

Editing the Cortona Laudario

THEODORE KARP

When Petrarch sent a copy of St. Augustine's *Confessiones* to his brother Gherardo, he included with his gift a cautionary letter. "As regards this book," he wrote, "its very cover will warn you of what to expect: new and naked, it has yet to undergo careful correction. It was handwritten by my helper whom you saw there with me last year, a young man more skillful with his hands than with his mind."¹ The same circumspection is expressed in more general—and equally haughty—terms earlier in the letter. "What shall I say of others who . . . through clear and uncorrupt judgment have become learned? Such men are ever a rarity, but in our age a truly rare species indeed! Not even from them may you always expect perfectly correct manuscripts: they deal with greater and nobler matters. . . . [I]t is the work of the ordinary intellect to prepare materials needed by the noble intellect. Thus among us, some scrape parchment, others write books, others correct them, . . . the noble intellect aspires to higher things, foregoing the humbler ones."²

73

Volume XI • Number 1 • Winter 1993

The Journal of Musicology © 1993 by the Regents of the University of California

¹ "De libro autem hoc quid speres ipsa te libri facies monebit. Novus et nudus est et nullo correctoris dente percussus. Familiaris illum meus scripsit, quem mecum intra tuum limen anno altero vidisti, juvenis, digit quam ingenii melioris." (Giuseppe Fracassetti, ed. *Francisci Petrarcae: Epistolae de Rebus Familiaribus et Variae*; Florence, 1862, 482.) Translation from Aldo S. Bernardo, *Francesco Petrarca: Letters on Familiar Matters: Rerum familiarium libri, XVII–XXIV* [= Vol. 3]; Baltimore, 1985, 51.

² "Quid de aliis dicam, qui . . . veri incorrupto iudicio sunt? Rarum semper, nostra autem aetate rarissimum genus. Sed ne ab illis quidem semper correctos ad unguem codices expectis. Maiora quaedam et laudabiliora pertractant. . . . Plebeii opus ingenii est praeparare, quod nobile consumet ingenium. Sic apud nos alii membranas radunt, alii libros scribunt, alii corrigunt. . . . Generosum ingenium altius aspirat, humiliora praetervolans." Fracassetti, ed., *Epistolae*, 481. Translation from Bernardo, *Letters*, 50. A brilliant exhibition, entitled *Bibliotheca Corviniana 1490–1990*, was held at the National Széchényi Library, April 6–October 6, 1990 (Palace of Buda Castle), Budapest. I found it fascinating to read some of the notes made by Archbishop János Vitéz, an early owner of some of the MSS on display, and list here his remarks: a) Budapest, Egyetemi Könyvtar, Cod. Lat. 9 = Tacitus: *Annales, Historiae*; Inscription at end: 1,

The modern scholar generally seeks to exercise necessary prudence in evaluating source readings by utilizing procedures developed by philologists for the establishment of critical texts. But what are we to do when concordances are either lacking or inconclusive? Then we find ourselves in more difficult straits. Particularly when dealing with monophonic repertoires, judgments of MS accuracy may depend upon the cultivation of a sense of style, and such a sense may easily be shaped (if not warped) by personal biases. The melodies of the well-known *laudario*, Cortona, Biblioteca comunale MS 91, illustrate problems of this sort.

My attention was attracted to this source when perusing the transcription of *Laude novella* in Richard Hoppin's excellent *Anthology of Medieval Music*.³ I found that my conception of the melody differed significantly from that of the distinguished editor. Pursuing this subject, I quickly found that mine was a minority opinion. The melody is fairly well-known, having been issued previously not only by Fernando Liuzzi, the editor of the extraordinarily handsome *La Lauda e i primordi della melodia italiana*,⁴ but also by Agostino Ziino,⁵ and by Higinì Anglès.⁶ Moreover, it has been available in a recording based on a transcription by Clemente Terni.⁷ All of these scholars agree that the MS is inaccurate and that the last phrase should be realized a third higher than written. I concur with this judgment, but not with other aspects of their respective interpretations.

My curiosity having been piqued, I went on to examine more closely the facsimiles and transcriptions provided in Liuzzi's edition. This study unexpectedly aroused suspicion that approximately a third of the Cortona readings contain either minor or major corruptions, owing either to scribal inaccuracy or to access to an inferior oral source. Often these passages were passed over in silence by the editor.

Archbishop János, read this manuscript in 1467, but it has not been corrected." b) Budapest, Egyetemi Könyvtar, Cod. Lat. 31 = Terentius, *Comoediae*; corrected by János Vitéz. c) Budapest, Országos Széchényi Könyvtar, Cod. Lat. 370 = Marius Victorinus, *Comentarii in Ciceronis Librum de Inventione*, f. 94v; "As far as I was able, I corrected this work in Saeben (= Sibiu), completing these corrections on 27 September 1462." c) Budapest, Országos Széchényi Könyvtar, Cod. Lat. 334 = Johannes Scholasticus, *Spiritualis Gradatio* (end of MS); "I completed the reading and correction on 26 September 1470." While various musical sources of the Middle Ages and Renaissance contain corrections, the authors of these are unknown. It would be of great interest to have more information concerning proofreading practices for music.

³ P. 103f (New York, 1978).

⁴ Rome, 1935.

⁵ *Strutture Strofiche nel Laudario di Cortona* (Palermo, 1968), 45.

⁶ "The Musical Notation and Rhythm of the Italian Laude," *Essays in Musicology: a Birthday Offering for Willi Apel* (Bloomington, Ind., 1968) 58.

⁷ *Musica Italica: Laudario di Cortona*, Musical Heritage Society, MHS 858 (issued originally by Angelicum Dischi).

Either they were regarded as permissible within the stylistic canon or they had escaped his eye. Because more than a half-century had elapsed since the issuance of Liuzzi's work, I proceeded to explore more recent publications to learn whether these melodies had drawn subsequent comment. It was soon apparent that some had. My findings overlapped those of intervening scholars. In the critical study that forms part of the monumental edition, *La música de las Cantigas de Santa María del Rey Alfonso el Sabio*, Higiní Anglès noted that the Liuzzi edition was defective.⁸ However, he chose to cite only some of the evidence for this charge.⁹ He did likewise for the laude of Florence, Biblioteca nazionale centrale, Banco Rari MS 18 (Magliabecchi II.I. 122).¹⁰ Unfortunately, not all of his comments are explicit.

Other scholars after Anglès had also reached some of the same conclusions. Independently, we had each succeeded in reinventing the wheel. But, strange to tell, our several wheels are of different sizes and have varying numbers of spokes. This is somewhat unsettling in itself, but still more disturbing is the absence of public discussion of the principles by which one may determine whether the reading of a monophonic unicum is trustworthy or not. This is not a healthy situation.

The purpose of this essay is to initiate discussion of criteria for the editing of this important genre of medieval monophony. Naturally, I hope that my assessment of individual pieces will be regarded as sound. But it is the issue of editorial policy that constitutes my underlying concern. It is possible, as I hope to show, to establish a normative stylistic canon for the Cortona repertoire. There are, however, a sizeable number of pieces that ostensibly contravene this canon in one way or another. At what point is the editor constrained to intervene? To what extent does the clear example of the majority weigh on and control our understanding of the minority? Basically my assessment of the MS is such that I consider an interventionist editorial policy to be necessary. The suitability of such policy may well form the focus of debate.

