

16.7.
SNOJ, J.
1998

QUIS INVENTOR MUSICAE: IUBAL AN PYTHAGORAS?

THE GREGORIAN CHANT IN THE HISTORY OF WEST EUROPEAN MUSIC

by
Jurij SNOJ

Institute of Musicology, Scientific Research Centre of the Slovenian Academy
of Sciences and Arts, Ljubljana, Slovenia

**JOURNAL FOR THE STUDY OF THE OLD TESTAMENT SUPPLEMENT SERIES 1998 ISSUE
289, page(s): 1727-1738**

Semiotical approach to the adiastematic neumatic notation shows the earliest written European music as a collection of musical items, whose actual melodic flow was not yet definitely established. This interpretation of the earliest plainchant records, which is in a way analogous to Huckle's understanding of musical differences between various plainchant repertoires, regards the carolingian plainchant as a music standing between oral musical culture and composed music.

Semiotički pristop k udiastematskim nevmam kaže najstarejšo zapisano evropsko glasbo kot korpus glashenih enot, katerih melodična podoba ni bila dokončno določena. Ta razlaga najstarejših zapisov koral, ki je v določenem smislu analogna Huckovemu razumevanju razlik med koralnimi repertoarji, vidi karolinški koral kot glasbo, ki stoji na meji med ustno glasheno kulturo in komponirano glasbo.

The paper deals with that musical culture which encompasses the oldest extant musical settings of Biblical texts on Slovene territory. These settings are numerous chants within the Gregorian tradition present in medieval plainchant codices or their remains, preserved in libraries or archives on Slovene territory. The oldest among them date back to c. 1000.¹ As is well-known, the Gregorian chant is the first preserved medieval music of any kind; the music which was written down and can be read from musical records, of which the oldest date from the ninth century. The nature of the Gregorian chant, as seen in medieval records, is by no means uniform; on Slovene soil, too, the extant records present regional characteristics, which can be understood and explained within the broader concept of the medieval plainchant tradition. This study leaves such examples on one side and concentrates on the Gregorian chant as the oldest medieval music written down.

The question arises: what is the Gregorian chant? Interestingly, such a question cannot be answered merely with the findings of music historiography. It is true that

¹ J. Höfler, *Tokovi glashene kulture na Slovenskem* (Ljubljana: Mladinska knjiga, 1970), 11ff.; J. Snoj, "Srednjeveški glasheni spomeniki v Ljubljani," *Muzikološke razprave* (ed. D. Pokorn; Ljubljana: Znanstvenoraziskovalni center SAZU, 1993), 7-23.

we vitally need answers to the questions when, where, in what circumstances, and from what source did the Gregorian chant come into being, who were its creators and who the bearers of the plainchant tradition? But the answers determine only the external conditions, and it is questionable how far these can define the music itself. From this standpoint the paper covers broader ground. Its central concern is the question what the plainchant, as found in the oldest records, is as music; what can be understood about the plainchant as music from those records themselves. The concept of the plainchant, as it can be created by reading the oldest neumatic records, is then ranged alongside the contemporary, that is the Carolingian theory of music, and since that is the continuation of Greek harmonic theory, the relation between ancient Greek music and the medieval plainchant tradition is also re-established. The third section deals with the question whether there exists a historical link between the plainchant and Jewish musical tradition, which was and still is considered the basic source of plainchant forms and indirectly even of actual melodies. From the answers or rather conceptualizations that will be formed in the sections indicated, an interpretation will be offered of what the plainchant is in European music history.

I

The Gregorian chant can be read from medieval musical records which differ greatly in their paleographical appearance as regards the time and place of their origin. The oldest of these records date from the ninth and tenth centuries and originated on the territory of the Frankish state.² Historically they have been interpreted in more recent times as part of Carolingian cultural activities and of the tendency to unify the formerly non-unified liturgy.³ There is no musical record that predates the ninth century.⁴ As it is not certain whether the oldest extant records are merely copies of still older texts, the fact that there are no musical records before the ninth century is binding: this means that one can speak about the picture of music in the earliest centuries only in the form of inductive hypotheses: to see or read it is not possible.

