

Newsletter

of the
Society for Music Analysis

Number six, January 1994

Executive Committee

Jonathan Dunsby (Chairman)
James Ellis (Vice-Chairman)
Deborah Roberts (Honorary Secretary)
Catherine Dale (Treasurer)
Nicholas Cook
Stephen Hinton
Robert Pascall
Anthony Pople (co-opted)
Alan Street
Arnold Whittall



Contents

page

| | |
|--|----|
| SMA Diary: in brief | 2 |
| Membership renewals | 2 |
| Noticeboard | 3 |
| SMA Plenary Meeting | 4 |
| TAGS Day | 4 |
| LancMAC '94 | 5 |
| SMA Elections | 6 |
| 'European Developments: Tunnelling Away?': Jonathan Dunsby | 7 |
| Newcastle Study Day, 30 October 1993: Abstracts | 9 |
| Nattiez Day, 14 November 1993: James Ellis | 11 |
| 'Reply to Nattiez: Analysis of Analyses': Jonathan Dunsby | 13 |

Contributors to this issue

Jonathan Dunsby is Professor of Music at the University of Reading.
James Ellis is Senior Lecturer in Music at City University, London.

SMA Diary-in brief

19 March 1994 : SMA Plenary Session

21 May 1994 : TAGS Day, Oxford Brookes University

23 - 25 September 1994 : Lancaster University Music Analysis Conference (LancMAC '94).

Subscription Renewals

Once again, Chronos has worked efficiently, inexorably and pitilessly in turning another calendar year. In a similar manner, renewals of SMA subscription are now due. It would be of great help administratively if Members were able to complete the following standing order instruction, which may of course be photocopied. Please send the completed form to the Membership Secretary, whose address is given below. Subscription rates remain at last year's levels of £25 (Ordinary) and £15 (Student).

Mr Peter Foster, Membership Secretary, SMA, University of Reading, Department of Music, 35 Upper Redlands Road, Reading RG1 5JE, UK

Instruction to your bank to pay the SMA subscription by Standing Order.

Please remember to complete the year you wish payment to commence.

To: The Manager,

Bank, Sort Code:

Address:

Account name:

Account number:

Please make payment of £25/£15* annually from my account on or soon after 1 January, commencing 199, to Society for Music Analysis, Midland Bank, University Branch, 550 Beverley Road, Hull HU6 7LQ, sort code 40-25-19, account no. 51331116, until advised otherwise by me in writing.

Signature:

Date:

*delete one option

SMA Noticeboard

Members of the SMA can display notices in the Noticeboard free of charge.

Gender Theory and Analysis

'Why are there so few women in music theory and analysis?'

Call for papers

The University of Southampton Music Department will be hosting a postgraduate study day on Gender Theory and Analysis on 23rd April 1994. Topics to be addressed will include: gender as an analytical paradigm; music theory as a gendered discourse; the relation of gender to music analysis as it is practised; and whether a consideration of music by women necessitates a reformulation of aspects of traditional music theory, as it has traditional historiography.

Proposals for papers/presentations are invited; those on the above and related themes are particularly welcome, although less closely-related themes will also be considered. Papers should be around 20-25 minutes in length; please send a short abstract by 7th March.

There will also be a 'round-table' discussion on analysis as a gendered practice. Short (5 minute) responses are invited to a position paper entitled 'Sex and Text: the Power Dynamics of Musical Analysis', which will be available on request from 1st February 1994.

For more information please contact Liz Garnett and Victoria Vaughan, University of Southampton, Department of Music, Highfield, Southampton SO9 5NH, UK.

Reception Theory and Music

King's College London, Saturday 5 February 1994

The Royal Musical Association will host a one-day Conference on Reception Theory and Music at King's College London. Proceedings, which are open to all, take place in the Council Room, with refreshments in the Committee Room. Coffee is served at 10.30, with papers from 11.00.

Speakers include Jim Samson (University Of Exeter), Friedhelm Krummacher (Christian-Albrechts-Universität, Kiel), Mark Everist (King's College London), Thomas Sipe (Westchester University), Scot Burnham (Princeton University) and Herbert Schneider (Hochschule für Musik und Darstellende Kunst, Frankfurt-am-Main). Robert Pascall (University of Nottingham) will chair the day. The directors of the Conference are Mark Everist and Jim Samson.

