

# *Newsletter* of the **Society for Music Analysis**



*Edited by* Nicholas Marston

**No. 12: July 1998**

## *Contents*

From the Editor; from the President	2
SMA Bursaries 1998	3
Announcement: Fourth EuroMAC	4
<i>Reports:</i>	
Adorno, Analysis, and Contemporary Composition, 21 February 1998	5
Schenker Study Day, 21 March 1998	10
TAGS Day, 21 May 1998	15
SMA Diary 1998-99	20
<i>Report:</i>	
Music Theory's Nature, 28-29 March 1998	21
Contributors to this issue	26
Note to contributors	26

## SOCIETY FOR MUSIC ANALYSIS Executive Committee

**President**  
Robert Pascall

**Vice President**  
Deborah Mawer

**Treasurer**  
Jonathan Cross

**Events Officer**  
John Rink

**Information Officer**  
Nicholas Marston

### From the Editor

*Editorial address:* Dr Nicholas Marston, St Peter's College Oxford OX1 2DL. Tel: 01865 278908. Fax: 01865 278855. E-mail: nick.marston@spc.ox.ac.uk

Taking some comfort from the well-known fact that May Week falls in June, I have dated this issue of the *Newsletter* 'July 1998' despite its August appearance. Delayed publication has its advantages, though, not least in relation to the greater amount of accurate advertising for forthcoming events that it has been possible to include. On the down side, some dates loom closer now than they might otherwise have done; and I would draw particular attention to the 4 September deadline for receipt of applications to this year's SMA Bursary competition (see facing page). This issue also includes a more than usually substantial account of events organized during the past year, and I am particularly grateful to all those who have not merely attended but also listened, reflected, and set down their thoughts to help create a vivid impression of the Society's activities. My thanks go also to Alan Street, Critical Forum Editor for *Music Analysis*, for his helpful channelling of some of this material; it seems to me entirely appropriate that such a supportive relationship should subsist between the journal and this publication.

We see and read much at the moment concerning the Starr-cross'd President of another great society. Closer to home, our own Robert Pascall has been characteristically modest in mentioning below his recent appointment to the Chair of Music at the University of Wales, Bangor. This follows his long and distinguished tenure at Nottingham, site of numerous stimulating and enjoyable SMA events. Whatever the future of 'that address' for SMA administrative purposes, we congratulate Robert very warmly, and salute this westward and Walesward drive for his and the Society's activities. This issue of the *Newsletter* could not have appeared, however, without the Nottingham-based skills and support of Sally Britten, to whom I am once again greatly indebted.

### From the President

*Address for correspondence:* Professor Robert Pascall, Department of Music, University of Nottingham, Nottingham NG7 2RD. E-mail: Robert.Pascall@Nottingham.ac.uk

I am grateful for this opportunity to thank you very much indeed for your continuing interest and support and hope that you have enjoyed the Society's activities this year as much as I have. Particular thanks to my fellow organisers of events John Rink, Craig Ayrey, Christopher Wintle and Nicholas Marston.

As some of you already know I am moving to the University of Wales, Bangor in September. I will keep you informed of any changes to the SMA administration details, and I look forward very much to continuing as your President for the next few years.

Yours sincerely  
Robert Pascall

## SMA BURSARIES 1998

The Society for Music Analysis will award up to four bursaries of £1000 per annum for two years to those reading for UK Master's degrees, on the following conditions:

1. Applicants in 1998 must be registered or hold the offer of a place for an MA, MMus or similar degree in music analysis, theory and analysis, or in a programme that contains a significant music analytical emphasis. The initial bursary will be paid to cover the period October 1998 to September 1999.
2. Applicants must be essentially self-funding and not in receipt of any substantial grant, bursary, prize, studentship, or similar financial support. Where despite some such funding a genuine need can be shown the application will be considered on equal terms with other applications.
3. The bursaries in 1998-99 will be renewed for 1999-2000, subject to a satisfactory report on work from the holder's institution. It will be the holder's responsibility to send this report to the Society during August 1999. In the case of a 1998-99 holder who goes on to read for a higher degree, the bursary will be renewed unless the student secures full funding for 1999-2000.
4. Successful applicants will be required to become student members of the SMA, if not already enrolled. They may be invited to assist the Society from time to time, but this will not be a consideration in respect of receipt and renewal of any bursary.

Applications should be made to Professor Jonathan Dunsby on [j.m.dunsby@reading.ac.uk](mailto:j.m.dunsby@reading.ac.uk) by **Friday 4 September 1998**. The application should be in the form of a *curriculum vitae*; a brief description of the degree course and the applicant's objectives in pursuing it; a statement of the applicant's financial circumstances based on an account of income and expenditure; the e-mail address of a referee whom we may contact; and the applicant's contact details and any special information that might be relevant. Please paste appended files into the body of any e-mail rather than attaching them. If you prefer to snailmail your application, please send it to the Department of Music, University of Reading, 35 Upper Redlands Road, Reading RG1 5JE, and include a photocopy of the entire document.

Applications will be reviewed by Jonathan Dunsby (Past President of the SMA), and Robert Pascall (President of the SMA and Chairman of the Editorial Board of *Music Analysis*). Successful applicants will be notified by the end of September. Reasons will not be given for decisions.

## FOURTH EUROPEAN MUSIC ANALYSIS CONFERENCE

The Fourth European Music Analysis Conference, hosted by the Rotterdam Conservatory in conjunction with the Dutch Society for Music Theory, will be held in Rotterdam from **Thursday 21 October to Sunday 24 October 1999**. The conference theme—'Analysis in Europe Today'—will be explored in a number of analytical symposia, round-table discussions, and other sessions. A Call for Papers will be distributed to SMA members and British Music Departments at the beginning of October 1998, and proposals for papers will be invited for the following sessions:

- Fragmentation and integration in Beethoven's Bagatelles, op. 126
- The *Trois Poèmes de Mallarmé* of Debussy and Ravel
- Ligeti's Violin Concerto [to be confirmed]
- Nicolas Gombert and the principle of parody
- Interactions between acoustic and electro-acoustic music
- Analysing structure in improvised music
- Free papers

In addition, there will be an all-day plenary session (convened by Jonathan Cross, University of Bristol) on 'Analysis in Europe today: the different traditions'; among other things, this will present the results of a Europe-wide survey on teaching practices and research activity in theory and analysis. Conference delegates will also be able to attend a number of concerts, including a performance by Irvin Arditti of Ligeti's Violin Concerto with the Rotterdam Philharmonic Orchestra conducted by Reinbert de Leeuw.

Further information can be obtained after 1 October 1998 from John Rink (Tel: 01784 443532. Fax: 01784 439441. E-mail: [j.rink@sun.rhbnc.ac.uk](mailto:j.rink@sun.rhbnc.ac.uk)), or from the Conference Director, Patrick van Deurzen (Tel: +31 10 476 7399. Fax: +31 10 425 3262. E-mail: [pdeurzen@xs4all.nl](mailto:pdeurzen@xs4all.nl))

**The Category of the 'New': Adorno, Analysis, and Contemporary  
Composition**  
**Goldsmiths College, University of London, 21 February 1998**  
**Martin Dixon**

This well attended and extremely thought-provoking conference, organised by the SMA in conjunction with the Department of Music and the Centre for Cultural Studies at Goldsmith's, yielded a series of outstanding papers and discussions. In many ways the event might be regarded as something of a sequel to last year's conference on Adorno and Analysis at Bristol University, and even as part of a general revival of interest in Adorno as the academic community at large considers exactly what to do with Adorno's formidable intellectual legacy nearly thirty years after his death. This year's conference benefited both from the focus on a specific, if slippery, concept—the 'new'—and the inclusion of contemporary composition as a closely related area of concern. The choice of the essay 'Vers une musique informelle' for the round table discussion served to underline the fact that Adorno never shied away from attempting to intervene in the more practical affairs of composition and the composer. The conference also harboured an intriguing subtext: which music, whose music, is 'new'? All the speakers put forward their own candidates.

In recent years, the principal debate concerning Adorno appears to have been that if he is to be discussed at all, should it be because he still has pertinent things to say about our own historical situation? Or has the demise of modernism led to history closing around him and his particular assumptions (Truth, the Subject, History)? Has he, therefore, become relegated to the past, and relevant only as a representative of that provocative brand of speculation once called critique? Do we, from our post-modern (post-history, post-subject) vantage point agree with Lyotard that Adorno's writings represent critique's last gasp?

Much depends, of course, on one's assessment of post-modernity. Much depends, too, on whether it can be argued that Adorno was

simply an emphatic modernist or whether some portion of his theory might admit to more subtle interpretation. An initial revival of interest in Adorno came about when certain affinities between his negative dialectics and Derrida's deconstruction were detected. Similarly, as the semantic excesses of deconstruction yielded to reveal its ethical dimension and a (Levinasian) concern for the Other, the aspect of non-identity and otherness in Adorno's thought suddenly appeared startlingly contemporary. Adorno was seen not only as something of a visionary precursor of post-structuralism: he soon became a rather more attractive alternative to it, since his critique of western rationality depended far less on politically dubious figures such as Nietzsche and Heidegger, and seemed less extravagant and more responsible in comparison with certain of those in the French tradition. Adorno's thought could serve as a weapon in the hands of those such as Robert Hullot-Kentor, who have no time for all things post-modern or post-structuralist, believing instead that these suspect phenomena require not precursors but a thorough critique. Post-modernism is reinterpreted as late-modernism, and thus continuous with the tradition with which Adorno was familiar: the 'post-' is revealed as fanciful and premature. If Frederic Jameson is to be believed, Adorno is not some obsolete cold-war aesthete, but the theorist of our post-Marxist, late-capitalist era.

All this is another way of asking what in Adorno's theory is actual? What is of contemporary concern and relevance? We are unlikely to reach a consensus on this, and not least because we are unlikely to agree as to what our contemporary situation actually is. Whether we abandon Adorno altogether (as inadequate, unsuitable, or simply wrong), whether we think through his theory so as to bring us to the brink of post-modernity and then

relinquish it, or whether we cling to it as the last hope for aesthetic value and truth, may rest on nothing more sophisticated than personal sympathy.

