

JOHN HAINES

---

## THE FOOTNOTE QUARRELS OF THE MODAL THEORY: A REMARKABLE EPISODE IN THE RECEPTION OF MEDIEVAL MUSIC

*In memory of Jacques Chailley (1910–1999)*

At the conclusion of his introductory book on musicology, Armand Machabey briefly hinted at a related study, that of musicologists themselves. The musicologist, Machabey affirmed, was on the whole a positive being who contributed to the good of society but who also craved isolation for work which often went unrewarded. This scholar's accomplishments, though sometimes tedious, were nonetheless beneficial to society, for, among other things, they increased public enjoyment of classical music. The musicologist had one flaw, however: a tendency to 'treat his conclusions as personal and untouchable acquisitions'. What is more, an undue 'attachment to an illusory priority can lead him to the tragic and ridiculous'.<sup>1</sup>

Although not explained in the text, Machabey's cryptic remark was a direct reference to the events surrounding the inception of the modal theory of medieval rhythm, then over fifty years in the past. A footnote at the bottom of the page clarified his allusion to this darker side of musicology. Machabey was referring to a dispute 'around 1907' between Jean Beck and Pierre Aubry over the paternity of the modal theory, a dispute which had recently been clarified by Jacques Chailley. Chailley's article disclosing newly recovered evidence had appeared in 1953, resurrecting the nearly

I should like to thank Elizabeth Aubrey for her comments on an earlier version of this essay. On the footnote, see A. Grafton, *The Footnote: A Curious History* (Cambridge, Mass., 1997).

<sup>1</sup> A. Machabey, *La musicologie*, 2nd edn (Que Sais-Je, 978; Paris, 1969), pp. 120–1: 'Il a une propension à tenir ses conclusions pour des acquisitions personnelles intouchables et son attachement à une illusoire priorité peut le conduire jusqu'au tragique et au ridicule.'

forgotten controversy. The article reassessed Pierre Aubry and Friedrich Ludwig's role in the creation of the modal theory, and concluded that it was not Beck and Aubry who should be considered its authors, but Aubry and Ludwig, in that order. A few years later, Friedrich Gennrich replied to Chailley's article, claiming that Aubry had never understood the modal theory until Ludwig explained it to him, and that therefore Ludwig should be considered the sole author of the modal theory. These events were then, and have since remained, musicology's most controversial moment, one which set off a unique chain of events: the only trial ever held over a musicological issue in a court of civil law, Aubry's suicide and Beck's permanent emigration, a tale so fantastic that, in the ensuing years, it was publicly hushed while false rumours were woven from whispers – a 'death by duel', as one scholar recently put it. It is also the most remarkable episode in the reception of medieval music, a field which has hitherto received little attention.<sup>2</sup>

<sup>2</sup> Ernest Sanders, cited at the end of the above paragraph, stated that Aubry had 'actually died of a wound he received in training for his duel with Jean Beck' (Sanders, 'Conductus and Modal Rhythm', *Journal of the American Musicological Society*, 38 (1985), pp. 439–69, at p. 468, n. 105). On further rumours surrounding Aubry's death, see J. Haines, 'The "Modal Theory", Fencing, and the Death of Pierre Aubry', *Journal of Plainsong and Medieval Music*, 6 (1997), pp. 143–50, at p. 143. See also J. Chailley, 'Quel est l'auteur de la "théorie modale" dite de Beck-Aubry?', *Archiv für Musikwissenschaft*, 10 (1953), pp. 213–22; F. Gennrich, 'Wer ist der Initiator der "Modaltheorie"?' in *Miscelánea en homenaje a Monseñor Higinio Anglés* (Barcelona, 1958–61), i, pp. 315–30.

The work of Hans Robert Jauss is especially associated with the study of reception; see his 'Literary History as a Challenge to Literary Theory' in his *Toward an Aesthetic of Reception*, trans. Timothy Bahti (Minneapolis, 1982), pp. 3–45. For the reception of medieval music, see: R. Lug, 'Zwischen objektiver Historizität, oraler Authentizität und postmoderner Komposition', *Studia musicologica Academiae Scientiarum Hungaricae*, 31 (1989), pp. 45–55; id., 'Minne, Medien, Mündlichkeit: Mittelalter-Musik und ihre Wissenschaft im CD-Zeitalter', *Zeitschrift für Literaturwissenschaft und Linguistik*, 90/91 (1993), pp. 71–87; id., 'Minnesang: Zwischen Markt und Museum', in W. Gratzner and H. Möller (eds), *Übersetzte Zeit: Das Mittelalter und die Musik des 20. Jahrhunderts* (Hofheim, forthcoming); K. Bergeron, *Decadent Enchantments: The Revival of Gregorian Chant at Solesmes* (Berkeley, Los Angeles and London, 1998); A. M. Busse Berger, 'Friedrich Ludwig, Jacques Handschin and the Agenda of Medieval Musicology', in A. M. Busse Berger *et al.* (eds), *Perspektiven auf die Musik vor 1600: Beiträge vom Symposium Neustift/Novacella 1998* (Hildesheim, forthcoming); E. Aubrey, 'Medieval Melodies in the Hands of Bibliophiles of the Ancien Régime', in B. Haggh (ed.), *Essays on Music and Culture in Honor of Herbert Kellman* (Paris, 2001); D. Leech-Wilkinson, 'Yearning for the Sound of Medieval Music', in A. Kreuziger-Herr and D. Redepenning (eds), *Mittelaltersehnsucht?: Texte des interdisziplinären Symposions zur musikalischen Mittelalterrezeption an der Universität Heidelberg, April 1998* (Kiel, 2000), pp. 295–317 and id., *Hearing Medieval Music* (forthcoming). My forthcoming book deals with the reception of troubadour and trouvère music: *Reading the Troubadours and Trouvères: An Account of the Reception of Medieval Music*.

Following its stormy genesis, the modal theory would emerge in the early twentieth century as the definitive guide for transcribing musical repertoires of the Middle Ages where rhythm was not clearly notated. The origins of this theory can be located in a debate between Hugo Riemann and Pierre Aubry. As their dialogue progressed, purely musicological skirmishes continued to be waged in the body of the text above, but increasingly personal disputes shifted to the footnotes below. In the footnote quarrels of the modal theory between 1905 and 1910, scholarly boldness in defence of patriotic honour swelled as the print shrank. It was patriotic honour, I shall suggest, which ignited the debate between Riemann and Aubry, and it was patriotic dishonour which led Aubry to consider suicide as the only course left to him, a suicide he covered up in a routine fencing practice one summer morning while vacationing in Dieppe. My retelling here places these personal footnote debates back in their place of origin, and traces in the text the more formal genesis of the modal theory; the two are presented intertwined, just as they were in the first decade of the twentieth century. The following essay can be read as two concurrent views of one event, one in the text and one in the footnotes. But this is only one way of reading.

In a series of articles published in the Leipzig *Musikalisches Wochenblatt* between 1896 and 1902, Hugo Riemann proposed that medieval vernacular monophonic melodies transmitted prior to mensural notation should be transcribed in quadruple time. A universalist by instinct, Riemann had already developed theories on musical topics ranging from functional harmony to medieval notation. Now in his scholarly prime and recognised throughout Europe as one of the premier musicologists of his time, he turned his attention to medieval secular monophony, and developed the first systematic theory for transcribing its repertoires, one inspired by systems created in the field of Old High German literature. The occasion for this was the review of five new publications on the music of the Minnesingers and one on Old French lyric song. And although he began the *Musikalisches Wochenblatt* studies exclusively in the realm of Middle High German songs whose notation did not indicate rhythm, Riemann soon expanded the application of

his system to similarly notated Old French and Old Occitan repertoires.<sup>3</sup>

The works reviewed by Riemann were attempting to resolve in various ways the difficulty of deciphering medieval notation which apparently offered no indication of rhythm. Paul Runge at first had simply transcribed the Gothic neumes of the Colmar (Munich, Bayerische Staatsbibliothek Cgm 4997) and Donaueschingen (Karlsruhe, Badische Landesbibliothek, Donaueschingen 120) manuscripts into square notation, although he would follow Riemann's principles in his later work; Heinrich Rietsch transcribed the songs of the Mondsee-Wiener manuscript (Vienna, Österreichische Nationalbibliothek, Vind. 2856) in a free rhythm

<sup>3</sup> H. Riemann, 'Die Melodik der deutschen Minnesänger', *Musikalisches Wochenblatt*, 28 (1896), pp. 1–2, and (1897), pp. 17–18, 33–4, 45–6, 61–2 and supplement; 'Die Melodik der Minnesänger', *Musikalisches Wochenblatt*, 28 (1897), pp. 389–90, 401–2, 413–14, 425–6, 437–8, 449–50, 465–6, 481–3, 497–8, 513–14; 'Die Rhythmik der geistlichen und weltlichen Lieder des Mittelalters', *Musikalisches Wochenblatt*, 31 (1900), pp. 285–6, 309–10, 321–2, 333–4, 345–7, 429–30, 441–2; 'Die Melodik der Minnesinger', *Musikalisches Wochenblatt*, 33 (1902), pp. 429–30, 441–4, 457–8, 469–71. The books reviewed by Riemann were, in order, P. Runge, *Die Sangesweisen der Colmarer Handschrift und die Liederhandschrift Donaueschingen* (Leipzig, 1896); F. A. Mayer and H. Rietsch, *Die Mondsee-Wiener Liederhandschrift und der Monch von Salzburg* (Berlin, 1896); P. Meyer and G. Raynaud, *Le chansonnier Saint-Germain-des-Prés* (Bibl. Nat. fr. 20050): *Reproduction phototypique avec transcription* (Paris, 1892), i; E. Bernoulli, *Die Choralnotenschrift bei Hymnen und Sequenzen* (Leipzig, 1898); P. Runge, H. Schneegans and H. Pfannenschmid, *Die Lieder und Melodien der Geissler des Jahres 1349 nach der Aufzeichnung Hugo's von Reutlingen* (Leipzig, 1900); and G. Holz, F. Saran and E. Bernoulli, *Die Jenaer Liederhandschrift*, 2 vols. (Leipzig, 1901). Riemann's ideas developed out of his more general theories of musical rhythm as enunciated in his *Musikalische Dynamik und Agogik: Lehrbuch der musikalischen Phrasirung auf Grund einer Revision der Lehre von der musikalischen Metrik und Rhythmik* (Hamburg, 1884), ch. 1.