But although the plainchant, such as it was in the ninth and tenth centuries, is preserved in records, from the viewpoint of a contemporary observer or of our contemporary understanding of music, there is no clearcut picture. The great majority of the records from that time, especially the older ones, are written in the so-called adiastematic

neumes,⁵ in a type of medieval music notation which does not mark either the pitch or length relations between tones. For the modern performer such neumes are inadequate nor do they tell the modern researcher and paleographer what he would like to know about the music written in them, since the relation between tones or rather the exact tonal course of the melodies cannot be understood from them. The exact recording of intervals was more broadly established only around the year 1000, and only from that time are preserved to a larger extent plainchant records in which the intervals (the pitch relations between the tones of the melodies) are exactly determined and the recorded tunes are readable in their melodic line, although still without the rhythm being determined.⁶

The adiastematic neumes have remained an incomprehensible curiosity: not only because they cannot be read or understood according to the modern conception of music, but also because it was not and still is not possible to imagine what and whom they could serve in the form they had. Older music historiography saw in the adiastematic neumes an unskilful, technically incomplete and primitive attempt at a musical notation which, precisely due to its technical deficiencies, was unreadable and thus scarcely of any use.⁷ In this sense the adiastematic neumes were and still are treated as simply an incomplete means, incapable of indicating the music in connection with which they arose and which they recorded, a means which was not essentially connected with the music itself.

A question of principle arises: Is it possible that the music of any historical period might be in its essence something other than what can be understood from its notation; is it possible that the neumatic system might not have the closest connection with the music with which it originated? In semiological terminology we might ask ourselves: Is it possible that any sign system could be strictly differentiated from its referent in such a way that there would be no internal connection between the two: neither on the level of individual signs nor on the level of the entire sign system?⁸

Although it is not possible to exclude such a possibility as a matter of principle, in the case of neumatic writing it is obvious that this is not a type of agreed ciphers, whose meaning would either have been lost or was never exactly determined, on account of which neumatic records cannot be unambiguously decoded into musical sound. As a musical notation neumes—in their substance and form (in the semiological sense)⁹—are essentially linked very closely with their referent, the music. As such, neumatic records have a completely determined referent, they mark completely de-

² "Sources, MS, II," *The new Grove Dictionary of Music and Musicians*, 17 (ed. S. Sadie; London: Macmillan, 1980), 609; W. Apel, *Gregorian Chant* (London: Burns & Oates, 1958), 79.

³ D. Hiley, *Western Plainchant* (Oxford: Clarendon Press, 1993), 514ff.

⁴ S. Corbin, *Die Neumen* (Köln: Arno Volk-Verlag, Hans Gerig KG, 1977), 3.21ff.

⁵ S. Corbin, *ibid.*, 3.181ff.

⁶ W. Apel, *ibid.*, 1.18ff.; D. Hiley, *ibid.*, 388–389.

⁷ P. Wagner, *Neumenkunde* (Leipzig: 1912, reprinted Hildesheim: G. Olms, 1970), 167.

⁸ P. Guiraud, *Semiology* (London: Routledge, 1992), 24.

⁹ P. Guiraud, *ibid.*, 29.

terminated music, and if nowadays that seems incomprehensible or indefinable, then the reason for their incomprehensibility does not lie in the incompleteness of neumatic notation, but in the different nature of conceiving and understanding the music itself. In other words: if the adiastematic neumatic records are incomprehensible from the standpoint of modern musical experience, then that musical experience is separated from the environment of musical experience in the period of the adiastematic neumatic records. This means that the musical culture of the ninth century must have been essentially separate from the modern.

