

# THEIR VOICES AND OURS (2006/2017)

Staale Sinding-Larsen

[Preface for Internet Publication]

Out of the blue came an invitation to contribute to an international conference on musicology at the University of Regensburg/Ratisbon in 2006 under the direction of Prof. David Hiley; surprising because I had never gone beyond my competence by publishing opinions about music, to say nothing of musicology.

But I had written on methodology - a set of parameters including theory, not mere method (keeping things in some order).

So I wrote the following piece, delivering an abbreviated version as a lecture. My contribution must have had some significance since it caused an uproar. Later on I was politely asked if I might consider not to publish it in the planned volume, since my article was "clearly different from the rest". And this I did understand, seeing that the other contributions were excellent offsprings from the great tradition of music scholarship, in which differences of approach were expressed within positivistically handled historical events and occurrences; avoiding theoretical "complications".

Taking for granted that a conference under a "European" aegis might accept some debate on principles, I tried to open one. To discuss methodology for a field beyond one's reach may display some useful pros and contras. It is in the context of interdisciplinary - in my terms: open-source - interests, rather than that of musicology, that I want to publish this piece.

The main idea is, simply, that we need theory to guide us to the What and the How. This was stated in the clearest terms by Albert Einstein according to Werner Heisenberg's *Die Quantenmechanik und ein Gespräch mit Einstein*:

*Aber vom prinzipiellen Standpunkt aus ist es ganz falsch, eine Theorie nur auf beobachtbare Größen gründen zu wollen. Denn es ist ja in Wirklichkeit genau umgekehrt. Erst die Theorie entscheidet darüber, was man beobachten kann.*

Here we go. My contribution was delivered with the following title.

CUM QUIBUS ET NOSTRAS VOCES: PARTICIPATING ON BOTH LEVELS.

## Introduction

If you, like me, are not musicologists and were reading scholarly works on cultural, social or political history in Europe in the Middle Ages and later, you might easily stay unaware of the role of music. To start with myself, in 1984 I published a book on the relations between iconography and the Mass ritual. The book, however useful it might be under other headings, was rightly criticized for silence with regard to one crucial factor: music. The omission was not exclusively due to my own incompetence in this field but also, to some extent, to the circumstance that music is rarely mentioned except in musicological literature. Even a cursory notion of its role should have alerted me to being more observant about such omissions - a claim I now want to look at in a wider interdisciplinary perspective.

## WHY DON'T WE HEAR MORE ABOUT MUSIC?

We outsiders, usually without realizing it, become accustomed to looking at music and song as something very special and extra. We may love to listen to it, but this is exactly the limited context we apply to it. It is more or less like thinking of paintings as something over a sofa.

We read about Galileo Galilei's physics and cosmology without being told that he excelled in playing the lute, and about Descartes' philosophy and mathematics while his *Compendium Musicae* of 1618 is mostly passed over, allowing us to forget that scientific imagination and artistic talent in many respects are two names for one thing.

We expect music and song in church service, and especially so in the Catholic world, while in actual fact it is everpresent in European history also in the so-called civic world.

And yet, in historical and political accounts about the activities of Louis XIV, for example, we are left ignorant about the circumstance that he was himself musically gifted and never did a thing without the accompaniment of music, from getting up in the morning, taking part in all sorts of ceremonies, eating his meals (his supper to Delalande's suites), and enjoying the company of his mistresses. While King Henri IV of France, even in a love poem such as the one to the Charmante Gabrielle, musters his Royal Music: *Je veux que mes trompettes, mes fifres, les échos, a tous moment répètent ces doux et tristes mots...cruelle départie...* We have to go to musicologist literature, like Anthony's book on French Baroque Music, to obtain information about such a musical culture. Perhaps political flair owes something to a capability that also enables one to handle the complexities of music (even though the disastrous politics of the music-loving Francis I might seem a disclaimer of such a notion).

Playing of instruments provided constant accompaniment to almost every sort of rite and action, such as tournaments, the formalisms of courtoisement and the pageantry and the brutal conduction of warfare. It is, therefore, somewhat surprising, when scanning Keen's important and excellent book on medieval and postmedieval Chivalry, to find nothing at all on music.

We learn about Händel's *Dettingen Te Deum* from musicology but not from history. It is as if anything that cannot be straightforwardly verbalized does not count; and this even at a time like ours when one leans heavily on pictures that more or less completely defy any verbalization; an issue to which shall return presently.

