Contents

Editorial Shay Loya .................................................................2
Letter to the Editor Karishmeh Crawford.................................................................3
President’s Letter: EuroMAC Roundtable Julian Horton ..................................................4
TAGS Prize Essay Christopher Tarrant.................................................................5
Schoenberg at 140: Legacy and Reminiscence Danielle Hood ...................................17
2 Reviews of EuroMAC 2014 ..................................................................................18
   Review I Katherine Williams ........................................................................18
   Review II Rebecca Thumpston ..................................................................20
SMA Music Analysis Workshop Martin Curda.........................................................22
Research Projects ..............................................................................................23
   The Solfeggio Tradition Nicholas Baragwanath ..........................................23
   News from the Schenker Project William Drabkin ....................................25
   Japanese Horror-Film Music Shay Loya (Hannah Bayley) ..........................25
   Diary ........................................................................................................27
Editorial

At the close of 2014, we are delighted to print in these pages Christopher Tarrant’s TAGS Prize Essay. Tarrant applies, or rather adapts, Darcy and Hepokoski’s Type-2 sonata model to a reading of a symphonic movement by Nielsen from the turn of the twentieth century. He is fully aware that the theoretical model is anachronistic (hence its adaptation) and only uses it insofar as it helps illustrate the sense in which the recapitulation ‘accelerates’. For the same purpose, he adapts Schenkerian techniques and synthesises them with his ‘Type-2’ reading. Overall, theories (in the plural) are used here in the service of the historically and analytically particular.

In some sense this reminds us of the issue raised by President Julian Horton in last May’s TAGS address (see September 2014 issue), particularly the important role present-day theory can play in the interpretation of the musical past—pace New Musicological attempts to circumscribe its reach. Horton reiterated his position recently at EuroMAC, 2014, and this is duly reported in his President’s Letter. Also from EuroMAC 2014, we have two reviews by, respectively, Katherine Williams and Rebecca Thumpston.

Martin Curda has reviewed the SMA’s first ever Music Analysis Workshop, which he had co-organized. He happily reports about the interest the workshop day has generated, and the multiplicity of disciplines represented within it, which seems to dispel the ‘ivory tower’ status of analysis. In that sense, Curda’s piece can be read jointly with Karishmeh Crawford’s Letter to the Editor, which expresses concerns about music theory’s (in)accessibility. There are other interesting links between this issue’s articles. For example, Danielle Hood similarly reports about a subdisciplinary convergence in a recent Schoenberg conference. Her enthusiasm for a lecture-recital session sympathetically echoes Crawford’s championing of ‘performative approaches to analysis,’ and also linked to Charles Wilson’s differentiation between ‘perceptibles’ and ‘observables,’ as reviewed by Curda.
Members’ news and publications will have to wait for a 2015 issue (apologies to those who have already sent materials). However, I am happy to report that we have two new sections. Crawford’s ‘Letter to the Editor’ launches a section that will be populated, I hope, with more letters in future issues. The intention is just to create a livelier Newsletter and foster a sense of scholarly community. Do send your thoughts to me!

Also new is a section about research projects. As can be seen from the three individual items by Nicholas Baragwanath, William Drabkin and myself (on behalf of Hannah Bayley), the idea is to give members news of current, funded projects of any size, and thereby also some sense of research funding opportunities. For this reason I very much welcome contributions from postgraduates too, especially recipients of special or less familiar research grants.

Finally: don’t forget that the closing date for the Summer School and KeeleMAC is the 5th January 2015 (see Diary for other events with approaching deadlines).

Wishing you a good Christmas break,

Shay Loya

Letter to the Editor

On Julian Horton’s Keynote and Related Matters

In his keynote address at TAGS 2014, Julian Horton, president of the SMA, defended an intellectual position without engaging in any disciplinary mud-slinging. Reading Horton’s measured rebuttal to Roger Parker and Richard Taruskin, I am especially reassured by the no-holds-barred rhetoric, which highlights the intellectual blind-sightedness of his musicologist colleagues. As a doctoral student studying under Horton’s supervision I am an interested party, of course. This background has also allowed me to appreciate the analytical detail that reinforces the main argument about music theory’s ability to illustrate present-day modes of hearing, while remaining historically sensitive where required. That being said, I cannot help but point out two seemingly innocuous omissions in this otherwise eloquent paper. First, Horton rightly states that music theory today continues to express a greater diversity of theories and methodologies than ever before, so it is disappointing he says nothing about the advent of performative approaches to analysis and analytical approaches to performance. Secondly, if music theory has experienced a renaissance, it is not only due to the currently fashionable neo-Riemannian theories and Formenlehre, but also due to an upsurge in analyses pertaining to the study of world and popular musics. But these are just minor quibbles in what is an emphatic and persuasive response to Parker et al.

My own scholarly pursuits fall outside the remit of Formenlehre and the classificatory vocabularies deployed by Caplin, Hepokoski, Darcy et al. Therefore, rather than debating specific points in Horton’s analysis, I would like to dwell for a moment on the author’s mode of discourse. First of all, as a fellow musician, I remain genuinely curious about the musical sources of motivation that have inspired such painstaking dedication to this corpus of piano concerti. More importantly, I feel that some of the most crucial aspects of this paper might very well be lost in translation, for Horton does not go a step further to point out other musical ideas that may engage the average student analyst who is not (yet) fluent in the author’s language. Issues of accessibility and inclusivity, while not directly associated with the keynote itself, are especially relevant in today’s changed educational landscape where music-theoretical knowledge risks being bartered about merely as academic capital, auctioned off to those bidders with the highest purchase power. While high-level academic writing need not substitute for light bedtime reading, we could all try to bring a certain vulnerability to the analytical enterprise from time to time. As I see it, Julian Horton’s paper is irrefutably a work of considerable brilliance that might benefit from a touch of restrained subjectivity. Enriched in this way, it has the potential to inform and influence analytically inclined musicians both within and outside the proverbial ivory tower.

Karishmeh Crawford
The EuroMAC Roundtable afforded the opportunity to present diverse views on the concept of the musical object, broadly understood as a central aspect of music-analytical, music-theoretical, and indeed music-historical research. Each participant developed a distinctive element of the debate surrounding this problematic idea. My own preference was to focus briefly on the relationship between the object of analysis and the competing claims of theory and history, since tensions between these two ways of understanding music have formed a persistent feature of recent research.

Attempts to subordinate theory to history constituted a major preoccupation of the new musicology in the 1990s. Accusations ranged from the claim that theorists were indifferent to the historical circumstances of the music they sought to explicate, to attacks on theory’s epistemological foundations, especially the idea that theory accessed quasi-scientific ‘truths’, which could be asserted regardless of their circumscription by shifts in cultural history and aesthetics. That these debates still have currency is attested by the recent exchanges provoked by Richard Taruskin’s revisiting of the analysis of octatonicism in Music Theory Spectrum, central to which is the view that theoretical assertions are evidentially baseless unless they find verification in history. As Taruskin argues, without historical contextualisation, theory is a fiction, which simply ‘perpetuates the absurdum of creationism’ (Richard Taruskin, ‘Catching Up with Rimsky-Korsakov’, Music Theory Spectrum 33/2 (2011), pp. 169–85, and 181).

Theorists have countered these accusations in part by historicising their discipline (Robert Gjerdingen’s work affords a benchmark instance). But I want to argue that theory’s epistemological legitimacy can be maintained without recourse to historical grounding. First, it is not clear that history itself possesses epistemological legitimacy of a kind that theory cannot attain. This argument assumes that music-historical narratives draw upon fact-based truth content, whereas music-theoretical narratives do not. But to argue for the objectivity of historical facts is surely to espouse a species of positivism that few historians would categorically endorse. In truth, history is in its own way as fictive as theory: both are ways of constructing narratives about music from a body of evidence.

Second, I would uphold the theorist’s right to construct new readings without recourse to historical context, even though my own analytical practice favours historical engagement. It is not excessive to state that the present’s enchantment with historicism has become a species of postmodern tyranny, which denies the present its novel right of response to past music. Music theory’s important task is therefore the construction of novel analytical readings, which respond to music as a phenomenon given in the present rather than inherited from the past. If we deny the validity of ‘presentist’ modes of engagement, then we also impoverish our dialogue with history.

