
GUIDE TO MUSICOLOGY GENERALS, 2021-2022

The General Examination in Musicology consists of a written and oral exam on six fields, chosen by the student in consultation with the Musicology faculty.

All students must pass the General Examination in Musicology before they are admitted into candidacy for the PhD. The exam is one of the central means by which the faculty assesses a graduate student's academic achievements during their first two years of enrollment and their potential for a successful academic career. The faculty maintains high standards for the General Exam; in the event of a failure of some or part of the exam, students may be given the opportunity to sit the exam a second time. After a second failure, enrollment is automatically terminated. Students who pass at least half of the exam but fail to qualify for PhD candidacy may, upon the recommendation of the faculty, be awarded a terminal Master's degree.

It is assumed that students admitted to the Musicology program will spend their first two years concentrating on their seminars and General Exam preparation. As noted above, students should check with the DGS before taking on other major commitments such as conferences, research projects, and major performances.

I. Eligibility

The General Examination in Musicology is usually administered in May of the second year of study, although under unusual circumstances students may petition to take the exam in September of the third year of study. All candidates for the PhD are required to take the General Examination, regardless of prior degrees or study elsewhere. To be eligible to take the General Exam, students must have satisfied all the other requirements for the program, including:

- Foreign language requirements (demonstrated competence in two languages)
- Theory Diagnostic Exam
- First-year paper
- Successful completion of 9 seminars by February 1 of the second year, with no incompletes. Students who wish to take only two seminars during their Generals semester must plan on taking an additional seminar during their third year.

II. Fields

Fields are chosen by the students and approved by the musicology faculty. Acceptable fields are quite broad (see the sample topics enclosed), allowing students to absorb large repertoires and ranges of scholarship. Students are asked to avoid narrow or vague topics, or those that are predicated on a single thesis or approach and are encouraged to use some of

the topics as opportunities to explore terrain that had previously been unfamiliar to them.

a. For students focusing on historical musicology the exam will comprise:

The exam should show substantial historical (representing at least three distinct time periods) and methodological breadth and should include at least one from each of these categories. You may also want to choose a topic related to your potential dissertation project.

1. At least one non-western topic
2. At least one theoretical /analytical topic

b. For students focusing on music theory and/or cognition the exam will comprise:

Three topics drawn from theory/analysis/cognition (see appendix for sample topics), and 3 from historical musicology/ethnomusicology/other approaches. In addition, at least 2 of these topics should relate to contrasting repertoires, e.g. common practice, non-Western, popular music, twentieth and twenty-first century music.

c. Subfields

We recommend that students divide their fields into four to six flexible subtopics, which help to organize the materials and provide a conceptual framework for studying. Please remember, however, that *you are responsible for the entire field* and should choose your subtopics accordingly.

d. Meetings with Faculty

The musicology faculty will convene three meetings each year to discuss Generals topics. In May, *first year* musicology students will be asked to meet with the faculty to discuss their prospective Generals topics. In August and December, *second year* musicology students will be asked to meet with the faculty to discuss their preparations for the exam, the compiling of bibliographies and repertoire lists pertinent to the approved topics. Students can also arrange separate appointments with individual faculty members to talk through their preparations, typically a maximum of one per semester. These individual meetings provide an opportunity to try out ideas with faculty, share interesting discoveries, and summarize problems. The DGS is available to answer any questions about the administering of the exam and how best to prepare for it.

III. Format

Individual exams are prepared for each student by the DGS in consultation with the Musicology faculty. **The written portion** of the exam is given over a 2-day period from 9 a.m.-5 p.m. and is usually administered and taken in the Music Department. Each

student writes on three fields per day, usually arranged in chronological order. For each field, students are given three questions, and are required to write one long and one short essay. You are thus allotted approximately 2.5 hours per field; you should plan to spend no more than an hour on any single essay.

This is a closed book exam. No books, notes, pre-written essays, computer files or web sites, recordings, scores or any other outside materials may be consulted.

The oral portion of the exam is administered by the Musicology faculty several days after the conclusion of the written exam and typically lasts between 45 minutes and an hour. It is expected that students will come to the oral exam not only prepared to correct or amplify their written exams but also to demonstrate an understanding of and mastery over the relevant scholarship and repertory in each field. The oral exam will not necessarily touch on every field.

IV. Passing the Exam

Candidates are expected to demonstrate a comprehensive knowledge of the core issues and debates of all six fields in writing and orally. Responses should show control of the relevant scholarship, methods, repertory and sources in the field. Candidates should demonstrate an ability to evaluate scholarship critically and to substantiate their views with examples.

Exams are evaluated by the entire musicology present at the oral exam.

a. Results

You will be informed about the results of the exam by email, usually the same day, but no later than 48 hours after the exam. Within one week, you will receive a written summary of your exam's strengths and weaknesses. The following results are possible:

- Pass the entire exam
- Retake one or more fields
- Retake the entire exam (possibly with new fields)
- Termination with MA (minimum pass of 50% of the exam)
- Termination without MA

After a second failure of the General Exam, enrollment is automatically terminated.

V. Typical Timeline

First year

Spring: Begin identifying and exploring potential topics

May: Group meeting with students and faculty to discuss potential topics and answer questions about the process

Between first and second year

Summer: Continue exploring, refining, and clarifying topics. Begin doing preliminary research for topics that are well established and straightforward.

August: Group meeting with students and faculty to finalize topics and answer questions about the process.

Second year

October 1: Submit final topics to DGS for approval. The faculty may request changes at this point.

November 1: Barring extraordinary circumstances, no topic changes permitted after this point.

December: Group meeting with students and faculty to finalize bibliographies and answer questions about the process.

Spring: Prepare, write practice essays.

May: General exams (2 days of written exams and 1 day of Oral Exams)

VI. Appendices

Appendix A offers strategies for preparing for the exam. Appendix B provides sample topics. Appendix C lists some exam questions that have been used in the past. Appendix D presents sample successful essays from graduates of the program. They demonstrate that there are multiple ways to show control of a field in a written submission.

Appendix A

Guidelines for Studying

1. Time commitment

Every student will require a different amount of studying, depending upon their prior preparation, knowledge of repertoire, familiarity with the given fields, and individual temperaments. It is expected that you will dedicate the majority of your time during the first two years taking seminars and preparing for the General exam. We recommend that you begin your General exam preparation during the spring of your first year of enrollment, and that the momentum and time commitment will increase as the exams draw closer. As it can sometimes be challenging to balance your seminar work and studying, we discourage students from taking on extra responsibilities, such as conference presentations or major performances, during their Generals year; *if you have any questions about whether an outside commitment is appropriate, please see the DGS.*

a. Goals of the exam

The goal of the exam is to demonstrate control of your fields both in writing and orally. You should be able to demonstrate control over the scholarship in each field, the traditional problems and controversies, the sources (as relevant), and repertory. The material should be sufficiently synthesized for you to be able to discuss the relative merits of the work done by the primary scholars in the field and show your knowledge of the repertory with specific examples. You should have formed opinions about lacunae in the fields and areas that merit further investigation. By the end of your preparation, you should know enough about your fields to be able to prepare the syllabus and lectures for an advanced undergraduate course on the topic.

While we will not ask you to hand in your bibliographies as part of the exam, it is useful to maintain them for each topic and use them as the basis of discussions with faculty about your fields.

b. Some hints for preparation

When you take notes from articles, it is best not to only write down the information in the article, but also include your own reactions and thoughts on the topic, including criticisms and evaluations of the argument presented. Do not assume that all published articles are perfectly argued and executed—look carefully at the argument and the evidence presented and identify any problems in logic or methodological flaws. Try to get a sense of where the author is coming from—what their methods are, preconceived ideas, historiographical assumptions, and make a note of these issues so that you can refer to them at a later point

in your studying. Follow the footnote trail. Often a book or essay will be part of a cluster of articles on a given topic. Make sure you understand how that cluster works— what is at stake, how one author interprets another and how these various writings intersect. If someone summarizes another’s point of view, you might want to verify for yourself whether a given interpretation is valid.

- When scholars refer to specific pieces of music, go listen to them! And, if applicable, find other examples or even counter examples to see if a given argument is credible. This also gives you an opportunity to expand your repertoire.
- While current scholarship often leads you to repertoire, don’t let it restrict your listening and studying of scores. You might want to identify and explore repertoire in your field that has not adequately been dealt with in the scholarship. Take time to listen to music and look at scores and familiarize yourself with a broad range of pieces in your field. Take notes about them; identify works that exemplify issues you might want to discuss in your essays.

As with anything else, preparing for the General exam requires practice. Writing practice essays, outlines, brief reactions to or comments about articles, discussions of pieces, are among the best ways to get “warmed up” for the event. Taking Generals without practicing writing both short and long essays under pressure is a bit like running marathons without ever going beyond a mile or playing a recital without a rehearsal. What kind of essay can you write on a topic related to your field in an hour? In 45 minutes? Remember, we are not looking for elegant prose—it is not simply impossible in the time frame. Try not to let your internal editor paralyze you.

II. Writing the Exam

Try to plan your time carefully and pace yourself so that you do not spend more than 2.5 hours on any given field. If you have written some practice essays, this will be easier.

A good essay addresses the question that is asked and deals with the underlying controversies or research problems that might have inspired the question. Students must demonstrate command over the dominant issues in the field, and support this with specific examples from repertoire and scholarship. The exam should be in complete sentences and paragraphs, but you do not want to become overly obsessed about style, as you simply won't have time. If you have an original perspective on something, you will want to share it as well, but make sure it is an informed opinion, and that you can support your point of view with appropriate examples. If there is a lacuna in the scholarship, you might want to discuss it, and give an indication of where scholars might want to focus their energy. There is no one model that is ideal for

everyone, as you each bring your own perspectives to the process. Some of you may write longer essays; these are not necessarily better—just different. However, if you have done some practice essays, you'll have a better sense of what you can or can't accomplish in a brief amount of time.

If you do run out of time, do not panic. Try to get as much down on paper as possible and be prepared to discuss the topic in detail at your orals.

III. Orals

The oral exam typically takes place 3 or 4 days after the written exam. It provides the faculty with the opportunity to ask for clarification about something on your written exam and to probe other matters relevant to your fields. It also gives you the chance to amplify and clarify your answers. It is thus particularly important that you use some of the time after the written exam to prepare for orals.

- Carefully reread your exam, looking for mistakes, inconsistencies, or omissions. You can use the day or so between the written portion and the orals to review your notes or investigate something that you think you should have known for the exam.
- The oral exam will take approximately 45 minutes. You may bring notes to the exam; you may also wish to prepare a handout with corrections for the faculty. Typically, each faculty member present will take the opportunity to ask questions about the fields closest to the areas of expertise. This may involve expanding or clarifying some points in your written essays, answering questions about repertory or scholarship that you omitted, or speculating about some issue relevant to your fields that was not specifically covered in the exam.
- Do not be afraid to admit that you do not know something; however, a challenging question should provide you with an opportunity to speculate a bit about a topic. Part of the purpose of the exam is to give you an opportunity to think on your feet – to have the kind of experience you will invariably have giving papers, job interviews, on panels when you will be required to comment on a question you might never have considered.
- Remember: you have spent a lot of time with your fields. It should be fun to think and talk about the issues that concern you with other scholars. Approach the questions as probes that encourage you to think flexibly about the body of work you have come to know well. Show that you can draw on your knowledge of the underlying literature to consider even new or unexpected ideas that arise in conversation.

Appendix B

Sample Generals Topics

Below please find some sample Generals topics. This list is intended to be exhaustive, but rather to provide you with an idea of the appropriate size and scope of a successful topic.

Medieval and Renaissance

Medieval Mode, Theory and Practice
Liturgical Drama, 900 - 1300
Medieval Reception of Ancient Theory
Byzantine, Latin, and Slavic Chant Traditions
Vernacular Song, 1100 – 1400
Medieval Plainchant
Troubadours and Trouvères
Polyphony, 900-1300
Secular Music, 1300-1500
Ars Antiqua and Ars Nova
The Motet, 1350-1550
Polyphony for the Mass, 1350-1550
Italian Madrigal: 1530-1638

Seventeenth and Eighteenth Centuries

French Opera from Lully to Rameau
Italian Opera from 1638–1678
Music and Theater in the Italian courts, 1580-1660
17th-century keyboard music
Music in New Spain, 1580-1700
Music in the age of Louis XIV
The cantata, 1660-1720
The baroque suite
Mode, key, and tonality in seventeenth-century music
Music in England from Dowland to Purcell
Convent music from 1550-1750
Music in Handel's London
Bach's Instrumental Works
Oratorios, Passions, and Cantatas in the age of Bach
Italian Theatrical Dance, 1580-1780
German sacred music before Bach
Eighteenth-Century Counterpoint

Fugue and Fugal Technique
Italian comic opera: Mozart to Rossini (ca. 1780-ca. 1820)
Classical Symphony, 1780-1826
The Keyboard Sonata: C. P. E. Bach to Schubert
Opera Seria from Arcadian Reforms to Gluck
Opera buffa from Mozart to Rossini

Nineteenth Century

Romantic piano
Program Music, 1830-1911
The piano and its music through to 1848
The concerto 1830-1900
Russian Romance Russian Piano Music
Early Romantic Piano Sonata Nineteenth-Century Lieder
Phrase Structure Analysis Post-1800
The String Quartet from Beethoven to Brahms
Italian Opera from Rossini to Aida
The Concerto from 1800-1900
The Symphony between Beethoven and Brahms Program Music
Nationalism
String Quartets 19th century
Felix Mendelssohn and Fanny (Mendelssohn) Hensel and their Circle
The Sacred Mass from the Late 18th to the Early 19th Century
Symphonic Poems from 1848 to WWI
Realism, Verismo, Naturalisme

Twenty and Twenty-first Centuries

Twentieth-Century String Quartets
The Twentieth-Century String Quartet
American Musical Theater
Second Viennese School
Narrative Film Music, 1927-1961
Hip Hop
Post-WWII opera
American Experimentalism: Ives through the Minimalists
Jazz from Origins to Bebop
Jazz from Bebop to the present
Music in the American South
Soviet Music
Gospel Music
Scandinavian Music
Stravinsky

Cognition

Rhythm and meter
Timbre
Social psychology of music
Pitch perception
Learning and development
Affect
Aesthetics and value
Crossmodality
Expectation
Expressive performance and nuance
Creativity and improvisation
Music and language
Tonality
Memory
Singing

Non-Western

Ethnomusicology
Indian/ Arabic Comparative Musicology
Race, Ethnicity and Musical Expression in the African Diaspora: 1945-Present
Ethnomusicology, Marxism, Postcolonialism and “World Music”
Traditions of Gamelan in Java and Bali
Popular Music in Angola, Cuba, and the Balkans Latin American Music

Analytical/ Theory Topics

Schenker and His Disciples
Voice-Leading beyond Common-Practice Organicism
Chromatic and post-Chromatic Harmonic Theory since the Mid-19th Century
Phrase Structure Analysis Post-1800
Music and multimedia
Phenomenology
Analysis and performance
Syntax
Corpus studies
Groove
Topic theory
Schema theory
Embodiment
Sonata theory

Popular Music Theory

Speculative Music Theory (789-1255)

History of Theories of Harmony 1600-1900

Transformational Theory

Semiotics

Post-Tonal Analysis in the Twentieth Century

Appendix C

Samples of General Exam Questions from past years

Troubadours and Trouvères

Women and men
Melodic transmission
Who performed these songs?

Sixteenth-Century Italian Madrigal

Petrarch and the madrigal
Stylistic innovations in the early madrigals
Gender ideology in the late madrigal

French Baroque Opera

French recitative: origin, style and performance practice
Quinault and the tragédie-lyrique
French vs. Italian Style in the opéra-ballet

Program Music, 1830-1911

Does the practice of nineteenth-century composers affirm or undermine the view that music lacks narrative capability?
To what extent is nineteenth-century program music a form of literary reception?
Richard Strauss and the symphonic poem

The “Sound” film, 1927-1960

Do Prokofiev’s and Shostakovich’s Soundtracks Constitute Propaganda?
Hermann’s Treatment of Harmony
Paradoxes of the Film Musical

Twentieth-Century String Quartets

Discuss the reception of the first Viennese school string quartets in the 20th century
Is the history of the string quartet in the 20th-century necessarily a history of national traditions?
What are the principal musical challenges in writing for string quartet in the 20th century? (Cite a range of responses, from highly successful to less successful).

Slavonic Liturgical Music

The Nature and Content of Znamennyi Chant
Russian Church Singing and Folklore

The Development of Russian Liturgical Polyphony

Concerto (from beginning to ca. 1750)

Myth and fact in the historiography of the baroque Italian concerto

The concerto in eighteenth-century London

Brandenburg Concertos: style, influences, scoring, and extra-musical significance

Italian comic opera at home and abroad: from Mozart to Rossini (ca. 1780-ca. 1820)

The tonal structure of comic opera ensembles

How comic is comic opera?

The uses and reception of comic opera in European (non-Italian) courts

Music in Ancient Greece

Plato on Music and Ethos—his writings and influence

Performing Tragedy

What Theory Doesn't Tell Us

Sixteenth-century Court Patronage

The Patron – Musician or Connoisseur?

Prestige, Competition, and Rivalries in 16th-century Courts

The Politics and Aesthetics of Court Spectacle

The Mass, 1480-1600

Origins of the Parody Mass

Palestrina's Masses and their Models

Josquin and the Mass—authenticity, chronology, and originality

Fugue: History and Theory, 1650-1750

The Keyboard Fugue in Germany Before Bach

The Gap Between Theory and Practice in Fugal Composition

The Influence of non-fugal styles and genres in Books I and II of *The Well-Tempered Clavier*

The Piano and Its Music Through to 1848

Genre Hybridity in Mozart's Piano Music

Sonata forms in the Schubert's Late Sonatas

The Social Life of the Piano Sonata

Appendix D

Sample Essays

*Western Plainchant, 9th-11th Centuries**1. Modes in theory and practice**

In his article on mode for the New Grove Dictionary, Harold Powers identified two ends of a spectrum for the term's definition. Mode can approach a "particularized scale" or a "generalized melody"; put differently, mode can be used to classify existing pieces as exemplars of a general type, or it can prescribe particular melodic tendencies for music to follow. Broadly speaking, mode in the theory of Western plainchant started out as essentially classificatory, then gradually shifted toward the regulatory end of the spectrum as a Greek-infused theory became more codified as a route toward explaining chant modes.

The first classification into 8 modes is seen in the Frankish lands with tonaries, books that arrange antiphons according to mode. The earliest tonaries, such as those of Metz and St. Riquier, served a pragmatic purpose. Under Charlemagne's *Admonitio generalis* of 789, the Carolingian Empire was required to follow the liturgy used at Rome, replacing the local Gallican practices that had developed previously. The amount of new music and text to be learned was substantial, and Busse Berger, in her book on the "art of memory" in the Middle Ages, suggested that tonaries served a similar purpose to other collated anthologies of text: to help singers memorize material (in this case, chant) in a systematic way, according to the 8 psalm tones. In his 1995 article "*Parapteres: Nothi or Not?*" Charles Atkinson focused on the purpose of classifying these chants from the perspective of a performer who already knew them. As antiphons, they were to be sung during psalmody, alternating between psalm tone and chant. (Edward Nowacki [2012] contested the historical validity of this practice, but he agreed that the antiphon did at least surround the overall psalm excerpt.) The beginning and end of the psalm recitation needed to fit properly to the prescribed antiphon; thus there were various psalm tones available, with different intonation and cadence formulas (the latter known as *differentiae*). Classifying the antiphons by mode allowed singers to know which psalm tone to select. As Atkinson describes, some psalm tones were designed to match antiphons that began and ended in different registers or different pitches; the *tonus peregrinus*, with two different reciting tones, is one surviving example. The classification system of 8 tones was likely borrowed from the Byzantine *octoechoi* practice; in 2001 Peter Jeffrey compared similar systems from other chant traditions to argue that this practice ultimately stemmed from Jerusalem. Keith Falconer, in an article from the same collection, observed that while neither the "Old" Roman nor the Ambrosian liturgies classified their chants by modes or used the *octoechoi*, they did have wide selections of *differentiae* for their psalmody, suggesting a similar concern with connecting antiphon with psalm that may predate the Frankish modal classification.

Atkinson's 2009 book *The Critical Nexus* tracks the integration of the Greek modal system into the Gregorian chant tradition. His central contention is that notation, theories of Greek mode, and theories of chant mode (which he called the *cantus* tradition) formed an inseparable "critical nexus" that directly affected development of the Gregorian repertoire. The principal sources for Greek modal theory in the Middle Ages were the treatises by Martianus Capella and Boethius; the former referred to the Greek *toni*, whereas the latter spoke of the *modi*. For Boethius, the modes were transpositions of the entire Greater Perfect System (modern A to a'), which was derived from intervals described as divisions of the monochord. (Confusingly, the "tonus" could also refer to a 9:8 ratio which defined what we would call a whole step.) The system was meant not for practical purposes, but to describe a more abstract view of *musica*, considered as an almost mathematical discipline. Boethius also defined three tetrachords, among them the "diatonic" (tone-semitone-tone) which would become important to

medieval modal theory.

Early medieval attempts to relate mode to the octoechoi are seen in Aurelian's *Musica disciplina* (ca. 840) and Hucbald of St. Amand's 9th century treatise *De modis*, both of which define intervals using examples taken from the chant repertory: incipits in the case of Aurelian, and anywhere from within the chant in the case of Hucbald. In his 2002 article on chant modes for the *Cambridge History of Western Music Theory*, David Cohen argued that Hucbald's aim was to use the inherited knowledge from Boethius to explain the pre-existing chant modes. Sarah Fuller in 2008 argued the opposite: the organization of Hucbald's treatise, defining intervals through known chants and giving only sketchy treatments of the chant modes, for her indicates that the chant modes were assumed from the beginning: rather than deriving chant modes from Boethius, Hucbald's aim was to explain Boethius using the chant modes and repertoire that were already familiar to singers.

The two anonymous treatises *Musica enchiriadis* and *Scolica enchiradis*, also from the 9th century, introduce a system of tetrachords that identify pitches as *protus*, *deuterus*, *tritus*, or *tetradus*, and which divide up the available pitches into the tetrachords of graves, finales (where chant finals occurred), superiores, and excellentes. The *Enchiriadis* system was unusual in that its outer extremes include augmented octaves between F- \sharp and C- \sharp . Rebecca Maloy has recently argued that the *Enchiriadis* conception was more flexible than later versions of mode by allowing for "vitia," or changes in tetrachord assignments in the middle of a chant. This would allow for local arrangements of tones and semitones that might not be consistent with the intervallic profile of the rest of the chant. Maloy cites *Oravi deum* as an example of a melody with potentially E-flats and even A-flats, which she justifies by noting the chant cue at the end of the melody is notated a step down from its pitched notation elsewhere in the same manuscript.

By Regino of Prüm's tonary (c. 900), antiphons that appear to begin and end in different modes were now organized in a separate section of "nothae" ("illegitimate" melodies), indicating that modal categorization is beginning to assume a regulative aspect on the chant (discussed in "*Parapteres: Nothi or Not?*" cited above). Further treatises continued to identify constituent scale segments, such as the *Alia musica* (10th century), likely composed by multiple authors, which in its most recent layer defined fourth and fifth species in terms of their intervallic content. Berno of Reichenau and Hermannus Contractus continued this line of thought by specifying modes as concatenations of fourth and fifth species. Richard Taruskin has illustrated that this conception of mode assumed compositional significance: in the 12th century, new melodies (he gives a Kyrie as an example) might "systematically" outline the separate tetrachord and pentachord of their mode in various sections of the chant. The codification of mode in terms of fourth and fifth species also had an impact on the existing chant tradition: Pseudo-Odo of Cluny (early 11th century) declared that chant modes were determined by the final and gave trained readers license to redact chants that did not fit the modes. (He also produced the complete Greater Perfect System, now extended to "Gamma" at the bottom, using the monochord from its lowest pitch step by step to its highest.) Guido of Arezzo's notion of *affinitas* (ca. 1020) allowed chants to end a fifth above their designated final, akin to Hucbald's earlier idea of *solicitas*, but a communion like *Beatus servus* would still prove troublesome for John of Afflighem later. Its melody is consistent with mode 4 in the beginning and end, but in the middle it has a whole step over the final tone. The early tonaries, which were concerned only with the beginning and ends of chants where the antiphon met the psalm tone, classified *Beatus servus* as 4th mode; for John, this was an inadequate classification because it did not apply to the entire chant. (The Dijon tonary (Montpellier H 159), transposed the melody up a fourth so that the variable note was B-flat/B-natural.) Theodore Karp, in his *Aspects of Orality* book, observed that later theorists tended to identify similar places where chant melodies appeared to depart from the notation altogether as the basis for lamenting the "corruption" of chant by singers. What this suggests is that chant practice continued independently of its modal theorizing, perhaps even straying in a consistent manner from notation, though the two would intersect more decisively in later Cistercian reforms of chant in accordance to modal principles.