The Chailley–Gennrich dispute was rooted in Franco-German musicological relations, whose history can be traced back to the rise of *Musikwissenschaft* and the work of such scholars as Hugo Riemann in the second half of the nineteenth century. Riemann's unprecedented musicological work emblematised Germany's academic prestige and exposed the deficiencies of French research. Since the founding of the new Berlin university in 1810, German scholarship had risen to mighty heights while the flagging French university system looked on. France's defeat in the Franco-Prussian War, ending with its loss of Alsace-Lorraine in 1871, only compounded the already low Gallic academic self-esteem. At the end of the century, the historian Ferdinand Lot deplored 'the lack of a true system of higher education' in France, declaring that 'the secret of Germany's scientific hegemony . . . is in the organisation of its universities' (*L'enseignement supérieur en France: Ce qu'il est – ce qu'il devrait être* (Paris, 1892), pp. 6 and 9). The musicologist Jules Combarieu, reminiscing on his exchange year at the University of Berlin where he had studied with Philip Spitta in the 1880s, further lamented the lack of music programmes in French universities and the general poverty of advanced music historical studies ('Cours d'histoire générale de la musique', *Revue musicale*, 5 (1905), pp. 3–6). In the last decade of the nineteenth century, the French academy deeply felt the need to revise its classroom approach and research methodology in order to keep up with its German neighbour (W. Keylor, *Academy and Community: The Foundation of the French Historical Profession* (Cambridge, Mass., 1975), ch. 4).

based on text declamation; Paul Meyer and Gaston Raynaud simply offered a facsimile reproduction of the Saint-Germain manuscript (Paris, Bibliothèque Nationale de France [hereafter BN] f. fr. 20050) without commentary or transcriptions; and Eduard Bernoulli transcribed various hymns and sequences in four-four time following Riemann, as he later did with Franz Saran in their edition of the Jena manuscript (Universitätsbibliothek E1.f.101). Each solution in one way or another appealed to the metre of the verse for the unlocking of the melodic rhythm. The method which Riemann developed in his review of these books drew more directly on philological scholarship, starting with Karl Lachmann's pioneering work of the 1830s. Lachmann observed that the half-verse lines of Old High German poems such as the ninth-century *Hildebrandslied* exhibited regular patterns of four accents (*vier Hebungen*), with the first and third being stronger than the second and fourth:  $\acute{x}\grave{x}\grave{x}|\acute{x}\grave{x}\grave{x}$ . This observation, 'the first scientifically founded theory of Old German verse', according to Eduard Sievers, became the basis for later theories. Hermann Möller dubbed this phenomenon *Viervierteltakt*. Eduard Sievers, in his 1893 *Altgermanische Metrik*, expanded Lachmann's principle to a detailed system of rhythmic patterns in Old Germanic verse, and created the five basic types which are still in use today. The first two of these, when reduced to their most basic form, were a trochaic and iambic accentual pulse,  $\acute{x}\grave{x}\grave{x}$  and  $\grave{x}\acute{x}\acute{x}$ , respectively. Sievers occasionally expressed these in musical notation as:  and .

<sup>4</sup> Quotation from E. Sievers, *Altgermanische Metrik* (Halle, 1893), p. 3. See K. Lachmann, 'Über althochdeutsche Betonung und Verskunst' (1831) and 'Über das Hildebrandslied' (1833) in id., *Kleinere Schriften zur deutschen Philologie*, ed. K. Müllenhoff (Berlin, 1876), i, pp. 358–448; H. Möller, *Zur althochdeutschen Allitterationspoesie* (Kiel and Leipzig, 1888), p. 110.

France's academic lag was especially manifest in certain research areas, most notably in the field of medieval literature. By contrast to the flourishing study of medieval metre in Germany, little had been written by French authors on this aspect of their heritage. In his 1900 survey of French metric studies, Franz Saran could claim that 'French nationalistic studies on prosody have not paid attention to the problem of poetic rhythm' ('Die nationale, französische Verslehre hatte das Problem vom Rhythmus des Verses nicht beachtet'; Saran, *Der Rhythmus des französischen Verses* (Halle, 1904), pp. 187–9). Saran noted the failure of such scholars as Edélestand Pontas du Ménil and Paul Edouard Passy properly to address rhythmic problems. It was thanks instead to German scholars such as Friedrich Diez, who had suggested the presence of regular accentual patterns in Old French and Old Occitan, that metric studies of French medieval literature had begun (Diez, *Altromanische Sprachdenkmale* (Bonn, 1846), pp. 75–132).



unlocked the key to the rhythm of secular monophonic melodies, following the wayward efforts of previous editors such as François-Louis Perne, Edmond-Charles-Henri de Coussemaker and François-Joseph Fétis, all of whom had proposed transcriptions in ternary metre.<sup>5</sup>

In 1905, three years after the last of these articles appeared, Pierre Aubry, a recent graduate of the prestigious *École des Chartes*, challenged Riemann's *Vierhebigkeit* in the introduction to his *Les plus anciens monuments de la musique française*. The self-proclaimed 'archiviste-paléographe' Aubry asserted that medieval French melodies were sung in triple metre. Although not notated as such, they were to be read like medieval motets whose mensural notation had been developed, Aubry argued, because of the rhythmic inadequacy of the Old French language. Beginning in

<sup>5</sup> First transcription, Riemann, 'Die Melodik', 28 (1897), p. 1 of appendix to pp. 61–2; second transcription, *ibid.*, p. 466, Diez citation, 450.

Riemann was playing into the French musicological insecurity expressed by Saran, Combarieu and Lot. The only French work Riemann could find to review, Paul Meyer and Gaston Raynaud's *Chansonnier Saint-Germain*, was an already dated facsimile edition which Riemann presented as typical of French scholarship. Readers of the *Musikalisches Wochenblatt* had only recently read his critique of two German scholarly works for comparison, and it was not in France's favour. Paul Runge and Heinrich Rietsch's editions featured weighty introductions and complete transcriptions of the manuscripts under study, whereas Meyer and Raynaud's facsimile edition opened to a paltry two-page introduction in which the editors promised a volume of transcriptions sometime in the near future – as it turns out, it never appeared. Riemann launched into a brief history of French scholarship on medieval monophony, referring at one point to the 'chaos of the scholarly literature in foreign areas' ('Chaos der Litteratur fremder Gebiete'; 'Die Melodik' (1897), p. 449). He cursorily reviewed the transcriptions of French scholars: the second volume of J.-B. de La Borde's *Essai sur la musique ancienne et moderne* (Paris, 1780); C.-E.-H. de Coussemaker's *Œuvres complètes du trouvère Adam de la Halle* (Paris, 1872); F.-L. Perne's edition in Francisque Michel's *Chansons du Châtelain de Coucy, suivies de l'ancienne musique, mise en notation moderne, avec accompagnement de piano, par M. Perne* (Paris, 1830); and the fifth volume of F.-J. Fétis's *Histoire générale de la musique* (Paris, 1876). They all, Riemann argued, had fallen into error by attempting to apply mensural principles of polyphonic notation to trouvère melodies ((1897), p. 450).

By contrast, he lionised German scholarship in this area as scientifically rigorous and innovative. He recalled its lineage, beginning with F. H. von der Hagen's four-volume work *Minnesinger: Deutsche Liederdichter des zwölften, dreizehnten und vierzehnten Jahrhunderts, aus allen bekannten Handschriften und früheren Drucken gesammelt und berichtigt, mit den Lesarten derselben, Geschichte des Lebens der Dichter und ihrer Werke, Sangweisen der Lieder, Reimverzeichnis der Anfänge, und Abbildungen sämtlicher Handschriften* (Leipzig, 1838–61), and culminating with recent publications he had reviewed. It was thanks to German work, both musicological and literary, that French medieval melodies could now be transcribed correctly according to 'principles of a rhythmic reading of melodies based on the metre of the text' ('Principien der rhythmischen Lesung der Melodien auf Grund der metrischen Beschaffenheit der Texte'; (1902), p. 429), that is to say, Riemann's own new principle of *Vierhebigkeit*.

the twelfth century and later codified by the theorist Franco of Cologne, mensural principles had been applied to both motets and trouvère songs. As medieval evidence for this, Aubry first noted the presence of motets and trouvère songs together in certain manuscripts, implying that both were read according to Franconian principles. Secondly, he pointed to certain Old French and Old Occitan songs found in mensural notation. These revealed what he called the ‘modal rhythm’ of these songs, that is, the regular alternation of long and short durations, the *longa* and *brevis* of medieval notation, which indicated one of the first three medieval rhythmic modes. But more often than not, the notation did not make this graphic distinction and presented only *longae*. In these cases, the fifth rhythmic mode was to be applied where each single note and ligature was to be translated as a perfect ternary *longa*. To illustrate, Aubry reproduced the original notation of the following trouvère *pastourelle*:



This should be transcribed as:



Although his ideas would soon be altered, Aubry had presented a plausible alternative to Riemann’s *Vierhebigkeit* and had laid the groundwork for what would become the modal theory.<sup>6</sup>

<sup>6</sup> P. Aubry, *Les plus anciens monuments de la musique française* (Mélanges de musicologie critique, 4; Paris, 1905); the pastourelle is found on pp. 11–13.

Riemann’s castigation of French scholarship had provoked the ire of Pierre Aubry, who was the first to develop the application of Franconian notation and the rhythmic modes of antiquity to trouvère melodies in his 1898 *École des Chartes* thesis entitled ‘La philologie musicale des trouvères’ (*Positions de thèses soutenues à l’École nationale des chartes* (1898), pp. 5–13; my thanks to Marie-Christine Moine of the Centre historique des Archives nationales for her assistance). He had continued to develop this idea in several articles published between 1900 and 1904 (cited in Haines, “Modal Theory”, p. 144, n. 8). Aubry’s work was in part motivated by a passionate patriotism born of the Franco-Prussian conflict. This was evident in his early collection of French nationalistic

Riemann was not won over by Aubry's arguments and he voiced his disagreement that same year in a review of *Les plus anciens*

songs, especially suited to a country 'which has been singing and fighting for ten centuries', as literary scholar Gaston Paris explained in the preface to Aubry's *Huit chants héroïques de l'ancienne France (XII<sup>e</sup>–XVIII<sup>e</sup> siècles)*, 2nd edn (Paris, 1896), p. 7. In a series of lectures given at the Institut Catholique in Paris, Aubry defended the enduring contribution of French musical scholars, founders of the modern scientific discipline he now christened *musicologie*. These lectures were published in the first of a series introduced by Aubry, 'Mélanges de musicologie critique'. His French musicological genealogy went back to Pierre-Benoît de Jumilhac (1611–82), whereas Riemann's lineage had begun only in the first half of the nineteenth century (Aubry, *La musicologie médiévale: histoires et méthodes. Cours professé à l'Institut Catholique de Paris 1898–1899* (Mélanges de musicologie critique, 1; Paris, 1900); see my forthcoming 'Généalogies musicologiques: aux origines d'une science de la musique vers 1900', *Acta musicologica*). At the time of Riemann's reviews, Aubry was the only qualified scholar to defend French scholarship on medieval monophony. As Jules Combarieu later put it, he was France's 'consolation and hope' (J. Combarieu, review of *Lais et descorts français du XIII<sup>e</sup> siècle* by A. Jeanroy, L. Brandin and P. Aubry, in *Revue musicale*, 3 (1903), pp. 508–11, at p. 509). Aubry's patriotic defence against Riemann's accusations generated *Les plus anciens monuments*, the fourth in his 'Mélanges de musicologie critique' series.

