



society for music analysis

newsletter

July 2002

Contents

| | |
|------------------------------------|----|
| Editorial | 2 |
| SMA Masters Bursaries 2002 | 3 |
| Winter Study Day: Review | 3 |
| 5 th EuroMAC: Review I | 5 |
| 5 th EuroMAC: Review II | 8 |
| TAGS Day 2002: Review | 11 |
| Correspondence | 13 |
| Events | 14 |

SMA

executive committee

President

John Rink
j.rink@rhul.ac.uk

Vice President

Nicholas Marston
njm45@cam.ac.uk

Events Officer

Amanda Bayley
a.bayley@wlv.ac.uk

Information Officer

Lee Tsang
l.tsang@hull.ac.uk

Administrator and Treasurer

Matthew Riley
m.riley@rhul.ac.uk

submissions

The Society for Music Analysis (SMA) publishes the SMA Newsletter in January and July, with respective submission deadlines of 1 December and 1 June.

Send materials for submission by email to l.tsang@hull.ac.uk or, if necessary, by post to:

Lee Tsang, Information Officer
SMA Newsletter/Website
Department of Music
University of Hull
Hull HU6 7RX

editorial

When it comes to hosting music conferences on an international scale, the SMA never fails to deliver. The Society's greatest success story of last semester was undoubtedly the impressive and stimulating EuroMAC held at the University of Bristol – an event so brimming with new ideas that we enlisted two reviewers (Andrew Timms and Björn Heile) to provide different perspectives on the wide range of papers presented. I thank them and the reviewers for the 'Music and Ethics' Winter Study Day (John Fallas) and TAGS Day (Ju-Lee Hong) for sharing their thoughts.

Aside from the usual reviews, this issue includes a 'Correspondence' section in which the reviewees can question and, where necessary, clarify comments made in earlier issues. Anthony Pople has taken this opportunity to respond to Christian Kennett's review of the Tonality Study Day at Reading (last issue), and Vincent Benitez has provided a belated response to Matthew Riley's OXMAC 2000 review. We warmly welcome this sort of feedback which helps to generate debate.

Our Events Officer, Amanda Bayley, has organised an excellent programme of events for the forthcoming academic year. First up is the Autumn Study Day on 'Analysing Recordings' at Sheffield University, and this will be followed by a Winter Study on 'Adorno's Schubert' at the University of Cambridge. If you're planning for the summer holidays, don't forget the next 'MAC', which will be held at the University of Hull on 10-13 July 2003 (not September, as advertised in the last newsletter). This will be an unmissable event – be sure to secure your place in one of the sessions (details for submitting abstracts are enclosed).

Here's to a good summer and another stimulating academic year.



Lee Tsang
Editor

Society for Music Analysis Master's Bursaries 2002-2003

The Society for Music Analysis will award up to four bursaries of £1,500 (full-time students) or £1000 (part-time students) per annum for one to two years to those commencing UK Master's degrees, on the following conditions:

1. Applicants in 2002 must be registered or hold the offer of a place for an MA, MMus or similar degree in music analysis or theory and analysis, or in a programme that contains a significant music-analytical emphasis. The initial bursary will cover the period from October 2002 to September 2003.
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. Bursary holders are required to inform the President of the Society of any significant changes of funding basis.
3. Where relevant, bursaries awarded for 2002-2003 will be renewed for 2003-2004 subject to a satisfactory report on work from the holder's institution. It will be the holder's responsibility to commission that report and to have it sent to the President of the Society during August 2003. If a 2002-2003 bursary holder goes on to read for a higher degree in 2003-2004, the bursary will be renewed unless the student secures full funding for the latter year.

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 by **Friday 30 August 2002**. The application should be in the form of a curriculum vitae; a brief description of the degree course and the student's objectives in pursuing it; a statement of the applicant's financial circumstances based on an account of income and expenditure; and the applicant's contact details and any special information that might be relevant.

Please also ensure that an academic reference in support of the application reaches Professor John Rink (SMA President) at the address below by the deadline of Friday 30 August 2002.

Completed applications should be sent to John Rink either by post (Department of Music, Royal Holloway, University of London, Egham TW20 0EX) or by email (j.rink@rhul.ac.uk). If email is used, please paste the text of the application into the body of an email message rather than attaching it; attachments will not be accepted.

Applications will be reviewed by John Rink and by Dr Jonathan Cross, editor of the journal *Music Analysis*. Successful applicants will be notified by the end of September 2002. Reasons will not be given for decisions.

SMA Winter Study Day: Review

by John Fallas

Music and Ethics

organised by Anthony Gritten

University of East Anglia, Norwich, Saturday 23 February 2002

Recent debates in the pages of the *Musical Times* may have alerted readers to a rising tide of interest in the use of concepts and ideas drawn from the field of philosophy to explore issues surrounding our experience of music. Interdisciplinarity of this kind is no longer either new or in itself particularly surprising, but if the word is to designate intelligent and aware practice rather than some fuzzy and dilute ideal, then a forced meeting of minds and exchange of ideas is clearly what is required. This consideration must have prompted and inspired Anthony Gritten (University of East Anglia and instigator of those *MT* exchanges) and Martin Dixon (Glasgow

University) as they drew up the extremely diverse list of invitees to speak at this study day on 'Music and Ethics'.

Both musicologists and philosophers of considerable academic standing convened in the far reaches of the snow-battered Norwich campus for a necessarily crammed but at times thrillingly intense programme. Keynote addresses alternated with shorter papers given in a round-table context to ensure some variety of format, and although the occasion was organised by—and principally for—musicologists, the keynote speakers were both philosophers: Andrew Bowie (Royal

Holloway), an expert on the German idealist tradition, and Simon Critchley (Essex), one of the leading British writers on so-called 'continental philosophy'. The question of the day seemed to be: what can critical theory offer musicology?

Bowie, opening the proceedings, set out the stakes of a philosophical discourse which would do justice to the way music works: a pragmatic understanding of 'music' as a historically evolving practice, in order to escape the paralyzing ontology of a rigid analytic distinction between the aesthetic, ethical and cognitive spheres. Bowie invoked Habermas, Adorno and Nelson Goodman in arguing the need for us to engage seriously with music and legitimate our judgments about it in ongoing dialogue with a community which is not simply the marketplace of the 'culture industry'.

With the second keynote address, there was an even stronger sense of the philosophers being here to 'teach' the musicologists. Critchley proposed a circular structure of approval and demand as a model of ethical experience and as a useful framework for comparing and placing different philosophers (though Hegel, for one, resists any such classification). This model starts from the need to explain motivation in discussing ethics: the domain of the ethical must be distinguished from that of the veridical, since the latter is indifferent to approval or affirmation. The idea of the good, then, serves to identify that which demands approval. Surveying philosophers in these terms we find them variously impelled by the demand of the Good beyond being (as in Plato), of the resurrected Christ (Paul, Augustine), or of the non-identical (Adorno). Rousseau's ethics would be seen as a response to the demand of the suffering other for compassion, Nietzsche's as centring on the demand of eternal return for affirmation. The paradigm for the transformation of pure into practical reason (the veridical into the ethical) is Kant, where the shift is accomplished by what Kant calls the *Faktum*: 'the fiction of a fact constituted through the act of approval'. But the autonomy of the Kantian 'fact of reason' gives way to heteronomy in Levinas or Lacan, with the subject called traumatically into question by, respectively, the Other or the Real. Comments from the floor focused, by no means unproductively, on the potential place of music in such considerations.