SMA Plenary Meeting, 19 March 1994

City University

The annual Plenary Meeting of the Society for Music Analysis will take place on Saturday 19 March 1994 at City University, London.

Schedule

- 11.00 Coffee
- 11.30 Annual General Meeting of Members
- 13.00 Buffet lunch
- 14.00 Round-table discussion of 'Music Analysis in the mid 1990s: Orthodoxy and Heterodoxy'. The leading speakers will be Ian Bent (Columbia University) and Arnold Whittall (King's College London), with Denis Smalley (University of East Anglia) in the Chair.
- 15.30 Tea and disperse.

Catering will be provided for Members in good standing. In order to facilitate the administration of this, please inform James Ellis (tel. 071 477 8274, fax 071 477 8576) by 28 February of your intention to be present. Should you wish to bring guests to the round-table, the cost, to cover catering, will be £8 per person, which includes lunch and tea.

The Meeting will be held in Level 5 refectory, main University building, Northampton Square, London EC1V 0HB. The nearest stations are Farringdon (Circle, District and Metropolitan lines, and BR Thameslink) and Angel (Northern line).

TAGS Day, 21 May 1994

Oxford Brookes University

The next one-day conference for graduates working in musical theory and analysis will be held at Oxford Brookes University on 21 May 1994. If at this stage anyone is interested in presenting a paper - even if that paper is far from ready! - please get in touch with Dai Griffiths at the following address to see whether sessions on a common theme are likely to emerge.

Dr Dai Griffiths, Oxford Brookes University, Music Department, Gipsy Lane, Headington, Oxford OX3 0BP, UK. Telephone 0865 485906.

Lancaster University Music Analysis Conference 1994

Call for papers

LancMAC '94 will take place on 23 - 25 September 1994. Proposals are invited for papers. The Conference will not be thematically organized, but the aim will be to present the best examples of current work in music analysis in an international context. The Programme Committee consists of Anthony Pople (Chairman), Jonathan Dunsby, Roger Parker and Robert Pascall. Abstracts of 300-500 words should be sent to the Conference Director, Dr Anthony Pople, at the address given below. They should be written in English, and must be postmarked no later than Friday, 11 March 1994.

Accommodation at Lancaster University includes rooms with en suite facilities.

Further information will appear in subsequent issues of this Newsletter. For specific enquiries please contact Dr Anthony Pople, Lancaster University, Department of Music, Bailrigg, Lancaster LA1 4YW, tel. 0524 593774, fax 0524 847298, Email mua002@uk.ac.lancaster.



AP

Election to the Executive Committee of the SMA

The Constitution of the Society for Music Analysis guarantees an annual election of Members to the Executive Committee. After the initial complete election last year, there will in this and subsequent years be an election for a third of the Committee, to serve for a period of three years. There are thus three vacancies to be filled. Nominations are invited, the closing date for which is 21 February 1994. Please send nominations to the Honorary Secretary, whose address appears at the end of the Newsletter. Ballot papers will be distributed on 28 February, and the closing date for receipt of voting papers in this postal election will be Thursday 17 March. Please attach a few sentences of biographical information about the Nominee suitable for inclusion in the ballot paper.

Designated Postgraduate Membership of the Executive Committee

Should a suitable nomination arise of a postgraduate music student registered for a higher degree at a recognized tertiary educational institution, further to a resolution of the Committee and following advice from the 1993 Plenary Meeting, an extra full membership of the Executive Committee will be declared. Should more than one such nomination arise, there will be a separate vote on the ballot paper to determine the outcome.

Name of
Nominee.....

Proposed
by.....

Seconded
by.....

Signed & dated by the nominee:

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 1994, please do so as soon as is convenient.

European Developments: Tunnelling Away?