As Craig Ayrey's opening remarks reminded us, determination of the category of the 'new' presents us with related problems. Not only must we discover what Adorno means by this concept, we must also grasp his understanding of conceptuality itself. While the former is an issue of semantics, the latter implies an entire philosophy. In the chronological sense, the 'new' is flat, neutral, undifferentiated; it means little more than the most recent, the latest, and as such we cannot escape the sense that the 'new' is only ever more of the same. Adorno offers a dialectical perspective: the 'new' arrives in an act of negation of the 'old'. The 'new' and the 'old' are co-dependent; the 'new' defines the 'old' and what is past, and against this determines itself. The 'new' is not a clean break with the past; there are no 'new' beginnings.

But the 'new' is impossible, the 'new' is unknowable. As Adorno puts it in *Aesthetic Theory*, the 'new' is not the 'new', but the 'longing for the "new"'. The 'new' cannot be known to us immediately; all that can be registered in the aesthetic object is that it is longing for the 'new'. Everything that might wish to be 'new' is implicated in this melancholy condition; everything that is 'new' suffers from knowing that it is not. To the extent that this suffering impinges upon the work itself, and is objectivised in it, this is all that we might have by way of the 'new'.

What these rather dispiriting conceptualisations point to is not dialectics, but a negative dialectics, a dialectics that is conscious of the non-identity of the concept with that which it attempts to conceptualise. Concepts 'long' to be identical with their objects, and artworks likewise 'long' to be 'new'. (And what could be more traditional, more Romantic, than the notion of longing?) The meaning of the 'new' must be considered in conjunction with Adorno's Utopianism, that remnant of Walter Benjamin's Messianism which,

allowing for Adorno's more enigmatic mediations, still clings to the late aesthetics. Utopia is the negation of the world, and the 'new' is the modernist aesthetic counterpart of that negation. The 'new' is non-identical, and as such is a place holder for the Other, an Other not content to be disclosed in terms which are those of the already known, the identical, the Same. The 'new', which on first sight seems a trivial component of our understanding of the modern, precipitates a metaphysics.

Alistair Williams's paper was situated within the late- versus post-modernism debate, and his observations and conclusions were compelling. Williams constructed a middle way, remaining in touch with aspects of Adorno's critique but exploiting post-modern diversification of interpretation. The terms of Adorno's critique of modern music—immanence, rationalisation, technocracy, reduction of subjectivity and so forth—need not be discarded with the passing of modernism. Rather, as in the post-modern manner of accessing and renovating previous styles, attention is focused on modernist critical practices, which are themselves remobilised and re-situated. Williams thinks of this middle way as a 'semanticised modernism' which entails reading against the grain of the modernist preference for de-historicised, semantically neutral, logically primitive material. The opacity of some modernist art is, despite itself, permeable to meanings, and what is more, in this interpretative act the subject, which is always vulnerable in the face of technology, reasserts itself. Systematic, processual music, such as that of Brian Ferneyhough, is not a thing-in-itself: these very processes remain susceptible to interpretation.

As Williams explained, semanticising modern art implies also the socialising and historicising of its objects, rendering them legible rather than presuming their autonomy and self-identity. This socialising and historicising entails the immersion of objects in specific human contexts, the recovery of mimetic potential,

and the reawakening of affinities and relations between them. Williams rehearsed these interpretative strategies on the sculptor Rachel Whiteread---a refreshing antidote to the all-too-familiar default to literary criticism.

Adorno's broadside against Stravinsky in *The Philosophy of 'New' Music* seems so immoderate, so dogmatic that it may well have stifled Adorno's wider acceptance. As a piece of polemic it has certainly hit its target, since it has managed to offend and enrage generations of Stravinsky enthusiasts. For Robert Adlington, Adorno gets Stravinsky wrong. It is as if Adorno suffered from what Wittgenstein would have called aspect blindness, as he failed to recognise what was radical and innovative in Stravinsky's music. As Robert Adlington outlined in this paper, one thing that Adorno might have missed in Stravinsky, and that might also be called 'new', is the problematisation of temporality.

As Adlington explained, one may distinguish time as being either linear or circular. Transferred to music, this distinction appears as that of the progressive or developmental versus the repetitive and static; music inhabits both dimensions to some degree. To this may be added a further distinction, that of time as experienced by the subject versus the rationalisation of time into sheer, abstract duration as 'clock time'. One of the most important aspects of subjective time is the sense of past and present---any sense of selfhood is impossible without temporality---and thus, as Adlington pointed out, the issues of time and subjectivity intertwine. Adorno's dialectical view of history sees the development of the subject as contingent on its release from repression in ritual and the mythic, which includes the mythic conception of time. The history of music also registers this process of enlightenment in the greater subjective freedom of disposition over the material and the expansion of developmental processes in composition.

In order to liberate itself from a mere

succession of events and the consequent collapse of the aesthetic into the empirical, musical temporality requires a sense of continuity, progression, and implication in the musical material itself. Implication is also the logicity of the material (if A, then B); it awakens movement, dynamic, relationship, and music's specific temporality. Adlington maintained that Stravinsky's deployment of harmony through processes of accumulation and the frustration of ordinary tonal implication leads to a transformation of our experience of time. Logicity is bivalent: if the implication is frustrated, or a less immediately apparent path is chosen, we are forced to reassess the original implication, restructuring it in order to accord with the actual events. Even on this local scale one's sense of the present can be enhanced or dispersed.

The denial of certain logical implications ---and this, in Adlington's opinion, is Adorno's error---does not necessarily lead to the suspension of musical coherence. Nor does it suggest a disregard for the historical nature of the material, since awareness of its potential implications is also an awareness of the history of its previous deployment. What is implied by a specific harmony is rarely unequivocal, and what arises in the course of Stravinsky's music is the establishment of competing implications. The discontinuities in Stravinsky's music are in fact mediated by what is denied and, therefore, absent.

Julian Johnson's paper addressed what is 'new' in the 'new' music of today, a question that is demanded by Adorno's own theory. Though Adorno's theory prospers best in a close atmosphere of crisis and catastrophe, reports of the death of art are greatly exaggerated, as is the suspicion that theory and analysis have become necrologues. 'New' music continues to be composed and there remains an imperative to adapt and develop critical strategies that are appropriate to it. Adorno's aesthetics will be of lasting relevance only if it can be shown to be equal to this task, and to that of illuminating repertoires less closely associated with its original sphere

of reference.

Johnson exemplified this with the music of Morton Feldman. Piecing together aspects of Adorno's aesthetics and Feldman's music is an intriguing possibility, not least because of the great differences between the two traditions. In this case a rapprochement is suggested because of Feldman's close artistic affinity with Samuel Beckett, to whom Adorno's *Aesthetic Theory* was to have been dedicated; like Beckett's work, Feldman's music problematises the self, dissolving it in anorganic processes; similarly, and for similar reasons, Feldman and Adorno take exception to serialism. While the Darmstadt composers saw in Webern a precedent for total rationalisation, Feldman seized on Webern's extraordinary timbral acuity and treatment of silence.

Johnson focused on one concept that enjoys a prominent place in Adorno's articulation of modernist art, namely blackness. Blackness in art is nothing less than the internalisation of the moral blackness of the world. Rather than capitulate to the regulated abundance of society, 'new' music submits itself to a radical impoverishment of means. Blackness results from a recoiling against traces of affirmation or consolation that may be present in the sensuality of colour. As Adorno writes in *Aesthetic Theory*, 'the most advanced arts push this impoverishment to the brink of silence'. The negativity inherent in art's purging of its resources, therefore, takes music further in the direction of silence. Johnson, however, still managed to detect a lack in Adorno's theory, in the form of an undialectical attitude towards timbre: Adorno failed to see that sonority could be treated as an element of the musical idea.

The round table 'The concept of form in the 'new' music' centred on Adorno's 1961 essay, 'Vers une musique informelle'. The session was opened by Max Paddison, who clarified the meaning of 'musique informelle'. *Informelle*, meaning not 'informal' but 'aformal', denies forms or organisational principles that are externally imposed rather than being derived from the disposition and demands

of the musical material itself. *Informelle* is in effect a rejection of superficial generality and the arbitrary nature of imposed rules or processes in favour of form as the expression of the radical particularity of the material. The artist is constrained by the needs of the material and is the executive of its demands rather than someone who manipulates the material indirectly through object-alien procedures. Hence the significance of the essay's opening epigram, taken from Samuel Beckett's *The Unnameable*: 'Dire cela, sans savoir quoi'. This *sans savoir* advocates not ignorance but rather the courage 'to make things of which we don't know what they are'. The over-determination of the aesthetic object is most often a response to the fear that, left to itself, the material descends into chaos; but this fear is excessive, and itself probably irrational. For Paddison, another Beckett adage stands as a good approximation to the process: 'to find a form to fit the mess'.

These issues might well reflect the artistic and philosophical dilemmas of the late 1950s and early 60s, but are they relevant today? This is one respect in which the opinion of composers could be decisive. Following Max Paddison, Brian Ferneyhough gave a typically robust and intricate rendering of his own compositional priorities. Ferneyhough, who for some would be their first choice as a representative of a technically advanced 'new' music, does in many ways diverge from Adorno's notion of a 'musique informelle'. For instance, Ferneyhough has made clear elsewhere that he shares neither Beckett's artistic concerns nor his sense of failure and despair; his music remains instead within the modernist paradigms of construction, process, parameterisation, control; it delights in the vigorous proceduralisation of composition.

All this notwithstanding, Ferneyhough is more aware of the status of the subject within these processes, and the role of Otherness, and this is where his aesthetics communicates most strongly with Adorno's. The German composer Claus-Steffan

Mahnkopf was more ambivalent about Adorno's legacy. As apologist and in-house critic for the Schoenberg School, Adorno's rather abstract interventions were ineffectual and had no consequences for compositional practice.