David Hesmondhalgh (Open University) offered a reading of the history of twentieth-century popular music in terms of the ambivalent relationship between homage and theft, with elements of black (in Hesmondhalgh's terms, 'disempowered') culture appropriated by 'dominant' (i.e. white) culture; the 'sampling' on Moby's album *Play* was discussed as a recent example. This was an engaging and thorough exploration of the fine line which separates honouring from abusing, but the narrowness of the underlying conception of ethics was revealed above all in the attempt to draw a practical conclusion: 'intellectuals' should 'intervene' to make the likes of Moby behave—and since Moby basically isn't that bad about acknowledging his sources anyway, maybe he should just give the surviving relatives of those sources a bit more money!

Other approaches seemed to draw more from, and interact illuminatingly with, the recent philosophical thought discussed by the keynote speakers. Alain Badiou, an ethical and political thinker who has quite recently become prominent and influential in French philosophy and (thanks to a spate of translations) its English reception, featured not only in Critchley's authoritative survey of the field but also in a fascinating contribution from electroacoustic composer and performer Jonathan Impett (UEA). The latter considered the potential for applying Badiou's concepts of 'eventness' and 'the local' in understanding improvisational contexts. The ensuing discussion threw up some interesting ideas about how Hesmondhalgh's questions of respect and responsibility might be raised more subtly at the level of the musical event itself: the issue is not one of financial recompense or recognition in a CD booklet, but of respecting that which is appropriated by allowing it to transform one's own thinking space.

Impett's preoccupation with real-time decision-making at the intersection of the aesthetic and the ethical resonated sympathetically with Gritten's own reflections on the make-up of a post-phenomenological ethics of performance whose watchwords might be surprise, obligation, creativity, risk, and discipline. Henry Stobart (Royal Holloway) was equally suggestive, bringing to bear the knowledge of an ethnomusicologist to illustrate the naturalness of a dialogical self in Andean culture, as against the Cartesian 'I' which still preoccupies Western ethical thought and cultural practice.

The afternoon round-table was, by comparison, disappointing. Dominic Moran (Oxford), a self-proclaimed 'outsider' to both music and philosophy, had taken advantage of Gritten's inclusive policy of invitation and set himself the task of destroying our 'fashionable illusions' around what he dubbed 'the often dyspeptic combination of music, deconstruction and ethics'. It is undoubtedly true, as Moran argued, that a significant portion of recent musicology is characterised by an appalling looseness in the use of ideas from recent continental thought, in particular Derrida's 'deconstruction'. But it seemed a pity that Moran didn't use his obvious detailed familiarity with Derrida to show what a philosophically rigorous 'new musicology' might look like, rather than, as it were, throwing out the baby with the bathwater.

This session also contained two doses of musicological Adorno-speak: Martin Dixon on composition, and Daniel Chua on the ethical imperative for analysts to make their work 'particular, surrendered and provisional' (*à la* Schoenberg) rather than 'totalising, instrumental, and closed'; Chua suggested that, like Stravinsky's music, 'postmodern' analysis may be in thrall to a particularity which remains unmediated, thus producing the paradoxical effect of a completely unintended 'arbitrary objectivity or totalitarian relativity'.

I wondered if there was a lesson in this day that musicologists working at the intersection of the disciplines need to take away from the encounter with 'real' philosophers. When invited to talk on music and ethics, the philosophers (whether through comprehensiveness in their native discipline or a

fashionable urge to keep up) seemed rather less stuck on Adorno (indeed, on rather uncritical paraphrase of an almost completely decontextualised Adorno) than the musicologists. The profession of musicology, by contrast, doesn't seem to supply its practitioners with much of an imperative to move onwards or outwards—to go broader or deeper, to find new areas of exploration or to build on previous work in the familiar areas. There's often little sense of one Adornian learning from another, or making sure that what is offered is new, different, and genuinely illuminating. Perhaps if the musicologists shifted their attention wholesale to Badiou, Bakhtin and

Barthes, and the philosophers filled in some historical and contemporary comparative scholarship on Adorno, then we would really have something to teach each other.

John Fallas is an MMus student at King's College London. His interests include philosophies of late twentieth-century composition, psychoanalysis, critical theory, Ligeti, and the use of music in Hollywood films.

5th EuroMAC: Review I

by Björn Heile

European Music Analysis Conference

organised by Jonathan Cross

Victoria Rooms University of Bristol, 4–7 April 2002

At Bristol's EuroMAC, the splendour of the Music Department's Victoria Rooms and the glorious sunshine outside encouraged a real sense of euphoria. And there were good reasons for feeling optimistic: more than sixty speakers from twenty-two countries all across the globe speaking on subjects ranging from 'Early Vocal Music' to 'Darmstadt and Beyond', 'Oral Traditions' to 'Popular Musics', and 'Performance Studies' to 'Analysis and the New Technologies' amply testified to the vibrancy of the discipline.

The proceedings opened in suitably international style, with welcoming speeches by Jonathan Cross (as conference organiser) and John Rink (as President of the SMA) expertly delivered in the three conference languages French, German and English.

In the ensuing opening address, Arnold Whittall (King's College London) exemplified with his own writings how analysis has evolved from strict formalism to the prominent critical-interpretive context of recent writings. He combined this account with an appeal for pluralism and diversity in the spirit of modernism, describing modernism as the cultural foundation for music analysis and vigorously defending it against its detractors, notably Lawrence Kramer and Fred Lerdahl. Whittall's call for an 'understanding of feeling' along the lines of Naomi Cumming's semiotic approach, which would complement what Lerdahl sees as a 'lack of structural coherence' in modernist music, perhaps shows how far analysis has come.

In a session on 'Performance Studies', John Rink (Royal Holloway, University of London) demonstrated his concept of the 'performance motif', which is characterised by elements such as timing, dynamics, articulation, timbre or physical gesture; and he contrasted this with the conventional compositional motif. Given such a promising premise, it was a little

disappointing when Rink privileged the score and limited his illustrations to his own playing of Chopin's Nocturne in E minor. By relating his dynamic shaping of an accompaniment figure to the overall development of the piece, Rink also invoked a concept of organicism he had earlier critiqued. These minor contentions should not detract from the fruitfulness of his overall approach, however.

Flavie Castelain (Université Charles de Gaulle-Lille 3) more clearly favoured auditory perception in her 'L'Opus 7 d'Anton Webern'. Commenting on the divergence between score and performance, she pointed out that perception of the pitch structure is obscured by the string playing techniques demanded by Webern, such as *col legno*, harmonics, and *sul ponticello*, as these heighten the noise element inherent in sound production.

Perceptual issues were addressed from a rather different perspective in Ju-Lee Hong's (Birmingham Conservatoire, University of Central England) 'Dynamics in Cello Performances of J.S. Bach's C major Sarabande BWV 1009'. Hong had electronically analysed dynamic values and, in some cases, the use of vibrato in nineteen performances of the piece and related the results to Heinrich Schenker's and Pablo Casals' performance indications. Her suggestion that Schenker's indications are valuable for performers put her in direct opposition to Rink's earlier argument that the injunctions of analysts *vis-à-vis* performers can be over-restrictive and may need mediation. As Rink, who was also chairing the session, pointed out, however, the more problematic issue in Hong's paper was her isolating dynamics from other expressive markers, such as agogics, which limited the persuasive power of her argument.

