

8 | 16

Number 1

Journal of the  
**Alamire** Foundation

BREPOLS



The *Journal of the Alamire Foundation* is published twice a year (spring and autumn)

**Founding editors**

David J. Burn  
Katelijne Schiltz

**General editors:**

David Burn  
Sarah Ann Long

**Editorial board:**

Barbara Haggh  
Christian Thomas Leitmeir  
Pedro Memelsdorff  
Klaus Pietschmann  
Dorit Tanay  
Giovanni Zanollo

**Advisory board:**

Bonnie J. Blackburn  
M. Jennifer Bloxam  
Anna Maria Busse-Berger  
Fabrice Fitch  
Sean Gallagher  
David Hiley  
Andrew Kirkman  
Karl Kügle  
John Milsom  
Emilio Ros-Fabregas  
Rudolf Rasch  
Thomas Schmidt  
Eugeen Schreurs  
Reinhard Strohm  
Philippe Vendrix  
Rob Wegman

**Coordinator:**

Stratton Bull

**Music examples:**

Vincent Besson

**Music font:**

Theodor Dumitrescu (CMME)

**Subscriptions:**

Brepols Publishers  
Begijnhof 67  
B-2300 Turnhout (Belgium)  
Tel.: +32 14448020  
Fax: +32 14428919  
periodicals@brepols.net

**Submissions:**

Journal of the Alamire Foundation  
c/o Prof. Dr. David Burn  
K.U.Leuven – Musicology  
Research Group  
Mgr. Ladeuzeplein 21, bus 5591  
B-3000 Leuven (Belgium)  
jaf@alamirefoundation.be

Submissions to the Journal can be sent at any time to the address listed above. For further information, including the Journal's style-sheet, see: <http://www.alamirefoundation.org/en/publications/journal-alamire-foundation>.

The Alamire Foundation was founded in 1991 as a collaborative venture between the Musicology Research Unit of the University of Leuven and Musica, Impulse Centre for Music. The organization is named after Petrus Alamire, one of the most important sixteenth-century music calligraphers. The Foundation aims to create an international platform for promoting research on music in or connected to the Low Countries from the earliest documents to the end of the Ancien Regime. The Foundation hopes especially to promote dialogue between the worlds of scholarship and performance. For more information, see: <http://www.alamirefoundation.org/>.

© 2016 Brepols Publishers NV

All rights reserved. No part of this publication may be reproduced, stored in a retrieval system or transmitted, in any form or by any means, electronic, mechanical, photocopying, recording, or otherwise, without the prior permission of the publisher.

ISBN: 978-2-503-56610-8

ISSN: 2032-5371

D/2016/0095/103



# Reconstructing Antoine Brumel: How to Bring the Chanson *Dieu te gart, bergere* Back to Life

OLIVER KORTE

Works that have been passed down to us as mere fragments pose a challenge. We all know the feeling of regret when we examine a work that, due to its fragmentary state, is doomed not to be heard again and condemned to a sad existence as a music-historical footnote. The desire to reconstruct such a composition might be strong.<sup>1</sup> But before setting out to do so, one should ascertain whether the surviving material provides the basis for a serious attempt. If it is too fragmentary, any reconstruction, even if technically correct, will most likely be rejected on the grounds that it is only marginally related to the original. In the case of the composition discussed in the present article, Antoine Brumel's chanson *Dieu te gart, bergere*, however, there is enough material to work with, as only the bassus part is missing. The article presents the completed score, including the missing bassus part that my colleague and friend Immanuel Ott and I have reconstructed. On the following pages, I will discuss questions that arose in the course of our work. I will show why the degree of certainty that the reconstruction matches the lost original varies from phrase to phrase. And I will give an account of the criteria that led us to make the compositional decisions that we did.

*Dieu te gart* is a typical *chanson rustique*. Its folksy text seems to have been quite casually cobbled together. A woman, probably a shepherdess, urges another one to take care of the cattle and to invite a man named Guillot to visit her: he is to play music, so that they may all dance together, and also to bring some goods that he promised her. The suggestion that Guillot 'bring his flute along' and the wording of the last stanza play with *double entendres* in a manner that is quite common for the genre:

Dieu te gart, bergere,  
et dieu te gart de mau.

