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For the next Newsletter we are particularly interested in reports on ongoing research projects. All materials for submission should be sent by email to information@sma.ac.uk.

Editorial

Ah, the conference circuit. I'm sure we all have your own tales to tell, and ordinarily I wouldn't bore you with mine. But as it happens two of the three conferences I attended this summer (excluding TAGS) involved some kind of ambassadorial role, promoting SMA interests and more generally those of our shared discipline. So I am duty-bound to report. The first piece about the May Confronting the National conference in Helsinki was actually commissioned by the SMA. The request was for a modest blog which I decided to expand a little, since the import of music analysis in this conference and field of research is not self-evident. Of more significance to the SMA was its sponsorship of an involvement in the joint BFE-AAWM Analysis, Cognition, and Ethnomusicology Conference at SOAS this July, in recognition of an important expansion of music analysis into worldwide music. The review of this conference gives a glimpse of the event as well as the SMA panel’s contribution (Costas Tsougras, Mark Gotham and myself), including President Julian Horton’s message to the delegates. The review is followed by a few words from one of the founders of Analytical Approaches to World Music (AAWM), Lawrence Shuster, giving readers an idea of the quiet revolution initiated by this interest group and journal.

But the Newsletter begins appropriately with an announcement about the TAGS Prize candidates and winner, and a full-scale review of TAGS itself, written by a dedicated team of postgraduate members, both veteran and new. This year we have aimed to allow reviews to contain a more robust critical slant, which I believe is in everyone’s interest. Likewise, Julian Horton’s polemical TAGS Keynote—a considered response to those identifying analysis with has-been musicology—maintains the critical momentum of this issue. I hope both reviews of the TAGS Keynote and Roundtable will provoke responses from members. It would be great to publish those in the next edition: please write to information@sma.ac.uk.

Shay Loya
TAGS Prize

This year’s competition was truly excellent with five short-listed papers from (in Alphabetical order) Katie Cattell, Martin Curda, Rebecca Day, Chris Tarrant and Adam Whittaker. The prize was £100 and the option of publication in the newsletter. It was awarded to Chris Tarrant (Newcastle University) for his paper ‘The Reversed Recapitulation and the Type 2 Sonata: the Case of Carl Nielsen’s Symphony No.3’. In addition, the two judges, SMA Committee members David Bretherton and Helen Thomas, ‘highly commended Martin Curda’s ‘Rhythm as Form-Generating Agent in the Music of Pavel Haas’. Many congratulations to all five: Katie, Martin, Rebecca, Adam, and Chris of course, whose article will appear in the next issue of the Newsletter. To give you a taste of what’s coming, here is his abstract:

The Reversed Recapitulation and the Type 2 Sonata: The Case of Carl Nielsen’s Symphony No. 3.

This paper considers Carl Nielsen’s treatment of sonata form in the opening movement of his Symphony No. 3, ‘Sinfonia Espansiva’, Op. 27. The idea of the ‘reversed recapitulation’ is widely acknowledged as a valid sonata strategy for composers in the late-nineteenth century, and is promoted particularly by Timothy Jackson, who interprets it as ‘a tragicprogrammatic deformation’ (Jackson, 1996). The concept is rejected in Hepokoski’s and Darcy’s Elements of Sonata Theory, however, on the grounds that it is in direct contravention of the principle of rotation, considered in sonata theory to be foundational. Hepokoski’s and Darcy’s remarkably entrenched stance on this theoretical element was widely criticised in the reviews that immediately followed the theory’s publication, and while the so-called reversed recapitulation can be understood as an example of Hepokoski’s and Darcy’s ‘Type 2’ sonata structure in the context of the late-eighteenth-century symphonic tradition, its strict application to the forms that were emerging around 1900, not least Nielsen’s, might be considered anachronistic. This paper will offer a sonata-theoretical analysis of the first movement of Nielsen’s 3rd Symphony, and explore how beneficial the Type-2 sonata reading is to sonata-form composition around the turn of the twentieth century.

TAGS Review

The following joint review by Will Bosworth, Steph Jones, Adam Smith, Martin Curda, William Green and Shay Loya follows the order of the programme.

Friday, 2nd May

Introduction and Sessions 1 & 2
Will Bosworth

This was my fourth year at TAGS. A whole generation of postgraduates has cycled through in that time, yet the conference has consistently retained a friendly atmosphere and remained an invaluable opportunity for postgraduate musicologists to present their work to a receptive yet non-threatening audience. This is perhaps partly due to its small scale, which also means that the academic substance shifts its centre of gravity (if it has one at all) each year. Some years many papers seem to analyse the aura around the music, or focus on less familiar repertoire, but this year’s loose theme seemed to be for presenters to get their hands dirty on more well-known notes. A whole session on twentieth-century form marked the (continuing? growing?) influence in Britain of the New Formenlehre, while even ‘NM’ approaches such as feminist readings of Brahms didn’t shy away from the dots. A bonus was the high number of audio examples: two days not just of talking about, but listening to, great music.

The keynote speech titles evince another constant theme at TAGS, which might be described as a feeling of a discipline under siege. In 2011 Arnold Whittall entertained us with ‘Written Off? Theory, analysis, and
twenty-first century musicology’, and Julian Horton’s inspiring keynote this year, ‘In Defence of Musical Analysis’, projected much the same feeling, at least in title. (William Drabkin’s 2012 keynote ‘Schenker’s Army: Defending the Fundamental Line of Mozart’s G minor Symphony’ also participated in the battle metaphor.) The more grown-up ‘Cerebration of Music Analysis’ conference last year also contained a roundtable on much the same theme. The feeling of demonization (or perhaps Kermanization) persists; will we ever reach a point where we stop feeling beleaguered by the surrounding musicological community? The self-critical approach that this forces us to take to our work, however, was much in show across the two days, and is surely a positive effect.

The gracious welcome by Royal Holloway’s new Head of Department, Professor Stephen Downes, touched on these themes. Since his attendance at the first ever TAGS (I’m not feeling so old anymore), the position of analysis has been endlessly questioned and challenged. Yet we only had to look around the room and at our programmes to realise the discipline remains vital, and Royal Holloway seems to be one of its flourishing bases, claiming five of the weekend’s papers by current students (and at least one more by alumni). Professor Downes also introduced Julian Horton, the new President of the Society, to the audience of SMA postgraduates.

‘Musical Form in the Twentieth Century’
Chair: Paul Harper-Scott (Royal Holloway, University of London)

Martin Curda (Cardiff University): ‘Rhythm as Form-Generating Agent in the Music of Pavel Haas’

Christopher Tarrant (Newcastle University): ‘The Reversed Recapitulation and the Type 2 Sonata: the Case of Carl Nielsen’s Symphony No.3’

Sebastian Wedler (Merton College, Oxford): ‘Thus Spoke the Early Modernist: Zarathustra and Rotational Form in Webern’s String Quartet (1905)’

The good health of the discipline was on show from the start, as the ‘hardcore’ first session explored several leading analytical trends: Sonata Theory, rotational and deformational form, and rhythmic-metric analysis. We also heard about composer’s own theories of music, and Schenker popped his head in once or twice. The notable trend throughout the session was how well all three speakers had internalised their respective theories, as opposed to just dabbling or shooting around the relevant buzzwords.

Martin Curda examined the music of Pavel Haas, who, like several other composers, responded to the twentieth-century crisis of tonality by turning compositionally to the rhythmic-metric dimension. Haas’s block-type forms, employing repetition, stasis, and juxtaposed contrasts, have already been related to Stravinsky’s style; this paper showed how an employment of Janáček’s hierarchical theories of metre could add fruitfully to the analytical mix. However, whereas Janáček’s style was one of motivic transformation rather than development, in Haas’s music manipulations across different levels of metre exhibit a full range of formal or compositional roles analogous to traditional tonal functions – differentiation and unification (with the idea of metre as key), development (systematic exploration of a metric space), tension and release through use of metrical dissonance, and an analogue to cadence in the return to ‘metric base’ (Janáček’s term for the lowest active level of motion).

Christopher Tarrant’s paper probed the subtleties of form even more closely – this time in Carl Nielsen’s Third Symphony, and mainly with the tools of Sonata Theory. The theme ordering and tonal layout of the first movement can lead to no less than four interpretations of the recapitulation and coda; most pertinent for the paper were the perspectives of reversed recapitulation as opposed to Sonata Theory’s Type 2 Sonata (where the second rotation features a nontonic P before tonic S and should not be labelled as recapitulation). The form was considered to have gone into decline after 1770, so such a traditional labelling may seem anachronistic in modernist works. But this arrangement features more than once in the early-twentieth-century symphonic repertoire (Sibelius’s 2nd and 4th symphonies were mentioned) and as such raises interesting conflicts within the new Formenlehre: old vs new, tonality vs narrative/rhetoric. Questions were confidently dealt with (Beethoven and Schubert were mentioned), and the paper as a whole was a skillful deployment of daunting technical apparatus.

The final paper of the session moved on a tangent to rotation and cyclical form; James
Hepokoski’s works once again featuring prominently. Sebastian Wedler looked at Webern’s String Quartet (1905), a newly identified landmark in Webern’s development from lyricism to his later style. Developing variation was argued not to be a large part of Webern’s language, at least at this point; while links to Schoenberg are also obvious, the paper set out to demonstrate a link to Richard Strauss, specifically through striking resemblances to Also Sprach Zarathustra. This connection pointed to a strand of Webern’s early modernist thought absent in his The Path to the New Music. Only when we see these repressed narratives do we see a need to, in a sense, ‘defend’ the early Webern against his later self-historiographic narrative. Questions covered aspects of this reassessment, as well as mentioning two-dimensional form.

‘Music Theory Pedagogy’
Chair: William Drabkin (Southampton University)

Clémence Destribois (Royal Holloway, University of London): ‘Sounding the Psalms? Psalm-tone Tonalities in the Ensemble Instrumental Music of Merula and Marini’

Adam Whittaker (Birmingham Conservatoire): ‘Late Fifteenth-Century Theoretical Integration: some initial thoughts on Johannes Tinctoris’s Expositio manus’

This session, on early music, was characterised by lucidity of exposition. Both speakers presented papers that were models in terms of how clearly they guided us through their material and thoughts. This level of professionalism, together with the level of analytical complexity in Session 1, set a high standard for the rest of the conference. Clémence Destribois started by noting a lacuna in the understanding of tonal organisation in some seventeenth-century music: so-called ‘Phrygian’ endings, for example, or pieces that begin in G minor and end on a D major chord, defy later concepts of tonality (Hello again, Heinrich). Gregory Barnett has suggested that psalm-tone recitation may have had a significant impact on pitch organisation in these repertories, and the paper drew on this suggestion to explore references to ‘psalm-tone tonalities’ within two collections of instrumental music, by Tarquinio Merula and Biagio Marini. Although a few of the claimed motivic references seemed questionable (a falling fifth as an allusive reference, for example), the argument as a whole was persuasive, particularly the idea that putatively ‘wrong’ starting chords actually played a part in clarifying which psalm-tone was being referred to. The wider impact of psalmody traditions on such works deserves further attention.

Adam Whittaker examined a single theoretical treatise by Johannes Tinctoris (his Expositio manus), arguing that its significance has been largely missed. The treatise integrates text and music examples to a unique extent. It presents custom-made examples, including the famous Guidonian hand, a recent debate on which has questioned the widely-held view that it was used by singers of all abilities. Moreover, the ‘quasi-symbiotic’ relationship between the text and examples actually constitutes a modern convention that was highly unusual in fifteenth-century theory. Another ‘modern’ aspect is Tinctoris’s treatise is its didactic practicality and concern for the reader, the need to elucidate carefully, as evidenced in the graphic illustration of the complexities of hexachordal mutation. These claims entailed a perspicacious reading of the treatise which was communicated with clarity, and it will be interesting to see how Whittaker’s research develops.