David Osmond-Smith historicised Adorno's essay, seeing it in the light of Adorno's troubled relations with Darmstadt. Adorno first spoke at Darmstadt in 1950, and then again in 1951 and 1952. In 1954 he was awarded the Schoenberg Medal, which gave him the right to act as an apostle for the composer. In 1957, the frosty reception of his talk on the 'Ageing of the "new" Music' was a parting of the ways: Adorno and what he represented was rapidly falling out of favour with younger composers. The following year Adorno did not attend Darmstadt, but a certain John Cage did. Osmond-Smith sees these events as a stage in Darmstadt's oedipal destruction of Schoenberg. By 1961, however, Adorno was able to be received back by Darmstadt, and 'Vers une musique informelle' was something of a peace offering. But the sense that Adorno failed to get beyond Schoenberg seriously hampers him from getting beyond the problematics of modernism. One resultant under-theorisation concerns the subject. Many post modern thinkers see Adorno's adherence to the subject as nostalgic and obstructive to the development of his theory. The threat to selfhood, a source of great disquiet to Adorno, is disproportionate to any actual threat. Osmond-Smith sees 'Vers une musique informelle' as modernism's last stand before being overcome by the post-modern.

The philosopher Raymond Geuss, who acted as respondent, admitted to many difficulties with Adorno's position. Firstly, Geuss detected an incompatibility between Adorno's dialectical methods and the formation of a manifesto or program. Dialectics works only in retrospect and is a method---albeit an extremely powerful one---for making sense of what is already there; it is not a predictive tool. However, one might point out in Adorno's defence that an aformal music had already

occurred in Schoenberg's expressionist period: *informelle* was not an image of some future practice, but an analysis of an already existing repertory.

Secondly, Geuss observed that for Adorno, musical material is pre-given by history and asks determinate questions to which there are determinate answers. Any decision made by a composer can, in a technical sense, be right or wrong. Thus can Adorno mobilise concepts such as truth and coherence as aspects of the work of art. Geuss felt that this was probably an overestimation of the material's ability to make exacting demands. Thirdly, Geuss raised the question of compositional freedom, suggesting that Adorno's idea of freedom owes much to Hegel's: that is, freedom not as the availability of alternatives or as legislation for oneself, but as freedom from obstructions to subjectivity. Freedom means freedom from otherness, and the means by which otherness is most effectively erased is through identity.

Once raised to the political stage, the consequences of this idea of freedom are profoundly dangerous and all too familiar. But one would have to say again that this can be seen as a misrepresentation of Adorno's position, since his philosophy embraces a very well developed sense of otherness and he was an assiduous critic of identity thinking and the notion of freedom in Hegel and others. Geuss's final point was concerned with Adorno's pessimism. For Adorno, the world is a terrifying place and no amount of anxiety is appropriate to it. If Adorno's plea is that one should do away with the need for security and the reassurance of predetermined form in music, why not do away with the fear of the world?

One general conclusion to be drawn from the day's events might be that it is still too soon to dismiss Adorno outright without seriously depleting our intellectual and critical resources. Adorno still represents one of our best means of understanding twentieth-century music, and probably the only means we have for moving beyond modernist paradigms in any lasting way.

**Locating and Interpreting Schenker in the late 1990s:  
Schenker Study Day, King's College London, Saturday 21 March 1998  
Elizabeth Arno**

In a musicological community that greets the older formalist regimes, as epitomized by its analytical subset, with increasing scepticism while embracing an ever greater interdisciplinary virtuosity, it might appear a rather dubious pursuit to consecrate an entire study day to the merits of Schenker and his archive collection of fossilized interpretations of a rare breed of tonal masterworks. Before passing judgement, however, it is valuable to contemplate some preliminary thoughts.

Firstly, there is the case of Schenker and what his theoretical output might still usefully offer to the analyst working in the late twentieth century, a period that has carved out its own distinctive musical culture: a culture which, broadly categorized as plural and 'post-modernist', seems quite incongruous with that particular musical world, situated at the other end of the century, of which Schenker considered himself a part. Such an historically narrow perspective of those theoretical 'foundations' laid by Schenker might be contested by advocates of the parallel analytical tradition established by Salzer. Nevertheless, even if the late twentieth-century analyst working in an authenticist spirit is content with a Schenkerian orthodoxy in which the rigorous boundaries of that 'tonal tradition' are maintained, the number of genuinely *new* ideas—ideas not already articulated either overtly or implicitly by Schenker himself—seems possibly limited.

Questions concerning the historical context and interpretation of Schenker's ideas lead to a second, more urgent thought. If there is a general musicological suspicion of what might be construed as an analytical conspiracy headed by the likes of Schenker, then there must be an underlying problem—ground that has been stared at often but threatens to sink whenever trodden upon. In advancing a generally receivable, or objective, response to more universal musicological preoccupations,

what sort of conclusion does a musical analysis actually offer? Merely to pose such a question may, however, jeopardize the very existence of an analytical discipline within musicology, since some ramifications demand an assessment and justification of the purpose of more formalist methodologies.

It is among these concerns that suspicions about music analysis and, more specifically, Schenker studies, are rooted as the twentieth-century draws to a close. Contrary to such pessimism, however, the discourse of the thirty or so speakers and delegates who attended the study day held at King's College London on Saturday 21 March upheld the continuing relevance for current musicological contemplation of some far-reaching implications inherent in Schenker's theory. Thanks to the collaborative efforts of Robert Pascall (SMA President) and Christopher Wintle (Institute of Advanced Musical Studies, King's College), along with Julian Littlewood (postgraduate assistant at King's), the assembly was able to profit very fully from this high-level replacement for the previously scheduled Corfu conference. The study day comprised five papers given by six of the most eminent specialists in the field from British, European, and American camps: Allen Cadwallader, Jonathan Dunsby, Nicolas Meeus, Nicholas Marston, and jointly Robert Pascall and Christopher Wintle in the running order of the papers. Although there was no rigid classification of papers into titled sessions, there seemed to be a broad division between the first three, tending towards theoretical concerns, and the final two, which presented more practical analyses of specific works.

Misinterpretation of Schenker's original intentions, largely by scholars subscribing to the Anglo-American analytical tradition, appeared to inform the background of the first two papers, chaired by John Rink. If such a tradition of

misinterpretation is to be checked, then it seems sensible to take a pedagogical route. For much of the past two decades, many university teachers and students have clung to Allen Forte's and Steven E. Gilbert's *Introduction to Schenkerian Analysis*<sup>1</sup> as the sole method-building textbook. With many criticisms voiced against the rigid reductionist approach advocated by Forte and Gilbert, now viewed by some musicologists as an outmoded denial of Schenker's own musical understanding, Allen Cadwallader's paper, 'Strategies for teaching Schenkerian analysis', was received as a much-needed and appreciated pedagogical alternative. Cadwallader, whose paper explored his recently published *Analysis of Tonal Music: A Schenkerian Approach*,<sup>2</sup> insisted that the teaching of Schenkerian analysis, forming part of the fourth year of the American degree programme, should be preceded by adequate harmonic and contrapuntal tuition. Such pedagogical imperatives are, however, minimal in the Forte-Gilbert scheme. Central to Cadwallader's proposed strategy, and a further point of contention with Forte and Gilbert, is an anti-paradigmatic approach to both Schenker and to music. Accordingly, Schenker should not be taught in a prescriptive manner whereby a model is presented into which the music is fitted. Moreover, when discussing structural levels Cadwallader suggested the notion of a 'range of levels' to avoid the rigidity of conforming to three levels alone.

Through a series of eleven musical examples, Cadwallader expounded his step-by-step approach from foreground linear patterns, construed through variation principles, to more elaborate graphics, via an explanation of 'middleground blocking' whereby *Ursatz*-related prolongations are annotated on the score. Cadwallader claimed that the 'careful selection of examples' is absolutely

<sup>1</sup>Allen Forte and Steven E. Gilbert, *Introduction to Schenkerian Analysis* (New York: Norton, 1982)

<sup>2</sup>Allen Cadwallader, *Analysis of Tonal Music: A Schenkerian Approach* (Oxford: OUP, 1997)

critical; his choices for this paper included Mozart's Variations on *Ah vous dirai-je Maman*, K. 265; *Greensleeves*; Bach's Prelude in C major (WTC 1) and Sonata in E<sup>b</sup>, BWV 1031; Haydn's Piano Sonata in C, Hob. XVI/35; and Beethoven's Piano Sonata in E<sup>b</sup>, op. 81a ('Das Lebewohl'). Among his favourite choices remains the often-cited C-major Prelude by Bach, but the most extensive example employed was the (spurious) Sonata, BWV 1031. The ensuing discussion revealed some disagreement concerning Cadwallader's interpretation of unsupported stretches of scale-degree 4 in BWV 1031, and Schenker's own statement on this matter was pitted against him. Nevertheless, the core strategies were generally welcomed by those who have taught Schenkerian theory at university level.

Whereas Cadwallader's desired amendment to Anglo-American misinterpretation remains an essentially implicit polemic embedded in pedagogy, Jonathan Dunsby's commanding theoretical account of the dynamics that motivate current Schenker studies, entitled 'Blasius and Snarrenberg: Schenker's argument, Schenker's practice, Schenker's here to stay', considered the rather more overt tactics deployed by the central characters elected. Dunsby began by revisiting a prediction that he made during graduate classes at King's College London in the early 1980s but now refutes: 'What makes you think we shall still be teaching Schenker ten years from now?' The revisionist endeavours of the past decade to re-route Schenker studies away from Anglo-American interpretations and to return Schenker to his epistemological roots in German organicism are implicated by Dunsby in specific connection with the tradition initiated by Salzer and Katz during the 1940s and 50s: one that, running counter to Schenker's own views, perpetrated the appropriation of general voice-leading practices to pre- and post-tonal repertoires. It is perhaps the tension between these two traditions that animates continued interest in Schenker and the presentation of defences that claim respectively to demonstrate the 'proper' understanding of his work.