Also: Hughes (2001) on deuterus tones gravitating toward tritus: pitch organization beyond the level of mode. Suggestion of an implicit "ladder of thirds" F-a-c-e in about 1/3rd to 1/2 of Gregorian

melodies, largely independent of mode. Example: Puer natus, the introit for the Third Mass of Christmas, is a mode-1 chant whose middle section largely centers on c, with circling to the upper and lower thirds of a and e. Guido remarks that if the all tritus tones were removed, half the chant would be missing.

(Factual errors in this essay, compiled during preparation for oral examination):

- Boethius's diatonic tetrachord was semitone-tone-tone, not tone-semitone-tone. The latter dates from the *Enchiridis* treatises and Hucbald in the 9th century.
- Hucbald's treatise was *De harmonica institutione*, not "*De modis*."
- The fourth modal degree is *tetrardus*, not *tetradus*.

3. *Changing attitudes toward transmission**

When David Hughes wrote his 1987 article defending the “traditional view of chant transmission,” he was returning to an idea that he indicated once went unquestioned. The Benedictine monks of Solesmes, in compiling early sources during the mid-to-late 19th century, assumed that they were recovering the Pope Gregory the Great’s original chants by sifting through the historical record. In the 1920s, Peter Wagner and Dom Paolo Ferretti (in his *Estetica gregoriana*) had abandoned the idea of a single author, but they still assumed that chants were composed much as one might compose music in the 19th century. For them, any overlap of melodic formulas represented merely a drawing together of pre-existing sources, what Ferretti referred to as centonization, in order to bring them to a unified artistic whole. The fact that fully notated manuscripts only appeared in the late 9th century but largely agreed with each other, even in relatively distant locations like St. Gall (in modern Switzerland), and Laon (in modern France) suggested that chant transmission before notation must have been oral (otherwise more manuscripts would survive) but *fixed* in memory. This is the view Hughes was defending. Singers would learn the repertory, travel, and teach it to other singers, where it would be very nearly exactly transmitted. Hughes identified different types of variations in the manuscripts, considering them to be mostly minor: filling-in of thirds, alteration of *deuterus* tones to *tritus*, differing numbers of repeated pitches. He gave the alleluia *Dies sanctificatus* as an example; the alleluia is of early provenance, appearing in earliest notated manuscripts with great fidelity from source to source. Theodore Karp revisited this alleluia in detail in his book *Orality and Formularity in Western Plainchant*, using a comparative analysis to again show just how stable oral transmission might be. According to Solange Corbin, notation was developed possibly to notate the more novel repertoire, such as tropes and prosulas, which appear in some of our earliest fragments (such as *Psalle modulamina*, a notated alleluia prosula roughly dated to 835); this notational system was later applied to plainchant.

In 1974, Leo Treitler published a radically different hypothesis in the article “Homer and Gregory.” His basic thesis was that the apparent stability of chant melodies might have resulted not from memorization of fixed chants, but from an understanding of particular melodic landmarks and gestures in a given chant, to be filled in by a knowledgeable singer who had an implicit system of constraints, based on the texts and on chant style overall, to realize the chants. A given chant might end up looking identical, but that was because of a stable *process* that gave consistent traces. Treitler compared several Tracts with similar melodies to illustrate how a combination of “formulas and formularity” was underlying these chants. This greatly eased the supposed burden on a singer’s memory: one had only to be a fluent in a particular system, not memorize the details of several hundred chants. Treitler’s inspiration was Albert Lord’s 1960 book *The Singer of Tales*, which arrived at a similar conclusion after examining the oral transmission of epics in Yugoslavia. Helmut Hucke supported Treitler’s view in 1980 with his article “A New Historical View of Western Plainchant,” considering every performance of a chant to be a re-creation. In 1982, Nowacki published an article on “text as a determinant” of chant melodies in the 8th-mode Tracts, similarly arguing that the variations we see in Tracts of this mode are largely determined by their individual texts, which lead to different accommodations of one formula.

Treitler and Hucke’s stance took a new approach not only to chant before notation, but also to chant in the tenth century after manuscripts became more common. For Treitler, oral practice continued alongside the rise of notation, such that notation itself was a sort of performance and could be a “window” into oral transmission. He looked to Aurelian of Réôme’s description of neumes in *Musica disciplina*, where Aurelian refers to individual syllables within chants using the names of accents, such as saying that a particular syllable was “circumflexed.” Treitler interpreted this as saying that melodic contours were conceived of in terms of vocal inflections in the delivery of text; they were fundamentally linguistic in nature. His classification of neume types thus proceeded from a semiotic stance: particular styles might be symbolic, conventionally representing all high notes with a virga, or iconic, using the vertical-extension-as-pitch metaphor to notate a rising *contour* with the virga.

Kenneth Levy responded to Treitler and Hucke’s argument in 1987 with essentially the opposite claim, by proposing that Charlemagne had a notated archetype of the Gregorian repertoire, possibly as

early as 800, about a century before the first fully notated extant graduals (Laon 239 being among the earliest, possibly from just before 900 according to Susan Rankin; others from the early 10th century include the Cantatorium of St. Gall [SG 359] and the graduals SG 339 and 376.) According to Levy's narrative, Charlemagne had a redaction of the chant books made, possibly at Metz, and this is what was distributed throughout the Frankish kingdom. Such a model would account for Levy had no direct evidence for this claim but relied on circumstantial "indices," such as that the repertoire was in his estimation too big to be memorized — some 75 to 80 hours of chant, or as he put it roughly equivalent in length to all of Beethoven's instrumental works and Wagner's operas — and that the lack of earlier notated manuscripts need not imply their absence. Dom Hesbert's *Antiphonale missarum sextuplex*, which collects the earliest text-only graduals and antiphoners from just after 800 (including of Mont-Blandin, Senlis, Corbie, Compiègne, and Rheinau), has only six such manuscripts, whereas Levy argued that such graduals must have been far more prevalent in Europe, presumably needed wherever the Mass and Office were celebrated. If only six manuscripts survive from such a large initial number, it is not hard to imagine that early neumed manuscripts might not have survived either. Levy argued against oral transmission, which he tended to characterize as "free improvisation," by again referring to the stability of chants. In "On Gregorian Orality," he used the offertory *Elegerunt apostoli* as a model for the limits of chant variation. There, he outlines the variants that exist, which are somewhat more considerable than in *Dies sanctificatus*; Ruth Steiner, writing on the same chant, noted that its verses even sometimes begin with different texts. Because such variations were associated with particular geographic regions, Levy and Steiner agreed that they likely resulted from local alterations to align it with regional traditions. This is an exceptional case; if orality were the norm, Levy argued, this would be seen far more often, at least in other offertories. Such offertories were instead, he suggested, "idiomelic": known by their distinct, unique contours, and thus more readily learned as melodies. Gregorian chant, per Levy, was essentially literate from the beginning.

Levy's view of chant transmission also came to bear on the differences between Gregorian and Roman chant in his 2001 article, "A New Look at Old Roman Chant." Roman chant, apparently unnotated until the 11th century (with the Gradual of St. Cecilia in Trastevere, dated 1078), contained many more apparently "formulaic" elements, including repeated use of melismatic gestures within a narrow pitch compass that Levy referred to as a "scrolling" style. This, he said, was what orality looked like. He cited Joseph Dyer's "*Tropis semper variantibus*" article which suggested that Roman offertories largely followed one of two set formulas in their construction, somewhat like what Treitler claimed for the Tracts. This reinforced his view that Gregorian chants were idiomelic, and he offered the example of the Frankish chant *Collegerunt principes*. In the middle of this chant is a pejorative refers to the Romans, where the melodic style suddenly changes to assume the "scrolling" character of Roman chant. Levy offered this as an example of a puckish Frankish melody that was intended to ridicule the Romans and their chant style. A similar argument was made more generally in 1967, when Paul Cutter claimed that the Frankish chant was a "frozen" version of Roman chant from the late 8th century, fixed in singers' memories, while the Roman chant continued as an oral practice through to the creation of the 11th-century sources, which record the effects of an ongoing oral tradition.

Emma Hornby (2003) contested Levy's arguments, saying that the apparent similarities of chant manuscripts could disguise different readings of the pitches, so that the actual chant melodies might not have been transmitted with as much exactitude as Levy suggested. (Andreas Pfisterer (2005) has also countered Levy's claims about the Mozarabic-Gallican origin of non-psalmsic offertories like *Precatus est Moyses*, claiming that they could be found in Roman circulation around 730, following methods derived from McKinnon's *Advent Project* (2000) but with a slight emphasis on feast priority.) Susan Boynton's recent article on hymns and orality makes another contribution, observing that in the 11th century, when neumed chant books were common, hymns were not always given a comparable neumatic notation, though some hymns were given more complete treatments than others, and the end of the century showed an increase in careful transcriptions of them. She considers hymns to have belonged to an oral culture at monasteries alongside the notated chant culture, suggesting that orality was still a force in sacred medieval music, even after neumes were available for notation.

(Factual errors in this essay, compiled during preparation for oral examination):

- *Estetica gregoriana* dates from 1934, not the 1920's.
- Levy does not imply that "chant ... was essentially literate from the beginning," which would imply that chant transmission depended on written notation.

Rhythm and Meter in Common Practice

*1. Toward a history of hypermeter in the common practice**

In his 2014 book *Beating Music in the Modern Era*, Roger Matthew Grant argues that recent theorists' concern with meter and hypermeter was already partly evident in the work of 18th- and 19th-century theorists, particularly Kirnberger, Sulzer, Momigny, and Weber, whom Justin London referred to as the "father of hypermeter." Grant cites the changing conception of the bar, particularly concerns over whether to notate a given melody in simple time or compound time. In a 1985 article, Floyd Grave illustrated the change from 4/4 as a compound meter (two bars of 2/4) to a simple meter (where the third beat is considered subordinate to the first, rather than its equal) by tracking decreasing use of the half-bar displacements for phrases. Danuta Mirka has described this phenomenon in relation to *Taktteile*, the units that distinguish simple meters, with one *Taktteil* per *Takt* (measure), from compound meters, with two *Taktteile*. For Grant, however, the important issue is whether theorists are thinking of measure-like units above the level of the notated measure. Kirnberger thought it an error to write 4/4 music in 2/4 meter and vice versa, because 4/4 implies a different hierarchical relationship between beats than 2/4 does. The fact that he perceived some 2/4 bars as being "erroneously" in alternating strong/weak pulses attests to an early awareness of hypermeter. Momigny would later describe "measures" that began in the middle of notated bars (what we would now consider an extended anacrusis); Weber offered that bars could cluster in duple pairings, which formed another duple pair of 2+2 bars, which could collect with another to form 4+4, each layer with an initial stress. Riemann's late 19th-century conception of a normative phrase would follow the same hierarchical strata with the opposite orientation: each duple layer would be end-weighted, giving a nested collection of iambs.

Several authors attest to a gradual move from a measure-level conception of meter in the Baroque era to a fluid use of hypermeter in the late 18th century, followed by increasing use of four-bar phrases in the 19th. Rothstein (1989) avoided talking about hypermeter in the Baroque because he claimed not to understand it. Channan Willner suggested that the principal approach to phrase rhythm in the 18th century relied on the rate of change of the Schenkerian middleground, which Willner called the "basic pace." Different phrase lengths result from changes to the basic pace; Willner particularly speaks of sequential expansions in the works of Bach and Handel works, whereby sequences interpolate chords that slow the basic pace by a factor of 2. McKee (1999) has written about Bach's minuets in the French Suites as being evident of a new galant tendency toward 2-bar hypermeter. He notes that hypermetric regularity is more evident there than in Bach's other dances, and he cites contemporaneous dance treatises to support the claim that it is truly *meter*, not phrase, that is regulative: the minuet dancer must be able to join the dance on the nearest downbeat, regardless of phrase boundaries.

In *Phrase Rhythm in Tonal Music*, William Rothstein uses the late works of Haydn as an example to show how, in the Classical practice, the interaction of phrase (defined as a musical movement with tonal motion from beginning to end) and hypermeter could become another parameter for the skilled composer. Haydn, according to Rothstein, started off with overly amorphous phrase lengths, particularly in his *Sturm und Drang* period; his middle period showed an increasing turn to periodicity, and his late works show a subtle interplay between hypermeter and phrase, where that interaction is revealed by reductions to duple "prototype" phrases. Grant, in the article "Listening in Transition," disputes Rothstein's argument that Haydn acquired this facility with hypermetrical manipulations only because he improved his craft over time, moving from excessive freedom to regularity and finally to a middle ground. For Grant, Haydn's change is emblematic of an overall turn toward hypermeter as a resource in the Classical era. Looking at theories of harmonic pivot chords by Rameau, Vogler, and Weber, he argues that music of the time was overall turning toward an emphasis on imagining the "listener's ear" as being subject to multiple interpretations of harmonies or — presumably — rhythm and meter; this is the basis Mirka's description (2009, *Metric Manipulations*) of the Classical string quartet as a "game proposed by the composer" between musicians and listeners.

The 19th century tends to be viewed as a time where four-bar phrases become more firmly established. The very term "hypermeter" originates with Edward Cone's *Musical Form and Musical*

Performance (1963), where it was used to refer to the sometimes unwelcome tendency of 19th-century music to fall into four-bar phrases with such regularity that they suggested meter at a higher level, in what Cone called “the tyranny of the four-bar phrase.” Rothstein took a similar attitude in his 1989 book, analyzing the music of Mendelssohn, Chopin, and Wagner as responses to the “Great Nineteenth-Century Rhythm Problem,” where the four-bar prototypes are now on the surface rather than manipulated by expansions or infixes. (In his view, Mendelssohn turned toward Classical methods; Chopin chose contrapuntal voice-leading that crossed over phrase boundaries; Wagner tried to undo the periodic prototype altogether.) Harald Krebs, in describing the Schumann’s practice (*Fantasy Pieces*, 1999), steps away from discussing hypermeter because, in his estimation, most of the interesting metrical concerns were at the level of the measure, in the form of metric dissonances.

It is worth noting that all of this discussion is highly dependent on a definition of what exactly hypermeter *is*. Richard Cohn has suggested that the reason hypermeter offers such theoretical interest is because it is elusive, not notated, and prone to inciting arguments over where and whether it is heard. Joel Lester, in *The Rhythms of Tonal Music* (1986), argued that so-called hypermeter was qualitatively different from meter. Whereas meter immediately begins a new unit as the previous one ends (as noted by Zuckerkandl’s wave model and Schachter’s reference of moving “toward” and “away from” the downbeat), “hypermeasures” could apparently have gaps between them. It was also prone to overlaps, expansions, and deletions, none of which occur in regular meter. Lester concluded that while these may be valid concerns, an analogy with hypermeter is not the way to explain them.

Rothstein accused Lester of confusing phrase with hypermeter, which Rothstein associates with regular patterning, especially if supported by harmonic changes, such that a durational reduction in the manner of Schachter yields sensible bars. But Lester’s concerns are not entirely unfounded. Ryan McClelland’s article on extended anacrusis mentions Mozart’s String Quartet in B-flat Major, K 575, where in the trio of the minuet, there are four-bar phrases preceded by a two-violin descending figure that has the quality of a prefix. For McClelland, the four-bar phrases constitute hypermeasures, and the prefix is not an expansion in the sense of Rothstein or Schachter, but an event existing entirely outside the hypermeter, putting it briefly on pause. Lerdahl and Jackendoff’s *Generative Theory of Tonal Music* (1983) provides a particularly strict conception of meter as a hierarchy of pulse cycles, which leads them to be somewhat circumspect on extending their definition above the bar level, allowing for at most 8-bar hypermeasures but no more. They analyze the opening of Mozart’s Symphony No. 40 in G Minor using 2-bar hypermeasures but conclude (unlike Schenker) that 4-bar hypermeasures are not useful here because of an apparent hypermetrical reinterpretation after the first period. Lerdahl and Jackendoff make a new allowance for hypermeters to “delete” their beats (which accounts for elisions) and suggest that further refinements might be necessary should one try to extend meter above the bar. Jonathan Kramer (1988, *Time in Music*) goes in the other direction, redefining meter to allow irregular beats of either 2 or 3 divisions at all hierarchical levels, which allows him to analyze the slow movement of Beethoven’s Op. 13 sonata as consisting of two giant beats. This rather recalls Cooper and Meyer’s hierarchical treatment of poetic feet (1960) that Schachter found so objectionable in his first *Music Forum* article.

Christopher Hasty’s conception of hypermeter in *Meter as Rhythm* (1997) comes in two varieties. He allows for meter, conceived as a projective process, to extend above the written bar; his analysis of the opening of Beethoven’s Sonata in F minor (op. 2/1), for example, shows nested projections at the level of two and four bars, and the accompanying prose makes reference to “2-bar measures.” A measure in this case refers to the temporal limits of projective processes; above this level, he considers hypermeter to be a different phenomenon, one predicated on awareness of parallelisms between the current material and previously heard material. John Ito (2013) offers a model for what precisely this alternative conception of what hypermeter is: rather than being meter writ large, it is a means of orienting oneself temporally to location within a phrase, based on a cognitively privileged level of the “heard measure” (which might subsume multiple notated bars, as in the scherzo from Beethoven’s Ninth Symphony). A given measure, by its internal rhetoric, carries with it the sense of beginning, middle, or end, which locates it within a paradigmatic mental model of phrase. In essence, this is a return to Riemann’s idea of the basic 8-bar phrase, where each bar can have a function, but Ito’s

conception is slightly more flexible; he analyzes the opening of Beethoven's Op. 31/1 sonata as consisting of bars 1 2 1 2 3 4 3 4 within a model four-bar hypermeter, whereas Riemann labels it as 1 2 3 4 5 6 7 8. Arguably, this returns to the question of separating phrase and hypermeter. Ito does call his system "hypermeter," but another conception would be that it answers Lester's charge to look at organization of above the measure level not by a strict analogy with meter, nor perhaps a simple turn to grouping, but by some other strategy that comes to terms with how stresses and relaxations are heard — how a phrase breathes — across a musical line.

(Factual errors in this essay, compiled during preparation for oral examination):

- (Some statements need more explicit references.)
- Cone's *MFMP* is from 1968, not 1963.
- Wrong key for Mozart K 575.

2. *Brahms the Rhythmicist: Theory and Practice**

In terms of rhythmic practice, Brahms is perhaps the most-discussed composer of the 19th century. The simple question concerns how to theorize rhythms that seem to conflict with the notated meter. In Lerdahl and Jackendoff's view (1983), meter is basically regular, and any irregularities on the surface, such as hemiolas and syncopations, result from phenomenal rhythmic groups that do not align with the meter that supports them. Harald Krebs takes a different view, whereby the supporting meter can itself contain conflicts that violate Lerdahl and Jackendoff's Metric Well-Formedness Rules; based on a single pulse layer, a meter can contain multiple "interpretation layers" that collect those pulses in different periods and phases, creating what he calls "metrical dissonance." Grouping dissonances (which Krebs called "Type A" in his 1987 article positing this theory) occur when two interpretive layers disagree on how many pulses are grouped into one beat at a higher level, whereas displacement dissonances ("Type B" in the early article) involve interpretive layers of the same periodicity that are shifted apart from each other so that they never coincide. Phenomenal events articulate these various dissonant layers. Frank Samarotto (1999) disputes that these surface rhythms can inhere in the meter, but he suggests they can set up a "shadow meter," whereby alternative metrical interpretations are suggested without completely supplanting the principal, regular meter. Danuta Mirka, in the opening chapters of her 2009 *Metric Manipulations* book, describes a model of audition drawing together all these ideas, whereby a regular meter assigned by Lerdahl and Jackendoff's model to a particular musical passage can be challenged by the incursion of a new, "metrically dissonant" layer, which proposes an alternate metrical reading that can be rejected or potentially confirmed in the listener's mind. The relevance to Brahms is that displacements and grouping dissonances have both appeared in his works, and any discussion of Brahms's rhythmic practice must confront them. Relevant precedents for Brahms's practice include Schumann, with his thorough use of metric dissonance (documented by Krebs in *Fantasy Pieces*) and even Beethoven, whose first movement of the *Eroica* symphony includes hemiola groupings that are offset from the main meter before the *tutti* statement of the main theme and again before the E-minor theme in the development.

David Lewin suggested an interesting approach in his analysis of Brahms's Capriccio Op. 76 No. 8, which is notated in 6/4 time. Lewin focuses on the two-measure level, giving 12 quarter-note beats to be grouped in one of three ways: 3:2:2 (that is, three whole notes, each divided into two halves, each divided into two quarter notes), 2:3:2, or 2:2:3. Lewin identifies that the opening of the Capriccio moves between these three groupings (articulated by various pitch events, such as the beginning of a rising contour in the bass) in a manner roughly parallel to the harmonic movement; Lewin even assigns the meters rough harmonic analogues as "tonic," "subdominant," and "dominant" functions. Richard Cohn's "ski-hill" formalism for this type of manipulation leads to "metric graphs" defined by adjacencies on his ski-hill diagram, which allow one to plot Brahms's metric "motions" in a certain abstract space. Ryan McClelland's analysis of this same piece observes that Lewin's initial model does not apply after the opening measures, but McClelland does continue to track the piece as presenting alternate divisions of the 6/4 bar into three half notes or two dotted halves. In his approach, various surface events align with either one interpretation of the bar or the other, setting up an apparent conflict between 6/4 and 3/2 that is eventually resolved in favor of 6/4.

David Epstein coordinated Brahms's rhythmic events with harmony in a different way in his analysis of the first movement of the Symphony No. 2. Epstein's focus is on hypermeter, claiming that the opening neighbor-note figure can be justified as either an anacrusis (by the textural arrival when the horns enter) or a downbeat (because of the initial tonic harmony that moves to the dominant). This supposedly ambiguous treatment of the anacrusis theme continues through the movement and is coordinated with the avoidance of structural tonics, with the exception of the arrival of the D-major violin theme (m. 44), which is heralded by a hemiola expansion of the neighbor-note motive and a firm tonic. For Epstein, real resolution is only achieved at the coda, when a 3-2-1 line confirms a tonic cadence that presents the neighboring motive not as an anacrusis, but as a firm hyperdownbeat.

Brahms can also use rhythmic processes of various types to articulate formal functions. Walter Frisch, in "Brahms and the Shifting Barline" (1990), offered examples of displacement dissonance in Brahms. Among them is the first movement of the Piano Quintet in F minor, where at the end of the

exposition, the piano line appears offset by the notated meter by one beat; the beginning of the development restores surface articulation of the meter. The end of the exposition of the first movement of Symphony No. 3 supplied another instance. Peter H. Smith revisited this issue by claiming that Brahms tends to use displacement dissonances at the ends of expositions and in retransitions, though Harald Krebs's article on metric dissonance gives an example of *grouping* dissonance at this point: in the same symphonic movement (Symph. 3/i), the retransition is heralded by hemiolas, introduced by the horns, which allude to the hemiola of the primary theme of the movement. The sonata-movement retransition is a particularly special area for Brahms; Smith, in his article on recapitulatory overlaps, argues that Brahms uses the retransition for rhythmic augmentation of thematic pitch content as part of an overall process of liquidation. This augmentation can impinge on the return of the primary theme, of which the recapitulation of Symphony No. 4, first movement, is a canonical example: the rhythmic reworking of the first phrase is in the service of a blurring of formal divisions.