Now, after this preliminary, what shall I say when even historical documents remain almost completely silent on music even when dealing with situations and processes in which we do know that music and song constituted an important element? Let me cite the ritual book for San Marco, Venice,

of 1564, a document which seems to include much medieval material, the *Rituum ceremoniale* (Bibl. Marc., cod. lat., III, 172 - Coll. 2276), (of which I have published a substantial part in a recent book). It was compiled by the Ceremony Master in 1564, that is, at a period when the Council of Trent had just finished its work, in 1563, having issued instructions on liturgical music (see, for example, Whenham's book on Monteverdi) and at a time marked with new developments in music, not least so in Venice. In the very extensive document there are just three direct references to music (see the Appendix). Two of them typically are inserted in order to record a change in a traditional rite; I say typically, for the recording of ritual change or alternatives runs through the entire document. The first one goes as follows: *quo finito [namely a specific rite] statim diaconus et subdiaconus intonant Te Deum laudamus. hoc fiebat quando cantores canebant Te Deum alternatim cum organis. sed posteaquam Magister capelle Dominus Adrianus [Willaert] composuit omnes versus ipsius Te Deum, cantores intonant, ut commodiorem sibj uocem accipiant.* To which I append an approximate translation: after this rite has terminated, the deacon and subdeacon will immediately intone *Te Deum Laudamus*. This was done when the cantors sang the *Te Deum* alternatingly with the organs. But since the Chapel Master, Master Adriaen [Willaert], composed <the music to> all the verses of the same *Te Deum*, the cantors intone in a manner that is adequate for this.

## THE SALVE REGINA RITUAL

The next reference to music (or song) also occurs in connection with a rite subjected to change and alternative details, namely the recital of the *Salve Regina*.

One section in the *Rituum caerimoniale* offers instructions about How to sing the *Salve Regina* on Sundays. The eulogy was recited from a book on a lectern close to the high altar upon which was placed an image of the Virgin Mary for the occasion; this probably was the so-called *Nicopeia Madonna* in San Marco, today in a chapel in the north transept. I shall present a synopsis of the text of the rite so close to the original as to amount almost to a full translation (the original text in the Appendix, where also the second documentation concerning *cantus figuratus* is quoted).

On every Sunday from the Octave of Pentecost until Advent, whenever we do the whole Sunday office ..., after Vesper we always go in procession to the image of the Virgin Mary, singing *Salve Regina* in plainsong, intoned at the high altar by two clerics. And the cantors sing those three versicles [which must refer to the two versicles and the response cited below] in '*cantus figuratus*' to the said image, with the chorus responding alternately, as usual. [cancelled in the ms at some later date: And after the prayer for the Mother of God {*pro parae: Deiparae*} has been said, the lectern with its napkin is removed from the choir, while the priest is praying, and is brought up before the said image.] [Addition: and the prayer book [*Orationale*] <brought> by the priest] [Addition: on a lectern brought there by the supervisor before the Vesper], for saying the prayer after *Salve Regina*, the versicle *Sempiternae Deus, qui gloriosae*. And the clergy say the versicle *Dignare me* with the response *Da mihi virtutem*. Thereupon prayer as above [the prayer for the Mother of God, and when the procession returns, ... *Maria mater gratiae* and *Gloria tibi Domine* are intoned, and that is all. [Addition: And on all feasts for the Virgin Mary, when the icon [anchona] is set upon the altar, and when it is brought back to the sacristy, always, going in and returning, *Maria mater gratiae* and *Gloria tibi Domine* are sung, either by the appointed clergy or by the Ceremony Master...].

In order to study such rites as this further, let us note first some basic features of the Roman Catholic Tradition, furthermore some scientific principles (Section 5.1.).

## FUNDAMENTALS OF THE ROMAN TRADITION

At the risk of sounding more Catholic than the Pope, not perhaps the preferable thing to do at the present celebration in Regensburg, I must nevertheless remind ourselves of some well-known fundamentals as a premise for my further argumentation. [the then functioning archbishop of Regensburg had a brother who was Pope].

It is the action in the liturgy, using the biblical material with support from the Fathers of the Church, that essentially defines Catholic Tradition. The term Tradition, involving dovetailing on a number of levels, is understood in the sense of Roman Theology, including the patristic body of texts, in the Liturgy, Sacramentology and Ecclesiology.

A common misconception, especially among Lutherans, who never liked sacrifices, surfaces in attempts to separate the Word parts of the liturgy from its sacrificial centre in the Mass.

An altar space functioning in the context of the Mass, whether directly during the celebration or because of the implications of the site, will have for its context the ritually and sacramentally acted expression of the entire Roman Catholic Tradition. This will be so on account of the functional cohesion distinctive of the systemic nature of the same Tradition, and it also holds for such a rite as the *Salve Regina*, which took place close to the altar and in connection with a Mass.

## OPERA BONA: DOING THE WORK

The Mass is the centre of the liturgy, and the liturgy is the fulcrum of the entire complex of what theologically is known as Good Works, *opera bona*, among which the celebration and participation in the Eucharistic Offering is the fundamental entity and model.

St. Benedict in his Rule employs the term *opus* for the liturgy when he proclaims the importance of the liturgy: *Ergo nihil Operi Dei praeponatur* (St. Benedict, *Regula*, c. 43): the liturgy must precede anything else, an admonition to latecomers!. *Opus Dei* is here the entire liturgy, which is a set of repeated ritual and sacramentally established processes.

