



society for music analysis

# newsletter

January 2001

## Contents

Editorial	2
OXMAC 2000 Review	3
Autumn Study Day 2000: Review	6
Whittall Lecture Series: Review	9
Events	12
SMA Master's Bursaries 2001	14



## committee

### President

John Rink  
j.rink@rhul.ac.uk

### Vice President

Nicholas Marston  
nick.marston@st-peters.oxford.ac.uk

### Events Officer

Amanda Bayley  
a.bayley@wlv.ac.uk

### Information Officer

Lee Tsang  
lee.tsang@uce.ac.uk

### Treasurer

Robert Adlington  
robert.adlington@nottingham.ac.uk

### Administrator

Matthew Riley  
matthew.riley@btinternet.com

## submissions

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

Send materials for submission by email to [lee.tsang@uce.ac.uk](mailto:lee.tsang@uce.ac.uk) or, if necessary, by post to:

Lee Tsang, Information Officer  
SMA Newsletter/Website  
Birmingham Conservatoire  
Paradise Place  
Birmingham B3 3HG

# editorial

Welcome to the first of our new-look, semi-annual SMA Newsletters. Some aspects of the format and design have changed, but we've retained the usual mix of reviews and information on forthcoming events. Those of you who are applying for postgraduate funding may be interested also in an item on SMA bursaries, which features information on this year's award winners and application details for the 2001-2002 awards.

I would like to express my gratitude to the reviewers who have contributed to this issue: Matthew Riley (OXMAC 2000), Tom Service (Autumn Study Day), and Vania Schittenhelm (Whittall lectures). I am most grateful also to members of the SMA Executive Committee for their feedback regarding the content and format of the Newsletter, particularly John Rink and Nicholas Marston for their responses to the reviews.

We've an exciting programme of other SMA events coming up over the next few months. If you've not yet attended Arnold Whittall's excellent lectures on 'The World of Twentieth-Century Music', be sure not to miss the next one. As Vania has noted in her review of the series, one could not hope for a greater authority on the subject; these lectures have been highly stimulating—a real success. Another unmissable event is the Study Day on improvisation that John Rink has organised in association with the Royal Musical Association. Such collaborative events seem an entirely appropriate and practical way for the Society to maintain its broad scope.

Our Events Officer, Amanda Bayley, has been busy organising collaborative events also for later in the year. Many of you who attended OXMAC 2000 will be delighted to hear that a Study Day is being hosted by the Music Department at Reading University (in association with the SMA) in October. This event is being organised in direct response to Anthony People's 'Tonalties' paper, which caused quite a stir at OXMAC 2000. It's great to see the SMA playing such a key role in promoting research that captures the imagination of so many and helps us to move the discipline ever forward.

A handwritten signature in black ink, appearing to read 'Lee Tsang', written in a cursive style.

Lee Tsang  
Editor

# OXMAC 2000: Review

by Matthew Riley

## Oxford University Music Analysis Conference

directed by Nicholas Marston

St Peter's College, Oxford, 22–24 September

The latest biennial Music Analysis Conference—OXMAC 2000—took place at St Peter's College, Oxford. It brought together familiar names and new faces from the UK, continental Europe, North America and Asia, and covered topics as diverse as jazz pianism, Brahms lieder, and representations of 'self' and 'other' in Western and non-Western musical thought. A review of such a conference can be only partially representative of delegates' experiences; regrettably, I could not hear every speaker because, as is customary at these events, some sessions ran in parallel.

During the first afternoon, two plenary sessions launched the conference in a suitably 'meta' spirit: most of the speakers used their own or others' analyses as the starting point for reflection on music analysis itself. Beate Kutschke (Humboldt University, Berlin) began by broaching some key philosophical issues in 'Analysis—Imagination—Notation'. Observing that 'mechanical' computer realisations of scores do not sound like real music, she warned against equating 'music' with a score. She invoked Nelson Goodman's idea that the musical work 'takes place' within a spectrum of possible performances of the score, and argued that, when we analyse a score, we analyse a performance taking place in our own minds. Focusing on analyses of Beethoven's 'Hammerklavier' Sonata by Charles Rosen and Erwin Ratz, she linked analyses with the personal performance aesthetics and the imagined performances of the analysts. Discussion following the paper centred on the thorny issue of compliance with notation and what this constitutes, both today and at the time the piece was written.

Kutschke's paper was followed by Bethany Lowe (Welsh College of Music and Drama) reading 'The Blind Man and the Elephant? Formal Analogy in Sibelius Studies, 1935–1965'. Lowe sought to rehabilitate mid-twentieth-century trends in Sibelius analysis. In contrast to recent scholars who have been keen to align Sibelius with a rising Modernist generation born in the 1860s, Lowe discussed Sibelius's symphonies in terms of conventional sonata form. She showed how mid-twentieth-century analysts applied the principles of *Formenlehre* to the first movement(s) of the Fifth Symphony. Although each advocate of *Formenlehre* insisted on the appropriateness of his or her structural delineation of the movement(s), no two analyses were the same: one analyst's exposition was another's development section, and so on. Such contradictions tell us much about the elusive relationship between Sibelius's symphonic processes and the traditional theory of sonata form. However, Lowe was equally interested in what the relationship could say about analysis. The paper provoked a discussion of *Formenlehre*, and highlighted this much-derided nineteenth-century concept's strong comeback in current musicology.

The second session began with Yuhwen Wang's (National Taiwan University) 'Confronting Judgemental Conflict: The *Symphonie Fantastique* and Gadamer's *Horizontverschmelzung*'. Wang addressed the question of how two or more conflicting judgements of a musical work may be assimilated without either admitting the invalidity of at least one of them or resorting to relativism. Like Lowe and Kutschke, she invoked the work of earlier analysts: in this case, Edward T. Cone and the nineteenth-century critic Franz Brendel. Whereas Cone praised Berlioz's *Symphonie Fantastique* for its 'directionality'—its drive towards a goal—Brendel believed that the work lacked 'beauty' because its structure is 'sectional' and it relies on programmatic description. As a way of reconciling their views, Wang drew on Hans Georg Gadamer's notion of 'horizon amalgamation' (*Horizontverschmelzung*). Exactly how the amalgamation might work in analytical terms was, unfortunately, unclear; Wang did not have time to present her 'Cone-ian' and 'Brendelian' analyses of the symphony. Moreover, the paper might have benefited from a sharper distinction between analysis and aesthetic value judgement.

In the following paper, 'Prestidigitation: Nietzsche's "Tempo" in Wagnerian Opera', Jill T. Brasky (University of Wisconsin) focused on Nietzsche's conception of tempo in *Beyond Good and Evil*. Nietzsche argued that the character of a nation was a kind of tempo that could be reflected in the nation's language. He believed that 'a German is almost incapable of *presto* in his language; [and] thus also [incapable] of daring nuances of free-spirited thought'. Taking into account Nietzsche's anxiety about the potential effeminacy of chromaticism, Brasky diagnosed the rhythmically ponderous, largely diatonic duet 'O sink hernieder' from Act II of *Tristan und Isolde* as a prime example of Nietzsche's 'German tempo'.