Keynote Address
Steph Jones and Shay Loya

Professor Julian Horton, SMA President (Durham University): ‘In Defence of Musical Analysis’
Chair: Anne Hyland (Royal Holloway, University of London)

Julian Horton opened his keynote jokingly apologising for a sense of disorientation stemming from the train journey from Waterloo to Egham, ‘in which you seem to cross the Thames from the North to the South about three times... so I’m now not entirely clear which side of the Thames I’m on’. No such confusion was apparent, however, in his arguments for the role of theory and analysis in the age of postmodernist scholarship. Horton’s paper conjoined ‘two parallel threads’ that run throughout his research of the past decade or so. The first, polemical thread describes a series of published position papers that have ‘tried to stake out a territory for theory and analysis’. The second, analytical thread ‘put into practice the terms of the position papers somehow’. Not surprisingly, given Horton’s field, this knitting exercise transmuted into a coherent five-part form, with a modulation from polemics to
Part 1 of the keynote cited two scholars whom Horton had identified as representative of a massive academic trend that has privileged ‘historical specificity over theoretical, analytical or hermeneutic engagement’. First, Horton recalled Roger Parker’s keynote speech from the 2011 conference for the Society for Musicology in Ireland, in which Parker, according to Horton, ‘aligned theory and analysis with a variety of dogmatic attitudes, not only modernism but also formalism, structuralism, positivism, organicism, Hegelianism, which by the turn of the millennium had come to be regarded as inhabitants of a historical dustbin’. He then mentioned Richard Taruskin’s view that only theory that explains composers’ actions in their historical context has historical, and therefore scholarly, validity. This, according to Horton, effectively ‘makes theory subservient to history, since history is the source of verification for theoretical explanations’. Adding the perspectives of New Musicologists to the mix (notably Lawrence Kramer and Susan McClary), Horton demonstrated how this basic stance has been radicalised and politicised to the extent that theory and analysis were charged with being somehow complicit in immoral acts of gender and race oppression.

In part 3 Horton began his defence by offering a plethora of personal reflections and rejecting the intellectually tyrannical assumption that we—all of us—have simply ‘passed from the time that generates discourse to a time that generates discourse about discourse’, as if no other scholarship were possible or desirable in the early twenty-first century. However, this did not mean a wholesale rejection of some of the things New Musicology brought to attention, which do indeed require us to think as theorists and analysts, notably, the need to address rigid cultural hierarchies and the consequences of ahistorical and canon-orientated musical-theoretical perspectives of the Western art-music repertoire. It was at this point that Horton brought in his personal research and put forth the notion of a ‘de-centred theory of sonata-form’, the idea of viewing this form from a variety of composers, locales and historical periods using a large-scale database, rather than through the lens of models predominantly based on Haydn, Mozart and Beethoven (as has been the case from A.B. Marx to Caplin and Hepokoski). Part 4 put this claim to the test through a number of case studies that challenged traditional Mozart-centred models applied to nineteenth-century piano concerti, in the course of which Hepokoski and Darcy’s Type 5 sonata form was put under special scrutiny. In the concluding part 5, Horton suggested that the aesthetic of the present, as uncovered by theory and analysis, is just as important as the techniques of history that uncover the aesthetics of the past. Plurality and interaction of these discursive modes are welcome, but each discourse can also sometimes operate independently to some advantage. In other words: theory and analysis can interact with the new discourses in immensely creative ways, without being subservient to them.

As is customary, formal questions were not invited to what the chair, Anne Hyland, described as a provocative address. Indeed, it was clear that Horton had conjured many-a-thought deep within the minds of the audience, some of which became voiced over post-address nibbles and wine. Overall, Horton’s keynote provided at least one clear example of how the discipline could decisively respond to, and even appropriate, the postmodern challenge. Indeed, the trend right now seems to be that of a quiet yet persistent convergence among the musicological disciplines (see Loya’s review of the recent BFE-AAWM conference), suggesting that it is the shrill and divisive posturing of 1990s that will soon find a home in the historical dustbin.

Horton’s keynote address appears on p. 11.

Saturday, 3rd May 2014

Session 3

William Green

‘Probing the Programmatic: Music, Narrative, and Gender’
Chair: Kenneth Smith (Liverpool University)


Rebecca Day (Royal Holloway, University of London): ‘Beyond the Phallus: “Feminine” Closure in Brahms’ Symphony No. 3’

Russell Millard (Royal Holloway, University of London): ‘The Salome of Greece’: Lyceion, Lycaenion, Daphnis, and Desire’
This session was devoted primarily to the hermeneutic readings music through the key terms of ‘Narrative’ and ‘Gender’. The first to speak was Jason Preece, who gave a composer’s account of Thomas Adès’ piece ‘Polaris’ in terms of Ernő Lendvai’s axis system. This interesting talk raised the question of harmonic function in the music, and to what extent minor third cycles can be mapped onto Adès, when even their original application to Bartók remains questionable. Preece’s enthusiasm for the music was clear, irrespective of this scepticism.

Rebecca Day’s stimulating discussion of Susan McClary’s reading of Brahms’ Third Symphony was an unusual one, one devoted to the positive realignment of McClary’s tired, ‘Brahms was a misogynist’ reading into one more attuned to nuances in Lacanian theory. However, the sheer magnitude of such a task (combining an analytical engagement with the nitty-gritty of the score with a focus on Lacan’s infamously complex and convoluted theoretical pronouncements) slightly defeated Day’s bold task. Her command of Lacanian theory was evident, but its direct mapping onto the music felt somewhat strained, the notoriously complex diagram of ‘sexuation’ being used to show how Brahms engaged with formal constraints. The ensuing questions clarified her account of the movement as a regular, ‘Type-3’ sonata-allegro, with Julian Horton remarking on the possible hermeneutic significance of the hexatonic organization of Brahms’ movement. Overall, and despite my misgiving about the application of Lacan, this was a brave and complex paper.

The final talk in this session, given by Russell Millard, teased out connections between the sexual politics of the Ballets Russes, a psycho-biographical sketch of the notoriously private Ravel, and the construction of feminine sexuality and the ‘Gaze’ within Ravel’s adaptation of Longus’ second-century Daphnis and Chloe. An astonishing welter of information was dashed off by Millard in an engaging fashion, though one which ended up opening more cans of worms than might have been desired. The talk started well, as the transformation from text to ballet of Lyceion’s sexual character (from erotic tutor to decadent, Kundry-like figure) was linked to the contemporary European craze for the dance of the seven veils. However, much of the evidence seemed circumstantial (as Millard actually acknowledged), and not able to bear the interpretative weight. The presence of the ‘Desire’ motif from Tristan und Isolde at the entrance of Lyceion was particularly speculative, when all that was left to remind us of it was extremely abstract, reductive and concealed: a mere four-note ascending chromatic fragment, slowed down in the middle of the texture as an accompanying line. This quibble should not detract, however, from a paper that was learned and engaging.

**Session 4**

**Martin Curda**

‘Set Theory, Pitch-Class Analysis, and Empirical Approaches to Post-Tonal Music’

*Chair: Martin Curda (Cardiff University)*

**Adam Smith** (Royal Holloway, University of London): ‘Harmonic Fields in Alois Hába’s Quatuor à Cordes im Vierteltonsystem No.2, Op.7 – Using Adapted Pitch-Class Set Theory for the Analysis of Quarter-Tone Music’

**Chenchen Gong** (Chinese University of Hong Kong): ‘Sonoristic Serialism in Górecki’s Scontri’


**Imre Lahdelma** (University of Jyväskylä, Finland): ‘The Affective qualia of single chords – distinct yet complex combinations’

This session comprised some of the most rigorously analytical papers presented at the conference. Most of the presenters thus faced a problem which is symptomatic of music analysis and largely responsible for the amount of anxiety it elicits among those who consider themselves ‘uninitiated’: namely, the problem of effective oral presentation of analytical research, which necessitates tough choices regarding level of detail and breadth of scope.

Adam Smith’s paper was well balanced in this respect. Smith took time to comment on the origins of Hába’s quarter-tone compositional technique, to explain the particularities of its notation and to illustrate the composer’s aesthetic motivations. Smith’s research questions were primarily methodological: is Hába’s quarter-tone music better analysed ‘horizontally’ or ‘vertically’; is it governed by principles of harmony or function analogous to
tonal music; is it a microtonal extension of the already chromatically ‘extended tonality’ (or perhaps of Schoenbergian ‘atonality’); or is it a wholly new compositional system? As a tool to tackle such questions, Smith proposed an adapted pitch-class set analysis software designed to operate with 23 rather than 11 distinct pitch-classes.

Chenchen Gong’s paper investigated Górecki’s idiosyncratic use of serialist techniques in Scontri (1960), explaining the compositional-technical background of post-tonal ‘sonorism’. Through a series of diagrams, Gong illustrated how Górecki used symmetrical designs to produce distinctive acoustic effects. The clear graphic presentation and the careful pacing made an otherwise challenging paper easier to digest. Yet I still feel that less is more when it comes to analytical detail and number of diagrams or examples, especially in a paper which requires such a level of specialist knowledge.

René Mogensen focused in his presentation on the interaction of electronic and ‘live’ acoustic components in ‘mixed’ electro-acoustic repertoire. His analytical reading of Saariaho’s NoaNoa took the shape of a series of ‘transformation network maps’ tracing the correlation between pitch and timbre, each of which provides context for the appearance and variation of the other. Despite all its conceptual originality and analytical insight, this presentation was one of the less successful in communicating its content to the audience. Many of the diagrams remained unexplained and, given the 20-minute time constraint, the paper as a whole necessitated more succinct argumentation and a clearer structure.

With Imre Lahdelma’s concluding paper, we turned from music analysis to empirical research rooted in semiotics and psychology. Based on a pool of 269 respondents from 29 countries, Lahdelma’s collaborative research studies the affective associations of isolated chordal sonorities. The presentation elicited a lively discussion. The point was made that the studied qualities were also dependent on timbre and articulation, which had been deliberately ‘neutralised’ in the synthetic samples used in this research. The significance of the results was also questioned due to an apparent lack of systematic attention to cultural and musical background of the individual respondents. The merit of the research question itself, however, was never in doubt and accounted for the lively debate that followed.

Session 5
William Green

‘The Romantic Fragment and Musical Analysis’
Chair: Julian Horton (Durham University)

Katie Cattell (Royal Holloway, University of London): ‘Different Notions of the Fragmentary in Schubert’s Impromptu in C minor, D.899 (op.90): Adorno and the German Romantics’

Sophie Hill (Cardiff University): ‘Fragment and Deformation in Liszt’s Kleine Klavierstücke S. 192’

First to speak was Katie Cattell, who gave an account of Schubert’s Impromptu in C minor, D. 899, viewed through the lens of the work of Adorno and Karl Wilhelm Friedrich Schlegel, the unappreciated Romantic author, famous for his Athenaeum’s Fragmente und Gespräch über die Poesie. It might have aided Cattell to engage more fully with the well-known work of John Daverio, whose influential book Nineteenth Century Music and the German Romantic Ideology deals with the relationship between this founder of Romanticism and the music of the period. Cattell’s focus on the negative Hegelianism of Adorno in his essay ‘Schubert’ (1928) somewhat overshadowed the original influence of Schlegel on the understanding of the fragment, which is more directly and historically situated by Daverio. Cattell devised an interesting explanation for the powerful C octaves at the opening, claiming that the whole introduction to the piece has coalesced into one single note. In retrospect, however, this does not seem unusual: to take only examples within C major/minor, the fourth movement of Beethoven’s First Symphony and the first movement of Brahms’s Piano Quartet Op. 63 both begin with unison octave Cs that may be, more or less, ‘fragmentary’. Overall I thought Cattell’s ‘fragment’ remained a conceptual conceit with limited analytical applicability, though this could be a function of the time constraints. It could well be that important parts of the argument and demonstration were missing: some thought-provoking moments in the paper have certainly suggested this.