*Les plus anciens monuments* was intended to be for secular monophony what the Benedictine scholar-monks of Solesmes's *Paléographie musicale* had been to plainchant. Jules Combarieu later wrote that Aubry had borrowed the outward form of the Solesmes publications, 'having taken their method and even a little of their spirit' ('après leur avoir pris leur méthode même et un peu de leur esprit'; 'Discours sur Pierre Aubry', *Revue musicale*, 10 (1910), pp. 485–7, at p. 486). In the *Paléographie musicale*, the Solesmes scholars had created what one writer considered one of France's 'most powerful scientific monuments' (N. Rousseau, *L'école grégorienne de Solesmes, 1833–1910* (Rome and Tournai, 1910), p. 23, n. 3). *Les plus anciens monuments* began with a lengthy overview which included a discussion of rhythmic interpretation, the bulk of the volume containing representative photographic plates spanning four hundred years of musical notation. In these respects, it imitated the second and third volumes of the *Paléographie musicale* which had appeared only about a decade earlier, *Le Répons-graduel Justus ut Palma*, parts 1 and 2 (Solesmes, 1891–2). Aubry had thus brought secular medieval monophony into the orbit of the new French science of musical palaeography. Like Aubry's work, the *Paléographie musicale* had also been a response to German scholarship, namely the 1877 *Graduale Romanum* Ratisbon edition (see Bergeron, *Decadent Enchantments*, ch. 2). When Solesmes scholar Paul Cagin recalled 'a German doctor of music' leaving the Solesmes premises as he disconsolately muttered that 'it was impossible . . . to prevent their (i.e., the Solesmes school) being everywhere and always ahead', it was primarily to gloat over France's hard-sought musicological victory over Germany in the field of plainchant (translated in Bergeron, *Decadent*, p. 86). As for the title of Aubry's work, it was apparently inspired by Gaston Paris's literary study *Les plus anciens monuments de la langue française (IX<sup>e</sup>, X<sup>e</sup> siècle)* (Paris, 1875).

Thus equipped, Aubry's *Les plus anciens monuments* lashed back at Riemann and other unnamed 'German musicologists' (p. 11). On the one hand, Aubry accused them of being over-systematic. On the other hand, he touted his own system as 'more scientific' than his adversaries', since it followed medieval theory rather than modern scholarship. But a careful reader would have also noticed that Aubry briefly defended French scholarship with less equanimity, accusing Riemann of 'incomplete knowledge of our chansonnier manuscripts' (p. 11, emphasis mine). The implication here was that all Riemann's German erudition could not replace the singular French advantage of owning and cherishing the original medieval parchment sources themselves, an advantage strengthened by Aubry's superior training in palaeography at the École des Chartes.

*monuments*. Although he did not deny the medieval evidence Aubry presented, Riemann considered the comparatively few mensurally notated trouvère melodies to be graphic corruptions by later scribes. He admitted what he called a medieval ‘mensural interpretation’, but only for these few uncharacteristic and isolated cases. Aubry was appealing to these, Riemann argued, rather than drawing more obvious conclusions from the greater poetic corpus. The dominance of triple metre was introduced in polyphony in the thirteenth century, not the twelfth century as Aubry claimed, and vernacular monophony, unaffected by this development, was sung in duple metre for most of the Middle Ages. Besides, the mensural interpretation was artificial and yielded stilted transcriptions. His *Vierhebigkeit* theory, on the other hand, was natural and simple in its application. To illustrate the contrast, Riemann recast the *pastourelle* of Aubry’s example into a quadruple mould:<sup>7</sup>

<sup>7</sup> The first segment of Riemann’s lengthy review appeared less than a year after *Les plus anciens monuments* was published (‘Die Melodik der Minnesänger’, *Musikalisches Wochenblatt*, 36 (1905), pp. 761–3, 777–9, 797–800, 817–20, 837–9, 857–9, 879–80; musical example from p. 879). The German scholar began by calling Aubry a ‘fanatical advocate of the mensural interpretation’ (‘fanatischer Vertreter der mensuralen Deutung’, p. 761), a distinctively French interpretation since, as Riemann had earlier stated, it had originated with Perne and Coussemaker. Then, one facsimile at a time, the Leipzig doctor dismantled Aubry’s work. He failed the editor for poor knowledge of Franconian theory (e.g., p. 762); he blamed him for transcribing incorrectly (e.g., p. 837) and for not transcribing when needed (e.g., p. 799). He even mimicked an Aubry transcription in one instance (p. 820). Aubry’s work was unreliable and therefore could not be considered a scientific method (p. 837). His ‘little study’ hopefully would be followed by more thorough publications, Riemann concluded (p. 880).

These denunciations were supplemented with attacks of a more vindictive nature embedded throughout the text. In one paragraph especially (pp. 837–8), Riemann responded with livid sarcasm to Aubry’s earlier passing accusation:

Now, I graciously acknowledge the state of my insufficient knowledge which, understandably and unfortunately, is limited to sources available to me, namely those published in print or various examples which I happen to discover. But I note from Aubry’s latest publication that the ‘embarrassment of riches’, on which source he sits, does not necessarily enable one to see more clearly, but apparently only confuses that much more. I maintain once again that Mr Aubry, surely without intending it, has transmitted to me in the work at hand abundant material both for a thorough examination of his competence in the undecided question and also for the completion of my defective knowledge.

(Nun, ich quittiere höflichst dankend über die Konstatierung meiner mangelhaften Kenntnisse, die sich allerdings leider auf die mir erreichbaren, d. h. durch Druck veröffentlichen oder mir anderweit zufällig vermittelten Belege beschränken. Ich ersehe aber aus Aubry’s neuester Publikation, dass der *embarras de richesse* dessen, der an der Quelle sitzt, keineswegs unbedingt schärfer sehen macht, sondern augenscheinlich nur um so mehr verwirrt. Aber ich bestätige nochmals, dass Herr Aubry, ganz gewiss ohne es zu wollen, mir in dem vorliegenden Werk ein reiches Material



Aubry soon returned to his mensural theory of monophony, however. Some two years after *Les plus anciens monuments*, he published

1908). On the Fauvel codex: Aubry, 'Un "explicit" en musique du roman de Fauvel', *Le Mercure musical*, 2 (1906), pp. 118–26, published separately that same year as a book (Paris, 1906); Aubry, *Le Roman de Fauvel: reproduction photographique du manuscrit français 146 de la Bibliothèque Nationale de Paris* (Paris, 1907). On the Montpellier codex: Aubry, *Recherches sur les 'tenors' français dans les motets du XIII<sup>e</sup> siècle* (Paris, 1907); P. Aubry and A. Gastoué, 'Recherches sur les "Tenors" latins dans les motets du XII<sup>e</sup> siècle d'après le manuscrit de Montpellier (Bibliothèque Universitaire, H. 196)', *La Tribune de Saint-Gervais*, 13 (1907), pp. 145–51, 169–79, published separately that year as a book (Paris, 1907); Coussemaker's earlier study was *L'art harmonique aux XII<sup>e</sup> et XIII<sup>e</sup> siècles* (Paris, 1865).

The first in the footnote quarrels of the modal theory was prompted by a development in tandem with but separate from the Riemann–Aubry exchange. The more plainly vindictive aspects of their debate, until now latent in the text of the printed page, began to surface in a private epistolary dialogue between Aubry and Friedrich Ludwig, and would soon emerge full-fledged in the space just below the printed page. On 30 April 1906, Aubry wrote to Friedrich Ludwig correcting the German scholar's statements about manuscript Madrid Hh 167, which Ludwig had described in an earlier article without directly consulting it (F. Ludwig, 'Die mehrstimmige Musik der ältesten Epoche im Dienste der Liturgie', *Kirchenmusikalisches Jahrbuch*, 29 (1905), p. 113).

Ludwig at first ignored Aubry's letter. But with the publication of 'Iter Hispanicum', Aubry made public the fact that 'a German musicologist, Mr Fr. Ludwig, in a recent article, has imprudently written about this manuscript (the Madrid codex) without having personally consulted it: we therefore need to start from scratch in this area of his work' ('un musicologue allemand, M. Fr. Ludwig, a eu l'imprudence dans un article récent de parler de ce manuscrit sans l'avoir personnellement consulté: aussi tout est-il à reprendre à cet endroit de son travail'; 'Iter Hispanicum', p. 339). The German musicologist immediately wrote to Aubry on 13 April 1907, defending his use of a reliable secondary source for the description of a manuscript. He then in turn accused Aubry of various inaccuracies, the greatest of which was his failure to decipher the modal rhythm ('modale Rhythmik') ruling motets and trouvère songs. Modal rhythm was latent, Ludwig insisted, even in the earlier square notation ('Quadratnotation') which failed to indicate it; this rhythm could be deciphered retroactively from later readings. The *longae* of Aubry's pastourelle, for example, should not be transcribed as *longae perfectae*, but as alternating *breves* and *imperfectae longae*, in rhythmic mode 2 (Ludwig's letter was published in Jacques Chailley's 'Quel est', pp. 216–22).

At the time of this letter, Ludwig was the greatest living authority on late medieval polyphony, having studied in unprecedented detail its sources, musical notation and development. His study culminated in his 'Studien über die Geschichte der mehrstimmigen Musik im Mittelalter' published in the *Sammelbände der Internationalen Musikgesellschaft*: 'I: Die mehrstimmige Musik des 14. Jahrhunderts' (4 (1902), pp. 16–69), 'II: Die 50 Beispiele Coussemaker's aus der Handschrift von Montpellier' (5 (1904), pp. 177–224), and 'III: Über die Entstehung und die erste Entwicklung der lateinischen und französischen Motette in musikalischer Beziehung' (7 (1906), pp. 514–28); these were reprinted in Ludwig, *Studien über die Geschichte der mehrstimmigen Musik im Mittelalter*, ed. F. Gennrich (*Summa musicae medii aevi*, 16; Langen bei Frankfurt, 1966). Ludwig was one of the very few professors of musicology in Europe, and at the University of Strassburg, one of Germany's premier research institutions and an outpost of Prussian culture in the newly annexed region of Alsace (J. E. Craig, *Scholarship and Nation Building: The Universities of Strasbourg and Alsatian Society, 1870–1939* (Chicago and London, 1984)). Ludwig's idea of latent modal rhythm, first presented in a lecture given in November 1905, would soon become the starting point for the interpretations of Beck and Aubry (see my forthcoming 'Friedrich Ludwig's "Musicology of the Future": Commentary and Translation').



