

<b>Zeitschrift:</b>	Basler Jahrbuch für historische Musikpraxis : eine Veröffentlichung der Schola Cantorum Basiliensis, Lehr- und Forschungsinstitut für Alte Musik an der Musik-Akademie der Stadt Basel
<b>Herausgeber:</b>	Schola Cantorum Basiliensis
<b>Band:</b>	38 (2014)
<b>Artikel:</b>	Reworking ideas on Reworkings : reflections on a 2014 symposium
<b>Autor:</b>	Memelsdorff, Pedro
<b>DOI:</b>	<a href="https://doi.org/10.5169/seals-868846">https://doi.org/10.5169/seals-868846</a>

### **Nutzungsbedingungen**

Die ETH-Bibliothek ist die Anbieterin der digitalisierten Zeitschriften auf E-Periodica. Sie besitzt keine Urheberrechte an den Zeitschriften und ist nicht verantwortlich für deren Inhalte. Die Rechte liegen in der Regel bei den Herausgebern beziehungsweise den externen Rechteinhabern. Das Veröffentlichen von Bildern in Print- und Online-Publikationen sowie auf Social Media-Kanälen oder Webseiten ist nur mit vorheriger Genehmigung der Rechteinhaber erlaubt. [Mehr erfahren](#)

### **Conditions d'utilisation**

L'ETH Library est le fournisseur des revues numérisées. Elle ne détient aucun droit d'auteur sur les revues et n'est pas responsable de leur contenu. En règle générale, les droits sont détenus par les éditeurs ou les détenteurs de droits externes. La reproduction d'images dans des publications imprimées ou en ligne ainsi que sur des canaux de médias sociaux ou des sites web n'est autorisée qu'avec l'accord préalable des détenteurs des droits. [En savoir plus](#)

### **Terms of use**

The ETH Library is the provider of the digitised journals. It does not own any copyrights to the journals and is not responsible for their content. The rights usually lie with the publishers or the external rights holders. Publishing images in print and online publications, as well as on social media channels or websites, is only permitted with the prior consent of the rights holders. [Find out more](#)

**Download PDF:** 16.01.2026

**ETH-Bibliothek Zürich, E-Periodica, <https://www.e-periodica.ch>**

## REWORKING IDEAS ON REWORKINGS

### Reflections on a 2014 Symposium

Reworkings<sup>1</sup> – and of course not only musical reworkings – have been a constant practice throughout history. For centuries, art, science, culture and language have been reworked in a permanent, endless process that can be seen as a complex bond between imitation and innovation.

European history has been characterized by this bond since antiquity, newly so at least since the Carolingian Renaissance, and then with Dante's *De vulgari eloquentia*, which struggles between the nobility of the vernacular and Latin as languages to express art and thought.<sup>2</sup>

After Dante, Petrarch also thematized reflection on models to internalize and replicate, both in terms of the faithfulness of imitation and of the tension between restoration and originality. Recalling Horace's famous image of the bee extracting honey from different flowers,<sup>3</sup> Petrarch inspired humanists of the 15<sup>th</sup> and 16<sup>th</sup> centuries to examine themselves in terms of language and philosophy: from the Florentine *Certame coronario* organized by Alberti and Piero de' Medici,<sup>4</sup> to the discussions between Poliziano and Cortesi on mimesis,<sup>5</sup> or between Barbaro and Pico della Mirandola on rhetoric and philosophy.<sup>6</sup>

Similar discussions can be found in the Aristotelian canon of the late 16<sup>th</sup> century, which informed naturalism up to Galileo, Bacon and Descartes, as they fuelled the *Querelle des anciens et des modernes* at the dawn of European nationalism. Not least, they shaped and influenced the varying expressions of *classicism* and *romanticism*.

As for music, musical reworkings have always played a major role in these reflections: from the constant reshaping of ecclesiastic song to the Provençal and French troubadour traditions. They are also found in the myriad techniques of musical re-elaboration of the 14<sup>th</sup> and 15<sup>th</sup> centuries, and in the re-invention of pseudo antique forms of monody and drama in Italian or Italianate *seconda pratica* throughout Europe in the 17<sup>th</sup> century and beyond.