Julian Horton
Durham University
President, Society for Music Analysis
TAGS Prize Essay
Structural Acceleration in Carl Nielsen's Symphony No. 3, Op. 27
by Christopher Tarrant

In the analytical literature surrounding Carl Nielsen's Third Symphony, composed in 1910-11, much attention has been given to the innovative strategies in the first movement's sonata form. Mina Miller remarks: '[T]he absence of a clearly defined tonic from the start, the mobile use of tonality, and an emphasis on continuous motivic development have led some to ask whether traditional sonata terminology is even applicable.'¹ This paper attempts a fresh reading of the first movement. Drawing on James Hepokoski’s and Warren Darcy’s Sonata Theory and Schenkerian voice-leading techniques, I will argue that the movement engages in a deep dialogue with the progressive sonata practices that were emerging in the later nineteenth century, especially Bruckner’s, and that the work is part of a wider trajectory in fin de siècle symphonic composition in northern Europe, particularly in the greater Baltic region from Copenhagen to St Petersburg.

Although there is broad agreement regarding its expositional layout, the tonal organisation of the movement has been a perennial point of discussion. The remarkable repeated unison A that opens the symphony (see Fig. 1) summons a kind of modernist response to the hammer blows that open Beethoven’s Eroica. A major emerges as the tonal destination for the movement, but it behaves locally as the dominant of D minor, a key which continuously questions the authority of A minor. Another point of intrigue in the exposition is the starting point of the secondary zone (Fig. 2), which is launched in A major (I). This does not obviously bear any meaningful relation either to A minor or D minor, and two readings have been offered for this tonal choice. The first, offered by Robert Simpson, is that ‘the eventual goal of the entire symphony is A natural major; this means that the opening attack is a determined attempt to reach this key, falling short at A flat.’² This seems to be a dubious proposition, since surely the main goal of any exposition is to achieve some sort of closure away from the tonic, and not to ‘reach’ it. The second reading, offered by Harold Krebs, is that the key choice is at the point of furthest remove from the origin, D minor, a tritone away. This is a more reasonable reading, and demands a comparison with Bruckner’s practice. Warren Darcy has noted: ‘Bruckner frequently employs the technique Hepokoski has termed “tonal alienation,” where a secondary theme occurs in a key other than the expected one - and is thus kept from the place of resolution.’³ This is certainly the case in Nielsen’s Third Symphony, as the theme fails to secure its own cadence; closure is eventually achieved by the more energetic closing zone a 3rd higher in C major. My own view is that the A major tonality could either be regarded as an upper chromatic neighbour to the dominant of the eventual point of arrival of the exposition, C major, thereby deferring the moment of closure and creating a schism between the modular layout and its tonal function, or alternatively as an expression of the ‘Northern’ hexatonic system, which contains both A and C.⁴

Another challenge for the analyst is to decide where to locate the beginning of the recapitulation, and this has remained a point of controversy. In the earliest large-scale English-language study of Nielsen’s music, Robert Simpson argued in 1952 for the traditional 3-part sonata form, in which an abridged launch of the primary theme in F minor leads into the recapitulation of the secondary material in E♭, down a 4th from its original appearance in A♭. Conversely, there are those who have argued that the design of the movement is an example of the reversed recapitulation type, in which secondary material is presented first. This reading was offered by the Danish critic Poul Hamburger as early as 1931, and is reinforced in Daniel Grimley’s recent study.⁵ Finally, Harold Krebs, who privileges tonal considerations over thematic ones, argues that a kind of false recapitulation begins at the same point identified by Simpson, but that the true recapitulation can only be said to have been reached very late in the movement when the first theme is retaken in D minor, so for Krebs the recovery of the original key is the governing factor.

⁴ See Cohn (1996).
⁵ See Hamburger (May 1931), referenced in Grimley (2010), p. 100.
Figure 1: Carl Nielsen, Symphony No. 3, Op. 27, first movement, bb. 1–20 (cont. below). All bb. nos. in subsequent music examples refer to the same movement.
Figure 1, cont.
Figure 2: The end of the caesura-fill and the beginning of the secondary zone in A♭ major, bb. 134–43.
The idea of a reversed recapitulation is an analytical commonplace, and has generated a great deal of discussion in the analytical and theoretical literature. Although Charles Rosen does not give much attention to the concept, he does write that

Ending a symphony or a sonata with the first theme forte was too common a practice for me to cite examples: if the reader cannot remember any, he can amuse himself by looking - he will find them with ease. The appearance of a recapitulation in reverse order - that is, second group and the first theme only at the end - is a rare variant of this technique. 

More recently, William E. Caplin has reinforced Rosen’s view, stating that ‘Some recapitulations delete the opening material of the main theme or even the entire main theme. At times the transition may be eliminated as well, and the recapitulation begins directly with the subordinate-theme area..’ A more specifically interpretative reading is offered by Timothy L. Jackson, who argues that in Bruckner’s symphonies the reversal of the order of themes in the recapitulation, and the associated uninterrupted Schenkerian Urlinie, produces a specifically ‘tragic’ formal pattern. He writes that ‘The idea of a second chance in the deep middle ground is foreign to tragic reversed sonata form. In the tragic context, the undivided upper voice and continuously unfolding harmonic-contrapuntal process parallel the inexorable unraveling of tragic destiny.’

However, the idea of the reversed recapitulation, tragic or otherwise, has been challenged in Hepokoski’s and Darcy’s Elements of Sonata Theory. In Sonata Theory the concept of rotation is considered to be foundational, governing the formal architecture and taking precedent over the tonal peculiarities of the music. The authors insist that the modules within any given rotation must always subsequently appear in the same order as they first emerged, owing to the specific functions that each fulfills. This makes the concept of a reversed recapitulation, in which the various modules reemerge in a scrambled succession, unthinkable within Sonata Theory, and movements in such a form are therefore usually regarded as examples of the Type-2 sonata, in which what seems to begin like a development section eventually begins to correspond with what appears to be a recapitulation of the second theme (Fig. 3):

It is inappropriate to claim that the ‘recapitulation’ in a Type-2 sonata ‘begins with S.’ Such an assertion, still commonly encountered, is one of several unfortunate consequences arising from the eagerness in the mid-twentieth century to define a sonata only in tonal terms, pushing to the side important considerations of thematic function and arrangement […] Type-2 sonatas do not have recapitulations at all, in the strict sense of the term.

References to P in the tonic at the ends of Type-2 sonatas are more accurately understood as codas existing in an extra space beyond the sonata form proper.

But while the ‘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 symphony, its strict application to the forms that were emerging around 1900, not least Nielsen’s, might be considered anachronistic. Grimley, in his analysis of Nielsen’s Third Symphony, observes that such a reversed recapitulation is in evidence when he writes:

---

8 According to Jackson (1997) the reversal of the order of themes in the recapitulation is associated with tragedy because of the effect it has on the formal plan as well as the place of the tonic, which is typically ‘suppressed or devalued’ (p. 143). He cites Aristotle, whose conception of tragedy arises from peripety, ‘a shift of what is being undertaken to the opposite,’ which is expressed in sonata form by the reversal of themes and the undermining of the tonic key.
The reprise clearly ‘fails’ [...] to obey the rule of symmetrical resolution - the crucial moment of double return, by which the first subject returns in the tonic at the start of the reprise, is here delayed (after an abortive start) so that it takes place only in b. 584, after the restatement of the second group (which also evades symmetrical tonal resolution). If the movement can indeed be understood as a deformational structure [...] it is only by suspending basic generic laws and conventions governing the category [...] In many ways, it would be more remarkable and noteworthy if the symphony clung closely to an anachronistically orthodox model.12

Notwithstanding the symphony’s clearly modernist conceit, the type of anachronistically orthodox model to which Grimley refers does indeed seem to emerge in the Type-2 reading, which adheres closely to eighteenth-century tonal goals: expositional closure is established in the mediant and structural closure in the tonic minor. And although comparisons have been made by Grimley and others between Nielsen and his Brucknerian, Mahlerian, and Elgarian inheritance, the Third Symphony arguably has more to do with Schubert’s sonata-form exemplars than with anything that came later.13 The idea of a tonally alienated secondary zone which gradually moves closer to its goal of achieving closure in a non-alienated key comes from Schubert’s chamber music, in particular his C major String Quintet, D. 956, the Quartet in G major, D. 887, and the Piano Sonata in B♭, D. 960. In such structures there is some sense of symmetrical tonal resolution, even if it is not directly related to the tonic; Schubert’s practice, recently observed by Suzannah Clark, of organising 5th-space around rather than from a proposed tonic provides a clear point of reference.14

We can therefore propose the radical formula of hearing the movement in line with Hepokoski’s and Darcy’s Type-2 sonata. That is to say, there is no recapitulation as such (see Table 1, comparing this interpretation to previous ones). After the end of the exposition we are presented with what sounds like the start of a development section, with its strong focus on primary-zone material. After a climactic point providing full closure in C♭ minor at b. 424 we are presented countergenerically with music from the closing zone which is heard in the place of the original medial caesura, dissipating energy and allowing the music to settle, only this time the music seems to have been tonally derailed, marooned on the remote sharpened 3rd degree, and contributing to the process of ‘alienating’ the S theme. Rather than hearing the next sounding of the main P theme as the start of some sort of abortive recapitulation in F minor, in the Type-2 reading it is experienced as a reminiscence of its previously stormy incarnation, a point of lowest ebb after the energy of the developmental music has been fully expended.