Last in this session was Sophie Hill, a Master’s student who spoke about Liszt’s Kleine Klavierstücke, S. 192, and their fragmentary nature. This fascinating talk delved into the compositional hinterland of
these pieces, and used a wide variety of analytical techniques to probe the sphinx-like musical surface. Hill relied much on Schenkerian analysis that needed no theoretical introduction, but comfortable familiarity was compromised by the amount of graphs one had to digest in a short space of time. This overload was somewhat redressed after the talk, when following a comment by Julian Horton about the disposition of the motives in the first piece (especially a C natural – B dyad), we were able to mull over this issue at some leisure. Hill also thoughtfully engaged with Caplin’s formal functions with regard to the Fourth piece. Any connection to the concept of ‘the fragment’ seemed more like the starting point rather than the focus of the paper, but the analytical exploration of Liszt’s music was conducted most effectively.

Session 6 and Roundtable
Shay Loya

‘Approaches to the Analysis of Pop Music’
Chair: Shay Loya (City University, London)

Teja Klobčar (University of Ljubljana, Slovenia): ‘Just a few Chords: Researching and Analysing the Music of Slovenian Singer-Songwriters’

Toby Young (New College, Oxford): ‘Let There Be House: Narrative Structures in Electronic Dance Music’


Before you read my account of session 6 you need to know pop music is not my field. That said, I have a side interest in analytical studies of pop, having taught such things in undergraduate classes. Sadly, I missed last year’s tremendous PopMac in Liverpool (reviewed by Brad Osborn in the previous Newsletter), so I was keen to get a glimpse of current research emerging from the postgraduate ranks.

Teja Klobčar made the case for applying figured bass and traditional notation to the representation of chord progressions in Slovenian pop-folk music. This was done with due ‘ethnomusicological’ sensitivity to the cultural particular, down to the very personal and idiosyncratic performance and language of the various artists presented. As an ethnomusicologist herself, Klobčar was weighed down by her discipline’s (commendable if sometimes obsessive) inclination to self-reflexivity, and self-doubt, including questioning whether her paper belonged in a conference like TAGS! She nevertheless bravely confronted doubts about the legitimacy of using her mode of analysis by addressing challenges from both musical-analytical (‘what is there to analyse?’) and ethnomusicological (the inappropriateness of ‘foisting’ classical-music-type analysis on Slovenian pop/folk music) directions. What she has shown is that there are particular progressions that expressively align with the content of delivery, and that traditional notation gives us more information about that (chord inversions, voice-leading, and so on). It would be very interesting to see where this takes her, but one thing is certain: TAGS was the right place for her paper. Our place of worship is broad! (Just look at the composition of our membership, our mission statement on the website, and—yes, I’ll slip this in again—our recent participation in the BFE-AAWM conference…)

Toby Young similarly explored what he described as the ‘symbiotic’ relationship between ‘extroversive’ musical gestures (especially those common in dance-music genres) and ‘introversive’ elements of harmonic prolongation and voice-leading, particularly as represented in modified Schenkerian graphs, which seemed on reflection more appropriate to the music’s quasi-modal harmony than the Neo-Riemannian approach promised in the abstract (the music’s diatonic modality and stable tonality hardly called for the latter). The connection Young made between the graphs and the extroversive elements of the music was overall convincing, but these two layers of explication were otherwise separated by the mode of delivery: can they be combined in a single graphic representation?

With Alexi Villianitis we returned to the problem of analytical application, this time with a focus on structural hearing. The crux of the matter was whether analytical approaches to classical music that encourage teleological hearing suit the short-scale repetitions and cycles that characterise pop music. Taking Taylor Swift’s ‘I Knew You Were Trouble’ as a case study, Villianitis reached a nuanced conclusion: yes, there is some teleology in music videos (both musical and visual), but not as we know it from classical models, since circularity can overtake goal-directed narrative at any stage. Most striking in this case was the
‘premature’ (from a classical-music point of view) climax that left little room for any residual ‘emergence’ of musical-dramatic narrative. Of course one cannot deduce too much from a single case study, and it would be interesting to see if more close readings will coalesce into a coherent theory of ‘discontinuous’ or some other qualified form of teleology in pop music.

Roundtable discussion: ‘The Future of Music Analysis on the University Curriculum’
Chair: Julian Horton (Durham University)

Facing the audience, with a bottle of wine and a mascot squirrel between them, SMA President Julian Horton and conference organiser Anne Hyland began a roundtable on the ‘future of music analysis’. This took place at Royal Holloway, on the very last session of TAGS 2014, on 3rd March. Continuing some of his arguments from the keynote address of the previous day, Professor Horton stated that he believes music theory and analysis should become core subjects in music studies in the UK, and that students should also be aware of the ethical dimensions of the discipline. The problem, of course, is how we go about achieving this. The ensuing discussion focused at first on the ethics of theory and analysis, but soon turned to the more urgent issue of the survival and growth of the discipline itself in academia. The lowering of technical proficiency requirements at A-level were identified as one central problem. However, Julian argued that (as he learned in a national meeting with teachers and civil servants) raising A-level standards would diminish the number of students studying music as an academic subject at secondary schools, and therefore the number of those applying for music courses at university. Damned if we do or if we don’t, it seems.

So the question went back to how we may raise music literacy in primary and secondary schools. After playing a simple example of invertible counterpoint on the piano, Julian turned to us with this question: why do we not teach such basic counterpoint to 12-year-olds who are perfectly capable of absorbing mathematics at a comparable level? Well, insofar as we should, the question was rhetorical. But it was both sobering and depressing to mull over the non-academic reasons for this. A point was raised about a cultural-political agenda that unfortunately identifies technical proficiency with social elitism (somehow math is exempt from the same association). And David Bretherton has argued that Music is the only A-level subject where private instrumental-vocal tuition is built-in by default, which means that most music undergraduates almost invariably come these days from better-off families, reinforcing the image of elitism. In other words, there is an expectation that private tuition will fill the gap, and this certainly applies to counterpoint, harmony and musicianship in general. The only thing that may break this vicious circle of social elitism and educational deficiency is a fundamental change in the perception of what music skills are for, which music skills should and can be acquired, and at what age. All we need to do now is convince the government. Good luck, everyone.

Perhaps we can try and change things in our own patch first. At present there are very few designated jobs for analysts, so most of us get into university positions by being able to do other things. This is fine as far as getting a foothold in academia, and as Anne reminded us (and I can concur), once one is part of an institution there is some scope to expand analysis in the curriculum, slowly but surely. But growth by stealth may not be enough. Towards the end of the discussion, Horton raised the prospect of adopting here the American model of institutionalised music theory. The argument for this is that the discipline will be protected, it will create jobs, produce students, raise the overall level, create its own prestige (which hopefully will trickle down to secondary and primary education)—and so on. Putting aside how this can be actually done in practical terms, there was some scepticism from the audience (as well as Horton himself) about this idea in principle. After all, some of our colleagues in the US routinely lament the level of undergraduate literacy. So irrespective of innovation at the highest levels, it seems that the trickling down is not working terribly well.
on the other side of the pond. Moreover, others have noted that institutional music theory results in more formalist and conformist work that often propagates central theories rather than critiques them.

So once again we were left with no clear answers and as much as I wished for a happy ending, the meeting and conference cadenced on a troubling note. If anyone has further thoughts about any of these issues please feel free to respond via this newsletter (write to information@sma.ac.uk) or the online blog:

In Defence of Musical Analysis
TAGS Keynote Speech
Julian Horton

At the 2011 conference of the Society for Musicology in Ireland, Roger Parker delivered a keynote speech, somewhat provocatively entitled ‘Should We Forget about (Musical) Form?’. Parker’s paper was motivated by anxiety over the so-called ‘new formalism’, a turn of thought arising predominantly in poetry and literary studies around the turn of the twenty-first century, which he regarded as threatening to the positive progress of musical scholarship since the 1990s. His argument developed a disciplinary narrative, the hero of which was a kind of postmodern pluralism, styled as the prevailing musicological mentality of our time, and the villain of which was an intransigent behemoth of a discipline, which we would broadly recognise as theory and analysis.

By his account, theory and analysis gained dominance in Anglophone musical research from the 1950s as a late bi-product of modernism, before being wrestled to the ground in the 1990s, thanks to the efforts of musicologists energised by the various discourses of postmodernism, who have come to be defined under the rubric of the ‘new musicology’. Parker thereby aligned theory and analysis with a variety of dogmatic attitudes—not only modernism, but also formalism, structuralism, positivism, organicism, Hegelianism—which had by the turn of the millennium come to be regarded as inhabitants of the historical dustbin.

Or so it seemed. Noting the return of form as a going concern in literary studies, Parker was keen to head off a similar resurgence in musicology, out of fear that the gates of our pluralist utopia might be stormed by rejuvenated modernists. His main objective was to nip this reanimation in the bud, and he marshalled a broadly historicist approach to this end; that is to say, an approach that privileged historical specificity over theoretical, analytical or hermeneutic engagement.

Those of us who have worked in theory and analysis over the last fifteen years or so could be forgiven for regarding this argument as an instance of the stable being secured after its equine inhabitants have left the building. After all, it has become something of a disciplinary commonplace to note that the new millennium signalled a music-theoretical renaissance, with neo-Riemannian theory and Formenlehre leading the way, and a variety of developments following close behind, from the cognitively orientated concerns of pitch-space theory to the historically focused body of work dealing with musical schemata. In brief, anyone fretting about the musicological impact of the new formalism should acknowledge that the rejuvenation of music theory seems somewhat more in step with its literary siblings than the residual postmodernism of the aging ‘new musicology’.

At the same time, it remains an issue for music theory that the most influential theoretical developments of the last decade have not for the most part arisen in conscious response to new-musicological concerns; and this has a concomitant impact on analysis, if it is understood broadly as applied theory. The fractious discourse around the discipline that defined the transatlantic literature of the 1990s bequeathed a broad range of hostile positions, to which Parker’s comments are a late addition; but theorists at the time responded defensively as much as proactively; and subsequent theories have not in the main deployed the terms of the postmodern critique as their foundational concepts. The fact that transformational theories of harmony, for example, rely less heavily on
organicist pre-suppositions than Schenkerian theory is a fortuitous consequence of swapping Schenker for Riemann, not the deliberate result of imagining a post-structural tonal theory.¹

In one sense, then, the title of my talk today is misleading, since it is not my objective to engage simply in disciplinary self-justification. Rather, what I want to do is explore ways in which the gap between analysis and its critics might constructively be narrowed, if not closed altogether. I offer a defence in the narrow sense that I respond, a little belatedly, to Parker's renewed challenge, and also to that of Richard Taruskin, on which more below; but my overarching ambitions are to dismantle some of the critical dichotomies persisting from the 1990s, and to explore one case study of a critically aware mode of theoretical practice, drawn from my own work on the theory of concerto first-movement form in the nineteenth-century piano concerto.