Jonathan Dunsby

On 18 September 1993 I had occasion to reply to a circular from Nicolas Mécus, who coordinates the Liaison Committee for European Music-Analytical Societies from Brussels and deserves our gratitude for this important task. Members may be interested to have an extract from my communication. I hope I got this right on your behalf:

"I feel it is inevitable among a community of scholars that we tend to 'all know each other' anyway [the words of a colleague in Italy], yet we don't know each other well enough, and it has been an achievement of Colmar [1989], Trento [1991] and perhaps the MAC conferences [1984, 1986, 1988, 1991, 1993] to bring musicians together in a way that would otherwise not have happened. Further, certainly in this country music analysis is far from being a 'hobby'. The great majority of the members of the SMA and more widely the thousands of readers of *Music Analysis* are, I believe, professional musicians. That many are principally composers, performers, historians, journalists, graduate students and so on is [in my view] a good thing. We want to promote analytical research so that it can find its proper place in the musical world in general, sometimes very conspicuously - thus for instance we have a Chair of Musical Theory and Analysis in the University of London - but perhaps most often in small but crucial ways. I think our goal has been to nurture a climate in which Music Analysis is widely held to be important and relevant. This...is as far from the idea of a 'hobby' as it is from Pierre-Marie Sgaard's vision of the 'professionalization' of [music] analysis."

The reference to M. Sgaard above results from his astonishing achievement in the establishment of the journal *Analyse*

Musicae and the French Society for Music Analysis. Also to his credit was the first European Congress in our subject at Colmar (see above). Unfortunately during 1992 M. Sgaard, a senior figure in the financial world and no doubt used to rapid processes of organizational growth, appears to have become frustrated with the European music-analytical scene (or lack of it) and to have withdrawn from this field. I am simply reporting here on the facts as they appear to me, and doubtless there was much more going on behind the scenes in continental Europe. You will see from the last clause of my letter above that I don't think the SMA would have been fully in tune with M. Sgaard's project had it succeeded longer than it did. For instance, it was decided very early in planning here (of what in draft documents was called the 'British Society for...', a folly of mine from which Robert Pascall insistently saved us all, I'm glad to say) that there would be no qualification for membership.

Since M. Sgaard's withdrawal there has been debate among members of the European Liaison Committee, but this debate seems to have been restricted in the main to contingents from Belgium, France, Italy (two contingents!) and of course the UK. The SMA has put forward two suggestions: first that if it is wanted we might host a 1995 European Congress; secondly that we might look forward to the formation of a European Centre for Music-Analytical Studies, perhaps in London, perhaps in Brussels.

A 1993 Congress in Marseilles was foreseen by colleagues abroad but then abandoned, presumably as a result of lack of funds. Because we have observed that certain European initiatives have been only tentative, we have tried to foster the interests of SMA members independently by going ahead with the

highly successful SotoMAC 93, and LancMAC 94 which will surely also be a fine meeting. The weight of opinion in our Society is, I believe, that a large annual conference is not sustainable. It can hardly be said that the approximately 1.5 year gaps between the City, Southampton and Lancaster meetings were foreseen, let alone planned, but they *did* result from consultation, cooperation and compromise and I think this is what members expect of the Executive Committee. If, or when the time comes that we need to make decisions in the light of significant European constraints, clearly the Society will need a further phase of careful reconsideration of its objectives. I doubt that this is imminent, but that's just one person's opinion.

The idea of a European Centre grows from the Liaison Committee, from the observation of various educational initiatives in France, and I must say in my own case from seeing the enthusiasm and commitment of SMA members at every SMA event in the last two years. It being my role at the moment - a most pleasurable one of course - to attend all meetings, like some others I have been able to form an overview, and I have been delighted by the breadth that has emerged. Not that long ago, we were in Reading hearing the views on current literature of some of the sharpest young academic researchers - and not all members would have understood all that was said, or wanted to perhaps! Yet not long after that at the Nottingham study day we had what I know some readers would call the 'real' thing, a quartet on stage, illustrating and responding to the various 'thinkers'. The Newcastle Study Day was equally 'live' in this way. I do not want to rehearse the 'heart and brain' debate, of which I notice repeatedly in any case that members have a sophisticated view; but to reinforce what I take to be members' likely position on the possible emergence of a European Centre, that this is acceptable if it serves some of the Society's needs, and it cannot be expected to serve them all.