This seemed a straightforward enough solution except for the unresolved difficulty of just how the poetic metre was selected, given rhythmically mute notation. The only element which Aubry's revised method still lacked was a system of criteria for determining this key matter.<sup>9</sup>

No sooner had Aubry's controversial 'critical examination' appeared in June 1907, than an article was published the next month in *Caecilia*, a local Strassburg monthly devoted mostly to church music, which stated that Pierre Aubry's latest theory was plagiarised. The author of the article was 'a young philo-musicologist', as the editorial introduction put it, named Johann-Baptist Beck who, as it turns out, was a doctoral candidate at the University of Strassburg. He had just read Aubry's *Revue musicale* article. To his surprise, Beck had found that it contained the key idea of applying rhythmic modes 1 to 3 to unmeasured notation,

<sup>9</sup> P. Aubry, 'L'œuvre mélodique des troubadours et des trouvères: examen critique du système de M. Hugo Riemann', *Revue musicale*, 7 (1907), pp. 317–32 (where the syllogism is found), pp. 347–60 (the musical example), pp. 389–95. This article was reprinted as a book, *La rythmique musicale des troubadours et des trouvères* (Paris, 1907).

The change in the first part of the book's title made plain that it was the question of rhythmic interpretation which was at stake. Just as he was entering into dialogue with Ludwig on this matter, Aubry stepped up the vigour of his defence of French scholarship against Riemann's attacks. The severity and length of Riemann's recent refutations of Aubry's arguments in *Les plus anciens monuments* necessitated a defence in kind, and 'L'œuvre mélodique' was just this. It is no coincidence that Aubry's subtitle 'examination' used the same term (*Untersuchung*) as Riemann (see above, n. 7). But an appropriate retort to Riemann's personal bellicosity could not remain in the body of the text.

The footnote quarrels of the modal theory began in a note at the bottom of page 352 of 'L'œuvre mélodique', where Aubry stated: 'I have always been a strong advocate, Riemann even says fanatic, *ein fanatischer Vertreter*, of the measured interpretation' ('Nous avons toujours été un partisan convaincu, Riemann dit même fanatique, *ein fanatischer Vertreter*, de l'interprétation mesurée'). Aubry apparently wanted to make clear that he had not missed the insult. At the same time, he was probably equally honoured by Riemann's christening him the defender of a French mensural interpretation, and consequently the hero of *musicologie*.

In the same note, Aubry admitted that there were some 'notable differences' between his 1905 exposition and the present one, and that these were due to a thorough comparison of the Montpellier manuscript with the monophonic chansonniers. To this, he added that he was the 'first to criticize (my) previous transcriptions'. What he did not state was that the present changes were partly prompted by his encounter in 1906 with a doctoral candidate at the University of Strassburg, Johann-Baptist Beck. Beck was at work on a theory of his own which contradicted Riemann's *Vierhebigkeit* and improved Aubry's mensural interpretation. In their conversations, the Alsatian student had pointed out to Aubry certain inadequacies in his earlier transcriptions. That neither Beck's name nor this encounter was mentioned is understandable. For what an unthinkable humiliation it would be for Aubry to relinquish his position as 'fanatic proselytiser' of the French 'mensural interpretation' to a doctoral candidate who, furthermore, was a native of the recently occupied territory of Alsace and a product of German education!

an idea which he had shared with Aubry during their private conversations in the summer and autumn of 1906 at the Bibliothèque Nationale in Paris. Moreover, Beck insisted, Aubry's recent interpretation faultily misapplied the modes to trouvère songs. He then explained his textual criteria for determining the mode of a given melody, such as the tendency of decasyllabic verse to be set to the third rhythmic mode. Beck's new method rested on the assumption that medieval French verse regularly alternated strong and weak accents. In many cases, this alternation was simply every other syllable, resulting in a musical transcription in rhythmic mode 1 or 2. Elsewhere, particularly in decasyllabic verse, two weak beats alternated with one strong one, yielding a mode 3 transcription. By counting backwards from the final accented syllable of a line, Beck claimed, one could easily establish the correct long and short values of the melody. (This idea, incidentally, was borrowed from Riemann and his philological predecessors as discussed earlier in this essay, although this was never mentioned by Beck.) So, for example, in the above-cited Colin Muset lai transcribed by Aubry in mode 2, a backwards count from the last syllables 'rai' and 'ai', according to Beck, revealed instead the first rhythmic mode, beginning with an accented syllable:


  
 En ces-te no -te di -rai D'une a -mo-re -te que j'ai

Its melody should be transcribed thus:<sup>10</sup>

<sup>10</sup> Johann-Baptist Beck, 'Die modale Interpretation der mittelalterlichen Melodien bes. der Troubadours und Trouvères', *Caecilia*, 24 (1907), pp. 97–105, example on p. 104.

Following their 1906 encounter, Beck and Aubry met occasionally at the Bibliothèque Nationale and also corresponded. As Aubry, the editors of the *Revue musicale*, and even Beck himself later acknowledged in a footnote, Aubry had put at Beck's disposal his large collection of photographic facsimiles (Johann-Baptist Beck, *Die Melodien der Troubadours* (Strassburg, 1908), p. 5, n. 1; Aubry, 'Zur modalen Interpretation der mittelalterlichen Melodien bes. der Troubadours und Trouvères', *Caecilia* (1907), pp. 131–3, at p. 132; editorial preface to Aubry, 'Lettre ouverte à M. Maurice Emmanuel sur la rythmique musicale des trouvères', *Revue musicale*, 10 (1910), pp. 261–70, at p. 261). It seemed only fair that, in return, the young scholar should share with Aubry aspects of his developing method which had been assisted by Aubry's generosity. Ironically, it was unsolicited offprints of Aubry's *Revue musicale* article sent by the author himself to Beck which prompted the younger scholar's *Caecilia* outburst (Beck, 'Die modale Interpretation', p. 99). Aubry's generosity in this case may be read both as a warning to Beck to keep out of the debate with Riemann, and as a proposal to side with him in this debate. The posted offprints had the very opposite effect, however, and turned Beck into a bitterly bold adversary.

In a footnote on page 99 of his *Caecilia* article, Beck reproduced the letter he had

John Haines



En ces - te no - te di - rai

Less than a year later, in January 1908, Aubry completed the bulk of his most ambitious work on the thirteenth-century motet thus far, three volumes (facsimile, edition and commentary) on a motet manuscript from Bamberg (Staatliche Bibliothek Ed. IV. 6, now Lit. 115), entitled *Cent motets du XIII<sup>e</sup> siècle* and published in October of that same year. The third chapter of its commentary volume pursued his conclusions on trouvère song by extrapolating rhythmic principles from the upper voices of mensurally notated motets. He had discovered that three predominant patterns were used in the Bamberg manuscript, rhythmic modes 1 to 3, and that these were varied by such means as an upbeat, or the compression and expansion of a modal pattern. In the following example taken from the triplum of a Bamberg motet (fol. 6<sup>v</sup>), he demonstrated the compression of a mode 3 pattern:



A la che - mi - ne - e El froit mois

Although poetic line-verse lengths and accentual patterns could serve as a general guide for the rhythmic mode of a given melody, trouvère songs, he concluded, could never be transcribed with the same certainty as motets.<sup>11</sup>

written in response to Aubry's offprints. After acknowledging receipt of these, Beck declared that he easily recognised his own 'système modal' – here named in print for the first time – throughout 'L'œuvre mélodique', and that a more developed critique was imminent. His footnote citation even included the two crisp closing flourishes of the letter: 'I shall return to this question. Distinguished regards.' ('Nous y reviendrons. Civilités distinguées.') Beck's stand could not have been clearer. If Aubry was plagiarising his ideas and trying to obtain his approval, Beck was here calling his bluff. He was making public the fact that, from July 1907 on, Aubry knew of his denunciation. Most importantly, Beck was now entering the debate between Riemann and Aubry.

<sup>11</sup> Aubry, *Cent motets du XIII<sup>e</sup> siècle publiés d'après le manuscrit Ed. IV. 6 de Bamberg* (Paris, 1908); musical example from page 133. The preface is signed January 1908, only six months after Beck's July 1907 *Caecilia* article.

Although Aubry's *Cent motets* was completed nearly half a year after Beck's *Caecilia* denunciations, no mention of Beck was made in the text of the commentary. Aubry presumably calculated that the best response to the Strassburg doctoral candidate's accusations of plagiarism was silence. Throughout the commentary volume of *Cent motets*, Aubry cited his *Revue musicale* article, which by now had appeared in book form. It was first cited as a 'historique de la notation mesurée au treizième siècle' and referred to throughout in his discussions of the medieval doctrine of *equipollentia*, the replacement of a longer note with ones of smaller value. This was to underscore that here, as in all his polyphonic studies published during this productive period, Aubry had simply confirmed his previous conclusions on the use of triple metre in trouvère songs.<sup>12</sup>

Seemingly undaunted by Beck's denunciations, Aubry meanwhile returned to the area recently contested with Friedrich Ludwig, medieval polyphony. In this field crowded with the German publications of Ludwig and others, the appearance of Aubry's triple volume *Cent motets* in 1908 came as a major accomplishment for French motet studies, especially fitting since Aubry had picked a manuscript of French motets held in a German library. In his eulogistic review of the work, Jules Combarieu wrote that he even felt 'a French joy comparing this great work, unconcerned with success in the market, with certain German books by famous authors, obviously intended to "make a lot of money"' ('j'éprouve même une joie française en comparant ce beau travail, dédaigneux des succès de vente, à certains livres allemands, signés de noms illustres, et destinés évidemment à "faire beaucoup d'argent"'); review of *Cent motets* in *Revue musicale*, 8 (1908), pp. 570–71, at p. 570). Aubry's Bamberg facsimile edition, with its separate volumes devoted exclusively to commentary and transcriptions, even more than the earlier *Les plus anciens monuments* and Roman de Fauvel edition, was the progeny of the Solesmes science of *paléographie musicale*.

<sup>12</sup> Citation in Aubry, *Cent motets*, iii, p. 22; his *La rythmique musicale* was cited on pp. 53, 121 and 141.

