

Newsletter

of the
Society for Music Analysis

Number four, January 1993



8-92

Contents	page
Membership of the SMA	2
SMA Diary - in brief and in full	2
Nomination form for election to the SMA's Executive	4
Founder Members of the SMA	5
Membership form, and renewal notice	7
Real Music: Jonathan Dunsby	8
Review and reflection: Deborah Roberts	10

Contributors to this issue

Jonathan Dunsby is Professor of Music at the University of Reading.

Deborah Roberts is Lecturer in Music at the University of Newcastle upon Tyne.

SMA: the first year

The Society for Music Analysis was founded on 1 January 1992. This issue of the Newsletter therefore marks the first anniversary. During this start-up period, there has been a salutary response from individuals and institutions alike. Membership is now into three figures, as can be seen from the list of Founder Members printed below, and the scheme for Institutional Membership has produced a very satisfactory initial response. The schedule of events has been limited only by the time which members of the Interim Executive Committee can expend on SMA matters: the growth of events, of different types, is clearly the next stage, which requires a greater input from members at large. These issues will be among those discussed at the Plenary Meeting of the SMA at Southampton: items for the agenda should be sent to the Secretary. For members' reference, the aims and objectives of the Society determined by the Interim Executive Committee are set out below in the membership form on p. 6.

Interim Executive Committee

Jonathan Dunsby (Chairman), James Ellis (Vice-Chairman), Deborah Roberts (Secretary), Catherine Dale (Treasurer), Craig Ayrey, Nicholas Cook, Stephen Hinton, Robert Pascall.



SMA Diary: in brief

26-28 March 1993 SotoMAC '93

University of Southampton Music Analysis Conference 1993. Director Professor Nicholas Cook. The Conference will include the first Annual General Meeting of the SMA.

15 May 1993 TAGS Day

City University, London, UK.

SotoMAC '93: University of Southampton Department of Music, Friday 26 - Sunday 28 March 1993

This conference is being held in conjunction with the 28th Annual Meeting of the RMA, which has a separate programme (apart from the joint sessions shown below). Long sessions include a break.

programme in brief

Friday 26 March

- 9.00 Registration
11.00-12.30 **Session 1: Webern I**
Gareth Cox, Shinichiro Okabe
Session 2: Italy and opera
Roberta Marvin, Helen Greenwald
1.30-2.10 **CONCERT: Joel Lester (violin) and Mina Miller (piano)**
2.15-3.45 **Session 3: Webern II**
Lauriejan Reinhardt, Catherine Nolan
Session 4: Italy and harmony
Michael Spitzer, Giorgio Sanguinetti
4.15-6.30 **Session 5: Neoclassicism**
Martha Hyde, Gottfried Scholz, Siglind Bruhn
Session 6: Music and meaning
Ayako Tatsumura, Gottfried Scholz, Siglind Bruhn
8.00 **CONCERT: Robert Ehrlich and friends**

Saturday 27 March

- 9.00-12.30 **RMA/SotoMAC Joint Session 1: Rock music**
Philip Lodge, Richard Middleton, Lori Burns, David Morris
Session 7: Genesis and analysis
Patricia Hall, Peter MacCullum, Nicholas Rast, Ray Komow
1.30-2.10 **CONCERT: Ronald Lumsden (piano)**
2.15-6.30 **Session 8: Performance and expression**
Roselyn Tureck, Bengt Edlund, Joel Lester, Eric Clarke, Walter Everett
Session 9: Analysis without scores
Michael Bridger, Geneviève Bernard-Krauss, Ramon Satyendra,
Susana Weich-Shahak, Linda Barwick
8.00 **CONCERT: Berenice (multi-media opera by Anna Carlisle, Ric Graebner and Larry Wakefield)**

Sunday 28 March

- 9.00-12.30 **RMA/SotoMAC Joint Session 2: Chinese music**
Robert Provine, Joyce Lindorff, Lulu Huang Chang, Helen Rees
Session 10: Oral and literate traditions
Dorothy Keyser, Claudio Annibaldi, Kelina Kwan, Stan Hawkins
1.15-2.45 **SMA Plenary meeting**
2.45-4.15 **RMA/SotoMAC Joint Session 3: (Mis)reading Mahler**
Julian Johnson, Lisa Robinson

- Through the generosity of the journal *Music Analysis*, a limited number of bursaries are available in case of hardship to students who would otherwise be unable to attend the conference.
- The conference fee is waived for SMA members.