Anyway, this too may be a long-term project. Meanwhile, we seem to be have encouraged continental colleagues in one respect: in the near future a European Music-Analytical Newsletter will be published by the Liaison Committee. It will be disseminated through the national societies such as ours. Whether it will be of sufficient interest to those who are reading these lines remains to be seen. Let us hope so.

Finally, I hesitate to appear twice (if in entirely distinct capacities) in one Newsletter and hope it will be well understood that this is just one of those things that happen.

Please write to me (ideally fax 0494 873284) if you are uneasy about anything said here, or if, as is surely likely in such a large group of informed readers, you see an angle, opportunity or duty that is being missed.



SMA Autumn Seminar Day, 30 October 1993

University of Newcastle upon Tyne

Issues of Analysis and Performance

Beethoven, Quartet Op. 132 and Bartók, Quartet No. 3

Abstracts of Papers

Nicholas Marston (University of Exeter): 'Writing the First Movement of Op. 132: Some Aspects of the Autograph Score'.

This paper presents a discussion of some of the revisions to the movement which are documented in the autograph, and highlights one or two readings which appear never to have been transmitted to the published editions. Integral are the performance of examples of such revisions.

Lesley Hatfield (University of Newcastle upon Tyne): 'Issues of Performance in Op. 132, with reference to the Autograph'.

An examination of performance problems encountered by the Adriano Quartet in interpreting Op. 132, demonstrating how knowledge of the autograph influenced their fresh view of the work. The discussion focusses particularly on issues of articulation and dynamics, and their importance in establishing character and style.

Amanda Bayley (University of Reading): 'The Function of the Slur in the Motivic Structure of Beethoven and Bartók'.

Issues surrounding the historical performance of music of the eighteenth and nineteenth centuries are already recognized as of paramount importance. However, it has yet to be realized that an investigation into the notation employed by composers of Bartók's generation is even more crucial. The development of notation in the twentieth century has left the performer without the basis of a commonly understood language, as used in the interpretation of Beethoven. Consequently, the implicit information as used by Bartók has to be interpreted as an integral part of the score.

Articulation is an aspect often overlooked by string players, who tend to regard slurs as suggestions for bowing rather than as structurally significant. The slur not only defines fundamental intervallic constituents in Beethoven's String Quartet Op. 132 and in Bartók's Quartet No. 3, but together with the rhythmic articulation it has an important role in identifying and even in concealing motivic relationships, according to the thematic context.

Deborah Roberts (University of Newcastle upon Tyne): 'Exploring Complementation: The Case of Bartók's Third Quartet (Seconda Parte)'.

Despite increased awareness in recent years of the concept of complementation, I maintain that its full potential has not yet been realized, and I aim to show the nature and extent of its applicability in Bartók's Third Quartet, as a means of responding to some of the questions raised by the work. Complementation (involving ideas of opposition and indeed apposition) is commonly related to pitch, but can also usefully be considered in relation to other parameters, such as texture, timbre, rhythm and form. It can also exist at different structural levels, on small and large scales, and can produce multi-faceted complexes. Various ways of implementing, or embedding, complementation may result in juxtaposition, polarity, or even synthesis. The concept can contribute both to our analytical understanding of the work and to performance-related issues.

Julie Brown (Emmanuel College, Cambridge): 'The Carnavalesque in Bartók's Third Quartet (*Seconda Parte*)'.

The *Seconda Parte* is essentially a dance, spiritually a type of scherzo movement, but it also contains some striking rhetoric. I interpret some of this rhetoric as parody and irony, and suggest, drawing on ideas of Mikhail Bakhtin, that the spirit is Carnavalesque. This notion, which seeks to describe a subversive linguistic style, proves useful for understanding the demystifying dialogue in this playful, linguistically synthesized dance, between its Austro-German art music 'language' and its Hungarian folk music 'accent'.

David Clarke (University of Newcastle upon Tyne): 'Bartók's Third Quartet as Modernist Artwork'.

Bartók's Third Quartet belongs to what might be called the 'classic modernist' canon. In this paper I explore, both from an aesthetic and an analytical point of view, what that assertion might mean. A primary concern is to examine what becomes in the work of historically conceived categories of signification. In particular I consider Bartók's treatment of the sonata form archetype, and his implanting within it of heterogeneous musical materials that both invite and resist assimilation. Inevitably also on the agenda will be issues such as discontinuity, fragmentation and non-closure. And fuelling the discussion as a whole will be Adorno's notion of a modernist condition 'where art revolts against its essential concepts while at the same time being inconceivable without them'.