Finally, some discussions of Brahms seem inclined to show his rhythmic techniques as those of a virtuoso. Samuel Ng's analysis of the Cello Sonata Op. 99, first movement, suggests that the irregular articulation of the meter by the cello is echoed on a larger level. The primary theme, secondary theme, and closing theme require the cello to articulate different beats in the measure, one associated with each theme. The development then sets up a massive hemiola, whereby the cello is first centered around articulations on beat 1, then on beat 3, then on beat 2, before returning to 1 again. (This takes a good deal of abstraction to argue. The actual sequence of attack points that Ng finds is 1-3-1-3-2-1-2, which he reduces to 1-3-2.) Brent Auerbach, meanwhile, argues that Brahms simultaneously unfolds distinct interval cycles in multiple polyphonic voices so as to generate an especially learned, "difficult" form of counterpoint with multiple rhythmic levels. The Capriccio in C-sharp Minor, Op. 76, No. 5 provides one example (the chromatic tenor line represents a "1-cycle" of intervals), as do two of Brahms's rhapsodies.

** *Extras*: McClelland op. 101: narrative of metric dissonances across movements 2 and 4: metric conflict not fully resolved by end of mvt 2; different types of dissonance used in the exposition of mvt. 4; secondary theme uses "subliminal dissonance" (from Krebs: refers to metric dissonance with respect to notated meter — Temperley disputes whether this can be heard; Krebs says it must be performed so that the conflict of meter and groups is evident); all this resolved in last four bars

(Factual errors in this essay, compiled during preparation for oral examination):

- "Peter H. Smith revisited this issue ..." Not Smith, but Walter Frisch.

Late-Romantic Symphonic Forms

*1. Narrative impulse in Strauss and Mahler**

Both Strauss's and Mahler's symphonic works have been particularly subject to narrative interpretations by scholars. On the most superficial level, this is probably abetted by Strauss's explicit claims to program in his tone poems and by Mahler's dalliances in programmatic readings of his early symphonies, such as the hero who grasps at victory without having truly achieved it in the finale of the First Symphony, the funeral march for that same hero in the first movement of the Second, or the arrival of Spring in the first movement of the Third. The turn toward narrative interpretation seems more plausible with Strauss and Mahler than it does with (say) Brahms, which is precisely why Susan McClary chose Brahms's Symphony No. 3 as her object of study ("the Old Faithful" in the "Yellowstone National Park" of absolute music) to claim that no music is "pure" and entirely free from the basic narratives of its time. Brahms is perhaps a less likely target for narrative readings because one can talk about his formal designs in the language of the Classical period. One might focus on how Brahms reworks earlier forms, often through the use of motivic development that cuts through or even supplants particular sections; this is the line taken by Walter Frisch in his book on the four symphonies (which points to motivic "fulfillment" in developments and codas), Elaine Sisman's article of Brahms's slow movements, and Kofi Agawu's chapter on formal design from the *Cambridge Companion to Brahms*. The point, however, is that the terms are largely the same. We might notice that the slow movements of the symphonies suggest sonata form, possibly without development, additionally overwriting the reprise of the secondary theme, using terms that are familiar from previous discourse. Brahms's symphonies are not immune to narrative readings: McClary gives one example, Mark Evan Bonds (*After Beethoven*) and Reinhold Brinkmann (*Late Idyll*) supply others for Brahms's First, and A. Peter Brown has argued that Brahms's Third is a symphonic poem without explicit program, citing Brahms's tolerance for others' narrative summaries of his works.

Strauss and Mahler, on the other hand, subject symphonic forms to such extremes that the question of labels seems particularly problematic. Donald Mitchell has suggested that sonata form is an entirely unfruitful analytical tool in Mahler's symphonies, and James Hepokoski cites a long line of analysts going back to Lorenz who have argued about the form of *Don Juan*. In the case of Strauss, Hepokoski argues in "*Don Juan Reconsidered*" that the program is essential to understanding the form of the work, which is necessary in order for him to justify the "extreme deformation" of its form as a rondo-turned-sonata. (Put simply, Hepokoski says the rondo scheme mirrors Don Juan's escapades, following a line of reasoning from Alfred Lorenz; the third episode, however, represents a woman who changes Juan's outlook to a more noble cause, represented by the Hero Theme, and which is encoded in the retrospective reinterpretation of the work as a sonata.) The same might be said of his analysis of "Till Eugenspiel," which justifies a rondo reading where the "reprise" is woven directly into the episodes, much as Till moves about through daily society, before the Law represented by a sonata reprise condemns him to death. Robert Samuels has looked to novelists, particularly Jean Paul, for precedents in Mahler, much as Scott Burnham has noted Jean Paul might be relevant for Schumann. Adorno, in particular, admired the "novelistic" quality of Mahler's symphonies, in which themes were not fragmented, developed, and recombined, but rather remained cohesive, emerging constantly changed in their intervallic details, even in "developmental" sections. He again compared them to characters of a novel.

Adorno identified one of the key advantages of a narrative approach to form: in a "narrative" work, the audience does not know in advance what will happen. Even over the course of a movement, tonal, thematic, and rhetorical goals are subject to question and might not be obtained. New material can intrude from apparently outside the discourse (as with the "breakthroughs" of the Mahler 1 finale or the Hero's Theme in *Don Juan*), or time can suddenly seem to suspend without teleological explanation (as in the development of the Mahler 6 first movement). Narrative theories supply a way to talk about a process being built through time without the prior assumption of a particular outcome, be it tonal closure or thematic reprise. This is part of the allure for Anthony Newcomb's reading of the finale of Schumann's Second Symphony: by circumventing existing formal language, it gives a way of talking about events that can "account" for them while respecting their apparent tendency to keep

hidden what events are still forthcoming.

Anthony Newcomb sought to adopt Vladimir Propp's approach to narrative in folk tales, which was based on the abstract functions of events occurring in a certain pattern. Others questioned the relevance of the word "narrative" to this approach. Carolyn Abbate asserted in *Unsung Voices* (1991) that a narrative requires a *narrator*, a specific voice who mediates related events and can introduce various discursive shadings. She argued that music does not generally narrate, and that it only does so at points of disruption where we feel the intrusion of what seemed to be an outside voice on the work. Her examples come from Mahler's Second Symphony, including the apparent "disruption" of the arrival of the second theme (which Kofi Agawu disputed as being more prepared than she acknowledges) and the sudden, violent appearance of the primary theme at more moments than expected, including at the beginning of a second exposition presentation and in the middle of the development. Nattiez (1990) argued that music does not narrate but supplies material that encourages listeners to impose a narrative (here again he cites Adorno, who said that Mahler wrote music in the way others narrated). Fred Maus suggested that without a narrative voice, we should consider music as a drama with actions and staged events, rather than as narrative *per se*.

In her article on narrative layers in Mahler's Ninth Symphony, Vera Micznik countered Nattiez's claim by citing narrative theorists who argued that even texts have their narratives imposed by the reader; music is not so different from text in this regard. Again, narrative provides an alternative to received forms; rather than needing to explain the DM return of the primary theme throughout the movement as some combination of sonata or rondo, Micznik can focus on the succession of events and how they seem to relate to one another. Her "narrative" reading relies on the increasing separation between the first and second themes (the fact that they are both centered on D is important to her, for key areas are insufficient for the discussion) and on the motivic "catalyzers" that connect "nuclei" of the main theme group statements, using terms borrowed from Barthes. This description is much more abstract than Anthony Newcomb's take on the same symphony, which for him represents the maturation or Romantic "spiral quest" of a youth from diatonic simplicity, through worldly chromatic threats, to a more stable but less pure maturity. (This is read on multiple levels. In the first movement, the chromatic d-minor theme sullies the diatonic D-Major theme, leading to a close with chromatic embellishments that represent durability but impurity. The delirious waltz of the second movement, saturated in major 3rds, nearly obliterates the Ländler; after the chromatic Rondo-Burleske, the finale eventually settles to a chromatically related key, D-flat major, unable to reach the initial D major.)

In his article on Mahler's first six symphonies, Seth Monahan seeks to reconcile narrative with sonata. In these earlier works, he argues, affective outcome is directly tied to whether the sonata recapitulation "succeeds" or "fails" in the terminology of Hepokoski and Darcy, namely whether a firm cadence in the tonic major arrives in the recapitulated secondary theme area or, if not there, then in the coda. Monahan imputes agency to the secondary theme as a subject trying to attain its own closure. His most harrowing reading in this manner is in his earlier article (2007) on the finale of Mahler's Sixth Symphony. Expanding on Adorno's view of this movement as asserting a top-down consistency at the expense of the individual, Monahan grants agency to the sonata form itself, claiming that the primary theme is fragmented precisely as (per Adorno) is atypical with Mahler, and the fragments subjugate or destroy the two secondary themes. Narrative methods are typically used to avoid imposing a formal scheme that seems unjustified. In Monahan's Adornian reading, that is precisely what Mahler does here, silencing one narrative voice with another, that of sonata form itself.

(Factual errors in this essay, compiled during preparation for oral examination):

- Micznik's article is not on "narrative layers," but on *degrees* of narration, comparing Beethoven's 6th and Mahler's 9th.

2. *Das Finale Problem?**

As Scott Burnham noted in his review of Steven Vande Moortele's *Two-Dimensional Sonata Forms*, there can be a historiographic tendency to view creative figures as trying to solve a *problem*, which explains the results we find. One of these is the "recapitulation problem," which describes a desire to avoid overly literal repetition while not wholly abandoning formal designs that use it, such as sonata forms. The "finale problem," then, refers to another tendency in symphonic writing from the 19th century: an emphasis on the ends of musical works as their moment of climax or apotheosis, whether within a movement (with an orientation to the coda of a first movement in sonata form, rather than the "double return" described by Webster for Classical practice) or across an entire multi-movement work, aimed at the last movement or even its coda. Two models are Beethoven's Fifth and Ninth Symphonies, both of which suggest a trajectory across the symphony of darkness to light, minor to major, that is resolved in the finale. Further precedents can be found in the first half of the 19th century, both for thematic connection between movements (Schubert's *Wandrer* Fantasy, Schumann's Symphony No. 4, Mendelssohn's Symphony No. 3) and an overall drive toward the close, even if it involves essentially an in-time re-casting of the finale movement's form (Schumann's Symphony No. 2, as discussed by Anthony Newcomb (1984) and Julian Horton (2013) as either a sonata-rondo or sonata that becomes a chorale prelude). Of these, it is perhaps Beethoven's Ninth that gets the most credit for setting a standard to meet or overtake; Carl Dahlhaus has described it as having a "circumpolar" effect on composers of the 19th century, whereby no matter how much time stood between them and Beethoven, his last symphony still exerted pressure on them. Frisch, in his book on Brahms's four symphonies, argues that Beethoven's Fifth and Ninth symphonies left behind competing imperatives to thematic unity and monumentality, two processes which could culminate at the finale.

The open evocation of Beethoven's "Ode to Joy" in the "primary" theme of Brahms's First Symphony has led to many anxiety-of-influence readings, which might be recalled by using Mark Evan Bonds's formulation (*After Beethoven*) that Brahms resolutely uses techniques associated with instrumental music to supplant the vocal theme and thereby reassert the authority of the (instrumental) symphony. (Specifically, the vocal melody is fragmented, sequenced, and treated as a source for motivic development, rather than as a song that endures to the end. In *Late Idyll*, Reinhold Brinkmann observed that after the recapitulation, the song melody disappears completely, apparently replaced by the Alphorn melody and then the brass chorale.)

Brahms's Third Symphony takes a different approach, one outlined by its movement-level tonal plan of FM-CM-cm-fm (to FM). David Brodbeck has suggested reading this symphony as a possible corrective to Liszt, as a way to integrate multiple movements "properly." The symmetric tonal plan suggests a giant I-V-I, which is supported by the fact that Brahms gathered his autograph for the score into three sections, keeping the middle two movements together. Moreover, the dominant is pointedly avoided in the first movement as a key area: the second theme is in AM (which decays to a-minor), and the retransition is accomplished by landing on a V/V chord in E-flat, whose bass is simply reconceived as the tonic return in F major. Tonally, F and C do not confront each other until the fourth movement, when the primary theme is in f minor and the second starts in C major. This key plan thus suggests a continual thread through the symphony, which is supported by the recurrent use of the "motto" F-Ab-F theme in the first, second, and final movements. (The chromatic C-C#-D theme has a similar tendency to reappear in the First Symphony.) The final return of the F-major cadences from the first movement have further weight now, not least as major-mode balm after the primary theme of the fourth movement, where the hints of F minor from the motto took over the entire primary theme. The passacaglia finale of Brahms's Fourth Symphony at once upends and reconfirms the idea of finale-oriented teleology altogether: as a symphonic conclusion, it is a uniquely austere realization of a variations-finale, yet Walter Frisch suggests that it has a quasi-sonata form built in its thematic development rather than its tone center(s), with an overall departure-return scheme of statement-development-reprise overlaid on the sequence of its variations. This gives a sense of gradual forward-vectored motion to the end, even a formal design that might resist that approach.

Bruckner's symphonies are characterized by their drive to the end. Walter Darcy (1997)

considered this to be built on sonata form deformations, particularly the non-resolving recapitulation, which delays firm confirmation of the tonic to the coda. Julian Horton countered that this was so prevalent for Bruckner as to be considered normative of his practice, rather than deformational according to a norm derived from other composers' styles. The rough model advanced by Darcy is that Bruckner's sonata movements usually proceed by rotations of the primary, secondary, and closing themes of the exposition, which continue once or twice through the development, again through the recapitulation (usually without firmly resolving the secondary theme in the tonic), then arrive at a coda where the tonic triad is affirmed in a static sound-sheet (the term comes from Dahlhaus, used to describe Wagner) and often a celebration of the primary theme or, in the finale, the primary theme from the first movement. The tonic *Klang* is thus the teleological impetus; one example is the coda of Bruckner's Fourth Symphony, where the opening horn call rings over an ecstatic Eb-major triad with swirls in the violins. This formal conception recalls Ernst Kurth's characterization of Bruckner's symphonies, which he said are most fruitfully considered in terms of "waves of energy" rather than their motivic or thematic working out.

The finale of Bruckner's Seventh Symphony can stand as another example. Timothy Jackson (1997) has analyzed this movement as containing a reversed recapitulation that returns to the tonic without truly confirming it. The three themes of the exposition are respectively EM, AbM, and am (at least initially), notably not landing on the dominant in a unique tonal move compared to Bruckner's other symphonic sonata movements. At the recapitulation, the closing theme returns in bm, but the secondary theme is in CM, completing a minor-third cycle started by the exposition and moving away from the dominant degree. The returning EM tonic of the primary theme is thus not quite prepared; only in the approach to the coda does it receive a structural dominant, after which EM rings firmly. Jackson's reading of the finale is programmatic here, as a testament of sorrow after Wagner's death, followed by an affirmation. The reading depends on Jackson's notion of the reversed recapitulation as a sign of tragedy, though it springs from Bruckner's commentary on the Adagio of the same symphony as a tribute to Wagner.

Bruckner's symphonies, Liszt's symphonic poems that feature thematic transformation leading to a climactic apotheosis (as with *Les Préludes*), and the existence of finale-weighted symphonies from earlier in the 19th century suggest that the "finale problem" was not so much a problem as a stylistic tendency, one coordinated with the rise in finales that were either based on sonata form (as in the case of Bruckner) or gestured toward it (as in Brahms's First). Others seem to avoid the matter altogether, as in Mahler's Fourth Symphony, whose folk-like song finale, like the symphony as a whole, gives little indication of monumentality in either barn-burning triumph or earth-shaking catastrophe. Certain other symphonies do however play into the same tropes. His Second has an outer frame similar to Beethoven's Ninth, with a tragic opening movement answered by an affirmational choral finale. There is a subtle difference, however, in that the finale requires more time to reach its apotheosis. In Beethoven's Ninth, the Ode to Joy enters soon after the recollections of the introduction. Mahler's Second, which has its own *Schreckensfanfare* (as does his First), has to wander through the abyss of the Dies Irae before the the clouds open. The result is a finale that pushes the end-weightedness further. In fact, Mahler's First, Second, and Sixth symphonies all suggest a design that echoes what Brahms's Third did in its key scheme. The early movements of all three symphonies suggest a variety of competing forces: the First has its pastoral first movement with a Haydnesque continuous exposition, with a development section that contains the motivic seeds of the last movement (as Seth Monahan points out in his 2011 article on Mahler's recapitulations). The Second has a funeral march, a whirling Scherzo that ends in a scream, and a desolate song; the Sixth again has march topics, another brutal Scherzo, and an imagined Idyll. In each case, the finale begins with a sense of "Where now?" (to take a phrase from Berio's *sinfonia*) which the finale must answer, at a cost. In these three Mahler's symphonies, one has the sense that the finale problem is not only one imposed by history. It is one posed by the symphony itself, which sets the stakes, then looks to its own conclusion to see how the conflict will be resolved, all in the course of one movement, with the answer at the end.

(Also: Tchaikovsky's Fifth Symphony -- another darkness-to-light with cyclic recalls of its motto theme, this time [Krebs] mediated by tone centers: DM as a catalyst for pulling e minor to E major)

(Factual errors in this essay, compiled during preparation for oral examination):

- "The 'finale problem,' then, refers to ... an emphasis on the ends of musical works as their moment of climax or apotheosis, whether within a movement (with an orientation to the coda of a first movement in sonata form ..." This is incorrect; the "finale problem" refers specifically to the last movement of a symphony.
- "Moreover, the dominant is pointedly avoided ... in the first, second, and final movements." This comes from Robert Bailey, not David Brodbeck.
- "Bruckner's symphonies are characterized by their drive to the end." Not quite accurate: characterized by delay of tonic resolution until the end.
- "coda of Bruckner's Fourth Symphony, where the opening horn call rings": It's not the same horn call, though the rhythm is the same.

Post-tonal voice leading

1. Is prolongation a viable concept for post-tonal music?

Attempts to apply prolongation to tonal music have not, in general, been received as successes. Often the analyst who invokes prolongational methods will resort to caveats, and invariably others contest the analysis. The early efforts by Adele Katz in the 1940s (*Challenge to Musical Tradition*) were put forward as tentative, suggesting the composers like Schoenberg and Stravinsky were deliberately contravening musical tendencies as expressed by prolongational methods, and the task of assessing their music was left to the reader. Looking to Schoenberg's criticism of Schenker, she added that if every pitch has harmonic importance, then music loses its sense of motion as she understood it, becoming a static succession of harmonic events. Prolongational analyses, if tenable, hold the promise of restoring (or recognizing) some sense of linear motion through time. While attempts such as Salzer's turn to Hindemith and Bartók in *Structural Hearing* are met with some indulgence, Milton Babbitt did find Schenker's pejorative analysis of the opening from Stravinsky's *Concerto for Piano and Wind Instruments* to be an illuminating way of hearing the passage, and Robert Morgan's 1976 article on dissonant prolongations in Schubert (*Die Stadt*), Liszt (*Die Trauer-Gondel*, *Faust Symphony*), Wagner (*Parsifal*, Act III Prelude), and Scriabin (*Enigme*) suggested that prolongation on non-triadic sonorities might have precedents in chromatic tonal music, tacitly implying that similar analyses might be fruitful in post-tonal music. Nonetheless, few authors broach prolongations today, although Olli Vaisälä's register-sensitive analyses of Schoenberg suggest that there may still be some validity in the approach, and Joseph Straus's biquintal model for Stravinsky's music. What becomes evident is that if prolongation is valid, it is sensitive to individual idiom of a piece or composer, and it cannot be assumed from the outset.

One controversy over prolongations began with Roy Travis's 1959 article "Towards a New Concept of Tonality," which suggested that prolongational methods could be applied to the music of Stravinsky and Bartók, provided the prolonged "tonic" was a contextually defined pitch set rather than necessarily a triad. The opening of the *Rite of Spring*, he claimed, prolonged the sonority C-Db-Ab (heard in the two clarinets against the bassoon), with the initial solo unfolding a subsidiary C-A dyad. In a 1966 article, he furthered his argument with prolongational analyses of music by Schoenberg and Webern, in response to earlier analysis by Allen Forte (1963, using pitch class sets) and Peter Westergaard. Schoenberg's Op. 19, No. 2 (from *Six Little Pieces for Piano*) likewise articulated a large-scale V-I progression in (roughly) C major, in which the opening G-B dyad split into two streams of thirds, with the B opening a soprano line up to Eb. The final sonority, which compounds CM7 (with added flat-10) with a similar chord based on G, was the ultimate tonic complex. Forte issued a rejoinder in a footnote to his 1973 article "Sets and Non-Sets," in which he argued that this last sonority was built up from overlapping thirds as foreshadowed in the opening G-B dyad, and that any attempt to read them as functionally triadic was misguided.

Joseph Straus made a broader reply in 1987 with his article "Problems of Prolongation in Post-Tonal Music," which claimed that prolongation was too strong a tool to import into non-tonal repertoire, that it asserted too much. In the spirit of Edward Cone's analysis of stratification in Stravinsky's *Symphonies of Wind Instruments*, Straus argued that in a statement-departure-return scheme, sonorities were not prolonged *through* surface departures in some deep middleground. Rather, they were only recovered anew. If material takes the form X Y X, he said, we should be able to talk about relationships between the two X regions without making any claims about Y, an approach Straus called "associationism." Straus critiqued Travis's analysis of the Schoenberg piano piece on these grounds, charging that there were no consistent criteria for the beaming Travis introduced in his analytic sketch. For prolongation to apply, Straus countered, four criteria must be met, involving surface hierarchies and harmonic hierarchies. He has since (as seen at the 2014 SMT meeting) reduced this list to two items: a prolongational analysis must have clear rules about defining which tones are structural and which are not, and it must be able to claim that the non-structural tones elaborate the structural ones. For example, if a supposedly referential harmony contains interval class 1 or 2, then we must be able to consistently identify whether an apparent neighbor-note motive that stays within the harmony is an elaboration or a small-scale arpeggiation. (Steve Larson later critiqued

Straus's initial set of criteria as too stringent, saying in his "Problems of Prolongation of *Tonal Music*" that even tonal repertoire did not meet his requirements.) To illustrate associationism, Straus alluded to his own 1982 analyses from "A Principle of Voice Leading in the Music of Stravinsky," which posited that certain pitch-class sets were so contextually emphasized as to become referential, and hearing partial statements of them induced an expectation to hear the set filled out as a form of "pattern completion" (with possible precedent in the expectation-realization model of Leonard Meyer's *Emotion and Meaning in Music*). In *Symphonies of Wind Instruments*, he argued, there is a referential set class represented by CDEF; statements of a prominent motive occur successively at pitch levels F, E, and D, lending a desire to fill out the pattern with C, which indeed arrives at the climax and in the last bar. Straus is emphatic that this is not a diatonic stepwise descent in a prolongational sense; it is merely a collection of separate notes that seeks completion. (Straus did note that the octatonic set might prove amenable to prolongation, which Forte [1988] applied in tandem with the diatonic set in another analysis of the *Rite of Spring* opening.)

Fred Lerdahl made another proposal for atonal prolongation in a 1989 article in which he argued that while post-tonal music might not have any foundational sonorities (it is "flat," he said), salience in the context of the piece does allow us to form a hierarchy of musical events that can be seen as a sort of prolongation — specifically, a time-span hierarchy, as adapted from his 1983 book with Ray Jackendoff, *A Generative Theory of Tonal Music*, in which at various temporal levels individual pitches are chosen as more fundamental than others. In tonal music, there are harmonic criteria, but in post-tonal, he said, criteria could involve any parameter, including register, timbre, articulation, and dynamic. (This aligned with Christopher Hasty's approach to segmentation from an earlier article in the 1980s in which he analyzed a quartet by Stephen Wolpe by outlining all the possible parameters by which pitch events might be perceived as related to each other.) Lerdahl again returned to the Schoenberg Op. 19, No. 2 (and No. 6) to illustrate his point. In 1994, however, Nicolà Dibben conducted an empirical study of Lerdahl's time-span reductions, both tonal and post-tonal. Subjects heard a particular segment of a piece and then performances of two proposed hierarchical reductions, one taken from Lerdahl (or Lerdahl and Jackendoff in the tonal examples), and the other a decoy reduction that distorted some level of the hierarchy. The tonal reductions were largely found to be valid: subjects overall selected the correct reduction, and when asked to rate the "badness" of the other option, their levels corresponded with the severity of distortion to the "correct" hierarchy. The atonal reductions, on the other hand, showed no such effect, and Dibben suggested that they might have less perceptual validity. In 1993, Jack Boss looked to Schoenberg's own musical analyses to suggest that the most appropriate method would allow for ornamentation at the very surface, using only neighbor notes and "dividers" (analogues to passing tones, adopted from Joel Lester's dissertation on atonal prolongation), without making any claims to a middleground or beyond. Michael Buchler made a similar argument in a recent talk at the SMT 2014 conference.