Given the seminal rôles played by Salzer and Katz in what Snarrenberg has described as the 'American abandonment of Schenker's organicism'<sup>3</sup>, Dunsby found it peculiar that neither Salzer nor Katz receives significant mention in the recent Blasius<sup>4</sup> and Snarrenberg<sup>5</sup> monographs on which his paper was centred. In order to locate the particular brand of 'revisionist Schenkerism' advocated by these two authors, Dunsby, taking his inspiration from a recent lecture by the poet John Fuller, attached a subtitle to his paper: 'the poetic power of intelligent calculation'. By invoking this power, which he reformulated as one of 'calculated hermeneutics', Dunsby framed both Blasius's theoretical preoccupation with 'why and how Schenker argues' and Snarrenberg's with 'how Schenker interprets his art'.

The revisionist agendas of Blasius and Snarrenberg were articulated by Dunsby against a train of thought that progressed from post-tonal voice-leading to 'graphic self-sufficiency' via the thorny issues of musical notation and compositional intention. Accordingly, both authors deem post-tonal voice-leading to be premature, Blasius arguing that music cannot have a commensurable epistemology, hence the appeal to Schenkerian theory for analysing modernist music, and Snarrenberg, who adopts a more platonic view, arguing that such voice-leading applications are irrelevant to the tonal masterpieces. Dunsby linked post-tonal music and Schenkerian music through notation and drew upon Schenker's own pessimism concerning the survival of the notation that defined tonal masterpieces.

<sup>3</sup>Snarrenberg, Robert 'Competing Myths: the American Abandonment of Schenker's Organicism', in *Theory, Analysis and Meaning in Music*, ed. Anthony Pople (Cambridge: CUP, 1994), pp. 29-56.

<sup>4</sup>Leslie David Blasius, *Schenker's Argument and the Claims of Music Theory* (Cambridge: CUP, 1996)

<sup>5</sup>Robert Snarrenberg, *Schenker's Interpretative Practice* (Cambridge: CUP, 1997)

In contrast to Schenker, Blasius understands the notated score to be the embodiment of compositional intentions in a 'perfectly replete symbolic system',<sup>6</sup> whereas Snarrenberg prefers to think of it as a 'reliable indicator of intention',<sup>7</sup> the latter idea supporting Dunsby's own view that the status of notation cannot be equated with musical content.

The controversy over notation and musical content has wider ramifications when situated in what Dunsby designated 'graphic self-sufficiency' which lies at the epicentre of revisionist Schenkerism: following Agawu,<sup>8</sup> there is a disbelief in graphic self-sufficiency in that a completed graph still requires supporting verbal conclusions. Pitting himself against those who rebuke Blasius and Snarrenberg for their essentially linguistic reading of Schenker's non-graphic work—to which group Agawu also belongs—Dunsby concluded that, by focusing on the linguistics, the two authors together demonstrate perspicaciously the single idea that drove Schenker, and thereby contribute towards eradicating the 'boring halo of "basic theory" and unfocused polemics' that Dunsby has identified in Schenker studies.

For those who are sceptical of the established writings on Schenker, Dunsby's meticulously well-referenced attempt to rid the subject of unjust interpretations will be considered highly successful. The immediate concerns aired during the discussion included Blasius' idea of 'epistemological commensurability', how predictions might be formed for the future of Schenker studies beyond the 1990s, and reflections on the status of Schenker studies as a 'ghetto' within the musicological discipline at large.

Following a substantial lunch break, in which several delegates took advantage of

<sup>6</sup>Blasius (1996), p. 43.

<sup>7</sup>Snarrenberg (1997), p. 87.

<sup>8</sup>Kofi Agawu, 'Schenkerian Notation in Theory and Practice', *Music Analysis*, 8 (1989), 275-301.

Christopher Wintle's table-booking in a nearby restaurant to continue discussions, the meeting reconvened under Jonathan Dunsby's chairmanship. The next two papers, by Nicolas Meeùs and Nicholas Marston, were testimony to the continued mileage available from traditional Schenkerian preoccupations, yet no doubt informed by the debate between a Schenkerian orthodoxy and Schenkerian misinterpretation. Nicolas Meeùs is the foremost French-speaking Schenker expert and counts among many seminal publications a translation of *Der freie Satz* as *L'écriture libre*. His paper, entitled 'The direction of Schenker's Fundamental Line', attempted to examine and justify the descending nature of the *Urfinie* from an historical-theoretical stance. Drawing upon musical examples from *Der freie Satz* together with the writings of distant avatars (perhaps most strikingly, and with no ironic but a purely forensic intent, Rameau!), Meeùs carefully traced the origins of thinking about the *Urfinie* as an exclusively descending phenomenon. It is clearly of great import if Schenker, passionate equally in his striving for a superior modernism founded upon artistic truth and in his rubbishing of mainstream received theory, may nevertheless be shown to be anchored in the European mainstream beyond and beside C. P. E. Bach.

Nicholas Marston was regrettably unable to attend the study day to present his paper, 'Divide and concur? Schenker's sonata form and the first movement of Beethoven's Piano Sonata in C minor op. 10, no. 1'. Following a morning of flurrying faxes from Oxford, those in attendance were very grateful to John Rink for his fine delivery of Marston's paper and live performance of the Beethoven movement. Marston demonstrated, through detailed analytical exegesis, that Schenker's interpretation of this notoriously experimental sonata form should not hinder the analyst from considering an alternative reading. Schenker's conception of the first movement of op. 10, no. 1, as a 'model' sonata-form movement derived structurally from a two-part division, is confirmed in his *Der freie Satz* analyses of

the exposition and development sections.<sup>9</sup> Raising doubts about the credibility of Schenker's neat classification of Beethoven's complex workings, however, Marston drew the recent work of David Beach and James Webster into the argument. Webster, in his essay 'The Form of the Finale of Beethoven's Ninth Symphony',<sup>10</sup> identifies an increasing tendency among musicologists to consider as overly simplistic those reductive theories of musical form that attempt to elucidate all musical domains under a single governing concept. Similarly David Beach, in his exploration of Schubert's sonata-form experiments,<sup>11</sup> and paying particular attention to the composer's 'fondness for beginning the recapitulation in the subdominant',<sup>12</sup> attempts to contradict Schenker's concept of a two-part division in favour of a sonata form that is an aspect of design separate from the tonal structure.

In agreement with the ideas presented by both Webster and Beach, Marston sensibly advised that interpretative alternatives ought to be considered in order to counteract analytical oversimplification of this 'experimental' repertoire. Indeed, and perhaps predictably from a self-selected group of specialist delegates, there was detailed discussion of Marston's paper; and if no consensus emerged, it was nevertheless clear that an analytical interpretation of the first movement of op. 10, no. 1 would almost inevitably turn upon attitudes towards Schenker's theory of structural division. In this sense, Marston's underlying point was firmly driven home.

The final session, which followed a short

<sup>9</sup>Heinrich Schenker, *Free Composition (Der freie Satz)*, trans. and ed. Ernst Oster (New York: Longman, 1979), Figs 154, 3 and 154, 7.

<sup>10</sup>James Webster, 'The Form of the Finale of Beethoven's Ninth Symphony', *Beethoven Forum* 1 (1992), pp. 25-62.

<sup>11</sup>David Beach, 'Schubert's Experiments with Sonata Form: Formal-Tonal Design versus Underlying Structure', *Music Theory Spectrum*, 15 (1993), 1-18.

<sup>12</sup>Beach, (1993), p.18.

tea break, saw Robert Pascall and Christopher Wintle join forces to present their most recent work on Schenker's 1921 analysis of Schubert's lied *Ihr Bild*. Pascall opened the session with a lucid and comprehensive introduction to his recent translation of Schenker's essay, published in the first volume (1921) of *Der Tonwille*.<sup>13</sup> Schenker's interpretation of *Ihr Bild* traces Schubert's 'masterly' translation of Heine's poem into tones. The poem comprises three strophes of two stanzas each, through which Heine elaborates the meditative journey of the 'unfortunate lover'<sup>14</sup> solitary in the perceived absence of his beloved. Standing in 'darkening dreams', the lover stares at her portrait which 'mysteriously stirred into life.'<sup>15</sup> Having travelled from dark solitude to illusory reunion, from the first strophe to the second, the lover delights in her wonderful smile, glistening eyes, and melancholy tears. As the tears flow down the lover's own cheeks, he is returned, in the final strophe, to solitude: 'Und ach! Ich kann es nicht glauben, daß ich dich verloren hab.'<sup>16</sup>

It is through this interpretation of the 'unfortunate lover' that Schenker approaches Schubert's musical appropriation of *Ihr Bild*. Heine's three strophes are transformed by Schubert into a ternary form in which the first and final parts, in B<sup>b</sup> minor and major, represent the progression from solitude to illusory reunion, while the central G<sup>b</sup>-major strophe corresponds to the joyful vision of the 'newly-resurrected.' According to

<sup>13</sup>Heinrich Schenker, *Der Tonwille* 1 (Vienna, 1921), pp. 46-49. Cambridge University Press is currently preparing an English translation of *Der Tonwille*.

<sup>14</sup>Heinrich Schenker, 'Franz Schubert: "Ihr Bild" (Heine)', trans. Robert Pascall, distributed at the Schenker Study Day, 21 March 1998, p. 1.

<sup>15</sup>Christopher Wintle, translation of *Ihr Bild*, distributed at the Schenker Study Day, 21 March 1998.

<sup>16</sup>'And oh, I can not believe it/that I have lost you.' Christopher Wintle, (21 March 1998).

