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“Ché non finire so cominciare.”
Orality’s Role in Shaping the Circular Poetics of Guittone’s ballate-lauda

Isabella Livorni

In Tuscany in the second half of the thirteenth century, a new form of poetry emerges in our written records of the lyric tradition, one that is not present in the earliest flourishing of the written Italian lyric tradition in Sicily. This form is that of the ballata, a refrain form that generally begins with a ripresa and then proceeds in multiple stanzas. The stanzas are made up of a *fronete* with two identical piedi or modulazioni, which lead into a *volta* that is often structurally similar to the ripresa and always ends with a verse that rhymes with the last verse of the ripresa. After each stanza, the ripresa is repeated. The form began as a popular one, often related to dance, as its name suggests; in fact, an alternate name for it was, in its early years, danza. The origins of this form have long perplexed critics; slightly different refrain forms were all over the Romance-language-speaking Mediterranean in the thirteenth and early fourteenth centuries, and we cannot say with certainty from which the ballata derived. Formal precedents are: the zajal form of Al-Andalus; Latin sequences and versus with refrains; the troubadour *balada* or *dansa*; and the trouvère *virelai* and *rondeau*, among others.\(^1\)

---

1 My thanks to Professor Teodolinda Barolini, who guided me during the development of the ideas laid out in this article and offered invaluable questions, comments, and suggestions; to my colleague Marco Sartore, for his paleographical expertise and his patient assistance in deciphering manuscript markings; and to the anonymous reviewer, whose attentive reading and apt recommendations were vital in the formation of this article's final version.


3 Aurelio Roncaglia notes the connection of the ballata-lauda to the zajal form in his groundbreaking article entitled “Nella preistoria della lauda. Ballata e strofa zagiialesca,” in *Il movimento dei disciplinati nel settimo centenario dal suo inizio* (Perugia, 1260), ed. Lodovico Scaramucci (Perugia: Deputazione di storia patria per l’Umbria, Centro di documentazione sul Movimento dei Disciplinati, Quaderno n. 1: 1960), 460–475. Roncaglia also sheds light on Latin sequences’ refrain forms in “Sequenza adamiana & forma zagiialesca,” in *La sequenza medievale: Atti del Convegno Internazionale, Milano 7–8 aprile 1984*, ed. Agostino Zino (Luca: Libreria musicale italiana editrice, 1992), 141–154. Related to this topic is the Latin *versus* and its refrain form, as analyzed by Margaret Switten in “Versus and troubadours around 1100: A comparative study of refrain technique in the ‘New Song,’” in *Plainsong and Medieval Music*, Vol. 16, Issue 02 (October 2007), 91–143. Guido Capovilla sums all this information up succinctly in “Note sulla tecnica della ballata trecentesca,” in *L’Ars nova italiana del Trecento IV* (Certaldo: Centro di studi sull’Ars nova italiana del Trecento, 1978), 107–147, 107: “I precedenti formali di questa struttura ritorrellata sono stati intravisti nella lirica mozaraba, nella poesia ritmica tardo-latina, nella tradizione liturgica, nella pratica di cantilene popolari la cui esecuzione, alternata fra solista e coro, si snodava segnando le fasi di un’azione danzata circolare. Sono state così postulate affinità o divergenze tra esemplari ballatistici e forme strofiche diffuse nella România occidentale o in area periferica, quali lo zadjal arabo-andalus, le portoghesi Cantigas de S. Maria, la dansa o balada provenzale, il rondeau e il virelai francesi, e il più tardo villancico castigliano del sec. XV; per quanto invece poteva concernere possibili filiazioni dall’ambito medio-latino, ci si è appaltati ai versus, alle sequenze, ai tropi” [The formal precedents of this refrain form have been glimpsed in Mozarabic lyric, in late Latin rhythmic poetry, in the liturgical tradition, in the practice of popular melodies (*cantilene*) whose execution, alternating between soloist and chorus, unwound according to the phases of circular, danced action. Similarities and divergences have been proposed, between ballata-like exxemplars and strophic forms widespread in the Romance-language-speaking west or on its peripheries, like the Arabic-Andalusian zadjal, the Portuguese [sic] Cantigas de S. Maria, the Provençal dansa or balada, the French rondeau and virelai, and the later fifteenth-century Castilian villancico; as far as potential origins in the Middle-Latin context, we have turned to versus, sequences, and tropes].
Although scholars will probably never be able to determine what was, in fact, the specific history of the ballata’s emergence as a form, it is important to note that no poems in ballata form have been found in the output of the Scuola siciliana. It seems to be a particularly Tuscan form: the first extant poem that uses ballata form and self-consciously refers to itself as a ballata is Bonagiunta Orbicciani’s “Molto se fa brasmar” (date unknown; sometime between 1242 and 1290), and a number of anonymous ballate appear (copied between 1265 and 1300) in the Memoriali bolognesi, a notarial register in which Bolognese notaries transcribed a number of poems in blank spaces. There is also a danza (utilizing the same form as the ballata) from Mantua, of uncertain date, but certainly transcribed no earlier than the second half of the thirteenth century. The real proliferation of this form, however, began during the flourishing of Tuscan and Umbrian poetry around 1260, with Raniero Fasani’s movement of the disciplinati, in the laude, of which Guittone d’Arezzo’s are, perhaps, the first written manifestation in ballata form.\(^9\)

The lauda existed before 1260; however, as Aurelio Roncaglia and Ignazio Baldelli have taken pains to point out, prior to 1260 religious poems of praise had a number of different forms, among them which has been termed the lauda salmistica, of which the most famous is St. Francis’ “Cantico delle creature.”\(^10\) However, between 1260 and 1300, the lauda’s form became more and more solidified into the ballata’s form: we see this fact in the examination of the Laudario di Cortona and the Laudario Magliabechiano, two of the largest extant laudarii from this period.\(^11\) Roncaglia posits that the movement of the disciplinati adopted the form of the ballata and made it the primary form of the lauda to assist in the transmission and popularity of these religious songs:

> Che i Disciplinati abbiano adottato per le loro laude spirituali lo schema strofico delle ballate profane è arcinoto [...] Ed è anche ben noto che l’uso di cantar laude era già diffuso, quando—nel 1260—si scatenò per tutta l’Umbria e per tutta


\(^5\) Giunta, La linea Bonagiunta-Guinizzelli, 290–1.


\(^7\) Contini, Poeti del Duecento, 766: “in generale la prevalenza statistica [nei Memoriali bolognesi] è per la ballata” [“in general the ballate are statistically predominant in the Memoriali bolognesi”].

\(^8\) Contini, Poeti del Duecento, 785–788.


\(^11\) Roncaglia, “Nella preistoria della lauda,” 469.
l’Italia il movimento di Raniero Fasani; e che le più antiche laude volgari, succedute alle latine, avevano forme affatto diverse da quelle della ballata. (461–63)

[It is well-known that the Disciplinati adopted the strophic pattern of secular ballate for their spiritual laude. And it is also well-known that the custom of singing laude was already widespread when—in 1260—Raniero Fasani’s movement erupted throughout Umbria and throughout Italy; and that the most ancient vernacular laude, which succeeded Latin laude, made use of form that were very different from the ballata’s.]

And, even more explicitly:

L’intenzione di far concorrenza al canto profano, accettandone le forme più diffuse e gradite e surrogandone il contenuto, sembra [...] innegabile [...] Non si potevano, invece, consacrare le ballate, volgendole a laude? Utilizzare, insomma, i modi esteriori della ballata come mezzo efficace per riconquistare più prontamente alla devozione religiosa di chi viveva tra i piaceri mondani? 12

[The intent to compete with secular song, accepting its best-known and most pleasing forms and replacing its content, seems undeniable. Wasn’t it possible to render the ballate holy by turning them into laude? To sum it all up, wasn’t it possible to use the exterior trappings of the ballata as an efficient means to bring those who lived among worldly pleasures back to religious devotion more efficiently?]