The Work quality of Roman Catholicism has always been accentuated. Dante's letter to the lord of Verona expresses the traditional idea, whether the letter is authentic or not, when it states that the *Commedia* was *non ad speculandum, sed ad opus inventum*. The link to active, elaborating Tradition is crucial: elaboration supplanting mere scanning of Biblical texts. These acquire full meaning only through their being acted out in the liturgy, with Mass as the fundamental *opus bonum*, something not always understood in Lutheran circles. Hence the traditional Catholic opposition against perusal of the Bible as the main source, something many Lutheran and other "bookish" theologians and art historians have never grasped: Panofsky for one. Typically, Caravaggio's *Calling of St. Matthew* and St. Matthew writing the Gospel, in its first version with the Gospel written in Hebrew, was based on the Breviary, not on the Bible. The Council of Trent only confirmed Tradition when stressing the predominance of Tradition over direct reading of the Bible. Even as late as in Stendhal's *Le rouge et le noir*, of 1831, an abbé is accused of Protestantism because he makes the protagonist, his pupil Julien Sorel, read the Bible rather than the Fathers of the Church.

We find clear instructions about this essential notion of activity in the Mass itself. It is specifically applied to our voices but by implication, again owing to the systemic nature of the liturgy; it is valid for all activities within the range of Catholic religion.

## **CONJUNCTION OF EARTH AND HEAVEN BROUGHT ABOUT BY THE MASS**

The functional basis for the use of song and music in a church in the Roman World is expressed in the Preface and Sanctus of Canon of the Mass in the following terms:

Cum quibus et nostras voces, ut admitti iubeas, deprecamur, supplici confessione dicentes: Sanctus, Sanctus, Sanctus Domine Deus Sabaoth. Pleni sunt caeli, et terra gloria tua... (We pray you, bid our voices to be admitted with theirs [the heavenly hosts, angels], joining together in exultation celebrate your majesty).

By this mechanism, at the celebration of the Canon of the Mass, Heaven and earth are joined together, as stated by St. Gregory the Great (died 604) and repeated later by Pope Innocens III (d. 1216) and Bishop Guillaume de Mende (d. 1296) (Postremo hic cantica Angelorum [the Sanctus] canimus, quia per hoc sacrificium terrena iungi caelestibus non dubitamus...). The *viventes*, the four "animals", man, eagle, ox and lion, produced from a combination of texts from Isaiah 6 and Revelation 4 lead the vocal celebration before the Trinity (illustrated with inscriptions in Saint-Sernin, Toulouse, an exceptional case) (they also, just because of this role, in addition became symbols of the four Evangelists). In Paradise, before the Throne, angels participate, often with contemporary musical instruments, as we see on innumerable paintings (see below).

The clause *Cum quibus et nostras voces* occurs so to speak at the definitory centre of Christian action and acquires thus a general validity: this and related formulas, such as those just cited, imply that there is no clear distinction between using voices for speaking, recital or chant/song, and thus also when voice expressions are accompanied by instruments. Their further implication covers Good Works in general.

An important implication of this conception, is that even artistic creation in painting as well as music, including the programming, the management and the craftsmanship, will be evaluated in the light of "our voices" that celebrate the Lord in unison with the heavenly beings. Furthermore, the cited concept provides the justification for pictorial representations opening the architectural space of the church by similarity of forms or, indeed, perspectively into a painted heaven. We see this in paintings from the fourteenth century and on with the heavenly throne repeating the shape of the frame, or the twelfth-century mosaic in Santa Francesca romana, with "internal" celestial columns continuing the rows of the real ones in the nave, right up to such dramatic "Baroque" coordinations of heaven and the architecture of the church as in Pozzo's vault frescoes in Sant'Ignazio, Rome.

## **ANGELS WITH FIDDLES**

To repeat: the issue is not what someone or something is but what they do and what we can do with them conceptually or otherwise. This perspective has been familiar to science theorists for the last fifty years.

Are angels male or female? Such a question is irrelevant because the Tradition leaves it undefined. In the liturgy they are referred to as males (to avoid having to say It about an angel) The point is what they do and how we can behave when invoking them. When exercising their fundamental functions, above all, participating in the celestial liturgy, carrying the offering up to God (as stated in the Canon) or such actions as leading humans in their role of guardians, in texts and imagery they assume human forms and behavior. It is their actions that are thus qualified. In this way they become approachable to humans and seem to allow humans to participate with them in whatever they do; that is, following the precept implied in the *Cum quibus et nostras voces* formula.

In an Antiphonale monasticum, cited by Ernetti, we learn: quorum quidam hunc modum cantandi ab Angelis didicerunt; alii, Spiritu Sancto rimante in cordibus eorum, per contemplationem perceperunt: (they learnt this way of chanting from the angels, others through contemplation, with the Holy Spirit in their hearts).