<sup>1</sup> The following initial paragraphs reproduce the introductory speech to the Symposium *Reworkings* that I have held at the Schola Cantorum Basiliensis on November 20, 2014, cf. <https://www.fhnw.ch/de/forschung-und-dienstleistungen/musik/forschung-schola-cantorum-basiliensis/symposien-und-studentage/reworkings> (last accessed on February, 20, 2018).

<sup>2</sup> Dante Alighieri, *De vulgari eloquentia*, ed. by Pier Vincenzo Mengaldo, Padova: Antenore, 1968; new edition by same editor, in Dante, *Opere minori*, Classici Ricciardi, Milano-Napoli: Mondadori, 1996.

<sup>3</sup> Francesco Petrarca, *Fam* XX 2 (letter to Boccaccio); see also *Fam* I 8 (to Tommaso di Messina), and *Fam* XXIII 29 (to Boccaccio).

<sup>4</sup> Anicio Bonucci, *Opere volgari di Leon Battista Alberti*, Firenze: Galileiana, 1843.

<sup>5</sup> Vincenzo Fera, „Il problema dell'imitatio fra Poliziano e Cortesi“, in: Vincenzo Fera and Augusto Guida (eds), *Vetustatis indagator. Scritti offerti a Filippo de Benedetto*, Messina: Centro Interdipartimentale di Studi Umanistici, 1999, 155–181 (now see also: Donatella Coppini, „La polemica de imitatione fra Angelo Poliziano e Paolo Cortesi. Dalla lingua di Cicerone alla lingua del cardinale“, in: David. A. Lines, Marc Laureys and Jill Kraye (eds), *Forms of Conflict and Rivalries in Renaissance Europe*, Göttingen: V&R Unipress, 2015, 39–60).

<sup>6</sup> Martin L. McLaughlin, „The Dispute between the Elder Pico and Barbaro“, in: Idem, *Literary Imitation in the Italian Renaissance: The Theory and Practice of Literary Imitation from Dante to Bembo*, Oxford: Clarendon Press, 1995, 228–248.

When Francesco Landini composed his madrigal *Si dolce non sonò col lir' Orfeo* around 1360, he at once alluded to Vitry and reversed models by Jacopo da Bologna. When composing his ballata *Che Cosa è quest' Amor*, on the other hand, he christianised an Averroistic sonnet by Guido Cavalcanti and cited *Divina Commedia* replacing Beatrice with his own beloved Nicolosa da Firenze, and Dante with himself, Landini.<sup>7</sup>

Thus, reworkings make up the history of European music as much as – and in the web of – art, architecture, literature or history. Not least, they prompted the very origins of the Early Music movement in the late 19<sup>th</sup> century, and generated the foundation of the Schola Cantorum in 1933.<sup>8</sup> Schola, indeed, emerged from the tensions between the retrieving of the past and a 'liberation' from 19<sup>th</sup>-century traditional conservatories. No topic could therefore be more central to the Schola Cantorum than musical reworkings, as it induces our scholars and performers to re-examine their own history and their own approaches to music and time.

Finally, it is along this line of thought that we have chosen to close the present Symposium with a concert – entitled *Metamorphoses* – and a debate focused on the interaction between Early Music and the Avant-garde. May it stimulate further reflection on the very identity of Schola Cantorum and its possible future.<sup>9</sup>

### 1. Background

Ironically, rethinking a *reworkings* conference from three years ago means doing it from the perspective of a *reworker*. Ideas that then seemed new are now more common, while in the meantime some of the theoretical bases we had postulated have been re-examined. An even partial review of these bases therefore seems appropriate, along with some new reflections on the relationship between the issues that were then discussed.