As is well known, the lauda structure consists of a refrain and a series of strophes. The refrain (*ripresa*) generally comprises two lines, but may occasionally encompass either three or four. The strophe is longer than the refrain. Most frequently it is made up of four lines,

⁸ Vol. III, pt. 2 (Barcelona, 1958), 503. It is unfortunate that the considerable section devoted to the laude (pp. 483–516) is not listed in the bibliography to the article by John Stevens in *The New Grove Dictionary of Music and Musicians* (edited by Stanley Sadie), X, 542.

⁹ "En esta ocasión me limito a señalar algunos casos," *Cantigas*, III:2, p. 503.

¹⁰ *Ibid.*, 503–4.

but when the refrain is longer than average, the strophe may have up to eight lines. Only the refrain and the first of the strophes are provided with music. There is but one exception to these rules of thumb. *Madonna, santa Maria*¹¹ consists of a uniform series of quatrains. The first of these is provided with music, while the staves for the second—corresponding to the normal first strophe—are left blank. As far as one can tell, the same music was intended to hold for this and all later strophes.

The MS itself emphasizes the distinctiveness of the two elements of the form by beginning the initial strophes on a fresh staff even if space remains following the conclusion of the refrain.¹² And the opening of the first strophe is further signaled by the presence of a minor initial. I mention these simple points because the layout of the Liuzzi edition underplays the distinction between the two elements and does not impress on the reader the necessity for the intervening and concluding refrains. Most melodies end the *ripresa* and the strophe on the same tone, and there is often a formal parallelism between the concluding phrases of each. If in the remaining instances we allow ourselves to lose sight of the necessity for the recurrent and concluding refrains, then we run the danger of confusing *ouvert* and *clos* cadences.

76

The notation is generally entered on a four-line staff, although staves of only two or three lines are employed as well. Each staff is normally headed up by a clef, and there are instances where two clefs are employed simultaneously. In addition, the scribe normally places a *custos* at the end of the respective lines. However, *custodes* are lacking between *ripresa* and strophe, and there are occasions when clefs too are lacking. These omissions provide difficulties in more than one instance. General opinion seems to hold that not all solutions offered by Liuzzi are well advised. Although other repertoires of monophony in the vernacular make use of flats and even sharps, these are entirely lacking in the Cortona laudario. It is not surprising that scholars differ in their assessment of when these ought to be supplied editorially.

Even cursory acquaintance with the melodies of the Cortona laudario will leave the observer with the impression of sturdy charm. The melodies are for the most part simple and direct, with a very clear sense of tonal order. They avoid the artificial and precious, the tortuous and the subtle. While some lauda melodies are throughcomposed, they tend on the whole to employ in the latter parts of the

¹¹ Liuzzi, *Lauda*, I, 270.

¹² The same practice is not followed in the Florence MS, B.R. 18.

strophe elements drawn from the *ripresa*. Indeed there are occasions when the entire strophe may be constructed from the repetition of the two phrases of the *ripresa*. The single most frequent form employs new material for the opening of the strophe and reuses the phrases of the *ripresa* for the end. The result is a structure equivalent to that of the ballata, with a *ripresa*, two *piedi*, *volta*, and return to the *ripresa*. There is no uniform concern to maintain literal repetition. Often enough a later statement may differ from an earlier in one or more details. I would attribute these differences to a fairly free mode of performance rather than to self-conscious variations or notational lapses. Freedom in performance would have been necessary to accommodate irregularities in poetic structure. While the general outlines of the poetic forms are clear enough, the poets did not feel constrained to maintain an exact equivalence of syllables in the respective lines of successive strophes. Furthermore, the musical settings often display a cavalier attitude towards the observance of elisions. Syllabication too may be inconsistent. In the *ripresa* of *San Iovanni al mond' e nato*, the word *Dio* is treated as having only one syllable, while in the opening phrase of the strophe, it is given two; in the *ripresa* of *Stomme allegro, pauroso* is allotted three musical units, whereas it is given four units when repeated immediately at the opening of the strophe. (See Examples 15 and 17 respectively.) The charm of the melodies lies in their natural freshness.

The sense of tonal clarity referred to above is in part a result of the repetitive elements of the formal structure, but it goes far deeper. Tonal order is inherent in the construction of individual phrases and in the manner in which these relate to one another. Well over half of the melodies occupy an authentic range, with noticeable emphases on the final, third, and fifth degrees.¹³ The structural tones are made clear by their appearance at the beginnings and ends of phrases, by relative frequency of occurrence, and by being reached or left by skip. The central function exercised by the final is generally quite marked. In some instances the underlying chain of thirds includes the seventh degree, while in others the structure depends more on the upper octave. In some five instances—including one emended through editorial intervention—the range occupies primarily the interval between the final and fifth degree. Constructions occupying the combined plagal and authentic ranges appear in *Spiritu sancto, dolce*

¹³ Charts of the main structural tones of the various melodies yield results comparable in many ways to the charts provided by Leo Treitler in his article, "Tone System in the Secular Works of Guillaume Dufay," *Journal of the American Musicological Society*, XVIII (1965), 155–62.

*amore*¹⁴ and in *Stomme allegro et latioso*.¹⁵ It is likely that *Altissima luce col grande splendore*¹⁶ and *Regina sovrana de gram pietade*¹⁷ belong to the same classification; these will be discussed in detail at a later point. Plagal constructions occur only seldom; *Chi vole lo mondo despreççare*,¹⁸ *San Iovanni al mond' è nato*,¹⁹ and *Salutiam divotamente*²⁰ furnish instances of this tonal formation. In addition, there are isolated examples that do not easily fit standard theoretical stereotypes. *Fami cantar l'amor di la beata*²¹ begins an octave above the final and descends, emphasizing the sixth and fourth degrees far more than the fifth and third. (The fourth degree is the cadential goal of the first phrase of the *ripresa*, which recurs as the first and third phrases of the strophe.) It is likely that *Vergene donçella da Dio amata*²² was intended to have a similar form of construction, albeit one that takes the fourth degree as the initial point of departure. This melody is another special instance that will be examined later. Finally, one must mention *Onne homo ad alta voce*.²³ This melody opens and cadences on *a* (the only example to do so). It extends downward in a chain of thirds to *d*. If one agrees that the concordance in the Florence MS Banco Rari 18 furnishes the correct reading, the highest pole of the melody is *d'*.

78

The Cortona MS itself alerts us to the need for a cautious appraisal of *Laudamo la resurrextione*.²⁴ The first staff presents the initial phrase complete, together with the first two syllables of the second phrase and their accompanying tones. The melody rises steadily over the interval of an octave, lending slight emphasis to the third degree by means of the opening skip. The peak of the octave having been reached, the melody turns downward to the fifth, reached on the final accented syllable. The phrase concludes with a binaria leading from the seventh degree to the sixth. According to the first staff, this binaria launches a continuing downward descent, the second phrase beginning a fifth above the first. However, when the first two tones are repeated on the second staff, the clef has changed, and the resultant pitches are a fifth higher than initially. Which of the two versions is correct?

¹⁴ Liuzzi, *Lauda*, I, 376.

¹⁵ *Ibid.*, 404.

¹⁶ *Ibid.*, 284.