While the name of Riemann, Aubry's public adversary, was cited in the text and the notes, Beck was relegated entirely to the space beneath the text. Apparently, Aubry was making as little as possible of the Alsatian's *Caecilia* denunciations. Yet even an uninitiated reader would have wondered at the footnote on page 141 of Aubry's *Cent motets*. For here, Aubry mentioned a 'colleague from beyond the Rhine, Mr Jean Beck' ('un confrère d'outre-Rhin, M. Jean Beck'), who had independently arrived at the same conclusions as he. The very next sentence turned this ambiguous honour into a thinly veiled insult. Aubry honoured Beck as the originator of the theory 'of the application of modal formulas to the interpretation of measured monophony' ('de l'application des formules modales à l'interprétation des monophonies mesurées'). That is to say, Beck had discovered modal patterns where they were already evident, in measured readings of monophonic songs. To this Aubry added that since Beck's work was hitherto unpublished, he did not yet know his exact arguments. Elsewhere, in a rebuttal to Beck's *Cecilia* accusation published in that same journal less than a year before the completion of *Cent motets* (January 1908), Aubry had insisted that, during their conversations at the Bibliothèque Nationale, Beck had never revealed anything more than the general outline of his modal theory. 'Since when are conversations cited in a scholarly work?' he asked ('Depuis quand dans un travail critique cite-t-on des conversations?'); Aubry, 'Zur





About a year later, in the early spring of 1909, Aubry's *Trouvères et troubadours* appeared. *Trouvères et troubadours* was an introductory handbook for a lay audience, in the series 'Les maîtres de la musique' which had included books on Bach and Mozart. Despite its popular nature, Aubry's work made an impact on medieval musicological scholarship, being the first book-length survey of these musical repertoires. The title of its opening chapter triumphantly corrected over a century of philological dominance: 'Autant que des poètes les troubadours et les trouvères sont des musiciens'. In an initial overview, the author declared that the melodies' rhythm was 'in a latent state and must be uncovered' ('à l'état latent et il faut le découvrir', p. 27); it was precisely here, he felt, that Riemann had failed. In the ensuing chapters, Aubry surveyed primary genres and poets, enlivening his discussion with fifteen musical examples. The author saved the controversial question of rhythm for the final chapter, entitled 'La théorie de la musique mesurée au XIII<sup>e</sup> siècle'. After contrasting the work of Coussemaker and Riemann, Aubry explained on page 190 just how he had come to the correct interpretation of trouvère melodies:

I personally hesitated between these two extremes of interpretation, De Coussemaker's and H. Riemann's, little satisfied with one or the other. As of two years ago, my transcriptions still showed this uncertainty. In the summer of 1907, when I was preparing an edition of the great motet manuscript from the Bamberg library, I took up again for my own sake the study of the Montpellier manuscript as one of several tasks related to the primary one. At this time, I realised that the rhythm of all these motets could be reduced to a small number of formulae which corresponded to the modes given by the theorists, and that the mode of a given piece was followed from beginning to end.

(Personnellement, j'ai longtemps hésité entre ces deux conceptions extrêmes, entre De Coussemaker et H. Riemann, aussi peu satisfait de l'une que de l'autre. Mes transcriptions, il y a deux ans encore, reflétaient ces incertitudes. Au printemps de l'année 1907, ayant à préparer l'édition du beau manuscrit de motets de la bibliothèque de Bamberg, je reprenais pour mon compte, au nombre de mes travaux d'investigations critiques autour du texte principal, l'étude du manuscrit de Montpellier. A ce moment, je m'aperçus que le rythme de tous ces motets était réductible à un petit nombre de formules, correspondant aux modes énumérés par les théoriciens, et que le mode adopté dans une pièce était suivi d'un bout à l'autre.)

Brief mention was made of Pierre Aubry in the introductory survey of the scholarly literature (pp. 3 and 4) in *Die Melodien der Troubadours*. It was in a footnote on page 5 that Beck thanked Aubry for lending him photographic reproductions. This was the first and last friendly interaction in print between the two scholars.

This was followed by arguments reminiscent of the syllogism in his *Revue musicale* article, a presentation of the six modes, and the same conclusion as before, that the first three were the most frequently used. Aubry now added what had been missing in 1907, seven succinct textual criteria for determining the correct rhythmic mode: the first four were based on the coincidence of poetic tonic accent and longer musical duration, and the last three on the frequent occurrence of certain modes in a given verse type, such as the third mode in decasyllabic lines. These criteria, and especially the last one, were reminiscent of Beck's *Caecilia* article.<sup>14</sup>

About a month after *Trouvères et troubadours* appeared, on 19 March 1909, Beck presented to the Académie des Inscriptions et Belles-Lettres the findings of his dissertation. After scholars had for years attempted in vain to decipher the notation of troubadour and trouvère melodies, he stated, he had at last found the key. He then accused Aubry of plagiarising this theory in his latest book. The very next month, Aubry, also speaking at the Académie, denied Beck's priority in this achievement, pointing to the fact that his *Revue musicale* article had been published before Beck's book. Although their methods were similar, he insisted, they were reached by different paths.

<sup>14</sup> P. Aubry's *Trouvères et troubadours* (Les Maîtres de la musique, ed. J. Chantavoine (Paris, 1909)) more than likely came as a complete surprise to Beck. Nowhere in the body of the book was his name to be found, except in the bibliography, where *Die Melodien der Troubadours* was cited. Of the thirty-some bibliographical items, the majority were by French authors and one-third by Aubry himself. The histories of the Belgian Fétis (see above, n. 5) and the German A. W. Ambros (*Geschichte der Musik* (Leipzig, 1864), ii) were deemed unworthy of mention: 'Everything in Fétis's book should be rejected, and in Ambros's, there is nothing useful' ('Du livre de Fétis tout est à rejeter, et dans celui d'Ambros, il n'y a rien à prendre', p. 221). The only mention of Beck was in a footnote at the end of the book, p. 192:

During the same period that I divulged for the first time these ideas on the role of modal formulas in measured medieval song in my *Rythmique musicale des trouvères*, a young doctor from Strasbourg, Mr Jean Beck, in his book *Die Melodien der Troubadours*, arrived at the same conclusions, but by completely different procedures and means of demonstration than those which I followed.

(En même temps que dans ma *Rythmique musicale des trouvères* j'exposais pour la première fois ces idées sur le rôle des formules modales dans la mélodie mesurée du moyen âge, un jeune docteur de Strasbourg, M. Jean Beck, dans son livre *Die Melodien der Troubadours*, arrivait aux mêmes conclusions, mais par des voies et des procédés de démonstration tout autres que ceux suivis par moi.)

Here, Aubry was setting the record straight: it was he who had first discovered the modal interpretation and this, without any help from Beck, 'a young doctor from Strasbourg'. Once again, Beck was cast outside the text.

The scholarly world would later find out that, shortly after his Académie lecture, Aubry called for a trial to settle the question of plagiarism, fully confident of an outcome in his favour. In June, Beck and Aubry agreed to submit to the decision of a six-man scholarly jury. Aubry selected Maurice Emmanuel and Jean Chantavoine, both music historians specialising outside the medieval period, and Beck named Joseph Bédier, a prominent literary scholar, and Louis Laloy, a poet and writer on music; these four in turn chose Charles Malherbe and Marcel Dieulafoy, opera and art historians respectively. Hearing Aubry and Beck's testimonies separately, the jury deliberated for several weeks, and submitted their decision on 29 June 1909. To Aubry's complete surprise, they decided that he was guilty of plagiarising Beck's system in his recent publications. Their verdict was that Aubry should destroy all circulating copies of *Trouvères et troubadours* and replace them with an emended edition clearly stating Beck's priority in the modal interpretation, and that furthermore, this sentence should be proclaimed in twenty scholarly journals – all this at Aubry's own expense. The decision of the jury was made official at the civil tribunal of the Seine the next month.<sup>15</sup>

<sup>15</sup> Beck, 'Séance du 19 mars 1909,' *Académie des Inscriptions et Belles-Lettres: Comptes rendus des séances de l'année 1909* (1909), p. 222; Aubry, 'Séance du 30 avril 1909,' *Académie des Inscriptions et Belles-Lettres: Comptes rendus des séances de l'année 1909* (1909), pp. 321–5. Details of the trial were later published in Johann-Baptist Beck, 'Zur Aufstellung der modalen Interpretation der Troubadoursmelodien,' *Sammelbände der Internationalen Musikgesellschaft*, 12 (1911), pp. 316–24; P. Aubry, 'Lettre ouverte à M. Maurice Emmanuel sur la rythmique musicale des trouvères,' *Revue musicale*, 10 (1910), pp. 261–70.

Beck's denunciation of Aubry in the very stronghold of French intellectual life, the Académie des Inscriptions et Belles-Lettres, made it painfully clear that he would not tolerate being dismissed to the lower margins of the page. To his war-like aggressiveness Aubry responded in frantic self-defence, just as much for France's honour as his own, against the ideological tyranny of Germany. First Riemann, then Ludwig, and now finally Beck had seized that French national treasure, the music of the thirteenth century, that golden age of the French Middle Ages. Beck's accusations were an affront to the French and a challenge which demanded a reply. Speaking to the members of the Académie, Aubry appealed to their patriotism in assessing this matter:

To sum up, if we owe to German erudition a renewed interest in our national antiquities, we must add that French musicology has not been shown up in this area, and that it is also in France that the long lost meaning of the musical language of Philip Augustus' and Saint Louis's contemporaries was rediscovered at the same time (Aubry, 'Séance du 30 avril 1909', p. 321).

(En un mot, si nous devons à l'érudition allemande une marque nouvelle d'intérêt à nos antiquités nationales, il faut ajouter que la musicologie française ne s'est pas laissé devancer sur ce terrain et que c'est en France aussi qu'a été simultanément

## The Footnote Quarrels of the Modal Theory

Aubry wasted no time in obeying the sentence. The second, emended edition of *Trouvères et troubadours* appeared less than a year after the June trial, in the early part of 1910. But even a careful reader would have been hard put to notice the three small changes that had been made to the text. The first of these was found in chapter 1: where it had previously read that a meeting of musical and literary studies had hitherto 'not occurred' in the study of these repertoires (page 4), this was changed to 'rarely occurred'. The second change was in the following chapter, where Aubry had written that attempts by 'musicologists' to decipher the rhythm of trouvère and troubadour melodies had failed until then; this was changed to 'musicologists up until the works of Riemann' (page 27). The third and final revision was found on page 204, where one had earlier read:

The circumstances and conditions surrounding the simultaneous rediscovery of this meaning by Mr Beck in Germany and in France by the author of this book are well known.

(On a vu dans quelles circonstances et dans quelles conditions cette signification a été retrouvée simultanément par M. Beck en Allemagne et en France par l'auteur de ce livre.)

This was now changed to:

The circumstances and conditions surrounding the rediscovery of this meaning by Mr Beck are well known, whose theory he calls the 'modal interpretation' and which is recognised by the author of this book.

(On a vu dans quelles circonstances et dans quelles conditions cette signification a été retrouvée par M. Beck, désignée par lui sous le nom d'interprétation modale' et admise par l'auteur de ce livre.)

retrouvée la signification longtemps oubliée de la langue musicale qui fut celle des contemporains de Philippe Auguste et de Saint Louis.)

The following year, he would express much the same sentiment to readers of the *Revue musicale*:

It is here at home, just as much and more so than in Germany, and by a Frenchman as well, that the long lost significance of the musical language of the French troubadours and trouvères was rediscovered ('Lettre ouverte', p. 269).