May God protect you, shepherdess,  
and may God protect you from evil.

Revire lez vachez de nostre preau,  
dieu te gart de mau.

Drive the cows back from our meadow,  
may God protect you from evil.

Et diz a Guillot qu'y viengne  
qu'il aporte son flagot.

And tell Guillot to come over  
and bring his flute along.

Dieu te gart de mau.

May God protect you from evil.

<sup>1</sup> Strategies of reconstructing sixteenth-century music are also discussed in: Irving Godt, 'The Restoration of Josquin's *Ave mundi spes, Maria*, and Some Observations on Restoration', in *Tijdschrift van de Vereniging voor Nederlandse Muziekgeschiedenis* 26 (1976), 53-83; Theodor Dumitrescu, 'Reconstructing and Repositioning Regis's *Ave Maria ... virgo serena*', in *Early Music* 37 (2009), 73-88; and David J. Burn, 'Reconstructing Senfl's Fragmentary Motets: A Method and a Case-Study', in *Senfl-Studien II*, ed. Sonja Tröster and Stefan Gasch (Tutzing, 2014), 525-56.



Et dancerons une si belle dance.  
Qu'il ont apporté de la guerre  
Qu'on appelle les trois saulx.

Dieu te gart bergere,  
Et dieu te gart de mau.

En tellez enseignez  
Qui me promet une bourse,  
Ung esplinguier, et ung pingne.  
Une coiffe et des cousteaulx.

Et dieu te gart de mau.

Mais par la foy de mon corps.  
S'il me fault a le bailier,  
Je le f'ray mordre a nostre pourceau.<sup>2</sup>

And we will dance a beautiful dance,  
which they brought back from the war  
and which is called 'The Three Willows'.

May God protect you, shepherdess,  
and may God protect you from evil.

And inform him to the effect  
that he promised me a purse,  
a pin-cushion and a comb,  
a bonnet and [some] knives.

And may God protect you from evil.

But upon the honour of my body,  
if I have to take him,  
I will make him acquire a taste for our pig.

As far as we know today, the chanson has survived in only one manuscript source, a chanson collection in part-book format held by the Biblioteca del Conservatorio in Florence.<sup>3</sup> While the part-books of the three top voices have been preserved, the bassus book has been lost. Until 2013, the Florentine collection had also been regarded as the only source for another work of Brumel's, *Le moy de may*.<sup>4</sup> However, a complete *contrafactum* of *Le moy de may* has now been identified in Basel.<sup>5</sup> Immanuel Ott and I had previously reconstructed the bassus part of this Brumel song as well. The discovery of the authentic bass part has, of course, rendered our reconstruction expendable. But, at the same time, it has given us a valuable opportunity to compare our version with the rediscovered original and adjust our reconstruction criteria accordingly.

In the Brumel *Opera Omnia*, Barton Hudson edits *Dieu te gart* with the bassus stave left empty.<sup>6</sup> In the foreword he nonchalantly writes, 'However, with a little imagination [a] satisfactory bass part...can be easily composed, probably very similar to Brumel's original one.'<sup>7</sup> In reality this is not quite so straightforward. The following summarizes the possibilities and limitations of the task of reconstruction.

A first issue is that one can never be certain that a reconstruction matches a lost original in all respects. To be sure, certain passages will leave little room for doubt. But other passages will allow several equally convincing solutions. Working on such passages, of course, is not arbitrary: they must be reconstructed in compliance with the general rules of the period from which the piece comes, and they must match the style of the composer—or, more precisely, an aptly chosen subset of his works—as far as representative passages in his oeuvre can be found at all.

<sup>2</sup> Antoine Brumel, *Opera Omnia*, ed. Barton Hudson, *Corpus Mensurabilis Musicae* 5 (s. l., 1972), vol. 6.

<sup>3</sup> The chanson is preserved in only a single source: Florence, Biblioteca del Conservatorio di Musica, Ms. Basevi 2442 [I-Fc Ms. Basevi 2442], No. 37.

<sup>4</sup> I-Fc Ms. Basevi 2442, No. 35.