**Postmodern Polemics**

First, however, we revisit the new-musicological critical terrain. Anyone entering the disciplines of theory and analysis after 2000 might struggle to grasp the sheer ferocity of this debate; but the current disciplinary landscape in the UK especially reflects the reordering of priorities that it compelled; and the way we conduct ourselves as theorists and analysts is still inflected by its fallout. Fanning out from a baseline assumption of the synonymy of theory and modernism, musicologists keen to absorb postmodern discourses of history and culture took aim at theory and analysis, and from the critique of organicism emerging in the late 1980s to a series of reanimations over the last ten years, accused it of offences, ranging from indifference to historical context to complicity with colonialism, patriarchy, ethnocentrism, and the like.

Perhaps the least controversial variant of the argument held that the study of history and culture should enjoy a privileged disciplinary position. Theory's great failing in these terms is that it considers music without regard for historical circumstances. At least in its post-War US manifestation, theory does this in the mistaken belief, fostered by Milton Babbitt in the 1960s, that it can proceed as a quasi-scientific discipline: it searches for the abstract basis of musical practice, much as theoretical physics looks for the mathematical underpinning of the physical world, and it very often invokes mathematical apparatus to reinforce the analogy. The mathematical turn of mind reinforcing this sense of disciplinary identity remains a prominent aspect of theory's complexion, as the geometrical abstractions spawned by neo-Riemannian theory make plain (how else should we contextualise a concept like the toroidal Tonnetz, for example?).

Dependent as it is on theory for its methodology, analysis falls prey to the same complaint. The analyst applying Schenkerian theory to (for instance) Corelli, Mozart and Brahms levels the historical differences between music from the seventeenth, eighteenth and nineteenth centuries in the false belief that it exemplifies a universal principle. The accusation might be levelled more forcefully at Felix Salzer's *Structural Hearing* of 1952, which applies an overarching concept of tonal coherence to music from Machaut to Prokofiev.

To musicological critics, this looked like an abdication of historical responsibility, or a wrong-headed attempt to extract music from its cultural context. An influential version of the argument was proposed by Lydia Goehr, who pointed out that theory-based analysis generally relies on the concept of a work, and thereby treats pieces of music as self-contained objects, which can be analysed much as one would analyse a phenomenon given in nature. The work concept is however historically determined; and it turns out that it comes into being around the same time as the conditions that produced the aesthetic mentalities of modern theory; that is, towards the start of the nineteenth century. Goehr in effect charged analysts with anachronism: Beethoven's Ninth might well be a work; but there is no point analysing Monteverdi's *Orfeo* in the same terms.²

---


² Lydia Goehr, *The Imaginary Museum of Musical Works* (Oxford: Oxford University Press, repr. 2007). Goehr explains her central thesis as follows: 'The main difference between the new approach and analysis is the explicit use it makes of history. This approach does not obviate the need for ontology, however; ontology is just reconceived to become inextricably tied to history. This does not mean either that ontological claims are justified solely by history or that the claims are incoherent on their own terms. It means a methodological priority is given
The persisting currency of the historicist argument is graphically demonstrated by the exchanges around the notion of octatonicism recently initiated by Richard Taruskin. Reanimating a debate started in 1985, Taruskin moved again to insist on the octatonic basis of passages in the music of Rimsky-Korsakov and Stravinsky on the grounds that this explanation chimed with contemporaneous pedagogy. This serves as the starting point for a broadside against any theory that cannot reveal its basis in compositional technique, and therefore in history. The alternative – a model of theory that is free to devise explanations without historical verification – is dismissed as ‘creationism’, the invention of scholarly fictions:

Only what is historically real can be said to be uncovered. The fictive is not uncovered by constructed. It has no reality beyond the historical conditions that give rise to its premises – and which can be uncovered by means of historical research …. To insist on the objective reality of cultural fictions is to engage in propaganda. Are these the words of a tyrant? No, they are merely the words of a confirmed evolutionist.  

In short, only theory that explains composers’ actions in their historical context has scholarly validity, and this makes theory subservient to history, since history is the source of verification for theoretical explanations.

Other commentators pointed instead to the baggage of nineteenth-century aesthetics that analysts drag along with them, particularly the concept of unity. As Alan Street argued, this concept has its roots in ideas of organicism stemming from German-Romantic natural philosophy. It has hung on in musical thought, despite the demise of organicism in many other areas of research. Differently formulated, philosophical scepticism leads to the charge of solipsism: theory extracts principles from musical repertoires, generalises them by induction, and then applies them analytically to the same body of music. The argument eats its own tail: the theory enables the analysis, and the analysis enables the theory. Analysis consequently becomes trapped in what Lawrence Kramer called its ‘frigid cell’, an hermetically sealed sterile environment, which is indifferent to the messy pluralism of history or the phenomenological diversity of subjective listening. This was less of a problem for nineteenth-century theorists, who looked at past music in order to derive principles for the teaching of composition; but it is a pressing concern for modern Fromenlehre especially, which scrutinises the Viennese classical repertoire in relentless pursuit of structural principles, which are then applied to the classical repertoire.

The debate became somewhat more fraught when sexual and cultural politics were added to the mix. Enter Susan McClary and her by now infamous 1991 article on (amongst other things) Beethoven’s Ninth Symphony, which affiliated that work’s first-movement recapitulation with the act of heterosexual rape, and went on to condemn both Beethoven and the musical culture constructed around him (which, recalling Lydia Goehr, means also the emergent culture of musical analysis) as complicit in aggressive phalocentrism and masculine hegemony. McClary’s argument was taken up a decade later by Robert Fink, who reaffirmed her reading of the Ninth, and explicitly called for the to making ontological claims compatible with the historical and conceptual complexity of the subject-matter with which they are associated. Ibid., p. 89.


dismantling of the hierarchies supporting 'modernist' theory. 7 (The analyst’s 'frigid cell' now no longer seems quite so frigid.) And once the gendered other of Western modernism is invoked, its political counterparts flood into the argument. Theorists’ focus on the Western canon becomes part of a structure of ideas reinforcing a Eurocentric imperial mentality, which drives a wedge between European high culture and its non-Western or vernacular alternatives. The full range of marginal subject positions — gendered, sexual, ethnic, political, and geographical — at once crowd in on the seemingly innocent activity of investigating the structure of Western classical music, with predictably disabling results. When Craig Arey, writing in 1994, noted that postmodern musicology had in effect paralysed the 'impulse to analyse', he described a condition that has since cast a considerable shadow over transatlantic musical scholarship. 8

And yet here we are.

The Theory Renaissance and the Defence of Analysis
The various countercpoints emerging in the midst of all of this (McClary versus Pieter Van den Toorn; Kramer versus Scott Burnham; Taruskin versus Kofi Agawu and others) evince theory’s capacity for self-defence; and theory’s subsequent renaissance gives eloquent testimony of its capacity for renewal. At the same time, a key debate, with which theorists have to my mind not sufficiently engaged, revolves around the question of whether theory and analysis need to be understood as antithetical to the values that the new musicology propounded. The straight equation of theory, analysis and modernism is highly problematic. If the long history of music theory demonstrates anything, then it is surely that its practice circumscribes epistemic change. There is antique music theory, medieval music theory, renaissance music theory, early modern and modern music theories; but in the present, conceptions of theory still betray the hallmarks of a research agenda that has set it in constitutive opposition to postmodernity (recall the idea of the theorist as ‘recovering modernist’, although it’s worth noting in passing, but not incidentally, that in poetry and architecture, the new formalism represented a neo-classical response to modernism, not a modernist reaction to critique).

In the first place, the accusation of ahistoricality misrepresents the double identity that music enjoys, now more than ever, as an historical artefact bequeathed by the past and a lived aesthetic experience in the present. Music certainly embodies the circumstances of its production; but, as reception history shows us, it is also available to the present for as long as it is disseminated and consumed. To subordinate theory to history is essentially to abdicate contemporary aesthetic responsibility; in effect, to let the past think for the present. There would, in point of fact, be no reception history to constitute the object of historical research if the guiding mentality of historicism held sway. To argue that we have passed from a time that generates discourse to a time that generates discourse about discourse, as Foucauld did, is simply not good enough. 9 We can hardly fight to curate the museum culture that dominates art-musical performance on the one hand, whilst insisting, as Taruskin does, that scholarship should play no part in developing the means to construct it afresh in the present.

The passage from these issues to more charged political debates rests on a twofold misconception. In the first place, the affiliation between modernism and an array of hegemonic cultural-political tendencies problematises coeval theories, but it does not problematise theory, understood as a general field of intellectual activity. There is no impediment to the development of theories that speak to marginal repertoires or communities, or alternative histories. What, for instance, would a theory of sonata form look like if it focused on music from Clara Schumann to Nadia Boulanger, or from Spohr to Szymanowski, instead of Beethoven to Bartók? Or what if its geographical anchor was London instead of Vienna (as Anselm Gerhard has argued for our definitions of classicism), or the USA instead of Western Europe? More radically, we could imagine an approach to sonata form (or any


8 “[I]t would appear that an awareness of the provisional and contingent nature of all statements about music, of all positions, is increasingly paralysing the impulse to analyse’; see Craig Ayrey, ‘Debussy’s Significant Connections; Metaphor and Metonymy in Analytical Method’, in Anthony Pople, ed., Theory, Analysis and Meaning in Music (Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 1994), 127–51, at 129.

other form) that refutes the concept of a centre altogether: in effect, a de-centred theory, which instead examines the perspectival counterpoint arising when Vienna, London, Leipzig, Warsaw and St Petersburg are taken as multiple vantage points for a given repertoire. Of late, such questions have been the focus of historical research; but they all have theoretical resonances and theoretical potential, which remains largely untapped. At the same time, we have to retain the ability to engage meaningfully with canonical repertoire. The theory of sonata form might well encompass Spohr or Clara Schumann, but it mustn’t lose sight of Beethoven, because Beethoven’s impact on Western musical history and culture cannot be retracted.

As an activity coordinated more precisely with the origins of modernism, analysis evinces a closer fit with the terms of the historicist critique than theory. But again, there is no reason why analysis can’t be liberated from its modernist origins, and yet still be maintained as a legitimate scholarly activity. For if we acknowledge the possibility of postmodern theory, howsoever defined, then we also acknowledge the necessity of its application, in which context the transition from theory to analysis is located. A de-centred theory of sonata form still requires the analysis of sonata-type works, if the theory is to have any claims to epistemological or empirical credibility.

The search for models of theory and analysis that respond strategically to postmodern critique has been a major motivation of my own research. To my mind, the theorist’s core challenge in this environment is to negotiate between the kinds of historical understanding that arise when we reconstruct music in its cultural context, and the kinds of analytical understanding made possible by theorising forms outside of their historical context. The intersection of these perspectives is not an irritation, as Taruskin seems to think, but an opportunity.

**Case Study: Concerto First-movement Form and Postmodern Theory**

Issues of first-movement form in the nineteenth-century piano concerto are especially attractive for this remit, because the structure of ideas appropriate to its understanding breaches almost every constraint imposed by the limitations of canon and geography. Broadly speaking, the theory of concerto first-movement form has been grounded in the high-classical canon, and orientated around Vienna; but the post-classical piano concerto is negligibly orientated towards Viennese high-classical precedent up to 1850, and troublingly cosmopolitan in its geographical distribution.

Theory, on the other hand, has tended to narrow the canonical and geographical field of vision for this practice. Hepokoski and Darcy’s explanation of the afterlife of the Mozartian ‘type-5’ first-movement form in terms of its gradual convergence with the symphonic ‘type-3’ or ‘standard-textbook’ sonata clearly exemplifies this. Citing Beethoven and Mendelssohn in particular, Hepokoski and Darcy identify the effective ‘collapse’, by the 1830s, of the type 5 into the type 3. They characterise this as a species of modernism, styling composers persisting with the type-5 variant (they nominate Brahms) as atavistic, reverting to an older model under the rubric of monumentality.

