.24.d.2

The pieces in this group are not all unique to Baldwin's sources, as were the pieces in the two previous groups, but they all appear in both of
Baldwin's vocal sources, ChCh 979-83 and R.M.24.d.2. Thus in each case they provide a valuable opportunity to compare his two copies. They vary in nature from complete shared vocal pieces (Parsons' *Libera me Domine*), to large-scale vocal pieces of which R.M.24.d.2 presents only an extract (Mundy's *Maria virgo sanctissima*), to a shared instrumental piece (Bevin's *Browning*) and a proportion exercise (Johnson's *Laudes Deo dicam*).

The comparative transcriptions are organized as follows. When both sources share a piece in its entirety, the transcription is taken from the source with Baldwin's own bar-lines, i.e. R.M.24.d.2, and the Christ Church variants are noted in red. When ChCh 979-83 presents a complete piece and R.M.24.d.2 only an extract of it, the transcription is taken from ChCh 979-83 and the R.M.24.d.2 variants are noted in red. Bevin's *Browning* and Johnson's *Laudes Deo dicam* appear complete, and without bar-lines, in both sources, so R.M.24.d.2 has been chosen as the standard, with the Christ Church variants noted in red.

In R.M.24.d.2, titles and attributions often appear at the beginning of works, and sometimes at the end as well. In ChCh 979-83, they take the form of a colophon appended to each reading, which often varies between voice-parts of the same piece. Both types of gloss are reproduced in these transcriptions; the Christ Church colophon chosen is the most extended, or in some cases the most interesting (because corrected or expanded) one available from the readings.

Taken as a whole, the transcriptions in this volume make one important point clear: the general pattern of unusual features is one of duplication of the same types of mistake. Those concerning rests are most numerous, followed by notes with missing or superfluous stems, omitted or duplicated syllables in the underlay, and, more rarely, an actual wrong note. These types of mistake are common to both ChCh 979-83 and R.M.24.d.2, and much more frequent than an error such as the duplicated line in the R.M.24.d.2 reading of Tallis's *Loquebantur variis linguis*, where the mechanism of the error and its correction are directly linked to the conditions of its copying — the score-book format.
The situation is the same with regard to divergences between readings of the same piece. Differences over accidentals, the distribution and placement of underlay, and details of rhythm (for example a case where one reading gives $0$ and the other $\downarrow\downarrow$) greatly outnumber actual pitch and melodic differences, and some of the more bizarre notational divergences present in, for example, the readings of Johnson's Laudes Deo dicam.
* Note that Superior key stem signature line is flat
Deus qui a tu es de nos

Se qui a tu es de nos

autem de hic tunc mea
* Notes and syllables not of step here
con - fite - bor ti - bi in ci - te - ra

* Note that this final syllable is given twice — cf. bar 139
* Notes and syllables out of step here.
This phrase and its stave added in the margin, joined to main stave

(2) Print sharp under this note
et deus me:

* Once again, last syllable given twice
(B) Final syllable of melody omitted
Beati omnes qui timent

Note the difference between the key's stave signatures. In view of the apparent usage of such signatures by Behaim and his contemporaries, he — or the scribe of his example — may have deliberately left the Eb out of the Superius signature because the part contains comparatively few Es.
* Baldwin's distribution of underlay implies the splitting of this ligature
Following this phrase, 'et Æ', is copied with no space above it, at the end of a line. It is repeated, this time with space, in the next line, after a blank space.
* Notes and syllables not in sync at this point
Note clash between two lower parts
* This Superior lego signature only lasts for one line; thereafter the only part which carries a signature is the Bassus. This discrepancy, which leads to many clashes, may have been transmitted faithfully from his exemplar; alternatively he may have copied the Bassus last, and decided, because so many flats had been involved in the other parts, that it would give it a signature.
* Too many notes for syllables at this point
* Notes and syllables out of step in this phrase

© There are too many notes for syllables in this phrase
*Notes and syllables out of step at this point*
Psalite [domino]

Psalite [domino]
* Note frequent use of repeat signs, unusual in Baldwin's copying outside the Cantus Firmus.

It may have been prompted to use them by the simplicity of the text.

(*) Note omitted syllable
Note and syllables slightly out of sync. Here
* Last letter of this word omitted
* Last Letter of this word omitted
* Note use of ligatures without syllables
* Miscellaneous annotation, crossed out
* The Suspending staff changes to C1 for the length of one line, then returns to C2.
fragilibus carpo re faverit
fragilibus carpo re faverit

fragilibus carpo re faverit

fragilibus carpo re faverit

fragilibus carpo re faverit
*The three syllables of 'versiculum' are laid under two ligatures.
*The word "et" is inserted above the underlay*
* Note variant word, 'deux', which is only given one note.

* Change of clef here, from C2 to C1
* A single word, 'in', is placed beneath this pair of minim A's
* Noted extra syllable. This could be a deliberate attempt to camouflage a mistake in the distribution, but it is more probable that Baldwin simply became confused over the word itself.
* Minim beat missing here: preceding note should probably have been a semibreve
* Change of clef here, from C2 to C1.
Parsons: O bone Iesu

* 19 bars' rest in this section, for both Medium and Bass, but Baldwin gives 24 for Bass and 32 for Medium
* Underlay implies that this note is reiterated to the same syllable

* 26 bars rest in this section, but Baldwin gives 24
* 2.2 bars rest in this section, but Baldwin gives 28
* Baldwin omits three beats here
A possible reference to the missing Tenor part
* Notes and syllables out of sync. — 'a' placed under rest
Notes and syllables out of sync. Here: 'in' placed under note.
Baldwin omit two beats here
*Note and syllabic out of sync. - 'quosiam' placed under previous rests
* After this note Baldwin gives rests equivalent to five minim beats — more than are required.