Fig. 3: Hepokoski’s and Darcy’s Type-2 sonata form, reproduced from Elements of Sonata Theory (Oxford University Press, 2006), p. 354.

Rotation 1

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Rotation 2</th>
<th>(Not-Sonata-Space)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Exposition</td>
<td>Development</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>P TR S / C</td>
<td>P TR S / C</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>I V V</td>
<td>V? modulatory</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>(Episodic</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>substitutions</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>(If this section</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>is provided; it</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>typically begins</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>with P!)</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

12 Grimley (2010), p. 103.
13 For more on Nielsen’s influences, see Fanning (2008).
14 See Clark (2011).
Table 1: Formal plan of Nielsen’s Third Symphony, Op. 27, first movement

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1</td>
<td>Intro</td>
<td>?</td>
<td>Exposition</td>
<td>Exposition</td>
<td>Exposition</td>
<td>Expositional Rotation</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>15</td>
<td>P</td>
<td>D</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>46</td>
<td>TR</td>
<td>g⇒</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>116</td>
<td>A♭: HC</td>
<td>A♭</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>137</td>
<td>MC</td>
<td>A♭</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>138</td>
<td>S</td>
<td>A♭⇒</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>226</td>
<td>S♭</td>
<td>C</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>259</td>
<td>EEC</td>
<td>C</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>259</td>
<td>C</td>
<td>C</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>284</td>
<td>Link</td>
<td></td>
<td>Development</td>
<td>Development</td>
<td>Development</td>
<td>2nd Rotation</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>297</td>
<td>P</td>
<td>A</td>
<td>Preparation Zone</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>331</td>
<td>P</td>
<td>g⇒</td>
<td>Central Action</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>424</td>
<td>c♭</td>
<td></td>
<td>Climax - PAC</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>424</td>
<td>c♭</td>
<td></td>
<td>Recapsulation</td>
<td>‘False’ Recapation</td>
<td>‘True’ Recapitation</td>
<td>Coda Rotation</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>452</td>
<td>F</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>483</td>
<td>S</td>
<td>E♭</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>562</td>
<td>S♭ (failed)</td>
<td>A</td>
<td>Reversed Recapation</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>584</td>
<td>P and S! (Brucknerian apotheosis)</td>
<td>d</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>‘True’ Recapitation</td>
<td>Coda Rotation</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>614</td>
<td>TR</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>647</td>
<td>MC overridden!</td>
<td>d</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>682</td>
<td>S♭</td>
<td>F⇒</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>710</td>
<td>ESC</td>
<td>a</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>710</td>
<td>Coda</td>
<td>A</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Note: The table provides a detailed analysis of the formal plan of Nielsen’s Third Symphony, Op. 27, first movement, with annotations from various theorists and scholars.
Figure 4: Nielsen, Symphony No. 3, first movement, bb. 419-428, C₃ minor PAC.
This substitution of the closing theme for the medial caesura is countergeneric, since the modules do not appear in strict order. Hepokoski and Darcy write that 'within the developmental portion of Rotation 2 […] one would normally expect no elements of S or C […] to intrude. When they do, we would be dealing with an exceptional procedure (an expressive deformation) that would require special explanation.' The emergence of the closing theme functions here as the sink into which all of the developmental energy is poured. Unlike the original medial caesura moment with its positive, heroic connotations that are derived from the strong 6-5 shift in the bass and the 4-3 suspension, the caesura here is entirely negative, the C subminor full close suggesting that the tonal drama has somehow lost its way, and seeks temporarily to find closure after the developmental storm in whatever tonal port it can find (Fig. 4).

In this scenario, what sounds like an emerging recapitulation of the first theme provides no more than a convenient link to the low-intensity secondary theme, which is not treated developmentally and whose key relates by 5th to its original expositional presentation. It is therefore experienced as if it were part 2 of a recapitulation. We know from the exposition that the secondary theme is tonally alienated and cannot achieve closure in the desired key. At this point, however, the burst of energy that originally precipitated the expositional closure fails too, producing what Hepokoski and Darcy call ‘sonata failure’, in which ostensibly the tonal drama has somehow lost its way, and seeks temporarily to find closure after the developmental storm in whatever tonal port it can find (Fig. 4).

Alienated moments aside, the basic tonal objectives of the movement are fulfilled if we are to read it as an example of the Type-2 sonata. If we accept that the movement is in A minor then the exposition closes in the normative mediant of C major, and structural closure is achieved (albeit deferred to a redemptive coda) in the tonic A minor. The only tonal event that is missing is the double return of theme and key at the start of a proposed recapitulation - something that is not an obligation of the Type-2 sonata; indeed, it is essential in the Type 2 that this does not occur. The Type-2 reading is further supported by the reemergence of the stab chords of the opening bars at the junction between exposition and rotation 2, as well as at the start of coda space. These provide signposts to the listener that a re-launch is about to occur as each rotation approaches its thematic point of origin.

The outcome of this reading is a considerably more continuous form in which motion towards the anticipated and richly desired structural closure is continually accelerated, and built up over a much longer span which covers over 400 bars of music. This point is made by Grimley when he argues that 'the coda becomes more directionised as it proceeds, as though the movement begins to assert a stronger sense of gravitational pull as it approaches its closing bars.' The very late glance to F# minor at the end, and after the A minor closure has been established, serves further to accelerate the symphony as a whole, since its relation to A minor is not clear, but its reference to A major is compelling.

The sense of acceleration, experienced as a result of the retrospective realisation that formal signposts have been progressively overridden, is supported by Schenkerian thinking. Grimley has argued that analysis of Nielsen’s music in terms of contrapuntal reduction is problematic. He writes that ‘Nielsen’s music is not prolongational in any orthodox Schenkerian sense. The chromatic progressions in the first movement [of the Third Symphony] cannot ultimately be heard as diminutions of underlying diatonic structures, and it is difficult to construct models of voice-leading that demonstrate complete coherence between foreground and upper middle ground levels.’ While this may be the case at the foreground - perhaps increasingly so as Nielsen's music became ever more dissonant and tonally expansive in the years during and after the First World War - there is a certain coherence that can be demonstrated between the background and deeper middleground prolongations, shown in Fig. 5. The graph shows that the opening P and TR themes outline the initial ascent elaborating the Kopfton C, first articulated by the S theme as the 3rd degree of A major. This C is then prolonged in various ways, supported in the first place by a relatively standard bass arpeggiation at b. 259 over C major, and then by Mixtur at b. 424 which generates the cs: PAC. The Urlinie descends only at the end of the movement, at bb. 709-710, producing an uninterrupted background structure in similar fashion to those identified by Jackson in Bruckner’s symphonies. But whereas for Jackson the uninterrupted structure parallels ‘the inexorable unravelling of tragic destiny’,

---

16 See Hepokoski and Darcy (2006), pp. 245-249.
perhaps belying the mood on the surface of the music (particularly in the case of the Finale of Bruckner’s Seventh Symphony, with its sunny, optimistic E major), the tragic interpretation does not pass muster in the context of Nielsen’s Third. Although there is ‘sonata failure’ evident here, a fresh reading is still demanded, not least because of the energetic and exuberant musical surface.\textsuperscript{19}

Figure 5: Background and lower middleground prolongations in Nielsen’s Symphony No. 3, first movement.