<sup>5</sup> *Bewar dich Gott mein khaiserin*, Basel, Universitätsbibliothek, F.X.17-20 [BasU F.X.17-20], No. 43; see also Sonja Tröster's contribution to the present issue of this *Journal*.

<sup>6</sup> Brumel, *Opera omnia* 6, 70-73.

<sup>7</sup> Brumel, *Opera omnia* 6, xxii.



Before we can discuss the process of reconstructing *Dieu te gart* in detail, the mode of the piece and the standard ranges of the four parts need to be determined. Nine perfect cadences (among them the final one) finish on *d* and seven on *f* (see Table 1). *D* is the *finalis* and *F* the third scale degree, which reveals the mode of the chanson to be Dorian, regardless of the different signatures of the surviving parts (the discantus has a *Bb*, contratenor and tenor do not).

Table 1. Antoine Brumel, *Dieu te gart, bergere*: perfect cadences (see also the full score in the Appendix)

Bar	Pitch
5	<i>d</i>
13	<i>f</i>
19	<i>d</i>
23	<i>d</i>
28	<i>f</i>
30	<i>f</i>
32	<i>f</i>
38	<i>d</i>
44	<i>d</i>
47	<i>d</i>
49	<i>d</i>
62	<i>f</i>
66	<i>f</i>
68	<i>f</i>
74	<i>d</i>
76	<i>d</i>

Now that we have identified *D* as the *finalis*, let us look at the ambitus of the voices (see Example 1). The tenor part, ranging from *d* to *f*', is authentic. The discantus ranges from *c'* to *c''*, and is thus also clearly authentic.<sup>8</sup> Now we would either expect the contratenor to display a plagal range or to match the ambitus of the tenor. Ranging from *d* to *f*', it does indeed match the ambitus of the tenor. For the bassus, the compositional rules of Brumel's time would prescribe a plagal range from *A* to *a*. A study of the bassus ambitus in Brumel's oeuvre shows that he often exceeds the octave by a third above or below, and occasionally even in both directions. In reconstructing the lost part we are thus free to extend the normal range in the same way, to *F* below or to *c'* above. However, solutions that exceed the standard ambitus should provide significant advantages over those that do not.

<sup>8</sup> See Thomas Daniel, *Kontrapunkt. Eine Satzlehre zur Vokalpolyphonie des 16. Jahrhunderts* (Cologne, 1997), 38.



Example 1. Antoine Brumel, *Dieu te gart, bergere*: ranges of the four voices

Discantus

Contra

Tenor

Bassus (assumed)

or/and

Now we can start the actual work of reconstruction. The cadences divide the composition into smaller portions. At these moments, the voice leading is generally highly standardized. Every cadence involves a series of mandatory bassus notes. These can most easily be determined by moving backwards from the *ultima*. The first phrase of *Dieu te gart* can demonstrate (see Example 2). In bar 5 the three upper voices execute a cadence to the first scale degree, each of them singing their respective *clausula*. Only the contratenor does not complete the cadence, but evades the *ultima*. The bassus *clausula* (A-d) must undoubtedly be added (see stave a). An octave-leap *clausula* A-a would be conceivable as well, but this variant had already become antiquated by Brumel's time and would thus look somewhat misplaced in a 'modern' chanson like *Dieu te gart*.

Example 2. Antoine Brumel, *Dieu te gart, bergere*, bb. 1-5: step-by-step reconstruction of the bassus

Discantus

Contra

Tenor

a)

b)

c)

d)

Bassus [reconstructed]

Dieu te gart, ber - gere, et dieu te gart de mau, de mau.



On the fourth minim of bar 4 in the bassus, the pitches *d*, *f*, and *a* are consonant and hence possible reconstruction candidates (see Example 2, stave b). But in linear terms only *d* makes sense: *F* would go beyond the constraints of the standard ambitus for no good reason, while *f* would result in a stylistically unlikely leap of a sixth down to the subsequent *A*; an *a* would cause uncalled-for part crossing. In this phrase, that brings the series of notes that almost certainly match Brumel's to an end. In other phrases of the chanson such series are considerably longer. The cadence in bb. 11<sub>4</sub>-13<sub>2</sub> might serve as an example. Here the five notes *c-d-b♭-c-f* are absolutely mandatory (only the *ultima f* could be evaded).

