Diskussion

Diskussion

Die Diskussion zum Tropus, als Schritt in den Bereich der Formen und Gattungen, mit denen das Mittelalter den überkommenen Bestand erweiterte, ging von den beneventanischen Beispielen aus. Sie begann mit einer kurzen Verständigung über Fragen einer modalen Bestimmung. Dabei unterstrich Alejandro Planchart den Unterschied zwischen dem Repertoire diesseits bzw. jenseits der Alpen, der sich darin zeigt, «that G-final pieces in the north tend to have large intervals, but that G-final pieces in the south tend not *to have large intervals». – Im weiteren konzentrierte sich das Gespräch auf einzelne Aspekte der Frage nach dem Verhältnis zwischen Musik und Text, die der Beitrag Leo Treitlers in den Vordergrund gerückt hatte, insbesondere hinsichtlich der «music as form of language utterance». Das betraf zunächst die Einordnung eines Beispiels aus Benevent.*

Leo Treitler: I have a question for Professor Planchart. Why do you think that the Beneventan singers or notators were less interested in clearly punctuating the texts, in projecting the sense of the texts than the northern singers or notators?
Alejandro Planchart: I did not quite say that. I said that the Beneventan version is very clear in its text-music relationship. In this piece, *Mulieres quae ad sepulchrum,* the northern version of Pistoia C 121 is far less effective in its setting off of the text than the Beneventan version. But the Beneventans have set the text in a repetitious manner – a carefully calculated repetitous manner – which is not that of the northern pieces like your lovely Epiphany trope work. There is something of a survival of the Beneventan melodic ethos in these tropes, similar to the survival of the Old Beneventan Masses in the same manuscripts. I believe that this may have something to do with political power of the dukes of Benevento, who may have insisted on the performance of the traditional chants in certain feasts. Thus these melodic styles survived until the middle of the eleventh century.

Ein Votum des Gesprächsleiters führte auf die generelle Frage nach Unterschieden hinsichtlich der «text-articulation» zwischen den Tropen und den älteren Gesängen, die damals erweitert wurden.

Leo Treitler: I wouldn't say a fundamental difference in a strict sense. I would say it is a matter of degree. As I said the more challenging the language-structure the more resourceful the melodic response to it. What they of course had in common is the principal task of the singer, which is to make clear the structure and therefore the sense of the text. Though in the paper that I prepared, I went a little further and put forward some notions about what happened in a hexameter-text, where very complicated matters arise about the relationship between the syntax of the language and the word-order. I have made some suggestions about that,

that could very easily be discussed and questioned. But in any case, just to summarize very briefly, it seems to me that the language is stylistically very different from what one generally finds in a traditional chant-text, particularly with respect to his matter of the relationship between the syntax or the sense-grouping of the words and the word-order itself. The conventions of the hexameter impose certain constraints on the language which the language as a literate language allows, and I have suggested that one would have read it as a language, one would have understood it in some sort of synchronic way where the word-order does not so much matter, but one looks down and makes the syntactical connections. But when one begins to sing that kind of language, it forces the issue because one has to sing from beginning to end and one is not able to make the syntactic connections visually, one has to make them aurally through the retention of elements. I have suggested that the musician served his purpose by making associations, by making clear the syntactic linkages that are difficult to take in when we hear the language in sequential order, and that especially seems to me to have enriched the form-making resources of the musical language and enriches them in a way that could be retained.

Die verbleibende Zeit galt der Verständigung über das oben wiedergegebene, für die Überlegungen Leo Treitlers zentrale Beispiel.

Max Haas: Wäre es für diese Problematik möglich, Tropus-Element 15 heranzuziehen. Wir finden hier acht Nomina, die vier Nominativ-Genetiv- bzw. Genetiv-Nominativ-Bildungen ausmachen. Die syntaktische Gliederung, die damit gegeben ist, scheint mir durch die Melodie aufgenommen zu sein. Darin liegt doch auch ein Element des Tropus, das gegenüber dem Choral neu ist. Dass das Tropus-Element 15 in die Antiphon *Ecce advenit* hineinführt, scheint mir klar. Aber ist dieses Tropus-Element nicht zugleich eine Art Vorbereitung musikalischer Art für das Tropus-Element 17?

Leo Treitler: Preparation in what way, what do you mean?

Haas: Ich denke an den Ambitus.

Treitler: Certainly, the ambitus has been opened up to that point by the climatic third phrase of trope-element 15.

Haas: Dann haben wir uns möglicherweise missverstanden. Ich dachte, der Hinweis auf das Wort «Jesus» würde sich auf eine Art «Wortausdeutung» beziehen.

Treitler: Yes, it is, I think. I just made the contrast between this case and the one in the next example at the beginning of the trope-element, where the words belong together syntactically and are set together in a phrase. Here I think it is a kind of «Wortausdeutung», it is separated off. I mean it is consequent to the opening part of the end in the first element. But it is striking to me that although the singer or the notator could simply have completed the phrase at the end of the first element or rather at the end of the antiphon with the word «Jesus», he did not, whereas in the other case he did.

Alejandro Planchart: I have one remark and a question for Leo. First, when Leo talked about point-notes or peak-tones, notice how different is the behavior, the «melodic ethos» of the northern trope from that of *Mulieres quae ad sepulchrum:* the Beneventan trope has not a single peak-tone all the way through.

Now the question: What do you do with the north French, Rhenish, and English versions of your trope, which begin element 17 simply with «Quem reges gentium,» thus leaving out the crucial «Jesus?»

Treitler: I said, you wouldn't analyze it in the same way.

Planchart: I insist because you have made a number of valuable and interesting distinctions between several kinds of variants and what I call recomposition. This is one variant I would not call «recomposition». How could we handle it, it creates an elided sense. Unfortunately we cannot tell what they did with the melody – there is not a single transcribable North French, English, or Rhenish source for this particular melody – but what is interesting is that the crucial «Jesus» is missing in some major sources.

Treitler: I don't know how you want me to answer the question, it certainly works differently. It is very difficult.

Planchart: What would be interesting to see – we do have a neumatic text for these pieces – is if there is a melisma in the sources that do not have the word «Jesus,» then we could argue for scribal corruption.

Treitler: That would make me quite worried about my interpretation of the setting of «Jesus», that is to say I would be committing the pathetic fallacy. I would be overinterpreting. That is to say, then one would have to expect that this person simply slapped this word underneath the opening pitches that were given.

138