¹⁷ *Ibid.*, 296.

¹⁸ *Ibid.*, 414.

¹⁹ *Ibid.*, 453.

²⁰ *Ibid.*, 475.

²¹ *Ibid.*, 288.

²² *Ibid.*, 322.

²³ *Ibid.*, 362.

²⁴ *Ibid.*, 372.

One might hope for some guidance in this matter from the concordance to be found in the Florence Banco Rari MS 18. Unfortunately, the Florence reading is unstable itself, and, quite apart from the passage in question, does not maintain a constant intervallic relationship with the Cortona version.²⁵ Banco Rari 18 provides three *figurae* for the opening of the second strophe, the second (a *climacus*) being curiously subdivided by an extended vertical stroke. It is disturbing to find that not only do these seven preliminary tones differ in detail from the corresponding opening of the initial strophe, but they differ in register.

Faced with the quandary posed by the Cortona MS, Liuzzi opted for the second of the two continuations. His choice seems unfortunate. The result is not only a strained melodic profile, but an underlying set of tonal piers that is without a counterpart elsewhere in the repertoire. As discussed previously, most laude evolve within a basic framework of an octave. In each of the two examples of combined plagal and authentic ranges cited above, the lowest pier is a fourth beneath the final, and not a fifth. If we opt for this second of our choices, we posit a strained structure for the *ripresa*. No such difficulties are encountered if we assume instead that the reading of the first staff is correct and follow through, ignoring either the initial clef or all later ones. On the whole, the version of Banco Rari 18 corroborates the option recommended here. However, the corroboration is weakened by the fact that this reading rises only to the seventh degree rather than the octave, and thus the second phrase begins a fourth rather than a fifth above the initial pitch. In addition, the cadence to the Florence version ends a second above the initial pitch, rather than on the same pitch, as seemingly implied in the Cortona version. Whether the basic melody is best notated beginning on *c* or on *g* is moot; compensation can be made in terms of editorial accidentals. I find it simplest to notate the piece on *g*, as in Example 1.²⁶ The same solution was reached earlier in the recording directed by Clemente Terni.

Comparisons between the Cortona and Florence readings of *Altissima luce col grande splendore*²⁷ and *Regina sovrana de gram pietade*²⁸ are more helpful, although still frustrating in some respects. Although the two poems have slightly different structures they are both set by the same basic melody. The strophes of the former are composed of hendecasyllabic quatrains, although the concluding line of the first

²⁵ Liuzzi, *Lauda*, II, 100.

²⁶ The first phrase is written a fifth lower in the MS.

²⁷ Liuzzi, *Lauda*, I, 284.

²⁸ *Ibid.*, 296.

EXAMPLE 1. Emended version of *Laudamo la resurrection*.

8 Lau - da - mo la re - sur - re - cti - o - ne

8 E la mi - ra - bi - le a - scen - sio - ne. Fine.

8 Di Ie - su Cri - sto, fi - liol de Di - o,

8 Ch'al suo pa - dre se ne gi - o

8 E'n co - tal di en ci - el sa - li - o:

8 San Mar - co'l di - ce in su - o ser - mo - ne. D.C.

strophe is over full. In contrast, the quatrains of the second poem end with a hexasyllabic line.

In both instances, the Cortona readings begin and end the *ripresa* on *f*. The melody ascends conjunctly to *a*, descends to *c*, cadences on *f*, and then resumes the upward motion to *c'* and *d'*. The structural underpinning is unequivocal. In both instances the Cortona MS begins the first strophe on the upper sixth. This is surprising in itself, because such a beginning is atypical. When laude begin the strophe at a high level the normal pitch at this juncture is the upper octave. This is true of no less than eight melodies in the Cortona laudario, and is likely true for five more, including these two.²⁹ The corroboration between the two Cortona readings may momentarily allay our suspicions, but these return in force when we find that in both instances the

²⁹ See *Fami cantar* (288), *Ave, vergene* (308), *Ben è crudel* (348), *Iesu Cristo* (366), *Spiritu sancto da servire* (386), *Alta trinità* (390), *Ciascun ke fede* (427), and *Ogn' om canti* (456). See further the previous discussion of *Laudamo la resurrectione* and the later discussion of *Venite a laudare* (256) and *Peccatrice nominata* (326).

Florence MS begins the respective strophes on the upper octave.³⁰ The version of *Altissima luce* in this source unaccountably begins the ripresa on *c'* before abruptly switching to the *f* level at the beginning of the second staff. (The intended interval between the two staves is, however, indicated correctly by the *custos*.) And the ripresa ends with an unexpected upward motion to *a* rather than the normative downward cadence to *f*. No such difficulties affect the Florence reading of *Regina sovrana*. Here, however, the seven tones given for the beginning of the second strophe do not correspond in register or shape to their counterparts in the first strophe.

The final two phrases of the strophes parallel the two phrases of the ripresa. In the two versions of the Florence source, these are identical in pitch height with their counterparts. By beginning the strophes at the dubious interval of a sixth above the final, the Cortona MS places these phrases a third below their initial level. John Stevens has already drawn attention to this anomaly in his transcription of *Altissima luce* for his section of the article on the 'Lauda spirituale' in the *New Grove Dictionary of Music and Musicians*.³¹ I concur fully with his position, as may be seen in Examples 2³² and 3.³³ It may be noted, however, that Agostino Ziino³⁴ and Clemente Terni accept the Cortona reading as it stands.

A point of special interest in the construction of *Regina sovrana de gram pietade* lies in the way in which the melody is modified to accommodate the final short line of verse. Instead of eliminating part of the final phrase of the ripresa or furnishing a new melody, we find that the final phrase is given in full, beginning with the tone setting the sixth syllable of the penultimate line. (Cf. the bracketed sections marked 'x' in the example.) The opening of the penultimate line is set to the first six tones of the initial phrase of the ripresa. Momentarily the structural elements of poetry and music are at odds with one another.³⁵ Though unexpected, this asymmetrical transfer of material is understandable when the same intervallic qualities are maintained. It is far less so if almost all of these qualities are changed. The latter procedure seems

³⁰ Liuzzi, *Lauda*, II, 120, 156, resp.

³¹ X, 539.

³² The strophe reads a third lower in the MS than given here.

³³ The strophe reads a third lower in the MS than given here.

³⁴ *Strutture Strofiche*, 46f.

³⁵ For comparable examples occurring among trouvère chansons, see this author's "Interrelationships between Poetic and Musical Form in Trouvère Song," *A Musical Offering: Essays in Honor of Martin Bernstein*, ed. by E. Clinkscale and C. Brook (New York, 1977), 137–61. Similar occurrences are to be found in the repertoire of chant, as, for example, in Sanctus I.

THE JOURNAL OF MUSICOLOGY

EXAMPLE 2. Emended version of *Altissima luce col grande splendore*.

Al - tis - si - ma lu - ce col gran - de splen - do - re,
 In voi, dol - ce a - mo - re, a - giam con - so - lan - ça. Fine.
 A - ve, re - gi - na, pul - cell' a - mo - ro - sa,
 Stel - la ma - ri - na, ke non stai na - sco - sa,
 Lu - ce di - vi - na, vir - tù gra - ti - o - sa,
 Bel - le - ça for - mo - sa, di Dio se' sem - blan - ça. D.C.