The final paper of the session, 'Inter-ethnicity in Jazz: A Third Level of Musical Meaning', was read by David Crilly with musical examples performed by Kevin Flanagan and his band (Anglia Polytechnic University). Crilly made some illuminating points about Charlie Parker's 'Parker's Mood', though—like the first three speakers—he was concerned ultimately with the nature of music analysis itself. Seeing twentieth-century analysis in terms of 'autonomy', 'formalism', 'unity', and 'integration', he complained that some analysis had become too preoccupied with detailed examination of music notation. He suggested that analysts could learn much from jazz, which, he argued, is concerned principally with stretching and elaborating an underlying (blues) progression. He stressed the importance of rhythm and gesture, which are not 'set in stone' by notation, and described Parker's bebop style as a 'music-language game' in which players constantly refer to, or deviate from, their own or others' musical gestures. Crilly argued that analysis could profit from an awareness

of these issues—even when it deals with traditional notated music. The paper was followed by a lively debate which drew together some of the themes of an interesting afternoon, albeit one in which the speakers sometimes laboured familiar arguments and criticisms.

As it happens, Crilly's paper was followed by an evening session entitled 'The Jazz Pianist as Composer', in which the speakers applied the tools of conventional theory and analysis to jazz; this provided an excellent opportunity to counter the prevailing trend of analysing jazz primarily in terms of improvisation. The session was convened by Steve Larson (University of Oregon) and included contributions from Henry Martin (Rutgers University), Steven Strunk (Catholic University of America) and Keith Waters (University of Colorado, Boulder).

Martin's 'Strategies of Non-Improvisation in the Stride Piano Works of James P. Johnson' was an intriguing examination of recorded and notated versions of Johnson's 'Carolina Shout'. Martin argued that the terms 'improvisation' and 'paraphrase' are hardly appropriate to describe the degree of variation that is applied to the small 'thematic blocks' on which the music is built. He suggested that each version is better understood as a fully thought-out, large-scale composition.

Strunk's 'Analytical Approaches to Chick Corea's Compositions of the 1960s' and Water's 'Modes, Scales, Functional Harmony and Non-Functional Harmony in the Compositions of Herbie Hancock' consisted of a wealth of interesting analytical strategies and observations; Strunk and Waters employed quasi-Schenkerian graphs and the Riemann *Tonnetz*, and broached the issue of so-called 'modality'. Non-specialist listeners might have been bewildered by the welter of material offered both verbally and on the generous handouts: each presentation could easily have filled an entire session.

Larson's 'Bill Evans as "Composer" in *Conversations with Myself*' examined a work that Evans created by recording and overdubbing a piano track. Larson used voice-leading analysis to illuminate the 'compositional' aspects of the piece; he proposed that composition and improvisation are interactive and lie on a continuum. At the end of the paper, a 'parallel jam session' of the piece was performed by Larson, Martin, Strunk and Waters on three pianos, and the evening closed with an animated discussion of the session's themes, focusing on historical precedents for the speakers' views on the composition-improvisation relationship.

The following day began with Eric McKee (Pennsylvania State University). Readers of *Music Analysis* will recall McKee's recent article about the influence of the eighteenth-century social minuet on Bach's French Suites. In his conference paper 'Dance and the Music of Chopin', McKee turned his attention to the role of the waltz in Chopin's social milieu; he noted the composer's documented experience as dancer and accompanist, and explained some of the steps that dancers might have taken. He claimed that Chopin's waltzes are unusual in that they often involve a melodic apex at the moment in a phrase that corresponds to a turn made by the female member of a dancing pair. The turn was potentially the most difficult—and risqué—manoeuvre in the dance; McKee argued that, here, Chopin turns his musical 'gaze'

on the woman. The melodic pattern that implies this 'gaze' occurs only in the waltzes that were unpublished during the composer's lifetime.

In a parallel session, Daniel Harrison (University of Rochester, New York) read 'Enharmonic Nonconformity in Late Romantic Music: A Study in Key Relationships'. Harrison's lucid delivery was complemented by splendid (and often witty) overhead projections. In contrast to much current analysis of nineteenth-century harmony, which posits a tonal space of twelve equally-tempered pitch classes, Harrison argued in favour of preserving enharmonic differences between keys. On a Riemannian *Tonnetz*, he plotted the tonal course of passages from Liszt's Piano Concerto No. 1 and Strauss's *Ein Heldenleben*. The *Ein Heldenleben* example was especially striking, since it showed that the work contains several Eb major tonics which function differently according to the ways in which they are approached. Harrison suggested that the differences between the initial and final tonics could be used to flesh out our intuitions about Romantic narratives, such as the 'struggle to victory'.

The next session began with Charles J. Smith (SUNY, Buffalo) reading 'Head-Tones, Mediants, Reprises: A Formal Narrative Through Brahms's "Handel" Variations'. Smith's work will be familiar to readers of *Music Analysis*; in this paper, he developed his ideas on conventional form and Schenkerian backgrounds. He traced through the 'Handel' Variations several parameters, including the identity of the head tone, the degree of concealment of the reprise of the theme and the harmony that is supported by the (ever-present) mediant. He considered Variation XXI to be the focal point of the piece, in that it brings to a head his discussion of the parameters. However, his analytical 'narrative' did not correspond to the rhetorical trajectory that is apparent in most performances of the piece. Smith admitted that, despite his interest in and attachment to the work, he had always felt that the work does not quite 'come off'; in practice, Variation XXI sounds anticlimactic or, at best, like a subdued preparation for the final four variations. The paper was Smith's attempt to express in analytical terms his critical judgement about the piece.

In 'Expounding Variation(s): Re-Proportioning Mozart', Roman Ivanovitch (Yale University) continued the variations topic. He was interested in variation technique not just in the 'theme and variations' genre, but in Mozart's entire output. His analytical approach involved modifying Schoenberg's definition of variation—'repetition in which some features are changed and the rest preserved'—into a conception of variation based on 'essential' and 'incidental' features. Appropriate passages from Mozart's String Quartet K499, Piano Concertos K467 and K488, and Serenade K361 illustrated the fruitfulness of this approach.

Meanwhile, in a parallel session, Anthony Pople (University of Nottingham) delivered a blockbuster multimedia presentation entitled 'Using Complex Set Theory for Tonal Analysis', which left a packed audience dazzled by both virtuosity of delivery and theoretical substance. Using an 'online' computer display, Pople presented his evolving theory whereby standard aspects of conventional tonal theory are presented in terms of multiple pc set systems. He applied the technique to

standard tonal repertory (Mozart's A major Piano Sonata K331 and Schumann's *Dichterliebe*) and repertory that is more readily associated with Fortean set theory, citing examples by Schoenberg and Debussy. The paper was one of the highlights of the conference—a tour de force which left the audience craving more; satisfying this craving will now be possible thanks to Jonathan Dunsby, who is organising a Study Day on Pople's theory at the University of Reading in October 2001, in association with the SMA.