With these statements, Roncaglia corrects an earlier thesis expounded by Ferdinando Liuzzi (one of the first historians of the lauda) that completely denied the lauda’s relationship with ballata form and insisted on its original, inspired emergence through the religious fervor of the disciplinati. 13 However, as Roncaglia notes, the correspondences between the form of the post-1260 lauda and that of the ballata are too great to be ignored, and at this point it is a widely accepted theory that the lauda adopted ballata form as a way to encourage popular involvement in the religious movements of the second half of the thirteenth century. 14

13 Ferdinando Liuzzi, La lauda e i primordi della musica italiana (Rome: Libreria dello Stato, 1935), 18–19. Liuzzi’s argument (notably formulated in the 1930s, during the Fascist Ventennio) is colored by his desire to discover respectable origins of Italy’s “national” musical life. He viewed the form of the laude as an organic union of poetry and music made possible through “il decorso poetico [che] accett[a] e segu[e] il decorso musicale in questo ch’è per eccellenza il disegno della melodia nostra” [“the poetic unfolding that accepts and follows musical unfolding in what is, par excellence, the outline of our melody”]. He insists on the special qualities of this “melodia nostra,” and finds the idea of the lauda using the form of the ballata as a way to increase its popularity insulting to the religious fervor of the Duecento: it is impossible, for him, “che per superficialità o cedevolezza del sentimento religioso la lauda abbia rubato alla ballata, con frivola ed equivoca furberia, movenze e melodie, in un secolo d’intensa fede quale fu il Duecento” [“that, out of superficiality or instability of religious sentiment, the lauda would have stolen motives and melodies from the ballata with frivolous and dubious slyness, in an intensely religious century like the Duecento”].
The performance practice associated with the ballata form most likely led to its adoption for the lauda: the ballata required participation in a collective performance, and this participation seems to have carried over to the performance of the lauda. The performance of the ballata was dictated by its precise form: the leader of the dance began the song by singing the ripresa, which was then immediately repeated by the chorus of other dancers. Then the soloist would go on to sing the stanzas of the ballata, and the chorus would sing the ripresa all together between the stanzas. The performance practice of the lauda mirrored this structure: laude were monophonic songs intended for collective performance, either antiphonally (in which two groups alternate singing different parts of the song) or responsorially (in which the group alternates with a soloist). It should be noted that performance practice for the laude not only has a precedent in performance practice for ballate, but also in performance practice for the Latin versus, a type of sacred strophic song that also employed congregational refrains. According to Margaret Switten, the refrain in the versus became the locus for group participation in these sacred songs: a participation that often involved both singing and dancing. Thus, the lauda’s performance practice and use of the ballata form also calls into question the role that dance played in the conceptualization of the lauda; I will return to this point more extensively in my later discussion of Guittone d’Arezzo's ballate-lauda.

I use the term ballata-lauda advisedly: indeed, when considering the formal overlap between the ballata and the lauda, it is difficult to determine the difference between these two types of poetry. Roncaglia and Baldelli articulated a difference between the lauda drammatica and the ballata-lauda (or lauda-ballata); the laude drammatiche (of which Jacopone da Todi wrote many) were a vehicle for telling biblical stories. Although at first they maintained the form of the ballata, they eventually became the root of the later sacre rappresentazioni. The lauda drammatica, then, can perhaps be differentiated from the ballata in its new performance methods. The term ballata-lauda, on the other hand, demonstrates how nebulous the relationship between these two forms really is. One could posit, perhaps, that the main difference between a ballata and a ballata-lauda is ultimately determined by its content: the ballata is secular in

---

15 Pirrotta, “Ballata,” 220: “L’elemento più caratteristico della [...] struttura della ballata fu la ripresa, il ritornello col quale chi dirigeva la danza iniziava il canto, e che era immediatamente ripetuto dal coro dei danzatori. Venivano poi le strofe, dette stanzze, pure cantate dal solista e seguite ciascuna da una ripetizione corale della ripresa” [“The most characteristic element of the structure of the ballata was the ripresa, the refrain with which whoever led the dance would begin the song, and which was immediately repeated by the chorus of dancers. The strophes, called stanzas, followed, also sung by the soloist, each of them followed by a choral repetition of the ripresa”].
16 Damerini, “Lauda,” 456: “Musicalmente le laude sono monodiche, per voce sola, ma destinate ad essere cantate all’unisono collettivamente” [Musically, the laude are monophonic, for one voice, but meant to be sung in unison, collectively].
17 Barr, “Lauda singing and the tradition of the disciplinati,” 37: the laude were “frequently antiphonal, and occasionally responsorial.” Giunta, too, connects the ballata to responsorial practices, in La linea Bonagiunta-Guinizelli, 290.
18 Switten, “A comparative study of refrain technique in the New Song,” 99: “these early usages [of the refrain] [...] point to origins [...] that have been adduced: responsorial chant and dances [...] [T]he notions of response and of physical movement, doubtless also of participation by a group of not necessarily trained singers, certainly play into the refrain.” Switten also notes the question of religious or liturgical dancing: according to her, “[R]itual or processional dancing [...] is more prominent than one might at first anticipate” in the versus (119).
19 Baldelli makes this distinction in his article on “La lauda e i disciplinati,” as does Roncaglia in “Nella preistoria della lauda.”
20 Vincenzo de Bartholomaeis, Laude drammatiche e rappresentazioni sacre (Florence: F. Le Monnier, 1943).
nature, whereas the ballata-lauda is sacred. However, even such a thematic division is somewhat complicated by the manuscript tradition. Although no study of the position of the ballate within the thirteenth-century canzoniere can claim to be definitive, due to the ballata’s not-yet-completely-standardized position as a written poetic form at the time these collections surfaced, it is significant to note that an examination of the ballata section of Banco Rari 217 (P)—the only thirteenth-century canzoniere to include such a section—contains only secular and specifically courtly or erotic ballate, leaving the one ballata-lauda it contains (Guittone’s “Ora vegna a la danza”) in its canzone section (along with two of Bonagiunta’s ballate—one of which, “Molto se fa brasmar,” is secular but moralizing—and a secular, courtly ballata by Pucciandone).  

Although, as Roncaglia and Baldelli stated in their now widely accepted theories, the early, popular ballata most likely gave the lauda its more standardized form around 1260, the ballata as a literary form—one used by self-styled lyric poets—did not gain prominence until after its usage in the ballata-lauda. Claudio Giunta notes the extraordinary number of anonymous ballate in the thirteenth-century canzonieri, conjecturing that a number of these poems belong to “non-institutional” and “pre-artistic” spheres. In tandem with the growth and diffusion of the ballata-lauda, the ballata began to grow into a form that was no longer “non-institutional” or “pre-artistic,” becoming accessible and even desirable as a mode of lyric expression (as catalogued by Dante in the De vulgari eloquentia, when he places the ballata just below the canzone and above the sonetto in his hierarchy of metrical forms; and as is made manifest in a thirteenth-century canzoniere like P, in its dedication of a whole fascicle to the ballata). Some critics have even gone so far as to conjecture that the lauda allowed the ballata to gain credibility and legitimacy as a literary form. Fabio Fano, for instance, states in his definition of the ballata, “fu con [il] tramite della lauda che la ballata poté ambire a dignità artistica più elevata, per lo più intesa come mezzo di espressione lirica (e perciò sempre solistica)” (“it was through the lauda that the ballata could aspire to higher artistic dignity, and be understood as a means of lyric expression (and therefore always soloistic”). Nino Pirrotta comes to a similar conclusion, echoing Fano:

Delle ballate più antiche non ci è pervenuta nulla, finché la loro struttura, col tipico alternarsi di solista e coro, non fu adottata per il canto di laude religiose delle confraternite dei Disciplinati e dei Battuti, che si diffusero in Umbria verso il 1260. Attraverso la lauda la ballata pervenne a una sfera artistica più elevata, nella quale fu adoperata prevalentemente come mezzo di espressione lirica, dunque in forma esclusivamente solistica.