In 2009, when referring to a vast contemporary literature (ranging from fundamental texts on semiotics, linguistics, literature and art theory such as Meyer, Kristeva, Genette or Baxandall, to musicological studies such as Keppler, Kneif, Günther, Rosen, Lockwood, Meyer, Brown, Gruber, Burkholder and many others), Maria Caraci Vela recalled:

<sup>7</sup> Pedro Memelsdorff, „*Dolce sinfonia di Paradiso. Tre commenti sulla musica e il silenzio nel cielo di e dopo Dante*“, paper read as *Lectura Dantis III. Paradiso* in Lugano, Istituto di Studi Italiani, Università della Svizzera Italiana, on September 17, 2014. (Since then the paper has been presented on several occasions including: University of Pennsylvania, conference *Dante and Music*, November 5–6, 2015, and Oxford, Dante Society, May 25, 2016).

<sup>8</sup> Anne Smith, „*Ina Lohr: Transcending the Boundaries of Early Music*“, *RIMAB*, <http://www.rimab.ch/content/research-projects/project-ina-lohr-1/papers-from-the-project-ina-lohr/ina-lohr-transcending-the-boundaries-of-early-music-a-smith> (last accessed on October 31, 2017).

<sup>9</sup> P. Memelsdorff, 20.11.2014.

In the history of Western culture, reflection on the most immediate intertextual behaviours (particularly *imitation* and *quotation*) has been attested to since antiquity in every field of art and thought: but systematic research of appropriate methods to study their complexity is a recent phenomenon, developed in the second half of the twentieth century. Such research has extensively covered all the fields of textual transmission, and above all classical studies [...], medieval and modern literature, and, by extension, the figurative arts, theatre, dance, cinema, and music.<sup>10</sup>

And she continued:

In musicological studies, intertextuality, long anchored to the single concept of „quotation“ (*Zitat* or *Borrowing*, names under which it can still be found in leading reference books<sup>11</sup>) has produced a rich bibliography, collected by the *Center for the History of Music Theory and Literature* at the Indiana University under the direction of Peter Burkholder.<sup>12</sup>

Burkholder, we remember, authored a thorough classification of phenomena of musical intertextuality – from the Middle Ages to the present day – and summarized it in a table entitled „Elements of a Typology of Musical Borrowing“, included in his article in *The New Grove*.<sup>13</sup> Subdivided into five main parameters and as many as 86 categories and subcategories, the vastness and above all the unsystematicity of this table have sometimes led to criticism – most recently from Marilena Laterza, who senses the danger of end-in-itself classifications, and of categories that are „generic, obvious, incomplete and reductive“.<sup>14</sup> Laterza indeed concludes:

<sup>10</sup> „Nella storia della cultura occidentale, la riflessione sui comportamenti intertestuali di più immediata evidenza (soprattutto di imitazione e di citazione) è attestata fin dall'antichità in ogni campo dell'arte e del pensiero: ma la ricerca sistematica di metodi adeguati a studiarne la complessità è un fenomeno recente, maturato nella seconda metà del secolo ventesimo. Tale ricerca si è ampiamente esplicata in ogni campo delle tradizioni testuali, e soprattutto in quello degli studi classici [...], delle letterature medievali e moderne, e, per estensione, delle arti figurative, del teatro, della danza, del cinema, e della musica“, Maria Caraci Vela, *La filologia musicale*, vol. II, Lucca: LIM, 2009, 122–123.

<sup>11</sup> J. Peter Burkholder, „Borrowing“, in: *NGroveD2*, 5–41 (cf. also *NGroveD-online*); Gernot Gruber, „Zitat“, in: *MGG2S* 9, 2401–2412. See also below, n. 26.

<sup>12</sup> „Negli studi musicologici l'intertestualità, rimasta a lungo ancorata al solo concetto di „cavazione“ (*Zitat*, *Borrowing*, sotto cui comprare tuttora nei principali strumenti di consultazione) ha prodotto una ricca bibliografia, raccolta dal *Center for the History of Music Theory and Literature* dell'Indiana University sotto la direzione di Peter Burkholder.“ Maria Caraci Vela, *La filologia musicale*, 126 and n. 37, which lists and comments briefly on further related articles in *MGG* („Bearbeitung“, „Parodie und Kontrofaktur“, „Transkription“) and in *The New Grove* („Arrangement“, „Parody“, „Transcription“).

<sup>13</sup> See above, n. 11.