Now that we have completed the cadence, we should work out the beginning (see Example 2, stave b). The *soggetto* 'Dieu te gart, bergere' is imitated through all three upper voices, always on the first scale degree. Its shape exemplifies a compositional cliché often found around 1500, touching the root, third, and fifth of one sonority (or, to use Zarlino's term, *harmonia perfetta*), here *d*, *f*, and *a*.<sup>9</sup> Thanks to their simplicity, *soggetti* of that kind can be easily and flexibly integrated into an imitative structure. This can make it difficult to localize the original point of entry of the voice to be reconstructed. In the case at hand, however, it is clear that the bassus has to enter on the first minim of the first bar, because it would be stylistically incorrect to open the chanson with a rest.

We have now advanced quite a bit from both ends towards the middle of the phrase. Up to this point, the reconstruction is in all likelihood identical with Brumel's original. This degree of certainty cannot be reached for the notes that are still missing. On the words 'et dieu te gart de mau' the three upper voices do not present a single *soggetto* that could be transferred to the bassus. Several equally valid bassus voice leadings are imaginable. Two guidelines can be employed to help decide between them. Firstly, the reconstruction should preferably contribute consonant pitches not yet contained in the other voices—provided that there *are* such pitches. Secondly, since there is no obligatory *soggetto*, a possible imitation of at least *one* of the other parts should be sought. Both guidelines prove useful in reconstructing the section under discussion. In the entire third bar the upper voices only sing *d* and *a*, which suggests that the *harmonia perfetta* is to be completed with an *f* (see Example 2, stave c).<sup>10</sup> In addition, a repetition of this note, beginning in bar 2, fourth minim, will (pre-)imitate the repetitions in the tenor and contratenor on the words 'et dieu te gart'. Another spot where the bassus can aid in completion of the *harmonia perfetta* is bar 4, second minim. Here the *g'*, *c'*, and *g* of the upper voices can be supplemented with an *e*.

Now only a few notes are still missing, and the parts already reconstructed leave only a limited number of possibilities for filling these gaps. In bar 4, first minim, vertically, both *b♭* and *g* are possible (see Example 2, stave d). But *b♭* would create a *mi contra fa* relation with the subsequent *e*. Hence we choose *g*. On the third minim both *a* and *c* would fit vertically. We favour *c* to reserve the *a* for the *penultima* and to obtain a better melodic line. Finally, we smooth the two thirds in bar 4 by inserting semiminims as passing notes.

Many phrases of the chanson can be completed employing the strategies described. The missing part is composed like a mosaic: one begins with the most mandatory notes and proceeds step by step to fill in the gaps.

<sup>9</sup> Gioseffo Zarlino, *Istitutioni harmonice* (Venice: Francesco de i Franceschi Senese, 1573), 287 ('E quella è veramente Harmonia perfetta, che in essa si ode tal consonanze; ma li Suoni, o Consonanze, che possono fare diversità al sentimento sono due, la Quinta & la Terza, over le Replicate dell' una & dell' altra').

<sup>10</sup> Note that the lowest pitch on the first beat of bar 3 is the *d* of the contratenor. A 3-6 sonority on a first beat would be stylistically less adequate.



Another key strategy in the process of reconstruction is to identify compositional techniques that can be employed not only to progress from one note to another, but also to compose longer stretches or even a whole phrase. A striking example can be found in the last eight bars of *Dieu te gart* (see Example 3). This phrase obviously plays with the character of the period's dance music. It is composed in a strictly homorhythmic fashion as a *contrapunctus simplex*, and the discantus sings in parallel sixths with the tenor nearly all the way through. Only at the cadence points can typical 7-6 suspensions be found, preceded and followed by octaves. In his treatise *De preceptis artis musicae*, Guilielmus Monachus describes how a contratenor bassus is to be sung under such a structure: in alternating thirds and fifths below the tenor.<sup>11</sup> Another rule of Guilielmus pertains to cadences: on the *ultima* the bassus should sing an octave or unison with the tenor, on the *penultima* a fifth below, and on the *antepenultima* a third below. These prescriptions can be straightforwardly applied to the eight bars under discussion, the only exception being bar 74, third minim, where an octave below the tenor is required. A fifth below the tenor (*d*) is impossible, because it would result in a dissonance with the contratenor (*c*), whereas a third (*f*) would lead to both a parallel fifth with the tenor and a parallel octave with the discantus.