One principle that is apparent in light of Sonata Theory is that there are generic markers, perhaps anticipated by an initiated audience, that are overridden, never to be reclaimed later in the movement. The generic multi-modular rotational scheme is laid out in the exposition with clarity, and salient thematic and cadential moments are clear, setting certain expectations for the rest of the movement. By the end of the exposition, the listener could feasibly still expect, after a development section, a clear return of P in either D minor or A minor, producing a Type 3 sonata and an interrupted Ursatz (Jackson’s ‘second chance in the deep middle ground’). As the S theme begins to be recapitulated in b. 483, the realisation is that this moment of double return has already been overridden. There has been an acceleration of the form in comparison to the generic markers established in the exposition. Similarly, the listener may expect closure to be secured with a I: PAC ESC by the S\textsuperscript{2} theme that begins at b. 562.\textsuperscript{20} This moment of closure is also overridden, propelling the movement into its long coda rotation. Closure is finally secured at b. 710 with a i: PAC, but this is immediately followed by the third scale degree being opened up, this time in the major mode, in what Grimley has referred to as a ‘radiantly uplifting sunrise’ that simultaneously ends the movement and opens up a fresh space for the rest of the symphony.\textsuperscript{21}

The structures identified in the sonata-theoretical and Schenkerian approaches that I have identified above, namely the Type-2 formal plan of the movement and its closely associated uninterrupted background structure, require careful interpretation. While Type-2 sonatas lend themselves more readily to the uninterrupted pattern, the two readings are by no means uniformly congruent, especially in major-mode works.\textsuperscript{22} The combination of the two does appear to be the case in some of Bruckner’s symphonic movements, most notably the finale of the Seventh Symphony, as well as the first movement of Nielsen’s Third. Although anglophone Nielsen scholarship is still in a relatively underdeveloped state at present, there is an overarching interpretation of this movement, which has been in existence at least since the 1950s, as

\textsuperscript{19} Jackson’s conception of the ‘tragic’ in sonata form operates on the level of deep structure - the Ursatz and its deeper middle ground prolongations. My own view is that it is important to remain in touch with the musical surface and its own expressive signifiers. In cases such as Nielsen’s Third Symphony, where Jackson’s tragic structure is not in accordance with the surface, a new reading of the structure is required.

\textsuperscript{20} In plain English, the Hepokoskian acronyms mean a perfect authentic cadence in the tonic key, in a secondary theme that temporarily behaves as a closing theme (S\textsuperscript{2}) by bringing the movement to its essential structural closure (ESC).

\textsuperscript{21} Grimley (2010), p. 127.

\textsuperscript{22} Hepokoski and Darcy identify the interruption halfway through Rotation 2 in their diagram of the Type 2 sonata, cf. Fig 1.
a stream of fluid musical energy. Simpson described the movement as ‘a tonal forge; everything is as fluid as molten metal’.\textsuperscript{23} Grimley’s more overtly modernist interpretation takes its cue from the context of scientific advancement that was in the public consciousness at the time of composition: Niels Bohr’s orbital model of subatomic structure leads Grimley to remark that the symphony’s opening gesture ‘is more properly a particle accelerator. The rapid bursts of energy or impulses that dramatically shatter the work’s silence are like a series of shock waves or sound barriers that rapidly gain momentum and seemingly begin to revolve, like charged particles orbiting a nucleus in Niels Bohr’s periheletic model of atomic structure [...] seemingly bending time itself so that we move from an entirely static, inert state towards a streamlined sense of things shifting constantly forwards into an expectant future tense.’\textsuperscript{24} The sonata-theoretical and Schenkerian interpretations I have offered above are partly intended to offer further support to this reading, and in particular the sense of structural acceleration that is experienced during the course of the movement. The idea of a Schenkerian Unterbrechung would, in a quite literal way, interrupt this sense of acceleration, rendering the Type 3 model, with its retrogressive referencing of the opening theme, rhetorically at odds with the work’s formal and expressive properties.

Nielsen was engaging with a form that is often characterised as being in decline after about 1770, but which enjoyed a period of resurgence in the decades around 1900. I have largely avoided discussing his specifically Danish and Nordic subject position because it seems clear that in the first movement the generic dialogue is primarily with a cosmopolitan, pan-European symphonic practice.\textsuperscript{25} ‘Nielsen the European’ is the subjectivity outlined here, compared to ‘Nielsen the Scandinavian’ or ‘Nielsen the Dane’ which becomes immediately apparent in the second and fourth movements of the symphony.\textsuperscript{26} Examples of the Type-2 layout emerge from diverse cultural, linguistic, and geographical contexts around the turn of the century, demonstrated in the first movements of Tchaikovsky’s Fourth and Sixth Symphonies, the Finale of Saint-Saëns’s Third Symphony, the first movements of Sibelius’s Second and Fourth and, arguably, the last movement of the Fifth, as well as the Finale of Mahler’s First. The fresh interest in the Type-2 structure is potentially indicative of a wider communicative strategy that was emerging at the time, and represents a move away from the reassuring certainties of the Beethovenian Type 3.\textsuperscript{27} While the Type-2 sonata combined with an uninterrupted Ursatz has the potential to carry both positive and negative narrative trajectories (as the other sonata types do), it can certainly be said that the first movement of Nielsen’s Third Symphony speaks in the ‘future tense’, to borrow Grimley’s characterisation, pointing a finger towards the rest of the work. When heard as a Type-2 sonata, the sense of acceleration can only be felt more powerfully and persuasively.

\textsuperscript{23} Simpson (1952), p. 58 and p. 61.
\textsuperscript{24} Grimley (2010), pp. 120-121.
\textsuperscript{25} For more on the way Nielsen’s practice closely parallels that of his European contemporaries, see Roth (2003).
\textsuperscript{26} Grimley takes the dichotomy of Nielsen’s provincial Danish childhood and cosmopolitan maturity as the starting point for his 2010 study.
\textsuperscript{27} Hepokoski has mentioned this as a point in passing in ‘Beethoven reception: the symphonic tradition’ in Jim Samson (Ed), The Cambridge History of Nineteenth-Century Music (Cambridge University Press, 2001), pp. 424-459. Interestingly, in his own analytical work Schenker avoided movements that eschew the double return of theme and key at the recapitulation. Gordon Sly has noted that there is not a single analysis by Schenker himself of a sonata movement whose recapitulation begins away from the tonic, with the one exception of Mozart’s Sonata in C, K. 545, the analysis of whose recapitulation is largely absent. See Sly (2001).
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**Schoenberg at 140: Legacy and Reminiscence**  
Christ Church University, 13-14 September 2014

Review by Danielle Hood

This conference marked Schoenberg’s 140th birthday by bringing together scholars specialising in different biographical and compositional aspects of the composer’s legacy. A packed programme encompassed all aspects of Schoenberg the man, the theorist, the composer, and the correspondent; indeed, the second day was given over almost entirely to the investigation of the vast amount of letters and documents kept by Schoenberg and his correspondents throughout his life. This resulted in a somewhat impossible task: to write a review of the conference with a leaning towards analytical studies. What this conference presented was rather a multifaceted, interdisciplinary investigation into Schoenberg’s life and works. It reminded me of Julian Horton’s recent TAGS keynote address, where he discusses the convergence of subdisciplines within musicology (see the September 2014 issue of the Newsletter). If anything, this conference has shown how this phenomenon works in practice.

Initial discussion centred on Schoenberg’s use of tonality, in which two analytical methods, offered by Arthur Kaptainis and Carlos de Lemos Almeda, focussed on Schoenberg’s early works. The latter presenter’s insightful and well set-out argument divided the early works into tonal styles based on an analysis of the First Chamber Symphony, op. 9. At the end of this session it became clear that discussions would be fervent, particularly in regards to Schoenberg’s Jewish identity, introduced by Jun Zubillaga-Pow’s presentation on the correlation between the cyclical form of the Second Chamber Symphony, and what the presenter coined a “Semitic” musical aesthetic. This theme continued into the second session which explored the relationship between Schoenberg’s religion and his political manifesto in Aoife Sadlier’s “Arnold Schoenberg’s quest for a Jewish Identity”, and Martin Brady’s exploration into Schoenberg’s employment of abstract film montages as an innovative solution to the Jewish prohibition against graven images. This session employed an interesting structure: the speakers completed their presentations then questions were directed at the three together. This created a more involved, cohesive discussion about Schoenberg’s religious decisions, such as his conversion to Protestantism rather than Catholicism as was more usual in Vienna at the time.

Fusako Makao provided insight into Schoenberg’s compositional process through an analysis of the metronome markings in his works, and at what point in the compositional and publication process they were added. This was followed by Gordon Root’s fascinating discovery of Schoenberg’s use of two-bar phrases as a consistent pedagogical material, which contrasts starkly from those of A. B. Marx and Stephen Krehl, in his Models for Beginners in Composition.