The 'Performance Studies' session closed with another comparative analysis—this time by Eitan Ornoy (Hebrew University of Jerusalem), who sought to determine how closely players from the authentic performance movement and 'conventional' performers adhered to scholarly findings. Ornoy pointed out that 'authentic' performers complied with earlier discoveries but ignored more recent scholarship which he saw as an indication that the authentic performance movement was developing its own canonical tradition. This argument was intriguing but, as Rink pointed out, it was circumscribed by Ornoy's schematic distinction between 'authentic' and 'conventional' performers.

The first of the conference's three keynote lectures was given by Jonathan Dunsby (University of Reading), who paid tribute to the late Derrick Puffett—a great writer on music from many periods, but principally on music of the early twentieth century. In this paper, which was exemplary in its use of audio-visual illustration, Dunsby praised Puffett for his both rigorous and perceptive formalist analyses, his profound awareness of the limits of such analyses, and his exceptionally lucid writing style.

The importance of late twentieth-century music for music analysis was underlined by no fewer than three sessions devoted to 'Darmstadt and Beyond' spread over the entire second day. This topic's prominence was surprising given that it was not included in the original call for papers. However, as became apparent, the dramatic developments in this field clearly justified such a central position. Whereas the analysis of serial music traditionally involves the reconstruction of (pre-) compositional systems, most papers emphasised either the esthetic aspect of serial music or the dialogue between production and perception, thereby illustrating that music analysis today is much more than composition in reverse. This was brought home forcefully by Robert Jamieson Crow (Universität Innsbruck/Universität Salzburg) who argued that—just as in tonal music (perhaps a contentious analogy)—pre- and post-war forms of serial music are fascinating not because of their intricate organic systems, but because of the conflict between those systems and the conventional cognitive models that audiences apply. In his brilliant observation on this matter, Crow described how serial composers play with the audience's desire to impose a familiar sense of structure, and how such structure is always assumed even if its specific manifestation is unknown.

In what seemed in many ways like a complement to Crow's paper, Edward Campbell (University of Edinburgh) described the shift from a focus on production to a greater emphasis on perception in Boulez's theorising, which he related to the influence of Adorno's concept of 'informal music'. Introducing Boulez's terms 'signal' and 'envelope' first in relation to Boulez's own music, he ended with a well-considered plea to apply these terms in modified definitions to a wider repertoire.

Iwona Lindstedt's paper (University of Warsaw), which was sandwiched between those of Crow and Campbell, was less germane to perceptual issues but

by no means less interesting: Lindstedt presented the concept of 'universal serialism' developed by the Polish theorist Antoni Prosnak in the early 1960s. Prosnak's unconventional theory, which had a strong influence on the generation of Polish composers in the '60s, took the 'Darmstadtian' model of total serialism as a point of departure, but combined an even stricter rigorosity (compared with 'Western' integral serialism) with an almost mystical belief in organicism.

The next session opened with John Dack's convincing proposition of analysing Stockhausen's *Kontakte für elektronische Klänge, Klavier und Schlagzeug* according to theories developed by Pierre Schaeffer. Dack's advocacy of theories oriented towards perception rather than production was similar to the approach outlined by Campbell. Schaeffer's theories make it possible to describe electronic and acoustic sonorities on the same terms, which is especially appropriate given Stockhausen's integration of the two sonority types in *Kontakte*.

The paper that followed—Nicolas Hodges' (University of Bristol) introduction to Bill Hopkins' *Études en Séries*—was lucid, entertaining, and particularly relevant given that the speaker was to perform the work in concert on the following night. Also interesting, but perhaps less convincing, was Joachim Junker's paper (Universität des Saarlandes) which featured a comparison of a listening-based analysis with the construction of Nono's *Con Luigi Dallapiccola* as it can be deduced from the sketches. Although his note of caution concerning the 'genetic fallacy' was well considered, Junker's distinction between listening- and score-based approaches to analysis would have benefited from an empirical basis.

The third session on 'Darmstadt and Beyond' began with Peter Niedermüller (Johannes Gutenberg-Universität Mainz) conclusively refuting Bernd Alois Zimmermann's claim that his opera *Die Soldaten* was derived from a single all-interval row. Niedermüller argued that this is demonstrably not the case in the final version of the work, since the compositional techniques employed bear little or no relation to Zimmermann's accounts. But in addition to this, there is also evidence that there were no earlier versions of the work which might have been constructed in the way Zimmermann claimed. According to Niedermeyer, the composer's falsifications must be seen in the context of his attempts to be taken seriously by the post-war avant-garde, notably Stockhausen.

Mieko Kanno then gave a fascinating insight into Ferneyhough's conceptions of rhythm, metre and musical time by investigating the use of irregular metres, such as 5/12, 3/20, or 4/10, in Ferneyhough's recent work. As she demonstrated with a recording of her own performance of *Unsichtbare Farben*, these metres produce a new sense of pulse and a feeling of 'velocity'—a phenomenon that Kanno distinguished from simple 'speed'.

The final paper in this session would have been Makis Solomos' (Université Montpellier 3, Institut Universitaire de France) 'Analysing the First

Electroacoustic Music of Iannis Xenakis'; Solomos was indisposed, but—fortunately for the delegates—arranged for hard copies of his informative paper to be distributed.

The formal part of the day was brought to a close by Jean-Jacques Nattiez's (Université de Montréal) keynote lecture—combining a formalist and a culturally contextualised analysis of the Ugandan Mbanga wedding dance. In an admirably developed argument Nattiez proved conclusively that, in isolation, formalist and culturally contextualised approaches would have led to misleading results, and that only their combination leads to relevant insights. However, his argument against hermeneutical exegesis seemed rather less well founded. Here Nattiez developed a hermeneutic reading which he contrasted with statistical data indicating that only a minority of the cultural community in question would support this reading. Such an argument is problematic, not least since the validity of readings as *interpretations* is not subject to suffrage. Moreover, it is questionable what the construction of a deliberately false reading can possibly prove. Finally, hermeneutics is an historical method and proving its inapplicability to an African oral tradition is somewhat beside the point. What Nattiez was right to point out is that hermeneutics is incompatible with the tri-partite structure of the poietic, neutral, and esthetic levels; this seems to be a reasonable caution against an uncritical methodological eclecticism. But his suggestion that this proves hermeneutics to be 'wrong' seems to suggest an *a priori* assumption of the superior truth claims of his own theory.

The third day of the conference was devoted partly to different national traditions in music theory. Svetlana Khlybova (Tchaikovsky Conservatory Moscow), Yulia Kreinin (Hebrew University Jerusalem), and Yuri Kholopov (Tchaikovsky Conservatory Moscow) introduced the work of Conus and Javorsky (Khlybova), Bobrovsky (Kreinin), and Lossev (Kholopov), respectively, and demonstrated how much western scholars have yet to learn about Russian theoretical traditions. One aspect that struck me in particular was that many Russian theorists appear to engage with musical history in its entirety—including the immediate present—rather than pigeonholing it into discrete periods. This broad perspective was especially marked in Kholopov's talk, which effortlessly spanned from medieval organum to recent work by Stockhausen.

In a session on German music theory, Stefan Eckert (University of Iowa) made a strong case against the common practice of referring to Joseph Riepel's terminology simply in terms of abstract, ahistorical definitions. The following paper was similarly devoted to the historical context of abstract ideas; Matthew Riley (Royal Holloway, University of London) convincingly argued that in addition to the usual major and minor modes the notion of the 'harmonic major' mode, as developed by nineteenth century German and Russian theorists, offers a better explanatory model for certain harmonic phenomena of the time than the competing theory of chromatic alteration. To close the session, Ludwig Holtmeier (Hochschule für

Musik 'Carl Maria von Weber', Dresden) provided a brilliant account of the influence of Nazi ideology on German music theory. This paper had already been delivered in German at the first meeting of the Deutsche Gesellschaft für Musiktheorie (see SMA Newsletter, January 2002: 4).

