

bei dem hier vorliegenden Neusatz um eine großartige Leistung. Dem Rezensenten liegt allerdings, da der Verlag sparen muss, nur der dritte Band vor. Er trägt den Titel von Lohmanns erstem Aufsatz zur Musik, *Musiké und Logos* (1956/57), und folgt zunächst der Sammlung von Lohmann'schen Schriften, die 1970 unter diesem Titel erschienen ist. Von den fünf weiteren Aufsätzen zur Musik, die Lohmann zwischen 1970 und 1980 publizierte (siehe die vollständige Liste in: Albrecht Riethmüller, „Vom Logos in Sprache und Musik“, in: *Sprache und Musik. Perspektiven einer Beziehung*, hrsg. von A. Riethmüller, Laaber 1999, S. 123f.), enthält der Band nur zwei, ohne dass – etwa durch Beigabe eines Gesamtinhaltsverzeichnisses – ersichtlich würde, ob und an welcher Stelle die anderen Aufsätze zu finden sind. Lediglich Hinweise im Text (S. 255, 258 und S. 306, Anm. 12) informieren darüber, dass der Descartes-Aufsatz im ersten Band zu finden ist. Die Herausgeber machen zwischen Lohmanns Fußnoten und ihren eigenen Anmerkungen keinen Unterschied. Zu der auf S. 123, Anm. 28 geäußerten Vermutung: Lohmann zitiert Marcus Meibom, *Antiquae musicae auctores*, Amsterdam 1652, S. 18 nach Albert Jahn, *Aristidis Quintiliani de musica libri III*, Berlin 1882, S. 11, Zeile 14–17; dieser Stelle ist ja auch der zweite „Nachtrag“ gewidmet (vgl. S. 168 mit Anm. 29). Warum manche, aber nicht alle der Herausgeberfußnoten mit Initialen versehen sind, wird im Band nicht erläutert.

(November 2021) Franz Michael Maier

*FELIX DIERGARTEN: Komponieren in den Zeiten Machauts. Die Liedsätze des Codex Ivrea. Würzburg: Königshausen & Neumann 2021. 257 S., Nbsp., Tab. (Würzburger Beiträge zur Musikforschung, Band 7.)*

As so often in such matters, the unnamed contributors to Wikipedia get it right (last seen 20 October 2021). With no need to

profile themselves academically, they report that opinions on the origin of the Ivrea codex include the papal court at Avignon, the south-west French courts of Gaston Phébus and the small north Italian cathedral town of Ivrea, but add stonily that ‘None of these three interpretations has become universally accepted’. Felix Diergarten takes no position on this, probably because he finds it irrelevant to his main theme (though one could disagree). On the matter of its date, though, he does lay out the case. Received views range from the 1360s to the 1390s. With most musical manuscripts of the fourteenth century there is little agreement apart from the beautifully illustrated sources in the Bibliothèque nationale de France, as a result of the marvellous research of François Avril and his colleagues. For the Ivrea codex the only basis for dating is that it includes Machaut’s rondeau “Dix et sept cinq”, which one of his letters states that he composed in September and October 1363. Diergarten (pp. 47–48) favours the 1360s or 1370s, perhaps because it fits with his aim of exploring the style of songwriters in Machaut’s time.

Central to the strategy here is the well known fact that Machaut’s music is almost never found outside the famous manuscripts devoted to his work. Diergarten states that only fifteen Machaut songs appear outside the Machaut manuscripts, and only four of them with ascriptions. Without the Machaut manuscripts he would disappear almost completely. And the book’s theme is to see what fourteenth-century song would look like if we knew nothing of Machaut.

But the main point must be that he counts the songs in the Ivrea codex as only eleven in number. He never mentions the three chaces which many of us would think among the most interesting songs of the century and certainly among the most influential. Nor does he mention the two textless pieces on the last page: the second could be anything but the first looks very much like a normal rondeau that simply had not yet had its text added. He

throws in “De ce que fol pensé” by Pierre des Molins, perhaps because many of the Ivrea songs are so thin and he wants a solid piece to start the book. But his approach is obviously to explore each song in as much detail as possible and to explain how they could not have been composed by Machaut. This he does with true virtuosity, going to work on the texts, the counterpoint, the dissonance treatment and the phraseology in each case. Quite apart from new editions of all the music at the end of the book, his discussions are full of most helpful musical examples, mostly analytical diagrams, which surely set the direction for future studies of this repertory.

For most pieces Diergarten has well-taken observations about the earlier editions of Willi Apel, Margaret Hasselman (unpublished Berkeley dissertation, 1970) and Gordon K. Greene. These are always musically illuminating and often lead to seriously better versions of the music. But they draw one inevitably to reflect, fifty years on, about the stunning achievement of Apel. In his three volumes of *French Secular Music of the Fourteenth Century* (1970–72), almost all of the 304 songs were previously unpublished, except in his own path-breaking *French Secular Music of the Late Fourteenth Century* (1950). The later editions of the same music by Gordon K. Greene in the series *Polyphonic Music of the Fourteenth Century* (1981–89) came perhaps too soon after. They were more elegantly presented and easier to read, partly because they used the transposing treble clef, as introduced in that series by Leo Schrade (1956) and by Manfred Bukofzer in his Dunstable edition for *Musica Britannica* (1953), whereas Apel and almost all other editors for *Corpus Mensurabilis Musicae* in those years confined themselves to treble and bass clefs for the presentation of music mostly in C1, C3 and C4 clefs, with what one must now state were disastrous results. And Greene underlaid every word of text to the notes he thought appropriate, whereas Apel confined later stanzas to a ‘graveyard’ of texts before

the edition proper. But otherwise Greene far too often simply copied what Apel had and far too often ignored the research of the intervening years. The literature is peppered with snide remarks about Apel’s work (not from Diergarten, I am happy to report); but his achievement in this area (not to mention so many others) is literally unparalleled. It is high time we saluted his major contribution to the topic.