The concept of facing and approaching the angels also was introduced into monastic rule. According to David Steindl-Rast, OSB, The rule of St. Benedict ... reminds monks that they stand in presence of angel choirs whenever they chant. He is obviously referring to St. Benedict's Rule, Chapter XIX, entitled The attitude to assume when chanting (De disciplina psallendi), with its reference to Psalm 137:1 (Confitebor tibi, Domine, in toto corde meo, quoniam audisti verba oris mei, in conspectu angelorum psallam tibi: chanting before the countenance of angels) and the sequel to this in the Rule itself: Ergo consideremus qualiter oporteat in conspectu Divinitatis et angelorum eius esse, et sic stemus ad psallendum, ut mens nostra concordet voci nostrae.

On this background, it is not surprising that imagery shows the angels as being approachable on a wordly or human level.

In the Paradise fresco by Guariento in the Doge's Palace, Venice, of ca. 1360 (the remaining portions after the fire of 1577 are assembled in a room across the corridor from the Sala del Maggior Consiglio), in the bottom row all the angels are playing various contemporary instruments. The case is far from unique, angels playing instruments at the feet of the celestial throne being found in a great number of pictures of the Late Middle Ages and Renaissance. Often other angels are shown with their mouths open, singing or chanting.

What is remarkable in this connection is the use of human voices and, especially, human-crafted musical instruments which are often meticulously represented. This reflects a liturgy-based conceptual imagery of the closeness of Heaven and earth and their contrapuntal celebration in concert. In this manner, the feeling may be intensified of paralleling celestial celebration whenever chanting the Salve Regina, with or without music, before a picture of her and generally, praising the Lord with or without a relevant image before one's eyes. It is this interaction between the world and Heaven that made it possible, to cite one among many late cases, to combine in one chapel and under one commission Caravaggio's "realism" and the lofty and idealized academism of Annibale Carracci (the Cerasi Chapel in Santa Maria del Popolo, Rome).

## **THE SALVE REGINA AGAIN**

Now let me briefly sketch out some features of our Salve Regina case with the purpose of discussing some of the premises for treating it as the complex process it really was.

A vast program of conceptualizations comes into view if we look at the Salve Regina rite in the ritual space and within the purview of message systems and communication networks. Then we become aware of the differences here according to role, outlook and competences in the people involved, and take into account the texts, the music and image as well as the traditional theological aspects of the Virgin figure. In the very briefest terms, there are her numerous roles and attributions, various modalities of her presence closely and in heaven and the different modalities attributed to the effects of addressing her image, whether this means the orthodox idea of approaching her through the image (when, in the Roman theory: adoration refertur ad prototypa) or the more popular one of believing in the efficiency of the image as such.

Our point of departure must be the general framework discussed in the past paragraphs, and secondly, the framework within which the specific Salve Regina rite took place, namely that of the

Roman Church in its Venetian-Governmental expression, implying the notion of Venezia favorita da Maria (Moore) and her role as national and political protectress. This "expression" came to the surface also with regard to particular rites, which differed from those of Rome herself. In this differentiation there are political, national, cultural-traditional and strictly ecclesiastic perspectives, while the ritualization factor with all its impact will press the different chunks of the cluster into a stereotypemould. The work of the Council of Trent, which was concluded in 1563, the year before the *Rituum caeremoniale* was edited, turned some of these inherited themes into burning issues of the day.

The image of the Virgin does not, in terms of design features, show any of the factors just hinted at, except for the implications of her direct gaze at the faithful. This feature at least should in any case call for explicit attention to the conceptualization mechanism and processes in action.

The idea seems to be that such conceptualizations or grasp of an idea draw from more or less the entire functional situation and process. Therefore their modalities will be diversified among people according to their capacities and competences in accessing greater or lesser parts of what is going on.

In terms of liturgical conception the type is not to be distinguish from the face-to-face images of Christ/God. As we have noted, the Nicopeia icon includes a frontal representation of the Christ Child. The functionality of the type of image is understandable in the basic context of the corresponding type of representations of Christ, from which the Virgin image and similar images of saints represent so to speak an extension.

This entire complex of parameters is, so to speak, embedded in a multilevel context. Catholic Tradition shares something essential with the theory of modern science because both are systemic and, just above the most basic levels, are focused on action and process rather than defined status, fixed propositions and products. It must be the entire complex involving the organizing and management of the rites, the creation and performance of music and song, and the creation of visual media, that does honor to Divinity, in terms of a Good Work reflective of the supreme *Opus bonum* of the Mass Sacrifice. For any larger decoration program in church or chapel, this means the creative activities of ecclesiastic expert committes setting up the content structure, a procedure that is very often documented, and the work of the artist or artists.

In addition, the very character of a ritual performance involves a series of partly formal and partly informal, even fuzzy, factors. The picture I have just presented may look to some extent managable. But this is a deception, for there are complexities underneath it that challenge any such optimism. Of course all research on non-formalized material is a question of approach not of conclusions.

Methodology, therefore, is and remains the primary concern.

Whatever we do, we are facing highly complex situations and processes. In the type of case discussed here, there is obviously the formal liturgy with its texts, chanting, colors and actions which is, or rather, seems, immediately graspable. This totality, however, quite clearly amounts to something more than the mere sum - in a list - of the various features, especially so if we take into account the conceptualization processes among those present and involved in different roles. Such a concept of a totality effec is referred to, with a ter from machine technology, as the Emergent properties.