Although the significance of this trend is hard to contest, any attempt to install it as an historical master narrative founders on the sheer disparity between the quantity of works comprising the performing and theoretical canon, and the variety of the repertoire as a whole. Theoretical perceptions of the genre up to 1850 usually reference concerti by Beethoven, Chopin, Mendelssohn, Schumann and Liszt, amounting to no more than twelve works in total. But the practices evident in concerti by Dussek, Cramer, Steibelt, Field, Hummel, Kalkbrenner, Herz, Moscheles and many others—in short, in the body of works habitually classified under the rubric of the ‘virtuoso concerto’, which is to say the vast of majority of works representing the genre in this time—suggest alternative histories, in which the type-5 sonata is sometimes expanded, sometimes compressed, and sometimes not only reduced to its type-3 sibling but also merged with the symphonic movement cycle.

---

10 A more expansive presentation of this material will appear in my ‘Formal Type and Formal Function in the Post-Classical Piano Concerto’, in Nathan Martin and Steven Vande Moortele, eds., *Formal Functions in Perspective* (Rochester: University of Rochester Press, in press).

I raise this point not simply as an historical corrective, but because it exposes the gap between the empirical basis of Formenlehre’s normative assertions and the diversity of the repertoire they seek to explain. Theories of concerto first-movement form have, from Koch’s Musikalisches Lexikon of 1802 to Hepokoski and Darcy’s type-5 sonata, orientated themselves overwhelmingly around Viennese-classical models and especially Mozart. But the body of music in the post-classical lineage exhibits a plurality, which is not reducible to the absorption or misprision of Mozartian principles.

Mozart, in other words, has become central to what William Weber has called the ‘pedagogical canon’: the body of pedagogical writing and the repertoire that is evidentially central to it, which over time conditions what we regard as normative to a given form. For the piano concerto, this has had the historically misleading consequence of orientating around a Viennese core a geographically diverse repertoire, which spanned multiple centres from London to St Petersburg and fed an international employment market and concert circuit. Discrepancies between this repertoire and Mozartian norms cannot be explained away as misreadings of an historical progenitor. As various commentators have shown, the dissemination of Mozart’s concerti was protracted and had scant impact on the concert life of London, Paris, Berlin, Leipzig and even Vienna before 1820. A Mozart-orientated formal theory is therefore unhelpful not only because it imposes a system of norms on a diverse repertoire, but also because it assumes a largely illusory continuity of influence.

In purely numerical terms, the dominant tendency between 1790 and 1850 is to retain the type-5 model but foster various habits differing from Mozart’s practice. Composers generally favour a modulating first ritornello (R1), often closed with a tonic reprise of the first theme. Ritornello and solo exposition (S1) usually share second themes, but present distinct first themes; and the absorption of virtuoso idioms into the solo part removes the need for a cadenza, which (Beethoven notwithstanding) becomes exceptional from Dussek’s Op. 14 of 1791 at least.

Table 1: Corpus

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Composer</th>
<th>Work:</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Beethoven</td>
<td>5 concerti</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Bennett</td>
<td>concerti nos 1–4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Chopin</td>
<td>2 concerti</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Cramer</td>
<td>9 concerti</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Dussek</td>
<td>12 concerti</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Field</td>
<td>7 concerti</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Henselt</td>
<td>1 concerto</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Herz</td>
<td>4 concerti</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Hiller</td>
<td>2 concerti</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Hummel</td>
<td>6 concerti</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Kalkbrenner</td>
<td>4 concerti</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Liszt</td>
<td>2 concerti</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Litolff</td>
<td>5 concerti</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Mendelssohn</td>
<td>2 concerti</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Moscheles</td>
<td>6 concerti</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Schumann</td>
<td>1 concerto</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Steibelt</td>
<td>8 concerti</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Weber</td>
<td>2 concerti</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Total:</strong></td>
<td><strong>82</strong></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>


Table 2: Post-classical form-functional practices

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Practice:</th>
<th>Explanation:</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Functional redistribution</td>
<td>Migration of functions within a single level of the grouping hierarchy (e.g. liquidation of a motive completed within continuation function; cadential function occupied with prolongational harmony).</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Multiple generation</td>
<td>Enlargement of intra-thematic level through novel application of extension and expansion techniques.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Functional transformation</td>
<td>Transformation of one function into another within a single level of the grouping hierarchy (Schmalfeldt’s functional ‘becoming’).</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Functional elision</td>
<td>Elision of intra-thematic, inter-thematic or large-scale functions through maintenance of an active bass progression.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Cadential deferral</td>
<td>Relocation of a structural cadence outside of its expected functional context.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Table 3: Glossary of terms and symbols

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Term:</th>
<th>Meaning:</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>A</td>
<td>first theme</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>B</td>
<td>second theme</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>C</td>
<td>closing section</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>A¹, B¹ etc.</td>
<td>reprise</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>A1, A2, A3; B1, B2, B3 etc.</td>
<td>new material under the same function</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>a1, a2, a3; b1, b2, b3 etc.</td>
<td>motives within the same function</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>TR</td>
<td>transition</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>RT</td>
<td>retransition</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>R1, R2, R3 etc.</td>
<td>ritornello succession</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>S1, S2, S3 etc.</td>
<td>solo succession</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>PAC</td>
<td>perfect authentic cadence</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>IAC</td>
<td>imperfect authentic cadence</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>HC</td>
<td>half cadence</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>MC</td>
<td>medial caesura</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>⇒</td>
<td>functional transformation (‘becoming’)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>⇔</td>
<td>elision</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

I want today to focus specifically on the thematic syntax that underpins these practices, by rethinking the concepts of tight- and loose-knit organisation formulated by William Caplin.⁴ In Viennese-classical music, Caplin associates the former with the closed, unitary designs of first themes, and the latter with multiform, cadentially elusive subordinate-themes. In the post-classical concerted repertoire, this distinction becomes hard to sustain, because a degree of formal loosening often characterises all functional contexts. Five such techniques are notably common, outlined in Table 1 (see previous page); the terminology I adopt in the analyses is explained in Table 2, and the meaning of symbols and acronyms I was is given in Table 3. As I hope to show, these categories are significant not only for thematic design, but also because they compel reformulation of the weighting and disposition of functions at higher grouping levels; in other words, they bear directly on how first-movement form changes in this period.

Redistribution of Functions

Many R1 A themes in this repertoire loosely retain classical proportions, but reassess the internal distribution of functions. Hummel’s Concerto Op. 113/i (1827), shown in Example 1, offers a clear

instance. Bars 1–11 exhibit an antecedent-continuation-cadence grouping structure, but question its typical functional characteristics. Bars 1–4\textsuperscript{3} imply an antecedent function, from which bars 4\textsuperscript{4}–8\textsuperscript{4} flow as a continuation. This, however, has the hallmarks of liquidation: Hummel isolates a motive from the statement (marked ‘a3’) and diminishes it towards the phrase’s apex in bar 7. Bars 8–11\textsuperscript{2} occupy a cadential position; but any suggestion that the V\textsuperscript{7} chord in bar 8 will resolve cadentially is dispelled by its deceptive move towards vi, and the tonic is attained in bar 11 via a linear bass ascent. As a result, A\textsuperscript{0} is confirmed as tonic by the voice leading, but not by cadential bass motion. Hummel seems both to dissociate function and rhetoric (the expected cadence fails to materialise), and also to relocate associated thematic processes (liquidation occurs in the continuation, not the cadence).

Example 1: Hummel, Op. 113/i, R1 A

Proliferation

The rather more spacious R1 A of Hummel’s Op. 89 (Example 2; 1819) exhibits a characteristically post-classical tendency towards phrase enlargement, achieved through a technique I call proliferation, by which I intend a syntactic promiscuity whereby multiple, often nested continuations ensue from a basic idea or statement. On the largest scale, Hummel’s theme has the character of a sentence, prefaced by a two-bar introduction: bars 3–18 function as a presentation; bars 19–40 comprise a long continuation; and bars 41–45\textsuperscript{1} furnish a cadence. Both presentation and continuation are, however, considerably distended. The presentation is itself periodic: the statement and response resemble an antecedent-consequent pair, even though the consequent cadence is deflected by a persistent 6/4; within this, localised sentential characteristics are also evident. The basic idea of the antecedent, which is one half of the statement within the overall sentence, can itself be partitioned into a two-bar statement and its response, a subdivision that naturally also obtains in the first four bars of the consequent. Altogether, the presentation phrase yields no fewer than five syntactic levels, all housed within a larger intra-thematic span.
Example 2: Hummel, Op. 89/i, R1 A

Allegro moderato

presentation
statement | response
antecedent | consequent
introduction
basic idea | contrasting idea
statement ("a") | response | statement

continuation
continuation phrase 1
model
contrasting idea
response
continuation phrase 2 (fragmentation - "a" only)
repetition
continuation phrase 3 (fragmentation - "a" only)
cadence (PAC)
The continuation, in contrast, makes use of what Caplin would term extension rather than expansion. Bars 19–26 comprise the statement and repetition of a four-bar model derived from the theme’s basic idea, from which bars 25–40 extract the first two bars (labelled a1 and a2), which are then spun out in two stages: bars 25–32 progress from i to V via an intervening Neapolitan region; bars 33–40 continue the concatenation of two-bar units over a gradual chromatic bass ascent from V to i, reached at the start of bar 41. The cadential phrase is then linked to the continuation as the terminus of a liquidation process, which takes hold from bar 27. In the cadence, motive ‘a2’, already isolated in bars 39–40, is diminished and given a new rhythmic identity in continuous quavers, set against its inversion in the bass.

Whereas the syntax of these themes remains tangibly linked to Viennese-classical precedents, for solo-entry themes composers developed novel designs, which evince the convergent evolution of syntax, topic and organology. Examples 3–6 show S1 A themes and TR openings by Dussek, Field and Chopin, each overlayed with syntactic analyses. Example 3 quotes Dussek’s Op. 29, published in 1795. It reveals three formal components, each conveying a distinct topic and fresh material. The soloist enters with a bravura preface, comprising a chordal presentation phrase split into statement and response, and continuation and cadence adorned with arpeggiated or scalar flourishes. A periodic ‘singing allegro’ follows, which I will call a cantabile episode, and which in later works cultivates the nocturne style. Finally, TR initiates a brillant display episode, demarcated (allowing for the persisting C in bar 112) by a PAC.

This design encapsulates the three basic topical elements, and therefore expressive postures, of the virtuoso style: bravura; singing style; brillant. Dussek’s London concerti of 1790–1801 are seminal to this style, because they both harnessed and compelled changes in piano design, especially as undertaken by Broadwood. Dussek’s bravura idiom was coeval with the expansion of the instrument’s compass, which Broadwood enlarged to six octaves by 1792; and his cantabile style capitalised on Broadwood’s refinement of the sustaining pedal, introduced in its modern form by Backers in London in 1772, an innovation that eventually spawned the nocturne style.

In later works, Dussek refined this threefold division of labour. In Op. 49 of 1801 (Example 4), the topical succession is more succinct: the preface divides into statement and response, each comprising basic and contrasting ideas; and the cantabile episode is periodic, although the balance of cadences between antecedent and consequent is unorthodox, depending on whether we regard the cadence in bars 133–4 as a PAC or an IAC with a displaced degree 3.

Dussek’s concerti verifiably furnished a model for John Field, who completed his apprenticeship under Clementi in London between 1793 and 1802. His Concerto No. 1 of 1799, the S1 A of which is shown in Example 5, closely follows Dussek’s example. Field writes a preface split into cadential flourish and post-cadential suffix, a sentential cantabile episode, and a brillant transition culminating on a V HC MC. And like all of Dussek’s examples considered, Field’s S1 A has no thematic precedent in R1. The cantabile episode here tends even more strongly towards the nocturne style, anticipating Field’s contribution the evolution of that genre.