• For further information and booking forms, please contact Nicholas Cook, SotoMAC/RMA 93, Department of Music, University of Southampton, Highfield, Southampton SO9 5NH, UK, telephone 0703 593425, fax 0703 593197, email ncook@soton.ac.uk.

Nomination form for election to the Executive Committee of the SMA

Name of nominee.....

Proposed by.....

Seconded by.....

You are reminded that any nominee, proposer or seconder should be a member in good standing of the SMA. If you have not yet taken out or renewed your membership for 1993, please do so as soon as is convenient.

Please attach a few sentences of biographical information about the nominee suitable for inclusion in the ballot paper.

The closing date for nominations is 15 February 1993.

Following feedback from members concerning the election procedures, it has emerged that no revision of the memorandum posted to members is necessary. The memorandum is reproduced below.

Signed & dated by the nominee:

Election Procedure

1 There will be nine places on the Executive Committee for which the first election will be held before 27 March 1993. On this occasion all nine places will be open for election. Members will serve for three years and will be eligible for re-election except that in 1993 by agreement following the result of the election three members will undertake to serve for a term of two years and three members will undertake to serve for a term of one year and in both cases be eligible for re-election.

2 The name of any member of the Society in good standing may appear on the ballot paper provided that it is proposed and seconded by two other members and that the candidate's signed agreement to stand for election is received by 15 February 1993 together with brief personal details.

3 Ballot papers will be sent automatically to all members on 1 March 1993 with the names of candidates listed alphabetically, and ballot papers will also be available at SotoMAC 93. Suitable arrangements will be made for the anonymity of voters and the scrutiny of vote counting.

4 Votes may be returned by post or delivered in person to the University of Southampton where the ballot will close at 6.00pm on Friday 26 March 1993.

5 The nine candidates receiving the largest number of votes will be duly elected to the Executive Committee which will conduct the plenary meeting on the last day of the Conference.

Founder members of the SMA

Robert Adlington, Brighton
Peter Auker, Luton
John Avgerinos, Athens
Craig Ayrey, Goldsmiths' College, University of London
Valeria Baker, Wimborne
Adrian Bamford, University of Birmingham
Amanda Bayley, University of Reading
Robert Beale, Manchester
Roger Beeson, London
Charlotte Bilefield, Trinity Hall, Cambridge
Alastair Borthwick, London
Julie Brown, Cambridge
Sarah Callis, University of Nottingham
Tahlia Cantrill, University of Newcastle upon Tyne
Simon Capey, London
Esther Cavett-Dunsby, Jordans
David Clarke, University of Newcastle upon Tyne
Eric Clarke, City University
Angela Cleall, Egham
David Coggins, London
Stephen Collisson, London
Nicholas Cook, University of Southampton
David Crilly, Anglia Polytechnic University
Naomi Cumming, Columbia University
H. Douglas Coustance, Laguna Hills
Catherine Dale, University of Hull
Lyn David, Llangadog
Sian Davies-Barnes, Camarthen
Richard Denison, Reading
Rosemary Dooley, Grange-over-Sands
S. Downes, Crowthorne
William Drabkin, University of Southampton
Jonathan Dunsby, University of Reading
Marija Duric, London
James Ellis, City University
Stephen Ferre, London
Adrian Finnerty, Glasgow
Joachim Fontaine, Universität des Saarlandes
Peter Foster, Oxford
Michele Fromson, University of Seattle
Bernard Gates, Milton Keynes
Elizabeth Graham, University of Newcastle upon Tyne
Dai Griffiths, Oxford Polytechnic
Robin Hartwell, Liverpool
Stephen Hinton, Yale University
Xavier Hudson, Bournemouth
Douglas Jarman, Royal Northern College of Music
Philip Jones, Melksham
Chris Kennett, Henley-on-Thames
Sam King, Mitcham
Kelina Kwan, University of Hong Kong
Rosalie Lamburn, Mogerhanger
Laura Lauro Taroni, Abingdon
Zelda Lawrence-Curran, Worcester College, Oxford
Daniel Lecch-Wilkinson, University of Southampton
Peter McCallum, Sydney Conservatorium of Music
Tom Mökelä, University of Helsinki
Evangelica Mantzourani, London
Robin Marsden, London
Nicholas Marston, University of Exeter