(C'est chez nous, autant et plus qu'en Allemagne, c'est par un français aussi, qu'a été retrouvée la signification longtemps oubliée de la langue musicale des troubadours et des trouvères français.)

Aubry urged the French people, in the name of French scholarly honour and for the sake of France's musical heritage, to defend his paternity of the new interpretation of troubadour and trouvère melodies.

Aubry had complied with the verdict of the jury by letter of law only. Nowhere in the text was Beck's paternity of the modal theory asserted. To the majority of readers who knew nothing of the trial, this second edition had simply been prompted by popular demand. Indeed, Aubry made no attempt to destroy copies of the previous edition; neither did he publish the verdict in scholarly journals.<sup>16</sup>

<sup>16</sup> The first of these three changes had apparently escaped Beck's notice (Beck, 'Correspondance', *Annales du Midi*, 22 (1910), p. 114).

In the mere space of a few months following his Académie plea, Aubry had suffered the unthinkable humiliation of being denounced by his own people in the city of his birth. The very nation he had served now betrayed him; he wavered between revenge, abdication and denial. His hurriedly published second edition, although seemingly admitting his plagiarism, actually defied the French jury which had wrongly declared German scholarship victorious. It was in two footnotes that the reader had to look for Aubry's true response to the verdict. Under cover of the margins, he subtly mocked the trial and its outcome. The first footnote appeared at the bottom of the first page of the emended edition:

N.B. – The second edition of this book allows me, by correcting a few errors offensive to Mr Jean Beck, to modify certain passages of the first edition which might have appeared to not do justice to the works of my colleague.

(N.B. – La seconde édition de ce livre me permet, en corrigeant quelques erreurs préjudiciables à M. Jean Beck, de modifier certains passages de la première édition, qui pouvaient paraître ne pas rendre une justice suffisante aux travaux de mon confrère.)

Thus there were only 'a few' errors, 'certain passages' – the three brief ones discussed in the body of this essay – which required emending, and these only 'might have appeared' to not do justice to Beck. The second footnote was an emendation of the already existing note at the bottom of page 192 (see above, n. 14):

This theory of modal interpretation, whose priority goes to Mr Jean Beck, and which I in turn had outlined in my *Rythmique musicale des trouvères*, was developed by Mr Beck in his book *Die Melodien der Troubadours*, etc. While admitting the principle and fundamental rules laid out by Beck, I do not think it necessary to agree with his ideas on certain aspects of the system, such as the alternation of modes in a given piece and the substitution of 6/4 for 3/4 in the third mode.

(Cette théorie de l'interprétation modale, dont la priorité revient à M. Jean Beck, que j'avais à mon tour esquissée dans ma *Rythmique musicale des trouvères*, a été développée par M. Beck dans son livre *Die Melodien der Troubadours*, etc. Tout en admettant le principe et les règles fondamentales posés par M. Beck, je ne crois pas devoir me rallier à ses idées sur certains points du système, tels que l'alternance des modes dans une même pièce et la substitution du 6/4 au 3/4 dans le troisième mode.)

Here, and here only, did Aubry state that the 'priority of the modal theory went to Beck', an assertion not even found in the text. But this was immediately undermined by his statements that he was the first to publish on this matter and that Beck's system was flawed. One can almost hear the echo of his *Cent motets* footnote, that Beck had originated the theory 'of the application of modal formulas to the interpretation of measured monophony' (see above, n. 12).

Further defiance of the verdict in the trial was found in the bibliography, where two changes had been made. Aubry added J. Tiersot's *Histoire de la chanson populaire en France*

Meanwhile, Beck had not been sitting still either. In the late spring of that same year, he published *La musique des troubadours*, a popular work in the series 'Les musiciens célèbres', which, like *Trouvères et troubadours* 'Les maîtres de la musique', included monographs on Bach and Mozart. It was subtitled 'étude critique', and was a show of scientific one-upmanship over Aubry's handbook. Beck provided an apparatus (index, list of songs and illustrations) which Aubry had not and a more thorough philological treatment than Aubry; where Aubry's explanation of rhythmic principles had been tentative and brief, Beck's exegesis of what he called the 'modal interpretation' was lucid and thorough. At the same time, the new work was more accessible than Aubry's. Beck usually translated poetic texts where Aubry rarely had, and the technical terms of medieval notation and poetry were more frequently explained. Moreover, Beck's book reversed Aubry's topical order, beginning with the more pressing question of musical notation and rhythm, and concluding with poetic genres. The latter section presented categories which more often than not differed from Aubry's, including an added one, that of motets. Despite these differences, the musical results of both scholars were surprisingly similar, as in their identical rendition of the opening of this song by Thibaut de Navarre (Paris, Bibliothèque de l' Arsenal 5198, p. 41):<sup>17</sup>

(Paris, 1889) to the *Bibliographie critique* (p. 221). It was Tiersot (a Frenchman), Aubry stated, who had first proposed the solution of a latent rhythm to unmeasured medieval melodies, before even Riemann and later 'current doctrines on thirteenth-century measured rhythm' ('doctrines actuelles sur la rythmique mesurée du XIII<sup>e</sup> siècle') – a thinly disguised expression for Beck's modal theory. The second change was the alteration of the title of Beck's book, given in the first edition simply as *Die Melodien der Troubadours*. This time, the full lengthy title was given, taking up seven full lines of text and making it the longest bibliographical item. The author's name was changed from 'Beck (Jean)' to 'Beck (Dr J.-B.)'. The abbreviation for 'Johann-Baptist' set Beck in a German camp with Riemann and against the francophone majority of the bibliography, which included Aubry; the title 'Dr' was the only one in the bibliography, placing the lonely young titled author in a crowd of renowned but untitled scholars.

<sup>17</sup> Jean Beck, *La musique des troubadours: étude critique* (Les musiciens célèbres, ed. André Pirro; Paris, 1910), example on p. 48; Aubry, *Trouvères*, p. 104.

Beck's defiance was only increased by Aubry's subtle and spiteful belittlement in his *Trouvères et troubadours*, and he decided to strike back in kind, with an introductory book destined for a general audience. On the occasion of this, Beck's first work in French, he reversed Aubry's bibliographic alteration, switching his surname back from 'Johann-Baptist' to 'Jean'. Enraged at Aubry's violation of the verdict in the trial, Beck decided to bring his discovery to the French public, the very audience which Aubry was attempting to seduce in his *Trouvères et troubadours*. Beck's *La musique des troubadours* was probably completed swiftly, beginning in the spring of 1909, when *Trouvères et troubadours* appeared. A lengthy footnote on pages 45 and 46 set the record straight:

## John Haines



Ro - bert            ve - ez            de Per       -       ron

It was only a few months later that the instigator of the rhythm debate in secular monophony, Hugo Riemann, first declared Beck and Aubry as co-authors of the new theory. His article entitled 'Die Beck-Aubry'sche "modale Interpretation" der Troubadourmelodien' appeared in the 1 August issue of the *Sammelbände der Internationalen Musikgesellschaft*. The starting point of the 'Beck-Aubry'sche' theory, Riemann asserted, was Aubry's work from about 1900 on, which had lately been given concrete form by Jean Baptiste Beck. And although both had claimed priority in this theory, Aubry had recently admitted that Beck was the author. Riemann was hereby indirectly making the trial and its outcome public for the first time. The purpose of his article was, of course, to demonstrate that this new interpretation of troubadour and trouvère melodies was wrong. But Riemann furthermore penned

The method which has enabled me in this chapter to establish the principle of medieval notation, and which I had discovered as early as 1905, was first explained in 1907 by Mr Pierre Aubry, in a *Revue musicale* article (vol. 12, p. 352 and following) without any reference to my name, even though Mr Aubry's documentation rested on new information which I had given him in strict confidence, and which he had promised me he would keep to himself. My article in the Strasbourg *Caecilia* journal (July 1907, p. 97 and following), by setting the record straight, contains the first original exposé of my theory of the modal interpretation. It is developed in great detail in my *Melodien der Troubadours* (Strasbourg: Trübner, 1908).

(La méthode qui nous a servi, dans ce chapitre, à établir le principe des notations médiévales et que j'avais trouvée dès 1905, fut exposée pour la première fois en 1907 par M. Pierre Aubry, dans un article de la *Revue musicale*, tome XII, p. 352 ss., sans indication de mon nom, bien que la documentation de M. Aubry reposât sur des révélations que je lui avais faites et dont le caractère strictement confidentiel semblait être assuré par sa promesse de garder pour lui ma découverte. Mon article de la revue strasbourgeoise *Caecilia* (juillet 1907, p. 97 et suiv.), en mettant les choses au point, contient le premier exposé original de ma théorie de l'interprétation modale. Elle est développée avec tous les détails dans mes *Melodien der Troubadours*, Strasbourg, 1908 (Trübner, éditeur).)

To this continuation of the footnote quarrels of the modal theory was added a parenthetical addition to Aubry's 1910 *Trouvères et troubadours* listed in the bibliography on page 122: 'The first Paris 1909 edition had to be taken out of circulation' ('La 1<sup>re</sup> éd., Paris, 1909, a dû être retirée du commerce'). Of the forty-some works in the bibliography, the majority were in German, compared with the predominantly French works in Aubry's. Beck's cogent and accessible work marked the triumph of German scholarship in French territory.

an idea which has endured up until the present day, that of a joint system called the 'Beck–Aubry theory'. Indeed, as many readers would probably have agreed, the similarities between Beck's and Aubry's work were greater than their differences. For all intents and purposes, the modal interpretation or modal system, as Riemann alternatively called it, was a single doctrine founded by two authors.<sup>18</sup>

As if to further complicate matters, Friedrich Ludwig chose this moment to enter the fray with an article in the *Zeitschrift der Internationalen Musikgesellschaft*. He began by contradicting Riemann's statement that motets could hardly be used as evidence for the rhythmic interpretation of monophonic songs. On the contrary, Ludwig claimed, the study of the motet was the starting point for solving the question of monophonic rhythm, as he himself had first suggested in 1905. Both Beck and Aubry were indebted to him for this insight and therefore to call their new theory 'die Beck-Aubry'sche "modale Interpretation"' was a deception. He, Ludwig, had first communicated these ideas orally to Beck during the latter's student days at Strassburg between 1905 and 1907, instructing him on the rhythmic modes of polyphony and suggesting that these should be applied to monophonic songs. Beck had then passed this insight on to Aubry in the autumn of 1906; Ludwig himself also wrote to Aubry on the same topic in

<sup>18</sup> Riemann, 'Die Beck-Aubry'sche "modale Interpretation" der Troubadourmelodien', *Sammelbände der Internationalen Musikgesellschaft*, 11 (1910), pp. 569–89.