The session which sparked the most discussion, however, consisted of three lecture-recitals, in particularly Pina Napolitano and Hugh Collins Rice’s “Performing Form – Schoenberg’s Klavierstück Op. 33b: a Dialogue between Performance and Analysis.” In this paper Rice described the discussion of form, analysis and performance from the complementary perspectives of the performer and the analyst. The dialogue tackled the issue of the form of the piece; in particular what constitutes a recapitulatory moment: the analyst’s pitch analysis contradicted the performer’s more intuitive decision based on similarities in temporality and stability. This emphasised the methodological integration which connected these panels and Joseph Auner’s keynote “Schoenberg as Sound Student.” In this speech Professor Auner highlighted how an investigation into Schoenberg’s understanding and use of the word ‘sound’ in his pedagogical and theoretical writings, and his representation of sound in Die glückliche Hand through, among other things, Sprechstimme, colour, noise and gesture, encouraged a more coherent insight into the composer. It became clear throughout the day, therefore, that one cannot appreciate the complexity of Schoenberg’s output, musical or non-musical without an amalgamation of historical, analytical, theoretical and performance-led disciplines.

As mentioned, the second day focused predominantly on the relationship between Schoenberg and others through his correspondence. However there was also a performance-based theme running through the latter part of the day. The compelling theory put forth by Severine Neff, for example, was that a recording of a performance could be analysed in
the same manner as a score, demonstrated convincingly as she outlined ‘how Leibowitz would interpret Stravinsky’s Le Sacre du Printemps with a Schoenbergian analysis in the mind’s ear and eye.’ Steven J. Cahn finished the day showcasing his use of a technique developed by the National Institute of Health for generating matrix images of recorded music. These were then analysed with regards their symmetry, repetition and formal factors among others.

The atmosphere which abounded throughout this conference was one of interest and enjoyment all around, evinced by the final roundtable discussion in which the problems the vast array of musicological terminology created was considered, but also by the reluctance of all participants to leave—a problem resolved by a general agreement to retire to the pub.

Danielle Hood
University of Leeds

2 Reviews of EuroMAC 2014
17-20 September, University of Leuven, Belgium

Review I, by Katherine Williams
The eighth European Musical Analysis Conference (EuroMAC) at the University of Leuven was an enormous conference, featuring over forty ‘sessions’ (affectionately dubbed ‘mega-panels’), several keynotes, guest lectures and round tables, and hundreds of delegates from all over Europe and North America. Leuven was a suitable location for a conference of this size: the historic university dominated the city (as proved by the fact that eduroam worked throughout!), and the university had plenty of lecture rooms for all the necessary parallel sessions, and spaces for coffee breaks. There was also a historic town centre, with Belgian beer bars and pavement cafes for after-hours socialising. The town was somewhat monopolised by music analysts and theorists: more than one of my coffee breaks at a pavement café was accompanied by the sound of intellectual opinions about timbral virtues (scholars at the table next door were comparing warm bowed string sounds with other sonic families—nasal sounds like oboe won out), and set theory.

The conference was designed (by the conference committee chaired by Professor Pieter Bergé) as a series of mini-conferences: the call for papers invited pre-composed sessions, lasting a day or more. Individual accepted papers were then arranged into ‘post-composed’ sessions. A cross-section of the theme titles offers an idea of the large a varied scope of this conference: music theorists; form; harmony, tonality and post-tonality; popular music and jazz; computational and mathematical analysis; music analysis and the body; music theory pedagogy; and Schenkerian theory.

The sheer number of sessions, and the countries represented, presented a logistical puzzle. The conference committee resolved this by designating rooms to different languages: sessions held in English, French, German, Swiss, and the all-encompassing ‘Euro-room’ (with papers mostly in English) were listed as such in the conference programme, and marked out by flags on the doors of the lecture theatres. With such a huge number of papers on offer, I needed to work out a strategy for my attendance. Rather than hopping from session to session, I decided to attend most of the keynote and roundtable sessions, and otherwise as much of pre-decided sessions close to my research area (popular music and jazz) as I could. This strategy provided me with a cross-section of current work being undertaken in music analysis, and a deeper understanding of my specialist field. As ever, the follow-up discussions and informal networking at coffee breaks proved valuable: in one particularly memorable conversation, I had a lengthy discussion with an Italian scholar about different interpretations of the same hand signals in different European countries.

My participation of EuroMAC 2014 began on Thursday 18th September, with Allan Moore’s panel ‘Analysing Popular Music: A View From 2014’. Professor Moore designed the panel to offer an overview of the current state of popular
music analysis, with scholars both explaining the theory behind different modes of analysis, and other scholars putting them into practice. Thus papers from the morning’s ‘Theory’ session (Dai Griffiths ‘Elevating Form and Elevating Modulation: So-called Popular Music as Music and Discourse’, Ruth Dockwray ‘Signifying Space: The Sound-Box’, and Anne Danielsen ‘Structure and Flexibility: Microrhythm in Groove-Based Music’, were put into practice in the afternoon’s ‘Corpus Analysis’ session. For example, my own paper, “This record is dedicated to me”: Rufus Wainwright’s Ego’ situated sound-box analyses (explained by Dockwray) in a biographical and social context. Structuring the session in this way allowed threads to be drawn between panels, and the generous amount of time allowed for questions and discussion enabled arguments, theories and case studies to extend. The late afternoon panel, ‘Detailed Readings’ (Kenneth Smith ‘A Neo-Riemannian Approach to Suede’, Justin Williams ‘Intertextuality and Lineage in We Ain’t by The Game, and André Doehring ‘Meaning and Alternating Form and Groove In Four Tel’s Electronic Dance Music’) extended modes of analysis and case studies still further. The range of genres covered in this popular music session was astonishing, especially as ‘popular music analysis’ is usually implicitly restricted to popular song.

Allan Moore began Friday morning’s ‘Interpretation’ panel by reinforcing his view of recorded song as the dominant experience of listening in pop (‘Addressing Meaningfulness in Popular Song’), thereby underlining the themes in his recent book Song Means (Ashgate, 2012). His suggestion that the persona in popular song is always a construction set up themes for Stan Hawkins’ paper in the same session, ‘Gender Performativity and Agency in Popular Song’. Professor Moore had encouraged the scholars that spoke on Friday morning to apply different methodologies to some of the case studies discussed the previous day, thereby connecting the papers in the session further.

The final session of ‘Analysing Popular Music: A View from 2014’ was a roundtable discussion of how the discipline has developed since the first popMAC conference in 1992, and the second in 2013. Major themes that emerged from this session were that the term musicology has been naturalised over the last 25 years, and that 25 years ago analysts that came to popular music brought their own techniques with them (indeed, Moore’s first book—Rock: The Primary Text, 1993—was in part a response to the dearth of resources available for teaching the analysis of popular music), but now popular music analysis use methodologies that have been developed specifically for the music (as exemplified by Michael Spitzer’s and Kenneth Smith’s papers). Stan Hawkins suggested the term ‘popular musicology’ be adopted. A theme that emerged is that there are generally considered to be two sides to music analysis: Western Art Music, and pop. While techniques from Western Art Music often inform popular music analysis, this weighting is rarely reversed.

In the afternoon of Friday 18th, I hopped over to the session organised by Barbara Bleij, on ‘Jazz Harmony: Theory and Practice’. Analysis of the kind practiced in most papers I attended divorces the musical content from its situational surroundings, as exemplified by David Maw’s ‘Chord-Voicing and Chord-Type in Oscar Peterson’s Standard Playing of 1959’, which focused on Peterson’s piano voicings. Here my own bias in jazz scholarship came to the fore, as I struggled to remove any contextual or musicalological setting. In ‘Notions of Mode and Modality in Jazz Harmony’, Barbara Bleij used Wayne Shorter’s music to explain the difficulties of applying a Western Art Music harmonic framework to jazz, suggesting that instead of attempting to capture jazz within an established tonal framework, we develop one that is specific to the modes used. As in the pop session, a need for suitable criteria for the music under consideration can be seen.

Some of these questions were debated further in the evening roundtable, where a group of senior representaties (mostly presidents) of music theory/analysis societies from across Europe discussed ‘The Object of Analysis—practices and theories’. The group comprised Mario Baroni and Alessandro Bratus (Italy, Gruppo di Annalisi e Teoria Musical), Julian Horton (United Kingdom, Society for Music Analysis), Francis Maes (Belgium, Vereniging voor Muziektheorie), Nicolas Meeus and François Picard (France, the Société Française d’Analyse Musicale), Tatiana Tsaregradskaya (Russia, Obshchestvo Teorii Muzyki), and Christian Utz, (Austria, Gesellschaft für Musiktheorie). The group discussed whether the object of analysis need be historically grounded, or whether it can be removed from its historical context to be discussed in the present. Another issue was whether the objectification of music leaves out a lot of pertinent historical detail, and whether music analysis should therefore focus more on the intertextual field between the composer, performer and listener. There was a sense of missed opportunity in the fact that most of the time was spent on reading out prepared positions rather than developing the
argument further in a debate. At least everyone had an opportunity to hear fresh positions on this issue from people who are at the forefront of advancing the discipline in their respective countries. Whether this can or will translate into action remains to be seen. From my popular music standpoint, it was a refreshing insight into the current Western Art Music analysis scene.