The influence of Dussek remains palpable in Chopin’s concerti, notwithstanding their evident debts to Field, Hummel and Kalkbrenner. Example 6 shows S1 A and the start of TR in the first movement of Op. 11, completed in Warsaw in 1830. The preface–cantabile episode–display episode succession is retained and sharpened articulate. The preface is periodic and invokes Dussek’s prefatory rhetoric; the cantabile episode is enlarged into a small-ternary nocturne; and TR again comprises a display episode. Function, grouping and topic are precisely aligned: the preface closes with an IAC, the cantabile episode with an elided PAC. At the same time, the integration of S1 and R1 is more thorough here, because both S1 A elements have an R1 precedent: the preface is based on R1 A; the cantabile episode on R1 TR.
Example 3: Dussek, Op. 29/i, S1 A (solo only)
Example 4: Dussek, Op. 49/i, S1 A (solo only)

S1 A

Piano

response

contrast episode

antecedent

consequent

IAC or PAC?

TR (display episode)
Example 5: Field, Concerto No. 1/i, S1 A and TR (solo only)
Example 6: Chopin, Op. 11/i, S1 A (solo only)

S1 A  
prelude (R1 A-based)

statement (has antecedent character, but no cadence)

(Allegro maestoso)

Piano

R1 A *Hauptmotive*

response (or consequent?)

Pno.

cantabile episode (small ternary, R1 TR-based)

presentation

statement

response

Pno.

celli

IAC

contrasting middle

Pno.

legatissimo

S1
Functional Transformation

In the concerti of Dussek and Field, there is relatively little correspondence with Mozart. Later first-theme designs – particularly those of Moscheles and Sterndale Bennett – show evidence of the hybridisation of the virtuoso repertoire with Viennese precedents. Moscheles’ concerti are notable in this respect, providing a tangible bridge between models developed in London and Central-European tendencies (he trained in Prague and Vienna, but moved to London in 1825, and eventually to Leipzig in 1846). The solo entry of his Op. 58 (1820; Example 7), evinces both Dussek’s first-theme rhetoric and more Beethovenian strategies of continuity, particularly the tendency for formal functions to transform as they progress, which Janet Schmalfeldt has identified as the process of ‘becoming’, and which I here define as functional transformation.\(^\text{15}\)

Moscheles begins with a statement-response bravura preface, each element of which divides into basic and contrasting ideas, and which presents new material; thereafter, cantabile and display elements alternate within three phrase groups, a presentation and two continuation phrases, delineated by three mediant half cadences. A and TR are not functionally differentiated; instead, one function transforms into the other within the same grouping. This is reflected in the mingling of topics: the modulation to III is underscored from bar 141 by a shift to display rhetoric. The threefold S1 topical discourse nevertheless remains intact, even though its components are not clearly differentiated by cadence.

Example 7: Moscheles, Op. 58/i, S1 A (solo only)
Moscheles is also more motivically minded than Dussek or Field. The cantabile episode presents a variant of R1 A, yielding two strands of motivic action: bars 141–3 extract and liquidate the motive labelled as ‘a1’, which measures 147–52 then take up in inversion. In fact, the movement is monothematic, deriving R1 and S1 A, B and C in from the same material, the only such ‘type-5’ first-movement form I have discovered in this repertoire.

**Harmonic Elision and Cadential Deferral**

Moscheles’ blurring of the boundary between A and TR indicates a potential for functional elision, of which later music makes extensive use. In the type-3 first movements of Mendelssohn’s concerti, this is achieved by maintaining active bass progressions across form-functional divisions. Example 8 shows a clear instance in the first movement of his Op. 25 of 1831. The transition arrives conventionally enough on a medial V/III at bar 72, but this does not preface a subordinate-theme entry securing the new tonic. Instead, V/III persists as a pedal, over which the second-theme presentation begins in measure 74. Rather than proceeding belatedly to a mediant cadence, however, the continuation is shaded with modal mixture, which becomes a platform for a modulation to flat V, in which key a PAC ensues in bars 81–3. Multiple subsequent continuation phrases fail to cadence in this key; a process of liquidation takes hold from bar 103, but this is not cadentially affiliated, leading instead to a return to III in bars 110–117, coincident with the brief return of A-theme material. A mediant B-theme presentation is initiated in bar 117, the display episode character of which confers on it closing-section rhetoric, but the music is not post-cadential, the first mediant PAC occurring in bars 121–2, that is to say between presentation and continuation.

Altogether, although Mendelssohn preserves the rhetoric of cantabile B group and display C section, the correlation of inter-thematic function and the disposition of cadences is systematically disrupted. The resulting misalignment is appraised in Example 9, which shows that the tendency to withhold
bass resolution in fact persists at the end of the exposition, because Mendelssohn sets up a cadential trill over V/III at bar 152, which never resolves. Instead, the exposition transforms into the development via a series of sequences culminating with the retransitional dominant entering in bar 165. The bass elisions here play havoc with classical syntax at two grouping levels. Because the medial V/III is only resolved cadentially at the end of the closing section’s first phrase, the inter-thematic succession TR–B–C is effectively suspended over a single active bass; and because there is no coincidence of cadence and expositional close, the large-scale succession exposition–development also lacks articulation.

Example 8: Mendelssohn, Op. 25/i, B; start and end of C
Example 8 (cont.)

Example 9: Mendelssohn, Op. 25/i, bass diagram of A, B, C, development and start of RT
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Conclusions
Here, then, is a theoretical terrain, which hardly justifies the accusation that theory is complicit with canon formation, organicism, the pursuit of unity, or the tendency to form historical meta-narratives around geographical centres. The approach, to be sure, borrows concepts from *Formenlehre*, and (in Example 9) from a loosely Schenkerian base. But these ideas are applied without canonical or geographical prejudice: Mendelssohn and Chopin cohabit with Dussek, Field, Moscheles and Hummel; and no effort is made to privilege Mendelssohn, as a representative of Berlin and Leipzig, or Hummel, as an inhabitant of Vienna, over Dussek and Field, whose practices evolved in Paris, London, St Petersburg and Moscow, or Moscheles, who represents both English and Germanic contexts, or Chopin, whose concept of the concerto is formed in Warsaw. This, in short, is a cosmopolitan repertoire, and it demands a theoretical attitude that renounces any Austro-German anchorage.

Moreover, the analyses seek no overarching, unifying element. On the contrary, they proceed from the guiding notion that these works are comprehensible through reconstruction of their syntax, the large-scale concatenation of which generates the nature of their sonata forms, and the intertextuality of which supplies the groundwork for any notion of a concerted practice obtaining in this time. We can comfortably assert that theory should seek a language for describing the properties of a given corpus, which can then be used to generate scholarly discourse, without insisting that such a language captures a set of higher-level principles. A theory that admits empirical provisionality and the limitations of its corpus of data is a theory nonetheless.

The scholarly labour that such theory performs, in this context and generally, is, to my mind, indispensable for any musical research agenda. Indeed, theory and analysis survive precisely because they are essential to the broader endeavour of thinking about music: theory because academic discourse on music requires specialised language; analysis because the generation of discourse about music cannot occur at all unless specialised language is applied to music itself. I am wholly in favour of making this discourse historically responsible, if that means ensuring it against the dangers of assuming that the music of a small number of canonically privileged composers enshrines a set of historically invariant universal principles. But I would reject Taruskin’s suggestion that the claims of theorists are simply fictions awaiting verification or refutation by historians. What this argument overlooks is the ‘creationism’ inherent in his own historicism. Taruskin’s assertion that novel theories have ‘no reality beyond the historical conditions that give rise to [their] premises – … which can be uncovered by means of historical research’ could equally be applied to the premises underpinning historical research itself, which, after all, is at base an historically mutable set of attitudes towards a body of evidence, not a search for facts.

I would prefer to see theory, analysis and history as equally legitimate modes of discourse: the former constructs the aesthetic object in the present; the latter constructs its manifold social and cultural contexts in the past. These modes of discourse can and should converse, ideally in the spirit of mutual reinforcement. But they can also go their own separate ways, for as long as music is available to us for analytical as well as historical scrutiny. The fact that my reading of (for example) Mendelssohn’s music marshals concepts, which would have been unrecognisable to Mendelssohn and his contemporaries has no bearing whatsoever on the reading’s plausibility; it simply tells us that, in this instance, analytical and historical discourses are misaligned. The possibility of such misalignment, and the tolerance required to guarantee its continued acceptance in the academy, are the hallmarks of a properly humane musical scholarship.

Julian Horton’s Keynote Address was given at the TAGS conference in Royal Holloway on 2nd May 2014. If you would like to respond in the Newsletter to any of the issues raised above please write to information@sma.ac.uk.
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Notes from ‘Confronting the National’
Third Sibelius Academy Symposium on Music History
Sibelius Academy, Helsinki, 21–23 May, 2014

A conference about nationalism in music and musicology is not necessarily where music analysts will normally choose to travel unless, like me, one happens to be preoccupied with such matters. But ‘Confronting the National in the Musical Past’ (Third Sibelius Academy Symposium on Music History) pointed to issues that we as analysts would do well to reflect upon from time to time: the concentration of musical-theoretical and analytical literature in English and German; the great amount of music, even art music, that escapes analytical attention due to, in part, a history of canon-formation informed by nationalism; and even the power of received language to shape our thinking, i.e. the way nationalist, ethnocentric and exoticizing labels given to musical materials influence how we approach scores, performances and recordings. For my own benefit, I saw in this conference an opportunity to think out of the disciplinary box, meet people from other fields and get a glimpse of the latest research. But most importantly, I wanted to learn more about how academic writings on music were (and to some extent still are) predetermined by nineteenth-century nationalist thinking.

I was not disappointed. Celia Applegate’s opening keynote Affektenlehre: Johann Mattheson and the Origins of Musical Germany illuminated the patriotic discourse that ran through theoretical treatises in the early eighteenth century and even much earlier (she took us all the way back to the sixteenth, if memory serves). This demonstration of how ‘the national’ was entrenched in music treatises before nineteenth-century nationalism and modern Musikwissenschaft was an important corrective to our usual nineteenth-century-centric view. On the second day, Philip Bohlman’s keynote Indian Music before India purported to take us further out of our respective Eurocentricisms. Bohlman showed how Indian nationalism clustered around both ancient traditions and the appropriation of ‘national’ musical genres (such as Irish airs) imported from Europe. This would strongly challenge any model of musical nationalism based on the European experience and that the same time the parallels with the latter are still striking. I was not sure whether Bohlman was advocating we should seek an alternative theory or to Indian nationalism or just modify Gellner, Anderson, Hobsbawm, Anderson, Smith et al., but his musical examples of identity formation could actually fit into or at least recall several modernist, primitivist and ethno-symbolist theories of nationalism, irrespective of these theories’ Eurocentric origins. But then I also know I might be thinking this way because I am not close enough to this area of research.

Due to the conference’s parallel sessions and my own time limits, any roundup of the papers will only highlight a fraction of the full programme. I was broadly interested in two of the conference themes. First, the construction of nationalist academic discourses, which was addressed in the above keynotes as well as a number of other papers (most notable of which, in my view, was Elaine Kelly’s Golden Ages and Cautionary Tales: Music History and National Identity in the German Democratic Republic). The other conference theme that interested me was about composers and performers who constructed their identity through musical responses to nationalism and ‘the national’, which resonated with my own Liszt paper. This was also the theme that touched on the role, and sometimes absence, of music analysis in such studies. I imagine this latter issue is of greater interest to most SMA members, so I will concentrate on this for the rest of the review.