The focus on German music theory was to be taken up later that day in the final keynote speech of the conference, which seemed in more than one sense like a complement to Holtmeier's paper. In 'Music Theory in Germany: Science, Art or Practice?' Clemens Kühn (Hochschule für Musik 'Carl Maria von Weber', Dresden) began by giving a lucid and entertaining historical account of the theoretical methods employed in German music theory since the war. This aspect of the paper was particularly illuminating, although Kühn mostly ignored the traditions of both East German and university-based music theory (without saying so). It also soon became clear that he is very much part of the system he set out to critique; he fell victim to one of its most problematic characteristics: the pervasive anti-intellectualism whose origins Holtmeier had analysed so impressively. The problem here was a lack of theoretical reflection, not least evident in Kühn's misuse of such terms as 'structuralism' or 'phenomenology'. This became even more apparent in the conclusion of the paper: Kühn pleaded for a rather uncritical synthesis of different theoretical approaches, and for practising music theory 'more as art than as science' (evidently the latter is to be understood in the sense of the German *Wissenschaft*, meaning 'scholarship' or 'the humanities'). Kühn didn't say how theory can possibly aspire to the status of art— and he clearly did not mean that analyses should be written and read as literature. I cannot see any way in which theory can serve art other than by developing appropriate explanatory models. But this would require a greater degree of methodological reflection than Kühn seems willing to contemplate.

Anthony Pople's (University of Nottingham) 'Tonalities Project' has already been discussed in some detail by Christian Kennett in the SMA Newsletter of January 2002, so I shall limit myself to some brief remarks. Most delegates at the roundtable session, which preceded Kühn's keynote lecture, were astounded by the 'musical sensitivity' the program demonstrates when used intelligently. However, the respondents Nicolas Meeüs (Université de Paris – Sorbonne) and Richard Cohn (University of Chicago) had some significant objections. Both argued that for the program to be used responsibly the analyst needs to be clear about the basis on which the program 'makes decisions', such as favouring one interpretation over others. Meeüs also criticised the program for not allowing tonal ambiguity, and Cohn had some difficulty generating outcomes that significantly complemented his own intuitions. The Tonalities system will perhaps prove most useful if it leads to intersubjectively meaningful (that is testable) interpretations that would not otherwise occur to the analyst, and if it reduces the amount of time and effort required to generate the data for such interpretations. Only time will tell if it can fulfill these expectations, but an analysis of Musorgsky's music by Michael Russ (University of Ulster) was a particularly impressive beginning; Russ mapped the

results of the programme onto a Riemannian *Tonnetz*—a reading which seemed to make intuitive music-analytical sense, but would have been very difficult to achieve without computational aid.

The prevailing twentieth-century theme dominated the last day of the conference, with sessions on 'Music in Eastern Europe Since 1945' and 'Music in the Twentieth Century'. In the first of these sessions, Amanda Bailey (University of Wolverhampton) discussed contributions to string quartet writing by Ligeti, Penderecki and Lutoslawski, and Tim Johnson (Goldsmiths College, University of London) argued that Ligeti's use of golden sections and certain harmonic aggregates was influenced by Ernő Lendvai's analyses of Bartók's music, which Ligeti had 'exported' to Cologne. Johnson's idea was certainly intriguing, but it was somewhat undermined by insufficient awareness of the developments in the 'Darmstadt school', such as golden sections in Stockhausen, or serial theory and technique after 'pointillism'. The closing paper of the session was an unconventional talk by Carl Humphries (University of Southampton) who developed a philosophical approach to describing in terms of kinetic associations the effects of musical textures and sonorities. I strongly support research into kinetic aspects of music, but Humphries did not seem to appreciate the complexity of this field. Kinetic energy associated with or encapsulated within a sonority does not simply equate to the action used to produce it, and for this reason Humphries' use of a table with 'yes/no' values for certain types of action seemed of little heuristic value, at least for music analysts.

In the last session, Steven Vande Moortele (Katholieke Universiteit Leuven) persuasively analysed the notoriously 'unanalysable' *Obbligato Recitative*, the last movement of Schoenberg's Op. 16, by combining a 'top-down' with a 'bottom-up' approach within the overall framework of Schoenberg's own analytical

techniques. Carol Baron (State University of New York) then related an analysis of Ives's First Symphony to a biographical account of Ives's difficulties with his teacher at Yale College and an investigation of the different trends in music theory of the time. In the final paper of the conference, Edward Latham (Temple University) presented an interesting analysis of Nijinsky's choreography to Debussy's *Prélude à l'après-midi d'un faune*. However, Latham did not go much further than suggesting that Nijinsky took certain clues from the score. The listener was therefore left wondering why it was necessary for Latham to present several conflicting (mostly Schenkerian) analyses in order to arrive at this conclusion, and whether the approach can really be called 'interdisciplinary' as Latham claimed.

The standard of the papers at this EuroMAC was inevitably as varied as the content, but on the whole it was remarkably high, and there was much that was presented here that offered food for thought. Throughout the conference, the professionalism of Jonathan Cross and the administrative team was exemplary and the success of the conference was in no small part down to the warm collegial atmosphere, which facilitated genuinely free exchanges of ideas between the different academic fields and different nationalities. Although euphoria may be premature, there are certainly reasons to be optimistic about the future of European music analysis.

Björn Heile is a Leverhulme Special Research Fellow at the University of Southampton, and is currently writing a monograph on the music of Mauricio Kagel. He recently completed a PhD thesis entitled "Transcending Quotation": Cross-cultural Musical Representation in Mauricio Kagel's *Die Stücke der Windrose für Salonorchester* (Southampton, 2001).

5th EuroMAC: Review II

by Andrew Timms

European Music Analysis Conference

organised by Jonathan Cross

Victoria Rooms University of Bristol, 4–7 April 2002

The sheer size of this analytical extravaganza makes it hard to know where to begin a review. In one sense the conference as a whole simply cannot be faulted, since there was so much going on—nineteen sessions, over fifty papers, two concerts, three official languages, three keynote addresses, an opening address, and a plenary session—that only those with paranormal powers could claim to have glimpsed anything more than mere fragments. In another sense the sheer variety of approaches, methodologies, subject-matters,

and personalities gradually became so dazzling over the four days that I began to pine for a straightforward discussion of something that could bridge the glaring gaps between the differing theoretical traditions. This was at once the strength and weakness of the conference: the magnificent organisational achievement of gathering together so many scholars (over twenty countries were represented) was negated somewhat by the realisation that it takes more than this heroic effort to foster a real sense of shared enquiry. I

felt like a visitor at an exciting zoo, or an anthropological *flâneur*, unsure about how to understand the bewildering multiethnic metropolis around which I skulked. At no time was this felt more keenly than after the papers given by a couple of the French delegates, in which the enigmatic "*c'est très intéressant*" was used as a genial, apparently convincing closural formula; such comments, which one might have expected to take as a point of departure, undermined what were, in fact, genuinely interesting papers. Differences of a similar magnitude were evident in analytical methodologies, too. Although perhaps less sophisticated than some might claim, our comparatively highly determined Anglo-American theories seem light-years ahead of the rather basic motivic analyses offered by some continental colleagues.