On Saturday 20th September, I attended some of the ‘Analysis Beyond Notation in 20th and 21st Century Music’ session. These papers expressed ways of thinking about music, and representing music, in ways that went beyond conventional Western notation. Mario Baroni, Roberto Caterina, and Fabia Regazzi suggested using a spectrogram to indicate levels of brightness and roughness in psychoacoustic analysis. Mario Lutz used pictures of bodily movement, and graphic representation of social interaction, to analyse performance as musical process. Freya Jarmen’s paper ‘Teaching Music Analysis to a class of Undergraduates with Radical Subject-Specific Diversity’ demonstrated that notational literacy is not the same as musical literacy. Freya developed a method of thinking about music (including Western Art Music such as Carmen) that was accessible to students from other disciplines, and a way of graphically realising their analyses without relying on Western notation. An interesting side effect to this research was that students that already had some notation literacy were more reluctant to step outside the score and realise their analyses in pictorial form. Although we frequently think of notation as the conversational musical language, Dr. Jarmen’s paper revealed that reading music can be a constraint to imaginative analysis. This paper brought my experience of the conference full circle—I ended as I started—using non-notational systems of analysis. However, having been to so many analytical papers, and having heard so many different ways of understanding and thinking about music, my end point was very far from where I began!

As a side note, Richard Taruskin’s key-note (‘Is Anything Unanalyzable?’) was held in a different venue in the city on Saturday evening. The walk to the venue resembled a lemming’s path, as theorists/analysts emerged from different alleyways to converge on the route towards the theatre. It’s the only keynote I’ve ever seen where attendants spill out of the door to get in—and once inside, the audience turned rapt attention on their speaker. And Taruskin did not disappoint. He gave a history of his times in musicology, verbally attacking those critics who have said he attacks analysis (both those present, like Suzannah Clarke, and those absent, like Arnold Whittal). Concerns he has with the discipline include a suspicion on the focus on the composer’s input into the musical text, the similarity that he sees between analysis and sketch studies, and the circularity between needing to see that a work is analyzable before beginning to analyse it. Taruskin’s two-hour keynote did not leave time for questions, as delegates were keen to attend the Belgian beer reception laid on by KU Leuven.

Overall, this was an enjoyable and rewarding conference. The sheer scale of it shows that music analysis is alive and thriving, and the confluence of scholars from different countries provided a warm and welcoming site to share ideas and network with colleagues. I am grateful to the SMA for the financial support that enabled me to attend.

Katherine Williams
University of Plymouth

Review II, by Rebecca Thumpston

Following previous meetings in Colmar, Trento, Montpellier, Rotterdam, Bristol, Freiburg and Rome, EuroMAC celebrated its 25th anniversary this year in the small but culturally rich university town of Leuven in Belgium. The eighth European Music Analysis Conference brought together over 500 music analysts from more than 30 countries in a stimulating four-day programme of events. While I was able to attend only the opening day of EuroMAC, due to the onset of a flu bug, it clearly indicated the richness of the conference to come.

A welcome address from Pieter Bergé introduced the conference while musing on developments in music analysis more generally. Bergé spoke of the need to continue to extend the scope of EuroMAC by broadening participation; as such, he formally welcomed the new Russian Society for Music Theory (OTM) as an official member of EuroMAC’s scientific committee. Bergé spoke on the manner in which English is becoming the normative language of music analysis, indicating both the benefits and limitations this creates; he then introduced a range of potential future initiatives for our discipline, suggesting, for example, the creation of a European music analysis council. His speech closed with the introduction of Music Theory and Analysis (MTA), the International Journal of the Dutch-Flemish Society for Music Theory. This new journal, Bergé explained, seeks to provide a home for short analytical vignettes as well as more
substantial contributions; MTA will appeal, for these very reasons, to the SMA community.

The opening keynote address, ‘Horizons of Metamusic: The Case of Richard Strauss’, was given by Prof. Hermann Danuser (Humboldt University of Berlin), and provided insights into Strauss’s music in his 150th anniversary year, drawing examples from the composer’s symphonic and operatic works. Danuser highlighted the manner in which political and aesthetic reservations regarding Strauss’s character and music have proved an obstacle to theory and analysis. His keynote sought, however, to address a different impediment: the one-sided focus in analysis on issues of material and compositional structure, which, Danuser argued, leads to a neglect of the meta-referential nature of modernity. Although hardly revelatory decades after the New Musicology began, there is still something notable about a doyen of musicology making such a claim to a gathering of analysts including a number of harder-line formalists. To persuade such potential sceptics of the manner in which the inclusion of metamusical ideas can alter analytical perspectives on musical structures, Danuser examined Strauss’s use of Nietzsche’s “Song of the Night Wanderer” in Also sprach Zarathustra. Here, the self-referential poetry reveals similar structures in the music, creating a musical mise-en-abyme (reflection-within-reflection), serving thus to represent a musical example of Nietzsche’s doctrine of eternal recurrence. In Strauss’s opera Capriccio, a similar propensity towards mise-en-abyme assumes the form of opera-within-opera.

A Leuven beer reception followed Danuser’s talk – the town is home to the Stella Artois brewery – enabling participants to discuss both the keynote and Bergé’s suggestions regarding the development of EuroMAC. With beers in hand, the delegates’ conversations flowed into less lofty subjects and into the extended lunch break. The afternoon marked the beginning of pre-organised sessions and individual papers. Pre-organised sessions were a key feature of EuroMAC’s mise-en-abyme-ish ‘conferences within conferences’, enabling a number of specialist topics to receive extended attention. One of these topics was ‘Music Analysis and the Body’, the session in which I was involved. Convened by Dr Nicholas Reyland, the speakers on this panel were all contributors to a book collection I am co-editing with Dr Reyland (Keele) and Dr Stacey Sewell (Plymouth). In addition to the editors, the panel included Professor Michael Klein (Temple), Dr Vincent Meelberg (Nijmegen), and Dr Joshua B. Mailman (Columbia). Six short position papers were given, highlighting provocations and issues for further discussion, which then opened out into a two-hour workshop exploring emergent themes and ideas.

Opening the discussion, Meelberg’s paper ‘Composing the Body Electric: The Bodily Aspect of Using Software in Music Creation’ explored the thesis that composing is a whole body experience that cannot be reduced exclusively to mental processes. Drawing examples from his own creative practice, Meelberg’s paper demonstrated the need to explore compositional process as an embodied act, not least in electroacoustic works where computing might further divert attention away from the body. Next was Sewell’s paper, ‘Embodiments of Making: Breath, Phrase and Entrainment in Electroacoustic Music’. Linking with ideas proposed by Meelberg, and drawing examples from Neil Luck’s Ground Techniques and Hildegard Westerkamp’s Breathing Room, Sewell focused on the manner in which we can hear the embodied ‘making’ of the sound in electroacoustic music. She ended by posing a range of pertinent questions: what is the object of analysis, for instance, when the focus is on music and the body? The composer and/or performers’ bodies? The listeners’? Musical bodies? The third paper, ‘Experimental Pragmatic Approaches to Interactive Music Systems’, was projected on screen with a disembodied voice-over (Mailman could not be in the session in person, courtesy of unhelpful interventions by the US travel network). Mailman examined developments in the field of interactive music systems (IMSs), advocating an experimental pragmatic approach inspired by music analysis and exploiting the potential of kinaesthetic learning. His paper offered a fascinating insight into his creative practices, systems he has built and the issue of embodiment in immersive interactive systems, and in many respects synthesised concepts from the previous papers while placing the issues rigorously in the context of recent music theory.