Example 3. Antoine Brumel, *Dieu te gart, bergere*,  
bb. 69-76, with bassus reconstructed according to rules given by Guilielmus Monachus

The musical score consists of four staves: Discantus, Contra, Tenor, and Bassus [reconstructed]. The Discantus staff is in treble clef with a key signature of one flat (B-flat) and a common time signature (C). The Contra, Tenor, and Bassus staves are also in treble clef with a key signature of one flat. The Bassus staff is labeled '[reconstructed]'. The score includes bar numbers 69, 72, and 74. Above bar 72, there are labels for 'Cad. III simplex' and 'Cad. I'. Above bar 74, there is a label for 'Cad. I'. The Bassus staff includes figured bass notation (6, 3, 5, 8, 6, 7-6, 8, 6, 6, 6, 6, 6, 8, 7-6, 8, 1, 3, 5, 3, 5, 3, 5, 1, 3, 8, 5, 3, 5, 3, 5, 1).

<sup>11</sup> 'Quarta regula est quod, si faulxbordon faciat supranum suum per sextas et octavas, facies contratenorem bassum descendentem subtus tenorem per quintas et tertias bassas, sed quod semper penultima sit quinta bassa subtus tenorem, quae erit decima cum suprano, et antepenultima erit tertia bassa, et sic iterando per quintas bassas et tertias bassas ita quod prima nota sit octava bassa vel unisonus, et ultima sit octava bassa vel unisonus.' ('The fourth rule is that, if faulxbordon should create its soprano in sixths and octaves, you should create the contratenor bassus descending beneath the tenor in fifths and thirds bassas, but that penultimate should always be a fifth below the tenor, which will be at a tenth with the soprano, and the antepenultimate will be a third below; and thus, by doubling at the fifth and third below, so that the first note is an octave below or unison, the final should be an octave below or unison.'). Eulmee Park, 'De preceptis artis musicae of Guilielmus Monachus: A New Edition, Translation, and Commentary' (Ph.D. diss., Ohio State University, 1993), 64 and 180.



Our reconstruction of bars 70-71 might be subject to debate. As seen in Example 3, we decided to let the rhythm of the bassus differ from the homorhythmic pattern of the upper parts. We considered this appropriate because, in bars 32-33, the rhythm of the contratenor diverges from that of the other voices in a similar way. We cannot be sure that Brumel composed the bassus in bars 70-71 exactly like that, but neither can we be sure that he wrote an entirely homorhythmic version. Our solution seeks to strike a balance between a certain simplicity required by the genre of the *chanson rustique* and the general demand of *varietas*.

In bars 6-9, three entries of the *soggetto* 'riveriez lez vachez' ( $\alpha$ ) can be found in the upper voices (see Example 4). The bassus should enter on the first minim, a fifth below the contratenor, as this makes for a plain and elegant imitation. The structure of the *soggetto*, with its two downward steps, results—after the initial interval of a fifth—in a succession of parallel sixths. Guilielmus Monachus describes this kind of voice leading in his treatise, and calls it a *gymel*, a 'twin chant'.<sup>12</sup> Looking for possibilities to continue the phrase using the same technique, we find that the second *soggetto*, 'de nostre preau' ( $\beta$ ), is nearly identical to  $\alpha$  (the tiny rhythmic divergence is merely a consequence of the different words and does not change the general musical congruence with  $\alpha$ ). A similar *gymel* can thus be created in bars 8-9 by coupling a first entry of *soggetto*  $\beta$  in the bassus with the last entry of  $\alpha$  in the tenor, resulting in parallel thirds. In the following bar, Brumel creates another short *gymel*, coupling two entries of  $\beta$  in the discantus and contratenor in parallel sixths. We take this as evidence for the adequacy of our solution.