Schenker's reading, Schubert draws the listener into the darkening dreams from the introductory two bars, their repeated bare B<sup>b</sup> octaves articulated as dotted minims separated by a crotchet rest. Schubert therefore causes the listener to 'stare with the note. And as we do so, we feel ourselves instantly transported, as if by magic, to the side of the unfortunate lover.'<sup>17</sup> Similarly, the listener enters the vision of her wonderful smile as the unison B<sup>b</sup> at the beginning of the second strophe expands gently into a major third, B<sup>b</sup>/G<sup>b</sup>. The vision slips away as the third strophe returns to the B<sup>b</sup> major-minor material of the first. Confirmation of renewed solitude is occasioned as Schubert 'withdraws the major-key motion' in the accompanimental epilogue and the 'gloomy minor tonality engulfs the whole realm of the soul.'<sup>18</sup>

Christopher Wintle continued the presentation with a compelling new reading of Schubert's *Ihr Bild* based on the observations affirmed by Schenker in the 1921 essay. As perceived by Wintle, Schenker's work contains an implicit belief that Heine's poem portrays unequivocally a man whose solitude derives from his mourning over the death of his beloved. Appealing next to Sigmund Freud's theory of bereavement,<sup>19</sup> supported by the empirical findings of a recent psychological survey of London widows that was not documented in writing on this occasion, Wintle claimed a psychoanalytical background against which to validate Schenker's judgements. Freud characterized bereavement as an inner struggle between a desire to become free of the deceased and a desire to retain him or her. In order to resolve this inner

<sup>17</sup>Schenker, trans. Pascall (21 March 1998), p. 1.

<sup>18</sup>Schenker, trans. Pascall (21 March 1998), p. 5.

<sup>19</sup>Sigmund Freud, 'Mourning and Melancholia' (1917), in J. Strachey (ed.), *The Standard Edition of the Complete Psychological Works of Sigmund Freud*, 14 (London: Hogarth Press and the Institute of Psychoanalysis, 1981), pp. 239-258.

struggle, the mourner must work out his emotions by following memories of the departed. Accordingly, Freud proposed a model that separates the symptoms of the bereavement process into four discrete phrases. The first is characterized by disbelief and shock; the bereaved experiences insomnia and uncontrollable bouts of weeping leading to the second phase, in which the bereaved wishes to return the departed to life. Developing awareness of the death marks the third phase and leads in the fourth to resolution and the desire for liberation.

Linking the psychological movement of Heine's character to the earlier two phases of Freud's model, Wintle presented his reinterpretation of the ternary form intrinsic to Schubert's *Ihr Bild*. He explained the lover standing in 'darkening dreams' through the idea of the disbelieving and shocked mourner of Freud's first phase. As the lover envisages the wonderful smile and glistening eyes of his beloved he wishes to return her to life in accordance with the second phase of the inner struggle. In the final strophe the lover is returned to his original state of disbelief. Following the psychoanalytical reading of the three parts, Wintle presented a set of detailed multi-level graphs, one for each of the strophes, and elaborated the music-analytical observations that support Schenker's reading of *Ihr Bild* as a ternary form.

During the ensuing questions, attention was drawn to Wintle's segregation of the background level across three distinct graphs. Other questions focused on

problems of translation. In the first instance there was some discussion as to how a translation of the outer strophes in the present rather than the past tense might alter the stimulating reading offered. Finally, there was some discussion concerning the invocation of bereavement theories for a poem that appears to resist an unequivocal determination of the mode and nature of the loss of the beloved: a point that Schenker did not attempt to clarify in his own analysis. It could be proposed that loss of love is a bereavement measurable by degree of which death is the most final and violent. In the case of Heine's *Ihr Bild*, however, there remain too few certainties and too many ambiguities excepting the plurality of illusions.

\*\*\*\*\*

If, as was suggested after Dunsby's paper, Schenkerian scholars are retreating into a 'ghetto' as the end of the century draws nigh, the state of music analysis as a unified discipline is a legitimate, yet not necessarily negative, debate to consider. Analytic traditions across the disciplines have been allied, through 'scientific' methodological endeavours, with the philosophic quest for truth that is now considered by many to have fallen into disrepute. 'Interpretation' and 'reading' were the most prominent ideas articulated throughout this study day. Perhaps the acceptance of plural interpretations alongside an established Schenkerian orthodoxy will provide enough ammunition to propel the relevance of Schenkerian thought for the truth-plurality debate in musicology well beyond the late 1990s.

## TAGS Day for Music Postgraduates, 21 May 1998 Julia Cheng

This year's TAGS day, organised by Nicholas Marston, was held in the Faculty of Music at Oxford University. There were eight papers covering a wide range of topics, though classifiable under four main headings.

*Session 1: Early Twentieth-century Music*  
The first paper, 'On the "colours" of Schoenberg's "Summer Morning by a Lake": pitch, timbre, psychoacoustics, and analysis', was delivered by Lee Tsang (University of Southampton). This thought-provoking study began with a few examples of Schoenberg's use of timbre in

the piece (op. 16 no. 3), illustrating how timbral similarity might connect otherwise contrasted passages and motives, and including observations on gesture, and rhythm of attack. All this, however, was merely a prelude to what followed. First, Tsang proposed a theory, with ten guidelines, which attempted to 'determine [the] textural and timbral divisions within a piece and [to] associate each segment with the most salient characteristics of particular sound sources and/or timbral dimensions'. The guidelines are extremely helpful in that they offer various criteria for divisions of timbral rhythm, thereby helping us to form a better picture of the work's timbral structure. However, at this stage Tsang's association of timbral dimensions is still relative, in the sense that comparison to other sonorities remains essential in order to realise the individual level of dimension for the specific timbre. This relativity is understandable, since a fixed chart of timbre perception (in contrast to perception of pitch and dynamic, for instance) is not yet properly developed: the multidimensional perceptual property in timbre makes the control of individual dimensions difficult.

Tsang went on to examine 'the perceptual interdependence of pitch and timbre'. By applying Parncutt's pitch salience algorithm to the canon (bars 1-13) in op. 16 no. 3, he concluded that the analysis in general proved that a continuous canonic movement can be perceived. However, in cases where the theory 'doesn't fit with the aural experience', one explanation might be that of individual instrument sonority.

In his essay 'Schoenberg's Orchestral Piece op. 16 no. 3 and the concept of *Klangfarbenmelodie*', Carl Dahlhaus stated that 'Schoenberg himself was not sure whether op. 16 no. 3 demonstrated the logic of alternating tone colours, in the possibility of which he believed, but in any case, the piece was meant to be a first attempt on those lines'. He further commented that 'Schoenberg was thinking of a feeling for the "logic" of a series of tone colours, a feeling which was as yet undeveloped but which had the "capacity"

to be developed'. If Dahlhaus was right about Schoenberg's supposition concerning the logic of tone colour, then Tsang's timbral analysis certainly offers us a possible reading of Schoenberg's 'feeling for the "logic"', not to mention its more general contribution towards the analysis of timbre.

The second paper in this session was 'Pitch-class set 7-34 as a compositional determinant in the music of Debussy, Ravel, and Scriabin'. Vasilios Kallis (University of Nottingham) offered a remarkable comparison of early twentieth-century harmonic frameworks and pc set 7-34. Works chosen to illustrate the use of 7-34 included *Jeux d'eau* (Ravel), *L'Isle joyeuse* (Debussy), and Scriabin's *Feuillet d'album*, op. 58. The importance of this particular pc set lies in the ease with which it may be transformed into different scales, such as the whole-tone pentachord, the octatonic hexachord, the diatonic hexachord, and a complete melodic minor mode. Recognition of the important transformational possibilities inherent in 7-34 offers a powerful means of analysing harmony in the music of these three composers.

#### *Session 2: Performance Issues: Chopin and Liszt*

Given the recent surge in the popularity of analysis-related performance studies, it was not surprising that some of these issues should be represented at the TAGS Day. It was regrettable that communication problems led to the absence of Alison Hood (Trinity College Dublin), whose paper 'Towards a methodology for interpreting and performing a score: Chopin's Nocturne in D<sup>b</sup>, op. 27 no. 2' thus remained unheard. The two papers that were given in this session, however, provided much stimulating discussion.

Mark Tanner (Birmingham Conservatoire), himself a talented pianist, spoke on 'Analysing performance: Horowitz and the Liszt sonata'. He began by admitting his indebtedness to Horowitz's 1932 version of the Liszt B minor sonata, and provided illustrations of this influence. First, Tanner expressed the opinion that present-day

recordings sometimes dwell (excessively) upon small sections which may demolish the effect of overall coherence, whereas the 'old generation', which played faster (and was sometimes accused of being too 'cavalier'), better maintained and communicated a sense of coherence and organic structure. As an example, Tanner cited Horowitz's decision to substitute a *pp* dynamic for an indicated *fff* at one point, in order to create a hierarchical structure. The aim was to create subsections within a larger passage so that a sense of goal-direction can be achieved. Tanner claimed that this type of preplanning allows for local interest and the expression of personal style while preserving hierarchical structure. He concluded by playing a section of his own recording of the sonata. Questions were raised later in the discussion concerning whether a performer has the right to tamper with the composer's intentions in the way that Horowitz had. Tanner's view was that this was a legitimate practice: the musical structure created by the performer might differ from that intended by the composer, provided that it was a coherent and convincing one. This led to consideration of what might constitute a 'wrong' performance, to which Tanner responded by stating that a synthesized performance (with pre-programmed basic musical instructions) would be such a case, since the result is 'utterly unconvincing'.

Such considerations raise interesting issues. What, for example, is our view on performance interpretation at the end of the twentieth century? It is difficult to say that there is one single view, for there are many claims but no agreement has ever been reached. A recent CD development may reflect this. As cited in the *International Piano Quarterly* (Spring 1998), a newly released CD called *CD-pluscore* boasts that it may be used as a CD-ROM, and comes provided with a score. Furthermore, users can make additions (such as phrase marking, fingerings) without affecting the sound. An intended future development will make the score and music interactive, allowing listeners to change the score and hear the resulting difference. This fascinating development in fact only

reflects the present-day view on interpretation: everyone may choose a personal style and interpretation. Will *CD-pluscore* stop the constant dispute about interpretation?

