

Carlton T. Russell—*The Southern French Tonary in the Tenth and Eleventh Centuries*

Ann Arbor: University Microfilms (UM order no. 66-7182, 1966.
243 pp., Princeton University diss.)

Clyde W. Brockett, Jr.

In "The Southern French Tonary in the Tenth and Eleventh Centuries" Carlton T. Russell has written a dissertation about one of the most interesting kinds of music treatises in the Middle Ages—the tonary. The interest of the tonary lies in its twofold purpose: to explain music as a theory made manifest in tonal modes and to catalogue chant melodies according to mode. As a book of theory the tonary has both didactic and philosophical value, while as a manual of practice it maintains such an intimate association with chants that it can be physically connected to books of liturgical music. When it occurs as an adjunct to an antiphonal of the Mass or the Offices, this modal catalogue, or "list" tonary, actually need not contain explanations or rationale. Yet, some descriptive passages and modal nomenclature generally appear in the manner of rubrics, and a brief theoretical exposition may introduce the catalogue.

It is important to point out this split personality of the tonary because Dr. Russell has had to face the problem of treating both practice and speculation, which he has done very nicely. Dissertation writers might well hesitate before undertaking examinations of the tonary precisely because of its indivisible duality and its magnitude. Furthermore, a researcher is expected to analyze and compare all sources of a selected treatise. In addition, the theory explaining the practice of intoning chants modally is on the whole exceedingly difficult to understand.¹ Reasons such as these may indeed account for the general lack of study of the tonary. But whatever the reasons, the fact remains, as Dr. Russell reminds us, that this type of half-theoretical, half-practical plainsong treatise has not commanded the attention of students to the extent one might wish.

For his part, Dr. Russell has carefully analyzed seven French "list" tonaries, all bound into graduals and tropers from the Limousine and the Aquitaine. He has considered the chants themselves, as well as comments in "theoretical" tonaries on the technique of singing them. These seven southern French tonaries are exempt from lengthy theoretical rationalization, and, accordingly, Dr. Russell preemptively dismisses speculative arguments, or, as he labels them, "certain important issues." Instead, he lays a foundation upon which he can reconstruct the organization and content of the southern French tonary. He proceeds by first recognizing and reconfirming the tonary's bifocal nature. Next, he proceeds to explain the character of the southern French tonary, first by presenting a historical survey, then by comparing the lists of a number of representative tonaries, next by interrelating the contents of the southern

French group, and then by describing the individual southern French tonaries themselves. In the second part of his dissertation (Chapters 4, 5, and 6), Dr. Russell develops hypotheses and draws some intuitively logical conclusions about individual chant types and modes.

Dr. Russell has divided his study into six chapters with an introduction and a summary. He heads his study with two quotations drawn from explanations of tonal modes which are more recent than the group of manuscripts to be described. The first quotation questions the tonary's practical value. No less sympathetic an author than Heinrich Glarean (*Dodecachordon*, I, Chapter 15) became skeptical about the need to retain the "superfluous" and "annoying" differences—connectors of verse endings to chant beginnings—and indeed would not consider them further. Continuing, Glarean observed that the difference system of the approaching mid-16th century was not concrete. On the other hand, Dr. Russell has presented evidence which shows that in the 10th and 11th centuries the difference system was remarkably stable in its transmission through the southern French tonaries. Their overall homogeneity prompts Dr. Russell to remark that the infrequent chants, which tend toward the addition of differences, are "peripheral," inasmuch as the system was already codified at the time it was first evidenced. This stability is noteworthy in light of the evolution of Western chant and its continual exposure to the accrual of newer compositions for the divine service. Evolution is the subject of a second quotation drawn from that bible of ecclesiastical chant by Peter Wagner, *Einführung in die gregorianischen Melodien* (III, 137). Wagner suggested that chant was never fixed, but rather a "täglich sich erneuerndes Leben." Later in his study, Dr. Russell holds that this "daily self-renewing life" suggests improvisation, affecting especially introit verse endings, either plain or elaborate, though made visible only through continuously recorded variants in the tonaries. Far from contradicting any system or order as presented by the differences, Dr. Russell understands that those musical variants which did occur took the nature of nuances rather than revisions.