Another technique, paired imitation, suggests itself for bars 58-66 (see Example 5). The basic principle behind this technique differs from those described so far. The latter govern the intervallic relations between voices, while paired imitation concerns the arrangement of whole phrases. Beginning in bar 59, tenor and discantus sing in two-part counterpoint. A *soggetto* of two bars in length is imitated *alla minima*, after which both voices cadence on the third scale degree. Firstly, it should be observed that the contratenor anticipates the beginning of this *soggetto* in bar 58. This in turn suggests that bars 58-59 should be completed by giving the bassus the line's corresponding counterpart. It must then be asked whether the bassus line should be extended. We see that the two-part counterpoint of the discantus and tenor in bars 59-62 is complete and perfect as it is. In particular, it does not contain any fourths that would require a bassus part to make them consonant. There is thus no need to continue the bassus line beyond the second minim of bar 59. On the contrary, it would be ill-advised to do so, given that the contratenor picks up the discantus phrase in bar 63. It is only then that the bassus should be reintroduced, carrying over the phrase that the tenor sang previously: this yields a paired imitation, which was *en vogue* around 1500.

The phrase just discussed provides an opportunity to make a general observation: in the process of reconstruction one is often tempted to write too much. However, rests are essential—about a quarter of each surviving part of *Dieu te gart* consists of rests.<sup>13</sup>

<sup>12</sup> Park, 'De preceptis artis musicae', chs. 4 and 6.

<sup>13</sup> The length of the *chanson* is equivalent to 314 minims. In the discantus part, the pauses add up to eighty-seven minim rests (approx. 27.8 %), and in both contratenor and tenor to ninety (approx. 28.7 %). In the reconstructed bassus part, the sum of the pauses equals seventy-seven minim rests (approx. 24.5 %).



Example 4. Antoine Brumel, *Dieu te gart, bergere*, bb. 6-9, with imitations employing *gymel* technique

Example 4 shows a musical score for four voices: Discantus, Contra, Tenor, and Bassus [reconstructed]. The score is in C major, 4/4 time. The lyrics are: "Re - vi - re le va - chez de nos - tre pre - au, Dieu te gart de mau." The score illustrates the *gymel* technique, where two voices enter with the same melody at different times. The Discantus and Tenor parts enter first, followed by the Contra and Bassus parts. The score is divided into two systems, with measures 6-9 in the first system and measure 10 in the second system.

Example 5. Antoine Brumel, *Dieu te gart, bergere*, bb. 58-66: combination of simple and paired imitation

Example 5 shows a musical score for four voices: Discantus, Contra, Tenor, and Bassus [reconstructed]. The score is in C major, 4/4 time. The lyrics are: "U - ne coif - fe et des cous - teaulx, des cous - teaulx. Et dieu te gart de mau, U - ne coif - fe et des cous - teaulx, Dieu te gart, ber - ge - re." The score illustrates a combination of simple and paired imitation. The Discantus and Tenor parts enter first, followed by the Contra and Bassus parts. The score is divided into two systems, with measures 58-61 in the first system and measures 62-66 in the second system. The second system is marked with a Roman numeral III.



Example 6. Antoine Brumel, *Le moy de may*, bb. 17-21:  
comparison of the reconstructed bassus with the original

Hence one should always ask whether adding notes to the surviving ones is necessary, advantageous, dispensable, or even detrimental.

Another of Brumel's chansons, *Le moy de may*, for which Immanuel Ott and I had also reconstructed the bassus part, offers useful insight into our reconstruction procedures. As mentioned above, the original bassus part had been deemed lost until, in 2013, Sonja Tröster discovered a complete *contrafactum* entitled *Bewar dich Gott mein khaiserin*. Comparison of our reconstruction with the rediscovered original provided valuable information on the possibilities and limitations of reconstructing Renaissance music.