<sup>14</sup> Marilena Laterza, *Gesualdo more or less. Sulla riscrittura nella musica contemporanea*, Lucca: LIM, 2017, 15.

After 20 years, the [Burkholder] project seems to have run aground in the preliminary stages. On the Indiana University website there is a bibliographic database, but only up until 2008; and the only editorial outcome of the project, which is still in a preparatory stage, is the long entry on „Borrowing“ written by Burkholder himself for *Grove* in the early 2000s.<sup>15</sup> [...] Overall, the desirable attempt to systematize the study of rewriting risks becoming a didactic, narrow, mechanical and somewhat frustrating project.<sup>16</sup>

This is not the place to discuss in detail Laterza's agenda and the criticism that she directs at Burkholder (and subsequently at Straus, Metzer and Watkins)<sup>17</sup> for what she considers their unsuccessful attempts to order the vast field of musical intertextuality. Nor is it to examine other arguments against or in favour of these or other mappings of a phenomenology which – as admitted by all the parties involved – is as vast and varied as the very history of music itself.<sup>18</sup>

Instead, we should be aware of the increasingly widespread tendency in the musicology of recent generations to examine the phenomena of musical intertextuality with the tools of literary theory, the most influential of which were probably those made available through Gérard Genette's *Palimpsests* and its reception in the last two decades of the 20<sup>th</sup> century.<sup>19</sup> They set the basis not only of the abovementioned works by Laterza and Caraci Vela but also of continental, English and American musicology in general. Suffice it to recall the collection of studies edited by Danuser and Plebuch in 1998,<sup>20</sup> or more recent studies by Meconi<sup>21</sup> and Milsom<sup>22</sup>, or by medievalists who followed in the footsteps of – and vastly expanded on – Ursula Günther, Wulf Arlt or

<sup>15</sup> *Ibid.*

<sup>16</sup> *Ibid.*, 16.

<sup>17</sup> Joseph N. Straus, *Remaking the Past: Musical Modernism and the Influence of the Tonal Tradition*, Cambridge, MA/London: Harvard University Press, 1990; David Metzer, *Quotation and Cultural Meaning in Twentieth-Century Music*, Cambridge, MA/New York: Cambridge University Press, 2003; Glenn Watkins, *Pyramids at the Louvre: Music, Culture, and Collage from Stravinsky to the Postmodernists*, Cambridge, MA/London: Harvard University Press, 1994; Laterza, *Gesualdo more or less* [see n. 14], 19–30.

<sup>18</sup> Cf. for example the discussion of Katelijne Schiltz in the present volume, p. 186 and n. 35. See also below, n. 26.

<sup>19</sup> Gerard Genette, *Palimpsestes: la littérature au second degré*, Paris: Seuil, 1982.

<sup>20</sup> Hermann Danuser and Tobias Plebuch (eds), *Musik als Text. Bericht über den Internationalen Kongress der Gesellschaft für Musikforschung, Freiburg im Breisgau 1993*, Kassel/Basel: Bärenreiter, 1998.

<sup>21</sup> Honey Meconi, *Early Musical Borrowing*, New York/London: Routledge, 2004.

<sup>22</sup> John Milsom, „Imitatio‘, „Intertextuality‘, and Early Music“, in: Suzannah Clark and Elizabeth Eva Leach (eds), *Citation and Authority in Medieval and Renaissance Musical Culture: Learning from the Learned*, Woodbridge: The Boydell Press, 2005, 141–151.

Reinhard Strohm, such as Yolanda Plumley, Elizabeth Eva Leach, Giuliano Bacco, and Anne Stone.<sup>23</sup>

However, it was Caraci Vela – returning to the beginning of this short review – who presented the first systematic and generalized reflection on the application of a Genettan classification to the fields of music philology and historical musicology.

