

## HANDSCHRIFTEN-STRUKTUREN

Beim dritten Themenkreis wurde die Frage nach dem Verhältnis zwischen "Peripherie" und "Zentrum" auf Handschriften-Strukturen bezogen. Die einführenden Bemerkungen zu den Papieren von Hughes und Stenzl wurden zusammengefaßt.

David G. Hughes

"Centers" are fairly easily defined with respect to the 11th-13th century repertoires of monophonic Latin lyrics.<sup>1</sup> Two centers may be inferred from the existence of groups of closely related manuscripts: one Norman (conceivably Sicilian), represented by Madrid, Biblioteca nacional, MSS 288, 289, and 19421; and one Aquitanian, represented by Paris, Bibliothèque nationale, MSS lat. 1139, 3549, and 3719, and by London, British Museum, MS add. 36881. There are sufficient concordances between the manuscripts of each group to justify considering each repertoire to be the product of an identifiable center, even though the problem of exact geographical localization may not be wholly soluble. A third large repertoire is contained in the last two fascicles of F (Florence, Biblioteca Laurenziana Pluteus 29. 1), and appears to be largely of Parisian origin.<sup>2</sup>

While there is considerable similarity (extending to some concordances) between the Norman and Aquitanian repertoires, and while the wide diffusion of a few of their pieces permit the conclusion that these sources preserve a basically normal tradition of Latin lyric song, the same cannot be said of the repertoire in F. Many pieces in this collection are unica; and many of the concordances that do exist are to manuscripts that are abnormal in one or more respects.<sup>3</sup> This may be in part the result of the more strongly literary orientation of F. In addition to the fairly numerous texts attributable to known poets, the typical poetic style of F is literary in a more self-conscious way than that of the Norman or Aquitanian poetry.

But the isolation of F springs also from the nature of the manuscript itself. F is fundamentally and intrinsically a source of polyphony; its admittedly extensive monophonic repertoire is an addendum, not shared, significantly, by either  $W_1$  or  $W_2$ . It is certainly not in any way a liturgical book, and its relation to the liturgy is determined solely by the then-obtaining relation of polyphony to liturgical practice (e. g., the Magnus liber, being intended for liturgical use, is arranged according to the church calendar; conductus and motets, which may or may not be liturgical, are ordered on the basis of musical techniques).

By way of contrast, the Norman sources are wholly intended for liturgical use. All three consist of a series of collections: Kyrie, Gloria, Proses, Sanctus, and Agnus Dei (the ordinary chants mostly troped) form the bulk of each manuscript, so that in this respect they are simply troper-prosers (with the proser in the correct liturgical place). There then follow further collections, including farsed epistles, genealogies, processional antiphons, dramas, and, at or near the end, versus and Benedicamus Domino poems (the latter two types forming separate collections, not intermingled). In short, the lyric poems are here a recognized type of liturgical embellishment, and find their place alongside roughly analogous types, with which they share a basically optional nature.

It should be noted that although these manuscripts are essentially Mass books, some of their content - including notably the Benedicamus Domino poems - is intended rather for the Office.<sup>4</sup> While there seems to be no conclusive explanation for this anomaly, it may be observed that the Office never generated a quantity of elaborative material comparable

to that produced for the Mass. Hence there was never a need for separate books serving as supplement to the antiphonal - i. e. "Office-tropers" do not exist as separate manuscripts. Moreover, antiphonals rarely contain "collections" of anything: they give what is needed when it is wanted, not groups of similar pieces from which a desired item is freely chosen. Thus if a collection of lyric poems were to be inscribed in any liturgical book, the end of a Mass-supplement would be as good a place as any - perhaps indeed the only conceivable place.

This solution is corroborated by various later manuscripts, copied when the vogue for tropes had declined to the point where such pieces as were needed could be copied in the gradual itself, thereby eliminating the need for supplementary books. This is the case with Limoges, Bibliothèque municipale, MS 2 (17), a fourteenth-century gradual in which tropes and a few other interpolations are entered directly into the Masses in which they are to be sung, but which concludes with a section of miscellanea (including *Benedicamus* poems) very like the last fascicles of the Norman manuscripts.<sup>5</sup> Since there is no reason to suppose any direct influence from the Norman manuscripts on Limoges 2, it may be assumed that terminal miscellaneous sections were normal and traditional.