82

to me to involve a kind of musical sophistication that is at odds with the general style of the repertoire.

While the value of the Florence concordances is somewhat lessened in the above instances by problems inherent within that source, the situation is other with regard to *Onne homo ad alta voce*.³⁶ Here Banco Rari 18 presents a reading without corruptions that is clearly superior to that of Cortona 91. In the latter there is an upward leap of a fifth in the initial phrase of the strophe between the tones setting the fourth and fifth counted syllables. After an ensuing descent the melody wends its way upward until it reaches a sixth and a seventh above the final. In all, the interval of an octave and a fourth is spanned. This produces an awkward and distended profile that lacks the focus present in most melodies. The Florence reading, on the other hand, presents the material from the point cited to the end of

³⁶ Liuzzi, *Lauda*, I, 363.

EXAMPLE 3. Emended version of *Regina sovrana de gram pietade*.

Re - gi - na sov - ra - na de gram pi - e - ta - de,
 En te, dol - ce ma - dre, a - giam re - po - san - ça. Fine
 Stel - la chia - ri - ta col gran - de splen - do - re
 Gen - te sma - ri - ta tra - he - ste d'er - ro - re:
 Reg - gi la vi - ta sî ch'a tut - te l'o - re
 Re - ser - viam le - an - ça. D.C.

the penultimate phrase of the strophe a third lower.³⁷ In this form the melody fills a central octave, utilizing a decorative tone above the higher end and below the lower one. The second and third phrases cadence on the final rather than on the third above, while the third phrase opens on the fourth degree rather than on the sixth. There is a far greater sense of tonal coherence to the structure, and the parallelism between the conclusion of the *ripresa* and that of the strophe is much more apparent. (See Example 4.³⁸) Past reactions to the Cortona reading have varied. Recognizing the importance of the parallelism just mentioned, Liuzzi presented the final phrase a third higher than given in the source. Anglès³⁹ felt that this adjustment should

³⁷ Liuzzi, *Lauda*, II, 68.

³⁸ The MS reads a third higher than given beginning with the seventh tone of the first phrase of the strophe.

³⁹ *La música de las Cantigas*, III:2, 503.

EXAMPLE 4. Emended version of *Onne homo ad alta voce*.

On - ne ho - mo ad al - ta vo - ce

Lau - di la ve - ra - ce cro - ce. Fine

Quan - to è di - gna da lau - da - re,

Co - re no lo pò pen - sa - re

Len - gua no lo pò con - ta - re,

La ve - ra - ce san - cta cro - ce. D.C.

have been made in the manner indicated above. On the other hand, both Ziino⁴⁰ and Terni accept the MS reading as it stands.

Setting aside the melodies under discussion in this essay, it is usual for recurrent material to return at the original level and thus with unchanged interval qualities. I suggest that this norm is sufficiently important to be used as a criterion in judging the accuracy of readings that come under question. Yet it is important to note that there are exceptional instances in which material may be repeated at a different pitch level. *Onne homo* provides an example of this practice, and it is instructive to observe the difference between the exception and the norm. One will note quickly that the third phrase of the strophe closely duplicates the contours of the first phrase of the *ripresa*. But in this instance, the intervallic distance does not remain constant. In terms of the emended transcription, the later phrase begins a fourth higher than the earlier one, but ends a fifth higher. (According to the

⁴⁰ *Strutture Strofiche*, 50.

MS reading, the later phrase begins a sixth higher and ends a seventh higher, a much less likely set of relationships.) Such an example is rare, though not unique. Small parallel excerpts may be found at different pitch heights. However, as far as I am aware, duplications of entire phrases at a constant interval occur only at those times when there are serious questions of MS accuracy.

We may now turn to a consideration of *Laude novella*,⁴¹ the piece that fortuitously launched the present study. The *ripresa*, neatly constructed on the basis of a chain of thirds, *d, f, a, c'*, opens with a motive characteristic of many Gregorian chants of the first mode. The strophe begins with a lightly varied return of this phrase. If we follow the literal reading of the MS we come to an unprecedented ending on *B* that has been rejected by all previous editors. This ending undermines the clear tonal structure of the *ripresa*, and does so by repeating the final phrase of the *ripresa* a third lower. The normal remedy that has been suggested has been to emend the final phrase so that it reads a third higher than written.

In so doing, one changes the downward leap of a fifth between the penultimate and final phrases into a leap of a third. Is this in fact the place where the MS goes awry? Our two clues indicating that the MS reading is faulty have consisted of the stylistically anomalous ending pitch and the disparity in the height of the repeated phrases. If we slowly work our way backwards from the end of the strophe, we find that this disparity in the height of equivalent material goes back much further. It originates not with the normative leap of a fifth between the third and fourth phrases, but with the unusual leap of a sixth that occurs between the first and second tones of the second phrase. Higinì Anglès had already recognized that this leap was stylistically suspect, and he emended it into a leap of a fourth when transcribing the melody for "The Musical Notation and Rhythm of the Italian Laude."⁴² However, he emended only this one note. He thus proposes two emendations, one of an isolated note and one covering an entire phrase. If we instead understand that it is at this point that the MS goes awry and make a single emendation from this point forward, the melody assumes quite another guise. (See Example 5.⁴³) We realize that there is a parallelism between the cadence to the second phrase of the strophe and that for the first phrase of the *ripresa*. We find that the third phrase of the strophe is parallel to the second phrase of the *ripresa*, although it has an open ending on the fifth rather than the

⁴¹ Liuzzi, *Lauda*, I, 260.

⁴² *Essays in Musicology*, 58.

⁴³ The MS reads a third lower than given beginning with the second tone of the second phrase of the strophe.

EXAMPLE 5. Emended version of *Lauda novella*.

Lau - de no - vel - la si - a can - ta - ta

A l'al - ta don - na en - co - ro - na - ta. Fine

Fre - sca ver - ge - ne don - çel - la,

Pri - mo fior, ro - sa no - vel - la,

Tut - to'l mon - do a te s'a - pel - la;

Nel - la bo - nor fo - sti na - ta. D.C.

closed ending previously employed. The downward leap of a fifth indicated in the MS is retained; it is a stylistically appropriate leap from the fifth degree to the final. The final phrase brings full closure. And the entire melody fits within the normative authentic range, allowing for the subfinal, rather than the far less usual range of plagal plus authentic.

The consequences of an unexpected and stylistically inappropriate leap affect also our understanding of *Madonna santa Maria*.⁴⁴ In the form presented in the MS this is quite a strange melody. Not only does it lack the clear tonal focus of almost every other melody in the source, but it ends on the anomalous pitch, *e*. No other lauda melody furnishes a precedent for such an ending. Indeed, Liuzzi characterizes the cadence as 'aperta' and wonders how a closed ending was eventually to be provided.⁴⁵

⁴⁴ Liuzzi, *Lauda*, I, 270.

⁴⁵ *Ibid.*, 271.