## 2. The Event

In the wake of similar theoretical reflections, early in 2014 discussion arose in Basel on the opportunity to devote a symposium of the SCB to the theme of musical intertextuality. Given the vastness of the field of inquiry – and the variety of repertoires to be considered – it became immediately clear that the topic needed to be limited to types of intertextuality that could be adequately covered over the few days available. And so it was decided to ignore the phenomena of ‚physiological‘ intertextuality,<sup>24</sup> i. e. unconscious and inevitable intertextual processes,<sup>25</sup> and focus on not only *documentable*, but also *intentional* and *significant* intertextual phenomena. Conscious that the last two epithets were problematic – but confident that this in itself would have enriched the discussion during the symposium – it was decided to adopt the term *reworkings* to especially emphasize them: *reworkings* as interventions on pre-existing models (musical, but as will be seen not only musical) that are *documentable*, *intentional* and *significant*. This clarification did not presume either the analogy between the Anglo-Saxon concept of *reworking* and the Italian one of *rewriting* (*riscrittura*, i. e., re-composition in a new style),

<sup>23</sup> Yolanda Plumley, „Citation and Allusion in the Late Ars Nova: The Case of *Esperance* and the *En attendant Songs*“, *EMH* 18 (1999), 287–363; Anne Stone, „A Singer at the Fountain: Homage and Irony in Ciconia’s *Sus une fontayne*“, *M&L* 82 (2001), 361–390; Yolanda Plumley, „Intertextuality in the Fourteenth-Century Chanson“, *M&L* 84 (2003), 355–377; Eadem, Giuliano Di Bacco and Stefano Jossa (eds), *Citation, Intertextuality, and Memory in the Middle Ages and Renaissance. I: Image, Music and Text, from Machaut to Ariosto*, Exeter: University of Exeter Press, 2011; Eadem and Giuliano Di Bacco (eds), *Citation, Intertextuality, and Memory in the Middle Ages and Renaissance. II: Cross-Disciplinary Perspectives on Medieval Culture*, Liverpool: University of Liverpool Press, 2013; Eadem, *The Art of Grafted Song: Citation and Allusion in the Age of Machaut*, Oxford: Oxford University Press, 2013; Clark and Leach (eds), *Citation and Authority in Medieval and Renaissance Musical Culture* [see n. 22].

<sup>24</sup> Maria Caraci Vela, *La filologia musicale*, vol. II, 139. Cf. also Milsom, „*Imitatio*“ [see n. 22], 142–144, which only discusses musicological texts written in English, however (*ibid.*, n. 3).

<sup>25</sup> Maria Corti’s ‚*cultura circolante*‘ (as alluded in *La felicità mentale*, Torino: Einaudi, 1983, 63), but see also the definitions of text as „a mosaic of quotations“ or „a fabric of quotations from the most diverse areas of culture“ used by Julia Kristeva and Roland Barthes respectively in „*Bakhtine, le mot, le dialogue et le roman*“, *Critique*, 239 (1967), 438–465, and *Le bruissement de la langue: Essais critiques IV*, Paris: Seuil, 1984, 61–67.

nor a reliance of *reworking* on the concept of *musical work* (*opera*, *Werk*) as understood in most 20<sup>th</sup>-century musicology and specifically in a well-known reference text by Lydia Goehr.<sup>26</sup>

All this being clarified, what developed was a reflection on the close relationship between intertextuality and intersemioticity, that is, on the relationship between phenomena conceived and developed in the area of different semiotic systems or codes. This involved synchronous treatment of phenomena related to various arts including – at least – music, dance, theatre, literature and the visual arts (painting, sculpture, architecture); and therefore the need to invite scholars from varying disciplines to the symposium. Musicologists, literati, historians, historians of art and architecture were then asked to attend, as if to a Warburgian *Problemsymposium*: how do these various fields of the arts and art-related disciplines interact when reflecting on the – thus defined – phenomena of *reworking*?<sup>27</sup>

The results of the symposium form the core of the present publication,<sup>28</sup> which preserves the order in which the *reworking* phenomena were then presented: first those relating to Venetian architecture and music discussed by Andrew Hopkins and Marco Rosa Salva, respectively; then two (in a certain sense specular) cases of 18<sup>th</sup>-century liturgical and musical ‚Romanization‘ in Lisbon and London presented by João Pedro d’Alvarenga and Johannes Menke. A case of collective and inter-artistic 17<sup>th</sup>-century *reworking* presented by Nicola Usula was followed by two studies on counter-reformation Germany: an art-historical one by Jeffrey Chipps Smith and an ethno- and historical-musicological one by Alexander J. Fisher. The series closed with three medieval enquiries: a literary-historical and iconographic search by Sylvia Huot, and two analytical and music-historical ones by Felix Diergarten and Anna Zayaruznaya. Finally, Katelijne Schiltz provided a conclusion on the *reworking* of ‚ancient‘ materials by composers in the 20<sup>th</sup> century.