Raymond Monelle, University of Edinburgh
 Jeremy Moore, London
 Malcolm Miller, London
 Ng Mui, Chai Wen
 Andrea Musk, Oxford
 Robert Pascall, University of Nottingham
 Alastair Pearce, Birmingham Conservatoire, University of Central England
 Glen Pearce, Brighton
 Bruce Philips, Oxford University Press
 L. E. R. Picken, Jesus College, Cambridge
 Luis Pipa, Reading
 Christopher Polyblank, Worcester
 Kenneth Pont, Mayfield
 Rosalie Prince, University of Newcastle upon Tyne
 Derrick Puffett, St John's College, Cambridge
 Nicholas Rast, Norwich
 Richard Rastall, University of Leeds
 Mark Richards, Birmingham
 Harvey Richardson, Haywards Heath
 Donald Riddell, Ferndown
 John Rink, University of Surrey
 Deborah Roberts, University of Newcastle upon Tyne
 Susanna Rooth, Bristol
 Tom Royall, Milton Keynes
 Philip Ruprecht, Yale University
 Julian Rushton, University of Leeds
 Philip Sawyer, Napier University
 Rachel Segal, Leeds
 D. Sibley, Cropwell Bishop
 Alison Smith, Manchester
 M. C. Allison So, Hong Kong Baptist College
 Simon Speare, City University
 Diana Stammers, Darwin College, Cambridge
 R. Stephens, Wellington
 Alan Street, University of Keele
 Teoh Su-Ping, Johor Bahru
 Chee Yee Jennifer Tong, University of Southampton
 Colin Touchin, University of Warwick
 Gillian Tucker, Oxford Polytechnic
 Cheong Wai-Ling, Chinese University of Hong Kong
 Michael Waite, Bishop Otter College, Chichester
 Colin Walker, Belvedere
 Helen Ward, Birmongham
 Gillian Ward Russell, Haldon
 Renate Wendel, London
 Arnold Whittall, King's College London
 Jonathan Williams, University of Newcastle upon Tyne
 Stuart Willis, University of Newcastle upon Tyne
 Luke Windsor, City University
 Christopher Wintle, King's College London



Membership of the SMA

The Society for Music Analysis, inaugurated on 1 January 1992, is open to all interested parties and will thrive if it gains a wide membership from musicians in the UK and abroad. The aims of the Society are best summarized as follows:

Aims and Objectives of the Society

The Society shall be organized for scholarly and educational purposes. The principal activities of the Society shall be:

1. To foster the development of all aspects of the discipline of music analysis and its connection with related disciplines.
2. To encourage teaching, research and creativity in music analysis and to advocate and uphold the highest standards of musicianship.
3. To promote, facilitate and provide a forum for the exchange of information and ideas pertaining to music analysis and its teaching, including the publication of a newsletter.
4. To conduct meetings of the Society.
5. To liaise internationally with societies with similar interests.
6. To provide contact for students and professionals with the music analysis community and to foster the interests of younger members.
7. To foster equal opportunities of all Members of the Society.

*

Following arrangements made by the interim managing committee, members will vote annually for all officers and members-at-large, who form the majority, to serve on a managing committee from March 1993.