The last talk in this session was by Elaine Goodman (Royal Holloway, University of London). Entitled 'Playing together: analysing the ensemble in music performance', Goodman's paper exhibited detailed observation of how ensemble players cooperate with each other in terms of tempo. Using the third movement of Chopin's Cello Sonata, op. 65, she had conducted an experiment examining the cellist's and pianist's tempo profiles when playing separately and together, across three recorded sessions (initial, rehearsal, and final). One of the results uncovered was that the pianist tends to play more slowly when she has the melody. Goodman explained this phenomenon as the 'melody strategy'. However, she did not provide any other explanations. As the score reveals, the accompaniment in the passage where the pianist does not have the melody is much easier than that in the melodic passage. This could be one of the reasons why the pianist took more time to play the melodic passage, but moved faster in other places.

It would have been helpful if Goodman had made a closer examination of how the structure of the piece affects the player's tempo decisions. For instance, in bars 8-9 the cello part certainly has a clearer sense of arrival than the piano, in which the continuation of the quaver figures prevents proper closure and thus weakens the sense of tonic arrival. This structural difference might suggest different interpretative judgements. The cellist might wish to slow down more towards the end of the phrase (bar 9), and pick up the speed again after the rest; however, the continued quaver movement and the ascending bass line both prevent the pianist from slowing down as much as the cello. In Goodman's experiment, this kind of conflict was resolved by the compromise on the pianist's part. Such an observation may be useful in obtaining more insights into an individual player's decisions, and it would be

interesting to see the result as they played together.

On the whole, Goodman's paper gave some valuable insights into both social stereotyping and personality traits. She also showed how players may retain some individual identity in the initial ensemble performance. Most importantly, her conclusion that a duo ensemble is in fact a combination of three conceptions (two individual and one ensemble) goes against the traditional view that in a duo ensemble,  $1+1=1$ .

*Session 3: The Later Twentieth Century: British and American Music*

The first of the three papers in this session was by David Beard (University of Oxford). 'Birtwistle and serialism: *Three Sonatas for Nine Instruments*' began with the story of the young Birtwistle withdrawing his *Three Sonatas* from the 1960 Aldeburgh Festival. Thirty-one years later, he merely commented that the composition had been 'fake Darmstadt'. Through his discussion, Beard aimed to discover why Birtwistle was not satisfied with the work, and set out to reveal some insights into its compositional process. Comparing Birtwistle's previous two compositions (*Refrains and Choruses* and *Monody for Corpus Christi*), Beard showed that both were much influenced by twelve-tone technique. And in *Three Sonatas for Nine Instruments* the use of a twelve-tone row is even more explicit. Beard also argued that the influence of Maxwell Davies and Webern on Birtwistle was indeed strong at this time, and suggested that because Birtwistle knew that *Three Sonatas* was so heavily based on the twelve-tone row, he feared that it might be criticised as merely a Webern imitation; hence his decision to withdraw it. Strong evidence for this theory comes from Birtwistle's next composition, which contains no trace of twelve-tone technique and might have been influenced more by Stockhausen than by Webern.

The second paper, entitled "You say "developing variation", I say "autogenetic development": Schoenberg's concept of "musical prose" in the music of Roy Harris

and William Schuman', was given by Richard C. Pye (University of Newcastle), who pointed out that Harris and Schoenberg shared similar compositional ideas. For example, similarities were drawn between what Schoenberg called the 'idea', 'basic motive' (or ' "germ" of the idea'), and Harris's simple 'germ figure'; the developmental techniques of both composers are likewise similar. William Schuman, Harris's best-known student, was naturally very much influenced by his teacher. It was against this background that Pye embarked on analysing melodic development in Schuman's Sixth Symphony. Pye chose to adopt Gilbert's trichordal analysis to work out the development of the melody. This method claims similarity with triadic analysis ('trichord' being used to denote any set of three pitch classes). Gilbert states that the 'three-note unit can serve not only as an index of the character of a musical line or phrase, but also as a referential element uniting an entire work or movement'. Furthermore, he claims that once the pattern is recognised and familiarised, 'our understanding of atonal music might be able to be commensurate to that of tonal music'. Pye's was a judicious analytical choice, as a trichordal approach can offer a very detailed account of melodic development. However, it was curious that although he drew comparisons between rhythmic patterns in connection with the working-out of the reiteration of the melodic segments, he did not examine relationships between harmonic and timbral aspects. Doing so would have led to more insights into Schuman's development of his three themes, and also into the influence Harris had on Schuman, not just on the basis of 'autogenetic development'.

The third paper, 'The musical persona of Elizabeth Maconchy: impassioned argument in the Tenth Quartet (1971)', given by Lorraine Crowe (University of Lancaster), demonstrated a detailed examination of that quartet in the light of the concept of 'impassioned argument', Maconchy's own description of her string quartet writing. Used in a musical sense, the word 'argument' may represent the various operations---transformation,

expansion, development—performed upon a basic 'motive'. However, 'argument' is not confined to the motive alone. It can be read as the interaction of the four voices in the quartet, or even as 'the argument between the composer and her ancestors'. This latter suggestion derives mainly from the similarity between Maconchy's Tenth and Bartok's Fourth String Quartet (both employ the viola in a dominant role).

However, the main issue of Crowe's paper concerned whether analysis of the music of a female composer can be completely separated from issues of gender. For although Crowe stated at the outset that her paper was 'not intended as a feminist reading or an attempt to expose feminine or female characteristics—whatever they may be', she went on to say that 'Maconchy may have felt a deeper anxiety of influence than male composers, as she had to prove her worth more than the white male composer since she had the disability (whether real or imagined) of being a woman'. This shows perhaps that it is indeed difficult to purge gender issues from the analysis of a woman's composition. My own belief is that music analysis need not necessarily involve any historical context, if the desire is to study only basic self-evident compositional matters. However, if there is any attempt to draw links between the music, the composer's gender, and the place he or she had in the musical world, or indeed in society in general, then research may need to be widened to include much more historical background before a judgement can be made. Crowe's examination of the musical language of Maconchy's Tenth String Quartet certainly provides a starting point for the exploration of Maconchy's other music, and of Maconchy the female composer.

#### *Session 4: Nineteenth-century Music Theory*

The last paper, 'Music theory in nineteenth-century Germany: a context for Wagner's *Ring*?', was given by Annette Armitage (Cambridge University). Armitage was attempting to place nineteenth-century music theory in its historical context and to demonstrate its relationship to Wagner's *Der Ring des*

*Nibelungen*. Similar approaches have been developed by numerous other scholars, a prime example being *Music Theory and the Exploration of the Past*, ed. Christopher Hatch and David W. Bernstein (Chicago, 1993).

Armitage began by stating that an ahistorical approach to nineteenth-century theory is unproductive, since music theory itself is based on characteristics drawn from a specific musical culture; it therefore cannot be simply 'timeless'. Furthermore, an ahistorical approach would neglect the 'primary purpose' of such theory, which was to provide instruction to students and teachers of its time. In support of this claim, Crowe cited the opening of *Das Rheingold*. On the one hand, it would be accurate to describe the notorious one hundred and thirty-six bars of E<sup>b</sup> as an extended pedal point; on the other, this pedal point so far exceeds in length any example known to mid-nineteenth-century theory as to make the music-theoretical explanation largely meaningless.

Having dealt with the ahistorical argument, Armitage began to impose an historical reading, whereby nineteenth-century theory may be used as a tool to reveal some 'nineteenth-century artistic and cultural ethos'. She suggested that the notion of 'the perfect artwork' in the nineteenth century is like 'a vision that looks to a musical utopia', and the perfect musical archetype—the sonata form—is what determines a perfect artwork. She went on to state that 'nationalism is a directing force which roots theory's perfection myth exclusively in Germany's artistic sphere', and that the Germans felt the need to claim an exclusively Germanic musical language. Under this broad aspect, she was then able to draw upon the *Ring* as an enactment of the complex relationship between . . . Wagner's artistic ideas and intentions and the prevailing artistic and cultural values of his time'.

Armitage's account is indeed plausible, and encourages us to look deeper into the relationship of nineteenth-century theory to Wagner's *Ring*. However, although she brought up the idea of 'Beethoven as the

national icon' for the German musical language, she did not develop the question of Beethoven's influence on Wagner, not least in the realm of the much-vaunted organicism of Beethoven's music. A better overall picture might have emerged had she elaborated this point. Nonetheless,

Armitage's paper provided a challenging and stimulating end to a memorable day, which consistently celebrated the continuing importance of issues in music theory and analysis to a coming generation of scholars.