22 Giunta, La linea Bonagiunta-Guinizzelli, 291: “l’indebolimento della authorship che caratterizza buon numero di rappresentanti del genere [della ballata] sarà da interpretare […] come prova statistica di una produzione e di un consumo mantenutisi per ampio tratto a livello non istituzionale, e, per dir così, pre-artistico: l’adesopia si rivela come ‘uno dei modi di essere più caratteristici della ballata’” (“the weakening of authorship that characterizes a large number of the ballata’s representatives must be interpreted as statistical proof of a production and a consumption that, for a long period of time, was kept at a non-institutional and, to put it bluntly, pre-artistic level: lack of authorial attribution is revealed to be ‘one of the ballata’s most characteristic modes of existence’”).
[No older ballate have reached us, until their structure, with the typical alternation of soloist and chorus, was adopted for the singing of religious laude in the confraternities of the Disciplinati and the Battuti, which spread throughout Umbria around 1260. Through the lauda, the ballata reached a higher artistic sphere, in which it was primarily used as a means of lyric expression, and thus in an exclusively soloistic form.]

The ballata-lauda, according to these critics, became the vehicle through which the ballata emerged as a written, literary form—through which it shifted from being a popular, anonymous, and collectively performed dance song to a self-aware poetic and, as both Fano and Pirrotta term it, soloistic (“solistica”) composition. These assertions cannot, of course, be categorically proven: chronology for the textual lives of ballate and ballata-lauda are too uncertain to state whether the ballata or the ballata-lauda gained textual legitimacy first. And yet, as Giunta notes, the contact between the ballata and ballata-lauda throughout the thirteenth century requires us to examine what he calls the “primordiale doppio registro erotico e religioso” [“primordial erotic and religious double register”] of the written ballata. Essentially, any examination we undertake of the ballata’s emergence as a major poetic form in the Italian lyric in the second half of the thirteenth century must include a discussion of its cross-pollination with the ballata-lauda.

In search of literary legitimacy: the emergence of the written ballata

The only examples of extant ballate that may precede the birth of the ballata-lauda are Bonagiunta Orbicciani’s five ballate, of uncertain date, but surely written between 1242 and 1290. Bonagiunta’s ballate contain similar themes to the ballate found in the Memoriale bolognese (c. 1265–1300), and focus on courtly praise of the lady with the inclusion, in true Bonagiuntian fashion, of liberal sprinklings of Sicilianisms. The last stanza of Bonagiunta’s ballata “Donna, vostre belleze” is a perfect example of these citations, even including a reference to Tristan and Isolde and a rhyme (between “Isolda” and “non solda”) that was previously used in Giacomo da Lentini’s discordo:

Maritate e pulzelle
di voi so ‘nnamorate
pur guardandovì mente.
Gigli e rose novelle
vostro viso aportate
si smirato e lucente.
Ed eò similemente
‘nnamorato son di voi
più ke non fue Tristano d’Isolda:
meo cor non solda—se non vostr’altura.

It is impossible to tell if the courtly language used here was a trope of the ballata before Bonagiunta, since we have no extant ballate written before his; however, it is quite possible that courtly language was widespread in the ballata, considering the amount of it present even in the oldest collection of ballate-laude, the Laudario di Cortona (c. 1270).

Bonagiunta was almost certainly the first of the siculo-toscani to use the ballata form; his primacy, however, is contested by Guittone d’Arezzo.28 If Guittone wrote any ballate in his life as a secular, courtly poet, none are extant; however, as Frate Guittone, he wrote a number of ballate-laude. The two poets’ almost-overlapping use of this new poetic form has proved to be fertile ideological terrain in examining different developments in the Italian lyric at the end of the thirteenth century. Gianfranco Contini, for instance, frames the poetic output of Bonagiunta and that of Guittone as a battle between the old (Bonagiunta) and the new (Guittone); he notes that although Guittone was probably born in 1235 and thus several years younger than Bonagiunta, “la […] robusta novità [di Guittone] fu innovativa specialmente rispetto al bonaguintismo” (“the robust novelty of Guittone was innovative, especially when compared to Bonagiunta”).29 Claudio Giunta, more recently, complicates this picture: in his view, Bonagiunta and Guittone both represent two different potential paths for Italian lyric poetry on the threshold of the Trecento. Bonagiunta, along with his secular ballate, represents the line that, according to Giunta, leads from the Sicilians to Guinizzelli to the stilnovisti; Guittone and his complex ballate-laude, however, represent another path, whose potential, in Giunta’s mind, remained largely untapped by the following generation of poets.30

Giunta is, of course, correct in stating that most ballate, into the fourteenth century and beyond, follow the characteristics set by Bonagiunta in his ballate: fewer stanzas, courtly themes, standardized metrical forms, and (for the most part) little theoretical or philosophical

---

28 Giunta, La linea Bonagiunta-Guinizzelli, 291, n. 69: “Il primato cronologico nella sperimentazione della ballata profana è contesto notoriamente tra Bonagiunta e Guittone per la sola testimonianza del Trissino, che nella Poetica cita alcuni frammenti di ballate amorose guitttoniane inattestate nei codici e databili agli anni pre-conversione” (“The chronological primacy in experimenting with the secular ballata is notoriously contested between Bonagiunta and Guittone, due merely to the testimony of Trissino, who cites in his Poetica a few fragments of erotic Guittonian ballate unattested to in the codices and datable to before his conversion”).

29 Contini, Poeti del Duecento, vol. I, t. I, 258. With regards to Guittone’s birth date, see Contini, Poeti del Duecento, 189: “il Ferretti ne situa la nascita circa il 1240. Ma bisognerà arretrarlo di qualche anno perché egli sia in grado di depolare, esule volontario fuor di Toscana, fatti aretini probabilmente del 1256 […] L’insieme dei fatti sembra parlare dunque per nascita verso il 1235 ed entrata nell’ordine [dei frati gaudentii] verso il 1265” (“Ferretti situates the date of his birth around 1240. But we must move it back a few years so that he is able to deplore, as a voluntary exile from Tuscany, events that most probably occurred in Arezzo in 1256. Taken all together, the data seems to refer to his birth as around 1235 and his entry into the Order of the Jovial Friars around 1265”).