Michael Spitzer (University of Durham): 'Topoi/Genera Interaction in Bartók's Third Quartet'.

Bartók stands apart from his contemporaries in having developed the most readily identifiable array of expressive modes, such as 'Night Music' or 'Bulgarian Rhythm'. Following Ratner's and Agawu's work on classical *topoi*, my paper arranges the composer's stylistic, generic and procedural references into a universe of extroversive signs. Like Agawu, I aim to show that the music's discontinuities result from an interaction between surfaces (expressive *topoi*) and background (harmonic genera). I borrow my terms from Eero Tarasti's and Márta Grabócz's typologies of isotopy in the music of Liszt.

Nattiez in London

James A. Ellis

The day devoted to valuable contact with Jean-Jacques Nattiez on 14 November 1993 proved as fascinating and as frustrating as could have been predicted. Fascinating in hearing the exposition of ideas linked in the most elegant of thematizations, and the elaboration of those ideas; frustrating in the incompleteness of debate that is inevitably part of seminar or conference format. The debate continues now, of course, for those disposed to follow through ideas and deal with developments that spin off the wheel of the imagination. There is surely much to contemplate.

The paper Nattiez gave was not new: he presented it at the Second European Congress for Music Analysis in Trento in 1991. Its title is 'Are different analytical methods related? A *propos* the theme of Mozart's G minor Symphony, K. 550'. In essence, Nattiez examines different analyses of the opening of the symphony. These are not only different in the sense of being the work of different individuals: they are different in method and theory. We might expect voice-leading graphs to differ between analysts (reflecting the epistemological problem of interpretation within the Schenkerian model), for instance. But here we have results totally different in purpose as well as method. Deryck Cooke's identification of emotional archetypes rubs shoulders with Réti's motivic, yet abstract and essentially unemotional, patternings; Schenker's graphs jostle with Meyer and Lerdahl-Jackendoff; distributional views knock against Abel's purely poetic metaphors of musical experience. As Nattiez puts it, 'a music analysis never presents the realistic image of a work under examination, but presents instead a construction which selects in its view a certain number of features which are deemed adequate to give an account of

the work'.

Nattiez categorizes these differences as follows. There are two overall categories of analysis, semantic and immanent. Within the immanent category there is a further division into taxonomic and linear. Example 1 shows the distribution of the analyses within this model.¹

The table of theoretical models is crucial to Nattiez's argument, for it not only reveals the differences between the analyses, but also the similarities. This last point is focussed on in the latter part of the paper, after discussion of the analyses themselves. 'From the initial typology and its progressive explication', he says, 'and from superposing lines of analysis, I draw three general conclusions'. The first concerns semantic and non-semantic analyses: 'If one acknowledges that...[they are]...not contradictory but complementary, or more exactly, that the immanent does not exclude the semantic, that taxonomic and linear approaches deal with non-concurrent aspects of musical substance, that poietic and esthetic strategies do not necessarily coincide, then the different methods which emanate from distinct ontological points of view correspond to pertinences which are self-complementary, and which derive from different aspects of the [same] musical substance'. Also, says Nattiez, 'analysis is endless..it is always possible to imagine a new line of analysis...this permits us to avoid a tendency to complete reductionism'. Finally, Nattiez observes that 'the confrontation between theories and their concrete applications...demonstrates each theory's general theoretical and epistemological limitation on the basis of which each model was elaborated. The absence of the semantic in certain ontological and semiotic conceptions of music,

| <i>Families of analysis</i> | <i>Explicit Methodology</i> | <i>Hierarchization</i> | <i>Semiological Pertinence</i> |
|-----------------------------|-----------------------------|------------------------|--------------------------------|
| Semantic | | | |
| Hermeneutic (Abel) | - | weak | not thematized |
| Cooke | - | - | -ditto- |
| Stefani | + | (+) | -ditto- |
| Immanent | | | |
| Taxonomic | | | |
| Paradigmatic | + | + | neutral level |
| Réti | - | - | poietic/inductive |
| Meyer | + | + | esthesis/inductive |
| Lerdahl-Jackendoff | + | + | -ditto- |
| Linear | | | |
| Schenker | - | + | poietic=neutral level=esthesis |
| Meyer/Narmour | + | + | esthesis/inductive |
| Lerdahl-Jackendoff | + | + | -ditto- |