*

Tangible benefits of membership will include:

- Free receipt of the quarterly Newsletter of the SMA.
- 25% discount on individual subscriptions to the journal Music Analysis and, prospectively, to other European and American journals.
- Consultation on the development of Music Analysis Conferences, Seminar days and TAGS days (Theory and Analysis Graduate Student days).
- Reduced conference/day fees.
- Representation of members' interests to national, European and international bodies and reduced subscriptions and fees wherever negotiable.

*

The Newsletter is a medium for the dissemination of information about events, publications and other topical matters. Through correspondence and short essays it is also a forum for the exchange of views about music-analytical matters, and members will be encouraged to communicate their ideas through this open-access publication edited by James A. Ellis.

*

The annual subscription determined by the interim managing committee is £25 (Ordinary) or £15 (Student).

*

Please detach the form and return it to:

Dr D. Roberts, Secretary SMA, University of Newcastle upon Tyne, Department of Music, Armstrong Building Newcastle NE1 7RU, UK.

I wish to *become a member/renew membership (*Ordinary/Student) of the Society for Music Analysis and enclose a cheque (made payable to 'Society for Music Analysis') in the amount of £

Name:

Address:

Contact telephone number:

Real Music

Jonathan Dunsby

Whether it will come to be generally accepted that there may be no complete or even significant correspondence between word and deed, 'analysis' and 'real music', and that this is not a problem, remains to be seen. Meanwhile, Tim Howell offers a new voice on the subject, suggesting in the recently published 'Analysis and Performance'¹ that there can be common ground, and when there is, it is worth tilling. A writer willing to grasp this bull by the vicissitudes is greatly to be welcomed as an antidote to the rampant formalist analysis-and-performance theory that is beginning to get a bad press in this country. Howell probably overstates his case in pitting the straw analytic man, who supposedly feeds on actual, performed interpretations of music, against a supposed opposite, Edward Cone, who argues repeatedly and consistently that an articulate performance is necessarily one informed by articulate analysis. Still, Howell's Scylla and Charybdis do make for good rhetoric (in a *partitio* of what will be three headings) and will help his readers to focus on where it is always easiest to hold one's attention, the third, middle way, the comforting British compromise, in short, positivism.

Wanting to be positive, not positivist, I would like to throw a lifeline (thrown, admittedly, from one also treading water furiously) just in case any of his readers fear Howell is drowning epistemologically, albeit serenely. This lifeline used to belong to John Blacking, who startled many charting the tides of musical anthropology by observing that all there is available to the music analyst is, not scores, not even interpretations, but, in the end, precisely and exclusively this: the difference between performances.² Mindlessly relativistic? Uselessly idealistic? I suspect not.

In order to begin to absorb Blacking's dictum, it has to be divided into what I, at least, understand to be its two components. First, music exists only in 'performance', performance meaning any instance of music. A broad notion of performance is needed here, for it includes what goes on silently in our heads. And, conversely, there's nothing pure and innocent about 'real' music that hits our ears: this too, I believe Nicholas Cook would argue, we have to imagine.³ Component one, then, is that all instances of music are real; they are instances because they exist in our imagination, in whatever form. Component two is even more easily argued, since there are very few committed Platonists around nowadays, though very many like to think half-platonically. No instance of music asserts the musical 'work' in its replete identity. Howell's Beethoven bagatelle is differently all over the place, in different heads, different editions, different recordings, on different pianos. Whether it has an ideal form of existence is a question in which we have, by and large, simply lost all interest. We are perfectly content to see the work of music scattered in all its instances - death of the author, intertextuality, that sort of ethos.⁴

And thus, I feel, we arrive not at a challenge, but at a real problem. More often than not what the analyst is working on is his or her own 'performance' in his or her head, and more often than not this performance will be second-, third- or worse-rate. Statistically, this must be the case. Pathology aside, we are all perfect language speakers, which is indeed one of the miracles of humanity. Yet we are not all perfect music imaginers: there is no such entity; and it is obvious that most 'people', and more to the point most professional Western musicians, are not

all that good at practising their art. The situation is a little like that of a child learning the piano: virtually all the playing she (my younger daughter) hears day in and day out is her own, rudimentary, embryonic at best, nearly hopeless at worst; and every good piano teacher has to give constant attention to the problem of imitability.