Bars 19-21 of *Le moy de may* show a series of parallel fourths between tenor and contratenor (see Example 6). We can be sure that Brumel wrote this section as a *fauxbourdon*, since the compositional rules of his time practically prohibited the use of parallel fourths anywhere else. Accordingly, from the third minum of bar 19 we had the bassus sing in parallel sixths below the tenor and finish with an octave at the cadence point in bar 21. This voice leading was confirmed by the rediscovered original. The beginning of this phrase, in bars 17-18, on the other hand, allows a number of viable alternatives. Our reconstruction was based on the following considerations. Bar 17 shows the *ultima* of a cadence to the fifth scale degree. The bassus could complete the cadence together with the other voices by singing a breve *a*. But such a decisive syntactic *caesura* did not strike us as very likely: it would occur far too early in the piece. We theorized that Brumel had the bassus evade the cadence and re-enter before the contratenor and tenor, and also that he would not miss the opportunity to write an imitation. In our version, the bassus thus enters on the second minum, on the *ultima* cadence pitch *a*, with a *soggetto* that is then imitated by the tenor. Comparison with the original version shows that Brumel indeed had the bassus evade the cadence and also, as expected, that he composed an imitation between bassus and tenor. But both the point of re-entry and the interval of the imitation are different. Brumel decided on a variant in which the bassus enters rather late, namely on the fourth minum, and, surprisingly, on the *ultima*



of a false cadence, *f*. He chose neither the most common point of re-entry after a *cadenza fuggita* nor the expected pitch. On the other hand, his imitation at the fifth is far more common than ours at the third, and furthermore Brumel's version allows a slightly longer literal imitation: at the fourth and fifth *soggetto* notes, our imitation kept the pitch, but not the rhythm of the tenor. In order to create exact imitation up to this fifth note, both in pitch and in rhythm, Brumel even accepts the slightly awkward jump of a fourth from a semiminim *d* up to *g* from bar 18 to 19. Our version is smoother, but not precisely imitative.

We gained valuable information about Brumel's priorities by comparing the different solutions to compositional problems in *Le moy de may*. In turn, this information helped our reconstruction of *Dieu te gart*. However, selective observations should not be misunderstood as rules to be applied to Brumel's style in general. Brumel's five surviving four-part secular works differ significantly from each other in style and technique. *De tout plongiet/Fors seullement* and *James que la ne peult estre* are quite conservative cantus firmus settings: polyphonic, but lacking imitation. *Tous les regretz*, is an only slightly decorated *contrapunctus simplex*, and also lacks imitation. *Dieu te gart* and *Le moy de may*, by contrast, are similar to each other: both are four-part *chansons rustiques*, and both employ imitation without a cantus firmus.

In this article I brought up for discussion certain criteria that guided Immanuel Ott and me in the process of reconstruction, strategies that helped us bring our reconstruction as close as possible to the lost original. At the same time I tried to make evident why it is in principle impossible to ensure that our—or any other—reconstruction perfectly matches the lost original in every detail. It is a matter of both artistic and scholarly honesty to mention that at some points the reconstructor has to settle on one solution among a number of equally valid alternatives. But our criteria reveal that Brumel *might* have composed the bassus exactly as we reconstructed it. The remaining margin of uncertainty seems tolerable in view of the fact that a fine chanson, regarded as 'most advanced' by Barton Hudson on the knowledge of the three remaining voices alone, can be sung and heard again.



# Appendix

## Antoine Brumel, *Dieu te gart, bergere*

I-Fc Ms. Basevi 2442, No. 37

Bassus part reconstructed by Oliver Korte and Immanuel Ott

Discantus

Contra

Tenor

Bassus [reconstructed]

Dieu te gart, ber - gere, et dieu te gart

Dieu te gart, ber - gere, et dieu te gart de

Dieu te gart, ber - ge - re, et dieu te gart

Dieu te gart, ber - ge - re, et dieu te gart de mau,

5

de mau. Re - vi - re le va - chez de nos-tre

mau. Re - vi - re le va - chez de nos-tre pre -

de mau. Re - vi - re le va - chez

de mau. Re - vi - rez le va - chez, de nos-tre pre - au

10

pre - au, Dieu te gart de mau.

au, Dieu te gart de mau. Et diz a Guil - lot qu'i

de nos-tre pre - au, Dieu te gart de mau.