### SMA Diary 1998-99

General enquiries concerning the SMA programme should be addressed to Dr John Rink, Department of Music, Royal Holloway, University of London, Egham, Surrey TW20 0EX. Tel: 01784 443532. Fax: 01784 439441. E-mail: j.rink@sun.rhbnc.ac.uk

#### 17 October 1998

Department of Music, University of Southampton

**Autumn Study Day: 'Analysis and the Performative'**

Contact: Professor Anthony Pople, Department of Music, University of Southampton, Highfield, Southampton SO17 1BJ. Tel: 01703 593721. Fax: 01703 593197. E-mail: a.pople@soton.ac.uk

#### 20 March 1999

Department of Music, University of Reading

**Winter Study Day: 'The Virtual Work of Music: Transcriptions, Completions, and Other Forms of Fluidity'**

Contact: Professor Jonathan Dunsby, Department of Music, University of Reading, 35 Upper Redlands Road, Reading RG1 5JE. Tel: 0118 931 8411. Fax: 0118 931 8412. E-mail: j.m.dunsby@reading.ac.uk

#### 20 May 1999

Department of Music, Royal Holloway

**TAGS Day (for Theory and Analysis Graduate Students and staff)**

Contact: Matthew Riley or Elaine Goodman, Department of Music, Royal Holloway, University of London, Egham, Surrey TW20 0EX. E-mail: m.riley@rhbnc.ac.uk or e.goodman@sun.rhbnc.ac.uk

#### 15-18 July 1999

Department of Music, University of Surrey

**British Musicological Societies' Conference**

Contact: Christopher Mark, Department of Music, University of Surrey, Guildford GU2 5XH. Tel: 01483 259317. Fax: 01483 259386. E-mail: C.Mark@Surrey.ac.uk

#### 21-24 October 1999

Rotterdam Conservatory

**Fourth European Music Analysis Conference**

Contact: Patrick van Deurzen, Rotterdam Conservatory, Pieter de Hoochweg 122, 3024 BJ, Rotterdam, Netherlands. Tel: +31 10 476 7399. Fax: +31 10 425 3262. Email: pdeurzen@xs4all.nl or Dr John Rink, Department of Music, Royal Holloway, University of London, Egham, Surrey TW20 0EX. Tel: 01784 443532. Fax: 01784 439441. E-mail: j.rink@sun.rhbnc.ac.uk

**Music Theory's Nature: A Symposium**  
**Merton College Oxford, 28-29 March 1998**  
**Daniel Grimley**

In his foreword to the landmark series of publications, Cambridge Studies in Music Theory and Analysis, Ian Bent remarks:

Theory and Analysis are in one sense reciprocals[;] two hemispheres that fit together to form a globe (or cerebrum!), functioning deductively as investigation and abstraction, inductively as hypothesis and verification, and in practice forming a chain of alternating activities.<sup>1</sup>

Bent's work, from the 'Analysis' article in *The New Grove*<sup>2</sup> onwards, has done much to generate the current fashionability of music theory as an academic discipline. However, despite Brian Hyer's call for a more performative criticism, the gulf between theory as historical inquiry and analysis as theoretical practice has widened in recent years. To speak of any kind of reciprocal relationship between the two seems increasingly difficult. As Bent concedes, 'our ideal image of twin hemispheres [has been] replaced by an intersection: an area that exists in common

---

<sup>1</sup>Foreword to James Webster, *Haydn's "Farewell" Symphony and the Idea of Classical Style* (Cambridge: CUP, 1991), p. xiii.

<sup>2</sup>See Ian D. Bent, 'Analysis', in *The New Grove Dictionary of Music and Musicians*, ed. Stanley Sadie (London: Macmillan, 1980), i, 340-388; Brian Hyer, 'Before Rameau and After', *Music Analysis*, 15 (1996), 75-99. Hyer writes (p. 93): 'there are tremendous opportunities for critical inquiries into historical music theories to merge with music criticism, so that the music forms an empirical field on which our encounters with these theories take place, or even better, becomes the *raison d'être* of those encounters. . . . A more performative approach to the interpretation of historical music theories would give us a means to reconstitute our own critical vocabularies, the effect being to add content to the music, allowing us to hear in the music what earlier audiences might have heard, but which has become muffled, fallen silent or been forgotten over historical time.'

between two sub-disciplines', but even this seems unnecessarily relativistic. Perhaps the most striking result of this conference was the sense that music theory has gained an autonomy that sets it entirely apart from analysis, whether post-structuralist or not. As the title of the conference implied, though the goal of analysis remains the illumination of the musical work, theory is more concerned with music as 'discursive practice'. It is not surprising, then, that during discussion periods the two most prominent figures in the history of music analysis, Schenker and Adorno, were supplanted by Rameau and Michel Foucault.<sup>3</sup> If this shift reflects a broader trend in the musicological community, this is not to deny that it also points to a process of professionalization. Music theory has become canonic in a similar way to other disciplines, though the canon itself has been formed too recently to have so far attracted much critical attention. However, treating music theory as some kind of sub-discipline of history and analysis is no longer sustainable since, as the conference demonstrated, the nature of music theory as criticism is its self-sufficiency.

Sadly, Bent was a notable absentee from a conference, auspiciously organised by Suzannah Clark (Oxford) and Alexander Rehding (Cambridge), which gathered together some of the leading music theorists from both Europe and the United States. The title of Daniel Chua's paper, 'Vincenzo Galilei, modernity and the division of nature', offered a provocative starting point; as Chua argued, 'unless we investigate the nature of nature, we cannot understand the nature of theory'. Chua's

---

<sup>3</sup>See, for example, Thomas Christensen, *Rameau and Musical Thought in the Enlightenment* (Cambridge: CUP, 1993), which is perhaps responsible for much of the recent interest in Rameau and the philosophical background of eighteenth-century music theory.

archaeological survey of the relationship between theory and rationality pointed to the role of nature as a validating presence or condition, even though nature itself remained unlegitimized. Drawing on Max Weber's definition of modernism as a process of rationalization, Chua examined various moments of 'disenchantment' in the history of music theory, stemming from Galilei's discovery that music as an empirical reality failed to live up to Pythagorean models. The desire to 'naturalize' music, to re-enchant music with the magical power supposedly lost in the act of modernization, has been present throughout the history of music from Galilei, Mei and the Florentine Camerata through the Enlightenment to Adorno and Weber. In effect, what Chua called the 'pastoralization of music theory' has become a mythic activity. Chua's attempt to reach a consensus as to what the 'nature of nature' might be was a bold but necessary project that attracted a good deal of attention. As the chair of the session, John Deathridge, added, Weber's definition of modernity must be understood in conjunction with the institutionalization of the state. This suggests that the nature of music theory is bound up with its function as a social system.

This last point is one with which Philip Weller, in his paper 'The theoretic idiom: music theory as cultural practice—a joyous or a melancholy pursuit?', might well have disagreed. Taking a small group of case studies from Prosdocimus de' Beldemandis's early renaissance treatise on counterpoint and Rousseau's *Dictionnaire* of 1768, Weller argued that the strength of music theory lies in its complex and sometimes contradictory relationship with practice. In other words, the nature of theory is defined by its ability to shift between various levels of potentiality or states of mind as it becomes actualized. It is precisely this actualization, however, which seemed remote from Weller's paper. Rather, the impression he gave was of theory as an apparently endless chain of interlocking self-regulatory systems, stretching throughout the history of modern thought and culminating in the work of two recent critics not involved in music theory: Jacques Derrida (whose 'On

Structure' of 1968 provided the starting point for the paper) and Martin Heidegger. Weller's stated aim 'not to reconstruct contexts but to discuss general issues and put forward a line of interpretation' was intriguing, although his critical pluralism seemed ultimately eclipsed by a sense of hermeneutic hubris.

Leslie Blasius's paper, 'Nietzsche, Riemann, Wagner: when music lies', took as its subject one such point where music theory and its actualization appear to have collided. In Nietzsche's *The Case of Wagner*, Riemann's naturalistic theory of music, based on the perceptual representation of the sonic world rather than its psychological function, is presented as 'a corrective, as a way of making music tell the truth; yet in its very attempt to substantiate its own truth value, . . . it is drawn into the Wagnerian phantasmagoria'. Nietzsche's problem, Blasius suggested, was not so much with music's lying, as with its being taken as truth; music's attempt to demonstrate its own truthfulness, through its gradual synchronization with textual narrativity, was ultimately untruthful, since music is incapable of being either honest or dishonest. Likewise, music theory's search for its own objectivity or discipline, through which Nietzsche claimed it was colluding with the Wagnerian project, was inevitably deceptive. As Deathridge suggested, Nietzsche was concerned not merely with Wagner, but the whole philosophical system of German Idealism. The very language of *The Case of Wagner*, for example, was intended to facilitate a critique of Idealism as closed and tautologous. The strength of Blasius's paper was that it not only suggested why Riemann's naturalism had become outdated by 1900, even though the theory of harmonic function had become widely adopted, but also why subsequent attempts (notably that of Schoenberg) to create a system or metaphysics of compositional veracity were equally problematic.

Scott Burnham offered a more literal examination of the nature of sonata form. The first part of his paper dealt with the status of sonata form within critical discourse as some kind of plot archetype:

sonata form constitutes a narrative whose fulfilment is the all-consuming principle of 'sonata-form pieces'. The second part dealt with a particular aspect of sonata-form syntax, namely problematic returns; Burnham's paper concentrated on James Webster's analysis of Haydn's Symphony no. 46. According to Webster, the reappearance of the minuet at the close of the finale constitutes a meta-reprise. The idealized return of the earlier movement is 'unreal', and closure is achieved only by the return of the Presto. Burnham maintained, however, that the return of the minuet is real, and that it confuses the sense of ending so that the finale stands as a 'loose end'. Hence, the recall enacts a return without any sense of resolution. Both Burnham and Webster are agreed as to the apocalyptic nature of the return, but Burnham's insistence on the symphony's open-endedness risks perpetuating a post-modernist preference for the problematic or asymmetrical that is out of tune with the balanced, symmetrical aesthetic of late eighteenth-century music.

The third part of the paper was less controversial. Burnham suggested that the moment of return is configured as an heroic project (the double return as a mythical return from the underworld). Furthermore, Burnham noted how conventional analytical methodology struggles with the notion of the repeat, which signals redundancy. In a sense, however, this reflects back upon his hearing of Haydn's Symphony no. 46: in seeking to deny closure, do we not ultimately underestimate the discursive power of a musical language that can perpetuate such a sense of large-scale dissonance and still achieve a satisfying resolution?