In Chapter 1, Dr. Russell proceeds to sketch the history of the tonary from around 800 to the 12th century and mentions the principal books. He reviews each tonary in a veritable procession according to age: "early," "middle," and "late." Here Dr. Russell also informs us that the 11th-century Montpellier manuscript *Faculté de Médecine H. 159* is not without its own brief "middle period" tonary of Office antiphons on folio 11^v (*Paléographie Musicale*, VIII, text edited on pp. 10–11). This folio seems not to have belonged with the rest of the codex originally. Yet, beyond the assumed misplacement of this folio, no conclusive reasons, such as provenance, have been provided for not treating it later within the corpus of the southern French tonaries. Even more curious is the discussion of the tonary from Gaillac (Albi) in Paris, B.N. lat. 776, voluble in Chapter 1 but laconic in Chapter 3, where the purely southern French sources are described. Perhaps Dr. Russell avoided a fuller discussion because of the bulk of Paris 776—1541 listed chants

—or perhaps because of the fact that it is complete for only the first five modes. Still, London, B.M. *Harley 4951* from Toulouse, a tonary fully discussed in Chapter 3, is also incomplete. The *De Modorum Formulis*, mentioned in passing, is a tonary appended to an *Epilogus* formerly considered to have pertained to Guido of Arezzo's antiphonal and attributed to Guido. Recently, however, it has been reconsidered as being of doubtful authorship.² Dr. Russell has somewhat apodictically ascribed it to Guido in three places (pp. 14, 35ⁿ, 113ⁿ). Moreover, the origin of its most complete source has been assigned (by Edmond de Coussemaker, who edited it, *et al.*) to the 12th century; therefore, its location among 11th-century books here seems an error.

In Chapter 2, Dr. Russell compiles impressive statistics to elucidate the limited number of southern French tonaries by comparing their lists of chants with those examples mentioned in the preceding chapter. He achieves convincing analyses through several tables which treat tonary types and purposes, totals of verse-connected chants, organization by modes and by classes of chants, and the number of differences. Appendix II, in the format of Dom R.-J. Hesbert's *Antiphonale Missarum Sextuplex*, compares all textual incipits in four southern French tonaries; Paris 909 is used as a reference point. An interesting fact deduced from tables of comparison is that adherence to liturgical order is more than coincidental. Noting the arrangement of the tonary, Dr. Russell proposes that the contents of the chant book to which it was annexed were probably scanned in their liturgical sequence and perhaps subsequently arranged according to mode. Further observation indicates in all of the lists the predominance of chants for that part of the liturgical year between Advent and Ash Wednesday. Dr. Russell does not explain the reason for this predominance. Perhaps it resulted from the fulfillment of an arbitrary quota for modal identification, in accordance with Dr. Russell's aforementioned hypothesis that liturgical books were re-coursed from their beginning.

To this point, Dr. Russell's discussions have dealt with tonaries in general, but Chapter 3 isolates the analysis of the southern French group, not including Paris 776. The conduct of this chapter depends upon the historical survey in Chapter 1, with emphasis now upon the seven southern French sources. The oldest and smallest of the seven manuscripts, Paris 1240 from St. Martial de Limoges, may date from the early 10th century. Whatever its precise date, we can appreciate the value of Chapter 1 in determining a *terminus post quem* as far as practicable. A facsimile illustration here, or a reference to one published elsewhere (e.g., *Paléographie Musicale*, XIII, figure 20, p. 123), would have helped, since there is mention of "cheironomy" applied to what we assume to be musical notation. The author has not adequately discussed the notation and leaves us under the impression that the original disposition of neumes in Aquitanian manuscripts is cheironomic, not diastematic. Even in this early manuscript, however, the neumes, although not very precise in their measurement, are nevertheless essentially diastematic.³ Perhaps "proto-diastematic" would have been a preferable

term. Even if they were adiaSTEMATIC, on the contrary, the notation still carries enough interest to warrant both an illustration and additional description. Other sources, Paris 909 and Paris 1121, are also from St. Martial. A fourth manuscript, Paris 1084, comes from Aurillac, farther south in France; a fifth, Paris 1118, is thought to have been written near Auch. Its fine illuminations depicting musicians are most attractive. Unreferenced historical data and several photographs are to be found in the *Paléographie Musicale*, XIII, p. 141, figures 21, 32, and 33. The two remaining southern French tonaries are attached to the graduals of Toulouse and Narbonne, the former complete for just the first four modes.

Two of these manuscripts, Paris 909 and Paris 1121, contain internal abbreviated lists, termed "brief" tonaries. Dr. Russell is aware of the enigma adumbrating the function of their samplings of antiphons and introits, one for each mode, but he reaches a hypothetical settlement in considering them "quick reference indices" and "tonaries of recitation tones" for readily intoning the eight modes by their convenient, separately located formulas. They appear not to be confined to nor conceived in these two manuscripts alone, for Dr. Russell, in a footnote, allies them with a similar section concluding Odo's tonary. Are they not perhaps Aurelian's Chapter XIX in the *Musica Disciplina* in substance, also? In that chapter Aurelian describes recitation formulas which could serve in the absence of some psalmodic plan, such as the notated doxology, which in later books "individualized" each mode. In other words, in a modernized tonary each modal formula might appear in the main body of the tonary at the head of its respective mode, instead of remaining in a separate section. Lawrence Gushee⁴ even states that just one tonary is represented in the three subdivisions of Aurelian's Chapters X–XIX, rather than three suspected formerly by Joseph Ponte. It appears likely that a separate section not intended to be a distinct tonary was also destined to appear at the back of the early Limousine tonaries, as governed by usual practice, or perhaps, merely by preference.