Lunch was followed by a session devoted to the elusive issues of sonority and timbre. In 'Sonoristics: An Unknown Theory of the Musical Work', Zbigniew Granat (Boston University) introduced 'Sonoristics'—an analytical approach developed by Polish musicologists in the 1950s and 1960s. Granat explained that the theory was partly a response to the compositional movement known as 'Sonorism', which involved Penderecki and others. However, it has also been applied to conventional idioms: we were shown some analyses of Beethoven's music that bore a striking resemblance to a Penderecki score! Although fairly widely practised in Eastern Europe, the approach has been neglected in the West: only one or two audience members were familiar with the theory. Nevertheless, the paper aroused much interest and was followed by numerous questions. We should be grateful to Granat for raising our awareness of this methodology.

Amanda Bayley (University of Wolverhampton) returned to some of the themes of the first afternoon. In her paper 'The Role of Timbre in Performance and Analysis: Ligeti's String Quartet No. 2', she explored relationships between analysis, performance and notation, and demonstrated the key role of texture and timbre in twentieth-century musical form. Bayley showed that, in the Quartet, performance directions are a crucial component of the notation. In conclusion, she observed that the investigation of timbre in twentieth-century notation may offer insight into musical expression in general, in that timbre may be viewed as an aspect of a performer's individuality.

Vincent Benitez's (Bowling Green State University) 'Simultaneous Contrast and Additive Pitch Designs in Messiaen's *Saint François d'Assise*' addressed the significance of the painter Robert Delaunay's colour theory for Messiaen's compositional techniques. Like Delaunay, Messiaen juxtaposed the 'colours' that he associated with certain sonorities according to complement relations determined by a theoretical 'colour wheel'. The juxtapositions produced 'vibrations' that Messiaen regarded as theologically significant. In the discussion that followed the paper, Benitez was asked whether or not Messiaen's encoding of musical 'colours' could ever be apparent to a non-synaesthetic listener. His response was that Messiaen was interested in the 'mutual enhancement' that arises from juxtaposing contrasting colours rather than in the effects of individual colours. He insisted that 'mutual enhancement' is an audible phenomenon of the music.

In the Keynote Address, which was entitled 'Musical Articulation', Nicolas Meeüs (Université de Paris-Sorbonne) sought to make sense of the nature and purpose of music analysis. Drawing on the linguistic work of André Martinet and Emile Benveniste, he pointed out that language is 'doubly articulated': one can first break

down a proposition into words, and then the words into syllables. According to Benveniste, music does not admit a double articulation, since there are no signifying elements that could provide a 'middle level' comparable to words in language. Meeüs qualified this judgement a little. He suggested that a 'middle level' of articulated units is possible if a passage is treated as belonging to a theoretical or compositional system that provides rules akin to those of Saussure's *langue*. Moreover, the capacity for having articulated units at 'higher' levels is far greater in music than in language.

The notion of articulation provided Meeüs with a useful theoretical framework for understanding music analysis. Meeüs stressed the importance of economy in articulations: later analytical levels ought to have fewer functional units. This principle had implications for papers that were presented earlier in the conference. With regard to the session preceding his address, Meeüs observed that perhaps the most important question was whether or not an 'economical' articulation may be devised for timbre. This extremely lucid presentation provided many delegates with much food for thought—and further sustenance was to follow in the form of a CUP-sponsored reception and the delightful conference dinner.

The final morning of the conference began with a stimulating session on Brahms lieder. Sarah Callis (Royal Academy of Music) discussed 'Competing Styles in Brahms's *Geistliches Wiegenlied*, Op. 91 No. 2'. She showed that the song's rich blend of styles and allusions is tonally underpinned, and pointed out that, in Brahms's music, Dahlhaus discerned a dialectic between the technical processes of chamber music and the ideal lied aesthetic of folksong-like melody and unity of mood. In Op. 91 No. 2, the dialectic is complicated by unmistakable references to the opening of Wagner's *Tristan und Isolde* and by the presence of a viola that plays its own 'song' (the fourteenth-century lullaby 'Josef lieber, Josef mein'). The paper provided a compelling discussion of the styles, genres, and archaic and modern aspects of the lied.

The presence of distinct 'voices' was an important topic also in Annalise Plummer's (Gonville & Caius College, Cambridge) 'Dialogue and Duality: The Dramatic Potential of the Duet Lied Explored in Brahms's *Walpurgisnacht*, Op. 75 No. 4'. Plummer traced in detail the emergence of a pair of abstract voices; these 'voices' developed from two motives that are associated with, but retain a degree of independence from, the singers' lines. Plummer took an interesting hermeneutic approach whereby the two motives stood for a direct 'question and answer' between the singers that is never quite realised in the text.

The final session, entitled 'Beyond Orientalism: Musical Representations of "Self" and "Other"', included presentations by Jeremy Day-O'Connell (Cornell University), Marc Perlman (Brown University), Steven Nuss (Colby College) and Yayoi Uno Everett (Emory University). In 'Pentatonic Exoticism Reconsidered', Day-O'Connell selected interesting examples of pentatonicism in European music from the late seventeenth to the late nineteenth centuries. He linked pentatonicism with 'exoticism', characterising the link as a duality comprised of both utopian promise and ominous threat. By highlighting associations with notions of 'purity' and

'simplicity', he sought to establish pentatonicism's place in nineteenth-century musical semantics.

Periman's 'Sensuous Impersonality: Aural Orientalism and Colin McPhee's Theory of "Metric" Rhythm' examined McPhee's hearing of Balinese music. McPhee's Modernist aesthetic led him to celebrate what he considered to be the music's lack of 'Romantic' traits; he heard the music in terms of utility, universality, objectivity, abstraction, formality, cool sensuousness and the absence of personal emotional statements. He claimed that this lack of 'Romanticism' highlighted a distinction between Western and non-Western music. For McPhee, Western music is associated with the 'dynamic' accents of emotional self-expression, and non-Western music is characterised by 'metric' accents that represent the physical motion of the body.

In 'Hearing Japanese / Hearing Takemitsu', Nuss examined controversial Japanese theories of physiological and cultural uniqueness and the claim that the Japanese organise language and sound in a manner different from all other nations. He showed that the idea of 'hearing Japanese' has had a considerable impact on the composition and reception of post-war Japanese art music, especially that of Takemitsu.

The conference drew to an end with Everett's 'Cross-cultural Syntheses of East Asian and Western Musical

Resources in Post-war Art Music: Analytical Paradigm and Taxonomy'. Everett applied a range of semiotic terminology to music by Isang Yun, Takemitsu and others. Her application highlighted the creative juxtaposition of diverse cultural indices from both East and West.

Nicholas Marston—the conference director—deserves special thanks for his efficient organisation of a most stimulating conference. He and the co-members of the Programme Committee, Jonathan Cross and John Rink, should be applauded for their judicious selection of compelling papers; the delegates' good spirits and lively debate were a testament to the conference's success. My only regret was that some sessions deserved to be better attended—a problem that has recently been noted at other musicology conferences. Nevertheless, if future MACs maintain the levels of interest and diversity apparent at OXMAC 2000, we will no doubt see an improvement in delegate numbers.