The note should in any case have had a stem, but the number of rests would still be incorrect.
In: Robert:

pauvres.
in consilio instarum

* Notes and underlay are off of sync here.
* Error here: this note, given as a breve here, is (incorrectly) a semibreve in Baldwin's reading.
Ferrabosco: Ultimi me
* Apparent error in these bars. The tenor should perhaps have had a final G, with the value and
2 a sign giving to the A, and Bass I a semibreve D preceding its final note.
Extra beat in this bar, and one too few in the following bar
* Extra semibreve beat in this bar, but its effect is not an error
Franco (i): Christe redemptor
* Note irregularity of rhythmic distribution throughout this piece
* Baldwin erroneously duplicated the previous phrase, and as a result the part is thinned out by three measures until the end of the section on p. 159.
* Baldwin re-states three of the chaft at this point
* Baldwin made an error here: the semibreve should be dotted, and the rest of the part one minim later until the middle of bar 20

++ Baldwin left this bar incomplete

† At this point - change of line in the original - Baldwin changes the alto clef from a C to a G form

‡ It looks as if there is an uncorrected error in the copying here. This part should be two minims later; the semibreve in its final bar was presumably added by Baldwin
* In subsequent lines of this part, the bass/stave signature gives a second B♭ an octave higher.
null
null
Distribution of underlay implies splitting of this ligature. The syllable 'me' is actually placed under the ensuing note.
* Note omission of symbols here
Sparis in diecisis et de caelo in domino

et de hibi pulchrum cor dedu i

debi pulchrum cor dedu i

Words and syllables out of step here
Revelandum veniam tu.

Note the use of two linking devices here.
* Distribution of underlay implies splitting the ligature in this phrase
*This connecting bracket cannot be observed if each syllable is to have a note.*
* These notes are erroneously given as minimus
*The middle syllable is missed out of this word, probably because a line or line cuts into the underlying time.
Iesus dominus et liberabit eos et remittit eos a peccatis suis et salvat eos et remittit eos a peccatis suis et salvat eos

*Notes and underlay out of step here*
 Parsens: Libera me Domine de morte
N.B. extra beats in this bar
null
Notes and syllables out of step

Note Chie spelling
The partial signatures in this piece are present in both readings.

* This line of copying petered out at bar 14. It is likely that Baldwin eventually realized that he had made a mistake over the rest of the piece in the very first bar, and so he simply stopped copying the line and replaced it with the one below.

** Rest too long here
* Superfluous rest here
* Soprano flute rest here
* Accidental not in score.
* See note at beginning of piece

[ ] Blank space  [X] Not in CLCh  [X] Not in CLCh

[+] Not in CLCh
* Ret section too short by 1½ bars
* Note duplication of last syllable
*This rest section too long by 1 bar*
*Balloon gives only 2 semibreves here at this point
Notación musical con partitura y texto en español.

*Nota: duplicación de último símil.*
* Baldwin gives a superfluous minim between these notes

* This next section 10 bars too short

† Two superfluous semibreve notes begin this part

‡ This next section 10 bars too short
This rest section is too short.
* Notes and syllables out of step here
* Superfluous semibreve rest at this point

(8) This rest section too long by half a bar
*Note and underlay out of step*
finis quad "w: mundia: one of the gentlemen: of the queen maesties: chapelle: lordes: deo:"

men.

men.
* Baldwin gives a whole bar's rest here
* Baldwin gives two redundant semibreve rests as well as this rest
et de-cor-a-vit et de-cor-a-

cor-a-vit et co-ro-

cor-a-vit et co-ro-

Et sie sum - ma tri-

Et sie sum - ma tri-

Et sie sum - ma tri-

* Note and underlay out of step

Two redundant semibreve rests at end of this section.
Baldwin gives a full bow's rest here.
*Notes and syllables out of step here*
Li qui o-munium so-lus de-us de-o-nun
* Notes and syllables out of step here
* Notes and syllables out of step here.
* Note direction as to how to distribute underlay during repeat sign.

(1) Note duplication of final syllable.
* Note omission of final syllable
* Notes and syllables out of step

Rest section before this entry is 8 bars too short
* Baldwin omits the dot this note.
* Note duplication of final syllable; this occurs at a change of line
*Note: duplication of last syllable*
Christ Church has the following section instead of 'Messias':

Et vocatio woman

* This semibreve beat probably an error
There seems little doubt that Baldwin was not completely familiar with the type of rhetorical intricacies found in this piece. Furthermore, it seems unlikely that he could have prepared a number of examples for it, so some discrepancies between the two readings may stem from his inexpert attempts to make changes, perhaps after an unsuccessful performance. Those connected with the violin itself, however, were very marked. Baldwin's two manuscripts are apparently the only surviving sources of this piece.
Baldwin: Cuckow as I we walked

* No corresponding Tenor reading in Christ Church because of the missing text.
In both MS readings, the key signature in each part lasts for only two or three lines, and is then replaced by a sharp (i.e. natural) signature, or nothing at all.