Having analyzed their contents in Chapters 1 and 2, Dr. Russell is now prepared to show the filiation of seven southern French tonaries. He says that though clearly similar in content, two traditions can be distinguished in the two principal groups: those sources from Saint-Martial and those from farther south in Aquitaine and Gascony. It follows that manuscript traditions testifying to practices in southern France are further distinguished by their regional backgrounds. Dr. Russell's next step is to discover the genealogy of the sources. He finds this a difficult task even as he lays his groundwork in Chapter 2 ("Difficulties of Erecting a Stemma"). Nevertheless, he produces a credible family tree. His Table No. 6 gauges the descent of southern French tonaries from 750, in a hypothetical lost prototype, to 1200, presaged closely by the Fleury manuscript, Paris B.N. *nouv. acq. lat.* 443. Paris 909 and Paris 1121 are closely tied, as are Paris 1118 and Paris 1084. Dr. Russell shows that the tonary of Toulouse descended from Paris 1084, and the tonary of Narbonne in turn from Toulouse. The tonary of

Gaillac reappears here as a possible direct descendant, as well as the tonary of Fleury, from Paris 1240, ancestor of the southern French family.

Chapters 4 and 5 deal individually with antiphonal and responsorial chants. Dr. Russell does not stop at identifying and tabulating the differences; rather, drawing from tables compiled, he analyzes melodic stereotypes in antiphons' beginnings. He thus intensifies his study of melodic incipits among the southern French antiphons, even including the *thèmes* of Gevaert (*La Melopée Antique*). *Initia* of introits and communions are compared by means of another table. He presents effectively his idea of the required adjustment of terminations to these beginnings as a ramification of Peter Wagner's *Anpassungsgesetz* (*Einführung*, III, pp. 78ff. and 129ff.). He develops his history of the system, which unfolds in stages from around 800, when no differences appear, to the latest version of the tonary from the 10th century (Paris 909), and then to the present. Next he correlates the respective involvement of the *tonus peregrinus* within the modal systems of his sources with Aurelian, Hucbald (?), Odo, and others. Students of the medieval modes may obtain worthwhile information here by noting the assignment of particular differences of the stock of peregrine-tone antiphons in the southern French tonaries. The treatment of the elaborate introit tones is extensive. Using Paris 909 as a standard, Dr. Russell has transcribed examples of them (Table No. 9) and compared versions in the tonary with those of the gradual proper. As a result, he can propound several kinds of interrelationships. Discussion of offertory chants, which swell the lists of Paris 909 and Paris 780, concludes Chapter 4. It is noteworthy that graduals, chants with nonstereotyped verse structure, are also found in Paris 909, Paris 780, and Paris 776. Although Dr. Russell does not make mention of the fact, the latter source even includes hymns, which are not associated with psalm verses.

In reading about responsorial chants in Chapter 5, we face the unanswered question: Why are six differences provided for the first mode in Paris 1121 when regularly the responsory is a class subject to but one difference? Dr. Russell suggests that since several differences for each mode, twenty-eight in sum, are acknowledged in Aurelian's *Deuterologium Tonorum*, responsories at that time normally adjusted to multiple terminations, a practice which appears to have been discontinued later. Thus the six different endings could have been either in error at the later date of Paris 1121, the early 11th century, or the consequence of proposing "out of purely theoretical interest" the categorization of responsories, like antiphons, by beginning formulas. Further investigation is needed.

The last chapter concerns the *Noeane* and *Primum quaerite*, modal vocalises which served to identify each mode with a characteristic melody. The *Noeane* formulas (or, as Byzantine chant authorities term them, *echemata*) had, perhaps, some liturgical background but are more probably purely theoretical remnants.⁵ They occurred earliest, for instance in Paris 1240, without melismas. Later, musical notation plus Latin phrases extracted from the Holy Scriptures were added; and still later, the Greek syllables were

abandoned in favor of the Latin verses. Dr. Russell finds that the Greek and Latin formulas had coexisted since the appearance of Paris 909 and that at some former time the Latin had compromised the Greek. Dr. Russell has undertaken a thorough comparison of the two systems and has established that they are sometimes parallel beyond their common purpose. He finds possible cross-relationships in the music in one or two cases, for example, similarity among the melismas of the *Commemoratio brevis* and Paris 1118, and even some melodic repetition in both Greek and Latin in Paris 909 and Paris 1121. The interesting comparison of *Noeane* and *Primum* formulas initiated in this research invites further study, and I hope Dr. Russell has plans to approach the tonary again from this direction.