---

**Matthew Riley** studied mathematics at Oxford before turning to music theory and analysis in his postgraduate work at Royal Holloway, University of London. His PhD thesis (2000) deals with the concept of attention in late eighteenth-century German theory.

---

## SMA Autumn Study Day 2000: Review

by Tom Service

### Music, Subjectivity and Analysis

directed by Craig Ayrey

Ian Gulland Lecture Theatre, Goldsmith's College, University of London, Saturday 18 November 2000

There may be no more contested arena in analysis than the relationship between the discipline and its putative subjects and subjectivities. The Autumn Study Day at Goldsmiths College, 'Music, Subjectivity and Analysis', attempted to pose and answer some of the key questions surrounding the terms and relations of the debate, with an international panel of speakers, including Lawrence Kramer (Fordham University) and Adam Krims (University of Alberta). If, in Craig Ayrey's (Goldsmiths, University of London) words, the day was centred around defining 'the place of subjectivity in analysis', the range of papers presented, round tables convened, and discussions ignited during the proceedings, broached still wider issues of the subject and its seemingly infinite positions. As Dai Griffiths (Oxford Brookes University) suggested in the afternoon's round table, chaired by Alan Street (University of Exeter) and titled 'Mapping Musical Subjectivity: Formalism and Beyond', the most obvious problematics of any discourse about 'subjectivity' or the 'subject' are the multivalent definitions of the terms. There are the 'subjects' of the analysts themselves—the sometimes unwritten 'I's behind all analytical writing—and the 'subjects' of their inquiry in the musical works or practices that they study. In turn, readers of analysis and listeners to

music constitute another level of receiving and interpreting subjects. Indeed, the practice of music analysis may be conceived as a chain of engagement between different kinds of subject. The constructed subjectivities that they create are kaleidoscopic prisms through which all analytical projects are refracted and reflected.

The day's papers dealt with different points and areas along this continuum of analytical subjectivity. The detail of Michael Spitzer's (University of Durham) work on the compositional theories of Koch, and Sulzer's theory of language ('Naturalizing the arbitrary sign: metaphorical cognition in Sulzer and Koch') was concerned more with metaphorical parallelism than with an obvious engagement with the day's theme. Yet even here—in Spitzer's exposition of Koch's individual negotiation between theory, language and compositional practice—the influence of the subjectivity debate was discernible.

Much more keenly focused around addressing the problems of fractured subjectivities were Anthony Pryer's (Goldsmiths, University of London) 'Ancient and modern subjectivities? Settings of Petrarch's "Or che'l ciel" by Schubert (D630) and Monteverdi (SV147)', and Julie

Brown's (Royal Holloway, University London) 'The subjectivities of music by Ravel and Claude Sautet's film *Un coeur en hiver*'. Pryer's central plea was for the need to 'theorise the relationships between the different subjectivities of individual musical works'. In dealing with Schubert's and Monteverdi's settings of the same text, he invoked a stratified model of subjectivity, in which the composers' creative subjectivities mesh with those of Petrarch and the poem. In a concise revelation of the contingency of these relationships, Pryer described how Schubert was unaware that Petrarch wrote the poem; Schubert believed that Dante was probably the author. This means that his conception of the text's 'empirical subject', in Pryer's terminology, was totally different from Monteverdi's. Knowing he was setting Petrarch, Monteverdi would doubtless have been aware of the poem's relevance to Laura, the great love of Petrarch's life.

In combination with Pryer's lucid discussion of the different historical and geographical distances of the composers from the real—or imaginary—origins of the text, Pryer's performative conception of subjectivity was a useful way of concretising some of the elusive secrets of musical subjectivity. Pryer extended the specifics of his conclusions to more general observations on the analytical role of models of compositional intention. He pointed out the paradox that the 'death of the author' has coincided with a reappraisal of the subjectivities of readers and listeners—but not of the subjectivities of the authors themselves. Understood in the context of Pryer's constructed subject positions, a reconfiguration of 'the composer's intentions' may, however, be possible. After all, as Pryer said, 'each kind of subjectivity has its own kind of intentionality, which cannot be eliminated'. Thought of as a network of interactions between different species of subjectivity, the notion of 'compositional intention' becomes richly multivalent rather than oppressively monolithic.

Julie Brown's project was to complicate the situation of the subject still further; her analysis of Sautet's *Un coeur en hiver* took into account the engagements between music, director, actors, characters, editing, and even camerawork. If the relationships between composer and poet are already as complex as Pryer indicated, then in the more collaborative field of film there exists a yet wider spectrum of possibilities for the articulation of subjectivities. *Un coeur en hiver* concerns the relationship between Stéphane, an instrument-maker, and a beautiful violinist, Camille. Much of the film centres on Camille's ensemble rehearsing Ravel's Piano Trio. Rehearsals and representations of this work assume crucial roles that both define the emotional tenor of the film and project its narrative. Brown illustrated how the values of the Piano Trio's 'mechanised' music are mapped on to characters in the story. In this 'mechanically produced film about the anxiety of mechanical musical processes', Brown observed 'a nomadic sense of subjectivity' in operation. Sautet's film thus sought 'to embody both the subjectivity of the music and of the characters'.

Pryer's and Brown's case-study approach used the immanent qualities of individual art-works to address wider, theoretical questions. However, the theoretical thrust of the whole conference was encapsulated by Lawrence Kramer's keynote address, 'The mysteries of

animation: history, analysis and musical subjectivity', and the issues he raised resonated throughout the day's other theory-centred papers and presentations.

Kramer may well be the musical doyen of that theoretical practice implicitly critiqued by Pryer in his musings on the death of the author. Kramer is one of the figureheads in the establishment of a framework for a reflexive, critical musicology, in which a complex formulation of subjectivity attempts to undermine the supposedly objective voices of power that, Kramer suggests, have underscored much music-analytical discourse. In his address, Kramer elaborated on many of the preoccupations of his *Classical Music and Postmodern Knowledge*, gearing his observations to the specific questions of the relationships between music, subjectivity and analytical rhetoric. Kramer used Tolstoy's experience of Chopin as the starting point for a meditation on how music constructs subjectivity. Responding to Chopin's music, Tolstoy claimed that he—the listener—'became the music'. Kramer reflected that in this description, Tolstoy takes on 'an identity fully other and fully his own'. Music, in other words, embodies a 'subjective mobility' (a phrase which parallels Julie Brown's suggestion of the 'nomadic' subjects in Claude Sautet's film). Suggesting that Chopin's music functions in a similar way to the 'big other' (Lacan's model of alterity) in Tolstoy's reflections, Kramer stated that music 'reproduces its subjective character in our own'; thus, 'music's primary action is not to express subjectivity but to address it'.