I suggest that the clue to the proper understanding of the melody is to be found in the downward leap of a fifth that concludes the second phrase. In the abstract, there is nothing abnormal about the leap itself. But the leap is unusual in its particular context. At the beginning, the melody floats ambivalently between the initial pitch, *f*, and the cadential pitch of the first phrase, *g*. The importance of the latter is reinforced by its use as the opening pitch of the second phrase, and the leap, *f-B* [flat?], contrasts uneasily with our memory of the earlier *g*'s. Recognizing this difficulty, Clemente Terni has apparently opted to emend the leap, replacing it with the leap of a third. I believe that this is indeed the correct solution. But in the recorded performance directed by Terni, the emendation is restricted to a single note. Instead of continuing with the ensuing upward leap of a third, present in the MS, the singers employ the interval of a unison and return to the actual reading in the MS. I suspect, however, that the MS has gone awry at this point, just as it went awry in *Laude novella*. If we continue to follow the pitch outline of the MS from the point of emendation, there results a melody that is less at variance with normal practice. Such a version ends on *g*, as is frequent in other lauda melodies. (See Example 6.⁴⁶) And this *g* has been established previously as a tonal center—albeit a weak one—in the manner described above. The *g* is a fourth above the emended cadential tone of the second phrase, again a readily understandable relationship. The initial *f*, set to a weak syllable, may be understood to have a prefatory function with respect to the second tone, *g*, set to an accented syllable. There is still an ambivalent balance between the tone set, *g-b[flat]-d* and the tone set, *f-a-d*. The emended melody is not a fine one, but it is at least a more readily comprehensible one.

Normative pitch relationships between materials common to *ripresa* and strophe provide clues to the intended shape of other melodies in the Cortona laudario. According to this source, the leap of a tenth occurs between the end of the *ripresa* and the beginning of the strophe of *O Maria d'omelia se'fontana*.⁴⁷ Anglès has already remarked on the fact that such a leap is entirely foreign to medieval monophony,⁴⁸ and his point is well taken. Terni, on the other hand, accepts the leap as valid in his recording; to my ear, the effect is strained. The ultimate result of this leap is that when the phrases of the *ripresa* return at the end of the strophe they read a fifth higher than they did formerly. The scribe has simply mistakenly notated c-clefs for the

⁴⁶ The MS reads a third higher than given beginning with the last tone of the second phrase.

⁴⁷ Liuzzi, *Lauda*, I, 292.

⁴⁸ *Cantigas*, III:2, 503.

EXAMPLE 6. Emended version of *Madonna santa Maria*.

Ma - don - na san - ta Ma - ri - a,
 Mer - cè de noi pec - ca - to - ri;
 Fai - te pre - go al dol - ce Cri - sto
 Ke ne de - gia per - do - na - re.

strophe instead of retaining the f-clefs that had been used for the *ripresa*. If one makes appropriate compensation, one finds that there is a much sharper tonal focus on the final. (See Example 7.⁴⁹) This degree is emphasized by means of interior leaps within the first and second phrases of the emended strophe and by cadences on the final in the first, second, and fourth lines. The total range is reduced to normal limits. To be sure, the leap of a sixth between the *ripresa* and strophe and between the first phrase of the strophe and the second is unusual, but this is the only important exception to the normative stylistic canon.

Another displacement of phrases by the interval of a fifth occurs in *Vergene donçella da Dio amata*.⁵⁰ Here the final two phrases of the strophe are written a fifth higher than their counterparts in the *ripresa*. The written version of this melody is unusual in several respects. It is the only melody in the collection to begin the *ripresa* a fourth higher than the final. Furthermore, the return from the strophe to the *ripresa* is fashioned from the leap of a fourth, another feature anomalous for the Cortona repertory. In Terni's recording the leap is managed with the best possible artistry, but I still find it to be unconvincing. Finally, the last tone of the strophe is a seventh higher

⁴⁹ The strophe reads a fifth higher in MS than given here. In the MS the *ripresa* ends with a ternaria and three notae simplices. In regrouping the first four of these pitches into two binariae I have followed the consistent practice to be observed in the strophe.

⁵⁰ Liuzzi, *Lauda*, I, 322.

EXAMPLE 7. Emended version of *O Maria d'omelia se' fontana*.

O Ma - ri - a, d'o - me - li - a se' fon - ta - na,
 Fior e gra - na: de me ai - a pi - e - tan - ça. Fine
 Gram re - i - na, chi in - chi - na cia - scun re - gno,
 Si m'af - fi - na la cu - ri - na quan - do se - gno,
 Io non de - gno, 'n co - re te - gno tuo fi - gu - ra
 Chiar' e pu - ra, ch'on - gne mal m'è'n o - bli - an - ça.
 D.C.

than the final. While we may be rightfully suspicious of the accuracy of the notated version, it is not simple to find a convincing alternative.

It is possible that the leap of a fifth between the final of the *ripresa* and the initial tone of the strophe caused the scribe to insert the same leap between phrases two and three of the strophe. The result of this action is a distended range that stretches an octave and a fourth above the final and a set of tonal centers that fail to relate to one another in any standard fashion. One must note, however, that this leap is present in the reading of Florence Banco Rari 18.⁵¹ While this source employs a different melody for the *ripresa*, the strophe presents the same music, apart from some minor variants. It is difficult to evaluate the import of this evidence because the Florence reading is itself a strange one. It opens with a gesture that is strongly reminiscent of first-mode melodies, beginning with an upward leap from *d-a* that is

⁵¹ Liuzzi, *Lauda*, II, 382.

filled in by a subsequent descent. But despite the normal implications of the initial gesture, the *ripresa* ends on *f*. The strophe then follows at the interval of a unison, rather than leaping up a fifth, as in the Cortona reading. The upward termination of the final cadence to the strophe brings the melody to an end on *c'*. One is then faced with a downward leap of a seventh in order to return to the *ripresa*. This is again most unusual.

Should we find the corroboration between the two readings of the strophe to be decisive, there remains the possibility that in the Cortona version the strophe was intended to follow the *ripresa* at the interval of a unison, as in the Florence version. This solution poses a different set of problems. If one retains the level of the *ripresa* and adjusts the level of the strophe, the first two phrases of the latter would then be in an unusually low range and there would be an astylistic cadence on low *B-flat*. If, on the other hand, one adjusts the level of the *ripresa* and retains that of the strophe, the resultant final, *g*, would be poorly prepared. In both instances, the motivic leap of a fourth, occurring in the bracketed portions of four phrases, would be displaced. Of the three alternatives, I have a preference for the first, which is illustrated in Example 8.⁵² Whether the strophe was intended to conclude with an open cadence or a closed one cannot be determined on the basis of the musical evidence available to us. In the emended version given below, the *ouvert* cadence ends a half-step beneath the initial tone of the *ripresa*, thus providing for a smooth transition. It is even possible that the last presentation of the *ripresa* might have had the concluding cadence adjusted so that the ending would have paralleled the ending of the strophe, minus the final tone. In that event the melodic construction would be in conformance with the norm. Regardless of the decision adopted, one cannot afford to present a transcription without discussing the problems of tonal order that occur in the two sources.

Although leaps of sixths are infrequent in the repertoire, one such downward leap occurs between the first and second phrases of *Peccatrice nominata*, another problem piece.⁵³ Here we find that the last two phrases of the strophe are a third higher than their counterparts constituting the *ripresa*. This is another of the pieces cited by Anglès, and, as shown in Example 9,⁵⁴ I again concur with his find-

⁵² The last two phrases of the strophe read a fifth higher in the MS.

⁵³ Liuzzi, *Lauda*, I, 326.