In this increasingly public debate pitting Aubry against Beck, Riemann's *Vierhebigkeit* was fast becoming parenthetical and, worse yet, old-fashioned. His *Sammelbände* article attempted once again to polarise the debate between himself and another camp by conflating two scholars into one, and to reinstate his *Vierhebigkeit* as the central monolithic system it had been in the 1890s. In coining the 'Beck-Aubry'sche' nickname, Riemann became the first to attempt to solve the paternity of the modal theory, an attempt which would continue up until Chailley and Gennrich a half century later (above, n. 1). Despite his title, it seems that Riemann could not decide between 'Beck–Aubry' and 'Aubry–Beck'. In the title and throughout most of Riemann's article, Beck's priority was asserted with the former appellation. But the transcriptions he critiqued were mostly Aubry's, and he wrote at one point exclusively of 'Aubry's discovery' (p. 572). Further on, he referred to the 'Aubry-Beck'sche System' (p. 579), and elsewhere their names were also found in this order (pp. 582–3). Apparently, he was undermining Beck's priority, despite the verdict in the trial. And when he cited Aubry's *La rythmique musicale*, the year of publication was given as 1906, a year earlier than it was actually published (p. 571)! On the other hand, Riemann's article, as stated in the body of this essay, did make public the verdict in the trial, and, for this reason, even more than Beck's *La musique des troubadours*, was probably the last straw which led to Aubry's suicide.

April 1907. So important was this to the Strassburg professor that he repeated these claims in an 'Excursus' in his *Repertorium* published a few months later. Neither Beck nor Aubry was to be declared the author of the modal interpretation, he concluded in both publications. It was he, Friedrich Ludwig, who had first discovered it. But by the time Ludwig's article actually appeared in September of 1910, a tragedy had occurred that would bring the entire quarrel to a sudden halt.<sup>19</sup>

With Riemann's August article, Beck and Aubry's disagreement over the paternity of the modal theory had become public knowledge. But this peculiar turn of events upset Beck even more, for

<sup>19</sup> Ludwig, 'Zur "modalen Interpretation" von Melodien des 12. und 13. Jahrhunderts', *Zeitschrift der Internationalen Musikgesellschaft*, 11 (1910), pp. 379–82; Ludwig, *Repertorium organorum recentioris et motetorum vetustissimi stili*, i, part 2: *Handschriften in Quadrat-Notation* (1910; repr. *Musicological Studies* 7, rev. L. Dittmer; New York, 1964), pp. 42–57.

Ludwig's sudden claims in 1910 to being the creator of the modal theory pleased very few. For Beck and Riemann as for the general musicological audience, he was just another voice in this increasingly confusing clamour. Besides, his claims were unverified. Where exactly had Ludwig first stated that motet repertoires were the key to unlocking the rhythm of trouvère songs, as he insisted? And just where were his transcriptions of troubadour and trouvère songs in modal rhythm? The only proof the Strassburg professor provided was in a footnote which cited an article entitled 'Die Aufgaben der Forschung auf dem Gebiete der mittelalterlichen Musikgeschichte', published in the supplement to volume 1 of the 1906 Munich *Allgemeine Zeitung* ('Zur "modalen" Interpretation', p. 381, n. 1; *Handschriften*, p. 55; a commentary and translation are provided in my forthcoming 'Friedrich Ludwig's "Musicology of the Future"'). As it turns out, this was the transcription of a speech given on the occasion of Ludwig's acceptance of the post of lecturer at the University of Strassburg in November 1905. He was probably counting on very few checking this reference, already difficult to find in 1910 and practically unavailable today – and for good reason. For in it, he had only briefly sketched his theory of a latent rhythm in non-mensural notation which could be checked by comparing later motets and mensurally notated monophonic songs. No specific evidence or transcriptions were given; the earliest of Ludwig's published monophonic transcriptions according to the modal interpretation date from 1924 (Ludwig, 'III. Conductus und Carmina Burana; Troubadours, Trouvères, Minnesinger und Meistersinger, die ältesten "Laudi" und die spanischen Cantigas; die Organa der Notre Dame-Schule; die älteste lateinische und französische Motette; der Sumer-Canon. Etwa 1150–1300', in G. Adler (ed.), *Handbuch der Musikgeschichte* (Frankfurt am Main, 1924), pp. 158–68).

Beck denied Ludwig's accusations of plagiarism in a supplement to his review of Aubry and A. Jeanroy's *Le chansonnier de l'Arsenal* ('Besprechungen', *Zeitschrift für romanische Philologie*, 34 (1910), pp. 738–46, at pp. 743–6). He insisted that he had already developed his interpretation prior to Ludwig's arrival in Strassburg in the autumn of 1905, and had presented his theory in a seminar presentation in the spring of that year, a fact which his dissertation supervisor, Gustav Gröber, had recently confirmed. Moreover, Beck revealed, he had instructed Ludwig in the application of his method, informing him of certain manuscripts of which Ludwig was not aware. According to Beck, Ludwig had even corrected proofs of his *Caecilia* article and was one of the readers of his dissertation; in both instances, he had nothing but praise. At no time until now, Beck declared, had he ever accused him of plagiarism.

the trial, rather than confirming his paternity as he had hoped, had instead produced Aubry's resistance, Riemann's meddling and Ludwig's wrath. Given Aubry's persistent refusal to have the verdict published in twenty journals, Beck took the matter into his own hands, and published the first one of these in the November 1910 issue of the *Annales du Midi*, with a second one sent to the *Internationale Musikgesellschaft* in June, published a year later. Meanwhile, practically no one was aware of the drastic toll which the controversy had taken on Aubry's health. Shortly after the trial, he had suffered a nervous breakdown and was now fighting bouts of intense depression. This was manifested in his dichotomous reaction to the verdict. Aubry followed his compliance in the matter of the emended edition with a public volte-face in two livid open letters to the jury published in the *Revue musicale*. The first of these, dated 15 May 1910, was a detailed rebuttal of the verdict, addressed to the man whom Aubry had picked to preside over the trial, Maurice Emmanuel. Aubry accused Emmanuel of incompetence, betrayal and ruining his life's work. He described the recent months as filled with 'waiting and reflection' and 'melancholy'. In a second, terse open letter dated 1 June and addressed to the members of the jury, Aubry denied ever agreeing with the verdict. He concluded with an eerie tone of resignation:

I shall conclude the matter here, and, when I soon speak again of the troubadours and trouvères, it will be, I hope, unhampered by fruitless preoccupations with personal polemic.

(Nous fermerons ici l'incident, et quand nous reparlerons bientôt des troubadours et des trouvères, nous le ferons, j'espère, sans la préoccupation stérile des polémiques personnelles.)

These were Aubry's last printed words. The musicological world was soon stunned to hear that on 31 August 1910, only thirty days after the appearance of Riemann's article which publicly acknowledged Beck as author of the modal theory, Pierre Aubry had accidentally died of a fencing wound. Rumours naturally emerged that he had been preparing to duel with Beck. But Aubry's death had actually been a suicide, one covered up in a routine fencing practice session in his summer vacation spot at Dieppe. This was clear to his intimate acquaintances, although practically no one else knew it at the time, least of all Beck, who actually believed Aubry

had been preparing for a duel with him. In fact, Beck's false belief is the rumour which has remained popular in scholarly circles up until the present day.<sup>20</sup>

A half year had passed since the tragic suicide when the trial proceedings were finally made public by Beck in the *Sammelbände der Internationalen Musikgesellschaft*. The international community of musicologists was informed of the details of the trial and the events which had led up to it: Aubry's *Revue musicale* and Beck's *Caecilia* articles, Aubry's *Trouvères et troubadours*, the ensuing trial and unanimous verdict, Aubry's emended book and finally, Beck's own *Musique des troubadours*. This account was followed by a copy of the June 1909 verdict. The article had been motivated in greater part by Riemann's earlier piece in the same journal where he had falsely claimed that Beck and Aubry were both equal founders of the new modal system. But, Beck insisted, he and he alone was the author of the new theory. He concluded with the following words:

Now I hope that in future reviews or critiques of works in which my modal interpretation of troubadour melodies is well or ill used, that the rights of the founder will no longer be violated in favour of a plagiarist's. Once again: *Suum cuique!*

(Nunmehr hoffe ich, daß in künftigen Referaten oder Kritiken über Arbeiten, in welchen meine modale Interpretation der Troubadoursmelodien gut oder schlecht angewendet wird, nicht mehr Rechte des Besitzers zu Gunsten eines Entlehnners beeinträchtigt werden. Abermals: *Suum cuique!*)

Although the article was dated June 1910, the editors had apparently delayed its publication following the news of Aubry's death,

<sup>20</sup> Beck, 'Correspondance'; Beck, 'Zur der Aufstellung'; Aubry, 'Lettre ouverte', pp. 263 and 269; Aubry, in 'Publications, œuvres nouvelles et exécutions', *Revue musicale*, 10 (1910), p. 318. On the myths and facts surrounding Aubry's death, see J. Haines, 'The "Modal Theory"'.  
The vitriol hitherto hidden in the notes slowly wafted up into the body of the text, death shuffling close behind. Now swinging ever more dangerously between emotional extremes, Aubry slowly realised that he would never be able to undo, or even put behind him the verdict in the trial, especially not with this growing crowd of claimants. The recent months had heaped disgrace upon disgrace: Beck's new book, then Riemann's article reducing him to Beck's forerunner; it is also possible that Aubry knew of Ludwig's upcoming article, even though it appeared after his death. These publications naggingly echoed what was for Aubry the deepest humiliation, to have been discredited by his own people. In his open letter, he lashed out at Maurice Emmanuel: 'Where are the services which you personally have rendered to French musicology?' ('Où sont les services que personnellement vous avez pu rendre à la musicologie française?', p. 269). By dishonouring him, Aubry continued, Emmanuel had dealt France's musicological heritage a wound from which it would never recover (p. 270).

in order to soften the blow of its combative tone. But it would have been bad timing one way or another. For by this time Beck, now informally cast out of certain European academic circles, was already making plans for his permanent emigration to the United States.<sup>21</sup>

<sup>21</sup> Beck, 'Zur Aufstellung', pp. 316–24.