There have been studies that have tried to recuperate the idea of prolongation. Olli Väisälä published yet another analysis of Schoenberg's Op. 19, No. 2 in 1999, noting that the final sonority, if taken as referential, has the property that most of its interval classes are represented by only one of its two inversional members: there were several major sevenths without minor seconds, for instance, and major thirds without minor sixths. To Väisälä, this registral disposition of intervals was important, because it allowed for what Straus required: a differentiation between structural and non-structural tones. Elsewhere in the piece, he found a neighbor-note figure that could be justified as an elaboration by more than gesture; it involved motion by an interval not represented in the final sonority, and therefore subsidiary. Väisälä used this approach to analyze deeper levels in a 2001 article, taking the register-sensitive harmonic series as referential. (One wonders whether the use of the harmonic series is not far removed from the "triad of nature." Väisälä particularly applied it to an analysis of Debussy's "Voiles," comparing his effort with Adele Katz's, using the interaction of a referential augmented triad with the harmonic-series notes over the low B-flat in the bass.)

Joseph Straus also returned to prolongation in his latest article on voice leading in Stravinsky, published in *Music Theory Spectrum* in 2014. He argued that scalar collections on the surface, whether diatonic, octatonic, or otherwise, were the surface manifestations of two structural fifths (or a fifth and

a fourth) that were filled in with various tetrachords to give epiphenomenal scales. Straus claimed these were fundamental, prolonged structures, linked perhaps with a “tactile” sense of Stravinsky’s two hands occupying two fifths (or fourths) at the piano, separated by register with perhaps one carrying the harmony and the other supplying melody. The variable element was the interval class separating these fifths and which tetrachords they framed.

Straus’s and Väisälä’s approaches are both intriguing, and both rely on specific prolongational practices for certain composers and situations. They do suggest that prolongational thinking need not be unilaterally abandoned. Used with care, it can still provide a worthwhile perspective into the pitch organization of a given post-tonal work. What is clear is that not only do the assignments of tonics (referential sonorities) need to be questioned, but the rules of prolongation themselves have to be defined anew.

(Factual errors in this essay, compiled during preparation for oral examination):

- Forte’s “Sets and Non-Sets” is from 1972, not 1973.
- Larson’s response to Straus isn’t quite represented correctly. He said that if Straus’s conditions were met, they were a consequence of prolongation, not a cause of it.
- “major thirds without minor sixths”: Other way around: minor thirds without major sixths.
- Väisälä’s emphasis is on structural vs. non-structural *intervals*, more than tones.

2. What Lewin made possible

Lewin's principle contribution was his advocacy for transformational thinking, as summarized in his 1987 book, *Generalized Musical Intervals and Transformations (GMIT)*. The book starts with a somewhat sophisticated mathematical formalism to describe generalized interval sets (GISes), which extended the notion of "interval" to nearly any class of musical object, even timbre. (A recent article by Steven Rings has addressed what precisely the word *interval* meant to Lewin, concluding that it took on various interpretations with context, including being a suggestive metaphor and being a label for an entirely unrelated idea.) The second half of the book then introduces transformations as an alternative conception of a similar object; specifically, a transformation can be considered as a "transposition" by a certain generalized-interval in a GIS. For all the abstraction this model required, Lewin's illustration of it was remarkably vivid. He imagines playing a piano and trying to move from one physical configuration to another, such as in a chord progression. The transformation was the "*characteristic gesture*" that described this motion. Lewin's focus was thus on actions that moved between musical "objects" (events, sets, nearly anything that could be labeled) rather than on the objects themselves. This was perhaps his most influential idea, and it can be seen in some of his earliest articles, such as his "Label-Free Method" for describing intervals, published in the late 1960s. (Again, there his emphasis was on focusing on the transpositional motion required to move from pitch to pitch, rather than on supplying the pitches with numerical labels and subtracting them, which he might later have called a "Cartesian" view of measuring an extent.)

Lewin illustrates the premise in his analysis of Stockhausen's *Klavierstück III*, an essay from *Musical Form and Transformation (MFT, 1994)*. He walks the reader through different approaches to describing its formal organization before landing on the metaphor of a musical space. He lays out four quadrants on the page, representing conceptual musical "regions," which Stockhausen moves through in a certain path, exploring different areas over the course of the piece. Lewin focuses on the listener's active creation of this musical space through time, which can then be explored over the course of the work. He cites an example from a 1986 study by Jeanne Bamberger, who noted that musically gifted children, when asked to play "Twinkle, Twinkle, Little Star" on a set of visibly indistinguishable handbells, arranged them in a spontaneous and improvised physical arrangement rather than in an abstract scale (as trained adults did) or in the straightforward note sequence (as typical untrained subjects did). Lewin offered that even in the case of this Stockhausen piece, the succession of harmonies was a dynamic process involving the creative abilities of the listener. This is a highly alluring idea. Elsewhere (in a 1991 article on "Some Problems of Music Theory"), Lewin applied it to tonal music, suggesting that while Schenker's monotonal framework gives the sense of ending where we started, Riemann's tonal maps (with keys running by fifth along one axis and by thirds along another) could allow one to end up literally elsewhere on the map, even in the same apparent key. He gave an example from Schubert, saying that in Riemann's model, we returned to the tonic after various modulations, although it was nominally the same, it was a different tonic from where we began.

Lewin's turn to Riemannian *Tonnetze* in *GMIT* was inspiring to other theorists for its ability to talk about tonal entities like triads and seventh chords without needing to postulate a root. (Richard Cohn's 1996 article on smooth voice leading and hexatonic cycles is among the more influential explorations of this idea.) In the realm of post-tonal music, however, transformations and spatial metaphors introduced a dynamism that was not captured by other approaches. (Prolongational methods, were they more accepted, might provide a rival.) Lewin's analysis of Webern's Op. 10, No. 4 in *MFT* was dedicated to Allen Forte and meant as an extension to his method: whereas Forte in *The Structure of Atonal Music* identified certain referential hexachords, Lewin focused on the transformations between them, noting affinities they had with the transformations between trichords in a distinct segmentation of the same piece. We can see this method again in Philip Lambert's 2000 analysis of Webern's Op. 11, which identifies a particular set class that tracks along a certain sequence of transformations in the first movement, backtracks along the same sequence in the second, then continues forward along the original track again in the third.

Although most invocations of transformations use only the transposition and inversion operators, Lewin was much more flexible in defining his transformations, allowing "characteristic gestures" to

emerge from the piece itself. As Joseph Straus observed, these often involved context-sensitive inversion operations that preserved certain subsets of pitches. (Such a method occurs as the *J*-inversion of the first three essays in *MFT*.) Straus used this to provide a finer mapping of set-class space than Forte supplied. Using Lewin's methodology, Straus obtained voice-leading maps of all the particular members *within* a given set class, rather than considering each, say (015), as a single entity.

Lewin's allowance for multiplicity of meaning and contextuality had its detractors. His 1990 article on Klumpenhouwer networks used Schoenberg's Op. 19, No. 6 to illustrate network isographies, which allowed the intervals of a given chord to be viewed as transformations, which were then seen as relating chords to each other, giving a recursive, quasi-hierarchical progression that realized the interval intervals of its components on a broad scale. (Klumpenhouwer's model allows inversions to qualify as intervals, so that D and F might be considered as related by T3 or by I7. The idea of network isographies, however, is already evident in Lewin's 1983 article on transformations in atonal music.) Lewin openly observed in the article that the methodology could be used to argue for a wholly different analysis, claiming that its virtue lay in the ability to represent musical relationships that had already been intuited. Still, his practice suggested simple manipulations of the diagrams on paper to find the relationships he was seeking, and Shaughn O'Donnell (1997), Philip Lambert (2002), and Michael Buchler (2005) all criticized K-nets for being overly permissive in their usage ("promiscuity" being the common term). Lewin, for example, observed that trichords needed to share only one interval class to be considered isographic in the K-net approach, which Buchler pointed out implied that the set class (026) was isographic to every trichord. This was, however, consistent with Lewin's overall approach that favored contingency and fluidity of analysis. K-nets provided a particular manifestation of that fluidity, and they were perhaps the most flexible method he used that other people adopted. Aside from his popularization of musical spaces, however, his use of transformations opened the door for analysts to find ways of describing music as consisting of motions through time without relying on global prolongational systems. They allowed for dynamism without univocality.

Notes: Metaphorical imputation of desire to tones in posttonal music. Schoenberg Op. 19, No. 6, as described in his 1983 article; the A that doesn't participate in the T6 transformation between right hand and left hand chords seeks its "partner," D-sharp, which arrives in a prominent register a few bars later. Reference to "lusts and urges" of notes. Akin to Straus's pattern completion; MFT analysis of Debussy's "Feux d'artifice" says 5 notes of a whole tone collection create "pressure" for last one to arrive. Focus is on returning idea of motion driven by yearning of pitches. Also: Straus's use of transformations to define post-tonal voices, considered abstractly, as distinct from "lines" presented by segmentations on the surface.

(Factual errors in this essay, compiled during preparation for oral examination):

- "He imagines playing a piano and trying to move from one physical configuration to another, such as in a chord progression." This conflates Lewin's interval function with transformations in general. He only talks about being in a particular position.
- "Lewin's turn to Riemannian *Tonnetze* in *GMIT* ..." *GMIT* does not mention the *Tonnetz*, though it does single out what would become the P, L, and R transformations.
- Buchler's article is 2005, not 2007.

Gamelan in Central Java and Bali

1. Composition versus improvisation in Gamelan performance

In the case of Balinese gamelan, improvisation is available but limited. In *Music of Bali* (1966), Colin McPhee indicated that the wealth of melodic doubling, particularly among the elaborate *gangsas*, constrained the freedom to improvise, and that only undoubled instruments such as the *ugal* had a flexible consideration of their parts. (John Roeder and Michael Tenzer make a similar point about the *ugal* in their 2012 article on the *kebyar* piece *Gabor*.) More recent genres like *kebyar*,

developed in the early 20th century in North Bali (described by Tenzer in his 2000 book *Gamelan Gong Kebyar*), have a highly dense framework of interlocking parts in what is called the *kotekan* technique. McPhee claimed that Balinese musicians had a set part in their minds as firmly as if it were in a printed score and that any changes to the work would need to be coordinated in rehearsal. Tenzer adds in his book that *kebyar* works can be considered essentially as fixed compositions, with composer names attached to them. The detailed coordination in rehearsal, where parts are learned by rote, allows for sudden shifts in tempo and cycle during the performance; some musicians even coordinate twirling their hammers for effect. Allowing for variations between different ensembles, Tenzer claims that this relative fixity of the works allows them to negotiate topical references to dances, social registers, religious functions, or the military; drawing on Kofi Agawu's *Playing on Signs*, Tenzer even compares Bali in the mid-to-late 20th century with late 18th-century Vienna in its richness of topical practice. Nicholas Gray has noted that not all gamelan works in Bali are considered fixed. He examines musical practice in the *gender wayang*, a four-person ensemble of metallophones that is small enough to allow some liberty in the parts, although these improvisations are opportunistic and may occur only out of the musician's desire for something more interesting. In this case, elaborations may occur in the right hand while the left hand maintains the underlying basis of the part.

The question of improvisation is much more involved for Javanese gamelan, because there the ontology of the work is more fluid. There has been a great deal of debate over what precisely constitutes the "piece," or *gendhing*, that a Javanese ensemble might play. The basic reason is that individual instruments have a great deal more independence from one another than in Balinese gamelan. The only significant doublings that occur are in the one-octave *saron* instruments that carry the *balungan*, a steady melody to which all the other parts relate in some way in manners distinct to each instrument. (While the Balinese gamelan does not have the same degree of freedom in the parts, it also has a basic melodic layer called the *pokok*.) The notation for a given work may carry only the *balungan*, written in cipher notation with numerals indicating the scale degrees of the melody. (The parts of a male vocal group called the *gérongan* might be notated as well.) The central question has turned on whether this notated *balungan* encodes all the essential information of what the work is, so that the other instruments simply elaborate on it in free but idiomatically constrained ways. Roger Vetter published a comparison of three performances of the piece *Puspawarna*, as realized by the court gamelan in Surakarta, the comparable court gamelan in Yogyakarta, and four street musicians using only zithers, drums, and flutes. The basic melodic material was conserved, but the repetition structures were not, such that some groups repeated internal sections more often than others (for instance in AABCD pattern rather than ABCD), and the temporal ratio of fastest parts to the *balungan* varied as well.

Benjamin Brinner has written about the dynamics of ensemble performance in Javanese gamelan in *Knowing Music, Making Music* (1995). He describes how much of the music is determined during the course of the performance. Different players have different roles, which have distinct competencies to match. Thus the *saron* players will know the *balungan* they play, but elaborating instruments may simply follow the lead of the other musicians in the ensemble, decorating the *balungan* in the manner appropriate to their instrument. Brinner cites a singer who claimed not to know the pieces she sings, because her part requires only playing off pitches previously sounded by other musicians. Musical signals are handled by the drummer, who signals changes in temporal structure, and *rebab* player, who indicates which piece to play next by the use of melodic cues, which are amplified by other instruments in the ensemble like the *suling* (flute) and *bonang* (a metallophone). There are cases where this can go awry. Brinner gives an instance when Mloyowidodo, a performer and theorist at one of the major conservatories, was leading the ensemble and omitted a small section from the *balungan*, which the other musicians accommodated seamlessly. Elsewhere, Marc Perlman has described playing the *rebab* part and cueing the wrong piece; the ensemble followed his lead, and he remained unaware of his error until it was brought to his attention later.

One of Brinner's points is that the ensemble allows for great flexibility in realization, but not total freedom, because integration of the ensemble is valued. It is possible for a musician to get lost during performance, in which case the favored tactic is "floating," playing unintrusive stereotyped patterns

until recovering his or her place. Far worse is to improvise freely, which might accidentally suggest a disruptive cue to the ensemble. Wayne Vitale has written on the idiomatic elaboration formulas called *wilayan*, which are realizations of more abstract figures called *cengkok* that have been collected in printed texts.

There has been substantial debate over exactly which melody it is that the Javanese gamelan musicians elaborate. In the 1940s, the Dutch ethnomusicologist Jaap Kunst (*Music in Java*) claimed that the *balungan* was the basis for all melodic realization in the ensemble, referring to it as a *cantus firmus*. Mantle Hood called it the “nuclear melody” and said that it carried all the information of the mode, or *pathet*. (*Pathet* classification in Javanese gamelan is another vexed question.) Judith Becker, in her 1980 book *Traditional Music in Modern Java*, expressed her concern that notation, which was developed for *balungan* in the late 19th century under Dutch colonial rule, would lead to a musical culture that was literate rather than oral, relying on the printed page, refusing to innovate on music received from the past in the form of notation. She feared that notation, which she called one of the most “insidious” legacies of colonial rule, would essentially freeze what had been a vital tradition in which works were freely re-created anew.

Becker’s focus was again on the *balungan* as the basis of the *gendhing*. In the appendix of her book, her melodic analyses focused only on the *balungan*, identifying 38 common contours in the *gatra* (four-note units of the *balungan*) out of a possible 125. R. Anderson Sutton followed this with another consideration of *gatra*. Drawing on Albert Lord’s 1960 book *Singer of Tales*, which tracked formulaicity in the oral transmission of Yugoslavian epics, Sutton argued that the Javanese repertoire was composed of a variety of *gatra* formulas, which could be recombined by knowledgeable musicians according to certain implicit rules to realize any particular *gendhing*. The melodic identity of any given *balungan* was not fixed, and different realizations of ostensibly the same piece should be considered as a web of family relations (in Wittgenstein’s sense) rather than having a true exemplar.

In 1978, the Javanese musician theorist Sumarsam, working with Vincent McDermott, offered an alternative theory to Kunst and Hood’s, suggesting that the real melody the musicians were elaborating was not contained in the *balungan* at all, nor was it played by any one instrument. It was instead a wholly conceptual, imagined “inner melody” shared among the musicians, which each of them realized in the manner best suited for their instrument. The inner melody, for example, might run out of the range of the *saron* instruments, in which case they would loop back to the bottom register and continue it. In his 1995 book *Gamelan*, Sumarsam revisited this theory, claiming that any talk of formulaicity and *balungan* was beside the point: gamelan *gendhing* were more likely to have their basis in *sekar*, Javanese poetry and songs, which were then adapted to the instrumental ensemble. (Colin McPhee made a similar proposal in 1966 about Balinese gamelan pieces.)

R. Anderson Sutton likewise wrote in “Concept and Treatment” about an alternative theory proposed by his teacher Suhardi, who said that the basis of *gendhing* was *lagu*, another conceptual melody not played by any member of the ensemble. Suhardi derived the *lagu* from the *balungan* by adding faster notes to account for agreement among the more rhythmically dense parts; furthermore, when the elaborating instruments deviated from the *balungan* but agreed with one another, the *lagu* determined the melodic material they shared. A third theory in the same vein was put forward by Suppanggah, another musician and theorist who said there was an *essential balungan* that was determinative. This was in contrast to Sumarsam’s “inner melody” in that its basis was the actual performed *balungan*, though it was more elaborate; in practice it resembled *lagu* but hewed more closely to rhythms of the *saron* instruments. Marc Perlman compared these three conceptions in his 2004 book *Unheard Melodies*, concluding that ultimately none of them were completely explanatory of the ensemble. Perlman suggested that they were instead creative attempts to systematize a practice through the use of metaphor, but that none of them could be entirely explanatory.

There is one last source worth mentioning which is historically speculative but has intriguing ideas. Noriko Ishida (2008) has suggested that Javanese gamelan before notation was in fact based on one melody, played by one instrument (usually the *rebab*) and imitated by the others with simple elaborations or “tracing.” Ishida points to a legend of one piece that was communicated by a deity to a person by playing on the *gendèr*. She also cites Marc Perlman’s 1998 article on gamelan in villages

outside the Javanese court cities of Surakarta and Yogyakarta, where he argued that an older tradition was retained in which elaborating instrumented hewed closer to the *balungan* melody; contemporary players in the court cities (especially Surakarta) saw this as an inferior manner of performance. Ishida proposes that during the development of notation in the courts, people may have written down synoptic summary melodies of what they heard in the gamelan texture; this became the notated *balungan*. With notation able to transmit a melody, the next generation of musicians now felt free to elaborate more, leading to the tradition now housed in the conservatories. (Ishida cites elderly musicians who remember their delight at inventing new realizations.) In this view, notation would have done exactly what Becker feared and reified the melody, but in the process would have opened up the possibility for the ensemble as it exists today. The article is largely conjectural, but it would suggest that Javanese gamelan musicians at one point cultivated novelty, contrary to views of this music as a historical relic (see next essay). The realization of performances today may depend more on communal cooperation, but it may be an innovation that made that particular style of ensemble integration what it is.

(Factual errors in this essay, compiled during preparation for oral examination):

- The *gender wayang* can also be a two-person ensemble.
- “Wayne Vitale has written on the idiomatic elaboration formulas called *wilayan* ...” The author is Wayne Forrest, and the formulas are called *wiletan*.
- Wittgenstein’s term is “family resemblance,” not “family relations.”

3. Concepts of time in Javanese and Balinese music

References to cyclical time in Javanese and Balinese gamelan focus on what Jaap Kunst called the “colotomic structure,” or time-keeping part of the gamelan ensemble. At this layer, time is divided into nested cycles of duple ratios, usually 2 or 4. Time is measured by the steady pace of the *balungan* or *pokok*, which may be taken as referential, although the beat might be placed on one of the faster levels. (In Balinese gamelan, there is a separate, faster layer played by the *kajak* that explicitly marks beats.) The largest unit, called the *gongan* in Javanese music, is punctuated by a single, deep gong strike on the last beat. Subdivision of the *gongan* will vary by genre; one version has a higher gong, the *kenong*, striking at twice the rate of the gong, creating units called *nongan*. These may be further divided by a gong called the *kempul* and a kettle gong called *kethuk*, giving a pattern of t-P-t-N-t-P-t-G/N, where t is the kethuk, P the kempul, N the kenong, and G the gong. (Unlike the standard conception of Euro-American meter, each temporal unit in each layer is considered to be end-weighted, so that the arrival comes with the gongs on the last beat.) The melodic instruments play over this explicit temporal framework, and they too will repeat their material in cycles, coordinated with the *gongan*. Not all genres are cyclical; an early article by Brinner describes *pathetan*, an unmetered “exploration of mode” featuring melodic lines that respond to one another. *Palaran*, discussed in Brinner’s book, lies in between, with an ametric vocal melody punctuated by metricized cadences in the ensemble. Most of the focus, however, has been on cyclic structures in gamelan music.

In 1981, Judith Becker published an article on “Hindu-Buddhist Time in Javanese Music” in which she claimed that the temporal structures of gamelan were reflections of Indian practices from their previous influence over Java. Hinduism came to Java from India in the 4th and 5th centuries; Buddhism later followed in the 7th century, and as Margaret Kartomi describes, both religions were blended with the local religious practices already in place. The arrival of Islam in the 13th century eventually led to its dominance in Java, although Bali remains “Hindu-Buddhist.” Becker said that Muslims in Java tended to be suspicious of gamelan, thinking that it might be non-Islamic, and she argued that their suspicion is correct because of its use of cyclic time. Citing Joseph Campbell’s description of Hindu cosmological time (involving cycles of universe death and rebirth in the eye-blinks of a deity), she suggested that Javanese gamelan involves a stasis and stability not associated with the eschatological time of Islam and Christianity. In another article (“A Musical Icon”) co-authored with her husband, the linguist Alton Becker, she claimed that musical cycles in gamelan held metaphorical power because they were icons of cycles in nature, as represented by various cyclic calendars in Java and Bali. The two claim that the local languages do not mark future and past tense, so that narratives do not carry an inherently linear temporal dimension. The most ritualistic gamelan pieces, they claim, are the ones with the longest cycles and least surface elaboration, which they note are associated with the most divine characters when the music accompanies the shadow puppet theater of *wayang kulit*. In her 1979 article on “Western Influence in Javanese Music” and her 1980 book, Judith Becker lists her concerns that modernization in Java is leading to a turn from cyclical to linear time, citing a propagandistic piece by Ki Wasitodipuro that used a gamelan texture as an index of antiquity and arranged its music to follow a linear narrative. Becker acknowledged that “Western” music has some cyclical elements as well in its use of repetition and meter, but she suggested that its teleological emphasis (along with other stylistic elements like the use of triple meter) risked rendering the gamelan unable to participate in modern life.

Some, such as Margaret Kartomi and José Maceda, have cited Becker’s writings without questioning them; Maceda in particular sound to prove that nonlinear or static temporality was a feature of music from across Southeast Asia. More recently, however, Becker’s view has been criticized. Michael Tenzer (*Gamelan Gong Kebyar*, 2000) said it recalled the ethnographer Clifford Geertz’s vision of Bali as existing out of time, unchanging and “aloof” from external influence, as well as other more generic exoticizing tropes. Although Becker was largely focused on Javanese gamelan, she did make extensive reference to Bali in her description of cyclic time, and Balinese gamelan has a far more flexible treatment of time than might be inferred from her articles. In a 2006 article in *Analysis of World Music*, Tenzer analyzed the *kebyar* piece *Oleg Tamulilingan* to show that both linear and cyclical processes were at work. On the most obvious level, *kebyar* allows for sudden changes of

tempo, so that gong cycles can occupy dramatically different lengths of time, ranging from second to minutes. These tempo changes disrupt any sense of stability; they are part of the intentional showmanship of the *kebyar* style, which arose in the milieu of contests between different gamelan ensembles. Tenzer also looked at the changes in several parameters such as texture, volume, and melody, and he concluded that they too might be said to adhere to cycles, but these cycles were out of phase with each other. Thus a given combination of texture, tempo, dynamic, and pitch material might be unique to its location within a piece. Tenzer and John Roeder looked at temporality in the *kebyar* piece *Gabor* in a 2012 article, where they observed that, in addition to the various changes in tempo, the gong cycles could be grouped into phrase structures that found parallelism between units of differing lengths: a phrase that seemed to suggest antecedent-consequent, for example, might have an antecedent of one cycle in length but a consequent of two. In 2008, Andrew Clay McGraw empirically measured instrument attacks in a Balinese gamelan and found that their speed moved in waves (which the Balinese call *ombak*), speeding up during the approach to a gong strike, slowing down toward the middle of the temporal unit. Moreover, there was a gradual drift toward increasing the speed of these strikes as the piece progressed, imposing a linear process on the cyclical waves of tempo.