That said, the contributions by the Europeans were by no means inferior. On the contrary, many of the papers (irrespective of nationality) were enthralling, beautifully presented, and thoroughly convincing. Nowadays it is almost a platitude to say that winds of change are blowing through the analytical windmills: Schenker popped up quite regularly in French, German, and Belgian papers; Riemann was met with knowing, rather than blank looks by English speakers; and the wilder number-crunching excursions of set theory were greeted by a respectful silence. There was very little overtly fashionable waffle: big musicological names were typically treated with admiration rather than adulation. Confrontation was mostly rejected in favour of camaraderie, and—apart from those who chose to switch sessions *en masse* whilst speakers were in the middle of reading their papers—most delegates were openly supportive of each other. There were, of course, low points, but these were fairly few and far between. It is worth noting that some of the session chairs did their job with masterful ease: for instance, Mark Delaere's hosting of the 'Theory and Metaphor' papers was outstanding, moving as he did from English to German to French with the flexibility of a well-tuned linguistic gearbox.

Although the musicological carnival was engaging from the outset, one of the most interesting and impressive sessions was the very last of the conference: 'Music in the Twentieth Century'. This title was a little ironic, given that the conference featured three sessions on 'Darmstadt and Beyond', and elsewhere in the building at the same time there was a session on twentieth-century music of a different social tradition ('Popular Musics'). A delegate pointed out that one of the pieces under discussion in the 'Music in the Twentieth Century' session was actually written in the nineteenth century—in fact, *two* of the pieces were impostors in this regard—but perhaps this criticism seems pedantic and unimportant, so wary are we nowadays of reading too much into historical chronology. In any case, it was a shame that three excellent papers did not quite garner the reception they deserved. Steven Vande Moortele's discussion of the last of Schoenberg's *Five Orchestral Pieces* op. 16 was urbane, especially when he drily and amusingly dismissed his mistaken orientation of one of his overhead transparencies; Carol Baron's analysis of the first movement of Charles Ives's First Symphony was persuasive and imaginative

in demonstrating the influence of Beethoven's Ninth Symphony, and her exposition of Ives's student woes was telling; and Edward Latham's lively paper on Debussy's *Prélude à l'après-midi d'un faune* was a real *tour de force*, but as with many other contributions I felt that the speaker needed double the available time to finish what he had begun.

Such was the case with Robert Adlington's earlier discussion of metaphors of musical temporality. An extremely interesting and lucid discussion had to stop unfortunately at the very moment when it was beginning to probe a particular piece of music in depth. Adlington's point—that the prevailing temporal metaphor is a cultural construction that dominates analytical discourse at the expense of other, equally viable metaphors—was well put, and it will be interesting to see where this idea leads in the future. Similar responses might be applied to several of the papers in the 'Systems and Interpretations' session: for example, Mauro Mastropasqua's discussion of a phenomenological ground for analytical hermeneutics, Erkki Huovinen's daunting research into tonality perception and interval-class content of pitch-class sets, and Mark Delaere's proposal for an authentic analysis practice. This last paper was especially thought-provoking, although it seemed that if the proposed approach were too narrowly pursued, it might fall victim to the well-documented problems of a more familiar kind of authenticity.

In some respects it was odd that we should be urged to analyse music using historically informed tools, especially if one notes that one of the most striking Schenkerian forays of the conference was willing to jettison some of its progenitor's more questionable readings. David Neumeyer's insightful discussion of background models in Bach was admirably critical of Schenker's own analyses, and the speaker's open 'why not?' approach points to an optimistic future. Neumeyer's essay was sandwiched between Felix Diergarten's analysis of Brahms's *Intermezzo* Op. 119, No. 1 and Bertil Wikman's enjoyable comparison of performance variants in Chopin's *Nocturne* in D flat major Op. 27, No. 2. Ideas, questions, and personalities flashed before our eyes, unfortunately with too little time to wander down potentially profitable avenues of discussion.

This was not the case, however, in 'Analysis and the New Technologies'. Leisurely chaired by François Delalande and attended by a small group of delegates (the session coincided with what was by all accounts an outstanding paper given elsewhere by Ludwig Holtmeier), this session contained only two presentations: firstly, Delalande's demonstration of *l'Acousmographe* (a program which renders a basic visual representation of some of the acoustical properties of sound inputs) and then Marc Battier's outlining of a research project into hypermedia and analysis that was carried out at IRCAM in Paris. Both these demonstrations were very much explanatory accounts of what is being done in these fields, and the relaxed, friendly nature of the session allowed some interesting points to be made—not least questions of the role of the acousmograph in sketch study and its

potential with regard to largely oral traditions. Obviously the actual interpretative uses to which these technological resources can be put is at this stage somewhat unclear, although the acousmograph could easily be pedagogically valuable since its results can be presented to those who cannot follow traditional score notation.

Whilst the session demonstrating these new technologies was a gentle affair, the plenary discussion of the grandly titled Pople Tonalities Project—another computer-centred development—was noticeably more ambitious. A panel of speakers—Anthony Pople, Michael Russ, Richard Cohn, and Nicolas Meeüs—unveiled the software and responded to their use of it. The software was described in the last edition of this newsletter (though Pople queried the review's use of Tonalities terminology) and I have no inclination to do the same here. However, criticisms from the study day held earlier at the University of Reading seemed to have some resonance in the nevertheless polite and eloquent contributions of both Meeüs and Cohn. Perhaps the most perturbing idea to come out of these contributions is that the project does not entirely shake off the idea of the analyst feeding pieces one by one into a machine in order to find printed dissections of the music emerging at the other; some delegates feared that the program would have the undesirable effect of alienating the analyst from the material components of the music. However, Pople pointed out that such doubts about the analyst's engagement with the music are unfounded; successful use of the program relies upon a corroborative process of assessing and re-assessing the program's results in the light of one's intuitions. The potential for misuse (along with some bugs which have since been eradicated) is precisely what has held back the general distribution of the software. Analysts who have hitherto been unable to experiment with the program will be pleased to know that Pople indicated that the software would be more freely available on publication of a forthcoming article which seeks to circumvent the pitfalls by outlining the theoretical grounding of the program and its potential applications.

Whereas the Tonalities discussion focussed one methodological tool on a selection of well-known turn-of-the-century composers, the 'Listening/Cognition' session married a mixed bag of interesting theories with a smaller and less familiar range of music. Two of the papers, for example, dealt with Bruno Maderna's *Quartetto in due movimenti*. This was no coincidence: the speakers belong to the same research group—the Gruppo di Analisi e Teoria Musicale (GATM). It was a highly diverse session. Aside from the GATM papers, Jean-Marc Chauvel introduced his research (somehow giving his paper in both French and English) into the cognition of structure, interestingly trying to steer a course away from the binary oppositions of traditional thinking, and Costas Tsougras presented analysis that applied Lerdahl and Jackendoff's generative theory of tonal music to 44 Greek *Miniatures for Piano* by Yannis Constantinidis. Common themes were touched upon by the speakers, but it is hard to adapt swiftly to such colossal differences in methodologies.

Surprisingly, this criticism was also true of the 'Music in Eastern Europe since 1945' session: Amanda Bayley gave a neat paper on the string quartets of Ligeti, Penderecki, and Lutosławski, discussing issues of performance ensemble and the structural implications of the coincidence (and divergence) of soloistic lines; Tim Johnson discussed Ligeti's analysis of Boulez's *Structures 1a*, and then proceeded to trace possibly fruitful, neglected connections between Ligeti and Lendvai; and finally, Carl Humphries delivered a paper that swept from Aristotle to Adorno and (unsurprisingly) well beyond the stipulated time limit. There was no time for any questioning of Humphries' provocative arguments, which attempted epistemologically to ground the significance of heard sounds and bodily responses, using Szalonek's *Musica Concertante* as an example.