The second trio of papers began with Reyland’s ‘Classing the Musical Body: Empathy, Affect and Representation in BBC TV’s The Royle Family’. Reyland focused on the importance of affect in the programme (including the affect of its many moments of musicking), asking the EuroMAC audience to question whether analysts with interests in issues of cultural meaning might wish to resist affect theory’s call for criticism focused not on what music represents but what it does. He highlighted moments of forced empathy in the show induced through groove, vocality and timbre – a recurring affective strategy in this humorous yet subtly political programme’s
representation of working class life. Following Reyland, my paper, 'The “Feel” of Expansion: Embodying Musical Growth', explored the manner in which our embodied experiences of the specific gesture of musical growth or expansion can feel as if it bears a form of volitional agency. Drawing examples from Elgar's Cello Concerto, Ravel's Piano Concerto for the Left Hand, and Britten's Symphony for Cello and Orchestra, I explored this gesture in various manifestations over different durational frames. My paper questioned whether or not listeners can embody longer-range processes of growth and expansion or whether one can only imagine that experience, as part of a reflective analytical process, but prompted by more tangible, shorter-range gestures. Concluding the paper session, Klein's paper, 'Musical Affect as Vital Bodily Force in the Work of Deleuze and Guattari' continued the exploration of affect from the vantage point of Deleuze and Guattari's A Thousand Plateaus. In a compelling manner, Klein analysed how affect works through music in examples including the famous hammer-blow in Mahler's Sixth Symphony, the double trill in Chopin's Polonaise-Fantasie, and the THX sound effect used when films begin in the cinema.

As intended, the six short papers raised complementary questions concerning music analysis and the body, and this enabled a fascinating two-hour workshop, involving panellists and a wide range of delegates, in which various ideas were discussed, critiqued and problematised. Among other concerns, the following themes and questions were discussed: What is the body? What is the musical body/object? Are there any universals in affect? Can music enforce affect? Can we avoid it? How can tacit knowledge become intersubjective knowledge? Is it desirable to do so? In short, during the ensuing debates, I think that all would agree that significant advances were made in our understanding of music as a vital bodily force. Furthermore, the value of opportunities for extended discourse at a conference of this nature cannot be underestimated, and I was grateful to Reyland and my fellow panellists for devising a structure that, one hopes, will productively be replicated at future music-analysis events.

Rebecca Thumpston
Keele University

SMA Music Analysis Workshop
Cardiff University, 29 November 2014

Review by Martin Curda

On the last Saturday in November, the first SMA Music Analysis Workshop took place at Cardiff University's School of Music. Alongside the TAGS conference, the biannual Summer School (coming up this July) and the Writing Club workshops, the Music Analysis Workshop constitutes a new and important addition to the varied events through which the SMA supports its student members and fosters interest in music analysis.

The conception of this project was formed during a series of discussions among members of staff at Cardiff University (particularly Charles Wilson, David Beard and Keith Chapin) and myself, in consultation with Dr Nicholas Reyland (Keele University) and committee members of the SMA. What emerged from these talks was the format of an interactive workshop, in which the participants get not only a theoretical introduction into a particular methodological approach to analysing music but also a 'hands-on' experience of its practical application. In that way we intended to reach out to a broader audience: those whose primary research interest lie outside music analysis were offered a comprehensive introduction into the discipline, while more experienced candidates were given the opportunity to explore methods they were not particularly familiar with.

The first workshop was conducted by Dr Charles Wilson (Cardiff University), who focused on post-tonal music theory. He started his session with an introduction re-negotiating the position of music analysis in the aftermath of the wave of criticism from the New Musicology movement. Challenging the common objection that music analysis is divorced from the 'actual' experience of music, he illustrated through musical examples as diverse as Debussy, Webern and Berio the correlation between 'perceptibles' and 'observables'; that is, between musical features or events which are perceived as significant in the process of listening (regardless of theoretical education or rational endeavour) and structurally significant features or
events which can be observed analytically in the score. This was practically demonstrated in the interactive parts of the session, when participants were asked to make ‘intuitive’ comments on musical examples, which were subsequently linked to more rigorously analytical observations. The participants learned to identify different kinds of scales (pentatonic, diatonic, hexatonic, octatonic, etc.) using ‘clock diagrams’, to trace their alteration within a piece by Debussy, and to compare the contrasting uses of such modes in pieces by different composers. Particularly in his analysis of a song by Webern, tracing the symbolism of Stefan George’s poetry in Webern’s treatment of hexatonic modality, Dr Wilson gave convincing examples of sensitive application of analytical methods, demonstrating that music analysis is one of many mutually interconnected ways of engaging hermeneutically with music.

These issues were also central to the second workshop, led by Dr Nicholas Reyland (Keele University) and focused on the functioning of music in audio-visual analysis of screen media. Dr Reyland drew attention to the ‘middle ground’ between sophisticated analytical reflection of music on the one hand and visceral response to musical stimuli on the other, in which music is perceived through familiar stylistic or topical conventions and, broadly speaking, enculturated knowledge. The participants had chance to ‘audio-view’ the newest Star Wars trailer and get closer understanding of the role music plays in it. Another interactive exercise involved ‘blind listening’ and ‘deaf viewing’ of a particular scene from Krzysztof Kieslowski’s trilogy Three Colors: Blue (music by Zbigniew Preisner). This technique of ‘masking’, in which the elimination of one element of perception draws attention to another, offered valuable insight into the ways in which music contributes to the production of meaning in multi-media contexts and generated lively discussion. It became apparent that approaches and techniques employed by audio-visual analysis have profound implications for analysing music on its own. Indeed, the argument was convincingly made that music is never quite ‘on its own’.

Although the above described sessions constituted the main body of the event, many exciting things happened in between and afterwards. Several participants made use of the opportunity, kindly offered by Wilson, Reyland and Beard, to discuss their research during thirty-minute individual meetings. Breaks for coffee and lunch (generously provided by the SMA) offered an opportunity to get to know colleagues from across the country. The event was formally concluded by a discussion session, attempting to wrap up the numerous topics and ideas let loose during the day. Particularly prominent was the question of the boundaries of music analysis, which were revealed to be far from solid, allowing significant and stimulating overlaps with other sub-disciplines and methodologies of music studies. This vibrant debate continued among many of the participants over a pint in a nearby pub.

The event attracted more than twenty participants from eleven UK institutions, including not only students of musicology but also ethnomusicology, performance and composition. This can be considered a proof that the interest in analytical understanding of music is not an ‘ivory tower’ phenomenon endemic to a particular academic discipline but rather one that it is shared by people from all branches of music studies. The enthusiastic and positive response of the participants suggest good reasons to hold high hopes that further similar events will follow this successful pilot scheme.

Martin Curda
Cardiff University

Research Projects

The Solfeggio Tradition

Why do we continue to use nineteenth- and twentieth-century theories to make sense of baroque and classical music, while paying so little attention to terms and concepts that were actually in use at the time? One reason is the difficulty of reconstructing the rudimentary lessons in scales, keys, and modulations that were taught to almost every eighteenth-century musician. To explain why professional maestros—J. S. Bach and Haydn as much as Pergolesi and Paisiello—referred to major keys as do-re-mi and minor as re-mi-la, it is necessary to know that the basics were taught by singing simple plainchant melodies to ancient Guidonian solfa syllables. Throughout Catholic Europe, Russia, and many protestant regions before the
Napoleonic wars, music education was controlled almost exclusively by the church.

The most intriguing innovations took place at the Neapolitan conservatories, where vocal and compositional skills were taught simultaneously through sophisticated solfeggio. In this AHRC project, Nick Baragwanath and Annika Forkert aim to tell the story of this forgotten solfeggio tradition. The results will be published in a monograph (2016) and a variety of journal articles, as well as through a dedicated website and network ('Historical Music Pedagogy'. The website will be up soon: www.historicalmusicpedagogy.ac.uk).

Thanks to the work of generations of scholars, the theory and practice of thoroughbass has been well documented. More recently, pioneering research has shone a light on the refined Neapolitan offshoot of this tradition known as partimento. In stark contrast, almost nothing has been written about its companion discipline, solfeggio. This state of affairs can be explained in part by the modern preoccupation with the bass as the foundation of all harmony, an assumption originating in Jean-Philippe Rameau’s investigations (1722).

Confining the study of harmony so exclusively to the functions of the bass appears at odds with the eighteenth-century emphasis on melody. At that time, vocal or instrumental parts could be added just as well below a line of music as above. Providing a bass for a given melody was no less crucial a skill for an eighteenth-century maestro than ‘accompanying’ a given bass with right-hand parts.

It is important to recognise that learning to sing plainchant with Guidonian syllables was the first (and often only) music lesson taught to children in the cantoral tradition. In many religious institutions, choirboys were seldom given the opportunity to acquire skills beyond sight-singing and, where required, basic instrumental playing. This would explain why the seventeen-year-old Haydn – a relatively typical case in 1749 – found himself so ill-equipped to compete for salaried positions when dismissed from the choir of St Stephens in Vienna. He had been provided with just as much training as was necessary for him to carry out his duties. After eleven years of service, his ability to improvise tasteful melodies at the keyboard or on paper would have been dismal in comparison with his fluency in solmization and knowledge of liturgical repertory.