Javanese gamelan is much more restrained in its use of tempo changes, such that Becker's idea of cyclical time may seem more valid there; indeed, most of her concrete examples are Javanese *gendhing*. However, Roger Vetter and R. Anderson Sutton have both drawn attention to variations in the *irama*, or density ratio of the slower instruments (such as the melodic *balungan* and gongs) to the fastest-moving parts (*panerusan*). Vetter's comparison of three performances of *Puspawarna* discusses the changes in *irama*; in one case, the surface tempo speeds up but the density of the slower instruments cuts in half, given a surface sense of acceleration with an overall slowing of deeper melodic motion. Vetter and Sutton collaborated on a 2006 article ("Flexing the Frame") that describes this practice in another Javanese piece. As they, Benjamin Brinner, and Sumarsam have described, changes in *irama* are cued by the *kendhang* (lead drum) player, who uses a rhythmic signal to modulate the rates of both the rapid *panerusan* and the slower *balungan* and gongs. Unlike Balinese gamelan, the changes are gradual, accomplished by measured rises and falls in tempo. Vetter and Sutton emphasize that despite the cyclical processes evident in this music, its temporal sense is fluid, able to expand and contract, and thus not static at all. The Javanese practice of performing gamelan medleys, as described by Brinner, also tends to move from slower pieces with long cycles to faster ones with short cycles, again contrary to the Beckers' claims. There is not evidence that any of this is only recent practice; and it is distinct from the evidence Becker adduced for the incursion of linearity, such as propaganda music after Indonesian Independence. As she noted, music can include both concepts of time. Balinese and Javanese gamelan do just that, with great allowance for internal variability.

(Factual errors in this essay, compiled during preparation for oral examination):

- "faster layer played by the *kajak*": *Kajar*, not *kajak*.
- Becker's article is from 1972, not 1979.

Music Cognition

2. Perceptual hierarchy in concept and practice

One of the reasons Lerdahl and Jackendoff's 1983 *Generative Theory of Tonal Music* was so successful was that it claimed to offer psychological models that could be tested. Among them were the time-span and prolongational hierarchies, which have their conceptual origins in the syntactic trees of linguistics but can also be related to the structural hierarchies of Schenker. Time-span hierarchies segment the piece into regular temporal intervals at various hierarchical levels and identify the most important pitch for each interval, based on various harmonic and metric criteria. Prolongational hierarchies are similar but are meant to describe affective tension and release over the course of the piece. Lerdahl and Jackendoff's book seeks to describe how a musically sensitive listener would conceive of the piece after hearing it enough times to have a full mental map of it, although it might be

acquired or perceived only partially. Implicit in this is the sense that the entire piece can be described in terms of a single hierarchy that is musically relevant for listeners.

In 1987, Nicholas Cook published an empirical study that suggested something quite different: that long-range tonal closure was essentially irrelevant to aesthetic judgment of pleasure and coherence. His study involved performances of several piano works of varying lengths, each played in two versions: one that was intact from the original, and one that included a covert modulation so that the final cadence was in a non-tonic key. (One piece was included twice intact as a control.) The subjects rated each piece on how coherent and enjoyable it was. The main result was that, supposedly, there was no difference between the two versions of each piece. The only work to suffer in “coherence” was the St. Anthony Chorale from Brahms’s *Variations on a Theme of Haydn*, which was the shortest excerpt, and even then, its aesthetic rating did not suffer. Cook concluded that tonal closure was only perceptible on time-scales within a minute or so. He allowed that large-range tonal hierarchies may be important to the composer when writing the music, but he added that it probably did not matter to listeners.

Robert Gjerdingen (1999) justifiably denounced this study as flawed, pointing out that all the subjects had heard the pieces in the same order, and (as Cook himself noted) that they all seemed slightly to prefer the second one they heard, regardless of whether it had tonal closure. The use of live performances also added potential variability between the intact and twisted versions. In short, none of the study’s results were valid, however suggestive they may have been. Nonetheless, the Cook study suggested a new possible avenue for empirical music research: the perceptual validity of large-scale structures proposed by music theory. It should be noted that Cook’s article was not the first to address the issue of perception in large-scale form; in 1986, Irène Deliège published a study on “cue abstraction” in works by Berio (the *Sequenza for Viola*) and Boulez (*Éclat*), suggesting that listeners mentally segment the music into parts that are bookmarked by recognizable musical cues, such as a distinctive melodic motion or timbre.

Studies by Serafine et al. (1989), Emmanuel Bigand (1990), and Nicolà Dikken (1994) directly tested some of the small-scale hierarchies proposed by Lerdahl and Jackendoff. The results were largely positive. Bigand’s study provided short melodies divided into two families, each with a distinctive but similar harmonic middleground and elaborated so that members within a family had distinct surfaces, but each had a similar surface to one melody from the other family. Listeners were exposed to one of the families (or a mix of the two as a control) and asked to identify melodies that belonged to it. They chose melodies with the correct middleground at rates better than chance (with musicians performing better at the task), suggesting that there was perceptual validity beneath the surface. Dikken’s study (described in another of my essays) showed that for a given tonal passage, listeners were able to choose the appropriate middleground reduction from two choices, a correct reduction and one with a slight deviation in the one of its hierarchical levels.

However, there appear to be perceptual limits to hierarchical functions, even for musicians. A study by Tillmann, Bigand, and Madurell (1998) used the “musical puzzle” method (first put forth by Deliège, Cross, et al. in 1996) in which subjects move icons on a computer screen and try to put musical fragments in their original order. Here the pieces were the first refrains of minuetts, chosen to have an 8+8 phrase structure with a tonic cadence at the end. (The familiar Bach Minuet in G Major provided one of the samples.) Each was separated into two phrases; depending on the minuet, some of the phrases ended with authentic cadences on the dominant, otherwise half cadences in the tonic, and the rest in authentic tonic cadences. When asked to arrange them, both musicians and nonmusicians showed a tendency to distinguish half cadences from authentic ones, indicating an awareness of local harmonic function; but both groups also tended to confuse V:PACs with I:PACs, putting the tonic cadence in the middle and the dominant cadence at the end. Subjects’ descriptions of phrase endings indicated that authentic cadences in either key were seen as closed; arrival on a local tonic took higher precedence over what that tonic was.

Scrambling music to disrupt hierarchies has been the focus on several studies, including one by Karno and Konečni in which the thematic regions of the first movement of Mozart’s Symphony No. 40 were arranged in five orders, including the original. Listeners did not show a preference for

Mozart's version; instead they most liked whichever one they heard first. (Fatigue is a probably a complicating factor in this study.) Taken to an extreme level, some have argued that only truly local hearing is perceptually relevant, without regard for hierarchies. Jerrold Levinson's 1997 *Music in the Moment* offers a "concatenationist" view of musical hearing in which the listener is only focused on the musical surface in a small temporal window about the present instant. This view has been adduced to explain results like those of Bigand (1996), who found that when short works by Bach, Mozart, and Schoenberg were cut into 6-second segments and put in reverse order, aesthetic judgment was not significantly different, and the majority of people who heard the reversed version did not realize it. (Surprisingly, only the Schoenberg piece — the 12-tone Gigue from Op. 25 — showed a slight negative aesthetic impact with a reversed order.)

However, there are indications that large-scale forms are not entirely irrelevant. A study by Marvin and Brinkman directly asked trained musicians whether short excerpts ended in the same key as they began, and the majority answered correctly, with musicologists and theorists responding more accurately than performers (about 70% to 60%). It was unclear, however, whether knowledge of closing gestures was interfering, so that the listeners knew which types of figures suggested closure in the tonic.

On a broader formal level, Granot and Jacoby (2008) published a musical puzzle study using a Mozart major-mode sonata movement and a Haydn minor-mode sonata movement, fragmented into their various themes. When listeners tried to rearrange them, only 2 recovered the original sonatas, but they did tend to maintain ternary structures with the development in the middle and thematic presentations on the outer ends, fitting what David Huron has referred to as the "tension curve" of a sonata movement. The tonal scheme of the exposition and recapitulation was not recovered in the major-mode sonata, even for musically trained subjects, although the change of mode in the Haydn sonata did allow some musicians to perform better with that task. Another study by Bigand (2006) using 6-second segments showed a similar awareness of musical tension over the course of a piece. Works by Ligeti and Xenakis "were fragmented and completely scrambled. Some surprisingly, nonmusicians showed greater preference for the originals, on the grounds that they had linear trajectories of increasing density; the scrambled versions "seemed to go nowhere."

Another study suggesting that tonality may not be the primary mediating factor of form is that of Lalitte et al. (2006), which looked at atonal reconceptions of the Beethoven *Waldstein* and *Tempest* sonatas. The first few minutes of each piece were rewritten to maintain their registral, rhythmic, gestural, and motivic profiles, while destroying any sense of tonality. Subjects were asked to segment each piece into important sections and to rate the level of intensity in the music over time. In each sonata, segmentations generally agreed for both the tonal and atonal versions, and the affective intensity profiles were very similar. The researchers concluded that non-harmonic parameters were likely the primary form-bearing dimensions of these sonata movements.

Finally, most of these studies did not relate to popular music (although the just-cited study did also include some). It is possible that untrained listeners would be more sensitive to forms in popular music than to tonal forms from the 18th and 19th centuries. Rolison and Edworthy (2012, 2013) used a musical puzzle task for verses, choruses, and bridge of a popular song and found that people were roughly able to order them correctly, albeit with some confusion of the choruses and occasional misplacement of the bridge. When asked about their enjoyment of misordered versions, there was no difference; however, when they listened repeatedly (six times) to both correctly-ordered and misordered versions, they showed quicker drop in favor for the original with linear increase in preference for the reconfigured one. Following Tan and Spackman's (2005, 2007) work with musical hybrids (where piano pieces cobbled together from Liszt, Copland, Shostakovich, and others showed a similar pattern on repeated listenings), Rolison and Edworthy suggested that there was a perceptual difference between the scrambled and ordered songs: the latter were seen as simpler and so became less-liked with multiple exposures, while the former were seen as more complex and thus more interesting over the course of multiple listenings.

Taken together, these studies suggest that hierarchical models of tonality, as represented by the models of Schenker and Lerdahl and Jackendoff, are not significant in the aesthetic appreciation of

music by either nonmusicians or musicians, and there is good indication that they are only marginally perceptible, perhaps only by those with training. As the last study indicates, it is important to remember that the musical environment of the contemporary listener is different from that of the pieces studied here, and so one's sense of what is musically "grammatical" or "interesting" may not be relevant for how the works of Haydn or Handel were heard in their time. Moreover, despite the study with reversed segments of Bach and Mozart, there is a trend toward awareness of, and preference for, broad tension profiles. These studies suggest, though, that tonal hierarchies are not a vital part of that process. If music is built from small moments, then it may be the accumulative impact of those moments that matters more than the tonal lines that trace between them.

(Factual errors in this essay, compiled during preparation for oral examination):

- Deliège's cue-abstraction article is from 1989, not 1986.
- "(although the just-cited study did also include some)." Not the cited study, but Bigand 2006.

3. The limits of language models

The music-language metaphor is a familiar one, and as often as it is invoked, it is qualified. Nattiez (1990) said that music cannot communicate a subject and predicate, indicating an agent who performed an action; Thomas Turino finds the semiotics of music to have greater semantic power as a system of indices, particularly when associated with extramusical referents, than as a system of (linguistic) symbols. Still, the association of music with language has appeal, especially on the lower, non-signifying levels of phonology, prosody, and syntax. Lerdahl and Jackendoff's 1983 book was explicitly inspired by Chomskian generative grammars, although the quasi-syntactical trees they offered took on a different form. Patel's *Music, Language, and the Brain* (2008) argues for a "shared resources hypothesis," claiming that while the linguistic lexicon and its musical equivalent may be stored in different physical and perhaps conceptual spaces of the brain, the units that process them syntactically may be held in common. (Here he is responding to case studies of people with amusia (described by Peretz and Ayotte et al.) or aphasia (Tzortzis), either congenital or acquired, without having the other condition, suggesting that the physical regions in the brain are distinct.) In particular, both involve the segmentation of material from a continuous stream of audio, possibly mediated by category perception (Newar, Cuddy, and Mewhort (1977) and Smith et al. (1994)), to form a possibly syntactic representation with a (potentially) semantic element. The book details studies to support his claims, of which one example will suffice.

Iverson, Repp, and Patel (1998) suggests that musically atypical and syntactically atypical events are processed similarly. In an magnetoencephalography (MEG) scan of people hearing sentences, there are typical changes in potential registered for hearing sentences that are semantically difficult (a negative spike 400 ms after the event, abbreviated N400) or syntactically difficult (a positive jump 600 ms after the difficult term, called P600). Patel et al. played three sentences that varied in their syntactic clarity: they were either clear, syntactically convoluted but correct, or ungrammatical. As expected, the P600 spike was observed, with a larger response for the ungrammatical sentence. Similarly, a musical phrase in C major was played with a V-I cadence in the middle. This stood as the analogue to the "clear" sentence; the "difficult" sentence was represented by the same phrase with a V-bIII progression instead. The "ungrammatical" phrase used V-bII. When the subjects heard these phrases, there was a P600 spike akin to that of the sentences, with a greater effect for the V-bII phrase. The suggestion is that a similar process is mediating both interpretations.

One more study, more recent than Patel's book, is Koelsch et al. (2013), which aims to justify the use of hierarchical trees in music processing, at least at a short time scale. The authors took 10-sec MIDI excerpts of particular Bach chorales that do not immediately resolve a half cadence. The local dominant is thus not answered until the tonic arrival at the next fermata, creating a tonal opening with nonadjacent closure. Koelsch et al. created revised versions of these chorales by transposing the phrase after the open dominant, thus removing the tonic arrival at the next cadence point. Subjects listened to

an enormous number of these chorales in various keys while distracted by another task, namely identifying when an errant bassoon line enters the music. Brain scans of these subjects found that when the non-resolving non-tonic arrived, there was a signature that was associated with a region they had already postulated was used in harmonic “integration,” namely completing a syntactic tree. Their ultimate aim was simple: to show that nonlinear dependencies mattered in music perception, just as they matter in sentence structure, and contrary to Markovian views that model harmony by immediate chord successions. They claimed that this was the only time such a nonadjacent, hierarchical dependency was shown outside of language.

Such approaches, however, bypass another aspect of music, that connected with movement and the body. Some of this discussion can be approached at a speculative level. Arnie Cox (in *Music Theory Online*, 2002) offered his “mimetic hypothesis,” which claims that all music, from children’s songs to Stockhausen, leads listeners to imagine that they are producing the sound, even if only by imitating timbres as subvocalization. Whether this is true of the general population may not be evident, but empirical evidence supports the claim for musicians trained in the instrument they heard. One study by Knösche and Haueisen looks at involuntary movements in pianists when they heard piano music. Another by Elizabeth Hellmuth Margulis (2009) shows that flutists and violinists show activity in the motor cortexes of their brain when listening to Bach Partitas for their own instrument, but not for the other. (Interestingly, the flutists showed activity for both instruments in Broca’s area, which is associated with language, whereas the violinists showed such activity only for their own instrument.) Kohler et al. (2009) report tests with monkeys where mirror neurons in the brain region associated with action planning are activated when they hear the sound of an action they recognize, but not when hearing the sound of an unfamiliar action.

The stress patterns of language, as Patel notes in his chapter on prosody, are not nearly so regular as those of much music, and when a rhythm supplies a regular pulse, entrainment — the basis of Justin London’s theory of meter (2004, rev. 2012) — can be observed. As described by Clayton et al. (2000), entrainment is the synchronization of a bodily rhythm with a periodic external stimulus; it can be associated with flashing lights as well as with sound. A straightforward example by Snyder and Large (2005) will demonstrate: MEG readings of individuals listening to alternative loud-soft pulses show amplitude spikes at the same temporal interval, which continue even one of the phenomenal pulses is silenced, and the height of these spikes is coordinated with the strength of the pulse. A recent motion-capture study by Toivainen (2011) shows that when people are asked to sway from side to side in time with music, they entrain at multiple metric levels, as seen on different axes: head motion along a vertical axis, for instance, can indicate a subdivision of the larger pulse. Rhythmic entrainment suggests one avenue by which music can manipulate our sense of temporality, particularly the subjective rate of passing time.

There may be elements of music that are distinct from both language and movement. Margulis (*On Repeat*, 2014) has suggested that repetitive exposure to a sonic stimulus, even a linguistic one (as in Diana Deutsch’s speech-to-song illusion), turns it into a form of music, shearing away its previous meaning. She does not note that this repetition imposes its own rhythm, a new form of periodicity for entrainment; the video of schoolchildren on Diana Deutch’s web site shows side-to-side swaying once the repetitions begin. All the same, Margulis’s reading suggests that repetition is part of what separates music from language, and that repetitive structures are precisely what move language away from the mundanely discursive toward the musical. How this relates to non-repeating sonic sheets could be worth pursuing. Perhaps there is a realm, a possibly timbral one drained of signification and movement, where the surface shimmer is all that remains, yet is still music.

(Factual errors in this essay, compiled during preparation for oral examination):

- The author is Dewar, not Newar.
- Knösche and Haueisen’s study did not look at involuntary motor movements per se, but rather involuntary action of the supplemental motor a

General Exams

Day 2

Note: I apologize to my readers and any trobairitzes out there for my inability to spell “trobairitz” correctly yesterday. My spell check does not know the word.

Nations and Nationalism in Opera, 1820-1915

Slightly longer (?) essay: Vladimir Stasov and the Kuchka

In his books *Musorgsky* and *Opera and Drama in Russia*, Richard Taruskin writes that journalist Vladimir Stasov, to a large extent, created the group of composers known as the *Kuchka*, serving as a public polemicist and publicist, as well as a self-appointed guardian of Russia’s musical past and future beyond his favorite group of contemporary composers. In a time when, to use Taruskin’s title, the musical definition of Russia was a matter of much debate and controversy, Stasov was a central figure in defining a musical canon of recent works, casting judgment on new ones, and proclaiming the direction in which he thought future efforts should be headed (Taruskin compares him to the prolific literary critic Vissarion Belinsky, who played a similar cheerleading role for Russian literature). As the most prolific chronicler of Russian musical activities in the nineteenth century, he provided a first draft of its history to future musicologists, told very much from his own point of view.

Opera was the most hotly debated medium of this time, and Stasov was uniquely important to its creation. He was a great admirer of Glinka, first of *Ruslan and Lyudmila* and later of *A Life for the Tsar*, though he described Glinka’s use of folk song as crude (perhaps considering the blunt juxtaposition of Russian and Polish music or the attempt to merge Russian protiazhnaiia and Italian arioso in *A Life for the Tsar*, or the imitation of epic song at the beginning of *Ruslan*). Later, he worked with several of the Kuchkists (a term he himself coined) on their operatic librettos, most importantly Alexander Borodin’s *Prince Igor* and Modest Musorgsky’s *Khovanshchina*, both works left unfinished and disordered at the time

of their composers' deaths. They are, however, very different works in many ways, and show different elements of the Kuchkist musical world.

Stasov was a major champion of Musorgsky. He viewed what were generally considered technical shortcomings of Musorgsky's (lack of) formal training as liberatory, leading the composer to a uniquely Russian form of musical language apart from what he at times condemned as Beethovenisms of Glinka. For Stasov, Musorgsky's composition was Russian through and through, unlike the superficial quotation of folk songs he had developed his own, Russian musical language. Musorgsky's first large opera (after the realist, Dargomizskyan *Marriage*), *Boris Godunov*, was based on Pushkin's play of the same title and premiered in 1872 in what is now known as the second version. Musorgsky's first, 1869, version had been rejected by the Kirov management, with the suggestion that Musorgsky fix a few eccentric orchestrations and create a major female role. But Musorgsky's revisions were much more drastic, adding the "Polish" act to include the mezzo-soprano lead Marina but also making major adjustments to nearly every scene, as described by Taruskin in *Musorgsky*. This results in an opera that is less 1869's musical setting of disconnected scenes from Pushkin's play (which owes a large debt to Karamzin's history, as described in Caryl Emerson's *Modest Musorgsky's Boris Godunov*) and more a coherent story in itself, each scene assuming a clearer shape and the entire plot containing fewer loose ends (in the 1869 version, Grigory/Dmitri disappears after the Inn Scene and his storming of Russia is only related to Boris by Shiusky, in the revised version he reappears in the Polish act). The plot is no longer so clearly centered on Boris, and now ends with the despairing Kromy forest scene, in which the simpleton laments the fate of Russia after Boris's death. Taruskin argues that these changes move the opera from a strictly realist conception to one more along the lines of grand nationalist opera, albeit one without the customary triumphant ending.

Stasov did not have a direct hand in the creation of *Boris*, but in his writings on Musorgsky described it as the composer's greatest work. Stasov did, however, have a direct relationship with

Musorgsky's next opera, the unfinished *Khovanshchina*. Roughly translated as "The Khovansky Affair," he and Musorgsky assembled the plot from a mélange of historical documents and fragments of Karamzin's historical narrative of the multiple Strelstny revolts just prior to the reign of Peter the Great. The result juxtaposes historical events that occurred decades apart, invents characters (Marfa), and is one of the most confusing plots in all of opera, particularly in its unfinished state. Musorgsky did not compose the scenes in any kind of order at all, and many parts of the score were unorchestrated at his death (they are usually heard today in a version by Shostakovich, with a final chorus by Stravinsky). Like *Boris*, the opera contains folk songs, again primarily in the chorus scenes, and here in particular, Marina Frolova-Walker briefly argues, Musorgsky's accompaniments seek to "folkify" the music more than Balakiev's somewhat authentic settings in ways that to his ears, untouched by ethnography, sounded rustic, avoiding dominant chords pointedly.

But Musorgsky's works were mediated by another force than Stasov: Rimsky-Korsakov. Though Stasov was alive at Borodin and Musorgsky's deaths, the job of piecing together incomplete operas seems to have fallen to their fellow composer rather than their favorite scenario-writer and critic. Taruskin, who seems to be virtually the only scholar to have written about this repertoire in English (Frolova-Walker's treatment is disappointingly brief), argues that by placing the a reprise of the "dawn" prelude near the end of the opera, Rimsky conferred an optimistic ending for *Khovanshchina* not contained elsewhere in the work, and that Musorgsky (and, presumably, Stasov) intended for their opera to have just as dark an ending as *Boris*. Since *Khovanshchina* ends with the beginning of the reign of Peter the Great, this was an extremely drastic change, moving from Musorgsky's negative view of the Westernizing tsar Peter as a destroyer of Russian-ness to Rimsky's more positive view.

Rimsky-Korsakov's first opera, *The Maid of Pskov* (first version 1868) has some similarities to *Boris* but also some key differences. Like the second version of *Boris* and like *Khovanshchina*, it tells history but

with a grafted-on Romantic plot. Rimsky-Korsakov's plot attempts to tell why Ivan the Terrible, when laying waste to Russia, stopped and didn't destroy the town of Pskov. The reason involves the titular Maid, Olga, who naturally has a rebel boyfriend but is actually the illegitimate daughter of Tsar Ivan "Terrible" II himself (it could be said to be the evil Russian twin of Verdi's 1869 *Simon Boccanegra*). Tragedy is not averted, but history is explained.

Rimsky's opera, particularly in its first version, it in the realist style of the first version of *Boris*, recitative-like settings of text and all. The opera contains many folk song settings, taken from Balakriev's collection and given coloristic settings by Rimsky-Korsakov, as well as surprisingly contemporary-sounding church music (involving the ringing of bells vital to any opera written after 1850). The opera, Taruskin argues, is intended as explanatory, speculative history, presenting Ivan not as a lunatic but as a rational, humane character, with the moral messages that pervade Karamzin's history. The original version was dominated, like *Boris*, by the chorus, particularly in the *veche* scene, which Taruskin compares to the St. Basil's scene in *Boris*.