'At any point in the analytical process', writes Howell, 'interpretation [analytic interpretation, that is] should be measured against aural experience'.⁵ So the monster has crept in through the back door: the work of music in its ideal form of existence and in all its customary mediocrity is bearing down upon us once again, embryonic at best, nearly hopeless at worst. 'The aural experience of what?', I would ask, not that I criticize Howell, but on the contrary exult in his confidence and sensitivity. Fancifully, it may be, I look forward to the day when articles will be entitled 'An Analysis of the Chorale *Ich bin's, ich sollte büßen* as Heard at the Royal Festival Hall Last Monday'. Perhaps worse than Blacking because even the consoling comparisons of relativism have been squeezed out? Perhaps so; yet if it drives us harder towards the identity of the work of music, almost any price is worth paying.

In an attempt to nail down the distance between the ideal form of music and real music, I offer a nit picked because it is so emblematic. Carolyn Abbate comments on an idealized *Sorcerer's Apprentice*, and its 'moment' where 'the piece begins to regenerate itself, by repeating again and again, *far too many times*, first a note...', but also where 'the moment may compose out what Freud understood as uncanny repetition', as indeed it may, 'in repeating each element *a few too many times*'.⁶ I suppose we all can see or 'hear' things differently from one imagining to the next, and there is always the slip of the pen. But as this reading stands, the gap between 'far too' and 'a few too' is of an awesome magnitude that is surely quite outside

the ranges of tolerance in Blacking's 'difference' between actual 'performances'. When such lurching images are in the analyst's head, real music is in peril and, as Howell might have put it in an extension of his thinking which he is entirely free to disown, we'll do better to attend to how it ought to sound truly than to what it is somehow telling us through a third party.

NOTES

1. In *Companion to Contemporary Musical Thought*, ed. J. Paynter et al. (London: Routledge, 1992), pp. 692-714.
2. 'The Problem of "Ethnic" Perceptions in the Semiotics of Music' in *The Sign in Music and Literature*, ed. W. Steiner (Austin: University of Texas Press, 1981), pp. 184-94.
3. *Music, Imagination and Culture* (Oxford: OUP, 1990). Mary Warnock's *Imagination* (London: Routledge, 1976) is a philosophical approach to what she calls this 'vast subject' (p. 9).
4. In a more formal setting than this, thorough note would have to be taken of various standard accounts of how music exists, in particular of Roman Ingarden's *The Work of Music and the Problem of its Identity* (Berkeley: University of California Press, 1986).
5. P. 699.
6. *Unsung Voices* (Princeton: Princeton University Press, 1991), pp. 39 and 56 respectively. My emphasis.



Agm.

SMA Day Seminar at Nottingham: Review and Reflection

Deborah Roberts

For its Autumn meeting, the SMA developed a programme in conjunction with the Department of Music at the University of Nottingham. A visit by the Allegri Quartet provided a fine opportunity to investigate further the complicated, complementary relationship between analysis and performance. The Seminar consisted of three papers which incorporated discussion with the Allegri Quartet, and was followed by an evening concert that included a performance of the day's subject matter, Beethoven's String Quartet in C# minor, Op. 131, together with works by Schubert and Schumann.

The event was well attended, and the audience of analysts, students and members of the general public were able to hear Jonathan Dunsby's chaired discussion, 'A Question of Performance', followed by Christopher Wintle's paper 'Beethoven's Functional Analysis: the String Quartet in C# minor Op. 131', and in conclusion Robert Pascall's 'The Beethoven Centenary: Wagner's Essay on Op. 131 Reconsidered'.

Jonathan Dunsby capitalized on what is still a relatively rare opportunity for detailed discussion between music analysts and high-level performers. Thus, he offered not a formal paper but a chance for a free exchange of views on fundamental issues of musical interpretation. His introduction flagged up various contemporary concepts for consideration, such as the idea that music may exist only in performance and that any such performance may never be 'complete'.