Kramer synthesised these thoughts on the 'amateur' listening experiences of writers like Tolstoy and Auden with Hegel's observation that music borrows listeners' bodies to compensate for its lack of physical embodiment, a process Kramer described as the 'ventriloquising of the big other'. He then placed analysis relative to conceptions of subjectivity, pleasure and representation. Kramer made a striking link between musical Modernism and music analysis. Hegel's formulation—exemplified by Tolstoy's description of listening to Chopin—defines the means by which subjectivity becomes animate in the listening experience. In Kramer's view, Modernism 'interposes its own formal objectivity on expression'. And that means a negation of Hegel's 'animation'. As Kramer said: 'Modernism is disembodied in a curious sense [for it possesses] a subjectivity that cannot become animate'. For Kramer, 'music's magic disappears when its nuts and bolts are obvious'. Analysis, like Modernism, 'upholds [this] lifelessness ... ironically, analysis takes us further from pleasure in its desire to know'. In this sense, analysis neuters subject positions, and, in Kramer's terms, 'does not require a historical subject ... the subject of analysis is virtual'.

The consequences of this line of thinking seemed to conflict with a key tenet of Kramer's musicological credo. Developing his thesis, Kramer suggested that analysis reflects 'pure intentionality, severed from subjectivity', in which individual listening experiences are 'parasitical additions', removed and disenfranchised by the totalising authority of the analytical voice. Kramer stated that even if as an analyst, one understood the contingency rather than the omniscience of this voice, this acknowledgement failed to redress the balance: 'analysis *qua* analysis has these properties—it de-personalises and disembodies the musical experience. Taken at face value, Kramer winds up in an apparently bizarre philosophical position here. For to

accept the power of the rhetorical voice of 'analysis qua analysis' is to suggest that the analytical project has actually succeeded in ridding itself of the subject, and has managed to create a purely objective discourse. And this notion contradicts one of the most powerful planks of Kramer's earlier critiques of analysis, expressed in *Music as Cultural Practice* and elsewhere: that the objective rhetoric of analysis is only a disguise, a fiction, which is used by writers to prop up their own viewpoints as the final solution to music-analytical problems. To put bluntly Kramer's erstwhile position: analysis is as subjective, as contingent, as any hermeneutics. Yet Kramer's present paper seemed to suggest otherwise.

Or maybe that's to misinterpret the real target of Kramer's address, which was the imagination of objectivity in analytical discourse rather than the practice embodied in analyses themselves. On this view, Kramer's apparent giving way to the putative truth-claims of analysis is consistent with his earlier positions in the debate.

(Answering questions after his presentation, Kramer suggested that it would be 'uncharacteristic' of him to say that 'any [discursive] space is free of subjectivity', but maintained that in some music-analytical circles, the imagination of total objectivity still holds sway.) This illusory *voile-face* proved a necessary rhetorical step to clinch Kramer's conclusions in his paper. Kramer ended with a suggestion of how analysts might use the lacuna of their discourse—that 'latent gap in which subjectivity is suspended'. Instead of conceiving this void as a true reflection of musical experience, Kramer demonstrated how it might be possible to use this (imaginary) objectivity as one part of a wider discourse, situated somewhere between analysis and hermeneutics, where analytical conclusions become the basis for interpretation and negotiation.

Kramer seemed to leave analysis in a precarious position, by demanding that 'an implicit subjectivity is not a sufficient understanding' of the subject's role in the discourse. Yet it is possible that his fascinating critique is most powerful against only one current of analytical writing. Against an analysis which seeks simply to open 'the gap between sound and subjectivity' that Kramer describes, and that does not allow for other meanings to take place, Kramer's conclusions are no doubt efficacious. However, against a kind of analysis that opens 'the gap' only to represent one way of imagining a musical work—acknowledged as one path amongst many, one analyst's viewpoint—and that positions conclusions as conditional and partial, Kramer's critique is likely to have heads nodding in agreement rather than rolling off the guillotine. Which is, perhaps, only to say that analysis may already be moving in concert with Kramer's conclusions.

Something similar needs to be said for Kramer's implied stance on Modernism. You have to conceive 'Modernism' very narrowly—indeed fallaciously—to say, as Kramer does, that it embodies an 'imposition of form which corrupts expression'. This strategy refuses to recognise the divergent paradigms of subjectivity which much Modernist music offers. In one prominent Modernist practice, works are designed as processes to be enacted rather than fully-finished artefacts, thus enfranchising the subjectivities of performers and listeners. In the round table discussion, Alastair Williams (University of Keele) considered some of the implications of Modernism for the

question of subjectivity, through the music of Wolfgang Rihm. Williams revealed a 'swaying subjectivity' in Rihm's negotiations with Romanticism and the music of Schumann.

There's another sense in which Kramer's critique is, after all, only relative. Kramer wants to rehabilitate listeners' experience as part of the analytical project. In the same way, one might want to reconsider the role played by readers of analysis and musicology in general. The confrontation between analyst and music is not the end of the story. Even if analysts or theorists might consider their conclusions to be terminal, their analyses always undergo a deformation in the minds and imaginations of readers. Tolstoy's experience of Chopin may not always be replicated by the reader of *Music Analysis*, but it might be possible to think of analysis itself as a surrogate 'big other'. (Or perhaps 'big brother' would be a more accurate description!)

Julian Johnson (University of Sussex) came the closest to engaging directly with Kramer's suggestions. In his round table presentation, Johnson discussed issues of autonomy and heteronomy in musical works. Starting with, as he defined it, 'the central paradox that works are worldly and yet autonomous', Johnson's position statement was, in part, a plea for maintaining the boundaries between works. (Kramer was less keen to preserve such distinctions; as he said, 'I like musical works... but I don't care about boundaries—they're changing'.) But Johnson also developed a rich concept of the relationship between the 'autonomy of form and [the] heteronomy of materials' in musical works. If autonomy is, in Nietzsche's terms, 'a necessary lie', one of the focuses of analysis should be a study of how individual works 'resist unity [in the very process of] forming it'. Johnson claimed that the subjectivity of individual works lies in the musical process by which an illusory autonomy is conjured from an immanent heteronomy. In this way, analysis is in dialogue with subjectivity. Concluding with the provocative statement 'the primacy of text may not be as reactionary as some think', Johnson glimpsed a way in which the analytical 'gap' between sound and subjectivity might be imaginatively employed. He offered also a convincing alternative to the vanishing points of narrow, sociological studies of heteronomy and dogmatic, analytical approaches to the explication of autonomous unity.