The other Kuchkist opera for which Stasov wrote the scenario was Borodin's *Prince Igor*, started in the late 1860s (meaning he wrote it before he wrote *Khovanshchina*), and still unfinished when Borodin died in 1887. Like *Khovanshchina*, it was pieced together by Rimsky (and his student Glazunov), and given its premiere a few years later. However, it is a dramatically different work. Like Stasov's favorite *Ruslan and Lyudmila*, it deals with Russian empire, only it is aggressively nationalistic in a way Tarskin describes as highly problematic. Stasov based the plot on the medieval *The Lay of Prince Igor*, but its imperialistic overtones make it more relevant to the Russia of the nineteenth century than the ancient one. The second act, in the Turkish kingdom of the Polovtsi, takes place in the most over-the-top Orientalist kingdom to be found in Russian opera, suffused with inaction, *negra*, and an exotic, emasculating East. This is, according to Taruskin, anachronistic to other operas of the time, without the realist influences of Musorgsky or the

early operas of Rimsky-Korsakov, full of “snake charmer music.” However, the “negra undulation” identified by Taruskin is given the broader name of the “Kuchka Pattern” or KP by Marina Frolova-Walker in *Russian Music and Nationalism*, which she argues often appears in an unmarked, non-Oriental form, and she points it out at several points in the non-Oriental first act of Prince Igor as well as the Oriental second.

So it is difficult for me to deduce a picture of Stasov’s ideology based on these works. Unlike his semi-nemesis Serov, he was not a composer himself, and by profession was in fact a librarian. His primary role was as critic, but through his encouragement of the historical subjects of Borodin and Musorgsky’s operas shaped their moralistic, minimally accurate, and, in Musorgsky’s case, nihilistic conceptions of history, and thus participated in the search for a musical voice for the Russian people.

Slightly shorter (?) essay: Wagner and ethnic nationalism

Wagner and German nationalism today evokes, first and foremost, an image of Hitler, of anti-Semitism and Bayreuth’s generational hold on the Wagner myth. While most of these images contain more than an element of truth, they do little to explain Wagner’s own inspiration. Though they may stand as his most prominent legacy, they also represent a simplified interpretation of his works that fails to account for his development over time or relationship with the history and ideology of the nineteenth century, particularly his acrimonious (and at the time one-sided) relationship with French culture.

Wagner’s first significant entry into the operatic world, after *Das Feen* and *Die Liebesverbot*, was *Rienzi*, premiered in 1842. It is what can only be called a shamelessly Meyerbeerian grand opera, which is particularly surprising in light of his copious condemnations of the Jewish Meyerbeer later in his life. Its political implications are analyzed by Rachel Nussbaum in her *Cambridge Opera Journal* article, “Wagner’s *Rienzi* and the creation of a people,” in which she challenges Adorno’s interpretation of the work as “proto-Fascist.” Based on a novel by Edward Bulwer-Lytton about a Roman tribune, Nussbaum argues that Wagner

composed *Rienzi* in order to escape from his own personal concerns of the time, and that the opera thematizes this very lack of connection between personal and public life in modern bourgeois society. *Rienzi* comes out of nowhere to attempt the creation of a Roman people based on an abstract conception of the rule of law, offering a model of the state that has no space for a personal life (ironically, Nussbaum points out, *Rienzi* is motivated to do this by the very personal concern over the death of his brother). *Rienzi*'s model fails, and the prenational job is unwilling to give up its private concerns in favor of national ones. In the terms of Benedict Andersen's *Imagined Communities*, *Rienzi* has failed to convince the people that the people who do not know each other personally still have a bond due to their shared membership in the abstract cause of the nation. Nussbaum describes the Romans as prenational, unaware of the ethnic nationalism that *Rienzi* is attempting to incite.

This attempt to create a mythic past is a common goal of nationalist movements. Due to its ability to tell a story and provide a national "sound," opera was an ideal medium in which to construct a nation. Herder's exploits in folk song collection promoted the idea of a national music, of a sound that was unique to a particular group of people through a shared body of folk music. This, combined with mythic elements in libretti, could pose a potent combination, creating what Michael Tusa, in his article on Weber's *Der Freischütz*, refers to as a body of symbols, a collective memory that creates a German people. (*Rienzi*'s Romans do not possess this greater cohesive identity.)

The interpretation of these symbols, however, is unclear and a major point of debate that will be crucial in my discussion of Wagner. In *Nineteenth-Century Music*, Carl Dahlhaus argues for an interpretation based primarily on reception history (particularly in regards to *Freischütz*). However, possibly due to his prolific self-documentation, much of the Wagner literature focuses not on reception but on intention. I would like to modestly propose that both are necessary for a nationalist opera: unless one subscribes to a Fichtean view of national consciousness pervading the composer of sufficient German-ness,

which results in a wholly German opera, the composer of a nationalist opera is actively attempting to engage with nationalist sentiments. But if the audience of his or her opera does not receive these as such, the opera does not fulfill its function (the conflict of these two views of nationalist opera—intention versus reception—can be seen extremely clearly in the debate over Verdi’s “Va, pensiero” by Roger Parker and Philip Gossett, as Parker primarily proceeds from Verdi’s intentions and Gossett primarily from the audience’s reception).

Weber’s singing hunters (who are, ironically, singing not in Bavaria but in the *Bohemian* forest, where later Smetana would set his echt-Czech opera *The Bartered Bride*), magic bullets, longing heroines, and valiant nascent Heldenentors would prove a decisive influence on Wagner’s development. In his *Weber and the Search for German Opera*, Steven Meyer frames the reception of *Freischütz* as one of Dahlhaus versus Wagner, in which Wagner took the intention side, arguing that *Freischütz*’s German character is the result of Weber’s use of German materials and German spirits in his work.

Unsurprisingly then, Wagner would later renounce the blatantly French *Rienzi*. Many of his later operas and music dramas, from *Tannhäuser* to *Der fliegende Holländer* to *Der Ring des Nibelungen* draw on the same well of mystic myth as Weber, taking place in a medieval or earlier past and often partaking of magic, and trying to establish a collective past for people who do not yet have a collective present. However, what these German materials are is left exasperatingly unexplained by many scholars, including Meyer.

Perhaps this relates to a nationalist trend in musicology itself. Eric Hobsbawm suggests in *Nations and Nationalism in Europe* that the effective scholar of nationalism cannot himself or herself believe in nationalist ideology. But to many German critics and musicologists, nationalism is something that happens to other nations’ music. Underlying this is the assumption that music is already German, it is the other countries that must alter it from its natural state to produce something of their own. This condition is

analyzed by Philip Gossett in his review of Dahlhaus's *Nineteenth-Century Music* and its origin and espousal by nineteenth-century intellectuals and composers is described by Celia Applegate in her piece "Germans as the People of Music." However, she locates absolute music as the most prestigious form of music for 19th-century Germans. Absolute music, particularly German absolute music, was assumed by the 19th century to be universal in its expression (such as the recent biography of Beethoven naming him "The Universal Composer"). Critical editions of the nineteenth century created a canon of German masters, and musicology was invented.

Back to Wagner. Wagner himself, though he saw Weber as consciously adopting German materials to make *Der Freischütz* German, also saw Germans as the "people of music," as he clearly wrote in many an essay. However, Germans were special in many other ways as well, and, as he wrote in his 1865 essay "Deutsche Kunst und deutsche Politik," (in the collection *Art and Politics*) he believed that Germans were the civilization with the "strength of spirit" to bring all of humanity back to a noble state and forever destroy the corrupting influence of French civilization. He frames German culture as a product of "Volksblut," a creation of the people that had not yet reached its full potential because it had not yet been embraced by the princes and rulers. French art, however, was a creation of its rulers, imposed on rather than created by its own people, and therefore would remain forever weak. Germany, not yet a united nation, could not harness the full strength of its own Volksgeist, but once it united, the universal spirit and strength of German art would be recognized by all. So Germany is once again framed as exceptional, here not only capable of producing better art but of saving humanity.

The work that relates to this essay most closely is the one that is most often analyzed in terms of Wagner's nationalism, the 1868 *Die Meistersinger von Nürnberg*, a story of medieval song contests like the earlier *Tannhäuser*. Even more than *Tannhäuser's* Wartburg, Nuremberg is a location of tremendous significance for the meaning of the opera, as analyzed in detail by Arthur Groos in his excellent article

“Constructing Nuremberg,” and in Stewart Spencer’s “Wagner’s Nuremberg.” Both Groos and Spencer note Nuremberg’s history as one of the richest towns in Germany in the medieval period, and more importantly its strict rules regarding construction after that period. Due to these regulations, the center of the town is the best-preserved medieval façade in all of Germany, and looked in Wagner’s day (and still does today) much like it had at that time. So while the opera is set in Medieval Nuremberg, it looks like it could also be the Nuremberg of today (or of 1868’s day). This, combined with its associations with Drürer and the Reformation, and location in the “heart” of Germany made it a culturally significant place for setting an opera eager to prove itself as German (and a good setting for *The Triumph of the Will*).

Groos argues that the opera, starting with its setting in a place that looked familiar and current to German audiences, engages in proleptic narrations, storytelling that while set in the late medieval period means to say something about current German society. Combined with this is a messianic typology, beginning with the hymn at the start of the opera, which links biblical material with the motive of the Mastersingers heard at the opening of the prelude. This is combined with material linking Hans Sachs with John the Baptist (most crucially David’s song to him in Act III), the river in Act III with the river Jordan, Eva with Eve, and, unspoken, Walther von Stoltzing as Jesus. While not overly literal, Wagner’s message, Groos convincingly argues, is that, preceded by Sachs, Walther’s song is the rebirth of German art (happening in the place with Luther prompted a rebirth of Christianity, and the song is, explicitly, baptized in the sextet in Act III Scene 1) that will bring redemption to humanity.

However, the moment that is always highlighted by present-day critics in *Meistersinger* is Sachs’s monologue at the very end of the opera cautioning of foreign influence and urging for the protection of “heilige deutsche Kunst,” a caution usually linked to the supposed anti-Semitic caricature of Beckmesser. However, this caution can also be seen in light of the essay described above, and the caution against French influence. The 1870-1 Franco-Prussian war was just on the horizon. But to put the statement in a

broader nationalistic context, it furthers the nationalistic imperative to create a self versus an other, and encourages the establishment of “German art” as directly opposed to some Other, whatever that may be.

Wagner’s nationalism, as portrayed in his essays, was virulently anti-Semitic and uncompromising. While his artistic goals in his operas were complex and numerous, by his choice of librettos and frequent invocations of an idealized and/or imagined German mythic past (from the Minnesang of *Tannhäuser* and *Meistersinger* to the quasi-Germanic myth of the *Ring*) that would promote Germany’s ascendancy as the savior of Western art and civilization, accessible to all but uniquely German in creation.

Sorry, I suppose this isn’t significantly different in length from the first essay, but it was intended to be the short essay.

The 19th-century concerto

Long essay: The Schumanns and the Concerto

Robert and Clara Wieck Schumann were both active composers of concerti (though Clara only wrote one) as well as, in Robert’s case, a critic and in Clara’s, a performer. Their roles in the musical atmosphere of mid-19th century Germany is an excellent lens through which to see the development of the concerto after Beethoven, though between them they only composed two major completed concertos, both for piano (Robert Schumann also wrote concertos for cello and for violin, as well as the *Konzertsück* for four horns, but none have received significant attention in the literature, however I will discuss them briefly later in this essay). For ease of writing, I will refer to Robert Schumann as “Schumann” and Clara Wieck Schumann as “Wieck.”

Schumann’s evolving views of the piano concerto are chronicled in Claudia Macdonald’s aptly titled *Robert Schumann and the Piano Concerto*. Schumann famously denounced the concerto in 1839 as having devolved from the noble form of Beethoven and Mozart into a musically insignificant vehicle for virtuosos

in which tuttis of unrelated and insubstantial material were combined with empty virtuosity for traveling soloists-composers. The targets of this criticism are usually considered to be Kalkbrenner and Hummel. However, stepping back almost a decade, Macdonald complicates this picture, portraying Schumann's views as having evolved over the course of the 1830s (as had Kalkbrenner and Hummel's compositions). Schumann had in fact sought to study with Hummel, and wrote part of a first movement for a Piano Concerto in F major (a work Macdonald has reconstructed from the surviving sketches). The Piano Concerto in F major is a relatively conventional work, with a double exposition and virtuosic material with minimal orchestra involvement, which Macdonald compares to the works of Ries and Moscheles as well as Kalkbrenner and Hummel. Schumann's views, she argues, became more critical over the course of this decade, and she follows a trail of unfinished concertos that are increasingly innovative.

A somewhat different perspective is provided by Stephen Lindeman in *The Early Romantic Piano Concerto*. Though he also quotes Schumann's condemnation, he notes that the works of these virtuosos were often innovative in a variety of ways, and that Schumann may well have been influenced by some of the more popular examples (indeed, Macdonald notes Schumann's positive review of one of Hummel's more creative concertos, and Schumann's note in his review of Hummel's Concerto No. 15 that Hummel's creativity had steadily declined from earlier heights). The father of all these concertos is Weber's 1821 *Konzertstück*, a one-movement, four section cyclic programmatic work in four parts without a clear sonata form.

The central challenge of many of these works was the elimination of the double exposition in concerto first movements. In a double exposition structure, the orchestra first presents the exposition, usually without a modulation (though Beethoven modulates in the Concerto No. 3, much to Tovey's distress), and then the soloist enters and cycles through much of the same material, this time with a prominent modulation to the dominant. This was perceived as redundant and ineffective in dramatic

terms, and composers sought a variety of solutions, from avoiding sonata form altogether to stretching it across multiple movements (both strategies attempted by Liszt) to modulating orchestral expositions (Chopin's Piano Concerto No. 1). The concerto, Lindeman argues, was not always a site of musical insubstantiality and empty virtuosity but a place where virtuosos and "artists" alike could experiment with new musical forms.

One of the concertos Lindeman selects for a detailed case study is that of Clara Wieck, which she wrote in the mid-1830s at the age of around 15. It was originally one movement, and she eventually wrote two more and published it (the original movement became the last movement). Its two central innovations are its single exposition structure in what would eventually become the first movement and its thematic unity: all three movements are based on the same material. Perhaps due to this unity of themes, the first movement is somewhat truncated, lacking a full recapitulation and segues directly into the second movement, similar to Weber's *Konzertstück*. However, Schumann did not like the piece much, and Lindeman suggests that this possibly discouraged Wieck from later composition. This was to be Wieck's only concerto.

The fact remains, however, that Schumann heard many formulaic, predictable concertos by traveling virtuosos who could not write with the luxury of an expected orchestra rehearsal, and his reviews clearly tell what he thought of them. Eventually, his stumbling towards a completed concerto reached the *Phantasie* in a minor around 1841, a sonata form movement for a piano and orchestra with a single exposition structure. At the suggestion of a publisher, Schumann would compose two more movements, a short *Intermezzo* and a finale, and it would become his sole complete Piano Concerto in 1844, premiered by Wieck. Shockingly, Macdonald only treats the first movement in her book, *Robert Schumann and the Piano Concerto*. The piece features Schumann's much wished-for interaction between piano and orchestra. It opens with a bang from the orchestra and flourish from the piano, somewhat reminiscent of the cadenza

at the opening of Beethoven's Piano Concerto No. 5 (a work Schumann knew well, as he mentioned it in many of his reviews). The winds present the first theme, but the piano quickly takes over. Later in the movement, there is a duet for piano and clarinet in the second theme area, and the borders between the written-out cadenza and coda are blurred (there is a trill partway through the cadenza, but the orchestra doesn't sneak in until much later), as is characteristic of many post-Beethoven concerti. The second movement is short and songlike, featuring a cello solo. The finale features motivic material from the first movement, like Wieck's concerto, and some surprising harmonic digressions.

The concerto would prove to be influential, most clearly on Edvard Grieg's 1868 Piano Concerto in a minor, whose opening is nearly identical and overall structure is clearly modeled on Schumann's work. Schumann's other two concertos have not been nearly as fortunate. Both are products of his problematic later period, and neither were performed during his lifetime. The Cello Concerto opens with a cello melody, like Mendelssohn's Violin Concerto in e minor, and like that work all three movements are connected, and like the Piano Concerto is cyclically constructed. The Violin Concerto is given even less attention, and indeed Joseph Joachim blocked its publication during the nineteenth century. It finally emerged in the twentieth, but has not assumed a place in the repertoire or the scholarly literature. Both continue his mission to combine virtuosity with musical substance.

Though Schumann would die in the 1850s, Wieck lived on as an influential force in the German musical scene, most of all in concerto terms with her relationship with Johannes Brahms. She served as a sounding board for all his concertos, but the piano concertos in particular, and she plays a central role in the much-debated potential program of the his first piano concerto, op. 15. This is a piece that underwent multiple evolutions, which are historically murky. It started life as a sonata for two pianos, in which only the first movement was sketched. In some letters, Brahms describes it as a prospective symphony, though it is unclear if he conceived of it orchestrally from the start (if he did, why would he write in the awkward

format of two pianos?). This symphony was to have a scherzo as its second movement, whose theme eventually found a home as the opening orchestral music of the second movement of *Ein deutsches Requiem* (the movement “Denn alles Fleisch, es ist wie Gras,” but preceding those words). Eventually, it became a piano concerto, and acquired two additional movements of a more conventional concerto form.

In his article “A Choral Symphony by Brahms?” in *Nineteenth-Century Music*, Christopher Reynolds constructs a somewhat precarious case that Brahms intended to write a symphony with a choral finale similar to Beethoven’s Symphony No. 9. More interestingly, he highlights the remark that Brahms made to Clara in a letter that the second movement (of the concerto, not the symphony form) was a portrait of her. Combining this with a remark by a contemporary of Brahms and Wieck that the fearsome opening of the concerto is a portrayal of Schumann’s plunge into the Rhine, he constructs a narrative program for the piece. He identifies a moment at the start of the second movement as a quotation from *Fidelio* at Florestan and Leonore’s reunion, positioning Schumann as Florestan (indeed this was the name of one of his many journalistic alter-egos) and Clara aptly as Leonore, a woman with a outsized responsibilities due to her husband’s incapacitation. While plausible in dramatic terms (though puzzling for a composer who never was particularly drawn to opera), it is not entirely convincing on a musical level.

George Bozarth criticizes Reynold’s analysis in his article, “The Genesis of Brahms’s Concerto, Op. 15,” describing it as musically selective and not adequately supported by evidence, particularly evidence that this was a technique Brahms used in other compositions. The most concrete evidence of program is Brahms’s inscription of the first few lines of the Benedictus hymn over the beginning of the concerto’s second movement, which Bozarth interprets much more broadly as a gesture to Clara. He does his best to untangle the threads of competing genres, programs, and movements in this composition, but the evidence, he writes, will always remain somewhat confused, and he doubts that Brahms intended a specific program for the piece, at least not at the level of detail Reynolds describes (and it isn’t always clear to

which stage of the piece's development Reynolds intends his program to apply).

Another matter, one completely independent from the programmatic concerns of the piece, is the last movement. Actually, this is somewhat significant—none of the programs, which mostly concern the work in its pre-concerto form—mention this movement at all, which existed only in the work's final, concerto incarnation. It is, according to Tovey and later Charles Rosen, modeled on the final movement of Beethoven's Piano Concerto No. 3. The themes are somewhat similar, but what Rosen concentrates on, in his analyses in "Plagiarism: Influence or Inspiration?" in *Nineteenth-Century Music*, is the movement's general structure. The piano first states the theme, which is then played by the orchestra as the piano plays arpeggios. The theme is later used as the subject for a fugato. This is part of Rosen's larger argument that the least obvious cases of influence are the most interesting—this one, being obvious, is not very interesting—but suggests that the *Fidelio* quotation might be slightly more plausible than it initially seems.

Though Clara Wieck continued to serve as a sounding board for Brahms later in his life (he played his pieces for her and recorded her reactions, and their letters contain many of her impressions—she was not overly fond of the Double Concerto), her role as an important force in his concerto composition seems to have ended. For his Violin and Double Concertos, he would turn to another close friend, the violinist Joseph Joachim, who, John Daverio argues, would receive a similar portrait treatment in the Double Concerto as is proposed for Wieck in the Piano Concerto No. 1

Shorter essay: Gender and virtuosity

Could the nineteenth-century woman be a virtuoso? Was instrumental virtuosity as an act coded as masculine? These are questions that come up only occasionally in the concerto literature, which prefers to consider tuttis and cadenzas. In large part, this is due to the relative novelty of masculinity studies. Virtuosos were for the most part male, and until recently this male-ness was little remarked upon.

However, several studies, almost all of them very recent, have examined this issue from a variety of standpoints.

Surely one factor in the paucity of female virtuosos in the early nineteenth century was the prevalence of the composer-virtuoso figure. Since women were not trained as composers, they were not equipped for the profession, and the Europe-wide tours these performers undertook were not considered appropriate. Clara Wieck, who did train as a composer if only briefly, showed definite talent in her early Piano Concerto and songs, but, in large because of her husband's urging, ceased composing. Though she had a major career as one of the foremost pianists in Europe, it would be difficult to claim her as a "virtuoso," per se, a label reserved at that era more for the flashier showmen of the piano. To adopt Lydia Goehr's terminology, Wieck fell under the category of artist rather than virtuoso.

Instrumental virtuosos of this era were largely confined to two instruments, the piano and the violin, and the foremost exponents of these were Liszt and Paganini, and the foremost scholars of these two composer-performers as virtuosos are Dana Gooley and Maiko Kawabata respectively. Both define their subject's virtuosity as a specifically masculine kind of activity. In "Warhorses," an article later incorporated into his book, *The Virtuoso Liszt*, Gooley argues that Liszt shaped his image in a way that invited his comparison to a military general, particularly as Napoleon. Liszt played up his resemblance to the emperor, and led an orchestra as a general might command an army. Particularly in his performances of his own version of Weber's *Konzertstück*, Gooley argues, Liszt portrayed himself and was seen by critics as alternately a warrior fighting against the forces of the orchestra, outnumbered by their mass but triumphant by the sheer volume of his sound (Liszt added significant doublings to Weber's score), and as a leader of the orchestra, playing along in *tutti* and commanding their forces (something he traces in visuals of Liszt during this era as well).

Kawabata's work on Paganini, notably her *Nineteenth-Century Music* article, "Virtuoso Codes of

Violin Performance,” also argues that he projected an image of heroism and virility, one that revolves around the image of a violin as a feminine object dominated by the male musician (something she considers in the context of several of Paganini’s predecessors and contemporaries as well). Unlike Gooley’s image of Liszt, the orchestra does not seem vital (and indeed, Paganini’s concertos give the orchestra an insignificant role, and many of his works are for violin alone). In addition, Paganini’s music, she argues, explicitly evoked military topoi such as marches. However, Kawabata does not explain that the march was a popular topic for music by all composers, notably including the opening of Beethoven’s Piano Concerto No. 3 and episodes in several other Beethoven concertos, such as the Violin Concerto (where it does not seem to carry with it any military aspect whatsoever). In her dissertation, “The Violin’s Voice,” Kawabata expands this across the violin literature. One of her best examples is Lalo’s “Symphonie espagnole,” written for the virtuoso Pablo de Sarasate. While Kawabata mostly considers this in terms of conferring a Spanish identity on a violinist whose Spanish bona fides were somewhat thin, she also notes that the violin is again a woman dominated by a masculine player.

The role of female pianists is considered by Theresa Ellsworth in her article in *Ad Parnassum*. Her area of study is limited to London in the second half of the nineteenth century, but she intriguingly finds that a majority of concerto performances by the 1870s were by women. The piano, Ellsworth writes, was considered by far the most appropriate instrument for women (as it does not contort the body like a violin or distort their mouth like a wind instrument, and the playing of a keyboard instrument had widely been considered a necessary part of a lady’s education since the eighteenth century), and indeed was eventually considered more feminine than masculine. The repertoire she describes being performed is surprising—mostly Beethoven concertos, pieces that the modern listener would consider to be highly masculinized. But due to a few resident virtuosa of considerable ability (some native British, some transplants), women came to dominate the concert piano stage, and gave the London premieres of most of the important pieces

of the time (including a Miss Baglehole performing Brahms's First Piano Concerto). Ellsworth ties this to establishment of permanent orchestras and subscription series in London—a process outlined in William Weber's *Music and the Middle Class*—which enabled the women to have a consistent career in one city, where they were often married and had families, without the touring that was not considered appropriate.