Once the discussion was under way, attention tended to focus on matters of phrasing, as in the opening of the second

movement (Example 1), which might be regarded as consisting of one, two, or even four phrases.

Christopher Wintle emphasised that the metrical working of second violin, viola and cello, articulated at the mid-point of the bar, must inform our understanding of the phrasing since the main theme played by the first violin oscillates subtly between the opposing concepts of metre. Issues of balance between bars 1-4 and 4-8 were also explored, in relation to the major/minor inflexion, and the 'meaning' of bars 6-7, a clarification of bars 2-3.

A second aspect, which revealed an interesting divergence of views between analyst and performer, concerned Beethoven's attention to dynamic markings, such as that at bar 38 of the same movement (Example 2).

Discussion highlighted most valuably the tensions which can exist between interpreting music instinctively and interpreting according to an analytic rationale. Peter Carter, leader of the Allegri Quartet, felt that the (unstable) chromatic ascent E-E#-F# suggested F# as the goal and that, although the diminuendo marked beneath the pitch E indicated a very gradual reduction of volume, this should not undermine the sense of continuing line. By contrast, Christopher Wintle argued that Beethoven's markings in the score were most precise (and had not been compromised editorially) and that one should adhere to them exactly. Wintle interpreted the same passage as demanding a much more deliberate, even dramatic, diminuendo. Had time permitted, one could have delved further into the fascinating area of the

Example 1

The image shows a musical score for the second movement of Beethoven's String Quartet in C# minor, Op. 131. The score is written for four staves: Violin I, Violin II, Viola, and Cello/Double Bass. The tempo is marked 'No 2. Allegro molto vivace.' and 'un poco rit. in tempo'. The score includes dynamic markings such as 'pp' and 'cresc.'.

Example 2

The image shows a musical score for Example 2, consisting of five staves. The notation is dense, with various rhythmic values and dynamic markings. The markings include 'dim.' (diminuendo), 'cresc.' (crescendo), 'p' (piano), and 'pp' (pianissimo). The score is written in a single system, with a measure number '40' visible at the top. The notation includes beams, slurs, and other musical symbols typical of a classical score.

communicating and signalling of analytical understanding through performance, whether implicitly or occasionally explicitly, by suggestion, projection or even contradiction.

The consideration of specific details within the opening of the second movement of Op. 131 was well supported by the Allegri Quartet, who demonstrated the different interpretations and provided us with two distinct performances of the *Allegro molto vivace*. In the opinion of members of the Quartet the opportunities offered by this discussion, and the papers which followed, allowed for a much more detailed consideration of analytico-performance interchange than they had experienced in similar workshop settings. The exercise was perceived as stimulating and thought-provoking, even when one was aware of as many questions as answers, as many conflicts as resolutions.

In his formal paper Wintle sought to connect the analytical thinking both of Beethoven and Hans Keller, through the medium of Functional Analysis, concerned here with the establishment of large-scale key relations. In his tribute to Keller's achievement in the field of Functional Analysis, Wintle reminded us of Keller's belief in the necessary 'artistry' of an analysis. The first example here, played by the Allegri, was of Keller's *Functional Analysis No. 2*, on Beethoven's String Quartet in F minor, Op. 95, first movement. The focus was once more upon the domain of dynamics and their re-balancing within Keller's interpretation. In emphasizing the integral nature of the dynamics, as around bar 24 of the FA, the Schoenbergian concept of *motif* was invoked, as one which embraced many musical parameters, including interval, contour, rhythm, harmony and nuance. Wintle suggested the idea of 'music behind music' and that it was perhaps discontinuities in their association which began to reveal Beethoven's purpose. Musical continuity and

analytical disruption helped to explain Beethoven's compositional process: it was as though Beethoven had composed both a piece and an analysis, and that he was telling us about the composition and instructing the performers from within the music.

On key relations, ideas of Rosen and Simpson were considered, and precedents for the C# (movement 1) to E (mvts 3-5) to A (mvts 4-5) progression within Op. 131 established by reference to developing practice in the Fifth Symphony and Op. 127. Wintle's own interpretation of these relations was illustrated by means of a modified Schenkerian graph. In addition, the distinctive contributions of Kerman, Dahlhaus, Winter and Tovey were acknowledged during development of the discourse.