Dieu te gart de mau Et diz a Guil - lot qu'i vien -



Appendix (continued)

15

Et diz a Guil-lot qu'i vien - gne Qu'il a - por - te son fla - got, Qu'il a - por - te son fla -

vien - gne Qu'il a - por - te son fla - got, qu'il a - por - te son fla -

Et diz a Guil - lot qu'i vien - gne Qu'il a - por - te son fla -

gne, Qu'il a - por - te son fla - got, Qu'il a - por - te son fla -

19

got, Et diz a Guil-lot qu'y

got, Dieu te gart, ber - gere, et dieu te gart de mau.

got,

got, Dieu te gart, ber - gere, et dieu te gart de mau.

24

vien - gne Qu'il a - por - te son fla - got, Dieu te gart de

et

Et diz a Guil-lot qu'y vien - gne Qu'il a - por - te son fla - got, Dieu te gart de

28

mau, et dieu te gart de

dieu te gart de mau, et dieu te gart de mau.

mau, et dieu te gart de

et dieu te gart de mau, dieu te gart de



Appendix (continued)

32

mau. Et dan - ce - rons une si bel - le dan - ce Qu'il ont a - por - té de la

mau, Et dan - ce - rons une si bel - le dan - ce Qu'il ont a - por - té de la

36

guer - re Qu'on a - pel - le les trois saulx. Dieu te gart ber - ge - re, dieu te

guer - re Qu'on a - pel - le les trois saulx. Dieu te gart ber - ge - re, dieu te

guer - re Qu'on a - pel - le les trois saulx. Dieu te gart ber - ge - re, dieu te

guer - re Qu'on a - pel - le les trois saulx. Dieu te gart ber - ge - re, dieu te

41

ge - re, dieu te gart, ber - gere, et

gart, ber - gere, et dieu te gart de mau,

re, dieu te gart, ber - gere, et dieu te

Dieu te gart, ber - gere, et dieu te gart de mau,

46

dieu te gart de mau, et dieu te gart de mau. En tel - lez en - se

et dieu te gart de mau. En tel - lez en - se

gart de mau, et dieu te gart de mau. En tel - lez en - se

et dieu te gart de mau. En tel - lez en - se



# Appendix (continued)

51

sei - gnez Qui me pro-mit u - ne bour - se, En tel - lez en - sei - gnez Qui me pro-mit u - ne bour - se, qui me pro-mit u - ne bour se

55

Ung es - plin - guier, et ung pin - gne. gnez Qui me pro-mit u - ne bour - se, Ung es - plin - guier, et ung pin - gne. Une coif - fe, et sc, Ung es - plin - guier, et ung pin - gne. Ung es - plin - guier et ung pin - gne. U - ne coif - fe, et des

59

U - ne coif - fe et des cous - teaux, des cous - teaux. des cous - teaux, U - ne coif - fe et des cous - teaux, des cous - teaux. cous - teaux,

63

Et dieu U - ne coif - fe et des cous - teaux. Dieu te gart de mau, Et U - ne coif - fe, et des cous - teaux. Dieu te gart, ber - ge - re,



# Appendix (continued)

67

te gart de mau. Mais par la foy de mon corps. S'il  
 dieu te gart de mau. Mais par la foy de mon corps. S'il  
 et dieu te gart de mau. Mais par la foy de mon corps. S'il me

71

me fault a le bai - lier, Je le f'ray mor - dre a nos - tre pour -  
 me fault a le bai - lier, Je le f'ray mor - dre a nos - tre pour -  
 me fault a le bai - lier, Je le f'ray mor - dre a nos - tre pour -

74

ceau, je le f'ray mor - dre a nos - tre pour - ceau.  
 ceau, je le f'ray mor - dre a nos - tre pour - ceau.  
 ceau, je le f'ray mor - dre a nos - tre pour - ceau.

## Abstract

Antoine Brumel's four-part chanson *Dieu te gart, bergere*—a work regarded as 'most advanced' by Barton Hudson—has survived in one manuscript only, a set of partbooks of which the bassus has been lost. In order to enable performance of the piece, the article offers a reconstruction of the missing part. The specific strategies employed are discussed, and some general conclusions are drawn concerning possibilities and limitations of reconstructing music from around 1500.