This includes the notions the rite will recall among the authorities, what it may have produced among the assistant individuals and groups, and the variations here according to what is being focused on, such as, for example, specific aspects of the Virgin, specific activities such as music or reading, use of imagery, collective or groupwise relevance among the congregation, social classifications in the modes of participation, and so on. Because of this chain of interpretive appendages, the originally

clear picture just seems clear because we are used to ignore the chain, while it is there all the time, blurring the picture. All non-formalized concern will have to work with blurred pictures; such is the world.

Most of these aspects are beyond direct apprehension, but there are two considerations that make them urgently relevant: first, they touch directly on the functionality of the rite; secondly, it is exactly such vague aspects as these that various new sciences are struggling to come to terms with, and they are mainly focusing on conceptualization processes, so that we should not ignore them.

So far issues concerning the general frameworks. Inside them there are specific scenarios such as the following one.

When the vocal performance before the Virgin image passes from plainsong executed by one group over to figured song by another one, various important issues may have been involved. The historical change in the rite itself raises a number of the issues mentioned above. Then the passage referring to music in the Salve Regina rite may be subjected to analysis not only by musicologists but also in a much wider paradigmatic context or framework as outlined above.

Now my main points are, first, that the traditional Humanities and most fields in the Social Sciences today cannot muster the tools by which to treat the cited complex of features in any adequate manner; secondly, that this is exactly where the cluster of disciplines and research paradigms referred to above come in usefully.

## **HANDLING INCOMMENSURABLES GRAPHICALLY**

[Today, of course, I would have elaborated the subject differently] In addition to the complexities already mentioned, there are the problems involved in the very nature of the media. The rite of the Salve Regina combines two kinds of media that do not seem to be commensurable and operate at the same level. This circumstance poses an almost intractable problem to analysis if we want to treat the rite as a whole: a process of words, song and actions on one hand and on the other, a static, unchanging picture which is physically, or spatially if you like, in the focus of the specific rite, all the features interacting on several levels under authority control and management. Such an apparently paradox situation can be faced analytically only by means of articulate models.

I am going to present a type of model for handling the subject as presented so far, refraining, in the present context to look more closely at the differences between the media. I am venturing this more with a view to suggest a general direction of arguing rather than pretending to come up with any specific solutions.

For handling complex matters, graphic models are indispensable since they have bi-dimensional space expansion and show structures in a way that linear prose cannot do.

A normal graphic model will capture just a moment of time in the ritual process. In order to secure an analytical grasp of the time-dimensioned process as such, one would have to produce one model for each selected stage with the respective notions called forth by the liturgical evolution.

The image or picture itself being static and unchanging, it is the ritual process, aided by such accompaniments as music and song, that so to speak projects changing interpretations on to one and the same picture.

At the "canonical" moment of a Mass celebration, as illustrated on the model, we have one stage at which Divinity is really present at the altar and the image reflects this, and then the logically ensuing situation of Divinity present at the Heavenly altar and the image reflecting this. The Mass, in fact, calls forth several modalities of divine presence, and one and the same image will be conceptualized



accordingly - thus becoming kinematic images. One and the same image may thus be connected with different stages or aspects in the liturgy. A corresponding shift of accent or reference might apply to the conception of the Virgin image under the impact of the various stages in the ritual process. An important point - treated at length in S. S.-L., Burden - is that respectively the processes contribute to interpreting conceptually the space in which the rites take place (a conceptual space).

## **BEYOND VERBALIZATION**

Let me first provide a summary explanation of the model on the next page.

The model to be presented in this Section is specifically intended to capture two alternative focusing processes concerning conceptual situations involving images: the Mass (Nr. 1) and the recital of the Salve Regina (Nr. 2). The rationale for analyzing both contexts by one and the same model resides in the functional cohesion referred to in Section 3, above.

Both processes involve several parallel courses, one reason why a serial or linear verbal account of them would be insufficient. Artistic value of the respective, notional images is set to standard, since style is not the main issue here. There are some abbreviations:

DIV. = divinity

FACIE AD FAC. = facie ad faciem: concerning the congregation's facing the divine Countenance in the Mass Canon INTERCES. = intercession SIT. = situation VAL. = value A graphic model of the type shown here consists [in terms different from my actual ones] in blocks with short names for concepts (of any kind) and lines (two-ways) or arrows (one-ways) indicating relations or interactions between them. Such a model can be used in several ways and I shall set out the most important ones.

It can be read off one passage from one box to another or between the two, extending the operation to embrace a smaller or larger portion of the over-all pattern. Each of the units may be expressed or read off verbally, but gradually a picture is being built up that may be taken in visually but defy verbalization - excepting the case when again we decompose the pattern into linear units which subsequently we interface into a whole.