Leaving aside Schiltz’s report for the moment, the interdisciplinary approaches of all other papers highlighted at least two major types of phenomenon. Firstly, cases or groups of cases in which *reworkings* that simultaneously occurred in different arts show varying degrees of correspondence due to more or less

<sup>26</sup> Lydia Goehr, *The Imaginary Museum of Musical Works: An Essay in the Philosophy of Music*, Oxford: Clarendon Press, 1992. Interestingly, the website on musical borrowing directed by Burkholder recently changed its name from „Musical Borrowing“ to „Musical Borrowing and Reworking“, perhaps resulting from reflections similar to – or indeed inspired by – the Basle symposium (cf. <http://www.chmtl.indiana.edu/borrowing>; last accessed on October 31, 2017).

<sup>27</sup> The structure of the symposium was not entirely conventional as it provided (1) an inverse chronological order of the phenomena, (2) carefully rehearsed *live* performances of all the music under discussion, (3) the interpolation of ten-minute *mini-concerts*, and (4) the setting up of an experimental concert – *Metamorphoses* – in which contemporary compositions commissioned from Olivier Cuendet and Pablo Ortiz based on works by Guillaume de Machaut and Matteo da Perugia were performed as a world premiere [see n. 1].

<sup>28</sup> Not all the participants in the symposium are represented here, since for editorial reasons some of them opted not to publish, for example Barbara Schellewald and Carlo Ginzburg. Cf. the full list of guests on n. 1.

shared ideological matrices. Secondly, cases or groups of cases in which *reworkings* that simultaneously occurred in different arts show obvious forms of interaction.

The first type includes examples discussed by Smith and Fisher, such as the militarization of the spaces for religious services (of which one case is St. Benno's triumphal arch in the Frauenkirche in Munich, and another the altar of Hans Degler in St. Ulrich and Afra in Augsburg, both dating to the 17<sup>th</sup> century), along with that of the Catholic processions in Munich, marked by „militaristic sounds, including the fusillades of hundreds of musketeers, [...] cannon fire, the blaring of trumpets and the beating of military drums.“<sup>29</sup> Or, in the cathedral of Freising, the contextual addition of a wooden frame to Peter Paul Ruben's monumental (and militarized) main altarpiece, along with the sculptural decoration of the organ, both commissioned to the sculptor Hans Krumper in 1623.<sup>30</sup>

True, in these two cases it seems impossible to exclude thematic interrelations – perhaps *intentional* and *significant* ones – while indisputably related phenomena are described by Huot, Usula and above all Hopkins.

Huot compares three late-Gothic *reworkings* of the myth of Polyphemus and focuses on a literary and art-historical comparison in the third case: the *Epistre Othea* by Christine de Pizan of c. 1400–1401. The illustrations approved by C. de Pizan portray Ulysses as a French knight, alongside an ethnically connoted (and therefore demonized) Polyphemus as a Turk or Saracen, thus favouring the reader's identification with Ulysses and contradicting the poetic text by C. de Pizan herself.<sup>31</sup> For Huot, this contradiction enables the polysemy of a text, which the use of only one code (that is, only one of the arts) would not have conveyed.