The interpretation of the adiastematic neumatic notation within the framework of questions about music aesthetics and semiology is a desideratum of contemporary musicology. For the time being it is not possible to present any new complex and more generally established insight into the early history of musical literacy, such as would interpret and understand neumatic records in the sense of a sign system in a set of semiological theories with all their possible implications. The following attempt is restricted to just one clearly recognizable aspect of neumatic signs and tries to understand it as the aesthetic nature of music set down in neumatic writing.

Most explanations attribute iconicity (in the semiological sense)¹⁰ to neumes as signs, that is, neumes are taken to be graphic icons of musical or vocal turns. If we describe their appearance in an unprofessional way, neumes are curves, hooks, semi-circles, lines and dots turned in different directions, arranged above the lines of the sung texts. As such they are understood as a reflection of individual musical procedures that comprise the melodic line.¹¹ In this sense neumes serve to transfer the musical movement, which necessarily flows in the category of time, into graphic signs which can remain in the category of space—or of the writing surface—to put it in concrete terms. When it is understood what in the written space serves what in the musical space, the basis is laid down for reading and understanding neumatic notation.

The connection shown here can provide an insight into the nature of recorded melodies such as the first neume writers of the ninth and tenth centuries must have had, especially those who did not record the exact pitch relations between tones. In the sense of this connection we can ask what the recorded music shows, if we imagine the individual neumatic signs to be icons, reflecting the musical flow of the sections comprising the music. It appears most of all as musical movement: rising, falling or floating; a movement which must indeed have been composed of tones as we conceive them nowadays, but concerning which the records do not show a clear awareness that their

¹⁰ L. Treidler, "Reading and singing: on the genesis of occidental music-writing," *Early Music History* 4 (1984), 177; P. Guiraud, *ibid.*, 25ff.

¹¹ H. Stäblein, *Schriftbild der einstimmigen Musik* (Leipzig: VEB Deutscher Verlag für Musik, 1975). Neumentabelle: E. Cardin, *Semiotologia gregoriana* (Rome: Pontificio istituto di musica sacra, 1968), 5.

basis and starting-point would be individual tones. Awareness of musical movement—even in early music theory differentiated from awareness of tones¹²—here obviously takes precedence over awareness of the tones themselves. The concept of a particular tone as a basic element and in this sense the source of everything musical is present in neumatic notation only in an indefinite way.¹³ We can deduce from this that musical movement, as shown by neumatic records, is not interchangeable with the concept of a structure composed of tones, with definite and strict relations between tones, it is not interchangeable with the concept of composition in the modern sense of the word.

Such an understanding of music preserved in neumatic notation (according to which adiastematic neumes do not record the pitch relations between tones, because in the music of that time this was not relevant), can be linked with more recent knowledge about the origin and nature of the earliest preserved plainchant repertoire. From comparisons and studies of the oldest neumatic records it is obvious that the written melodies were not conceived as final compositions but as possible musical realizations within the melodic plainchant tradition, which allowed—for the same text in the same liturgical function, that is, for the same chant—different renderings in actual performance.¹⁴ Those involved in the Carolingian plainchant culture, who included neumators, were therefore not merely users or transmitters of finally formulated musical works, of compositions, but were above all bearers of the melodic plainchant tradition, which was not acquainted with finally formulated compositions and final completion in general. So it is understandable that the records themselves cannot demonstrate final completion.

With the conceptualization of the melodic plainchant tradition shown here it is possible to have a different understanding of Isidore of Seville's famous dictum as regards recording music. Isidore says that music must be memorized, otherwise it is lost when it is not possible to record musical tones: *Nisi enim ab homine memoria teneantur, soni pereunt, quia scribi non possunt*.¹⁵ In the literature on music history this statement was considered indisputable proof that in the first half of the seventh century, that is, in the time of Gregory the Great, there was no musical writing, which also means that Pope Gregory could not have plainchant melodies recorded. The content of the dictum is not in dispute nor does it need any new explanations. Nevertheless it is still more enlightening if we try to read it with an awareness of the musical culture in which it originated. It is not only that musical writing did not exist, musical writing was not even pos-

¹² Aristoxenus, *Elementa harmonica* 1.11 (ed. A. Barker, *Greek Musical Writings II*; Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 1989).