In terms of widening the debate still further, and offering suggestions for how the purview of analysis may be extended and focused, contributions by Adam Krims and Dai Griffiths were particularly revealing. In Krims's first presentation—'Cultural revolution, cultural studies, urban geography and classical recordings'—the strategy was to rescue a Marxist notion of cultural objectivity from the jaws of cultural theory. In Krims's view, the weakness of cultural theory was that it could not account for the historical situations of musical phenomena. Discussing recordings of Sarah Brightman and Charlotte Church (recordings that Krims rightly said represent 'classical music culture' for many people, but which tend to be ignored by musicologists), Krims wanted to find reasons why this music was being produced now and not, say, twenty years ago. Positing that 'changing realms of production impact upon culture and its understanding', Krims analysed how recording technologies have enabled the creation of virtual sonic spaces. Krims compared Sarah Brightman's



brazenly bastardised version of Albinoni's *Adagio* with the Eroica String Quartet's recording of Beethoven's F Major String Quartet, Op. 135. Both use recording techniques to construct a listening experience impossible to replicate in a live concert situation; both, in other words, are 'a new kind of object', as Krims suggested. These 'new objects' construct unique subjectivities, not just from the way that they sound, but from the places where they are sold and the ways that they are marketed. In Brightman's case, her recordings are sold in DIY and furniture shops as a kind of interior decoration, and in the case of the Eroica String Quartet, the marketing and distribution of the recordings emphasises the perceived prestige of Beethoven's music and its performance. There's a complex interaction here between the technical novelty of these recordings and their (subjective) receptions. For this reason, Krims claimed that 'it may not make sense to talk of musical subjectivity without talking about cultural objectivity'.

In his round table presentation, Krims elaborated on these observations, extending the reach of virtual spaces to encompass the 'design-intensity', as he put it, of contemporary cities. He left a challenge for analysis: he appealed for 'new analytical tools grounded in spatial mapping', believing them to be necessary for us to come to terms with 'the intersection of the social and the private'.

Dai Griffiths similarly suggested the necessity of dealing with the technological and ontological development of recorded sound. Discussing Aretha Franklin's version of Otis Reading's *Respect*—a 'version' which has become the definitive substantiation of the song—Griffiths suggested that it was possible to 'hear identity in movement ... in the variation between Otis and Aretha'. One way of characterising the history of popular music, Griffiths said, was as 'a racialised discourse around vocal recordings'. Griffiths went on to discuss the diverse subject positions that are engendered by the different situations of the song in various compilations and media.

Echoing Krims, Griffiths wanted to find ways to determine 'how this [mediation of identity in recorded music] works'. By observing the denial of a 'multiplicity of subject position' in Elliott Carter's setting of Elizabeth Bishop's *A Mirror on Which to Dwell*, he demonstrated the way that these issues affect a wide range of musical cultures.

Introducing the round table, Alan Street meditated upon the 'ensemble of discourses' about subjectivity, and drew on Terry Eagleton, Kofi Agawu—as well as 'that most prevalent of absent signifiers: Kilroy'. Via Webern's Op. 6 No. 3, Jerry Springer, and sex with alligators, Street concluded his fantasia with Lawrence Kramer's maxim that 'a postmodern subject is still a subject'. The last word of the day was left, appropriately, to Kramer, responding to the round table's discussions. Taking 'diversity as the primary data' from the chorus of voices heard throughout the conference, Kramer surmised that it was 'only in the babble [of discourses] that we can understand ourselves'. If there was a single overarching conclusion to be drawn from the papers as a whole, it was, Kramer said, the need for a 'hermeneutic calculus to engage with the changing and changed' subjects of music analysis. The precise terms of that 'calculus' may still be obscure, but this day at Goldsmiths suggested many fascinating paths for the discipline to follow. If Craig Ayrey's opening question remained unanswered, then maybe that failure was itself the most telling definition of subjectivity and its place in analysis: as Kramer put it, 'subjectivity is socially constructed ... I don't have it, you don't have it—but we trade in it all the time'.

---

Tom Service is working towards a PhD thesis on the music of John Zorn at the University of Southampton. He writes about music for *The Guardian*.

---

## Whittall Lecture Series: Review

by Vania Schittenhelm

### The World of Twentieth-Century Music: A Series of Six Public Lectures

by Arnold Whittall

Sponsored by the Department of Music, Royal Holloway, University of London and supported by the Society for Music Analysis

Lectures 1-3: 26 October, 16 November, 7 December 2000; Chancellor's Hall, Senate House, University of London

Judging by the first three lectures, a written version of Arnold Whittall's 'The World of Twentieth-Century Music' would stand out among the myriad of documents relating to this most recent and eventful historical period. Anyone wanting to explore last century's music could not wish for a better guide. Whittall has been a formative force in the milieu of Modern music. His career as broadcaster, concert presenter, teacher and writer on music and music theory has involved a detailed examination of the musical world since the mid-nineteenth century. His work has helped to

form generations of musicians, directly influencing the academic landscape in Europe and America.

Whittall is a consummate speaker, always able to engage and guide the audience through his vast knowledge and experience. When he speaks, I always have the feeling of being in good, erudite hands, of knowing that I will be exposed to work that has been thoroughly researched. I was curious to find out how he would forge a narrative of twentieth-century music, what this narrative would reveal about this 'world' and Whittall's way of viewing it.

The first lecture, 'Western Discontents: Locating Modernism before 1914', began with reflections on the series title. We were asked to disregard any generic claims about 'The World of Twentieth-Century Music', thinking instead in terms of Whittall's own musical world. Whittall addressed this issue by questioning authority. Implicitly acknowledging that texts are constructed nearly as much by their audience as by their creators, he emphasised how only the judicious process of selection and interpretation required by research could arrive at the 'authority of true authorship' and highlighted the dangers of 'hiding behind the authors'. Refusing to embark on a 'sonic tour' of so-called 'world music', he delimited quite clearly the space occupied by a Whittallian musical world; this world is concerned principally with 'Modern' music.

Whittall's search through the early years of the twentieth century started with Schoenberg's *Chamber Symphony No. 1* of 1906—a work that has many of the attributes associated with Modernism. Viewing Schoenberg as the archetypal Viennese composer, Whittall suggested linking specific locations to musical structure. He conceded that such stimulating links might be dangerous, because literal transference of images to the musical fabric is often difficult to establish.

Nevertheless, aspects of musical structure may offer insights into Schoenberg's reactions to his society and its cultural climate. In Europe and America, the climate was characterised by great change; cities experienced major technological advances, such as fast, direct means of communication and mass transport systems. The effect that these developments had on the population was considerable. For many, the new order verged on chaos—a situation that Schoenberg emulates in *Chamber Symphony No. 1*.

The relationship between composers and the cities that they inhabit is complex. A comparison of the metropolitan Paris with the inward-looking Vienna might, by itself, suggest a simple, binary opposition; however, Debussy and Schoenberg are revolutionary composers that were shaped by these cities. According to Whittall, their intelligence and instinct ultimately determined the modernity of their works.

Modernisation of cities was closely intertwined with a cultural crisis. The early century's radical changes brought about fragmentation. In Whittall's terms, the 'special kind of interaction' between fragmentation and integration is at the heart of Modernism. Whittall stressed Modern art's multiplicity, showing how Debussy and Stravinsky, whose compositional approaches and styles differ substantially, are linked by their geographical location (Paris), the innovative qualities of their music and the way in which they channelled into a Modernist mode of expression their dissatisfaction with bourgeois values.