From the beginning of this conference, then, I was confronted by a glorious musicological *mélange*—one that showed analysis to be alive, but perhaps not 'alive and completely well'. The virtual absence of the existential soul-searching that has haunted analytical practice almost *ad nauseam* in recent years was in one sense extremely refreshing—confidence-building, even. On the other hand, I could not help but wonder how some papers would go down in California: ignoring the claims of poststructuralism might not be the most propitious line of defence against some of its more troubling arguments. In many ways the question that bothers me most is rather like one that might be asked of postmodernism: is this the beginning of the new, or the last gasp of the end? There were some contributions that made one veer towards the former answer, but an awful lot of what went on suggested that, contrary to expectations, a certain type of analytical enquiry seems intent on chasing its own tail. Also, the recurring references to what seems to have been something of a golden age of analysis at King's College, London in the early 1980s created a slightly injudicious atmosphere, as it bathed the British analytical project in an autumnal light. Ironically, these nostalgic references were contextualised by none other than Arnold Whittall's perspicacious opening address, in which he tried very hard to reject that most egregious of musicological slurs—'formalism'—but also to reconcile the careful pluralism of today with the spirit of conviction that established the journal *Music Analysis*. Such delicate balancing acts seem to be typical of analysis at the moment, and—although commendable in one sense—are in danger of stifling certain advances in the discipline. Although EuroMAC was, by all accounts, a huge success, it might have benefited from more speakers willing to push out the boat.

Andrew Timms is a PhD student at the University of Bristol. He is currently studying the music and reception of Maurice Ravel in the light of various theories of modernism and postmodernism.

TAGS Day 2002: Review

by Ju-Lee Hong

Theory and Analysis Graduate Students' Day for Music Postgraduates

organised by Craig Ayrey with Kristian Hibberd and Greg Laybourn

Ian Gulland Lecture Theatre, Goldsmiths College, Saturday 25 May 2002

Since its launch back in the 1980s, TAGS Day has held a remarkable reputation for providing music postgraduates and established academics with an opportunity to debate the hottest topics in music analysis. This year's TAGS Day consisted of seven analytical papers on a wide range of subjects. The majority of speakers based their analyses on relatively new theories or methods, such as Neo-Riemannian theory, computer-based spectrum analysis and spectro-morphology, pitch class set genera, and computational-based tapping methods for measuring tempi. Others addressed issues of an historical, racial and pedagogical nature.

An introduction by Kristian Hibberd—one of the conference organisers—was followed by the first session, which was dedicated to twentieth-century music analysis. The first speaker, Andrew Timms (University of Bristol), presented a dazzling paper on 'Analysis after the End of History', which began with a discussion of Ravel's *Daphnis and Chloé*. Timms considered Lawrence Kramer's contention that '*Daphnis and Chloé* is a celebration of material, sensuous and erotic pleasure divorced from all moral and social concerns' (*Classical Music and Postmodern Knowledge*, 1995: 220) and questioned the authority of this particular interpretation, focusing on the subjectivity of Kramer as writer, of Ravel as composer, and of himself as reader. Timms also suggested that finding the central themes of modernity is perhaps more useful than looking forward to a postmodern paradise.

David Manning (University of Cardiff) analysed 'Vaughan Williams's Harmonic Style and Neo-Riemannian theory'. He claimed that Vaughan Williams's harmonic style makes it difficult to assess through conventional harmonic analysis the relationships between chords, as consonant chords dominate the musical surface in the majority of the composer's works. Manning used Neo-Riemannian theory to throw some light on the subject, identifying certain characteristic features of Vaughan Williams's harmonic style, including mediant shifts, false relations, enharmonic changes and common tones. In this way, the paper provided a refreshing alternative to the usual approaches to analysing Vaughan Williams's works. On the whole, it was warmly received and some useful comments were made by the delegates: Matthew Riley suggested that Manning might consider exploring the semitone relationship in Vaughan Williams's harmonic style, and Bryan Solomon advised him to compare Neo-Riemannian theory with a more widespread theory such as Schenkerian analysis.

After a lunch break, we launched into a session on analysis of electroacoustic and theatre music. Koichi Fujii (University of Keele) spoke on 'The Genesis of Electroacoustic Music in Japan', which built on the well-structured paper that he presented at the last TAGS Day (Birmingham Conservatoire). As in his earlier presentation, Fujii's use of visual aids greatly facilitated comprehensibility. According to Fujii, post-1950 Western electroacoustic music, such as Stockhausen's realisation of *Solo* (1965-66) and *Telèmusik* (1966), has influenced the works of Japanese composers—a point which can be successfully demonstrated by comparing spectrum and spectro-morphological analyses of selected electroacoustic works by Western and Japanese composers. In response to a question by John Dack (session chair), who explained that electroacoustic music has a brief yet complex history even within Europe, Fujii elaborated on his thesis by identifying interesting commonalities between Japanese and French perceptions of electroacoustic music.

The day's fourth speaker, Catherine Parsonage (City University), delivered a paper on 'The concept of "Twoness" in *In Dahomey: A Negro Musical Comedy*'. According to Parsonage, *In Dahomey* embodies Du Bois's notion of 'twoness' on many levels, and the philosophy and background of its black creators influenced its musical and dramatic content. Parsonage claimed that the conflict between Black African pride and White American aspiration within African Americans is embodied in many aspects of the show. She examined this conflict through the analysis of music and lyrics of specific songs and evaluated the extent of the British understanding of "twoness" in the show, and the British reception of other black musical entertainment in the early twentieth century. Parsonage portrayed a stereotypical image of the Negro in British society that provided the context for understanding other forms of Black American culture, including jazz, in early twentieth-century Britain.

The day's final session was dedicated to computer applications. It started with a discussion of pitch class set genera and progressed to the use of analysis as a practical tool in performance teaching; the latter ended with a demonstration of the relationship between musical structure and performance. The first of these—Bryan Solomon's (King's College, University of London) "Constructing" PC Set Genera—was one of the day's most stimulating papers. Solomon began by introducing the background of pc set genera theory according to Richard Parks, Allen Forte, Chris Kennett, and Craig Ayrey who all featured at the dedicated CUMAC '97

roundtable. Offering a solution to the inherent problems identified at CUMAC '97, Solomon introduced a software application that facilitates the grouping of pitch classes into 'genera systems' and the comparison of genera; he chose Schoenberg's early songs as case studies. Towards the end of the paper, Solomon claimed that however adequate and efficient the software may be, it is no more than a tool that helps music theorists and analysts to make and substantiate statements about music and its interpretation. This idea that the analyst is responsible for methodological and interpretative decisions was consistent with views expressed about the *Tonalities* software at the SMA Reading Study Day and the recent EuroMAC. Solomon's 'genera systems' software is an equally welcome addition to the growing number of programs available to music analysts, and its circulation is likely to broaden the appeal of pc set genera theory.