¹³ M. Bieltz, *Musik und Grammatik* (München/Salzburg: E. Katzschler, 1977), 47.

¹⁴ H. Huckle, "Toward a new Historical View of Gregorian Chant," *Journal of the American Musicological Society* 33 (1980), 464.

¹⁵ Isidore of Seville, *Sententiae de Musica* 1 (ed. M. Gerbert, *Scriptores veteres de cantu et musica positum ecclesiastica* 1; Sankt-Blasien, 1774).

sible, since music is something that is not finally completed and fixed. Isidore understood music as a matter of memory, that is, as part of human spirituality. If it were written down and performed according to written records, according to something outside the performer's awareness, it would in its very essence be something different.

II

If we attempt to test these findings about neumatic notation and the music written in it against contemporary, that is, Carolingian music theory, we can confirm them only through negation. The concept of music as seen in neumatic records is not compatible with that seen in Carolingian writings on music theory. Although Carolingian music theory makes constant appeal to the plainchant repertoire and even quotes it explicitly, it is obvious that the former's basic starting-points are not to be found in the observation of that contemporary music. Its fundamental concepts are the tone, the interval, that is, the measured relation between two tones, the arrangements of tones and semitones within some larger interval, and modes,¹⁶ all of which are exactly those given conditions of music that cannot be understood from the contemporary adiastematic records.

In keeping with this, illustrative examples of these musical writings are set down in different notational systems: those which exactly mark the pitch relations between tones, either with letters or with the sung text written down in the stave or both.¹⁷ This is a significant fact: obviously it was possible in the ninth and tenth centuries to write music so that the pitch relations between tones were determined, which means that the plainchant could also have been recorded in such a way if it had been conceived differently. It is precisely the different nature of the neumatic notation that can serve as an indicator that the plainchant melodic tradition had a different conceptual background to that of the contemporary music theory.

The sources of Carolingian music theory are well-known: it is the continuation of classical music theory, especially the continuation of an undisputed medieval authority, Boethius, the author or translator of the treatise *De musica*.¹⁸ But Greek music theory was not independent of the music of its time: despite all the problems which accompany the relation between it and Greek melopoetic culture it is possible to assume that it came into being with the observation of actual contemporary music, and along with this observation was some pondering over where the causes lay for

¹⁶ C. V. Palisca, "Theory, theorists," *The New Grove Dictionary of Music and Musicians* 18, 744ff.

¹⁷ D. Hiley, *ibid.*, 392.

¹⁸ J. P. Migne (ed.), *Patrologia latina*, 64.

this or that musical ethos. Fundamentally there is the conviction that the given aesthetic conditions of music and its ethos are hidden in the given physical conditions of sound, or at least in the properties of theoretical abstract concepts. The discussion of musical sound, caught in mathematical expressions, means in Greek music theory discussing its aesthetic defining lines.

One can conclude from this that the concept of music as seen in Greek music theory is noticeable in Greek music itself, and this is also confirmed by extant records of Greek music¹⁹ or just Greek notation itself. The Greek notation signs indicate the tones of the system and also their length,²⁰ which means that the extant examples of classical melopoetic culture are definable in their tone and rhythmic composition—their music is thus measured in rhythm as in intervals. In this way the preserved remnants of Greek music harmonize in their essence with the starting-points of Greek music theory, according to which the elements and beginning of music are tones, intervals and systemata.