A few minor errors nearly escape notice. The phrases "ordinary Mass pieces" and "ordinary chants" (p. 43) are confusing, since they may allude to either the Ordinary, requiring capitalization, or to usual chants, in which case some other adjective might have been less ambiguous. The phraseology is similarly misleading in "Paris 780, which even includes the ordinary chants" (p. 98). The spelling of "diastemy" (p. 42) defies interpretation. Is it a synthetic form of diastemata, which is a correct term in the context in which it is used? A discrepancy occurs in the note to Table No. 2 (p. 22), allotting Paris 780 the total of chants for Paris 776. In the concluding bibliography, one author, Joseph Smits van Waesberghe, has been listed under V rather than S. Such reference to compound cognomina is not infrequently a cause for perplexity among American authors (even more noticeably when they cite Spanish authorities). Perhaps of less consequence is Dr. Russell's translation "modulation" for *modulationem* (p. 107). One customarily finds some synonym of melody for this most problematic word.

This dissertation will provide the reader with several prospects for further research. One such prospect is the investigation of troping introts and the practice of adding melismas to introit verse-endings (pp. 86-87). Also, Dr. Russell's comments concerning the antiphons' beginnings as they are aligned with verse-terminations in the southern French practice ask for further study, as do the *echemata*. Dr. Russell's work deserves praise for its potential help to anyone studying tonaries. He has presented a spectrum of examples, not merely the southern French ones, and his statistics can be useful to anyone undertaking further comparisons. The excellent "Key to Difference Symbols Used in Appendices I and II" is actually a digest of psalm and introit verse-tone differences within the southern French sources. Equally useful are the musical transcriptions of entire tonaries in Paris 1118 and Paris 1121, best representing the two traditions. These are now available for comparison with Messine archetypes edited by Walter Lipphardt.⁶ Results might show relationships or nonrelationships between northern and southern French traditions more conclusively than we now recognize. In terms of the seven tonaries scrutinized, Appendix I provides the most complete data for the prescribed difference of every chant, conveniently indexed alphabetically by mode. Although Dr. Russell does not mention in what form

he studied his material, bibliographical reference to the southern French tonaries indicates that he could have found them only in source manuscripts or on microfilm. Dr. Russell's bibliography makes abundantly plain the fact that, heretofore, theoretical treatises, rather than liturgical music manuals, have received the lion's share of editors' attention. The time has come to examine the tonary afresh from a purely practical standpoint, and "The Southern French Tonary in the Tenth and Eleventh Centuries" has made a good start toward that end.

NOTES

¹ The encyclopedic *Musica Disciplina* of Aurelian of Réôme encompasses its tonary in Chapters X through XVII and *Deuterologium Tonorum*. The erudite commentary by Lawrence Arthur Gushee, "The *Musica Disciplina* of Aurelian of Réôme: A Critical Text and Commentary" (Ph.D. dissertation, Yale University, 1963), comprehends both speculation and practical musical phenomena of the 9th century. Dr. Gushee's dissertation makes Aurelian's writing seem less esoteric by means of an extremely pertinent diagnosis of semantics, and it is a pity that Dr. Russell neglected it, or that it was unavailable to him. Dr. Russell has employed the translation of the *Musica Disciplina* by Joseph Ponte (Ph.D. dissertation, Brandeis University, 1961) published in 1968 as Volume 3 of the Colorado College Music Press Series of translations. Both the Gushee and Ponte dissertations are reviewed in this issue of *Current Musicology*.

² Joseph Smits van Waesberghe, S. J., *Musikerziehung*, Vol. 3, Part 3 of H. Bessler and M. Schneider, *Musikgeschichte in Bildern* (1969), p. 196; also *idem*, *De musico-paedagogico et theoretico Guidone Aretino eiusque vita et moribus* (Florence, 1953), p. 143.

³ The notation in Paris 1240 is classified in the *Paléographie Musicale*, XIII, p. 141, as the most primitive diastemata. For a more recent assertion see Manfred F. Bukofzer, "The Music of the Laudes," Appendix I in Ernst H. Kantorowicz, *Laudes Regiae* (Berkeley, 1958), p. 191, Source No. 2.

⁴ *Op. cit.*, p. 205.

⁵ It is difficult to say just how practical *Noeane*, *Noeagis*, etc., were in the West. It may be that along with Dr. Russell (note on p. 35) we are too willing to admit them as a pure practice, whereas we should raise some real doubts about any liturgical employment. Dr. Russell (p. 112) suggests that they had been discontinued in the service probably long before they were eliminated from liturgical books, but he offers no information as to the nature of their former employment in the service.

⁶ *Der Karolingische Tonar von Metz*, Heft 43 of *Liturgiewissenschaftliche Quellen und Forschungen* (Münster, 1965).