Of the Aquitanian sources, lat. 1139 stands closest to the pattern found in the Norman manuscripts, although it is not an entirely orderly book. The remaining Aquitanian manuscripts, however, show no trace of the apparently normal order - and for a very good reason: they contain a large number of polyphonic pieces in addition to monophonic songs, whereas polyphony is either wholly or largely absent from the Norman sources and from lat. 1139. Perhaps because polyphony required specially trained performers, predominantly polyphonic manuscripts are organized according to musical criteria (or, in the case of the pastiche lat. 3719, scarcely organized at all). It may be that collections of polyphony were first added to the miscellany that concluded the book of Mass supplements (as in Madrid 19421) and later expanded to dimensions that made such inclusion difficult or impossible. In fact, both lat. 3549 and lat. 3719 perpetuate the association of liturgical accretions (in this case ordinary tropes) with lyric poems, but with a tendency to articulate groups of pieces according to number of voices (one or two). This growing preference for ordering based on musical principles culminates in the Notre-Dame manuscripts, especially F, as has been seen; and the strength of this preference is strikingly reflected in the manuscript Oxford, Bodleian Library, Rawlinson C 510, in which the order is by number of voices, even though no music is given.<sup>6</sup>

Thus from before 1200, repertoires of monophonic Latin songs may be found in two different contexts: in a traditional role as one of several types of liturgical ornament; and as a special case ("conductus simplex") of an otherwise polyphonic genre. It is hardly surprising that the monophonic lyric failed to flourish in the second of these. Compilers of later monophonic manuscripts would have been unlikely to turn to F for liturgical embellishments; and the makers of up-to-date musical manuscripts would have had little use for monophony.

Of course there was nothing to prevent the modernization of a given poem by adding a second voice to the original monophonic setting, and it appears that this in fact occurred, although not very frequently. There are pieces that occur in one source as monophonic and in another as polyphonic compositions, sometimes perhaps the result of "modernization", but sometimes - when the polyphonic version appears to be the earlier - for other, unknown reasons. These instances, taken together with Franco's celebrated description of conductus composition,<sup>7</sup> make it clear that even in the polyphonic conductus, it was still the tenor melody that was, conceptually, "the piece". This point is of some consequence, as particularly in some pieces in the Aquitanian repertoire, a straightforward monophonic rendering of a metrical poem is overlaid with a more or less melismatic upper voice, thus radically altering the perception of the verse. The relatively free transmission of upper voices (as compared with tenors), when the same work appears in two manuscripts, points in the

same direction. But this latter is merely part of a more general tendency for scribes to reproduce (in this type of music) melismas less exactly than syllabic passages. Is it then conceivable that melismatic ornament - whether in an added voice or in the monophonic melody - is in some sense conceptually posterior to a fundamental melodic idea? This seems to me not impossible, provided that (1) the non-melismatic sections are quite simple (i. e. basically syllabic, with few ornaments, and these not exceeding 3-4 notes); and (2) the melismas occur at structurally significant points in the piece - line endings and beginnings, for example.

The importance (if any) of this idea lies in the resultant possibility of setting up a clear and simple typology of melodies, as follows: (1) those that are inherently melismatic (i. e. that contain numerous melismas not conforming to the second condition above); and (2) those that are basically syllabic, (a) without, or (b) with added ornaments and/or structurally placed melismas. (These "added" portions are of course not necessarily posterior to the basic melody, any more than Couperin's agréments are later than the piece in which they occur.) This classification reduces the number of pieces that would otherwise have to be placed in some intermediate category, although some such still remain. The reduction offers certain advantages. For one, a theory of origin of setting-types, however hypothetical, may be ventured. The syllabic type may be derived from the prosula - a hypothesis supported by the presence in the repertoires from the beginning of some Benedicamus poems that are in fact prosulae. The inherently melismatic type, on the other hand, stands closest to the trope (especially, perhaps, to the introit and Gloria trope), with its seemingly aimless distribution of notes and groups of notes on stressed and unstressed (or long and short) syllables.

It would, however, be futile to insist on any monistic theory of origin, given the present state of the evidence. The prosa or the versus ad sequentiam may well have served as model for the syllabic type, and the melismatic type may have been no more than a by-product of the general medieval equation between musical complexity and general solemnity. And of course the various relations between the Latin and the vernacular song have yet to be fully explored.