After such an incremental processing, or straight on without preparatory scanning, something that depends on the complexity of the overall pattern, this can be taken in at one view. At one view, for example, one might assemble into a unity the four almost equal rectangular boxes on the lower right in the model. This kind of operation seems compar- A

Counterpoint as exemplified by Ziegen-rücker, No. 348.

able to the way some plurilevel (more than one hand or voice or more than one instrument performing at the same time) section of a music score will be appreciated by a musically competent person; such as the counterpoint case illustrated here (to take a very simple example).

Thirdly, of course, the model, if thus equipped and operative, may be run off on a parallel machine, again, it seems somewhat in the same way as a complex score is being played by more than one instrument or sung by more than one voice.

It is the second approach that is particularly interesting. For here, independently of machine running, we may take in larger or smaller units with a directness and swiftness a verbal account could never achieve. Again, we would have to decompose and interface the bits into linear units in order to make the pattern accessible to verbalization.

## FUNDAMENTALS FOR ANALYSIS

Developing and using such a model as the one presented above, means creating an artificial reality. In doing so, we are abundantly justified. Abbreviating to an extreme degree, let me note that today we know, firstly, that all observation is dependent on theory and on the framework each of us has in the background. When studying something involving other people, we have to count with their frameworks, too: objectivity is not possible.

Secondly, and in part deriving from the picture just presented, most of what we take to be the reality in front of us is our own construal, so that analysis of any reality is a question of construction from our own interest, competence, goals and situational conditions, in short, our framework. We are creating the reality around us; there is no way around this. Which entails that it is the functionality of the system we apply that counts, not its "truth". Of course, functionality ceases to operate if the system contains plainly defective parts. The outcome of all this is that hypothetical and systematic abstract models represent the only available resource for describing or explaining anything whatever on any level of some interest and importance. Any real-world reference beyond sheer triviality is a picture of our own making. Whatever we do, then, is reduced to representing an artificial reality.

Another aspect concerns the use of some version of the systems approach. All disciplines, including Humanities such as Art History, have always been handling systems, even though they have tended to stay unaware of this crucial circumstance. No explanation, however, can be more than extremely fragmentary unless the systems character is actively utilized. Let me cite Radnitzky as quoted by Kitcher (The Nature of Mathematical Knowledge): < the > important thing is systemization and... explanation <is>... but a by-product of systematization. Explanation means to put the observations into a system with many factors interrelated and interacting with each other. To set up a linear chain of cause-and-effect provides merely an illusory, and, above all, an entirely useless way out the dilemma, enticing us into forgetting the network character of most situations and processes and the complexities that will always be involved. Without an argued use of a systems approach, our observations and interpretations will float in mid-air.

## EXPANDING THE CONTEXT

The predominant idea behind my discussion so far is that we have to enlarge in width as well as in depth our range of study. In the present section, I shall look a little more closely at this extension. In the liturgy and the ritual extensions to it, there are two major aspects we have to try to come to terms with. One is the complex network of interactions itself, the other is the ensuing message system and network of communications.

Now you might say that some non-musical people like myself, regardless of our technical incompetence, still are to some extent aware of music and when omitting to refer to it, do so with an uneasy feeling for the simple reasons that we love it and are vaguely aware of its importance and furthermore since we do not believe there is such an unbridgable distance over to the field of musicology.

For these reasons we may not experience the remoteness we may feel to such fields as physics, mathematics, the cognitive sciences, artificial intelligence, management, information theory etc. You don't sit back, close your eyes and love physics or artificial intelligence.

As I have noted already, today we are becoming gradually aware that a number of seemingly alien fields not only have a lot to offer for our own tasks, but do some of the things we are trying to come

grips with much better than we and with a far better equipment than what has so far been available to us.

The case I have been trying to make concerning the unawareness of music among many of us, forces me to recognize exactly the same flaw in my relation to all the fields just mentioned. Looking more closely at them, we will discover that they, too, are just as relevant to our central concerns, at least with regard to methodology and theory development.

Paradigms, insights and techniques from the fields I just listed may not always be directly usable but they do represent a rich idea bank. For the cited disciplines and research paradigms, regardless of their more or less (often less!) successful results, yield important by-products in exactly these two closely interconnected fields, even in ventures primarily focused on practical solutions. Also, methodologically speaking, their process orientation substituting "thing" orientation (How? rather than What?) proves more efficient and philosophically more trustworthy.

Much traditional philosophy and speculation is being rendered somewhat obsolete in view of these paradigms and research perspectives. Thus, most of Wittgenstein's speculations, except perhaps some sections of his mathematical argumentation, must be relegated to history. This is so with regard a subject of present concern, rituals, the term considered, then, as referring to situation-bound processes combining actions and verbal, symbolic and musical expressions in repeated patterns, that are in themselves evaluated in the context of expectations and fulfillment. His ruminations on the nature of rituals, expectation and fulfillment are based on what you might call an unaided reading of anthropologist accounts mainly from exotic cultures. They fade into insignificance when rituals are being discussed in the light of recent science developments under the perspectives of systems analysis, information, communication and management. His general ideas of rituals cover only those rituals for which the same ideas are applicable. A careful study of the liturgy of the Roman Church reveals that he missed out crucial features and functions of ritual processes. In fact, his general ideas about rituals and his related expectation-fulfillment semantics set off the Roman case by contrasting it; perhaps not what he intended.