However, they were known as interpreters of others' work, not as composers. This is perhaps another important reason women were more established as solo artists in the later nineteenth century. With important concertos in the repertory, they did not have to establish themselves as composers as well to have large careers, and the incursion of virtuosity into the serious repertoire (by way of Schumann) allowed them to display greater technical prowess without necessitating composition lessons. Some pieces even became known as vehicles for female virtuosity, as Berlioz writes in his entertaining story "The Piano Possessed," in which an Erard piano involved in a competition goes off the deep end after one too many fleet-fingered Parisian women (and a few men) play Mendelssohn's g minor concerto on it.

I have tried to be careful to refer to the virtuosos in this essay as "instrumental" virtuosos, because when considering female musicians in the 19th century, the most important virtuosos were certainly the singers. This is outside the scope of this essay, but surely vocal phenomenons such as the bel canto-era Maria Malibran, the "Swedish nightingale" Jenny Lind and many, many others were the most visible and famous virtuose of the century. While the instrumental aria far predates the nineteenth century, the soprano's bel canto line was an important influence on many instrumental composers of the nineteenth century. Dana Gooley considers the influence of opera on Paganini's work in terms of comedy in his "Commedia dell'arte" article, but, as suggested by Kawabata's *Symphonie espagnole* essay and brief consideration of Sarasate's own *Carmen Fantasy*, the violin in particular as opera singer and the implications of this in terms of gender identity is a subject still to be fully addressed.

Jazz**Long essay:** Race and identity in the early history of jazz

Jazz started in New Orleans. For most scholars, this is not negotiable. Some of jazz's jazz-like predecessors such as ragtime and dance band music of the 1910s were centered in other cities (St. Louis and New York, respectively, and both among black musicians—Scott Joplin and James Scott in ragtime, and James Reese Europe in dance bands), but what we know as jazz is virtually always placed in New Orleans. However, establishing this solves few problems, because New Orleans has the most unique and arguable most complex mixture of racial politics and identities in the United States, a dynamic that in fact led Thomas Fiehrer to declare the city so culturally separate as to not be part of America but under the sway of the Caribbean and Latin American orbits (an assessment which finds little support among other scholars).

The city consisted of three major ethnic groups: whites, Creoles, and African-Americans. Creoles consisted of a culturally distinct but fractured group between those who identified as Creoles of color and those who identified as white. The population was largely segregated by neighborhood and not the haven of cultural exchange, mixture, or “gumbo” some more utopic historians enjoy to claim. Each group had a unique cultural identity and entertainment institutions. Many historians such as Ted Gioia, Ken Burns, Gunther Schuller (to some extent) and Kathy Ogren identify the mixture between these populations as the “cause” of jazz. The combination, they argue, of the rough swing and beat of the African-American population with the dance music of the Creoles and white populations evolved into what we know as jazz.

Each population has been given individual responsibility for the creation of jazz by at least one historian. Early scholars proclaimed jazz a creation of white people, probably due to the Original Dixieland Jass Band, the first jazz group to record and make a national impression (in 1917, with “Livery Stable Blues”). This was the history told by the aptly named Paul Whiteman in his 1927 Carnegie Hall concert that traced the history of jazz, and it was based on no research, only a myth that had no place for African-

Americans or Creoles.

Thomas Fiehrer, in a 1991 article, “From Quadrille to Stomp” identifies the Creoles as the key figures. Early jazz musicians, he asserts, were generally musically educated professionals who played at Creole dance venues but incorporated elements of African-American music into their style. More broadly, Fiehrer argues for a “Creole” culture of mixture in New Orleans, and again for jazz as a hybrid creation.

The most convincing, and most recent, case appears in Thomas Brothers’s *Louis Armstrong’s New Orleans*, the most extensively researched and detailed history of early jazz. Brothers sketches a picture of the musical activities of each of New Orleans ethnic groups—with the large exception of whites, who he argues had little role. The Creoles, he argues, were loathe to mix with the African-American “Uptown” population, who they saw as uneducated, morally suspect, and uncivilized (Storyville, New Orleans’s red-light district, lay in an African-American neighborhood, and many black musicians played in brothels and other venues there until its closure in 1917). Their musical culture did prize education, they read music, and played in a generally European way. The few early jazz musicians who were Creole, such as Sidney Bechet, were often racists themselves or cultural outcasts for their incursions into Uptown musical culture.

This culture is where he says jazz began, in a musical world where little was written down but music was everywhere, from churches to picnics and parades. The instruments were often primitive, and the music simple. Brothers returns to one of jazz’s oldest founding myths, that of Buddy Bolden, long said to be the first jazz musician. According to Donald Marquis’s biography, the African-American Bolden was a musician of minimal education but great volume, known for his phenomenally loud trumpet tone. He enjoyed only a very short career in the early 1900s, but as a bandleader pioneered a raucous style of dance music that evolved into jazz, known for his “draggy time” and “raggy time,” meaning both that his music was extremely slow in tempo and that it was syncopated in the manner of ragtime. His venue was the Funky Butt Hall, and his most well-known song was the Funky Butt. Such lack of sophistication was not

something Creoles, who Brothers portrays as class-conscious social climbers, would associate with.

Marquis attempts to track down more detail, but documentation is scarce, though he finds Bolden's career was cut short by what he deduces to be schizophrenia, and he died in an asylum (he also attempts to ascertain if the legend that Bolden's trumpet could be heard the whole way across Lake Pontcharain could possibly be true, and concludes that barring the chance of a freak wind event it was an exaggeration, unsurprising for a figure that in later oral histories such as those of Alan Lomax would assume a misty, mythic status, a status of which Marquis is refreshingly skeptical).

Brothers traces the history early bands of Kid Ory and King Oliver, who gave Louis Armstrong his first jobs, arguing that Armstrong, according to Gunther Schuller "jazz's first great soloist," and the bands he played in were products of African-American culture and African-American culture alone. He argues for a gumbo of musical styles, but styles that all existed within the single frame of African-American life, where musicians played in a wide variety of styles in a wide variety of settings. The Great Migration brought enormous numbers of new residents to New Orleans in the early twentieth century, and they brought blues, spirituals, and many other kinds of music to the city.

The matter of slave music and African music should also be discussed. While it is clear that blues, spirituals and work songs descended from the music of slaves, no studies in my mind have convincingly linked jazz directly to African music. Considering the differences of time (the slave trade ended in the 1830s, jazz began after 1900), this should surprise few, particularly because little is known of African music in 1830s. The most extensive comparison appears in Gunther Schuller's *Early Jazz* and as an analysis is extremely problematic. His sole source is the field work of A.M. Jones in Ghana, and thus depends on the study of a small area of Africa in the twentieth century for the musical fact of all of Africa a century earlier, betraying a conception of Africa as a monolithic and timeless musical entity. While the comparison is in itself sometimes interesting, I don't think that it proves anything.

As jazz moved north to Chicago in the early 1920s, it gained in national popularity, as described in William Kenney's *Chicago Jazz*. King Oliver's band led the way from New Orleans to Chicago, and was soon followed by Sidney Bechet and others, and joined by Fletcher Henderson and other bandleaders from elsewhere in the country. In Chicago, jazz bands could find steadier work, better pay, and, importantly for historians, a recording industry that increasingly preserved their performances. They also found a different cultural atmosphere, in which white audiences increasingly heard their performances. However, black bands' performances were usually marketed by the record industry as "race records," and sold particularly to African-American audiences. As arrangements became more complex in this period, more musicians learned to read music.

Jazz was increasingly demonized in the white press as a threat to moral fiber and a dangerous music (as several primary source documents in *Keeping Time* attest, including an article in *Etude* in which several major American composers condemn jazz as degenerate and only one or two seem to consider it promising). But it was also increasingly popular among white youth. Unsurprisingly, white musicians wanted some of the action, and many white dance bands began to incorporate more jazz in their repertoire of foxtrots and waltzes, albeit in a smoother, watered-down form that lacked the harder swing, dirty song, and "hotness" of the black bands (this had been prefigured by James Reese Europe's incorporation of ragtime into the repertoire of music he played for the ballroom dancers Vernon and Irene Castle in the early 1910s). Foremost among these were Paul Whiteman and Jean Goldkette, who reached a national audience that the black bands often could not reach with what was eventually known as "sweet jazz." Their bands often included strings (and were in fact referred to as orchestras), played at more sedate tempos, and featured no improvisation. Their musicians all read music, were white, and often featured singers singing sentimental songs. They are usually condemned today by jazz historians such as Gunther Schuller as a syrupy, false, watered-down imitation of jazz not worthy of listening to or studying, but have

been taken seriously by some historians intrigued by their massive popularity. Foremost among these is Joshua Berrett, whose book *Louis Armstrong and Paul Whiteman* provocatively juxtaposes the two musicians, particularly considering the changes in Armstrong's style around 1930 when he simplified and cooled down his music in an attempt to reach a larger (and whiter) audience, developments that drive Schuller to despair (he prefers his artistic icons not to be motivated by money, as Armstrong, who grew up in poverty, apparently was). Whiteman in the mid-1920s, began calling himself the "King of Jazz," prompting much scorn among today's historians (also including Ted Gioia) who favor Armstrong. But for white audiences who could see Whiteman on TV every week, it was probably true.

In other parts of the country, jazz was not so segregated. In his book, *Early Ellington*, Mark Tucker chronicles the career of Duke Ellington before and just after his arrival in New York. Ellington, born into the lower middle class in Washington, D.C., was musically educated and served his apprenticeship as a pianist in a variety of bands before starting his own. Tucker describes them as a party band, playing for all kinds of functions in the capital area, often for white audiences, and competing directly with white bands for the same gigs. However, in the page of band from a newspaper, the bands are all clearly identified as "colored" or "white." They are also labeled as "reading" or not, which implies a stylistic distinction between the more polished sound and elaborate arrangements of a reading band or a rougher non-reading one (Ellington's was a reading band).

When Ellington's success led him and his band to move to New York in 1927, they found gigs on bills that included both black bands and white bands. New York clubs and hotel ballrooms outside of Harlem (located mostly in the Times Square area) catered to a primarily New York audience, though it seems middle class African-Americans were not unwelcome if rare. An account of this scene can be read in *Come in and Hear the Truth*, Patrick Burke's chronicle of jazz clubs on 52nd street through several decades. Harlem clubs came in a variety of characters (Duke Ellington's longtime home, the Cotton Club, was

typically named and considered one of the fanciest) but catered to primarily African-American audiences. As jazz began to gain in popularity, though, more and more white people began to venture into Harlem to hear it.

Though the so-called Swing Era no longer is early jazz, I would like to conclude by discussing it briefly. It is often seen as a short period of racial utopia and harmony, but the split between the “sweet bands” (including Glenn Miller as well) and swing bands persisted, some white bands just began to play in a way that was more jazz than sweet. Some real advancements were made, foremost Benny Goodman’s racial integration of first his combo (including vibraphonist Lionel Hampton) and later his band (including guitarist Charlie Christian, and others). During this brief period in which the jazz identified by connoisseurs as “real jazz” found a national popular audience, the music’s racial tensions did cool somewhat. Lewis Erenberg, in *Swing Changes*, traces the connection between a few jazz musicians and bands and left-wing Popular Front politics, such as Count Basie and Benny Goodman. The central figure in these efforts was the impresario John Hammond, a promoter who believed in the utopic promise of jazz to unite African-American and white populations, and, in some places, and in some ways, it was briefly proved true, and, as Ingrid Monson argues in *Freedom Sounds*, lay some foundations for the civil rights movements to come.

Short essay: *Composition versus improvisation in the history of jazz*

Most of the earliest jazz musicians in New Orleans did not read music. Tunes were worked out by each group, usually consisting of a beat set down by a rhythm section of piano, drums, tuba (later bass), and banjo. The “front line” instruments consisted of trombone, trumpet or cornet (sometimes more than one), and clarinet. The trumpet played the melody, the trombone a lower supporting line and the clarinet an upper counterpoint, a texture dubbed “New Orleans polyphony” and referred to by Thomas Brothers as heterophony. Though the broad details were worked out, the details could be different in every

performance, and the solos in which a single front line player was accompanied by the rhythm section could be planned or improvised. The “composition” at this point consisted of the melody line and chords, and each band had their own version. Each soloist had his or her own solo style, though the amount of variation of his or her solo between performances is unclear.

As this suggests, the line between composition and improvisation is often difficult to define, and the process of improvisation was constantly changing. Some styles featured ample space improvised solos, in some styles it was not appropriate. Some players were known for their abilities in spontaneous invention, some played stock solos exactly the same every time. The value assigned to improvisation also changed with the times. The paradigm that survives today was mostly developed in the bebop era, and my survey will end there.

In the earliest recorded examples of jazz, it is impossible to know what is improvised or not. Solos sound spontaneous, but did a certain player “compose” that solo, or improvise it one night, decide it was just right, and keep it? Due to the paucity of recordings and of reliable accounts of this era, it can be hard to know, however the sound of spontaneity was important, staged or not. Larger reading bands of the early 1920s such as Fletcher Henderson’s relied on more elaborate arrangements of tunes, which often prescribed a strict structure without much space for improvised solo turns. Jeffrey Magee, in his book *The Uncrowned King of Swing*, examines stock arrangements of pop tunes in comparison to Don Redman’s arrangements for the Henderson band to play at its regular gig at a New York club, and finds them to be meticulously arranged. The composition would be sent by the publisher in a standard instrumentation which Redman would pick apart and rearrange in a more interesting way, adding introductions, bridge sections, and varied orchestration, and often notating solos for each band member. Sometimes he would leave choruses open, planned for improvisation for a particular band member with the accompaniment of the rhythm section, but notated solos were just as common and the difference between them may not

have been apparent to audience members. The band's polished and well-rehearsed sound was carefully planned, and composed. Redman's great innovation was his switches of instrumentation "inside the strain," setting up the band in two choruses (brass vs. reeds) and splitting the melody between them within the space of a chorus, while a conventional arrangement would only alternate instrumentations between choruses.

Louis Armstrong came out of the New Orleans tradition of King Oliver, outlined above. In "Telling a Story," Brian Harker examines Armstrong's improvisatory style, which he divides into several categories. The first consists of largely playing the melody of the song but with some embellishments, the second involves increasing departures (particularly involving Armstrong's characteristic arpeggios), and the last involves an entirely new melody built from the same underlying chord structure. The structure of solos is similarly examined by Frank Tirro in his *JAMS* article, "Constructive Elements in Jazz Improvisation," in which he argues that each player and style has a certain repertoire of acceptable gestures, and the confident improviser builds a solo out of these gestures in a new combination.

Gunther Schuller identifies Louis Armstrong as jazz's first great soloist in large part due to his "superior choice of notes," a vague designation that says little other than he was good. Harker seeks to determine what makes a solo coherent and Armstrong's note choices superior, examining Armstrong's long-range planning to show that his best solos build from small gestures to longer, more dense ones. Schuller is dismayed when, listening to multiple recordings of Armstrong playing the same piece, he hears the same solo, which he had assumed was improvised but was apparently not. As my Fletcher Henderson example demonstrated, the line between composition and improvisation was not always intended to be clear to an audience. Schuller, who thinks that the essence of jazz is the spontaneous improvisation of free jazz, seems quite upset at this moment, and goes so far as to question whether his first great soloist deserves to be called a jazz musician at all.

Duke Ellington's band further explored the potential of elaborate arrangements along the lines of Fletcher Henderson, and indeed Henderson himself wrote many arrangements for the band. Ellington's trademark was to compose for the specific talents of his band members, and sought to capture their characteristic sounds and preferred quirks in his compositions (something carried on by the arranger Billy Strayhorn, who followed Henderson). While many solos remained planned, the band members often composed their own, or collaborated with Ellington or Strayhorn in the arrangement. This contrasts with Count Basie's band, who sought a uniform sound and swing from his musicians, whose individual personalities were not as prominent. However, Basie's arrangements did still contain improvisation.

Improvisation came to the fore during the bebop era, beginning around 1942 and by 1945 the most prominent sound in jazz. During this era the combo replaced the big band (the style originated in small clubs, and during wartime combos were appealing for budgetary reasons as well) as the standard ensemble, usually consisting of a rhythm section of drums, bass, and piano (and sometimes a guitar) and several melody instruments, usually including a trumpet and one or two saxophones. The elaborate arrangements of big band were gone and a bare structure replaced it: a "head," a short melody played in unison (sometimes with an intro, or even a simple arrangement), usually based on the changes of a popular song, sometimes with chromatic alterations ("I Got Rhythm" underlies an astonishing percentage of bebop music). The band plays the head together, and then a series of solos follow, ranging from a few choruses to many. Then the band plays the head together to end, sometimes with a short tag at the end. The form is simple, infinitely flexible, and requires little joint rehearsal. Provided the musicians all know the changes, they can play. The head often exists as little more than a frame for improvisation.

The solos of this era were complex and often astonishingly virtuosic, particularly those of Charlie Parker and Dizzy Gillespie. Composition consists of little more than the choice of a set of changes, sometimes swapping a few out for more interesting options, and the composition of a single line. So

individual improvisational style becomes much more recognizable at this point, and really the only characteristic of importance (the ability to play with a band, or compose more complex charts, is no longer important). This doesn't mean that there was no interaction, particularly between soloists and members of the rhythm section, but that interaction was a spontaneous part of the improvisation. The development of this personal musical style is examined in depth by Paul Berliner in *Thinking in Jazz*, and the communication between musicians by Ingrid Monson in *Saying Something*. Both studies were conducted among more contemporary musicians, but the bebop style lives on today as the standard language for much of jazz.

While spontaneous invention is the key to improvisation, that does mean that each solo is entirely new. The development of a solo comes not only from bar to bar but from performance to performance of the same changes, something that can be heard in outtakes of recordings, where musicians play a similar-sounding but slightly different solo in successive takes. The broader musical signatures and favorite harmonic devices of important bebop musicians are examined by Thomas Owens in *Bebop: The Music and its Players*, in which he surveys the prominent players of each instrument and seeks to define their musical style and some motives that they use characteristically. Owens does not focus on process but on the heard results, which tells us little about how musicians may have constructed solos and more about what they came up with.

For Gunther Schuller, a free jazz musician himself, free jazz is the most important kind of jazz. Under his criticism of all styles runs this undercurrent of distrust for anything he knows was composed as less valid jazz: real jazz is improvised. This is common in jazz historiography, which often treats jazz as a style that is internalized or that players are born with and then are able to realize without thought but through some instinctual ability, an attitude that can have troubling racial aspects. It is also ironic considering how musically educated and extremely literate most jazz musicians are, a process documented by Berliner. Since improvisation is by definition not written down (except after the fact) and many jazz

musicians learned by apprenticeship rather than from textbooks, the fact that they were trained and did learn how to improvise, just as others learn and perfect their composition, can be easily lost by historians intent to make the playing of jazz a mystical, organic ability available only to the gifted.

General Exams: Day 1

Troubadours and Trouvères

Long Essay: *“Discuss what evidence we have, and what we can infer from it, about the typical career and lifestyle of the twelfth-century troubadour—class, education, gender, professional status, literacy, residence (if any), relation to church, etc.”*

The personal and professional lives of the troubadours have often been as romanticized as the world portrayed in their poems. In some ways this is completely understandable, because the confessional, private discourse of many of the poems openly invite autobiographical interpretations. Since the poems themselves are the greatest records we have of these artists, their contents have been mined by scholars with varying degrees of skepticism. To consider the lives of the troubadours, therefore, necessarily means considering the material contained in the songs, but scholars have drawn from additional sources such as the fictional sort found in romances and actual historical records. Like virtually all troubadour scholarship, the results are often speculative, but some conclusions can be drawn. The troubadours came from a wide variety of classes but were often more tied to court culture and feudal patronage for their livelihood than their somewhat later, northern trouvère cousins, they were mostly but not all men, and they were educated but not necessarily literate.

The greatest sources of information on the lives of the troubadours, which embody many of the problems described above, are the *vidas* and *razos*. The *vidas* are biographical sketches, mostly short and almost all formulaic. The *razos* are short stories that tell of the circumstances that led to the composition of a particular song. Both *vidas* and *razos* are found in several manuscripts, preceding the works of the troubadour or the song they describe. Many are believed to be the work of a single late troubadour and jonglar, Uc de St.-Circ (according to Elizabeth Poe). Since almost all of the troubadour manuscripts, with

the exception of the Chansonier St-Germain-des-Près (troubadour manuscript X, trouvère manuscript U, c. 1240-50) originated long after the heyday of the troubadours whose works they contain, these stories were presumably accounts of figures who were already historical (and even X/U originates from northern France, somewhat distant from the area in which troubadours were active, as described in Christina Linklater's dissertation).

The *vidas* assume a formulaic shape, though they vary in length and amount of detail. They usually contain some information about each troubadour's origin or family, a note that he (very unusually, she) was very beautiful and wrote many beautiful cansos and sang them very well, and often a description of the lady or ladies that the troubadour loved, usually unrequited. As well as their problematic transmission—we have no idea what Uc de St-Circ and his fellow *vida*-writers' sources were--this predictable shape has led several scholars to question the *vida*'s veracity as history. They are, in fact, a literary form all of their own, similar to the songs themselves.

Elizabeth Poe, in her essay on the *vidas* in *The Handbook of the Troubadours*, outlines these formulae and makes the extremely valuable point that many of the *vidas* seem to be constructed almost entirely from information contained in each troubadour's extant poems. Could the *vida*-writers have just compiled the biographies from the material they had at hand and invented a few extra details for color? Poe examines the *vida* of Gaucelm Faidit in particular detail. It states that the troubadour wrote many beautiful poems but "was the worst singer in the world," was enormously fat, and married a woman who grew to be as fat as he was. This *vida* has been examined by several scholars such as Christopher Page in terms of the performing activities of troubadours. But Poe argues that it should not be so easily taken at face value, because it presents an exact inversion of the handsome troubadour singing a lovely serenade to a beautiful and inaccessible lady. Perhaps, she suggests, none of it is true, and tells us nothing about Gaucelm Faidit's life, it is just a satire of the narrative that conflates a troubadour's art with his life.

Another, perhaps more credible account, is contained in the late troubadour Raimon Vidal's song *Abril issia*. In the song, a jonglar tells the narrator about a typical year in his life, mentioning specific geographical places (outlined in a map in Christopher Page's *The Owl and the Nightingale*). He travels from court to court, hoping for patronage at each but only sometimes succeeding. Page suggests this account could accurately describe the lives of the troubadours who were also jonglars, such as Marcabru.

But a number of the troubadours were not wandering minstrels at all. Historical records show several troubadours to have had noble rank, though none as exalted as the trouvère Thibaut, King of Navarre. Guilhem de Peiteu, the earliest known troubadour, was a duke. For these troubadours, the composition of songs was probably a hobby (as for the main character in the *Roman de la rose*, who composes a few troubadour songs of his own as well as hearing many others performed in his court), for those of slightly lesser rank it may have been a way of paying tribute to a greater lord. Whether these troubadours performed their own material is unclear, though it seems likely from its wide dissemination that they did transmit the songs beyond the spaces of their own memory. Traveling jonglars, whether they were troubadours or not, usually included a number of troubadour songs in their repertory, and may have performed ones by nobles.

Other troubadours were not nobles. It is unclear how they came to the profession, since the highly refined and complex nature of the verse means they must have at least been relatively educated. Occitanian society was much more feudal than that of northern France, and it seems likely that most of the troubadours grew up in the sphere of a lord who perhaps offered them patronage from an early age. Bernart de Ventadorn was, unsurprisingly, from Ventadorn, but was, according to Elizabeth Aubrey's *The Music of the Troubadours*, probably the son of servants.