30 Giunta puts it rather bluntly, in La linea Bonagiunta-Guinizzelli, 288: “La linea ‘vincente’ che porta a Petrarcha è insomma quella che restaura, dopo la diversione guitttoniana, il sublime disimpegno della poesia amorosa […] Lo stilnuovo non è affatto un ‘ritorno,’ involontario o deliberato, ai siciliani; è invece la scelta, storicamente spiegabile benché non storicamente necessaria, di una delle due linee poetiche che si affrontavano in Toscana nell’ultimo trentennio del secolo” (“The ‘winning’ path that leads to Petrarch is ultimately the one that, after the Guittonian diversion, restores love poetry’s sublime disengagement. The stilnuovo is not an involuntary or deliberate ‘return’ to the Sicilians; instead, it is the historically explicable but not historically necessary choice of one of the two poetic paths facing off in Tuscany in the last three decades of the century”).
content.\textsuperscript{31} Still, as I have observed above, the \textit{ballata} and the \textit{ballata-lauda} are deeply imbricated one with the other throughout their early textual history; ultimately, it seems impossible to consider the fate of the \textit{ballata} in the Trecento without considering its roots not only in the Bonagiuntian secular, courtly \textit{ballata}, but also in the Guittonian \textit{ballata-lauda}. In fact, Guittone’s \textit{ballate-laude} represent a pivotal moment in the history of the refrain form in Italian lyric poetry: they demonstrate the way that Guittone managed to take a primarily orally performed poem and use it to his advantage in the creation of a hyper-literarily conscious one, moving the \textit{ballata} and \textit{ballata-lauda} away from the sphere of collective performance and into (to quote Pirrotta) “espressione solistica.”\textsuperscript{32} Guittone applies his \textit{trobairitz}—a poetics deeply connected to the written text, as noted by Wayne Storey\textsuperscript{33}—to a form that was originally performed orally; and in fact, in these poems Guittone uses the form’s echoes of oral performance in support of certain innovations in his poetics. Such a process was seminal in pushing the refrain form beyond its popular or choral components, allowing it to become a space where poetic prowess could be performed and claimed. In addition, the circular poetics that Guittone obtains through his revolutionary use of the refrain form has implications for Italian lyric production beyond the \textit{ballata}.

\textit{“Davanti alla regina fanno danza”: performative links between the \textit{ballata} and the \textit{ballata-lauda}}

Guittone’s \textit{ballate-laude} acknowledge an oral, performed, perhaps even participatory and danced context—and they thematize this acknowledgement, finding new ways to make an impressive union of form and content in the written word through the self-awareness of their oral past. This union of form and content is not unique to Guittone’s \textit{ballate-laude}, as Claudio Giunta has pointed out in an analysis of Guittone’s \textit{trobairitz} and its relation to the concepts that Guittone attempts to express.\textsuperscript{34} Giunta mainly focuses on Guittone’s love lyric (in comparison to Bonagiunta’s), but I believe that an examination of Guittone’s religious poetry reveals a similar preoccupation with matching form and content. In the case of the \textit{ballate-laude}, Guittone uses \textit{trobairitz} to convey the difficulty of the concepts he is trying to express: namely, how to depict and praise the divine. Indeed, many of his \textit{ballate-laude} discuss his concern that his words are insufficient to communicate the saint’s praise (an element of these poems that I will analyze fully later on). At the same time, Guittone instrumentalizes a knowledge of the performed form of the \textit{ballata-lauda} to allow for a sense of ecstatic mysticism to enter the poem: a “giocundare” [rejoicing] (as he puts it in his \textit{ballata-lauda} “Vegna, vegna—chi vole giucundare” [“Come, come, whoever wants to rejoice”])\textsuperscript{35} represented by worship through singing and dancing, an enactment of praise whose performance makes up for words’ potential failures.

That Guittone conceived of the \textit{ballata-lauda} as being related to communal worship comes through in two of his \textit{ballate-laude}: “Vegna, vegna—chi vole giucundare,” and “Ora vegna a la danza.” Both poems include references to a “danza,” another word for the \textit{ballata} form, as we

\begin{itemize}
\item \textsuperscript{31} Giunta, \textit{La linea Bonagiunta-Guinizzelli}, 213; 288; 293.
\item \textsuperscript{32} Pirrotta, “Ballata,” 760.
\item \textsuperscript{33} Wayne Storey, \textit{Transcription and Visual Poetics in the Early Italian Lyric} (New York: Garland Pub., 1993), 30: “Writing becomes the only vehicle for this poetics, requiring study like a university text [...] many of Guittone’s and Guinizzelli’s experiments which depended on stylistically difficult systems of troping and imagery were deeply entrenched in the written forms of poetic discourse.”
\item \textsuperscript{34} Giunta, \textit{La linea Bonagiunta-Guinizzelli}, 211.
\item \textsuperscript{35} Egidi, \textit{Le rime di Guittone d’Arezzo}, 107–8.
\end{itemize}
see in various early ballate. For instance, “Seguramente,” from the *Memoriali bolognesi*, includes an invitation to dance in its *ripresa*:

Seguramente  
vegna a la nostra danza  
chi è fedel d’Amore  
e hagli cor e speranza.  

[Surely, may he who is one of Love’s faithful and has heart and hope come to our dance.]

An anonymous *danza* from Mantua, “Venite, polcel’ amorosa,” contains a similar invitation:

Venite, polcel’ amorosa,  
madona, vinit a la dansa,  
mostrati la vostr’ alegrança,  
si como vu siti çoyosa.

[Come, loving maiden, my lady, come to the dance. Show your happiness, how joyous you are.]

“L’anghososa partença”—another of the *ballate* from the *Memoriali bolognesi*—even contains a *congedo* in which the poetic composition is termed a “novella dansa amorosa” and ordered to go to the lady and speak to her, according to the typical personification of poetic form that often occurs in the *congedo*.

A number of the *ballate-laude* from the early *laudarii* contain these references to dance, potentially pointing toward a tradition of liturgical dance. In the *Laudario Magliabechiano*, “Ave Maria, stella diana” commands its participants to raise their hands, perhaps in a dance meant to honor the Virgin Mary. The *ballata-lauda* “Regina pretiosa” mentions the heavenly dance of

---

36 Justin Steinberg notes the similarities between Guittone’s “Vegna, vegna” and “Seguramente” in the *Memoriali bolognesi* in *Accounting for Dante: Urban Readers and Writers in Late Medieval Italy* (Notre Dame, Ind.: Notre Dame University Press, 2007), 34. He asserts that “Guittone almost certainly encountered the popular ballad [“Seguramente”] during one of his extended stays in Bologna.” Although this certainly could be possible, I am hesitant to draw a direct connection between Guittone and this *ballata* from the *Memoriali*; this kind of language (the invitation to dance directed at “chi vole giocundare” [“whomever would like to rejoice”] or “chi è fedel d’Amore” [“whomever is faithful to Love”]) is fairly common in the *ballate* and *ballate-laude* in this period and not unique to “Seguramente” (see, for instance, almost any of the *laude* in the *Laudario di Cortona* (c. 1270)).


39 Anonymous, “L’anghososa partença,” lines 22–30, ed. Contini, *Poeti del Duecento*, vol. I, t. II, 776: “Novella dansa amorosa, / move cun [grande] pietança, / non far seçorno né posa, / van’ a la mia dolçe amança, / ver’ la plu rengratïosa: / contagli la mia pesança, / dili ch’aça membrañça / de mi, che vivo ‘n pene / et altro non ten – lo meo cor en dog[i]a” [“New amorous dance, move with great pity, do not stop or rest; go to my sweet love, the most graceful one: tell her the weight I carry, tell her to remember me, since I live in pain, and nothing (other than her) keeps my heart in pain”].

the saints in the heavens around the Virgin Mary, as if she were the leader of the celestial dance (the “sovran de le belle,” in the words of one ballata from the Memoriale bolognesi), and later invites all penitent participants in the lauda to whip themselves in time with this danza—“se egli avrà il cuor pentuto / vadasi scoriando a questa dança”—in a reminder of the lauda’s connections to the movements of the disciplinati and the battuti.

Thus, the ballata-lauda’s implied connection to liturgical dance is not a feature unique to Guittone. However, Guittone’s “Vegna, vegna—chi vole giocundare” and “Ora vegna a la danza” both demonstrate Guittone’s awareness of the popular, communal roots of the ballata-lauda and its status as a participatory lyric form. In addition, a suggestive miniature accompanies “Ora vegna a la danza” in the richly-decorated Banco Rari 217 (P): it depicts four women holding hands in a circle on a flat blue background, all contained within the “O” of “Ora vegna a la danza.”