Spreading the geographical net, Whittall showed how Bartók and Ives translated into music a sense of discontent with their surroundings. Bartók's city—Budapest—was divided between opponents and advocates of the Modernist movement. Whittall perceives a sense of this polarity and unity in Bartók's use of bitonality. By employing common tones, Bartók was able to reconcile the contrasting tonalities, achieving a sense of stability and consonance. On the other hand, Ives's city—New York—was both decadent and progressive. Whittall hears in the superimposed musics

of *Central Park in the Dark* a representation of America's multi-stratified culture.

In the second lecture, 'Old Institutions, New Music', Whittall underlined the interrelationship between locale and a composer's personality; he investigated the uneasy relationship between the musical establishment and the creation of innovative modern music. Analysing the self-reproducing role of institutions, Whittall discussed their authoritarian approaches and the way in which they have influenced the musical canon. Quoting from the writings of Nicholas Cook and Dai Griffiths, he discussed the changes in the teaching practices of academic establishments; he outlined the polemic caused by departures from Western traditional art to multiculturalism, and the growth in the number and types of music courses. For some, greater accessibility embraces and delivers mediocrity, resulting in a battle between elitism and open-mindedness.

Whittall attempted to show how both institutions and supporters of innovation were, on the one hand, guilty of inflexibility and, on the other, capable of adaptation. His analysis of musical establishments, from the BBC and Arts Council(s) to music societies, publishers and concert promoters, touched on the dangers of a politically correct culture which tries to press the right buttons, dismissing formalist approaches in favour of a 'new look' critical interpretation. He was keen to point out the need 'to get close to the music' even when attempting to broaden one's audience, and defended a balanced view that attempts to understand the value of both formalist and new interpretative approaches.

'Schoenberg or Stravinsky?' (the third lecture in the series) began by questioning the assumption that these conspicuously different composers may be understood in terms of their dissimilarities. Whittall suggested that the ability to identify affinities or degrees of similarity is more interesting and satisfying than an opposition.

This lecture was also about how Modern art may be perceived through twentieth-century historiography. A seismic shift in the concept of Modernism may be detected: in contrast to Adorno's writings, with their archetypal opposition between Schoenberg the progressive and Stravinsky the restorer, a convergence between these composers began to emerge in the 1960s. Leaving aside the simplified oppositions of the early century, Whittall outlined an elaborate picture of Modernism's variety, arguing that Schoenberg and Stravinsky might be considered on the same continuum. Although aware of the dangers of this project ('if everything fits, then it might not be particularly significant'), he outlined the benefits of 'building bridges between Schoenberg and Stravinsky'. Whittall showed how comparing works by these composers, delineating their differences and stressing their points of contact, could be a fruitful and appropriate way of exploring their music.

---

Vania Schittenheim has written on Busoni and the aesthetics of transcribing music. She is also a free-lance arts critic. Her latest articles discussed the work of Antony Gormley, the photography of Charles Jones and the opening of Tate Modern.

---



## **TAGS Day for Music Postgraduates**

**Thursday 24 May 2001**

In association with Birmingham Conservatoire, the Society for Music Analysis invites postgraduate music students to propose papers dealing with any aspect of music theory and/or analysis. Papers should last a maximum of 20-25 minutes.

Proposals for papers (maximum 250 words) should be sent, preferably by email (please do not use attachments), to:

Lee Tsang  
Birmingham Conservatoire  
Paradise Place  
Birmingham B3 3HG  
Email: lee.tsang@uce.ac.uk

Authors should include name(s) and affiliation(s), postal address, email address and daytime telephone number.

**THE CLOSING DATE FOR RECEIPT OF PROPOSALS IS 9 APRIL 2001.** All selected speakers will be notified by 19 April.

## **events**

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

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

## **THE WORLD OF 20<sup>th</sup>-CENTURY MUSIC**

**A series of six public lectures  
by Arnold Whittall**

Sponsored by the Department of Music, Royal Holloway,  
University of London

Supported by the Society for Music Analysis



**26 October 2000  
Western Discontents:  
Locating Modernism before 1914**

**16 November 2000  
Old Institutions, New Music**

**7 December 2000  
Schoenberg or Stravinsky?**

**25 January 2001  
The Subject of Britten**

**22 February 2001  
Playing the Establishment:  
Boulez, Carter, Birtwistle**

**15 March 2001  
Revoicing Expression:  
Postmodern Classicism**

Lectures take place on Thursdays from 6 pm to 7 pm at:

Chancellor's Hall  
Senate House  
University of London  
Malet Street  
London WC1

**Admission is free, without ticket.**

Further information is available from: [www.sma.ac.uk](http://www.sma.ac.uk)

Professor John Rink  
Department of Music  
Royal Holloway University of London  
Egham TW20 0EX  
Tel: 01784 443534 Fax: 01784 439441  
Email: j.rink@rhul.ac.uk

# RMA-SMA Study Day: Improvisation

Saturday 24 February 2001

Wettons Terrace, Royal Holloway,  
University of London



A Study Day on Improvisation will be held on Saturday 24 February 2001 at the Music Department, Royal Holloway, University of London, on behalf of the Royal Musical Association and the Society for Music Analysis. The day will start at 9.30 am with coffee and registration (Undergraduate Common Room, Wettons Terrace), and papers will commence at 10.00 am and end at 5.15 pm. A concert of improvised music will follow in the Picture Gallery in the Founder's Building, given by Cari Burdett and other performers, and there will be live demonstrations during many of the papers. The proceedings include Keynote Papers by Nicholas Cook, Eric Clarke and Richard Widdess, while case-study papers will be presented by Margaret Bent, Stephen Cottrell, Marc Perlman and Steve Larson. Lunch will be available on a cash basis in the Crossland Suite in the Founder's Building, and coffee and tea will be provided in Wettons Terrace.

There is no registration fee for members of the Royal Musical Association and Society for Music Analysis; non-members are welcome to attend, at a registration fee of £5 per person (payable on the day). Coffee and tea are free to SMA members but cost £1 each to all others attending.

Wettons Terrace is located opposite the Founder's Building and across the A30, at the top of Egham Hill. Egham is easily reached by car (five minutes from the M25) and by train (Reading line from Waterloo Station). Taxis can be pre-booked on 01784 432222 to get from Egham Station to the Music Department on campus.

Please contact Professor John Rink (tel 01784 443534; fax 01784 439441; email [j.rink@rhul.ac.uk](mailto:j.rink@rhul.ac.uk)) if you have any enquiries.