Beck's insistence on being vindicated even after Aubry's death ultimately cost him an academic post in Europe, for the published trial, no matter how just its verdict, made Aubry a musicological martyr and Beck his persecutor. Meanwhile, Beck subtly appealed to musicological judicial precedents. His concluding *Suum cuique*, prefaced by its enigmatic 'once again' ('Abermals'), was a direct reference to an earlier footnote quarrel over the origins of neumatic notation. In 1852, Coussemaker announced his theory of the origins of neumes in grammatical accents. A few years later, Théodore Nisard claimed in a footnote that he, not Coussemaker, had first revealed this theory in 1848–9. In 1889, the editors of the *Paléographie musicale* pronounced in a footnote their verdict that Nisard's claims were null, concluding with the phrase *Cuique suum*, that is, 'to each his own' (*Paléographie musicale*, i: *Le codex 339 de la bibliothèque de Saint Gall* (Solesmes, 1889), p. 102, n. 1). Jules Combarieu, Aubry's close friend and colleague, later referred to this footnote verdict as a judicial sentence which had put into practice musicology's penal code, as he put it (J. Combarieu, 'Archéologie musicale de Coussemaker et Th. Nisard', *La Tribune de Saint-Gervais*, 9 (1895), p. 10). It is possible, although not presently demonstrable, that Combarieu was the one who had suggested the idea of a trial to Aubry in 1909. This would in part explain his expansive public grief in the *Revue musicale* and his citation of earlier words spoken to his friend: "Your writings are a glory to us in the sight of foreigners" ("Ce que vous écrivez est pour nous un titre d'honneur aux yeux de l'étranger"; 'Discours sur Pierre Aubry', *Revue musicale*, 10 (1910), p. 486).

Following the announcement of Aubry's death, the *Sammelbände* editors delayed the appearance of Beck's article until the following year. Beck, feeling increasingly attacked, added a postscript to his article berating the editors for their delay and accusing Johannes Wolf, in his recent obituary of Aubry, of glorifying the French scholar at his expense and calling the entire trial into question (Wolf, 'Pierre Aubry †', *Zeitschrift der Internationalen Musikgesellschaft*, 12 (1910–11), pp. 13–15). Beck partially cited from the following, taken from Wolf's conclusion:

The fact that he who called himself the father of the (modal) idea needed to bring in support troops from France simply confirms the old saying that a prophet is least honoured in his own country. The greater the accomplishment, the greater the rivalry . . . Aubry assured me of the independence of his research with evidence from his own hand, and I believe him (p. 15).

(Wenn ihm, der sich offenbar als der Vater des Gedankens aufspielte, Hilfstruppen in Frankreich erstanden, so beweist dies nur die traurige Wahrheit des alten Satzes von Propheten, der nichts in seinem Vaterlande gilt. Je bedeutsamer die Leistung, um so größer die Anfeindung . . . Aubry hat mir die Unabhängigkeit seiner Forschung in die Hand versichert und ich glaube ihm.)

In several footnotes to his appendix (p. 321, n. 2; p. 322, n. 1), Beck enumerated Wolf's oversights and cited incriminating private correspondence from him. The appendix concluded with Beck's further defence against Ludwig's accusations.

But the *Sammelbände* editors did not allow Beck to have the last word. His bitter postscript was followed by a one-paragraph counter by Johannes Wolf which concluded the article. Wolf candidly stated that the trial and Aubry's death had been a blow to musicology and had furthermore caused personal sorrow both to him and to many of his colleagues. Aubry was not guilty of plagiarism, he maintained; the jury's verdict was

In an ironic twist to this story, only seventeen years later Beck completely revised his modal theory in his edition and commentary of the Cangé chansonnier (Paris, BN f. fr. 846). Just as the single Bamberg manuscript had led Aubry to his new conclusions in 1907, so it was one book which now changed Beck's mind, a then little-known troper in the Cistercian convent of Las Huelgas (Burgos). Beck's study of the mensural pieces in this manuscript had led him to conclude that the coincidence between poetic tonic accent and longer musical duration occurred far less frequently than he had hitherto imagined. This admission flew in the face of his previous modal interpretation, as he himself conceded. His new conclusion was that an isochronous rather than a modal approach had prevailed prior to the late twelfth century, that is, up to and including the time of many troubadours and the earliest trouvères. Beck now believed that the troubadour and trouvère repertoires were not to be transcribed exclusively in triple metre, but also in duple time, as well as in rhythmic mode 5; most of his transcriptions of the melodies of the Cangé manuscript were either in three-four or four-four metre, however. Twenty years after Riemann's *Vierhebigkeit* and Aubry's advocacy of rhythmic mode 5, both of which he had vigorously condemned, Beck had come around to his deceased opponents' point of view.<sup>22</sup>

questionable, since no specialist of medieval music had been on the panel. It was Ludwig, if anyone, who was the real author of the modal theory, he concluded, although Beck did deserve credit for its unprecedented development, and for this reason alone the jury's decision was to be respected despite its shortcomings. The last statement, cited above, might have read as a concession to Beck, except for Wolf's final sentence which followed: 'But panels of judges are also prone to err' ('Aber auch Richterkollegien können irren', p. 324).

<sup>22</sup> Jean Beck, *Les chansonniers des troubadours et des trouvères: le Chansonnier Cangé* (Corpus cantilenarum medii aevi, no. 1, ser. 1; Philadelphia, 1927), ii, pp. (35)–(64).

Nearly twenty years after the trial, Beck had undergone not only a theoretical change but an identity transformation in his new American homeland. He was teaching Romance philology and writing exclusively in French, with his Christian name permanently changed to Jean. (By this time too, Alsace had returned to France.) An Aubry-like patriotism was expressed in note 41 of page (56) in volume 2 of his *Chansonnier Cangé* edition. Here, Beck wrote that France was the cradle of polyphony, whose art had come much later in Germany. This statement nearly echoed Aubry's discussed above in nn. 6 and 15. Furthermore, Beck's 1908 *Melodien der Troubadours* was cited throughout as *Mél. d. Troubadours* (e.g., p. (56)), the abbreviation denying its Germanness while retaining the letters of the original title, and the acute accent suggesting instead a French work. Nonetheless, the old spectre of the modal-theory debate still loomed: in footnote 28 on page (52), Beck fervently defended his paternity against Ludwig's 1910 claims.

From whence had come Beck's knowledge of the Barcelona manuscript? In note 17 on page (45), he revealed that the monks at the monastery of Burgos had sent to Pierre

Beck's change of mind marked a turning point in the reception of medieval monophony: the beginning of the decline of the modal theory. As scholars accommodated the system to various repertoires by making it more flexible, it was prevented from becoming a unified, universal system. Higinio Anglés's study of the cantiga repertoire in the 1940s led him to accept binary and mixed metres; Heinrich Husmann limited the period and regions of modal activity and expanded possibilities within the modal framework; and the most ardent and prolific proponent of the modal theory, Friedrich Gennrich, offered increasingly subjective and unsystematic transcriptions. By mid-century, a wave of critics was dismissing the theory, reviewing the feuding past with contempt. When Jacques Chailley, in his preface to Higinio Anglés's posthumous edition of Thibaut de Navarre's melodies, summarised the state of the modal theory in 1973, it was more as a reminiscence of a mighty trend now thankfully past than as a presentation of a viable method. Even Anglés, Chailley wrote, once a stalwart defender of the modal theory, had later grown weary of it – 'like many others', Chailley added. The quarrels of the modal theory had taken their toll, and the old field of rhythmic studies in medieval monophony, weighed down with controversy and tainted

Aubry a complete photographic reproduction of the troper so he could identify its contents. 'Aubry lent it to me', Beck continued, 'and I copied it entirely' ('Aubry me la communiqua et j'en pris une copie complète'). In another unrelated matter, Beck claimed in note 31 on page (52) that some of Friedrich Gennrich's transcriptions had plagiarised his own. For this reason, none of Gennrich's works had been included in his bibliography.

Gennrich responded to this accusation a few years later in a lengthy footnote which further revealed what he claimed was the truth about the Barcelona troper (Gennrich, 'Lateinische Kontrafakta altfranzösischer Lieder', *Zeitschrift für romanische Philologie*, 50 (1930), pp. 195–6, n. 1). He first countered that Beck was not the author of the modal theory, but his teacher Friedrich Ludwig, a fact which Beck had himself admitted, Gennrich insisted. As for Beck's access to the Barcelona troper, Gennrich had news for his readers. Given the tension between Aubry and Beck after 1907, he argued, how could Aubry have lent his adversary these precious photographs in 1910? The truth was quite different, Gennrich announced. According to him, shortly after Aubry's death, Beck had gone through his archives recently donated to the Sorbonne by his widow, and had stolen the Burgos photographs sent five years earlier by the monks of Silos. Gennrich would repeat this claim several decades later ('Initiator', pp. 329–30). Whether or not Gennrich's claim was true will have to wait for further discoveries, since I have been unable to locate these photographs either in Aubry's archives at the Sorbonne or in Beck's archives at Princeton University.

with ill rumours, was slowly – although not entirely – being deserted in favour of less controversial topics.<sup>23</sup>

Shorter College

<sup>23</sup> Anglés, *La música de las cantigas de Santa María del Rey Alfonso el Sabio*, 3 vols. (Publicaciones de la sección de música, 15, 18 and 19; Barcelona, 1943–5), vols. 17, pp. 44–6 and 19, pp. 177–9; Husmann, ‘Zur Rhythmik des Trouvèregesanges’, *Musikforschung*, 6 (1953), pp. 110–31; Gennrich, *Neidhart-Lieder* (Summa musicae medii aevi, 9; Frankfurt, 1962); id., *Der musikalische Nachlaß der Troubadours* (Summa musicae medii aevi, 3, 4 and 15; Darmstadt, 1958); id., *Exempla altfranzösischer Lyrik* (Musikwissenschaftliche Studien-Bibliothek, 17; Darmstadt, 1958), to name just a few. Two useful post-modal theory retrospectives are B. Kippenberg, *Der Rhythmus im Minnesang* (Munich, 1962) and H. van der Werf, *The Chansons of the Troubadours and Trouvères: A Study of the Melodies and their Relation to the Poems* (Utrecht, 1972). Chailley’s preface is found in H. Anglés, *Las canciones del Rey Teobaldo (Obra póstuma)*, ed. A. Sagaseta (Pamplona, 1973).

The debate between Jacques Chailley and Friedrich Gennrich on the paternity of the modal theory, discussed at the start of this essay, did not end with Gennrich’s 1961 article. In a footnote to Anglés’s posthumous edition (p. 14, n. 5), six years after Gennrich’s death, Chailley had the last word. He quoted a letter from Félix Raugel, an old student of Pierre Aubry’s, dated 1 December 1961, in response to Gennrich’s claims that Aubry had admitted that Beck was the author of the modal theory. Raugel knew Aubry at the time of the trial and stated that he had suffered a nervous breakdown (‘dépression nerveuse’). This had led him to make contradictory statements, first granting the paternity of the theory to Beck, then, in the months before his death, denying this vigorously, as I have explained above. But Raugel’s full disclosure was not included in Chailley’s footnote. In 1995, Jacques Chailley finally revealed to me what Raugel had mentioned to him by word of mouth, that Aubry’s death had been a covered-up suicide (‘un suicide déguisé’). Evidence discovered shortly before Chailley’s disclosure confirmed Raugel’s statement, and both findings were made public in 1997 (Haines, ‘The “Modal Theory”’).

The full story has been told here for the first time.