Newly signed-up apprentices at the Neapolitan conservatories received similar rudimentary instruction in sight-singing using the Guidonian Gamut. They were required to master traditional solmization by singing solfeggi. They learned to conceptualize keys and to modulate between them entirely by singing instructional melodies. The derivation of the cycle of fifths and its associated system of key signatures from the properties of B-fa and B-mi in Guidonian solmization would have been obvious to any eighteenth-century musician trained the conventional way. Only then would they have been allowed to start lessons in partimento. Neapolitan maestro Francesco Ricupero confirmed as much in his guide to partimento playing (1803, p.50): ‘my system is that taught by our famous and renowned masters, who would never sit youngsters at the harpsichord unless they had already received three years of instruction in solfeggio’ (Il mio sistema è quello appunto de’ nostri celebri, e rinomati maestri, i quali non mettevano mai i giovani al cembalo, se prima pel corso di tre anni non si fossero istruiti nel solfeggio). This means that when they began to pick out standard cadences and the ‘Rule of the Octave’ at the keyboard, they would already have been thoroughly familiar with them, as well as many other conventional schemata, not only from their appearance in instructional melodies but also from the accompaniments played by the maestro. They arrived at their first keyboard lesson having spent a year or more singing the melodies and listening to the basses of the very patterns they were about to be taught how to play. This explains why instruction manuals for partimento playing, such as Fenaroli’s classic ‘Rules’ of 1775, concentrate on techniques for generating chords and only rarely mention the crucial issue of melodic contour. There was no need, because the pupils already knew which melody usually went with which bass. What they needed to learn was how best to fill the gap between them using their fingers.

Evidence suggests that for eighteenth-century musicians the tonal system remained conceptually simple, however complex its results. This is hardly surprising, given that it was designed to turn eight-year-olds into commercially marketable performers and composers by their early teens. The renaissance practice of knowing when to sing culturally acceptable ficta notes within a basic system of (transposable) Guidonian scales remained alive and well until the 1800s, although less was left to chance in terms of notation. Because sharps and flats were considered to be fundamental only when associated with the fourth and seventh of a scale, by analogy with the B-fa and B-mi of
plainchant, all others could be dismissed as mere vocal or instrumental inflexions. The complex theories devised in the nineteenth century to accommodate and explain these many ficta accidentals would have been completely unnecessary for the musicians who actually knew how to use and interpret them. The cumulative evidence of many thousands of solfeggi thus allows us to understand eighteenth-century music practice and composition in a previously unknown dimension. Moreover, this project will harness the potential of these findings to enhance modern approaches to music education in regard to theory and analysis.

Nick Baragwanath completed the basic research for this project by singing and memorizing over 1,000 solfeggi in the manner of an eighteenth-century apprentice. He has already written-up the main theory chapters for the book and is currently finishing the analyses of contemporary repertoire. Annika Forkert has started to convey these findings through a variety of engagement activities, including an international network, a website, a forum, and plans for workshops and a conference.

**Nicholas Baragwanath**
University of Nottingham

**News from the Schenker Project**

The University for Music and the Fine Arts, Vienna, has been awarded a grant from the Austrian Science Fund to continue the publication of Schenker’s diaries, in German and in English translation, on the Schenker Documents Online website ([http://mt.ccnmtl.columbia.edu/schenker](http://mt.ccnmtl.columbia.edu/schenker)) for three years (July 2-14 to June 2017). This follows on from the most recent phase of the project, in which Schenker’s diaries from 1925 to 1930 were mounted on the website, together with letters from many of his correspondents during that period: the publishers Universal Edition and Drei Masken Verlag, and pupils, friends, performers, administrators and scholars in Vienna, Austria and Germany, and further afield. It is anticipated that the diaries from October 1930 until Schenker’s death in January 1935 will be mounted in the first two years of the project; it was in these final years of his life that Schenker received the necessary resources for the publication of his opus ultimum, ‘Free Composition’, and his diaries chart in detail the progress made on this work. Those from the two-year period immediately prior to the outbreak of the First World War, 1912-14, will appear on the website by the summer of 2017.

The project is based in Vienna, with an ‘English team’ comprising academics from the University of Southampton. It will be led by Professor Martin Eybl (Vienna); Dr Marko Deisinger (Vienna) is responsible for transcribing, editing and annotating the diaries; they will be translated by William Drabkin, with further annotations. Andrea Reiter, Professor of German (Southampton), continues to act as language consultant for the project, and Dr. David Bretherton (Southampton) will serve as computing consultant. Kirstie Hewlett (London) and Iby Jolande-Vargas (Vienna) will mark up and encode the texts for web publication.

**William Drabkin**
University of Southampton


**Japanese Horror-Film Music**

**AHRC IPS Fellowship at the International Research Centre for Japanese Studies, Kyoto**

As part of her PhD research, **Hannah Bayley** is analysing the scoring practices of recent Japanese horror films, their American remakes, and the socio-cultural contexts of both traditions, under the supervision of Dr Nicholas Reyland (Music) and Dr Neil Archer (Film Studies). She was awarded a five-month fellowship by the AHRC at the International Research Center for Japanese Studies in Kyoto, one of the six member institutes of the NIHU (National Institutes for the Humanities). The fellowship placement, which began 20th October 2014, gives Hannah the opportunity to access unique national archival collections detailing Japanese folklore and the use of music and sound in different forms of traditional Japanese theatre. It will also allow her to take part in a number of research events, forging international contacts and collaborations, while developing her AHRC-funded doctoral research.

**Shay Loya (editor)**

Note: My thanks to Hannah Bayley for this information. As Hannah was keen to emphasise, These AHRC fellowships (known as International Placement Scheme, or IPS) are open to all disciplines and research topics that may benefit from placement in one of the institutions listed here: [http://www.ahrc.ac.uk/Funding-Opportunities/Pages/InternationalPlacementScheme.aspx](http://www.ahrc.ac.uk/Funding-Opportunities/Pages/InternationalPlacementScheme.aspx)
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.

Please note: the **deadline** for both events is **5th January 2015**.

Applications for the summer school should be sent to Dr Shay Loya, information@sma.ac.uk, or Dr Helen Thomas, development@sma.ac.uk. To send proposals to KeeleMAC email keelemac2015@keele.ac.uk. More details about the content of both events and their respective submission requirements can be found in the **Summer School Call for Applicants** and **KeeleMAC CFP** on our website (click on links).
## Diary

**8-10 January, 2015**

**RMA Research Student Conference**

http://www.bristol.ac.uk/arts/gradschool/pg-activity/conferences/rma/call-for-papers.html

**17-18 January, 2015**

**Video Game Music**
Fort Worth, Texas, USA

http://list.bowdoin.edu/pipermail/ams-announce/2014-August/005242.html

**24-25 January, 2015**

Nationalism in the Totalitarian State
Budapest, Institute of Musicology, Hungarian Academy of Sciences

http://zti.hu/mza/docs/Nationalism_in_Music_in_the_Totalitarian_State.pdf

**TAGS 2015: Details TBC**

**4–6 June, 2015 [Deadline: 18 January, 2015]**

**IASPM: Over and Over: Exploring Repetition in Popular Music**
University of Liège, Belgium

http://www.iaspm.org.uk/over-and-over-exploring-repetition-in-popular-music/

**22-25 June, 2015 [Deadline: 9 January 2015]**

**Fifth Biennial International Conference on Mathematics and Computation in Music (MCM2015)**
Queen Mary, University of London

http://mcm2015.qmul.ac.uk/

**25-26 June, 2015 [Deadline: 9 January 2015]**

**Listening Cinematically**
Royal Holloway, University of London

http://goldenpages.jpehs.co.uk/2014/09/24/listening-cinematically/

**6-10 July 2015 [Deadline: 5 January, 2015]**

**KeeleMAC and SMA Summer School**
Keele University

See Newsletter advert.

**9-11 September, 2015**

**RMA Annual Conference**
University of Birmingham


**2-4 October 2015 [Deadline: 6 February 2015]**

**The European Salon: Nineteenth-century Salonmusik**
National University of Ireland, Maynooth

http://www.sma.ac.uk/2014/08/cfp-nineteenth-century-salonmusik/
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](http://www.societymusictheory.org/grants/travel)