Vicky Ward's (University of Leeds) paper was entitled 'Music Analysis's Potential as a Tool for Performance Teachers'. Ward defined common purposes of music analysis and performance teaching and considered whether or not instrumental teachers themselves recognise the common purposes of these two activities. Her study, which was based on questionnaire data gathered from teaching members of the Incorporated Society of Musicians, concluded by stating that performance teachers have—without realising it—already been using "music analysis" as a tool. From the floor, Bethany Lowe asked whether or not keyboard (mainly piano) performance teachers are more analytically conscious than other instrumental groups, to which Ward replied that she had not found many striking differences between instrumental groups. Ward defined simple suggestions through intuition, such as the awareness and/or direction of phrasing, as the act of "music analysis" in performance teaching. This raised a heated debate between Timms and Ward: Timms claimed that performance teaching and studying the score through analyses should be approached as separate discourses; his argument seemed to be based on a concern for students to develop individuality in musical performance. However, his concern was not irreconcilable with Ward's position; analysis is necessary in performance teaching in order that students observe certain conventions and establish a rationale for their own interpretations. The argument ended as Chris Kennett suggested that

both participants read an article by John Rink in *The Musical Times* (vol.142, 2001: 9-15), which shows an expert concert pianist's (Murray Perahia's) awareness of Schenkerian analysis.

Yu-Lee Hong (Birmingham Conservatoire) delivered the day's final paper, which was on 'Analysing Tempo in Performance: Schumann's Sonata in A minor for Violin and Piano, Op.105'. Hong used a computational tapping method to analyse the tempos used in four commercial recorded performances of the sonata. This tapping method enabled her to examine the performers' tempo fluctuations in relation to the sonata's overall structure, and to consider briefly how the performers articulate the relationship between the rhythmic pattern of the first motif and the phrase boundaries. As one might expect, Hong found that her subjects consistently used timing to highlight the piece's compositional structure, and concluded that although they do this in different ways, emphasising the structural features by means of tempo fluctuation can be said to be common practice. Chris Kennett (session chair) asked Hong which of the recordings was her favourite, and she responded that, for her, Kremer and Argerich (1987) offered the most structurally and analytically oriented interpretation. Given that much earlier in the day Julie Brown had raised the issue of the relationship between performance and analysis, Hong's evidence-based paper provided a fitting end to the day's proceedings.

This year's TAGS Day was a stimulating and enjoyable event, showcasing much provocative and fascinating material from a variety of analytical specialisms and allowing the participants to debate and criticise constructively the research of their peers. The event, which was set up by Craig Ayrey, was very efficiently organised, with one organiser (Greg Laybourn) providing technical assistance and another (Kristian Hibberd) welcoming and assisting participants. As in the past, the only disappointment was that the day was not better attended...

Ju-Lee Hong is based at Birmingham Conservatoire where she is currently preparing a PhD dissertation on the performance analysis of selected cello recordings. She has read research papers at major conferences including Bristol's recent EuroMAC, and as a cellist she performs regularly at London Concert Halls.



correspondence

Tonalities: some notes of clarification

Anthony Pople, University of Nottingham

I mostly enjoyed reading Chris Kennett's review of the Tonalities Study Day held at Reading in October 2001. It was heartening to learn that, for him, the day provided both riveting interest and lively debate, but I'm sorry he also suffered 'maddening frustration' - not, surely, on account of any shortcomings in Jonathan Dunsby's excellent organisation of the event.

The nub of the problem seems to emerge towards the end of Chris's comments, when he addresses the availability of the software. Certainly, I can see that Chris's misapprehension of some of the terminology employed in *Tonalities* may not have been helped by his not having the software on his PC while he was writing his review—though he, like all delegates, was provided with a decent-sized 'Getting Started' document (see www.nottingham.ac.uk/music/tonalities/) that ought to have protected him from using the word 'gamut' where I (mostly) use 'prolongation' or 'analysis' (nor do I understand his remarks about *The Rite of Spring* and neural nets, but those are small points). I also have to say that I had anticipated that there might be some among the delegates who would have preferred to spend rather more—or even most—of the time in a private hands-on session, whereas this was (rightly, I think) set up as the meat in a sandwich, of which presentation and debate formed the scholarly daily bread.

Chris mentions that when asked about the dissemination of the software I replied that I didn't think it was ready. He really should have taken this statement at face value! I was fully expecting to

return from Reading with a list of suggestions, a list of 'bugs', and probably another list of ideas I'd been stimulated into by the comments of colleagues. Certainly, in the time I've had since then to work on the project, several bugs have been fixed and a number of musical improvements added. In fact, the bug fixes have been made very much with a wider dissemination in mind—because, as any software developer will tell you, it's one thing to get it working for oneself, quite another thing to make it 'user-proof' in the hands of others. This second goal has to be conscientiously aimed at if users are to be protected as far as possible from the risk of software crashes - 'maddening frustration' indeed, which I hope to avoid as far as possible.

As I write, the possibility of a reliable dissemination in these terms is very close (though the need for musical improvements will surely remain). Please watch the web address given above if you are interested—though I also intend to email those who attended the Study Day, where I know their email addresses. I'm gratified by the evident interest shown in this project, and for the tangible support of many colleagues, notably those who were closely involved in the Reading event (Nick Cook, Jonathan Dunsby and Mike Russ). But I must stress that this is work-in-progress, and that whatever has been managed so far merely gives an indication of what might eventually be done. It is inevitable that at some stage I shall have to relinquish this project, and I hope I will be forgiven for trying to ensure that, rather than it suffering a false start, the initial distributed version of the software gives it a strong chance of viability.

OXMAL 2000: a response to Riley

Vincent Benitez Bowling Green State University

I want to thank Dr. Matthew Riley for his review of my paper, 'Simultaneous Contrast and Additive Pitch Designs in Messiaen's *Saint François d'Assise*' given at OXMAL 2000 that appeared in the January 2001 issue of the SMA Newsletter. I would like to bring the following information, however, to the attention of your readers:

My paper explored how simultaneous contrast functions as a structural principle in Messiaen's music by examining three compositional designs ('additive designs') used in *Saint François d'Assise*. To establish a framework for my examination of how Messiaen structures both multi-layered textures in the opera and passages governed by a tonality, I

argued that a painter's use of simultaneous contrast had musical cognates in Messiaen's use of pitch and timbre. Moreover, I drew upon Christian colour symbolism to interpret the dramatic significance of Messiaen's use of tonalities in the opera. Finally, I neither delved into Messiaen's synaesthetic responses nor made any attempt to relate the 'colouristic vibrations' produced by any two hues directly to any musical structures. Rather, I stressed the analogy between music and painting throughout my paper.

A revised version of my paper will appear later this year in Music Theory Online.

SMA events 2002-2003

26 October 2002

Autumn Study Day: 'Analysing Recordings'
(University of Sheffield)

Contact: Nicola Dibben
Email: n.i.dibben@sheffield.ac.uk

22 February 2003

Winter Study Day: 'Adorno's Schubert'
(University of Cambridge)

Contact: Nicholas Marston
Email: njm45@cam.ac.uk

31 May 2003

TAGS Day for Music Postgraduates
(Royal Academy of Music, London)

Contact: Sarah Callis
Email: s.callis@ram.ac.uk

10-13 July 2003

Hull University Music Analysis Conference (HUMAC)
(Hull University)

Contact: Lee Tsang
Email: l.tsang@hull.ac.uk

28-31 August 2003

Music and Gesture (SMA, ESCOM, SEMPRES)
(University of East Anglia)

Contact: Anthony Gritten
Email: a.gritten@uea.ac.uk

other events

26-29 June 2003

Third Biennial International Conference on Twentieth-Century Music (University of Nottingham)

Contact: Robert Adlington
Email: robert.adlington@nottingham.ac.uk

SMA

Adorno's Schubert Winter Study Day

 **UNIVERSITY OF
CAMBRIDGE**

Saturday 22 February 2003

In association with the University of Cambridge, the Society for Music Analysis presents a study day focusing on 'Adorno's Schubert'.