It is obvious that the plainchant melodic tradition, such as existed in the Carolingian period, was neither planned nor understood according to concepts of classical harmonic theory and its continuation in the Middle Ages, nor was it founded on the same aesthetic starting-points as classical Greek melopoetic culture. But not only the divergence between music theory and the plainchant melodic tradition, seen in Greek notation as compared with neumatic notation, but also the actual comparisons of extant examples of Greek music with the plainchant convincingly show that the plainchant tradition represents a culture that cannot be linked with the classical Greek musical world.²¹

III

Until recently music historiography held that the source of the Christian melodic tradition was to be found in the music of the Jewish Old Testament services and that the basic form principles of the Gregorian chant as well as individual melodies were taken from there. This conviction rested especially on the fact that psalmody, which can be seen as the starting-point of the Gregorian chant repertoire, was one of the important elements of the Jewish temple and synagogue liturgy.²² New knowledge connected with the synagogue liturgy, which supposedly arose only some centuries after the de-

¹⁹ E. Pohlmann, *Denkmäler altgriechischer Musik* (Nürnberg: H. Carl, 1970).

²⁰ R. P. Winnington-Ingram, "Greece, Ancient," *The New Grove Dictionary of Music and Musicians* 7, 668ff.

²¹ W. Apel, *ibid.*, 36.

²² O. Ursprung, *Die katholische Kirchenmusik* (Potsdam, 1931), Iff.; W. Apel, *ibid.*, 34.

struction of the Temple in AD 70, and as such could not be either the continuation of the temple liturgy or the starting-point of the Christian liturgy, shows the link between temple, synagogue and early Christian liturgy and music in a new light. We can claim with certainty that no direct and clear historical evidence exists for positing a link between early Christian and Jewish music.²³ Searching for historical links between the two is also questionable because music historiography in the first Christian centuries is founded merely on a series of mostly unconnected statements about music or mentions of it, the interpretation of which, especially regarding musical terms, is always hypothetical and debatable.

It is possible to step onto firmer ground as regards the relation between Jewish and Christian music only with the twelfth century, from which the first written examples of music from a Jewish background are preserved. But even for these cases it is not certain what they are: newly created melodies, records or arrangements of music from some Jewish environment in Europe or something else. These examples are written in Italian neumes—their recorder ought to be Italian—thus in a notation which was conceived as that of the plainchant.²⁴ The music of these instances can be recognized as related to plainchant melodies, but this relationship is due more to this being music that arose in the environment of medieval European monody than due to supposed historical connections between early Christian and Jewish music of a millenium earlier.

Most music of Jewish communities was written down only after 1700;²⁵ in the nineteenth and twentieth centuries it was recorded also in the sense of the modern interest in national musical culture outside West European composed music and the supposition about the source of early Christian music in Jewish music should find confirmation precisely in the music of modern Jewish communities, recorded in more recent times. But records of Jewish music of the nineteenth and twentieth centuries, which have been compared with the plainchant, are more than fifteen hundred years younger than that melodic culture which could be a common source for modern Jewish music as well as the plainchant tradition of the Carolingian period. Conclusions about the historical link between early Christian and Jewish music, based on these comparisons, are founded on the assumption that Jewish music remained unchanged for one and a half millenia. Such an assumption cannot in any way be supported.

Similarities between modern Jewish music and the plainchant do exist, though they are not particularly striking.²⁶ But even though we acknowledge them, the deriva-

tion of historical links from recognized melodic similarities is questionable. The comparison of music recorded in the nineteenth century with records of a thousand years earlier is debatable especially because the treatment of a musical creation is divorced from its environment. If from the semiological view we understand actual melodies as a message of signs, which can be read and understood differently according to a different code, then the equality of the signs cannot mean similar referents. The mere form of a sign does not determine its meaning,²⁷ so that sameness or similarity in melodies in itself cannot be proof of historical connections.