⁵⁴ The last two phrases of the strophe read a third lower in the MS than given. In the source there is a fourth descending tone, *f*, for the penultimate syllable of the opening phrase. This has evidently been erased in the source, but is retained in the Terni performance. One may further note that at least three tones associated with the

EXAMPLE 8. A possible realization of *Vergene donçella da Dio amata*.

Ver - ge - ne don - çel - la da Di - o a - ma - ta,
 Ka - ta - ri - na mar - ti - re be - a - ta. Fine
 Tu fo - sti be - a - ta da fan - ti - na,
 Per - kè fo'n te la gra - ti - a di - vi - na;
 Na - ta fo - sti en ter - ra a - le - xan - dri - na,
 In om - gni sci - en - ti - a col - lau - da - ta. D.C.

ings. Liuzzi comments on this passage, suggesting that it is fruitless to speculate on the scribe's possible omission of a clef change. He points out quite correctly that in the MS reading the final pitch of the strophe agrees with the opening pitch of the *ripresa*. Terni apparently agrees with Liuzzi and performs the melody as written. However, the correspondence between the *ripresa* and strophe is only one of the issues at stake. Even more important is the nature of the structural skeleton and the unusual range postulated in the Cortona reading. Furthermore, the *ouvert* ending indicated in the MS goes against a powerful stylistic norm.

In subtle ways the notation of *Peccatrice nominata* provides further clues that we ought to be wary of the scribal expertise underlying the

close of the final phrase of the strophe were originally entered a second too low and then corrected. It would appear that not all such errors were caught; cf. the discussion of the next two examples.

THE JOURNAL OF MUSICOLOGY

EXAMPLE 9. Emended version of *Peccatrice nominata*.

8 Pec - ca - tri - ce no - mi - na - ta,

8 Ma - de - le - na da Dio a - ma - ta. Fine

8 Mag - da - le - na de - cta ste - sti,

8 Dal ca - stel nel qual na - ce - sti,

8 Mar - ta per so - ro - re a - ve - sti;

8 Nel van - ge - lio a - sai lo - da - ta. D.C.

92

preparation of Cortona 91. Most of the melody is entered on f. 38v, but the last three units of the penultimate phrase and the final phrase run over onto f. 39r. No clef is given for the lone staff, but the continuation is defined by the *custos* concluding the preceding verso. One may note that the scribe began by entering five pitches on 39r. These were then partially erased and replaced by a similar set written a line higher. Following the five corrected pitches there ensues a downward leap of a sixth. Since the scribe had not entered any clef, his corrections did not affect the reading of relative pitch. It would seem, rather, that he belatedly realized that at the level originally chosen there was not sufficient space for the downward leap without employing a change of clef. Disregarding the ease of this solution, or otherwise reluctant to utilize it, he erased the material and began anew.⁵⁵ (In the Cortona MS the only change of relative pitch within a

⁵⁵ A comparable correction occurs in *L'alto prençe*, at the beginning of the fourth staff of f. 111r. Here, however, a clef is given at the beginning of the staff, and the

staff occurs in *Ave, Dei genetrix*, towards the end of the third staff of f. 26r; it is accomplished by means of a custos placed beneath the note affected.) The scribe had been in similar straits at the beginning of the third phrase of the strophe. He had already arrived at the bottom line and there was no space for the downward skip of a third that I have postulated. It would appear that he had committed himself sufficiently not to erase the clef and seven initial pitches. He simply plunged ahead, either unawares or confident that any user of the source would realize the proper solution.

Not all dislocations in Cortona MS 91 are equivalent to the misreading of clef. In *Spiritu sancto da servire*,⁵⁶ the second phrase of the strophe is (with the exception of the first tone) a tone higher than the second phrase of the *ripresa*. As a result this phrase is the only one to end on a tone other than the fifth degree or the final. The opening two phrases of the strophe outline an anomalous descent of a seventh to this second degree, followed by a still more anomalous leap of a seventh to the ensuing octave. This is a most unlikely situation for a highly repetitive melody, although we may note that Terni does accept the MS reading as given. The recommended emendation is presented in Example 10.⁵⁷

In *Alta trinità beata*, the melody that follows in the Cortona laudario,⁵⁸ it seems probable that the last three symbols of the third phrase of the strophe are written a second lower than intended. Though this phrase lacks the initial pitch of the *ripresa*, it otherwise parallels the opening phrase, and a cadence on the fifth degree, followed by a downward leap to the final is considerably more appropriate than the cadence present in the source. (See Example 11.⁵⁹) Again, one ought acknowledge that more conservative scholars, such as Ziino⁶⁰ and Terni prefer to adhere to the MS reading. Unfortunately, the reasons for this preference are not given.

In addition to the examples discussed to this point, there are others in which the manuscript fails to provide sufficient evidence and in which Liuzzi's interpretations are subject to question. The opening lauda provides a case in point. *Venite a laudare* is notated without clefs

reason for the change is opposite: the scribe had not left himself sufficient space for the upward motion of the ensuing phrase. Five pitches are erased and re-entered a line lower.

⁵⁶ Liuzzi, *Lauda*, I, 386.

⁵⁷ Except for the first tone, the MS reads a second higher for phrase 2 of the strophe.

⁵⁸ Liuzzi, *Lauda*, I, 390.

⁵⁹ The MS reads a second lower for the last four pitches of phrase 3 of the strophe.

⁶⁰ *Strutture Strofiche*, 49.

THE JOURNAL OF MUSICOLOGY

EXAMPLE 10. Emended version of *Spiritu sancto da servire*.

Spi - ri - tu san - cto da ser - vi - re,

Dann' al co - re de te sen - ti - re. Fine

Spi - ri - tu di ve - ri - ta - de,

E fon - ta - na de bo - ni - ta - de,

Per la tu - a be - ni - gni - ta - de

La tu - a vi - a ne fa se - gui - re. D.C.

and with only a single custos between the first and second staves.⁶¹ Liuzzi suggests that the slightest trace of a c-clef may be found on the middle of the three-line staff. He therefore begins his transcription on *g*. Scholars agree that this is undoubtedly the correct solution. While concurring, I would prefer to put its justification in other terms. Since the first tone is placed in a space, the possible opening pitches, assuming the clef to be a c-clef, are *e*, *g*, and *b*. The first and last of these are anomalous in terms of the normative style for the repertoire. If we assume the clef to be an f-clef—far less likely—then the possible pitches are *A*, *c*, and *e*. Again the first and last of these are stylistically inappropriate. The only two reasonable possibilities are *g* and *c*, and the very minor differences in the respective realizations disappear when editorial accidentals are taken into account.

The problem posed by *Venite a laudare* concerns the transition between the *ripresa* and strophe. Liuzzi opts for an upward leap of a

⁶¹ Liuzzi, *Lauda*, I, 256.

EXAMPLE 11. Emended version of *Alta trinità beata*.