In fact, I would like to address a problem raised by Julian Horton in his TAGS keynote, in response to Taruskin demand to make analysis subservient to history (see this Newsletter, p.13). My view is that meaningful analysis is always subservient to a research question. Of course we can analyse for fun, or for pedagogical purposes, rather than as part of a well-formulated research. But when we publish scholarship, we usually use it to answer particular questions. In that sense analysis is simply a technically rigorous mode of closely reading texts (or performances, or recordings) in pursuit of such questions, and so it may be affiliated with music theory, or history, or culture studies etc., or a combination of several disciplines. I don’t know how much damage Kerman et al. did to the discipline in real terms. Music theory seemed to suffer very little. On the other hand,
to judge by music history conferences I have attended, including this one, there seems to be a scarcity of analysis in historical studies. I am beginning to think that the problem was not the ahistoricism of analysis as much as the established disciplinary norm of music historiography with no musical-analytical input. Could it be that the real damage of the debates from the 1990s was done to music history more than theory? I certainly think so.

But not all is doom and gloom: analysis is always present where scholars retain their inquisitiveness about the working of the music they explore, and this was still evident in some papers. Actually, in all fairness (1) not every historical question requires music analysis (I’ll return to that point) and (2) getting the balance right between technical detail and deep historical or cultural analysis is a difficult thing to pull in 20-minute papers. With the latter point in mind, I am happy to report that Florian Scheding’s Strategies of Migration: Between Nationalist Nostalgia and Internationalist Heterotopia, struck a particularly happy balance between cultural and musical analysis. By identifying and interpreting the change in technique and musical materials used by Hanns Eisler and Mátyás Seiber, composers who fled Nazi Germany, he was able to highlight an interesting dialectic relationship between national memory and international ideology. Scheding’s careful arguments and analysis demonstrated effectively how particular (and ostensibly abstract and non-national) techniques can be understood to reflect an anti-Fascist internationalist ideology whilst expressing nostalgia for the homeland. That such a thing is possible is precisely why Scheding’s analysis could prove a useful model for examining other instances of music composed in exile.

There were other papers dealing with music under the shadow of oppressive politics, but most skirted an in-depth reading of the musical content. For example, Martin Lücke’s Jazz in Nazi Germany: German vs. American Jazz: A Narrative Construction gave plenty of examples of the Nazi appropriation of Jazz, especially the way in which the most ‘racially undesirable’ musical elements were cleaned out, whereas supposedly ‘German’ elements (such as the sound of strings) were strengthened. Granted that 20-minute papers allow only so much to be shown, a slightly deeper analysis of fewer examples could have still questioned the success of this putative Germanization, rather than just underline the differences between American and German jazz during 1933-45. In other words, analysis could complicate simple assumptions about oppression and cultural difference. What struck me with equal force, listening to the fascinating recordings played by Lücke, was the unstoppable jazziness that was still played by approved German bands. It actually exposed the fallacy and impossibility of cultural purity, and the power of the performing musician—particularly in the realm of instrumental music—to outwit the censor. A close reading of these subversive elements could have given us a more complicated (and truer, I think) picture of a transcultural influence that consistently undermined the ideology of race purity whilst appearing to propagate it on the surface.

Another paper which looked at issues of music and race purity from a different angle was Anne Sivuoja-Kauppala’s Wainö Sola’s Artistic and Cultural Agendas in Creating La Juive in the Finnish National Opera (1925). Sivuoja-Kauppala probed the actions, and possibly tortured mind, of one of Finland’s greatest Finnish tenors, who also happened to be a xenophobic nationalist and anti-Semite who invested much of his time in the 1920s translating, planning staging, and singing the lead male role in — of all operas — Fromental Halévy’s La Juive. As one would expect from such a personality, Sola portrayed the character of Elazar in a way Goebbels would have approved of. I was struck by the sheer operatic investment in such a negative enterprise, and how Sola transformed himself into a Fegin-like character, both on stage and in the promotional posters. It was as if he was exercising ‘the Jew’ out of what he perceived to be Finnish purity, but in the process becoming possessed by a nightmare of his own creation. This was a fantastic example, in my view, of how extreme othering came at a personal cost. (Did the aesthetic grow on him? Did he enjoy it? How?). Music analysis could certainly help with some questions. To give a simple example: is it possible he sang this role in a particularly distinctive way that sheds light on ideology and construction of identity?

But I am really not suggesting music analysis is needed in every instance: sometimes the circumstance in which any particular music was performed is clearly more significant than the particulars of the musical content (or put differently; those particulars will tell us little or nothing about this significance). Jonathan Rosenberg’s Border Crossings: Leonard Bernstein in Berlin was clearly one such
case. Providing a rich biographical, cultural and political analysis of Bernstein’s and the New York Philharmonic’s historical 1960 visit to Berlin, Rosenberg showed how Bernstein’s individual ideas and insistence on intoning a Jewish prayer before performing Beethoven’s first piano concerto as conductor and soloist complicated the original idea and message of ‘strengthening and warming American-German relations’, as conceived by the American government and the Ford corporation that sponsored the trip. The choice of Beethoven, the quintessentially German yet universal composer, was completely in tune with Bernstein’s complex personal messages as well as the official political idea of ‘strengthening relations’. So what is there to analyse? Bernstein’s composition? Bernstein’s playing? By his own testimony, we know Bernstein did not play as well as he wanted on that occasion, probably because his manic multitasking did not leave much time for practice. What would a close reading of the performance yield? It really is about the symbolic circumstances of what was played rather than the music itself. Unless we discover something really significant in very occasional mishaps (as in ‘he omitted notes in the theme used by the Third Reich!’), or the slipping in of some politically meaningful gesture (‘Listen! He gives the Hungarian-Turkish elements in the finale a jazzy AND Klezmer twist!’), I don’t see why we should go into Bernstein’s notes in this context. The methodologies used for that paper were completely appropriate for the kind of questions it investigated.

On the other hand, there are aspects to the construction of musical identities that really do cry out for deeper musical-analytical readings. In my own field, Liszt has been subjected to competing nationalist narratives, emphasizing his Hungarianness, Germanness or Frenchness as the case may be, or in some respect accepting or condemning him as a cosmopolitan with no fixed nationality. More recent scholarship (e.g., Gooley, 2004; Damien Erhardt, 2008; my own book, 2011) looked more critically and nationalist (including Liszt’s own) constructions of his identity, as well as its heretofore neglected, misunderstood or suppressed transcultural aspects. One glorious role for music analysis informed by such a transcultural perspective is to reveal the cultural complexity behind supposedly monolithic musical representations of nationality, highlighting the multivalent or even contradictory ‘meanings’ of the same material; or highlighting extremely abstract use of material beyond representation and stereotype; or further interpreting the novel compositional role of such materials. I could go on: the potential for musical-analytical development in this field is vast. I hope something of this came out of my paper Liszt’s transcultural composition in the year of the Franco-Prussian conflict.

But whatever it is I had to contribute to this conference, I got much more back: critiques of nationalist historiographies that resonated with my own, a clearer perception of nationalist biases hidden in supposedly abstract theories of tonality and form, and fascinating case studies of identity construction in composition, performance and music pedagogy (with regard to the latter, it is with great regret that I had to absent myself from the third keynote, Tomi Mäkelä’s Teaching Music Nationally).

Despite its belligerent title, ‘Confronting the National’ was a relaxed and enjoyable affair, thanks to the affable hospitality of the organizers, the many cultural events surrounding the conference the laid-back atmosphere of Helsinki during the heat wave. It remains to thank and congratulate the organizers: Vesa Kurkela (chair), Anne Sivuoj-Kauppala, Heidi Westerlund, Lauri Väkevä, Veijo Murtomäki, Kaarina Klipiö, Markus Mantere (special thanks), Olli Heikkinen, Sajialeena Rantanen, and ‘our’ very own Derek Scott (I note with questionable national pride). My thanks also to the SMA’s Development Fund for sponsoring my participation. In fact, I should end by disclosing that this piece was commissioned by the SMA; and this is also why I have been banging on about the role our discipline can play in confronting the national.

Shay Loya

Click on the links for further information about Confronting the National and/or the SMA’s Development Fund. Some of the themes in this conference were also covered in the recent 2:2014 issue of the Finnish Music Quarterly. Incidentally, if you are interested in finding out how musicology can be made more accessible to a wider audience, this journal is a good place to start. Even hard-core music analysis is not beyond its remit: see Jarkko Hartikainen’s ‘Seeking the shape of music’.
Notes from the BFE-AAWM Conference
SOAS, London, 1–4 July 2014

The Analysis, Cognition and Ethnomusicology (ACE) Conference took place at the School of Oriental and African Studies (SOAS), London, in the first four days of July. This was a joint Meeting of the Third International Conference on Analytical Approaches to World Music (AAWM 2014), and the Annual Conference of the British Forum for Ethnomusicology (BFE 2014), featuring over 100 papers and three keynote addresses by (in order of appearance) Nicholas Cook, Martin Clayton and Laudan Nooshin. It was hosted by the Department of Music SOAS as well as the Institute of Musical Research (IMR) at Senate House, and associated with the Centre for Music and Science (University of Cambridge). The SMA’s involvement comprised of financial assistance and also being represented there by a special panel I have convened, of which later.

Why were we involved? AAWM was launched about four years ago and since then went from strength to strength. It is not exactly an organization in the formal sense as an interest group that started as an international conference (see their 2010 CFP), and then expanded also into an online journal that has seen five issues since its launch in 2011 (see also Lawrence Shuster’s summary on p. 36 of this Newsletter). But both conferences and journal are part of a greater ongoing convergence among historical/critical musicology, ethnomusicology, music theory and cognitive studies that has accelerated in the last decade — a trend theorised in publications by Nicholas Cook, Georgina Born, Wim van der Meer and Laudan Nooshin among others. Such a massive trend is pulled by different interests and agendas, of course. Perhaps not every agenda is that friendly to the kind of scholarly activities that engage most SMA members, but on the whole the trend itself is very good for our discipline, in the way it opens up new repertoires and challenges traditional theoretical norms.

Analysis has taken a battering in the 1990s, prompting several defences— memorably by Kofi Agawu in 2004 (Music Analysis, 23/ii-iii) and more recently by Julian Horton’s TAGS Keynote. It is the inherent malleability of the discipline and the intellectual curiosity of its practitioners that nullifies such attacks in the first place. Moreover, many of us have already moved some time ago into analytical studies of music that transcend West-versus-rest divisions. As institutionalised boundaries continue to dissolve, the systematic and rigorous analysis of music is no longer regarded, at least not by serious scholars, as some form of Western intellectual imperialism, to be kept with a barge poll away from the study of ‘non-Western’ music. If it were, then a joint conference of AAWM and BFE would have been all but impossible.

Nevertheless, some institutional divisions were still apparent through the simple fact that this was a joint event, organised by two different bodies with two different conference traditions. Panels did not mix: they were either based on 30-minute analytical papers, or 20-minute ethnomusicology ones. This says absolutely nothing about the excellent coordination and relations between the BFE and AAWM, and this being early days one can understand the practical and logistical difficulties of a more complete merger. Perhaps in future it would be possible to integrate the two traditions in a single conference so that the boundaries are further dissolved, and delegates have an even greater chance to mix with and meet scholars across disciplines.