This circular dance is a hallmark of the secular ballata, as Capovilla has noted, in addition to having been historically linked to liturgical dance, as John Freccero has laid out in his analysis of Paradiso X. Guittone’s poem describes one such religious (indeed, heavenly) dance, mixing the courtly, popular, and religious registers, as was typical of many laude at the time:

Ora vegna a la danza
e con baldanza—danzi a tutte l’ore
chi spera in voi, Amore,
e di cui lo cor meo disia amanza.

[Now let him come to the dance and let him dance at every hour with joy, whosoever places his hope in you, Love, and from whom my heart desires love.]
Such a ripresa would make it seem as if the ballata-lauda were being sung by a servant of Love in praise of his lady; the marker of its status as lauda, in addition to its status as ballata, comes in the first stanza, when the poet states “Oh, quanto è dilettoso esto danzare / in voi laudare, — beata Maria!” [“Oh, how pleasurable is this dancing and praising of you, blessed Mary!”]. The illumination seems to serve a similar function, as it mixes different references to the courtly, the popular, and the religious: the women dance in a style similar to that recalled in the Memoriali bolognesi, but they do so on a flat blue background, making it look as if they were dancing ethereally suspended in the heavens. Of course, as Wayne Storey has noted, one must be cautious not to over-interpret illumination; as Storey puts it, “this register of illumination [present in canzonieri like P] was never intended to function as an INTEGRAL ILLUSTRATION [sic] of its accompanying text nor on an interpretive par with the poetic message.” While bearing this caveat in mind, it is still significant to note that the illuminator of P was made aware (either through a copyist’s instructions, by copying from another manuscript, or by reading the poem) of the content of Guittone’s ballata-lauda and was reminded of its connections with dance practices in religious and extra-religious contexts.

“Ora vegna a la danza” is one of Guittone’s more traditional ballate-laudes: it follows forms and registers that link it to popular ballate (like the ones of the Memoriali bolognesi), newly courtly ballate (like Bonagiunta’s), and religious coopting of those forms (like the laude from the Laudario di Cortona or the Laudario Magliabechiano). However, the other ballata-lauda in which Guittone explicitly references dance, “Vegna, vegna,” does not merely follow these codes; in fact, it contains, within its form, certain hallmarks of Guittone’s ornatus style, with rime equivoche (the “faccia-faccia” rhyme of vv. 3 and 5, for instance) and dense repetition as in the fourth stanza:

O vita vital per cui ëo vivo,
for cui vivendo moro e vivo a morte,
e gaudio per cui gaudo e son gioivo,
for cui gaudendo onni dolor mi sorte,
degna—degna—la mia alma sponsare
and farlaTe tutta degna.51

[O lively life for whom I live; outside of whom I, living, die, and live death-like; and delight for whom I delight and am joyous; outside of whom I, rejoicing, am filled with pain; in marrying my worthy, worthy soul, make it wholly worthy of You.]

Such a dense use of polyptoton is reminiscent of Guittone’s prior secular lyric poetry (a prime example would be his sonnet “Tuttor ch’eo dirò gioi, gioiva cosa”). In “Vegna, vegna,” then, Guittone brings his signature methods of trobar clus into the ballata-lauda. This move is an essential one in Guittone’s transformation of an oral, participatory form into a soloistic one revealing the prowess of the lyric poet. Guittone breaks with the typical formulaic poetic

49 Storey, Transcription and Visual Poetics, 182.
material of the ballata-lauda here: although he explicitly thematizes the idea of participatory performance and worship, his poetry still contains the weight of what Contini termed “[il] capitale ma ingombrante trobar clus di Guittone” (“Guittone’s fundamental but burdensome trobar clus”).

We see this same use of Guittonian style—specifically, the use of *rime equivoche* and closely packed repetitions, mainly polyptota—in Guittone’s four other ballate-lauda: “O bon Gesù, ov’è core”; “Graziosa e pia” (to the Virgin Mary); “Meraviglioso beato” (to St. Dominic); and “Beato Francesco in te laudare.” In all of these ballate-lauda, Guittone’s poetics reveal a hyper-awareness of the relationship between the content of his poems and the form they would take if they were to be performed in the manner dictated by the oral tradition. He uses the idea of oral performance that this form evokes to assert his poetic prowess, even in a context that includes popular, participatory, and collective features, like the refrain or *ripresa*. Guittone’s instrumentalization of the echoes of an oral form, used in service to the text, provide a new perspective on his hyper-literary *trobar clus*. As Wayne Storey has noted, textuality is central to Guittone’s *trobar clus*: writing is essential to its development and reading is essential to its comprehension. However, in his ballate-lauda Guittone does not only rely on textual techniques: he takes advantage of oral implications in order to seek new methods of unifying word and deed, *signum* and *res*, in the poetics of praise, displaying his poetic prowess as he does so. In my exploration of how Guittone transforms the participatory ballata-lauda into a soloistic and hyper-literary expression of his own skill as a lyric poet, I will primarily examine the ballate-lauda to St. Dominic (“Meraviglioso beato”) and to Saint Francis (“Beato Francesco, in te laudare”).

**From “segno” to “fatto”: the enactment of the word in Guittone’s ballate-lauda**

Of the two poems, “Meraviglioso beato”—the poem to St. Dominic—is the stylistically and formally simpler one, and yet it presents kernels of elements that emerge in more elaborate form in the ballata-lauda to St. Francis. The poem’s rhyme scheme is fairly straightforward: it is made up entirely of *ottonarii* and *novationi* (with some *quinarii* and *senarii* for the internal rhymes) with a two-verse *ripresa*. The stanzas are made up of two *piedi* that follow the same structure as the *ripresa*, linked to the *volta* (which also shares a rhyme scheme with the *ripresa*) through a kind of transitional verse that does not typically appear in the ballata-lauda, although Guittone does use a similar technique in “O bon Gesù.”

One significant element of “Meraviglioso beato” is Guittone’s brief meditation on Dominic’s name in the second stanza:

O nome ben seguitato
e onorato—dal fatto,

---

52 Contini, *Poeti del Duecento*, 258.
53 Storey, *Transcription and Visual Poetics*, xxiii: “This more complex poetics [of these early experimenters with the appearance of the text] was inexorably linked to the written word and even the ACTIVITY OF WRITING itself. As early as the 1250s, a written poetics informs Guittone d’Arezzo’s lyric production.” Storey also comments on the reader’s experience of Guittone’s poetics, 26: “The thirteenth-century ‘philosophization’ of the Italian lyric was quickly translated into an elevated sense of the lyric poem’s written form as the primary vehicle for transmission. And though there was no early consensus on the scribal formats for these lyrics, the fact was that their themes of sententious philosophical and/or political import required, both in their composition and their reception, the attentive reading of the written text.”
Domenico degno nomato,  
*a Domino dato*54

[O name well-followed and well-honored by deed, Dominic worthily named, given to God]

Although meditations on Dominic’s name are common in the Middle Ages, having started through biographies of the saint,55 the way that Guittone thematizes the name followed and confirmed by the fact or the doing (“nome ben seguitato / e onorato—dal fatto”) introduces the question of *res* versus *signum* that he expands upon in his much longer *ballata-lauda* to St. Francis. In the case of Dominic, he is rightly named (“degno nomato”) because his name (the *signum*) aligns with its enactment (the “fatto” or *res*): his consecration to God.

The discourse of the word and the action (the “fatto”) that represents it reemerges in the last stanza of “Meraviglioso beato,” in which Guittone declares:

> Forse ch’io perdo tacere,  
> poi non so compiere—aonore:  
> ché vertù di tanto savere  
> sommo chere—laudatore.  
> Und’eo sarò tacitore:  
> ma tuttavia ciò ch’è ditto  
> ascondo ni gitto—non fiore.56

[Maybe I should have been silent, since I do not know how to honor you; because such knowledgeable virtue requires an excellent praise-singer. Therefore I will be silent: and yet I do not hide or recant any part of what has been said.]