## Programme

09.30–10.00	Coffee and Registration (Undergraduate Common Room, Wettons Terrace)
10.00–10.10	Welcome and Introduction John Rink (Royal Holloway, University of London)
10.15–11.00	<b>Keynote Paper 1: Beyond Improvisation</b> <b>Nicholas Cook (University of Southampton)</b>
11.00–11.30	'Singing on the Book' and Conventions for Unwritten Counterpoint in the Fifteenth Century <b>Margaret Bent (All Soul's College, Oxford)</b>
11.30–12.00	Coffee (Undergraduate Common Room, Wettons Terrace)
12.00–12.45	<b>Keynote Paper 2: Psychological Processes and Aesthetic Principles in Improvisation</b> <b>Eric Clarke (University of Sheffield)</b>
12.45–14.15	Lunch (Crossland Suite, Founder's Building)
14.15–14.45	Between a Rock and a Hard Place: The Ambiguity of Creation and Re-Creation in Performing Roger Redgate's <i>Graffiti</i> <b>Stephen Cottrell (University of Middlesex)</b>
14.45–15.30	<b>Keynote Paper 3: 'Who knows who's improvising?'</b> Ethnomusicological and Related Perspectives <b>Richard Widdess (School of Oriental and African Studies)</b>
15.30–16.00	Jazz Recipes <b>Steve Larson (University of Oregon)</b>
16.00–16.30	Tea (Undergraduate Common Room, Wettons Terrace)
	<i>to Picture Gallery, Founder's Building</i>
16.45–17.25	Improvised, but not Improvisatory? The Nature of Melodic Variation in Central Javanese <i>Gamelan</i> Music <b>Marc Perlman (Brown University)</b>
17.30–18.15	Concert of Improvised Music: Moon Velvet Collective (saxophone, trumpet, viola, voice), directed by <b>Cari Burdett (Royal Academy of Music)</b>

## SMA events 2001

Thursday 22 February	<i>The World of Twentieth-Century Music: Lecture 5</i> (Senate House, University of London) Contact: John Rink, email: <a href="mailto:j.rink@rhul.ac.uk">j.rink@rhul.ac.uk</a>
Saturday 24 February	RMA-SMA Study Day: <i>Improvisation</i> (Royal Holloway, University of London) Contact: John Rink, email: <a href="mailto:j.rink@rhul.ac.uk">j.rink@rhul.ac.uk</a>
Thursday 15 March	<i>The World of Twentieth-Century Music: Lecture 6</i> (Senate House, University of London) Contact: John Rink, email: <a href="mailto:j.rink@rhul.ac.uk">j.rink@rhul.ac.uk</a>
Thursday 24 May	TAGS Day for Music Postgraduates (Birmingham Conservatoire) Contact: Lee Tsang, email: <a href="mailto:lee.tsang@uce.ac.uk">lee.tsang@uce.ac.uk</a>
Saturday 27 October	Reading Study Day: <i>The Anthony Pople 'Tonalties' Project</i> (Reading University) Contact: Jonathan Dunsby, email: <a href="mailto:imsdunsb@rdg.ac.uk">imsdunsb@rdg.ac.uk</a>
Saturday 17 November	Autumn Study Day: <i>Music Analysis and Popular Music</i> (Cardiff University) Contact: Ken Gloag, email: <a href="mailto:gloag@cardiff.ac.uk">gloag@cardiff.ac.uk</a>

## other events of interest

Saturday 24 March	<i>Gustav Mahler and the Twentieth Century</i> (University of Surrey) Contact: Stephen Downes, email: <a href="mailto:s.downes@surrey.ac.uk">s.downes@surrey.ac.uk</a>
Thursday 19 to Saturday 21 April	Royal Musical Association Annual Conference: Music and Film (University of Southampton) Contact: Robynn Stilwell, email: <a href="mailto:r.j.stilwell@soton.ac.uk">r.j.stilwell@soton.ac.uk</a>
Thursday 28 June to Sunday 1 July	2 <sup>nd</sup> Biennial International Conference on Twentieth-Century Music (Goldsmith's College, University of London) Contact: Keith Potter, email: <a href="mailto:k.potter@gold.ac.uk">k.potter@gold.ac.uk</a>
Wednesday 8 to Sunday 11 November	24 <sup>th</sup> Annual Meeting of the Society for Music Theory (University of Pennsylvania) Contact: Christopher Hasty, email: <a href="mailto:chasty@sas.upenn.edu">chasty@sas.upenn.edu</a>
Thursday 15 to Sunday 18 November	AMS Atlanta 2001 (Atlanta) Contact: Robert Judd, email: <a href="mailto:rjudd@sas.upenn.edu">rjudd@sas.upenn.edu</a>

# Society for Music Analysis Master's Bursaries 2001

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

1. Applicants in 2001 must be registered or hold the offer of a place for an MA, MMus or similar degree in music analysis or theory and analysis, or in a programme that contains a significant music-analytical emphasis. The initial bursary will cover the period from October 2001 to September 2002.
2. Applicants must be essentially self-funding and not in receipt of any substantial grant, bursary, prize, studentship or similar financial support. Where despite some such funding a genuine need can be shown, the application will be considered on equal terms with other applications. Bursary holders are required to inform the President of the Society of any significant changes of funding basis.
3. Where relevant, bursaries awarded for 2001–2002 will be renewed for 2002–2003 subject to a satisfactory report on work from the holder's institution. It will be the holder's responsibility to commission that report and to have it sent to the President of the Society during August 2002. If a 2001–2002 bursary holder goes on to read for a higher degree in 2002–2003, the bursary will be renewed unless the student secures full funding for the latter year.
4. Successful applicants will be required to become student members of the SMA if not already enrolled. They may be invited to assist the Society from time to time, but this will not be a consideration in respect of receipt and renewal of any bursary.

Applications should be made by **Friday 31 August 2001**. The application should be in

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

**Please also ensure that an academic reference in support of the application reaches Professor John Rink (SMA President) at the address below by the deadline of Friday 31 August 2001.**

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

Applications will be reviewed by John Rink and by Dr Jonathan Cross, editor of the journal *Music Analysis*. Successful applicants will be notified by the end of September 2001. Reasons will not be given for decisions.

## Award winners

The Society for Music Analysis awarded two Master's Bursaries for study in 2000–2001, to Alexandra Dixon and Joanna Purnell. Both recipients are enrolled on the MA degree programme at the University of Nottingham. The SMA wishes to extend its warmest congratulations to the two successful applicants and to wish them every success in their MA studies.

John Rink  
President, SMA

# Society for Music Analysis Membership Application

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

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

- substantial discounts (up to £47) on subscription rates for the leading journal *Music Analysis*
- a semi-annual SMA Newsletter and a regular programme of mailings, keeping you up to date with the latest events and developments in the discipline
- free registration and refreshments at the Society's frequent Study Days, which focus on topical issues and include presentations from scholars of international renown as well as those entering the profession
- back copies of *Music Analysis* and the SMA Newsletter for those joining the Society during the course of the year
- especially advantageous terms for students

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

Dr Matthew Riley  
SMA Administrator  
Department of Music  
Royal Holloway  
Egham TW20 0EX



## SMA Membership: Application Form



Choose from the following membership options:

- £35** Full membership of the Society including a copy of each issue of *Music Analysis* during the year of membership (+£10 for subscriptions outside UK/Europe)
- £25** Student membership of the Society including a copy of each issue of *Music Analysis* during the year of membership(+£10 for subscriptions outside UK/Europe)
- £20** Membership of the Society without *Music Analysis*
- £15** Student membership of the Society without *Music Analysis*

Name: \_\_\_\_\_  
Address: \_\_\_\_\_  
\_\_\_\_\_  
\_\_\_\_\_  
Tel no: \_\_\_\_\_  
E-mail: \_\_\_\_\_