With over 100 papers spread over four days, a structure of four parallel sessions, three keynotes and concerts galore, the organisers and formidable team of student helpers (with unforgettable tee-shirts) should be applauded for making the whole thing run like a well-oiled machine. But all this richness is also difficult to capture in one review: in fact, this is not the kind of review that should attempt such a thing. Looking solely at the more analytical part of the conference, papers theorised all manner of musical parameters across cultures from melody, harmony, rhythm, metre, sound/timbre and so on to ostinato patterns, cycles, improvisation, schemata and gesture. Familiar tonal theories, most notably pitch-class-set, Schenkerian, and generative theories, were put through their paces as they ventured beyond their cultural comfort zones. But if you really want to get a sense of the content you should take a peek at the programme and abstracts. As I mentioned, a more fulfilling review, selecting a few papers
and picking up more specific themes from this conference, may be forthcoming: watch this space.

The SMA panel at SOAS, left to right: Shay Loya, Mark Gotham and Costas Tsougras

But I should get back to the SMA’s contribution. I explained why we were involved but not so much how. Apart from the sponsorship, we were represented by a special panel (no. 26 in the programme) entitled ‘Traversing Disciplinary and Geographic Continuums. As the title suggests, there was a fortuitous geographic continuity between my paper that focused on Transylvanian Gypsy-band music, Mark Gotham’s (University of Cambridge) which looked an Balkan music, and Costas Tsougras’s (Aristotle University of Thessaloniki) that applied (Lehrdhal’s) generative theory to the polyphonic singing tradition of Epirus in North Greece. Furthermore the middle (Mark’s) paper on metre and rhythm counterbalanced the two outer papers that concentrated on pitch. We also progressed from the near past (nineteenth-century and early twentieth-century repertoire) to the present. So it was a really nice, well-balanced and coherent session, I thought; and happily it was well attended and well-received too, with plenty of follow-up discussion, even if my time-keeping left something to be desired.

Anyway, this panel took place on day 3 of the conference by which time the SMA’s profile was already raised so to speak. As the panel’s chair I originally planned to speak a little about the SMA’s involvement when our session started and read out a message from our President, Julian Horton, to those attending our session. But fortunately, in an early meeting on the first day of the conference Richard Widdess kindly suggested I should address the whole conference in the more imposing surroundings of the Brunei Gallery Lecture Theatre, just before Nicholas Cook was due to give the first keynote. And so I did, which certainly meant we got more attention. I was also able to read out Julian’s message, now addressed to all of the delegates. It sums up, in more elegant prose, some of the points I have made above about the purpose of our involvement:

‘One of the happiest consequences of the pluralism that defines our present scholarly environment is a new rapprochement between analysis and ethnomusicology. Disciplines, which may in the past have seemed irretrievable distant, have come together over the shared territories of performance, cognition and expression; structural commonalities between the musics of widely dispersed cultural contexts have returned decisively to the research agenda; and repertoires that until recently seemed beyond the pale of analytical engagement are now comfortably within its purview.

The energy behind these developments is amply attested by this year’s joint BFE/AAWM conference, which brings together an extraordinary diversity of papers around its theme of Analysis, Cognition and Ethnomusicology. I would like to take this opportunity to congratulate the programme committees of the AAWM and the BFE and the conference organisers. I’m delighted to offer the Society for Music Analysis’ wholehearted support, and look forward to many fruitful affiliation in the future’.

In my view, this healthy growth that Julian describes above counteracts the shrinking habitat of our discipline in other fields. So when the AAWM came to town, as it were, all the SMA needed to do was seize the opportunity and signal our interest, show that we really do welcome analytical research ‘in all musical repertoires and cultures’ as our home web page declares. And so we did: sponsorship, panel and welcoming message—a good start. But the fourth aspect of our involvement is perhaps the most important, namely the fruitful affiliation in the future’. Julian hinted at. It has already started, in fact, through informal networking during and after the conference, and will probably lead in the short term to some involvement with the next AAWM 2016. Expect more news to follow.

Shay Loya
Guest Article: Introducing the AAWM
Lawrence Shuster (College of St Rose, Albany, NY)

Unlike many scholarly music organizations, AAWM is not a society but rather a coalition of closely coordinated groups that have emerged as result of the enthusiasm following the success of The First International Conference on Analytical Approaches to World Music held in February 2010 at the University of Massachusetts Amherst (AAWM 2010: UMASS) and organized by Kalin Kirilov, Rob Schultz and myself with the intention of providing a unique interdisciplinary forum in which to explore the panoply of global musical traditions, both past and present, from the broadest possible array of theoretical, cultural, historical and analytical perspectives. Keynote addresses were delivered by Kofi Agawu and Michael Tenzer. Subsequent instalments were held at The University of British Columbia (AAWM 2012: Vancouver) with keynotes by Stephen Blum and Robert Morris; and, most recently at SOAS (AAWM 2014: London) featuring keynotes by Laudan Nooshin, Martin Clayton and Nicholas Cook. The fourth instalment of the conference series (AAWM 2016: New York) will be co-hosted by The New School for Jazz and Contemporary Music and the CUNY Graduate Center in June 2016 featuring Jay Rahn and Richard Widdess as keynote speakers. The current organizing committee consists of John Roeder, Michael Tenzer and me.

The open-access, online journal Analytical Approaches to World Music (AAWMJournal.com) was established by Rob Schultz and I in 2010 to in order to provide a much needed publications outlet for scholars engaged in analysis of world music whose research was often marginalized as result of either being too ‘technical’ or ‘analytical’ for mainstream ethnomusicological publications; or, conversely, too ‘exotic’ for theory journals with their emphasis on western art and popular music. The current editorial team consists of Daniel Goldberg, Peter Manuel, Jay Rahn and myself. More recently the AAWM Journal has added a Chinese language edition edited by Ya-Hui Cheng that includes translations of select articles from our English version, as well as original contributions in Chinese.

Ya-Hui Cheng and I also co-chair the Society for Music Theory Interest Group on Analysis of World Music, which sponsors presentations, panels and special sessions on analysis of world music and provides an important link connecting AAWM to the broader music theory community of North America. The group’s activities for the upcoming SMT annual meeting in November will include a special session on global hip-hop featuring Eric Cherry, Ellie Hisama and Michael Berry, in addition to a panel session devoted to ‘Cycles’ featuring Kofi Agawu, John Roeder and Michael Tenzer.

The Society for Ethnomusicology Special Interest Group on Analysis of World Music sponsors similar types of activities within the SEM community. Forthcoming activities for the upcoming SEM annual meeting in November include a special session Rob Schultz and I will be presenting on contour theory.
An invitation to

KeeleMAC

International Music Analysis Conference and Summer School
Keele University, UK, 6-10 July 2015

Keynote speakers & Summer School tutors:
Prof. Amanda Bayley (Bath Spa)
Prof. James Hepokoski (Yale)
Prof. David Neumeyer (Texas)

Conference organizer:
Dr Nicholas Reyland (Keele)

The Society for Music Analysis UK invites you to its next conference, which will be held at Keele University from 8-10 July 2015. ‘KeeleMAC’ will be preceded by the Music Analysis Summer School for Postgraduate Students from 6-7 July 2015. We are honoured to announce our keynotes and Summer School tutors will be Professors Amanda Bayley, James Hepokoski and David Neumeyer. The KeeleMAC CFP, plus Summer School application details, will be issued by major international musicology e-mail lists and appear on the SMA website in October. All enquiries, in the meantime, should be directed to Dr Nicholas Reyland (n.w.reyland@keele.ac.uk).
**Diary**

**September 17–21 2014, Leuven Belgium**

**VIIIth European Music Analysis Conference (EuroMAC)**

[www.euromac2014.eu](http://www.euromac2014.eu)

---

**October 19-21, 2014, Montreal, Canada**

**Gérard Grisey, the spectral moment, and its legacy**

**October 19-21, 2014, Montreal**

A bilingual colloquium and concerts co-hosted by McGill University, Université de Montréal, CIRMMT, and OICRM


---

**24 October, 2014, University of Oxford**

**Schubert as Dramatist**

Keynote Speaker: Lorraine Byrne Bodley (National University of Ireland, Maynooth)

Organizers: Joe Davies (University of Oxford) and Sholto Kynoch (Artistic Director, Oxford Lieder)

[www.oxfordlieder.co.uk](http://www.oxfordlieder.co.uk)

---

**19 November 2014, 10:00-18:00, Chancellor’s Hall, Senate House, University of London**

**Re-thinking analysis and music performance**

Delegate fee payable.

[http://events.sas.ac.uk/imr/events/view/16438/Re-thinking+music+analysis+and+performance](http://events.sas.ac.uk/imr/events/view/16438/Re-thinking+music+analysis+and+performance)

---

**29th November 2014, School of Music, Cardiff University**

**The SMA's Music Analysis Workshop (for postgraduates)**

Call for participants: Expressions of interest should be sent to Martin Curda (curdam@cardiff.ac.uk) by Friday 31st October 2014.

[http://www.sma.ac.uk/event/music-analysis-workshop/](http://www.sma.ac.uk/event/music-analysis-workshop/)

---

**6-10 July 2015, Keele University**

**KeeleMAC and SMA Summer School**

Keynote speakers & summer school tutors:

- Prof. Amanda Bayley (Bath Spa),
- Prof. James Hepokoski (Yale),
- Prof. David Neumeyer (Texas)

Conference organizer: Dr Nicholas Reyland (Keele University)

See advert in the Newsletter. A CFP will appear in the next Newsletter.

---

**2-4 October 2015, National University of Ireland, Maynooth**

**CFP: The European Salon: Nineteenth-century Salonmusik**

Keynotes: Professor Susan Youens, Professor Glenn Stanley, and Professor Harald Krebs

Deadline for abstract submission: 6 February 2015

Procedure for the award of grants from the
Music Analysis development fund

1. Grants to Individuals

The Editorial Board of the Journal makes grants from its Development Fund in the form of support for travel and subsistence to UK-based students and scholars working in the discipline of music analysis to attend conferences abroad, to consult library and archival resources or to pursue other comparable research activities. Individual grants will not normally exceed £500.

The Board will also consider requests from individuals for forms of support other than those detailed above. Such requests might concern, for instance, the acquisition of microfilms or photocopies of sources, or assistance with the preparation of material for publication.

Criteria governing the award of such grants are: i) the academic strength of the planned research and its relevance to the study of music analysis; ii) the financial need. Applicants should therefore give a brief (c. 300-word) account of the research to be undertaken and/or research material to be obtained, explaining its relevance to music analysis; additionally, they should give details of any other applications for support that have been made, or should explain why funding is not available from other sources. Student applications should be supported by a supervisor’s reference.

The Board does not fund sabbatical leave or research assistants.

2. Grants to Support Conferences and Other Meetings

In addition to offering grants to individuals, the Board supports UK academic conferences, seminars and meetings concerned wholly or in part with the discipline of music analysis. Support is offered in three forms: i) a guarantee against loss; ii) a grant to assist with the travel and subsistence of a senior scholar from overseas; iii) a grant to support the attendance of students delivering papers on a music-analytical subject, or of students registered on courses including a substantial component of analysis. The Board will not normally entertain applications for more than one of these forms of support for a single conference or event.

Applications should be supported by a draft programme or a brief (c. 300-word) account of the conference or event; additionally, they should give details of any other applications for support that have been made, or should explain why funding is not available from other sources.

3. Application Procedures

Applications, either in writing or by email, should be addressed to the Chair of the Editorial Board at the address given in each issue of the Journal. Applications will be considered and awards made by a sub-committee of the Editorial Board. There are no application deadlines; each application will be considered on receipt. Applicants may normally expect a decision within one month of their application.

SMT international travel grants

International Travel Grants are available for the purpose of attending Society for Music Theory (SMT) conferences. Application information can be found on the website of the SMT’s Committee on Diversity: http://www.societymusictheory.org/grants/travel