Guittone states that he will now be silent (“sarò tacitore”) because he cannot adequately honor Dominic in his praise (“non so compiere—aonore”). Dominic’s knowledgeable virtue (“vertù di tanto savere”) requires skillful praise (“sommo chere—laudatore”), which Guittone claims not to have. And yet, in the last two lines of the stanza, he undermines all his claims of unworthiness by declaring that, despite everything he has just declared, he will not hide or recant a word of it (“ma tuttavia ciò ch’è ditto / ascondo ni gitto—non fiore”).57 Guittone’s undercutting of his previous self-deprecating statements at the beginning of the final stanza, and his reassertion of ownership of his verses, is enacted by the repetition of the *ripr esa* that, in the performed tradition of the *ballata-lauda* form, would occur after every stanza, including the last one. Therefore, his

55 As Anna Maria Chiavacci Leonardi states in her notes on *Paradiso* XII (Milan: Mondadori, 1997), 327–355, 341: “terzo segno di predestinazione, anch’esso, come i due sogni, presente nelle biografie del santo: e perché fosse anche nel nome […] quale era di fatto, […] dal cielo venne (ai suoi genitori) una divina ispirazione perché lo chiamassero col possessivo di colui (il Signore) del quale egli *era tutto*, cioè a cui totalmente apparteneva” [“this, like the two dreams, is a third sign of predestination present in biographies of the saint: and so that he could be, in his name, what he was in reality […] a divine inspiration came from the sky (to his parents) so that they would name him the possessive of the Lord, whose he was *entirely*, that is, to whom he belonged completely”].
57 Or, in Contini’s helpful paraphrase: “[di ciò che è stato detto] non nascondo né sconfesso punto” [“I do not hide or recant anything of what was said”]. Contini, *Poeti del Duecento*, 229.
assertion that he would not take back even a word of his lauda—no matter how unfit he may be for the task of praising Dominic—moves from words (the signum) to performative enactment (the res) in the final repetition of the ripresa.

This move has a number of implications: one, it expands on the idea of signification and representation that Guittone had already briefly touched upon in his meditation on Dominic’s name in the second stanza of “Meraviglioso beato”; two, it enacts the reclaiming of poetic ability in praise that the end of the last stanza implies; and three, it represents a significant step in the conceptualization of the refrain as no longer a simple, codified element that allowed for popular participation in the ballata or ballata-lauda, but rather a formal tool that could be used in the demonstration of poetic prowess. All three of these elements play significant roles in Guittone’s lauda “Beato Francesco.”

“Beato Francesco” is a much denser poem than “Meraviglioso beato,” despite its lack of Guittone’s characteristic internal rhymes. Instead, this ballata-lauda contains a high number of hendecasyllables and a four-verse ripresa. The stanzas are also lengthy: each is ten verses long (as compared to the seven verses in each of the stanzas of “Meraviglioso beato”) with two three-verse piedi and a four-verse volta. “Beato Francesco” begins with the poetic statement found in the last stanza of “Meraviglioso beato.” In fact, in the ripresa itself, the poet asks St. Francis whether he is worthy of praising him:

Beato Francesco, in te laudare
ragione aggi’ e volere:
ma prendo unde savere,
degnità tanta in suo degno retrare?58

[Blessed Francis, I have reason and desire to praise you; but where can I find enough knowledge and ability to worthily depict you?]

The poet has reason and desire (“ragione” and “volere”) to praise St. Francis; however, he wonders, does he have the knowledge (“savere”) to properly depict (“retrare”) the saint’s high worth in his lauda? The use of the word “retrare”—to depict—is significant, especially in its appearance in the ripresa, where, according to the responsorial form of the ballata’s performance, it will be repeated after each stanza. In addition, this poem is extraordinarily long, with thirteen stanzas and a congedo (also followed by the ripresa), meaning that, were this ballata-lauda performed, the ripresa would be heard fifteen times. The idea of “retrare” is essential to the questions of signification that I have already examined in “Meraviglioso beato” and will only continue to emerge—with even more intensity and insistence—in an analysis of “Beato Francesco.”

The poem’s first three stanzas focus on the ripresa’s question: where will I find the knowledge, the “savere,” to be able to sing your praises and depict your noble worth? In the fourth stanza, a shift occurs:

E perché parva era umana scienza,
e non degno om omo angel laudando,
prese Dio la tua laude in sua potenza,
tuo caro merto degno orrato orrando;

And since human knowledge was scant, and no man was worthy to praise an angel, God took your praise into his power, honoring your precious, worthy, honorable merit. He did not do so in words, since they do not easily show value, but he proved it in marvelous deeds; multiple times he had birds honor you by obeying and following you, and upon making the dead rise, he made your precious virtue speak.

The poet explains that, since human knowledge lacked the ability to properly praise St. Francis, God himself took matters into his own hands (“prese Dio la tua laude in sua potenza”). God, however, did not praise Francis in words (“in dire”) where worth is difficult to portray (“u’ non ben par valenza”)—but rather in marvelous acts (“mirabili fatti”) like birds following and obeying him, and the dead rising because of him. Here, once again, as in “Meraviglioso beato,” Guittone pursues a metapoetic meditation on res and signum: here, he states that the only worthy lauda of St. Francis comes from the miraculous actions he has performed—his “mirabili fatti” (res)—rather than “dire” (signum). And yet, Guittone then contradicts his claim that “mirabili fatti” are worth more than “dire” in the praise of St. Francis when he states, at the end of the stanza, that through these actions, Francis’ virtue was made to speak: “la tua cara vertù fece parlare.” Thus, here we see a vindication of the word (“parlare”) and spoken praise, even in God’s method of praising Francis through his miraculous acts.

In fact, Guittone mixes together the categories of res and signum throughout the poem, and as the ballata-lauda progresses he continues to assert the merging of actions and words (or signs), especially when discussing the miracles (deeds) that God executed to praise Francis. According to Guittone, these miraculous acts take the form of embodied, corporeal signs: specifically, Francis’ stigmata. The stigmata are first described in the seventh stanza:

Magne de tua vertù, magne d’amore
da Dio a te son prove este, e son nente
inver che c’è sorgrande e sormaggiore
e sola tua, ch’è maggio e maggiormente,
ché, ciò che fu en sé maggio e megliore,
le suoi piaghe, mise in te apertamente;
e ciò per magne due cose asegnare:
una provando como
la via si è ’l tuo dentro, omo;
altra teco una cosa esser mostrare. (65–74)

[These are great signs of your great virtue and great love from God to you, and they are nothing compared to what is so great and only yours, which is even greater, because what was in Him greatest and best—his wounds—he put openly
in you; and so he marked two things as great: one, proving how the path is within
you; the other showing his oneness with you.]

God makes the stigmata appear on Francis’ body: he signs them (“asegnare”) onto him. The verb
“asegnare” exemplifies the mixing of res and signum toward which the poem now moves: God
actively places signs on Francis that are physically and corporeally manifest.

The stigmata represent, within the poem, the union of “dire” and “fare,” as Guittone explicitly specifies in the eleventh stanza:

Segnano anche altro esti segni in teie.
Dice Cristo: chi vol poi me venire
tolla la croce sua e segue meie;
cioè piaghe suoie degga in cor sculpire
e nel suo dire e far portarle in seie;
e chi non ciò, non pol ver cristian dire.
Unde tu, che dovei ricoverare
in vita vera e voce
di penitenza croce,
merstasti gonfalon esso portare. (105–14)

[These signs in you mark other things as well. Christ says: whoever desires to
come with me, let him take up his cross and follow me; that is, this man needs to
sculpt Christ’s wounds in his heart and carry them with him in his words and
deeds; and whoever does not do this cannot say that he is a true Christian.
Therefore, you, who recovered the cross of penitence in your true life and voice,
deserved to carry the standard.]