The case presented by Usula is even more complex: the new prologue added in 1671 by Alessandro Stradella to *Giasone*, an extremely successful opera which Francesco Cavalli had premiered in 1649. In this new prologue Stradella replicates the *topos* of the ‚crollo‘, that is, the feigned collapse of the scenery and the subsequent competition between the arts, that is Architecture, Painting, Poetry and Music, in trying to reconstruct it.<sup>32</sup> As Usula illustrates, an initial reparative intervention by Architecture is followed by a sort of musical ‚rehearsal‘ between Poetry and Music, who propose (and perform) a ‚new aria added to the drama‘.<sup>33</sup> The device, meta-theatrical as well as inter-artistic, merely legitimizes and even monumentalizes the operation of *reworking* as a solution to the obsolescence of the ‚collapsed‘ (and ‚reconstructed‘) text by Cavalli. At the same time it warns the audience of the *reworked* nature of the opera as a whole. If one wanted proof of *intentionality* and *significance* in a *reworking*, one could probably not find anything more explicit.

<sup>29</sup> See below, p. 111.

<sup>30</sup> See below, pp. 102–104.

<sup>31</sup> See below, pp. 127–130.

<sup>32</sup> See below, pp. 77–78.

<sup>33</sup> Cf. Usula's acute and fascinating interpretation of the relationship between the score and the libretto (*Ibid.*).

Finally, Hopkins concludes his series of *reworkings* of Venice's principal civic and religious spaces with a description of Baldassare Longhena's Chiesa della Salute (1631)<sup>34</sup> as an „enormous piece of petrified ephemera, especially given the annual procession to the church, when a temporary votive bridge would be constructed.“<sup>35</sup> This ‚petrifying‘ of the Salute leads him to reflect not only on possible analogies with the construction of the Rialto Bridge by Andrea Palladio, Vincenzo Scamozzi and Antonio da Ponte,<sup>36</sup> but also and above all on the theoretical-artistic connotations of the phenomenon:

„Petrify[ing] the ephemeral‘ also reminds observers of the transience of the apparently long-lasting, or even permanent; just as momentary ‚performance‘, whether decoration, ephemeral scenes or musical performance, *indirectly* acquires its own legitimacy.<sup>37</sup>

The term *indirectly* reminds us of the complexity of the operation – a *mise en abîme* emphasized by both Longhena and Hopkins, which is not limited to reflecting (or provoking reflections) on one or many arts, but questions artistic artefacts as to their materiality and transcendence altogether.

### 3. Musicological Contribution

In addition to inter-artistic reflections such as those just mentioned, the symposium also led to more specifically musicological results.

Before *Reworkings* we did not actually know which was the „Tu di saper procura“ aria used by Hasse in his Venetian version of Metastasio's *Olimpiade* in 1738 – illustrated by Marco Rosa Salva. And we had no explanation of the process that transformed a melody of the *Jeu de Robin et Marion* by Adam de la Halle into a virelay-tenor of the 14<sup>th</sup>-century Codex Ivrea 115, as closely analyzed by Felix Diergarten. Even more surprisingly, we did not know that the methodology used to date of Vitry's motets (and the *ars nova* motets in general) crumbles because of the discoveries of Anna Zayaruznaya, presented here for the first time. Zayaruznaya not only challenges the monumentalization of the ‚cathedral motet‘ – claimed for decades by the *corpus* of medieval musicology, from Ludwig to Page and Busse Berger – but also deconstructs and redefines the paradigmatic *art-work non-art-work* dichotomy of Goehr (and Wegman) mentioned before.<sup>38</sup>

Finally, the *reworkings* found by Zayaruznaya in a number of *Ars-nova* motets led her to hypothesize on their circumstantial adjustments to new uses throughout their existence. *Rex quem metrorum*, for example, may have been ‚modernized‘ on several occasions over the course of Robert of Anjou's career in Naples; and a similar case could be Vitry's *O philippe/O bone dux*.<sup>39</sup>

<sup>34</sup> See below, p. 14.

<sup>35</sup> See below, p. 9, my italics.

<sup>36</sup> See below, pp. 10–13.

<sup>37</sup> See below, p. 10, my italics.

<sup>38</sup> See n. 26, and below, p. 171.

<sup>39</sup> See below, p. 173.

