.N.L.CROI

Raulin (? = Roelkin =? Rudolphus Agricola
Baflo 1443/44 - Heidelberg 1485)

30

.N.L.   CROI

Tenor

Contra

37

James   ault   ne   veul   .N.L.CROI

44

car   el de   mer   et   de o(n)vul cest celle en qui mamour

51

ai donee

amendment

Magl XIX 176

58

De   son   voul - ler

Verte

Tenor

Verte priora   Contra

ma don - ne la puisance A

De son voulloir

sa plaisance

Ces deux lettres po portet

a ma devise

Critical comment to Raulin, .N.L.CROI

For this edition I used a print of a microfilm of Florence, BNZ Magl. XIX 176, obtained from the Utrecht University Library. Besides I was helped by Clemens Goldberg's edition at http://www.goldbergstiftung.org/file/florenz176gesamtalt.pdf (change -alt- to -neu- for modern clefs). This piece may be found on fol. 108 verso – 111 recto.

As far as I know this manuscript is the only source for nearly all known pieces by Raulin. Another piece, according to DIAMM http://www.diamm.ac.uk/ by Raulin, occurs in a manuscript in Perugia, Biblioteca comunale augusta 1013: De tous bien plaine. We know the same piece from a manuscript in Segovia cathedral, with the composer's name Roelkin. Francesca Grauso, staff member of Perugia library, kindly told me by e-mail in January 2015 that the Perugia manuscript does not give the name Raulin, and that this piece is anonymous. Another piece in the Segovia ms. by Roelkin, Vrucht ende moet is gar dahin, also occurs as Freud und moet in ms. Ulm Münster Bibliotek 236 a-d, according to DIAMM with the name of Raulin, and nr. 237 a-d, according to Bonda, *De meerstemmige Nederlandse liederen van de vijftiende en zestiende eeuw* (Hilversum 1996), p 487, fo 17 verso-18 in volume a; Bonda says it is anonymous too. Bonda, p. 46 and 112-115, suggested the identification of Roelkin with the humanist Rudolphus Agricola, and I agree with him, see the critical comment to my edition of Roelkin's works, especially Et trop penser. He also proposed the identification of Roelkin and Raulin; but it remains hypothetical.
I think an Italian on hearing "Roelkin" would have written: Rol(e)cchino and a Frenchman Raul(e)quin: the missing k is hard to explain. According to Fallows, New Grove Online s.v., this Raulin is probably not Ranlequin de Mol, another 15-th century Dutch composer, of whom one Latin motet is known, Ave decus virginum, in four voices. If the n is to be read as u, it would solve the k- problem. But Mol is situated in Brabant and not in the Northern part of the Netherlands, and: Agricola Frisius.

I tried to stay as close as possible to the manuscript, only applying necessary corrections; they are identical with the solutions of Goldberg, except bars 55-56. I do not agree in all points with his transcription or interpretation, see below. The following remarks concern the edition of the original score. In the transcriptions for modern use they should be transformed as to note value etc.

The piece is a so called bergerette. Repetition is only sparsely indicated in the score. After bar 59 there is the remark: Verte priora, meaning: turn back to the first page, so a repeat of the first part. Elsewhere the note verte or verte cito means: turn (the page) or turn quickly. The two final chords appear after 3 ½ breves, which represents the opportunity to improvise for the performer of the tenor, to whom the ms. gives no text at all, or a very dramatic silence. Maybe the two final notes should bear a last desparate or triumphant .N.L. This would be conform the "petite bergerette" as described in the French version of Wikipedia, http://fr.wikipedia.org/wiki/Bergerette ; in that case the text of the stanza of the bergère is

missing, and only the marquis is speaking, his text being incomplete. So I did not try to give a version with reconstructed song text.

All other corrections and remarks concern the Contratenor:
Bar 30.1 Sbr f in ligature : corrected to Br f. The second note of the ligature (black brevis, to be performed as a dotted minima) should not be corrected.
Bar 45.2 Min f : corrected to Min e.
Bar 55-56 is corrupt. The ms. wrong notes are added in a separate staff, with my new contratenor. I think the flat sign was a note in the original score, but I tried to stay as close as possible to this original and to make it sound as good as possible. Any better proposal will be welcome.
Bar 83.1 Br e: corrected to Min e.
The last note of the contra, bar 98, is an evident Maxima on the fifth, where the other two parts show a Longa on the fundamental d. I have no explanation for it.

I put the text in the original score according to the manuscript as much as possible. It is a lacunal and corrupt French text. ".N.L.", between dignity points, is doubtless an abbreviation for the name of a loved one. "CROI" may be another pseudonym meaning "Cross" or an exclamation "Believe it" or "Verily" . As I am not sure I leave it untranslated.

Text, with corrected French:

.N.L. CROI cest sous ma pe(n)se	.N.L. CROI c'est sous ma pensée
.N.L. CROI sen est ma destinee	.N.L. CROI tant est ma destinée
.N.L. CROI james ault ne veul	.N.L. CROI jamais aultre ne veul
.N.L. CROI car el demer et de onvul	.N.L. CROI car (or : quand) elle demeurer veul
cest celle en qui mamour ai donee.	c'est celle en qui m' amour ai donnée.
De son voulloir ma donne la puissance	De son vouloir m'a donné la puissance
a sa plaisance	à sa plaisance
Ces deux lettres po	Ces deux lettres
Portet a ma devise	portent à ma devise.

In the corrupt onvul there is an oblique stroke through the n. The word beginning po is superfluous after putting portet in the right place, unless was meant: the two letters p.o., which seems to be pointless.

Translation:
.N.L. CROI is in my thoughts, .N.L. CROI, such is my destination, .N.L. CROI, never I want somebody else, .N.L. CROI, for (or: when) she wants to stay (?); it is her to whom I gave my love. (Second stanza missing) Of her own free will she gave me the power, to her pleasure; those two letters (NL or PO) complete my device.