The stigmata, physical and corporeal signa that incorporate the res into their very manifestation,
become abstracted: “[s]egnano anche altro esti segni in teie.” In fact, they signify (“segnano”)
the symbolic internal wounds carved into Francis’ heart as a true follower of Christ. The stigmata
are, in this sense, the reification of the signum, which would be these symbolic internal wounds.
Francis himself becomes the vessel for the union of the res and the signum: he bears the wounds
in his saying and his doing, “nel suo dire e far.” He physically carries, in his person, the symbolic
standard—the “gonfalon”—of Christ.

These meditations on the role of the language (signum) and its concrete execution (res) that
are found in “Meraviglioso beato” and, to an even greater extent, “Beato Francesco,” penetrate to
the center of the meta-literary discussion of representation that is a signature feature of the Italian
lyric since its origins in the Scuola siciliana, where, in Giacomo da Lentini’s work, we can
already observe anxiety about the relationship between res and signum in the poetic act.59

59 I am thinking, in particular, of poems like the canzonetta “Meravigliosamente,” or the canzone “Madonna, dir vo’
voglio,” in which the question of how to express the love the poet is feeling—and the explicit references to not only
writing, but also different acts of representation like painting—demonstrate the poet’s anxiety surrounding the
relationship between signs and things and, also, the relationship between form and content. Teodolinda Barolini
discusses the relationship between form and content in Giacomo da Lentini’s sonnet “Io m’aggio posto in core a Dio
Wayne Storey also briefly discusses Giacomo da Lentini’s “Meravigliosamente” in terms of poetic representation
and pictorial representation, in Transcription and Visual Poetics, 185–186.
Throughout “Meraviglioso beato” and especially “Beato Francesco,” Guittone strives, in his songs of praise, toward a unification of poetic language (signum) and the execution of this language (res). This attempt appears, as stated above, at the end of “Meraviglioso beato,” where Guittone declares his unworthiness to sing Dominic’s praises only to retract this statement and reaffirm the praises he has already sung (“ciò ch’è ditto / ascondo ni gitto—non fiore”), an assertion that is then concretely performed and enacted through what would have been the traditional oral performance of this poem: the repetition of the ripresa that opens the poem.

Thus, Guittone uses the reference point of the ballata form’s traditional oral performance to transform the ripresa from an element of popular song, meant to encourage collectivity and group participation, into a solo expression (“espressione solistica,” to once again quote Pirrotta), that enacts the union of “dire” and “fare” upon which Guittone meditates in these poems. This enactment takes place in the conclusion of “Beato Francesco,” as well. In the last, truncated stanza (made up of just a volta), Guittone restates his unworthiness to sing St. Francis’ praises (an anxiety articulated in the ripresa of this poem and in its first three stanzas):

Mercé donque, Messer; me perdonare
a te piaccia e ai toi,
se non laudat’ho voi
degno, ché non finire so cominciare.  

[Pardon me, then, Messer; let it please you and yours to forgive me, if I have not praised you worthily enough, since I know how to begin but not how to finish.]

At the closing of this poem, Guittone admits that although he began this poem, he does not know how to finish it: “non finire so cominciare.” This admission is then enacted by the rules of the poem’s oral performance, which would involve a return to the ripresa—which opens the poem—after the last stanza. Therefore, Guittone, as at the end of “Meraviglioso beato,” is making his “dire” into “fare”: he declares that although he does not know how to end, he knows how to begin, and then, through a repetition of the ripresa, he returns to the beginning of the poem. He makes his linguistic signum into res by using the popular performance of this form in service of his complex, hyper-literary poetics. Guittone’s statement that he knows how to begin, but not how to finish, is confirmed by the form of the ballata-laude itself, which doubles back and repeats itself, in a circular manner, through the ripresa.

In the case of “Beato Francesco,” this circularity is marked in the manuscript itself: it appears in the Guittone-centric Laurenziano Rediano 9 (L), along with four more of Guittone’s ballate-laude. L is divided into two sections, a canzone section and a sonetto section; a block of Guittone’s poetry opens both sections (in addition to a section dedicated entirely to Guittone’s prose letters, which opens the codex). L contains no ballata section, and the five ballate-laude within it—all Guittone’s—are found one after the other (between fols. 49r–51v, in fascicle VII) in the section of the manuscript that belongs to Guittone’s canzoni. Three out of the five ballate-laude (“O bon Gesù,” “Beato Francesco,” and “Vegna, vegna”) contain a responsorial marking—like the ones that appear in breviaries—on the left margin, next to the last stanza,

---

indicating, perhaps, that the response (the refrain or *ripresa*) should be sung after it. Of course, the lack of standardization in the writing of the *ballata* or *ballata-lauda* form at this point makes it difficult to come to any kind of definitive conclusion regarding the responsorial marking: it is not used consistently in L (two out of the five *ballate-lauda* do not have it—including “Meraviglioso beato”—and it appears next to the last stanzas of a few of the *canzoni* in addition to the *ballate-lauda*), and it does not appear in P.\(^\text{62}\)

We cannot know whether Guittone had any direct supervision over the textual layout of his *ballate-lauda* in L, despite what some philologists have conjectured (or hoped for) in the past.\(^\text{63}\) However, whether or not Guittone himself mandated the responsorial marking or it was added by a scribe, the written poem itself seems to necessitate it, as a way of linking it back to its beginning when the poet states that he cannot end the poem, but he can begin it. One wonders to what extent the inclusion of the responsorial marking could be considered a minor manifestation of Guittone’s “authorial strategy of linguistic and visual networking,” as Storey puts it in his analysis of Guittone’s *Trattato d’amore* in the MS Escorial e. III. 23.\(^\text{64}\) As stated above, many uncertainties and conjectures must accompany any analysis of the responsorial marking next to the last verses of certain *ballate-lauda* in L. However, despite the inconsistent use of this marking, I would hazard to state that it is, perhaps, significant that it accompanies a poem like Guittone’s “Beato Francesco”: it directs the reader, who has been following the text linearly and most likely in silence, back to the *ripresa*, enacting the return to the beginning of the poem suggested by the poet in the last line (an effect that would have occurred aurally if the *ballata-lauda* were to have been performed orally). Perhaps this marking encourages the reader to engage in a silent, circular meditation, a loop of endless praise that does not know how to end but knows how to begin.

**Circularity in the poetics of praise: implications for later Italian lyric**

The way that the ending of the *ballata-lauda* links the *res* and the *signum* in its praise of St. Francis mirrors the way that, as Guittone described in the previous stanzas, God links the *res* and the *signum* in His praise of St. Francis through the union of the miraculous deeds (“mirabili fatti”) and signs (“segni”) that he assigns, or marks (“asegna”), onto Francis. Guittone, then, draws a parallel between his own praise of St. Francis and the praise of St. Francis that God in his glory undertook (the “laude […] [che] prese Dio […] in sua potenza”). Such a statement asserts Guittone’s awareness of his own poetic prowess and ability in his *ballata-lauda*. Notably, Guittone instrumentalizes the echoes of an oral/performative tradition within a written/textual medium as a way to demonstrate his skill. By bringing together the oral and the written, we can sense how preoccupied he is, in his poetics, with questions of representation—a preoccupation that, as mentioned above, runs throughout the Italian lyric tradition, linking him with the earlier *Scuola siciliana* and the later *stilnovisti*, and, in particular, Dante. Remarkably, Guittone chooses the *ballata* as the form through which he could execute his praise poems: a form that, before him, had been almost exclusively oral and popular. It seems improbable and reductive to attribute Guittone’s use of the *ballata* form as merely a way to compete with secular forms, as

\(^{62}\) In fact, the stanzas of the *ballate* in P are marked by a V, the companion to the responsorial marking, indicating their similarity to a *verse* followed by a *responsory* in a breviary.