The point here is not so much that Wittgenstein may have been wrong; it is, first, that his kind of methodology, for what it really might have been, is inadequate; secondly, that recent science developments have left his methodology behind by suggesting others more adequate for handling complexities (and still, reading his notebooks can be extremely inciting and rewarding). Focusing on systems methodologies free us from having recourse to "examples" that often leave us with wondering what kind of thing it is that they are considered as exemplifying. We observe and argue about things through some kind of methodology and only by focusing on this, are we enabled to enter a generalized discourse. One cannot generalize straightly from examples; we need the theory to which they are connected and unified.

## **INTERDISCIPLINARITY**

Trying to exploit such resources as are being offered by contemporary scholarship, of course means to be taking interdisciplinarity serious - which is not such an easy venture as it might sound.

First of all, the paradigm cannot be exactly described since so few of the available disciplines and research programs are amenable to precise definition, staying, at least so far, as nothing more than debatable program perspectives. What they do, however, is, to repeat, to offer an enormously rich idea bank and a set of very articulate methodology developments. Of course, all interdisciplinary ventures must focus primarily on method and theory.

Now let me say that I am interested in the liturgical function of music, a thing about which I am incompetent and need expert help to integrate in any situation that I am studying. Then I should acknowledge that the expert's contribution will make analytical sense to me, so that I can use it for my purpose, only provided that I can integrate her or his contribution in a framework of my own, one that is fashioned with a view to the final configuration I hope to produce.

This means, I have to construct a basis on which to locate her or his contribution, in other words a scenario which spells out the main features and functions of some specific process or situation to which to relate the entire procedure. This is a question of theory and methodology.

Secondly, for interdisciplinarity to acquire some constructive meaning, our grasp must reach over more than the closest disciplines. To connect art history and religious studies or other branches of the Humanities does not achieve more than what has always been normal: thinking in the same terms but with different names. We have to connect programs that differ in their methodologies, trying to bridge the gaps between them.

Thirdly, interdisciplinarity may be meaningful and constructive only to the extent that we keep our focus actively on the problems of methodology and systems analysis in one form or the other. It is on the methodological plan that alien disciplines - say, information theory or management - may be activated as resources for our work. Methodologies are amenable to being abstracted and thus generalized. Substantive argumentation that is only loosely attached to methodology and theory will too easily catch us in the predicament of definition and categorization, defying generalization. Thus I have argued, for example, that a cross reliquary being "baptized" at the Epiphany rite in San Marco, Venice, is definable only in terms of our analytical operation on it: it is the network of its various conceptualizations and functions that we build up analytically that is the cross. To cite a well-known concept from the philosophy of logic: a thing consists in the manner of handling it.

## **CONCLUSION**

I have been considering it my task to try to come up with some constructive ideas concerning interdisciplinarity, because this is how I interpret the extremely kind invitation to this seminar, for which I am very grateful indeed. But I do want to end my discussion on a note of modesty, quoting Thomas Mann's Hochstapler Felix Krull: ... beschleicht mich das flüchtige Bedenken, ob ich diesem geistigen Unternehmen nach Vorbildung und Schule denn auch gewachsen bin. Which, of course, I am not.

## APPENDIX

Conventions: a3, b3 etc. represent abbreviation signs in the ms. (tot.3 = totus chorus); /// - unreadable parts; <...> - insertion in the ms by the original editor or others; /.../ - word(s) cancelled in the ms; ab?cd - doubtful reading of single letter.

### 1. De salve Regina in Dominicis Diebus.

In omnibus Dominicis Diebus ab octava penthecostes usque ad Adventum quando facimus totum officium de Dominica, et quod non fiat commemoratio de alijs octavis, nec Duplex officium pro feria secunda, semper post vespere jmus cum processione ad ymaginem virginis Mariae. cantando Salve Regina in cantu plano, intonata ad Altare maius, à Duobus clericis, et cantores cantant illis tribus versiculis, in cantu figurato ad dictam ymaginem, respondendo alternatim à choro, ut moris est. /Et dicta oratione pro parae [Deiparae = the Virgin] in choro eleuatur legile cum suo panno et cum oratione per clericum, et portatur ad Dictam ymaginem/ <super legili ibi portatum per guardianum ante vespere.> <& portatur orationale per clericum> pro oratione Dicenda post salve Regina <ut in medio ecclesie, q?t sit ch?? pro cantoribus cantantibus ibi /// ///> versus omnipotens sempiternus Deus, qui gloriose etc., que est in fine orationalis <ut in graduale noui ///>. et dicitur versus a clerus [SIC?], versus, dignare me etc. responsorium, Da mihi uirtutem etc. postea oratio ut supra, et in reuersione processionis in choro, intonantur à capite chori cuius est Æbdomada, in tono de o gloriosa Domina, Maria mater gratiae, et gloria tibi domine, et est finis. <Et in omnibus festiuitatibus sanctae mariae, quando portatur anchonam super altare, et reportatur in sacristia, semper tamen ineundo quam in redeundo, cantantur Maria mater gratiae, et gloria tibi domine, intonata à ministris apparatis, uel à magistro chori. in ch. & tot.3 chor.3 complet. [?]>.