The somewhat problematic C#-D progression between the first and second movements was seen as embodying the conflict between performance and analysis, but the idea of the first movement merely as an introduction to the main argument was convincingly rejected. Rather, it was simply that Beethoven had exploited ambiguity of key and that different progressions could be perceived at a variety of levels. Within the E major movement, the fifth, Beethoven was looking simultaneously both forward and back, and, through this process, produced some 'exceptional disruptions in continuity'. Finally, acknowledging Deryck Cooke's notion of arch-structure, and making connections particularly between movements 1 and 6, Wintle brought back into focus the concept of the work as a whole. He concluded by stressing that our understanding of this whole was dependent upon giving due weight to Beethoven's deliberate use of interruption, which in turn revealed the composer's superb 'analytic self confidence'.

The final paper, by Robert Pascall, provided an attractive shift in

discussion: from considering Beethoven's music at first hand, to appreciating it from the point of view of Wagner. Pascall explained the history of Wagner's writing on Beethoven, from the early material that appeared in Paris in 1839, to the extensive essay to mark Beethoven's Centenary in 1870, which represented the first significant discussion of emotion in Beethoven's music. Pascall placed Wagner's work appropriately within the literary-musical romantic ethos of the mid nineteenth century, making association with E. T. A. Hoffmann (1776-1822), and the tone poems of Franz Liszt. He discussed the idea of poetic interpretation, the hermeneutics of Eduard Hanslick (1825-1904); the relationship between music and drama and Wagner's 'Music of the Future'. Wagner's essay on Beethoven the 'hero' was seen in the light of the philosophies of Arthur Schopenhauer (1788-1860), with the notions of 'cry', 'dance' and the 'dream' image. Association was also made with contemporary thought, notably the significant work of Harold Bloom, *The Anxiety of Influence: A Theory of Poetry*. Ultimately, however, Pascall argued that one could regard the idea of 'evocation' as part of a tradition which extended back to Aristotle.

Having placed the essay on Beethoven within its socio-cultural context, Pascall drew to the gathering's attention, by means of his own translation, Wagner's specific comments upon the String Quartet, Op. 131. The opening sentence proved most apt within the context of the Day Seminar: 'I shall choose, then, to illustrate such a genuine 'Beethoven day' in the light of its inmost occurrences, with his great String Quartet in C# minor: premising that if we remain content to recall this tone poem to memory, an illustration of the sort may perhaps prove possible, at least up to a certain degree; whereas it would hardly be feasible during an actual performance...'

The Society for Music Analysis
 Secretary: Dr Deborah Roberts
 University of Newcastle upon Tyne
 Department of Music
 Armstrong Building
 Newcastle NE1 7RU, UK

Wagner's subsequent comments on his perception of an emotional programme within Op. 131 complemented our structural, analytical understanding of the work, as for instance with regard to the second movement: 'Then the eye turns inwards...and sees the comforting phenomena it alone can perceive (*Allegro 6/8*), in which longing becomes a sweet, tender, melancholy disport with itself - the inmost hidden dream-picture awakens as loveliest reminiscence'. Finally, Wagner views the 'Allegro Finale' (movement 7) in embracing a full spectrum of emotions, as 'the World's own dance: wild delight, cries of anguish, love's ecstasy, highest rapture, misery, rage...and high above the gigantic musician!...He laughs at himself; for the magic was, after all, but play to him. Thus night beckons. His day is done'.

And so this final paper concluded the afternoon's proceedings in the most apposite fashion, maintaining the connection with issues of performance and the compelling image of Beethoven commanding from within and behind the music; yet also supplying the new dimensions of historical, literary criticism and the associated perceptions of 'emotion and meaning' in music.



Newsletter of the SMA
 Editor: Dr James Ellis
 City University
 Department of Music
 Northampton Square
 London EC1V 0HB, UK