This device – to conclude – may easily be associated with the case of the Latin *ballade Ore Pandulfum* (copied in the MS Modena A around 1415),<sup>40</sup> which I presented at the same symposium.<sup>41</sup> Already studied by Pirrotta in 1945 and Günther in 1966 and 1970, the song was edited by Apel and Greene in 1953 and 1982 and re-examined by Atlas and Stone in 1988 and 1994.<sup>42</sup> One of its two *contratenores* (which in 2009 I attributed to Matteo da Perugia)<sup>43</sup> completely transforms the contrapuntal design of the piece, shifting the musical emphasis from verses with devotional and autobiographical content to verses with heraldic-military content. Matteo's re-elaboration might simply have been aiming to update the piece or, rather, to re-functionalize it because of changed circumstances or new, special occasions – as Zayaruznaya now suggested for *Rex quem metrorum*.

#### 4. Reworking today?

Lastly a note on the contribution of Katelyne Schiltz, following the eclectic *Metamorphoses* concert of November 22, 2014.<sup>44</sup> Before embarking on a thorough discussion of the *reworking* of Luigi Nono on the ideas and works of Giovanni Gabrieli and Carlo Gesualdo – and of Nono's notoriously problematic dialogue with John Cage – Schiltz posed a series of questions that are particularly relevant in this context:

To what purpose did composers connect with the music of the past? How is this music being made fruitful for their own work? To what extent can the study of the musical tradition help a composer to sharpen his own language and – paradoxically – to foster novelty? But also: when a composer seeks to legitimise his own approach via a comparison with and/or assimilation of musical techniques from the past, how far can this go; in other words, where are the boundaries of the analogy?<sup>45</sup>

<sup>40</sup> Modena, Biblioteca Universitaria Estense, MS. a.M.5.24, fol. 33r.

<sup>41</sup> See n. 1.

<sup>42</sup> Nino Pirrotta, „Il codice Estense Lat. 568 e la musica francese in Italia al principio del '400“, Estratto dagli *Atti della Reale Accademia di Scienze, Lettere e Arti di Palermo*, Serie IV – Vol. V – Parte II, Palermo: 1946, 101–154; Ursula Günther, „Das Manuskript Modena, Biblioteca Estense a.M.5.24 (olim lat. 568 = Mod)“, *MD* 24 (1970), 17–67; Willi Apel (ed.), *French Secular Music of the Fourteenth Century*, CMM 53, three vols: III, s.l.: American Institute of Musicology, 1970, n° 300; Gordon Greene (ed.), *French Secular Music, Polyphonic Music of the Fourteenth Century*, vol. XX, 26–29 and 248–249; Allan W. Atlas, „Pandolfo III Malatesta mecenate musicale: musica e musicisti presso una Signoria del primo Quattrocento“, *RIM* 23 (1988); Anne Stone, *Writing Rhythm in Late Medieval Italy: Notation and Musical Style in the Manuscript Modena, Biblioteca Estense, a.M.5.24*, Ph.D. diss., Harvard Univ., Cambridge, MA, 1994, 12; Eadem, *The Manuscript Modena, Biblioteca Estense, a.M.5.24. Commentary*, Lucca: LIM, 2005, 75–78.

<sup>43</sup> Pedro Memelsdorff, „*Ore Pandulfum*. Il contratenor come glossa strutturale“, in: Maria Teresa Barezzani and Rodobaldo Tibaldi (eds), *Musica e liturgie nel medioevo bresciano (secoli XI–XV)*, Brescia: Fondazione Civiltà Bresciana, 2009, 381–420. This contratenor led to a joint seminar presentation by Michael Cuthbert and Pedro Memelsdorff during the same symposium in Basel [see n. 1].

<sup>44</sup> See below, pp. 177–187, and above, n. 1.

<sup>45</sup> See below, p. 177.

Rather than answering these questions directly, Schiltz engages in a more general reflection on the conditions in which various *reworking* phenomena took place in the 20<sup>th</sup> century, including the complex relationships between composers and musicological research, and between composers and performance practice. Refraining from anticipating her far-reaching conclusions, one should here only recall one of the issues she may allude to: the (not always obvious) relationship between ‚contemporary rewriting‘, on the one hand, and ‚historical composition‘ conceived as an art form, on the other.

Faced with the vastness of such a subject, one can only hope that a future symposium be dedicated to it, which would be in many ways complementary to the events remembered here.

Pedro Memelsdorff, September 2017