Alex Rehding's 'Two cultures as nature: August Halm, Beethoven's sonata and Hegel's state', delivered at the end of the first day, dealt more explicitly with issues of canonicity and music history. Halm's Hegelian historical project treated music as the representation of the spirit, in which linearity is a metaphorical sign of eternal life and thematicism one of individuality. According to Halm, Bach's music was entirely self-sufficient and enclosed. Beethoven's music, however, was no longer

subservient to its themes but to the demands of the overall form itself. When Halm compared musical form to Hegel's definition of the nation state ('like a state of ants'), he suggested that Beethoven's music had reached only a preliminary stage of development. Melody (hence 'individual freedom') for Halm only became liberated again in the music of Bruckner, whom Halm sought to elevate as the natural successor to Bach. Halm could therefore write: 'I am convinced that the Classics would have hailed Anton Bruckner as their King, and worshipped him. . . . These great predecessors would have not only recognized in their greater pupil the King but the redeemer'. Rehding's exposition was persuasive, though limitations of time prevented him from investigating the relationship between Hegel and Halm in greater depth. Furthermore, there was no time for a more detailed discussion of Halm's analyses of Bruckner's music, which might have offered a useful comparison with later writers such as Ernst Kurth. Indeed, Marie-Agnes Dittrich's paper, ' "Music is a force of nature within ourselves": Ernst Kurth's method of musical analysis' might have provided such an opportunity for comparison, but Dittrich instead offered an introduction to Kurth's theories, with some suggestion for the application of his ideas for current analytical projects.

Suzannah Clark's paper, 'Seduced by notation: Oettingen's topography of the major-minor System', was also expository. Clark neatly demonstrated the paradox between Oettingen's insistence on the symmetrical structure of the major and minor triads and the lack of empirical evidence for such a structure. Clark described how Oettingen heard major and minor scales as reflections of each other, but derived them both from the note D, since this is the only pitch for which both scales produce chromatic accidentals at the same points. Despite Oettingen's commitment to the empirically verifiable procedures of the natural sciences, Clark argued, his ultimate authority was the aesthetic belief that music must, by definition, be symmetrically organized. However, there was no time in which to discuss the wider cultural 'significance of symmetry in

nineteenth-century intellectual thought. Moreover, Clark's paper seemed to leave tantalizingly unanswered the question of exactly what Nature represented for nineteenth-century natural scientists.

David Cohen's paper, ' "The gift of nature": musical instinct and Rameau's *Theory of Harmony*', was concerned with the activity of the listening subject within Rameau's theory of harmonic generation. The function of the fundamental bass, Cohen argued, is akin to linguistic competence, so that the ear, for Rameau, is used metonymically to signify mental cognition. However, since cognition for Rameau is an essentially conscious (Cartesian) activity, the ear acts as sense, not mind. Rameau therefore posits a 'musical instinct' which enacts the transformation from sense to science. Although the nature of this musical instinct remained unclear, Cohen suggested, Rameau 'evidently conceive[d] it to be the subjective correlate within the human mind of the objective phenomenon of the *corps sonore*, and thus, perhaps, of the mental faculty or capacity whose existence would explain how the mind can unconsciously deduce its unconscious grammatical knowledge of music from a purely acoustic phenomenon.' Cohen concluded by offering the *corps sonore* as a locus of rationality, a point at which two definitions of nature merge: on the one hand, nature as a purely physical, acoustical phenomenon subject to empirical investigation; and, on the other, nature as benevolent, divine force, bestowing the gift of 'musical instinct'. As Blasius suggested, although Rameau's use of the term 'instinct' is contemporary with the dissemination of post-Lockean sensationalism, for Rameau the term connotes something posited within the individual rather than learned or acquired. Brian Hyer noted that the tension between the miraculous and the mundane is perpetuated in Rameau's operas, where representations of the *corps sonore* are often associated with celestial light and the supernatural.<sup>4</sup>

---

<sup>4</sup>Hyer, 'Before Rameau and After', pp. 75-76: Rameau 'confuses hearing for seeing, perceiving pitch in terms of a flash of

In his own paper, 'Kurth and the musical unconscious in *Götterdämmerung*', Hyer discussed 'Hagen's watch' (Act II) as a dreamed narrative whose 'eerie chromaticism derives from the same unconscious mental processes that regulate dreamwork in Freud'. Turning to Kurth, Hyer suggested that his assertion that 'harmonies are reflexes from the unconscious' grounds Kurth's theories 'in the discursive rhetoric of psychoanalysis'. Chords, for Kurth, are the byproduct of melodic motion, which is in turn the energetic representation of an auditory acoustical stream. According to Hyer, the processes of chromatic alteration and melodic displacement in Kurth's *Romantische Harmonik und ihre Krise in Wagners Tristan* are commensurate with the transfunctional activities of dreamwork, such as substitution, suppression, and displacement. The discharge of melodic tension in romantic harmony combines two tendencies in a single harmonic event, the seventh chord. Hyer argued that Wagner's music is saturated in energetic harmonies which, in Freudian terms, become a source of guilt as the tonic is withheld or, rather, hidden from view. As a simulacrum of human emotion, the music strains to effect the impression that the psychological tensions it depicts are real. However, there is no synthetic moment of completion or closure: repetition poses as development, transposition as motivic work. Wagner's music is therefore 'inauthentic' or unreal. Kurth's importance, Hyer concluded, was his introduction of the notion of absence, which in turn 'contributed to the emergence of a fragmented and fractured musical subject'.

---

light. His confusion is reminiscent of the "instantaneous flash" that, Benjamin believes, defines our experience of mimesis. In "Doctrine of the Similar", Benjamin comments that, unlike other forms of perceptual awareness, the perception of similarities "cannot be held fast", but rather culminates in a flash of recognition a moment before the resemblance then recedes, like a "constellation of stars", into the natural world.'

The last two papers addressed the issue of music theory as an anthropological system, constructing both 'self' and 'other'. In his 'The gendered eye: music analysis and the scientific outlook in German early romantic theory', Ian Biddle began by invoking de Man's tension between the author and the speaking voice to suggest that the construction of authorship is a crucial issue in theoretical writing. Wackenroder throws out the empirical self, Biddle suggested, in a Rousseauian search for purity, in which the ideal self is under threat from its empirical other. Biddle described the rise of organicism as the result of the demise of encyclopaedic science through its failure to systematize experience. The move from Cartesianism to romantic dialectics was based in part on the tension between two levels of experience, the general and particular. Performative analysis, Biddle argued, hardens the opposition between the two. Hence, music analysis emerges as a discipline at the point when the reflexive relationship between theory and praxis began to break down. The most provocative part of his talk, however, was Biddle's discussion of gender within critical dualism. The figuration of music as feminine, Biddle suggested, was linked to the need to delineate the musical object as 'other'. Hence, it was through the constant yearning for symmetry on account of a sense of imbalance that gendering became both useful and necessary.

Peter Hoyt's paper, 'On the primitives of music theory: the savage and subconscious as sources of analytical authority', was more global in its chronological reference. Hoyt noted how 'appeals to mental operations found in many recent discussions of sonata form parallel—to an unsettling degree—past invocations of man in the state of nature.' Savages were prominent in theory because they challenged presumptions about cosmology and earthly civilisation. Hence, Hoyt maintained, savages became a hidden component of the West's self-image; the possibility of savagery was essential to the modern conception of human nature. Furthermore, the image of the savage became prominent

at historical points when foundational principles were deemed to be in crisis. Hoyt proceeded to offer examples of savagery in music theory, ranging from Quantz, who treated the music of savages as a kind of negative space, to Reicha, who used savages to raise his discussion of phrase rhythm to a universal level. Hoyt concluded by noting that the savage has been reconfigured in contemporary theory: for example, in connection with the role of the subconscious in the perception of large-scale harmonic organization. The appearance of savagery here, Hoyt suggested, is associated with the crisis of belief in musical structures that could have arisen purely as a result of compositional process or performance practice.

In spite of the potential offered by the conference title, speakers in general seemed more concerned with discussing the nature of music theory rather than musical theories of nature. Indeed, no global definition of exactly what 'nature' might mean was offered, though Daniel Chua's paper came close to suggesting that a definition was a necessary precondition of further discussion. Rameau aside, mention might also be made of the predominance of Austro-German thought and practice in many of the papers; surely one interesting area for further exploration would be definitions of nature in cultures less hegemonic than the European mainstream. This might at least have emphasized the need for an account of the changing historical relationship between nature and theory, as well as an awareness of the extent to which nature is a culturally-conditioned subject. If music theory is to respond to the challenges faced by other musicological disciplines during the 1990s, it must find a way to broaden its scope of enquiry without losing the critical depth that was so powerfully demonstrated throughout this conference. As Hyer has suggested, music theory might then 'fulfil the promise of a criticism more continuous with its object, a criticism that is itself (and in the best sense) music-theoretical.'<sup>5</sup>

---

<sup>5</sup>Hyer, 'Before Rameau and After', p. 93.

## Contributors to this issue

**Elizabeth Arno** is currently working on a doctoral thesis on profundity in music at the University of Reading. Her research relates particularly to the repertoire of the Second Viennese School.

**Julia Cheng** is reading for an M. Phil. in Musical Performance at St Peter's College Oxford. An accomplished pianist, her thesis topic is concerned with performance analysis in the music of Chopin.

**Martin Dixon** is a research student at Wolfson College Cambridge, and is completing a Ph. D. thesis on T. W. Adorno's compositional theory.

**Daniel Grimley**, a research student at King's College Cambridge, is currently completing a Ph. D. thesis on the music of Nielsen.



### Note to Contributors

The Editor welcomes contributions to the *SMA Newsletter*. All material should be sent to Dr Nicholas Marston, St Peter's College Oxford OX1 2DL. Tel: 01865 278908. Fax: 01865 278855. E-mail: [nick.marston@spc.ox.ac.uk](mailto:nick.marston@spc.ox.ac.uk)

Material for inclusion in the *Newsletter* may be submitted in hard copy, but it will greatly facilitate the production process if contributions are sent pasted into email messages (not as attachments) to the address above. Material may also be supplied on disk, provided that this is compatible with AppleMac hardware. Contributors are asked to use a minimum of formatting in electronic copy; only one space should be left between sentences. The present issue of the *Newsletter* was produced using *Word* version 4.0 on a Power Macintosh 7100. Font: Palatino.

**MATERIAL FOR INCLUSION IN ISSUE 13 (JULY 1999) OF THE SMA NEWSLETTER SHOULD REACH THE EDITOR NOT LATER THAN 1 JUNE 1999**