In any event, the question of origin is less important than the typology itself. For the Latin songs, the choice of a syllabic or a melismatic setting is not, as far as is known, predetermined (as in liturgical music), but rather freely chosen. The choice is of fundamental importance for the hearer's perception of the verse as such. However rendered, a melismatic setting will largely fail to reflect accurately the often sophisticated meters of the poems (as is also the case with the tropes, in which hexameters, when present, are not heard as such). Conversely, the syllabic and near-syllabic settings can hardly avoid - again, whatever mode of performance adopted - creating at least intermittent patches of regular meter. This in turn involves - or re-involves - the question of center versus periphery. The Latin lyric reached its full flowering in the twelfth century, at about the same time that musical meter first became the object of notation. The performance practice of the Latin songs was doubtless regulated by local singing, and may well be irrecoverable. But it is at least provocative that, of the two most attractive possibilities, one - the iso-syllabic reading - produces binary meters that were not unequivocally notatable until the fourteenth century, while the other, which equates stress with length,<sup>8</sup> gives results that virtually duplicate those of Notre-Dame clausulae. The implications of the latter for the pre-history of the rhythmic modes, are obvious, and invite systematic exploration.

#### Annotations

- 1 The general title "Latin lyric" will be used here to include pieces entitled versus and conductus, as well as Benedicamus Domino and Deo gratias poems.
- 2 This conclusion would seem to be justified by the Parisian origin of much of the content of the manuscript, and, more specifically, by the presence of poems by Philip the Chan-

- cellor. See also R. A. Falck, *The structure of the polyphonic and monophonic conductus repertoires*, Dissertation, Brandeis University 1970, I, pp. 24-27.
- 3 Falck, op. cit., II, pp. 24-27, provides a table of concordances.
  - 4 The verse and response *Benedicamus Domino - Deo gratias* were of course used as a conclusion at Mass, but only in penitential seasons when any elaboration would have been unlikely, and the use of the surviving poems, which are without exception festal in character, out of the question.
  - 5 The Exeter gradual described by Fr. Ll. Harrison (*Benedicamus, Conductus, Carol: a newly-discovered source*, in: *AMl* 37, 1965, p. 38) may be similar; I have not seen it. Here the *Benedicamus* poems are apparently mostly of the prosula type, and the manuscript gives textual clues to identify the source melismas, most of which are from office responsories.
  - 6 Falck, op. cit., I, p. 13.
  - 7 *Ars cantus mensurabilis*, ed. G. Reaney and A. Gilles, Rome 1974 (*Corpus scriptorum de musica*, 18), pp. 73-74.
  - 8 See W. Arlt, *Ein Festoffizium des Mittelalters aus Beauvais*, Köln 1970, Editionsband, pp. XVI ff. The two methods in question may be illustrated as follows:

1. 

Dies ista colitur tange sinfoniam

2. 

- into which small ornamental groups can be fitted as needed, merely by subdividing the basic metrical units.

Jürg Stenzl

#### "PERIPHERIE" UND "ZENTRUM": FRAGEN IM HINBLICK AUF DIE HANDSCHRIFT SG 383

Nur auf den ersten flüchtigen Blick scheinen jene, die sich mit mittelalterlicher Musik befaßt haben und befassen, eine einheitliche Gruppe (und heute schon beinahe eine Sekte) zu bilden. In Wirklichkeit ist die musikalische Mediävistik seit Joseph Louis d'Ortigue (1802 bis 1866) oder Edmond Henri de Coussemaker (1805-1876) in der zweiten Hälfte des 19. Jahrhunderts weitgehend in eine Gruppe von Choralforschern und eine von Musikhistorikern aufgeteilt gewesen, und "Grenzüberschreitungen" waren bis in die Tage von Jacques Handschin und Bruno Stäblein eher selten. Der Hauptgrund dafür lag bis zum II. Vatikanischen Konzil wesentlich darin, daß die Choralforschung in ihrer Arbeit in starkem Maße von der praktischen Choralpflege der römisch-katholischen Kirche getragen wurde, selbst dann, wenn sie sich etwa mit Formen wie dem Tropus oder der Sequenz befaßte, die wenig oder keinen "praktischen Nutzen" hatten. So ist es denn kein Zufall, daß es bis zum zweiten Weltkrieg (und vereinzelt noch danach) ausgesprochene Choral-Zeitschriften und Publikationsreihen, aber nie ein musikgeschichtliches mediävistisches Periodikum gab.

Diese hier - zugegebenermaßen schematisch - skizzierte Lage der Musikforschung zum Mittelalter läßt sich am Schrifttum über die Handschrift St. Gallen, Stiftsbibliothek, Cod. 383 (abgekürzt: SG 383) recht deutlich ablesen. Voraussetzung dafür war ihr Aufbau und ihr Inhalt: neben "Choral" enthält SG 383 auch "kunstvolle Mehrstimmigkeit". Diese Besonderheit ihres Repertoires läßt es als sinnvoll erscheinen, sie einmal im Hinblick auf die Fragestellung "Peripherie und Zentrum" zu diskutieren.