### 2. De die martis carnis priuij.

Hac die cantores non veniunt ad Missam neque ad vespere, licet olim consueuissent venire, et quandoque cantauerint Missam in cantu figurato ex arbitrio, moti ex iucunditate Diei. verum si hac die occurreret festum Duplex, cantores agerent omnia tan in Missa quam in vespere, secundum eorum obligationes, et similiter organiste, et semper in tali Die post vespere diei dicuntur vespere defunctorum tantum. Et nota quod non dicitur psalmus, lauda anima mea domine etc., quia officium hodiernum fit de sanctis, non autem de feria. vide rubricam in nostro orationali loco suo. post vespere cohoperiuntur altaria, et cruces, cortinis. Et fiunt cineres per sacristam ramis oliui benedicti, pro sequenti die imponende capitibus, post benedictionem. <Etiam cohoperitur crux magne que est super choros ad apostolos [i. e., on the roodscreen separating the sanctuary from the crossing], cum sua cruce rubra. Sed crux que est in altari argenteo, eleuatur, usque ad feriam quartam post pasquam, postea reponitur>

## BIBLIOGRAPHY

- Allem, M. (ed.), *Anthologie poétique française. XVI siècle*, Paris 1965.
- Anthony, James R., *French Baroque Music from Beaujoyeux to Rameau*, 2nd.rev. ed., Portland (OR) 1997.
- Brooks, R. ., "Intelligence without representation", in Kirsch, D. (ed.), *Foundations of Artificial Intelligence*, Cambridge (MA), 1992, pp. 139 - 159.
- Drake, Stillman, *Galileo at work. His scientific biography*, Chicago 1978.
- Eizenhöfer, L., OSB (ed.), *Canon missae romanae. Pars prior, traditio textus*, Rome 1954 (ref.s to ancient versions).
- Ernetti, Pellegrino M., OSB, *Il canto gregoriano. Trattato generale ad uso dei seminari ed istituti religiosi*, I/II, Venice 1960/61.
- Fry, T., OSB, *The Rule of St. Benedict in English*, Collegeville (MN) 1982.
- Gisolfi, Diana, and Sinding-Larsen, Staale, *The Rule, the Bible and the Council. The library of the Benedictine Abbey at Praglia*, College Art Association Monograph, Nr. LV, Seattle 1998.
- Heisenberg, W., *Quantentheorie und Philosophie, Vorlesungen und Aufsätze*, ed. J. Busche, Stuttgart 2006.
- Keen, M., *Chivalry*, New Haven (CT) 1984.
- Kitcher, Ph., *The Nature of Mathematical Knowledge*, New York 1984.
- Pricoco, S., *La regola di San Benedetto e le regole dei padri*, Verona 1995.
- Rothstein, E., *Emblems of mind. The inner life of music and mathematics*, New York 1995.
- Selfridge-Field, Eleanor, *Venetian instrumental music*, 3rd revised ed., New York 1994.
- Sinding-Larsen, Staale, "Some observations on liturgical imagery of the twelfth century", *Institutum romanum Norvegiae, Acta*, VIII, 1978, pp. 193 - 212.
- *Iconography and Ritual*, Oslo, distr. by Oxford Univ. Press., 1984.
- "A walk with Otto Demus. The mosaics of San Marco, Venice, and art-historic analysis", *Institutum romanum Norvegiae, Acta, Series II*, 1993, pp. 145 - 205.
- "Chiesa di Stato e iconografia musiva", in Bertoli, Bruno (ed.), *La Basilica di San Marco*, 2nd. ed., Venice 1998.
- *The Burden of the Ceremony Master. Image and Action in San Marco, Venice, and in an Islamic Mosque*, *Institutum romanum Norvegiae, Acta*, Vol. XII, Rome 2000.
- Steindl-Rast, David, OSB, *The music of silence*, San Francisco 1995.
- Ødegaard, Åse, and Sinding-Larsen, Staale, *Royal Piaffe. Clouet's Portraits of Francis I and ruler portraiture*, in Eriksen, R., and Malmanger, M. (eds.), *Basiliké eikon. Ruler portraiture in the Renaissance*, Rome 2001, pp. 50 - 70.
- Whenham, John, *Monteverdi. Vespers (1610)*, Cambridge 1997.
- Ziegenrucker, W., *ABC Musik. Allgemeine Musiklehre*, 3rd. ed., Wiesbaden 2000.

publications: <http://folk.ntnu.no/staaalesl/books.html>