Speakers will include:

Jonathan Dunsby (University of Reading)
Beate Perrey (University of Cambridge)

For further information please contact:

Dr Nicholas Marston

SMA Winter Study Day
Faculty of Music
University of Cambridge
11 West Road
Cambridge
CB3 9DP

Email: njm45@cam.ac.uk

feedback

The SMA committee welcomes feedback about recent events and suggestions for future events. If you would like to suggest a topic or would like to host an event, please contact:

Amanda Bayley, SMA Events Officer
Department of Music, University of Wolverhampton
Gorway Road, Walsall,
West Midlands WS1 3BD
Email: a.bayley@wlv.ac.uk



Analysing Recordings

Autumn Study Day

**Department of Music,
University of Sheffield**



Saturday 26 October 2002

This study day considers critical, analytical and theoretical approaches to analysing recordings. As well as considering some of the technical and methodological issues involved in analysing recordings, the day will focus on the nature of recordings as objects/events and the consequences of their production circumstances for analysis.

- Bethany Lowe (Welsh College of Music and Drama), 'Issues in analysing the timing of recordings: The strawberry plant, the tapping foot, and the can of fish'
- Luke Windsor (University of Leeds), 'Measurements, similarities and differences: when is the objective subjective?'
- Amanda Bayley (University of Wolverhampton), 'A performance analysis of Bartok's String Quartets'
- Ingrid Pearson (Kingston University), 'Romancing the stone': poetics and performance in Schubert's *Der Hirt auf dem Felsen*'
- Peter Johnson (Birmingham Conservatoire), 'Recordings as evidence of best practice'
- Allan Moore (University of Surrey), 'Revisiting the sound box'
- Catherine Parsonage (City University), 'A contextual re-examination of the Original Dixieland Jazz Band's British Recordings'
- Steen Kaargaard Nielsen (Musikvidenskabeligt Institut Aarhus Universitet), 'The phonographic reconceptualisation of the Broadway musical'

Attendance is free for SMA members; £5 for non-members.

For booking and further information please contact:

Dr Nicola Dibben
Department of Music, University of Sheffield
38 Taptonville Road
Sheffield S10 5BR
Tel: 0114 222 0480

Email: n.j.dibben@sheffield.ac.uk

Hull University Music Analysis Conference (HUMAC)

Department of Music, University of Hull
10-13 July 2003

Call for Papers

In association with the University of Hull and the journal *Music Analysis* (Blackwell Publishers), the Society for Music Analysis will hold its biennial international Music Analysis Conference at the Department of Music, University of Hull, from 10 to 13 July 2003. Keynote addresses will be given by Richard Middleton (University of Newcastle), Richard Taruskin (University of California, Berkeley), and Nicholas Cook (University of Southampton).

The Programme Committee invites proposals for papers of 20-25 minutes' duration. Papers on the following themes are most welcome; please indicate the category into which your proposal falls:

- Music Analysis and Performance
- Music Perception
- British Music Post-1945
- Music Analysis and Editing
- Second Viennese School
- Analysis of Musical Multimedia
- Computer Applications

Please note that proposals for poster sessions and papers that fall outside these categories are also welcome.

Proposals should be in the form of an abstract of no more than 250 words and should be sent on disk or by email to: Dr Lee Tsang (Conference Director), HUMAC, Department of Music, University of Hull, Hull HU6 7RX, UK. Email: L.Tsang@hull.ac.uk

DEADLINE FOR RECEIPT OF PROPOSALS: 1 December 2002

Organisation and Programme Committee: Amanda Bayley (Wolverhampton), Alastair Borthwick (Hull), Catherine Dale (Hull), Nicholas Marston (Cambridge), Lee Tsang (Hull).

The full programme will be announced in January 2003 and details will be posted on the conference website at <http://www.sma.ac.uk/>



International Conference
Music and Gesture

University of East Anglia, Norwich, UK
28–31 August 2003

Call for Papers

Gestures play a central role in our lives. We gesture, make gestures, respond to other gestures, read and interpret gestures. We live in a gestural world. Various types of gesture form vital and integral parts of our musical activities, including physical, cognitive, psychological, expressive, communicative, emotional, sociological, analytical, and pathological gestures. This conference seeks to explore the ways in which gestures function in and in relation to musical practice, whether performance, listening, composition, or other such activities.

Keynote addresses will be given by Nicholas Cook (Southampton, UK), Jane Davidson (Sheffield, UK), Robert Hatten (Indiana, US), David Lidov (Toronto, Canada), Justin London (Ohio, US), Alexandra Pierce (California, US), and John Rink (Royal Holloway, UK).

The Programme Committee invites proposals for papers of 20 minutes duration. Papers on the following topics are encouraged, though *all* proposals will be considered:

- Rehearsal and performance
- Semiotics and temporality
- Kinetics and body movement
- Analysis and interpretation
- Improvisation
- Rhetoric
- Subjectivity and voice
- Technology and gesture
- Music education and music therapy
- Musical gestures in other media e.g. ballet, film
- Psychology of music
- Composition
- Popular music

Postgraduate students are encouraged to submit proposals. Proposals for poster sessions and roundtables are welcome (roundtable proposals must include topics and participants). Proposals, in the form of an abstract of no more than 300 words, should be sent by post or (preferably) email to Anthony Gritten, School of Music, University of East Anglia, Norwich NR4 7TJ, UK [a.gritten@uea.ac.uk].

Deadline for receipt of proposals: 31 January 2003
Programme announced: March 2003

Conference Committee: Amanda Bayley (Wolverhampton), Jane Davidson (Sheffield), Elaine Goodman (Hull), Anthony Gritten (UEA), John Rink (Royal Holloway). The final programme and information about booking and accommodation will be available from March 2003 at <http://www.uea.ac.uk/~g519>.

Society for Music Analysis Membership Application

Please copy this page and pass it on to someone who is interested in joining the SMA.

The SMA is a dynamic, friendly group of scholars, students and other parties who share an interest in the theoretical and analytical issues of music. The Society is always delighted to welcome new members. The generous benefits of membership include:

- substantial discounts on subscription rates for the leading journal *Music Analysis*
- a semi-annual SMA Newsletter and a regular programme of mailings, keeping you up to date with the latest events and developments in the discipline
- free registration and refreshments at the Society's frequent Study Days, which focus on topical issues and include presentations from scholars of international renown as well as those entering the profession
- back copies of *Music Analysis* and the SMA Newsletter for those joining the Society during the course of the year
- especially advantageous terms for students

If you would like to join the SMA, please copy and detach the form below and send it together with a cheque (in pounds sterling or euros) payable to 'The Society for Music Analysis' to:

Dr Matthew Riley
SMA Administrator and Treasurer
Department of Music
Royal Holloway, University of London
Egham TW20 0EX



SMA Membership: Application Form



Choose from the following membership options:

- £35 (€57)** Full membership of the Society including a copy of each issue of *Music Analysis* during the year of membership (£40 for members outside UK/Europe)
- £25 (€41)** Student membership of the Society including a copy of each issue of *Music Analysis* during the year of membership (£30 for members outside Europe)
- £20 (€33)** Membership of the Society without *Music Analysis* (UK/Europe only)
- £10 (€16)** Student membership of the Society without *Music Analysis* (UK/Europe only)

Name: _____

Address: _____

Tel no: _____

E-mail: _____



www.sma.ac.uk