IV

From the foregoing discussion it is evident that historical evidence does not allow a direct linkage between the Jewish musical tradition and the early Christian one; similarly, the divergence between Carolingian music theory—the continuation of the classical—and the Carolingian plainchant shows that this is part of a different musical environment than ancient Greek music, which thus cannot be the distant predecessor of the Carolingian plainchant. We are left with the alternative of seeing the plainchant as music of the time and place where it was recorded. Nevertheless it is not possible to conceive the history of the early beginnings of this extensive medieval musical repertoire as the work of a definite number of individuals from the same period and region. It must be presented as a musical tradition that existed in the Western Christian liturgy for centuries before the first extant records.²⁸

What this melodic or musical tradition was like prior to those records cannot be known. From the nature of the oldest preserved records, those in the adiastematic neumes of the ninth and tenth centuries, however, it is apparent that an oral musical tradition was written down in which the individual units were not finally determined in musical terms. In this sense the various recorded melodies—as has been shown—represented possible renderings which, prior to their being written down, if we can imagine it, did not have any exclusive value that would preclude different renderings of the same liturgical text. Thus the first records are in the nature of being records of actual music events rather than finalized musical items.

Here it becomes necessary to pose the question about the place of the musical record in the communicative process of that period or about the beginnings and purpose of writing down music altogether. This question is not merely paleographical

²³ J. W. McKinnon, "On the question of psalmody in the ancient synagogue," *Early Music History* 6 (1986), 159–191.

²⁴ E. Werner, *The Sacred Bridge II* (New York: Kniv, 1984), 206ff.

²⁵ E. Werner, "Jewish Music, Liturgical," *The New Grove Dictionary of Music and Musicians* 9, 616.

²⁶ E. Werner, *ibid.*, 625; W. Apel, *ibid.*, 34.

²⁷ P. Guiraud, *ibid.*, 27.

²⁸ H. Huckle, *ibid.*, 464ff.

but also semiological: it concerns not just ascertaining when, where and with what signs neumatic notation arose but also the question of what music actually became, to necessitate its being written down.²⁹

The answer to this question can be illuminated by some facts connected with the general cultural endeavours of the period. It is well-known that the West European Latin rite was codified in the Carolingian age. Parallel with this was the forming of a unified Latin writing which became the basis for all future Latin scripts. At the same time a punctuation system took shape, or was at least strongly developed, whose function was to provide a logical and sensible articulation of texts, the understanding of which thus became much more clearly defined and less left to individual judgment.³⁰ Here the closest parallel with music can be perceived. Just as it was necessary to define the logical sense of texts for them to be consistently understood, so it was necessary to define the musical sense of sung liturgical units; plainchant melodies, the oldest preserved renderings of Biblical texts, are musical interpretations which, precisely by virtue of being written down, became a binding fact. From then on, the musical as well as the logical interpretation of texts was no longer completely left to the passing mental or emotional impulse of the individual, that is the performer, but one prescribed form had to be maintained. Adiastrumatic neumes, which still do not mark the pitch relations between tones, stand in this sense at the beginning of the process whereby plainchant melodies were given exact, melodic, tonal definition, this coming about some decades later. The plainchant melodies written in the Carolingian age are not truly compositions as we know them from later periods, yet in their written form represent a decisive step towards the concept of conscious tonal formation, of composing in the modern meaning of the word.

Medieval writers on music theory, including pre-Carolingian ones, often in the introductory chapters of their treatises, will pose the question of the beginnings of music or of its originators or inventors. *Quis inventor musicae* is thus one of the topics of medieval music theory discussions.³¹ In this connection two names occur: the Biblical Jubal, whose only mention in Genesis is as the father of all Jewish musicians³² and Pythagoras, supposed to be the first who established that the mystery of music

lies in strictly defined and measurable numerical ratios.³³ The question as put in those medieval treatises is on the level of a mythological understanding of imaginary musical beginnings and not on the level of a logical consideration of music and its fixing in time. In this sense it is difficult to ascribe to it any other extension. But it is precisely the mythological nature of the topos that gives it the indefiniteness that allows both persons, Jubal and Pythagoras, to be freely understood as symbols for two different conceptions of the musical.