Al - ta tri - ni - tà be - a - ta,

Da noi sem - pre si' a - do - ra - ta. Fine

Tri - ni - ta - de glo - ri - o - sa,

U - ni - tà ma - ra - vil - lio - sa,

Tu se' man - na sa - vo - ro - sa

A tut' or de - si - de - ra - ta. D.C.

sixth, and his example is quoted by Gustave Reese in *Music in the Middle Ages*.⁶² While such a leap was apparently intended in *O Maria, d'omelia*, as explained previously, it is most unusual in the present context. It creates an unstable relationship between the various tonal centers that is stylistically inappropriate. Furthermore, as mentioned early on, the normative leap at this point is that of an octave. Anglès has already pointed to this solution,⁶³ and has been seconded by Clemente Terni. The most likely solution is as given in Example 12.

While clefs are present for the *ripresa* of *De la crudel morte de Cristo*,⁶⁴ they are lacking for the ensuing strophe. Characteristically, no *custos* is given at this juncture. Under these circumstances, Liuzzi

⁶² New York, 1940, 238. The example employed is taken from an earlier transcription by Liuzzi that had appeared in his article, "Melodie italiane inedite del duocento," *Archivum Romanicum* XIV (1930), 538.

⁶³ *Cantigas*, III:2, 503; Anglès indicates only that Liuzzi has read the phrases of the *piedi* poorly since he has not taken into account the change of clef.

⁶⁴ Liuzzi, *Lauda*, I, 354.

THE JOURNAL OF MUSICOLOGY

EXAMPLE 12. Proposed version of *Venite a laudare*.

8 Ve - ni - te a lau - da - re, per a - mo - re can - ta - re

8 L'a - mo - ro - sa ver - ge - ne Ma - ri - a. Fine

8 Ma - ri - a glo - ri - o - sa bi - a - ta

8 Sem - pre si' mol - to lau - da - ta:

8 Pre - ghi - am ke ne si a - vo - ca - ta

8 Al tuo fi - liol, vir - go pi - a. D.C.

96

opted to begin the strophe on the final. The result is an unusual tonal structure that stretches from a fifth below the final to an octave above. Anglès has justifiably indicated that the strophe should begin at the upper fifth.⁶⁵ When one begins the strophe in this manner it is quickly apparent that the penultimate phrase is equivalent to the first phrase of the *ripresa*, and one can thus justifiably employ the second phrase of the *ripresa* as the melody for the final phrase of the strophe, which has been left blank in the MS. In the recording based on the transcription by Clemente Terni this formal identity is realized. However, Terni begins the strophe on the third degree and shifts the level beginning with the third tone of the second phrase. In so doing he negates the clear parallelism between phrases one and two of the strophe. In my opinion Anglès' solution is clearly preferable. This is shown in Example 13.

⁶⁵ *Cantigas*, III:2, 503.

EXAMPLE 13. Proposed version of *De la crudel morte de Cristo*.

De la cru - del mor - te de Cri - sto

On' hom pian - ga a - ma - ra - men - te. Fine

Quan - do' Iu - de - ri Cri - sto pil - liâ - ro,

D'o - gne par - te lo cir - cun - dâ - ro;

Le sue ma - ne stre - cto le - gâ - ro

Co - mo la - dro vil - la - na - men - te. D.C.

The melodies examined to this point have involved either allegations of major distortions in the source or faulty interpretations of ambiguous indications. There are, in addition, others in which only small areas are suspect. The *ripresa* of *Faciamo laude a tutt' i sancti*⁶⁶ firmly establishes *g* and *c'* as opposing tonal centers. The force exerted by the former is built from its use as the opening pitch of phrases one and three and as the cadential goal of the first three phrases. The *g* accounts for four of the eight pitches forming phrase two. The strength of the upper center is established by its frequent reiteration. It occurs five times as a recitation in the opening phrase. And it is stated thrice at the beginnings of the first, third, and fifth phrases of the strophe.

Although phrases three and four of the *ripresa* do not repeat phrases one and two, there is a noticeable parallelism between their respective constructions. Thus it is quite surprising to find that the

⁶⁶ Liuzzi, *Lauda*, I, 448.

THE JOURNAL OF MUSICOLOGY

EXAMPLE 14. Emended version of *Faciamo laude a tutt' i sancti*.

8 Fa - cia - mo lau - de a tutt' i san - cti

8 Col - la ver - ge - ne mag - giu - re,

8 De buon co - re, cum dol - ce can - t[i],

8 Per a - mor del cre - a - to - re. Fine

8 Per a - mor del cre - a - to - re

8 Cum ti - mor e re - ve - ren - ça,

8 E - xul - tan - do cum bal - do - re

98

final pitch of the *ripresa* is given in the MS as *a*. The correctness of this ending comes under still stronger question when one finds that the last two phrases of the strophe, which basically repeat the third and fourth phrases of the *ripresa* use *g* as the final pitch.

The Florence MS gives basically the same melody, albeit pitched a fifth lower and with numerous small variants.⁶⁷ This version is markedly more symmetrical in cadence structure than the one in Cortona MS 91. There is a regular alternation between cadences on the second degree and cadences on the final. Under these circumstances, the *ripresa* concludes with a normal *clos* ending on *c*. In the Cortona version, the cadences to the first and third verses of the *ripresa* both end on the final rather than on the second degree. It is

⁶⁷ Liuzzi, *Lauda*, II, 394.

EXAMPLE 14. (*continued*)

Per di - vi - na pro - vi - den - ça

Tutt' i san - cti per a - mo - re,

In - ten - di - am cum ex - cel - len - ça

De far fe - ste a lor pi - a - gen - ça

Cum gran - dis - si - mo fer - vo - re. D.C.

difficult to reconcile this increased drive towards the final with a concluding cadence that is *ouvert*. The probability that the Cortona *ripresa* was intended to end on *g* is high. This solution has previously been adopted in the recording by Terni and is shown in Example 14.⁶⁸

A similar, although less forceful example occurs in the lauda that follows in the Cortona MS, *San Iovanni al mond' è nato*.⁶⁹ Here the role of the initial *f* is established by continuing with a lower neighbor and return. In this melody, however, there is a more equal balance between the *f-a* third and the contrasting *c-e-g-b[flat]* chain. Nevertheless, it is still surprising to find that the *ripresa* closes on *g*, lending the impression of an *ouvert* cadence, while the strophe ends with a comparable phrase leading to a *clos* cadence on *f*. The recommended interpretation is given in Example 15.⁷⁰ The Terni recording follows the reading of the MS.

There can even be questions of the appropriateness of *ouvert* endings for the strophes of certain melodies. The *ripresa* of *Salutiam*

⁶⁸ The MS reads a second higher for the last two notes of the *ripresa*; these are not ligated in the source.

⁶⁹ Liuzzi, *Lauda*, I, 453.

⁷⁰ The last three tones of the *ripresa* read a second higher in the MS.

THE JOURNAL OF MUSICOLOGY

EXAMPLE 15. Emended version of *San Iovanni al mond' è nato*.

San Io - van - ni al mond' è na - to:

Ogn' om lau - di Dio pi - e - to - sa. Fine

Di - o per sua gran cor - te - si - a

Ga - bri - el cum pro - phe - ti - a

Man - do a San Ça - cha - ri - a

K'a - va - rea fi - liol gra - ti - o - sa. D.C.