In his last chapter Diergarten turns to the famous fragments in Cambrai, mostly collected in Ms. B 1328 but in 1976 expanded by eleven new leaves plus clarifying offsets of a further ten of the otherwise illegible pages in the original set. The leaves containing motets were explored in the dissertation of Irmgard Lerch (1987). But the songs have yet to be studied: in fact most of them have not yet been retrieved from the bindings where I first saw them in 1972. And the scans provided by the Oxford website of DIAMM offer a very incomplete account of what is there. My own estimate was that, apart from two leaves of chant and one leaf containing songs by Adam de la Halle, they are all on parchment of a consistent quality and therefore all from a single parent manuscript, despite significant variants in ruling on the various leaves. I take comfort in knowing that the great Friedrich Ludwig reached the same conclusion about the leaves of Ms. B 1328 that were available to him.

Inevitably, Diergarten discusses these fragments in far less detail. He kindly credits me with identifying the ballade “J’aim. Qui? Vous. Moi?”; but it was correctly identified by Gilbert Reaney in his 1969 RISM catalogue of fourteenth-century polyphony (B IV 2, p. 124) – a book that Diergarten never cites despite its beautiful cataloguing of the entire repertory, including the Ivrea codex and the Cambrai fragments. I never let it be far from my elbow as I was preparing this review. But the presence of that ballade raises quite a few questions. It recurs in the Oxford manuscript Canon. Misc. 213 with an ascription to ‘Paul-

let'. As Paula Higgins eloquently demonstrated in 1987, Poullet must be the Mathieu Poullet or Macé de Saint-Pol who was a chaplain at the Sainte Chapelle in Bourges, 1405–14. Those dates work for the style of the song, in tempus perfectum with rocking trochee/iamb homorhythmic exchanges and sudden repeated semiminims. The dates also work well in terms of the surrounding pieces in the Oxford manuscript, even though my guess for the first copying in that manuscript is ca. 1428. (Others disagree, among them Christian Berger, when reviewing my facsimile of the manuscript in these pages.)

Now there are three details that need to be added. First, the contratenor in Cambrai breaks off after about three bars, but up to that point it is definitely quite different from the one in Oxford, so we are clearly dealing with an earlier version of the song. Second, Diergarten finds (p. 223) a different version of the tenor at the 'open' ending in the middle of the song: I simply cannot see the notes that he prints, and unless he has a separate set of scans I am inclined to ignore that, if only because such a substantial variant at that point in the tenor would be a unique case in this repertory. Third, though, this is a most unusual song, with its entire text a dialogue between the man and the woman, often, as in the first line, just one word each, but sometimes as much as a whole line. At the same time there are passages in which the two lower voices imitate the discantus and have text underlaid to them in the Oxford manuscript. Quite how it would be performed is a tricky question best left for another day. But obviously the main question is how early the piece can be. Diergarten (p. 213) cites Hasselman as proposing that the fragments are 'before 1360', cites me (1976) as saying that they were before Machaut's death in 1377, and cites Lerch as saying 'before 1380' but never offers his own view. I find it hard to believe that "J'aim. Qui? Vous. Moi?" even in its earlier Cambrai version, could be before 1390. And that in its turn would mean that

the Cambrai fragments contain music with a date-range of at least eighty years. The fuller study of this material, based on the latest information, is now seriously overdue.

(November 2021)

David Fallows

*CHRISTINE ROTH: Kirchenmusik, Reformation und Traditionsbindung. Überlieferung in Lünebeck, Lüneburg und Schwerin. Kassel u. a.: Bärenreiter-Verlag 2020. 394 S., Abb., Nbsp., Tab. (Catalogus Musicus. Band XX.)*

Um es gleich vorwegzunehmen: Die hier vorliegende Studie von Christine Roth ist definitiv originell und Maßstab setzend für die Annäherung an die Kirchenmusik des 16. und frühen 17. Jahrhunderts im Spannungsfeld von Reformation und Tradition.

Die drei großen Schlagworte „Kirchenmusik, Reformation und Traditionsbindung“ könnten qua terminologischer Breite zunächst zu definitiven Ausschweifungen führen. Diese umgeht Roth jedoch geschickt, indem die Autorin bereits in der Einleitung die „konfessionelle Perspektive“ seit den „Anfänge[n] der musikwissenschaftlichen Fachrichtung“ (S. 9) anhand des maßgeblichen Schrifttums dazu aufflistet. Ebenso verzichtet sie auf eine unnötig lange und fruchtlose Diskussion des historischen Ereignisses „Reformation“; das Unterkapitel „Musik als Bestandteil einer lutherischen Konfessionskultur – Terminologische Grundlegung“ (S. 16ff.) liefert eine für diesen Arbeitsbereich ausreichende terminologische Schärfung. Weitaus ausgeprägter und für die Thematik interessanter – und hier liegt eine Stärke von Roths Dissertationsschrift – ist die Diskussion des Traditionsbegriffes. Der grundlegende Unterschied in der Auffassung von Musik als immaterieller Kunst und von Musikalien etc. als materieller Grundlage von Musik spiegelt sich genau in diesem Punkt, nämlich dem Verständnis von Traditionsbildung, wider. Besonders