Example 1 : Typology of analyses

ignorance of linearity in the taxonomists, avoidance of melody in certain 'linearists', and so on: all this is taken into account in the premises of my approach here'. Nattiez concludes by questioning whether relations do indeed exist between diverse methods of analysis. He indicates a tentative affirmative, with the *caveat* that 'in understanding the differences between analyses, it is necessary to understand the preoccupations from which each author started out. That is the sole basis for knowing how an analysis was made, and on the basis of previous propositions, how it might be possible to make a better one'. [All translations are from the original and are my own.]

Discussion followed the lunch break, and allowed elaboration of ideas contained within the paper, as well as a more general grounding within Nattiez's Grand Unified Theory: the tripartition.

Particularly interesting was the idea that an individual can think in a way that contains more than one strand or level of concept, thinking 'stereophonically' or, better, 'polyphonically', so that different levels of thought are simultaneously considered. Projected onto the result of thought, theory, this point echoes Arnold Whittall's notion of plurality: '...pluralism *within* a method or theory is a more exciting possibility than the obvious variety that occurs when we approach the same music in quite different ways'.²

Jean-Jacques Nattiez graciously accepted the title of Corresponding Member of the SMA during the day. It is to be hoped that he will not be parted from these shores for long.³

Notes.

1. Individual analytic graphs or

examples are not given here. For the complete paper, in the original French, see *Secondo Convegno Europeo di Analisi Musicale. Atti di R. Dalmonte e M. Baroni*, pp. 535-565. This is available from Cenfor International Books, Via Belenzani 39, I.38100 Trento.

2. Arnold Whittall, 'A Reply to Jean-Jacques Nattiez', *Secondo Convegno Europeo di Analisi Musicale. Atti di R. Dalmonte e M. Baroni*, Trento, 1992, pp. 585-92.

3. Readers should know that Nattiez's latest book *Le Combat de Chronos et d'Orphée* has just been released by Christian Bourgois éditeur, and contains, amongst other items, essays on Glenn Gould, Hanslick, Wagner and Boulez's *Répons*. It is not stocked by any of the large bookshops in the UK, but may be ordered through local stores.



Reply to Nattiez: Analysis of Analyses

Jonathan Dunsby

It will not be long before my years of replying to Jean-Jacques Nattiez will be counted in decades¹. Once again he has nourished us with his words worthy of profound reflection, and the privilege of even a brief response is most welcome. It is in two short parts.

First, considering the topic of the session in general, it should be recorded that there has been relatively little comparative analysis in the literature, and I do not need to cite those symposia, at conferences as well as in print, where different approaches to the same music have yielded just that - differences, of which it can usually be said that they were already well-known in any case. To take one actual manifestation, there seems to be very little point comparing the analyses of

Schoenberg's Piano Piece, Op. 11, No. 1, by Allen Forte and Will Ogdon², which might be thought better material than various partial approaches to a tune by Mozart, since they are thorough analyses of a whole piece of music. Among the various reasons why so little is to be gained in comparing them, even when they are printed together, is because, theories aside, one is lucid in its execution, but the other is confused and confusing. Even with comparisons of work similarly executed and on similar theoretical ground, sterile comparison of undecidables often obtains, as anyone will know who has had the misfortune to hear two Schenkerians (one of them possibly myself!) debating a difference of 'reading'. Even when there is a common purpose and commitment, there can be a lack of interaction, a lack

which is of itself just uninteresting, not worth discussing - some here may recall this vividly from a symposium on Boulez's *Répons* in Oxford [four]...years ago, with fascinating speeches from those who seemed to breathe the air of entirely different planets.