\(^{63}\) See Leonardi, *I canzonieri della lirica italiana delle origini*.

\(^{64}\) Storey, *Transcription and Visual Poetics*, 172.
Roncaglia posits with regards to the lauda’s adoption of ballata form. Rather, in Guittone’s case it appears that the choice to use ballata form has less to do with an attempt to make his ballate-lauda more popular or accessible, but instead regards his repurposing of the refrain form as a method of constructing a circular poetics of praise that loops back on itself in a potentially never-ending meditation on the divine.

We can see this circularity—this disruption of the poem’s sequential nature—through Guittone’s use of repetition on various levels. On the micro level, as mentioned above, Guittone often employs polyptoton, like “dolgosia doglia” in “O bon Gesù,” “coronato d’onore / onor sé onora” in “Meraviglioso beato,” or “deber segni essi a segno in te segnare” in “Beato Francesco” — all this, paired with his frequent usage of rime equivoche. These two elements are, as stated previously, typical elements of Guittone’s poetry that are intensified through formal repetition in the ballata-lauda.

“O bon Gesù” is a prime example of such repetition: each stanza begins with the apostrophe “O bon Gesù,” a repetition that extends beyond what appears on the printed page when we remember that, according to traditional ballata structure, the ripresa—which also begins with “O bon Gesù”—would be repeated between each of the stanzas. This anaphora disorients the reader, making typical signposts of the poem difficult to locate and disrupting the poem’s sequentiality. This disruption also surfaces, of course, at the end of “Beato Francesco,” when the last stanza of the poem points us back to the beginning (“ché non finire so cominciare”), enacting a circularity that does not allow for the fixed beginnings and endings of most poems (“O bon Gesù” is, incidentally, another poem that includes a responsorial marking next to its last stanza in L).

Such poetic self-consciousness certainly propels the ballata-lauda into the terrain of a potentially virtuosic, poetically skilled composition, and contributes to the shift from the perception of the ballata as a popular, oral form to a literarily viable one (although it should be noted that the ballata never shed its association with popular performance). Although scholars, like Giunta, have noted that ultimately Guittone’s model of the ballata-lauda was subsumed by the secular, courtly, Bonagiuntian-style ballata (as we see in the production of the stilnovisti), it is undeniable (as I discussed above) that the secular and/or popular manifestations of this refrain form were deeply connected to its religious manifestations during its establishment as a lyric

69 Dante’s classification of the ballata as inferior to the canzone in the De vulgari eloquentia (which seems due, in large part, to the ballata’s use of a ripresa) may have contributed to this perception. As it is, in the Trecento Petrarch will consider it to be a popular or “popolareggiante” form, according to Emilio Bigi in “Le ballate del Petrarca,” Giornale storico della letteratura italiana 152 (1974): 481–493, 482: “Si può ragionevolmente pensare che il [...] gusto aristocratico e fortemente selettivo [del Petrarca] lo portasse a giudicare la ballata come un genere ‘plebeo’ secondo la definizione che ne dà egli stesso in una postilla del Vat. Lat. 3196, a proposito di Amor, quando fioria: ‘hoc est pricipium unius plebie cantionis’” [“We could reasonably think that Petrarch’s aristocratic and highly selective taste brought him to judge the ballata as a ‘plebeian’ genre, according to the definition he himself gives to it in an annotation to Vat. Lat. 3196, regarding Amor, quando fioria: ‘here is the beginning of a plebeian song’”]. Bigi goes on to posit that this is due to “[l’]origine popolare o popolareggiante (a differenza di quella del sonetto) della ballata, e soprattutto l’impiego di essa, anche e proprio ai suoi tempi, come strumento di comune intrattenimento” (“the popular or popularizing origin of the ballata (unlike the sonnet), and above all the use of the ballata as a means of common entertainment, even in his own time”). Giunta echoes this sentiment, in La linea Bonagiunta-Guinizzelli, 293: he states that in the ballate of the stilnovisti, the popular or popularizing tradition associated with this poetic form does not allow for great innovation in the hands of a poet like Dante.
genre. Therefore, although the structure of Guittone’s *ballata-lauda* was not necessarily taken up by the following generation of poets, I believe it fair to assert that the hyper-literary, formal, and representational experiments that Guittone undertook in his use of the *ballata* helped dispel the perception of the refrain form as an exclusively orally performed genre (which would render its written form a mere transcription of an oral performance). Instead, in his *ballate-lauda* Guittone propelled this form to a new poetic legitimacy.

Guittone’s innovative literary use of the presumably widespread orally performed *ballata* to create a poetic meditation on representation, sequentiality, and circularity in narrative time during the act of praising the divine merits further consideration, even outside the context of the *ballata*, and its contribution to the Italian lyric tradition that follows it requires, perhaps, some reevaluation. Although the themes of Guittone’s *ballate-lauda* are not directly continued in the *ballate* that succeed his poetic production, it could prove useful to consider the implications of the circular poetics of praise developed in Guittone’s *ballate-lauda* outside of the *ballata* form. In fact, the influence of Guittone’s circular, never-ending poetics that disrupts mere sequential reading, employed within the context of divine praise, could be linked to Dante’s attempts to avoid the constraints of narrative time in the poetics of his *Paradiso*; indeed, as Teodolinda Barolini has written, Guittone is “the only one of Dante’s lyric precursors who could actively imagine, if not the Comedy itself, at least the space that the Comedy would later fill.” This statement is especially pertinent when considering the close links between *Paradiso* XI and XII and Guittone’s *laude* to St. Francis and St. Dominic, in addition to potential ways that Guittone’s poetic techniques in these poems are echoed in events like the circular heavenly dance of *Paradiso* X and the archangel Gabriel’s “circulata melodia” of *Paradiso* XXIII.

Even more broadly, using Guittone as a case study in our examination of how the *ballata* as literary form was established alongside (or perhaps even thanks to) the *ballata-lauda* demonstrates the necessity of considering the role of oral performance in the development of early Italian poetics. If, in our reading of Guittone’s *ballate-lauda*, we ignore the form such compositions would have had in oral performance, we lose much of their poetic complexity: the way that they harness echoes of orality to assist in meditations on poetic time (or sequentiality), circularity, and representational considerations (the union of *res* and *signum*; as Dante would say, in *Inferno* XXXII, the desire that “dal fatto il dir non sia diverso” [“that the word may not differ from the deed”]). Moving beyond the oft-embraced paradigm of the so-called “divorce” between music and poetry in the Italian *Duecento* laid out by Roncaglia nearly fifty years ago and considering interactions between textuality and orality in the early Italian lyric allows for reinterpretations of previously inaccessible, impenetrable, or simply neglected poems from this time period. In a similar vein, abandoning dichotomous perceptions of popular (often associated with oral performance) and literary (often associated with written texts) poetry in favor of a more

---

70 Giunta, *La linea Bonagiunta-Guinizzelli*, 213. Giunta considers the abandonment of Guittone’s *ballata-lauda* form by later poets to be a “rifuito [...] categorico” [“categorical rejection”] in favor of a *ballata* form “dove non si varcano le quattro stanze e non hanno spazio temi extracortesi” [“where the four stanzas are not exceeded and there is no space for themes outside of the courtly”].


holistic approach to *Duecento* lyric may lead to a reevaluation of the relationship between what have historically been considered separate spheres.