100

divotamente,⁷¹ the concluding lauda of the Cortona MS, alternates between the contrasting poles of *f* and *g*. The initial *f* accounts for three of the first four pitches for the first and third phrases. It lies at the lower boundary of the *c'-a-f* chain employed in phrases two and four. The tone, *g*, occurs five times during the course of the opening phrase and is the cadential goal of the first three phrases. The fourth and final phrase, however, returns to the initial pole, and the melody ends with a succession of three *f*'s. Although the strophe is built of a slightly varied repetition of the *ripresa*, it ends with two repeated *g*'s. Was this intended, or did the scribe mistakenly reiterate the cadence for the antepenultimate phrase, whose last three pitches occur as the third to fifth tones of the penultimate phrase? (See Example 16.⁷²) The answer is not certain, but the written version is sufficiently contrary to

⁷¹ Liuzzi, *Lauda*, I, 475.

⁷² The last two tones of the strophe are a second higher in the MS.

EXAMPLE 16. Emended version of *Salutiam divotamente*.

Sa - lu - ti - am di - vo - ta - men - te
 L'al - ta ver - ge - ne be - a - ta,
 Et di - ci[a] mo: A - ve Ma - ri - a,
 Sem - pre sia da nu - i lau - da - ta. Fine
 Sa - lu - ti - al - la dul - ce - men - te
 Et cum gram so - le - ni - ta - te,
 Ki sa - pem ve - ra - ce - men - te
 Ke per la sua u - mi - li - ta - de
 La di - vi - na ma - ie - sta - de
 Fo di [lei] in - na - mo - ra - ta. D.C.

EXAMPLE 17. Emended version of *Stomme allegro et latioso*.

Sto - me al - le - gro et la - ti - o - so

Que - sto mon - do de - lec - tan - do:

Ma'l iu - di - cio ri - men - bran - do

Sto do - len - te e pau - ro - so. Fine

Pa - u - ro - so è di fal - lan - ça

Que - sto mon - do pien d'er - ro - re:

102

normal procedures that Terni has chosen to realize the final phrase of the strophe as an accurate counterpart of its counterpart in the *ripresa*. Ziino, on the other hand, has adhered to the MS reading in his transcription.⁷³

*Stomme allegro et latioso*⁷⁴ poses a similar problem for the editor. Again the initial phrase of the *ripresa* sets up contrasting centers on *f* and *g*. Here, however, the primacy of the center on *f* is established with far greater force. The chain, *f-a-c'-f'*, clearly provides the main structural underpinning, while the chain, *g-e-c*, is secondary. The final four phrases of the eight-line strophe are set to a varied repeat of the *ripresa*. However, the strophe concludes with an *ouvert* cadence rather than with the *clos* cadence of the *ripresa*.

Again the manuscript reading is reasonable. But its correctness is questionable. (See Example 17.⁷⁵) Where we do find a clear instance

⁷³ *Strutture Strofiche*, 58f.

⁷⁴ Liuzzi, *Lauda*, I, 404.

⁷⁵ The last two tones of the strophe read a second higher in the MS.

EXAMPLE 17. (continued)

Si - gnor, fai - te pe - ni - ten - tia,
 Ke s' a - proc - cia'l grand' er - ro - re:
 Ke 'l ni - mi - co a - rà'l va - lo - re;
 Ciò fie a la fi - ne del mon - do,
 Ke cia - scun si - rà re - mon - do
 D'e - sto di - lec - to fe - to - ro - so. D.C.

of an ouvert ending for a strophe, as in *Gloria 'n cielo e pace 'n terra*,⁷⁶ there is no correspondence of material between strophe and *ripresa*. The strophe ends on the fifth degree of the mode, and this is the initial tone of the *ripresa*. The strophe of *Salve, salve virgo* also ends with an ouvert cadence. Here, too, structural parallelism with the *ripresa* is lacking. Terni had previously recognized the importance of the formal parallelism in *Stomme allegro* and provided for a closed ending to the strophe.

Let us assume, for the sake of argument, that one were to concede most of the interpretations presented above to be justifiable. Is it not possible, however, that while they represent one form of historical reality, the readings of the Cortona MS represent another? Perhaps. Even if we restrict our field of vision to the Cortona MS itself, we find indications of a certain degree of freedom in performance. And if we

⁷⁶ Liuzzi, *Lauda*, I, 336.

study the concordances with the Florence MS, we find still stronger evidence of such a variety. It is not at all unlikely that different performances of laude varied from each other either with regard to small details, or, as in *Vergene donçella*, in major respects. Our sources come out of an oral tradition. In our own experiences of oral tradition, we are often painfully aware of amateur singers in either church or synagogue who dislocate phrase relationships because their voices break without their realizing this. To be sure, these persons are not singing the tune as it was meant to be. But yet their versions have a definite historical reality. It is certainly possible that some of the Cortona versions may have arisen in similar fashion. I maintain, nevertheless, that the editor has the responsibility of determining whether or not the reading in the source is consistent with its own internal values and whether it would have been judged good by knowledgeable contemporaries. That is what I have sought to accomplish.

I am keenly aware that a meddling editor can be the bane of the historian. In my first published essay I had occasion to deal with a nineteenth-century transformation of a pair of lines from a chanson by Thibaut de Navarre.⁷⁷ By altering a few letters here and there,

104

Car je n'i os parler de raençon / N'estre ostagiez s'en bele guise non.
became:

Car je ni oui parler de rien connoitre ou tanger / Sans belle guise non.

In the process, both form and meaning had been altered. I have no desire to do likewise with the Cortona laude. This notwithstanding, the reader should bear in mind that every scholar who has dealt closely with Cortona MS 91 has found editorial changes to be imperative at one point or another. What has been lacking has been a reasonably comprehensive list of problem passages and a discussion of the criteria for their evaluation.

Certainly, the foregoing account of the Cortona MS is dismaying. I have tried to show, step by step, how many clearly anomalous situations are to be found in this source. One might perhaps argue that together these document a contrasting practice that I have wilfully ignored and destroyed. I do not think, however, that this argument will stand scrutiny. To be sure, there is a common denominator for many of the examples that I have cited, namely, the seeming reuse of material from the *ripresa* at a different pitch level in the strophe. Nevertheless, there is no common way in which a change in level comes about. There is only one instance in which one finds a presumed leap of either a tenth or a seventh. There is only one instance

⁷⁷ "A Lost Medieval Chansonnier," *The Musical Quarterly* XLVIII (1962), 55.

of a melody ending on *e*. Almost every one of the numerous examples cited is idiosyncratic in some respect. As for our common denominator, there may be different explanations for the various displacements noted. These form but a small part of a much larger problem that takes in all repertoires of medieval monophony, both sacred and secular. Displacements in some repertoires may be notational strategies to avoid having to deal with pitches not present in the Guidonian gamut. Others are undoubtedly simple errors. Still others may represent different performance traditions. We shall eventually have to tackle this larger problem.

Any prospective editor of the Cortona laudario is faced with an inescapable dilemma. We have seen first that the MS presents internal contradictions. When we find concordances with the Florence laudario, there are often significant differences between the two. And while the Florence source itself is not free of internal contradictions and other vagaries, the few readings examined from that source seem to give a somewhat better account of basic melody shapes than does the Cortona MS. With respect to *Laude novella*, all editors agree that the source is corrupt. Viewing the ensemble of our evidence, a simple faith in the accuracy of the source is no longer viable. We must evaluate each melody with care. We must determine the stylistic boundaries of the repertoire as a whole. I have suggested that these are marked out in terms of a strong sense of tonal order.