Now, Nattiez would reply that in a semiological perspective any phenomena can be brought into conjunction, and that if I reject this conjunction, I am simply displacing on possible symbol - the objects as compared - by two other symbols, the objects I wish to keep distinct. From the semiological perspective, this is absolutely true, and I propose to demonstrate the process in reverse, in the following, second part of this discussion. There is, I detect, a symbolic form at work in Nattiez's own narrative, which supervenes the individual symbolic identity of the analyses he discusses. I would apologize for the analysis of an analysis of analyses, were it not so much in the spirit of the occasion.

Secondly, then, notice how Nattiez emphasizes - not for the first time of course - the assertion that no analysis can be, to use his term, 'complete'. The question of whether there is any substance to this assertion goes to the heart of his enquiry, for he is seeking to discover, by comparison, whether some analyses are 'more true, more complete or better than others'. No doubt there is an informality in this phrase, which leaves us to guess whether one analysis could be more true, more complete, but worse than another; or indeed whether it could be simply less true but more complete. Beneath the informality, however, lies the incisive application by Nattiez of a rigorous empirical methodology which seems to me to turn around the question of our ability ever to say 'this is finished'.

Is the work of art itself complete? There are many temptations to argue that it cannot be, because the composer is never satisfied, because each new performance is different, because criticism changes our perceptions; we do not need semiology in order to admit these temptations. Yet the work of art

does have an identity. It can be recognized: it can be named. In its identity - a proof, if you will, of its very existence - it can be considered alongside more similar and less similar works of art or indeed any other kind of object; but there is no fundamental overlapping of identities if there is to be identity at all. The work of art is complete in its identity.

I make this assertion to make a firm grounding for an issue Nattiez does not properly address here - and far from being a criticism, this is an attempt to carry forward the stimulus he has offered, as we shall see at the end. The issue is: are these various analysts analysing the same object? If not, then to compare the analyses would be a very much harder enterprise than that undertaken by Nattiez. I take the view that the object, the so-called 'theme' of the first movement of Mozart's 40th, varies from one analysis to another. After all, the theme is not a work of art, for although we can recognize it from the first two or three notes alone, we cannot as it were 'name it'. Where, for instance, does this so-called theme end? To push some examples to their extreme, one might argue that paradigmatically it ends where the length of paper written upon runs out; that for Schenker it ends at the last point of the finale; and that for Meyer it never ends because of the network of unfulfilled implications and the ever-changing memory we have of it and the schemas we bring to it. I cannot argue at length on this occasion why this theme is essentially incomplete, but I suspect that few would argue differently anyway. And thus the problem: to assert that a complete analysis is impossible of an object which in the first place has no identity is surely to do very little positive analytical work at all.

This is far from being an anti-semiological proposition. On the contrary, semiology of the kind Nattiez has introduced into our discipline expresses very well the shifting identity across the poles of symbolic reference. The difficulty of analysis is to fix that identity for a particular purpose, to say with precision what is

the nature of what is being analysed - it is what we all struggle to do. Nattiez admires the richness of Schenker - 'phenominologically' he adds, cautiously and I suspect almost tautologically - because Schenker tries to 'get inside Mozart's skin'. But this appeal of the poietics is a distraction. Nattiez would be just as content if we could persuade him, in esthetics, that Schenker gets inside our own ears, or even only that Schenker offers an explicit and systematic parsing of the musical score. In the end, for all Nattiez's denial of completeness, it is his search for plenitude that continues, and comparison is supervened.

Notes.

1. This paper followed Jean-Jacques Nattiez's presentation of the paper 'Existe-t-il des relations entre les diverses méthodes d'analyse?' at the *Secondo Convegno Europeo di Analisi Musicale* in Trento in 1991. Permission for reproduction from the publishers of the Proceedings is gratefully acknowledged. [Details of the publishing house are given in the previous article.]
2. Both analyses appeared in *Journal of the Arnold Schoenberg Institute*, Vol. V, No. 2, 1981.



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

Mr Peter Foster
Membership Secretary, SMA
University of Reading
Department of Music
35 Upper Redlands Road
Reading RG1 5JE, UK

Dr James Ellis
Editor, Newsletter of the SMA
City University
Department of Music
Northampton Square
London EC1V 0HB, UK
Fax 071 477 8576