These concepts can be expressed through these two questions: Is the source and essence of music hidden in measurable and definable nature, in the embodiment of sounds, in such a way that all the possible realizations of music lie in the nature of sound itself, determined by it, and requiring only that they be discovered; or is music something which starts only where the world of natural sound ends, so that sound is just an essential means through which music can be transmitted from performer to hearer, a means which otherwise is not linked with music itself as art? If we apply this dilemma to the music of the immediate environment of the writers who asked about the originators Jubal and Pythagoras, if we apply it to the plainchant and ask ourselves what understanding of music is shown by this music, we can say it is not possible to ascribe to the plainchant as an oral musical tradition any consciousness of the measurability of musical elements and of their cosmological extension and parallels, such as was seen by Greek theory. Nevertheless the Carolingian and post-Carolingian reception, which attributed a hagiological source to the plainchant, wanted to see it as an unchangeable law, whose aesthetic defining lines were not to be found in the momentary effect of musical events, but were founded on principles hidden behind the actual musical phenomena, and which only theory could reveal.

The centuries-long history of the Gregorian chant, the oldest Biblical music, allows the plainchant to be understood in both these ways.

Translated by Margaret DAVIS

Summary

Jurij SNOJ

QUIS INVENTOR MUSICAE: IUBAL AN PYTHAGORAS? GREGORIAN CHANT IN THE HISTORY OF WEST EUROPEAN MUSIC

This paper concerns the historical and aesthetical determinants of Gregorian chant, whose melodies include the oldest preserved musical settings of biblical texts. As a result of a different approach to the neumatic notation, the plainchant melodies, which were first written down during the ninth and tenth centuries, cannot

²⁹ L. Treitler, *ibid.*, 207-208.

³⁰ *ibid.*, 138ff.

³¹ [Isidore of Seville, *ibid.*, II; Aurelianus Reomensis, *Musica disciplina* II (ed. L. Gushee; *Corpus scriptorum de musica* 21; American Institute of Musicology, 1975); B. Prasperi, *Clarissima plane atque chorialis musica interpretatio* (Basel, 1501), without pagination.

³² Gen 4.21.

³³ Guido of Arezzo, *Micrologus*, 20 (ed. J. Smits van Waesberghe; *Corpus scriptorum de musica* 4; American Institute of Musicology, 1955).

be conceived as thoroughly defined musical entities or compositions in the modern sense of the word; rather they are random musical renderings of the formal liturgical texts, carried out within the limits of the plainchant melodic tradition of the time. As such, they stand in sharp contrast to ancient Greek music that has been preserved and also to the Greek and Carolingian music theory. According to recent research, it is also impossible to draw a direct link between the Jewish Temple or synagogue music and early Christian chant. Plainchant should therefore be considered as the indigenous music of the period in which it was set down with neumatic notation. As the starting point of composed music, plainchant could be regarded as a border line between two different concepts of music.

Povzetek

Jurij SNOJ

QUIS INVENTOR MUSICAE: IUBAL AN PYTHAGORAS?

GREGORIJANSKI KORAL V ZGODOVINI ZAHODNOEVROPSKE GLASBE

Prispevek se ukvarja z glasbenozgodovinskimi in glasbenoestetskimi določilnicami gregorijanskega koralu, znotraj katerega so tudi najstarejše ohranjene uglasbitve svetopisemskih besedil. Izhajajoč iz drugega razumevanja nevmatskih zapisov se koralne melodije, zapisane prvič ob koncu 9. in v začetku 10. stoletja, ne kažejo kot dokončno določena glasbena dela, kompozicije v sodobnem smislu, pač pa kot možne glasbene ureščitve posameznih liturgičnih spevov v sklopu koralnega melodičnega izročila dobe. Take so v ostrem nasprotju s preostalimi spomeniki antične grške glasbene kulture in tudi v nasprotju z grško in karolinško glasbeno teorijo. Po novejših glasbenozgodovinskih dognanjih tudi judovske tempeljske ali sinagogske glasbe zgodovinsko ni mogoče neposredno povezovati s krščanskim melodičnim izročilom. Koral se tako kaže kot izvira glasba dobe, ko je bila prvič zapisana, in ga je mogoče razumeti kot mejnik med dvema pojmovanjema glasbe v zahodnoevropski glasbeni zgodovini.