In the 1960s, Erich Köhler offered a Marxist interpretation of troubadour songs: the composition of songs was a way for minor, possibly unlanded knights (such as Raimon de Miraval, whose *vida* notes that

he had to share his castle with three other knights) to advance themselves. The lady of the troubadour poems in Köhler's interpretation is not in fact a lady but the distant, probably impossible, specter of social advancement through the acquisition of property. This account has come under criticism by later scholars (citing the wide variety of backgrounds of the troubadours), but still offers an intriguing perspective.

The troubadour as feudal servant is explored more in Alberto Gallo's *Music in the Castle*, an account of musical life in the Provençaux areas (though it must be noted that this is probably from the later eras of the troubadour, possibly into the thirteenth rather than twelfth century). The troubadours in Gallo's account, based on historical records of the castles, are very much under the patronage of the lords, but advancement is not impossible. The life of a troubadour included access to the highest levels of nobility, and apparently one troubadour impressed with his character enough to earn a title and eventually go crusading with his lord. In fact, the *vidas* of several troubadours mention crusading, and a few songs describe this as well, which suggests that the work that the troubadours performed included those of a traditional vassal as well as composition.

The status, and even existence, of the *troubaritzes* (the feminine form of the Occitan troubadour), has been disputed. A *vida* for one survives, the so-called Countess of Dia, along with a few *cansos*, one with music. Elizabeth Aubrey, in *The Music of the Troubadours*, notes that her status as a countess has been questioned, particularly in light of her suggested name, Beatriz. The most likely Beatriz is the daughter of a Count of Dia who may have inherited the title and kept it even after her marriage. These problems are typical of the *troubaritzes* in general, as recounted by William Paden in his introduction to the collection *The Voice of the Troubaritz* and Carol Nappholz in *Unsung Women*, a collection of *troubaritz* poetry. The Countess of Dia's "I must sing" is the only song attributed to a *troubaritz* that has survived with music.

Nappholz closely examines the dilemma of anonymous verse. Like the distinction made by the

editors of *The Songs of the Women Trouvères* between *féminité textuelle* (a female speaker) and *féminité génétique* (a female author), anonymous songs with a female speaker may be written by a male troubadour and vice versa. However, again echoing the *Songs of the Women Trouvères* authors, Nappholz attributes the overwhelming attribution by scholars of poems with a female speaker to male authors to scholarly misogyny. This has perhaps not been as widespread in the troubadour scholarship as the *trouvère*—since more firm evidence of *troubaritzes* such as the Countess of Dia exist, they are harder to deny—but is still widespread. Nappholz highlights an interesting, anonymous example. It is a *sirventes* that could perhaps even be called an *eneug*, a song of annoyances. In it, a woman complains of the conduct of men towards women, describing with a sharp eye both the narcissism seen in troubadour poetry and the exclusion of a society without a clear place for a female troubadour.

This brings me to the performance space of the troubadour lyric, described by Christopher Page in *Voices and Instruments in the Middle Ages*. Though his conclusions are lightly supported by evidence, most of it from the songs themselves, he describes the atmosphere as generally intimate (as in the *Roman de la rose*), and probably mostly masculine. Between this and the feudal place of troubadour songs, it is easy to see why *troubaritzes* were only in small numbers. Or were they? Paden, in his *Voice of the Troubaritz* introduction, notes that there is good reason to believe that the lyrics of *troubaritzes* may have been preserved at a significantly lower rate than their male counterparts (Nappholz similarly speculates as to why so many might be anonymous). So the historical evidence may give an even more incomplete picture of the world of the *troubaritz* as it does of the troubadour.

An additional factor may have been education. Troubadour lyric is an intricate art, prizing nuance and sometimes obscurity of meaning. While the education of troubadours is mostly unknown, it was clearly at a high level simply from the complexity of the poems themselves. Whether they were necessarily also literate, however, is unclear. The transmission of the poems until their codification in the surviving

manuscripts (most of which, as described above, postdate the composition of the songs by a significant number of years), is unclear. Robert Labaree, in his dissertation, *"Finding" Troubadour Song*, argues, based on melodic variants, on a largely oral transmission. Earlier scholars, such as Karl Lachmann, were eager to construct stemmata and track variants between surviving manuscripts with an eye to determining the "most authentic version." Labaree asserts that this phantom version probably doesn't even exist, and that the song was variable from the beginning. While he somewhat exasperatingly hesitates to extend this assertion into historical speculation, it seems to suggest that the poems were not often written down, or at least transmitted primarily by oral communication.

The manuscripts' status as a shorthand of sorts further reinforces this impression. The greatest issue in the troubadour scholarship, the rhythm of the songs, is born out of the manuscripts' lack of detail in notation. While in historical terms this lack of detail should not be surprising, it further suggests that the transmission of troubadour song was through the ear rather than the page, and that detailed description of matters such as rhythm were unnecessary.

One place where troubadours may have been educated was the church. Several troubadours are known to have had church connections, most obviously the Monk of Mountadon, author of several saucy eneugs. In fact, the Monk's most famous song complains at length of the faults of other troubadours (it has been used for dating), indicating a worldly knowledge somewhat at odds with monastic life. Similarly, Bernart de Ventadorn is thought to have entered an abbey at some point during his life, though this has been disputed by William Paden. More closely, there are some troubadour texts with religious subjects, though not nearly the size of the Marian tradition in trouvère poetry.

The feudal world of 12th century Occitania was the world of the troubadours, and this structure was the greatest influence on their lives. While they occupied a variety of places in the hierarchy, and their poetry potentially elevated them, they were still governed by the hierarchies that pervade their poetry.

The trouvères, in northern France, lived under more bourgeois circumstances. But the troubadours' various roles were often hidden in the poems themselves, which conformed to a whole different set of rules and formulas, and to some extent the troubadours of humble and noble backgrounds sought to speak in the same voice, of the same matters.

Short essay: *The major unresolved problems: what are they, and what is the state of research?*

The current state of research of the troubadours and trouvères is highly fractured. Though the extremely heated debates within the musicological arena seem to have cooled in the last few decades, factions and scars remain, and musicologists and literary scholars seem to operate in largely separate worlds with little communication between them. Due to the paucity of evidence of the troubadours and trouvères, problems will probably always remain, but a few examples of increasing cooperation and broad-minded approaches show major progress. Unfortunately, good editions of the troubadour and trouvère songs with music are still scarce.

The “rhythm debate” dominated the musicological side of the field for decades. The conversation began in late-19th century Germany and culminated in the development of the modal rhythm theory by the German Jean Beck and the French musicologist Pierre Aubrey, working independently at more or less the same time. Disputes over its discovery led to what is probably the only civil suit dealing with musicology in history, and possibly to an abortive duel that caused Aubrey’s death (as chronicled in John Haines’s “The footnote quarrels of modal theory”). Beck’s students, Gennrich and eventually Tischler, carried on the modal theory, eventually leading to Tischler’s publication of a complete edition of the troubadour songs realized in modal rhythm. Unfortunately for those who do not follow this theory, it remains the most complete edition of troubadour song.

However, the theory has come under great criticism from many sides and it seems safe to say that

it is today largely discredited, in part by literary scholars such as Bec and Zumthor's work showing Beck and Aubry's limited understanding of French and Occitan poetry, and by more careful examination of a broader array of sources. Beck's work was largely based on Chansonnier O, the "Cangé" manuscript, which dates from after the age of the troubadours, and the Chansonnier du Roi, which contains a few songs in modal rhythm that John Haines shows were written in at a later date than the rest of the manuscript. Modal theory, Elizabeth Aubrey argues, was probably unknown in most of the south during the age of the troubadours. Its application to the trouvère repertoire would possibly be more plausible (as Christopher Page has argued for in his high style/low style distinction), but the early modal theory scholars chose to concentrate on the traditionally more prestigious troubadour repertoire.

But none of the theories that have replaced the modal rhythm debate has found wide acceptance. John Stevens's isosyllabic theory and Hendrik van der Werf's constantly evolving "declamatory rhythm" theory are similar theories based on entirely different reasoning, though van der Werf tentatively extends an olive branch to Stevens in one publication, because their results are so similar. Robert Lug's theory, somewhat modal and based on the rhythms of Latin poetry, is complex and flexible but also has not been widely adopted. Typical is Elizabeth Aubrey's summary in *The Music of the Troubadours*, which acknowledges the wide variety of theories, suggests that some song may have been measured while others was not, but hesitates to take a firm stand in the debate. Even the participants such as van der Werf and Stevens seem somewhat tired of the discussion. Christopher Page's theory of high and low style was recently criticized by (Elizabeth) Aubrey in a paper on Grocheo at the AMS Nashville, but she again hesitated to put forth a theory in its place, perhaps in fear that Page would challenge her to a duel.

After all the discussion of rhythm, the melodic analysis of the music has received relatively little attention. Van der Werf's 1972 book remains the most lengthy treatment, advancing a theory based on chains of thirds. Some individual studies, such as Margaret Switten's *The Cansos of Raimon de Miraval*,

also contain analyses, as does Mary O'Neill's *Courtly Love in Medieval France* (dealing with the trouvère repertoire only), but this remains largely unexplored territory.

In musicology, the recent trend has been towards study of orality and of individual manuscripts rather than individual troubadours. Foremost in the studies of orality is Ardis Butterfield's *Poetry and Music in Medieval France*, which examines intertextuality, performance, and particularly refrains in the trouvère repertoire, but with disappointingly little attention to the music. Butterfield also considers the role of songs in epics such as the *Roman de la rose* and *Roman de la poire*, as does Sylvia Huot in her *From Song to Book*. Huot also examines the manuscripts in details, as do the dissertations of Elizabeth Aubrey, John Haines, and Christina Linklater, which each take on one major manuscript. The strengths of all three differ: Aubrey considers troubadour manuscript R's origins and notation in an exhaustive and very valuable study, John Haines traces the compilation of the so-called Chansonnier du Roi into its present form and the dating of its various components and subsequent provenance, and Linklater disappointingly does little beyond provide an inventory of the fascinating and unusual Chansonnier St-Germain-des-Près. However, none of these dissertations were published as books, though Haines's became a succinct and very useful article.

The study of troubadour and trouvère song has recently even become a topic to study in itself. Haines has subsequently considered the historiography of troubadour and trouvère scholarship (as described above in relation to the modal rhythm theory and in his book, *Eight Centuries of the Troubadours and Trouvères*), as has Daniel Leech-Wilkinson in his *The Invention of Medieval Music*. This acknowledges the disciplinary boundaries that marked early medieval scholarship, and the often nationalistic impulses of Riemann, Beck, and Gennrich.

The area of literary scholarship is somewhat different. Since so many songs were preserved without music, while for musicologists the troubadour and trouvère corpus is a fragmentary selection of

songs, for literary theorists it is a giant body of work. Perhaps this is what has led to the music being neglected in comparison. Many scholars pay minimal attention to the performance and music, and treat them solely as poetic texts. This study, as contained in many collections such as *A Handbook of the Troubadours* and *An Introduction to the Troubadours* has produced a number of fascinating insights into the nature of troubadour and trouvère poetry, but to a musicologist is sometimes limited in its lack of accounting for performance.

However, these works often consider matters such as gender, so-called “courtly love,” and poetic form with more nuance than any of the musicologists, such as Moshe Lazar’s perceptive essay on “Fin’amor” in *A Handbook of the Troubadours*. If one believes Hendrik van der Wef’s somewhat rash statement that the poetry of this repertory is significantly more important than its music, this is sufficient.

Collaboration between musicologists and literary scholars is rare but not entirely non-existent. Both collections mentioned above contain one essay on “the music,” by Hendrik van der Werf and Margaret Switten respectively. Better examples of integration are William Paden’s collections *Medieval Lyric* (examining traditions beyond just the troubadours and trouvères as well) and *The Voice of the Trobaritz*. However, just because these anthologies contain a more harmonious mixture of literary medievalists and musicology medievalists doesn’t necessarily mean that they two groups are communicating. The best proof is in the small body of work that considers both musicological and poetic matters on an equal footing by authors with expertise in both spheres, such as Butterfield’s work on refrains in the *Journal of the Royal Musicological Academy* (which contains more musical detail than her book, suggesting that the marketing of scholarship to different audiences is itself a limitation and that her book was perhaps intended for a non-musicological audience), Aubrey’s magisterial *Music of the Troubadours*, and Margaret Switten’s study of Raimon de Miraval.

Hopefully, these are signs of the future. The detailed study of manuscripts, as well as historical

records, epics, and various other sources beyond just staves with music on them have opened up great new vistas in the study of medieval vernacular song in past decades. Consideration of all available material by people with expertise in music, literary theory, and feudalism (or cooperation between specialists), can only lead to further discoveries. Comparing Beck's introduction to the troubadours book (from around 1900) to Aubrey's (1992) show the great advances of the field, though also the great mysteries that still remain.

String Quartets of Mozart, Haydn, and Beethoven

Long essay: Beethoven's Op. 18 quartets: influence and innovation

By 1800, the string quartet had risen from its humble *divertimento* beginnings to become the most prestigious and intellectual form of chamber music, the place where a composer could display the full range of his or her art. This prestige was largely due to the large body of quartets by Beethoven's short-term teacher, Haydn, who at this time was still composing them (Opus 76 was published in 1797, the three-quartet Opus 77 soon after, and its presumed three-quartet mate Opus 103 would be half-completed at his death). And Mozart had also been an acclaimed composer of string quartets, most of all his 1785 set of six quartets dedicated to Haydn. Beethoven, who was to "receive Mozart's spirit out of Haydn's hands," was understandably intimidated. He hesitated to take on the form until he had spent almost ten years in Vienna, finally publishing the set of six quartets, opus 18, in 1801, having written that they had caused him much trouble (Mozart, interestingly, made a similar statement about his "Haydn" quartets).

So while for Beethoven Opus 18 was clearly an entry in the tradition of Mozart and Haydn, they have not always been interpreted as such by Beethoven scholars. For while they drew on a long tradition of quartets, they also were the start of Beethoven's own journey with the string quartet, one that would eventually lead to some of his most radical late works. Indeed, Beethoven's quartets fall more neatly into

the three-style paradigm than any other major genre, with the Opus 18 as the early style, Opus 59 as middle, and Opus 127, 132, 130, 131, and 135 as late. Only Opus 95 and 74 cause some trouble, variously labeled middle and late. For musicologists, then (Joseph Kerman above all), the Opus 18 quartets have a vital role to play in this historical narrative as well.

While it was not the first to be composed (that honor falls to the oft-neglected Opus 18 No. 3, whose play of topic given a paradigmatic analysis by Kofi Agawu in “Communication in 18th-Century Music”), Opus 18 No. 1 is a good place to start as any. Beethoven’s labors over the first movement are well-documented, and in fact the subject of a book, Janet Levy’s *Beethoven’s Compositional Choices*. The movement is saturated by its opening turn motive, a decisive gesture that seems final in a way initially unlikely to generate a whole movement. But Levy shows how Beethoven’s original version contained even more instances of the turn motive than the revised final version did. His revised version is structurally clearer, tighter, and somewhat less monomaniacal about the turn. It also contains a number of dynamic changes that make the second version more dramatically effective and exciting, if somewhat shorter on dramatic sforzandi and shocks than the original.

This turn figure is highlighted by Kerman as an allusion to Haydn’s Opus 50 No. 1. The similarity is obvious. Both begin on F on a dotted quarter note, turn on sixteenth notes to G and F and then down to an E on an eighth note. Kerman fails to note, though that Haydn’s movement is in B flat and Beethoven’s in F, so the roles of these turns are played out in entirely different ways. Haydn’s turn, as analyzed in W. Dean Sutcliffe’s *Haydn Opus 50 Quartets* entry in the Cambridge Music Handbooks series, is a gesture that doesn’t resolve, one that sequences but continually fails to descend to scale degree 1 (it is harmonized in the other voices of the quartet) until the end of the movement. Beethoven’s gesture is given a bold and simple unison orchestration, and due to the different key its harmonic role is more decisive. Despite the similar shapes, its function is entirely different—it is not an avoidance of closure but an excess of closure, a

gesture that seems like it could be a dead end. In this it is more similar to the cadencing beginning of Haydn's Opus 33 No. 5.

This relationship is of the sort analyzed in Mark Evan Bonds's "The Sincerest Form of Flattery" in *Studi Musicali*. While the subject of Bonds's article is Mozart's "Haydn" quartets, he hypothesizes that Mozart's relationship to Haydn is not one of a student to a teacher but a composer to an equal composer, showing how similar materials (such as the cantus-firmus fugue subject shared by K. 421 and Opus 20 No. 2) can result in entirely different results. While I do not wish to say that Beethoven was asserting equality with Haydn in this moment, the tribute seems to be one more of rivalry and respect than slavish imitation (as Bonds attributes to Pleyel in his article "Replacing Haydn: Mozart's "Pleyel" Quartets).

Bonds also evokes Harold Bloom's theory of the "anxiety of influence." He was not the first to do this, in fact he was following Jeremy Yudkin's earlier article, "Beethoven's Mozart Quartet," on the influence of Mozart on Beethoven's Opus 18 quartets. Unlike Evan Bonds, Yudkin focuses on a far more clear-cut case of modeling, that of Opus 18 No. 5 and K. 464, both in A major. This relationship is noted by Joseph Kerman as "dangerously" close, an attitude which I will take up later in this essay. Kerman highlights similarities between the last two movements, a variation slow movement and the finale, but Yudkin considers all four movements.

Mozart's variations movement is given a perceptive analysis by Elaine Sisman in her book *Haydn and the Classical Variation*. She shows that Mozart originally planned to arrange the variations so that the most active part would proceed down through the parts from the Violin 1 in the first variation to the cello in the last, followed by a contrapuntal variation involving all four instruments. However, Mozart rearranged this to connect the slow movement with the finale and put the cello variation last. Beethoven's variations, with a similar theme in the same key, also puts the contrapuntal variation (somewhat of an oddity in itself) early, in fact much earlier on than is conventional (Sisman would consider this an example

of her more recently developed concept of “tertiary rhetoric” such as in *The Century of Bach and Mozart* and *Haydn and Rhetoric*). Similarly, Beethoven has a cello solo lead into the finale. The finales are compared in detail by Yudkin. They are in different meters, but linked by unusual chromatic complexity, similar structure of texture, and constant hemiolas (considered by Harold Krebs in *Beethoven’s String Quartets*, ed. Kinderman, as “metric dissonance”). On a larger scale, Op 18 No 5 is one of only two of the Op 18 quartets to contain a minuet rather than a scherzo, and to place that minuet second (just like in Mozart’s quartet) rather than third.

Joseph Kerman has major reservations about this movement, which relate to his ideology of Beethoven present throughout his *Beethoven’s String Quartets* book. While Yudkin views Beethoven through the lens of the so-called classical era, a place where Sisman’s tertiary rhetoric is not only ubiquitous but a positive virtue in composition, Kerman wants Beethoven to be a Romantic, and Romantics don’t model their string quartets on those of their predecessors. Kerman classifies the first three quartets as the more classical and the second three as the more adventurous, but Opus 18 No 5 is a major exception to this, and he contemplates at length why Beethoven would have felt the insecurity to “revert” to modeling on Mozart. While Yudkin, Bonds, and Sisman, consider this kind of modeling to be standard practice and not a sign of weakness but (according to Bonds) even a sign of confidence that the composer can measure up to his or her source, Kerman considers it a dangerous failing, and one Beethoven would not make again in his later years (Yudkin in fact extends his comparative analysis into Beethoven’s Op. 132 and Sisman into his Opus 74, but no mind).

Elsewhere in Kerman’s discussion of the Opus 18 quartets, the search is on for signs of the “maturing” Beethoven beneath the conventions of the classical style. He dismisses the tempestuous C minor Opus 18 No. 4, the most dramatic and dark of the quartets and the one in one of Beethoven’s most significant keys, as “crude,” possibly due to the violence of its contrasts between Haydn-esque classicism

and something darker. However, it also contains other signs of innovation, such as an allegretto in place of a slow movement, but still, in Kerman's view in embryonic form. Kerman, somewhat unsurprisingly, highlights Opus 18 No. 6, "Malincolia" as the most innovative of the set, particularly its finale.

This finale begins with a slow, chromatic, quasi-fugal introduction that Ratner, in his *Beethoven's String Quartets* describes as reaching expressive heights unmatched elsewhere in the set. It also foreshadows slow introductions to come, in Opus 59 No. 1, Opus 130, and elsewhere. Kerman still finds it somewhat disappointing compared to these, but finally can hear the later Beethoven in the early one. Ratner classifies the earlier movements as galant, making the depth of this introduction even more startling. Ratner also highlights two places in the ensuing rondo where the adagio seems to briefly reappear.

In expressive terms, it is surprising to me that Beethoven's scherzi in this set have not been paid more attention. The designation is a clear signal to Haydn, who first designated his former minuets as scherzi in his Opus 33 string quartets of 1781, though they were not clearly differentiated from his minuets of the time. Beethoven's scherzi are given particular attention by Harold Krebs in "Beethoven's Opus 18 and Metrical Dissonance," as are some of the first movements. By analyzing groupings versus time signatures, Krebs shows some hemiola effects in Opus 18 that we will see in much later string quartets of Beethoven, such as the Presto of Opus 130. Of course, as James Webster would probably point out, Haydn did all of this as well.

So the dual nature of the scholarship—some focusing on Beethoven's looking back to Haydn and Mozart and other parts looking forward to Beethoven's later works—is apt considering the nature of the quartets, though the tone sometimes seems unnecessarily divisive. What is harder to capture, just like the unmistakable differences between Haydn and Mozart, is the overall rhetoric of the pieces, which shows many of Beethoven's stylistic signatures such as insistent motivic repetition (as discussed in terms of Opus

18 No 1) and constant sforzandi. So, while they are a late entry in the classical style and fully in dialogue with the great quartets of that time, they stand equally as an early entry in the Beethoven corpus, aptly a bridge between the eighteenth century and the nineteenth.

Short essay: Haydn's rhetoric (in selected movements from op. 33, op. 50 and op. 76)

“Rhetoric” is an oft-used term in the analysis of Classical-era music. Mark Evan Bonds first analyzed it in terms of music in *Wordless Rhetoric*, examining 18th century treatises and their possible connections to musical composition. A more concretely musical explanation can be found in Elaine Sisman’s *Haydn and the Classical Variation*, which argues, using examples not from treatises of rhetoric but from composition treatises such as that of Koch, that the rhetorical process of formulating, elaborating, and delivering an idea can best be related to variations form—not solely to be found in variation sets but the expansion of a small idea into phrases and phrases into series of phrases and ultimately into large scale forms and movements. Sisman also has created the concept of “tertiary rhetoric,” a kind of intertextual dialogue in which works communicate with each other through allusion and quotation, to be appreciated by the educated audience member.

Haydn proclaimed that his quartets opus 33 were composed in a “new and special way.” While scholars disagree to what extent this is true and to what extent it is an advertising slogan, the quartets are generally considered to be Haydn’s lightest and are often counted as a landmark in the development of a classical style of equal voices and “classical counterpoint” in which accompanying voices can be instantly transformed into melodic ones (as in Charles Rosen’s *The Classical Style*). To what extent actually differentiated between audiences for different opus sets is unclear, but it is clear that he sought a uniform tone for each set (as analyzed in Sismans “Six of

One: The Opus Set”). The determination of this tone could be said to be the first step of the rhetorical process.

An example of Haydn’s rhetorical playfulness and lightness in Opus 33 is the final movement of Opus 33 No. 2, the “Joke.” The main theme of this rondo (a new, lighter form for the finale, particularly after the fugues of Opus 20) is bouncy, repetitive, and somewhat banal, and easily circulates through numerous repetitions. As analyzed in Gretchen Wheelock’s *Haydn’s Ingenious Jesting With Art*, these repetitions prompt a hilariously ambiguous ending rife with dramatic pauses, strangely dramatic minor chords, and a final non-cadence that is, in fact, the end. By manipulating the clichés of the style in an unexpected way, Haydn shows how dependent the audience is upon their signs. He almost repeats the trick at the end of Opus 33 No. 4, where the final statement is in pizzicatos, a quiet and comedic ending to an otherwise fairly noisy quartet.

Floyd and Margaret Grave, in *The String Quartets of Joseph Haydn*, classify Opus 50 as Haydn’s most intellectual and complex set of quartets. Written for a cello-playing patron, they begin with a repeated note in the cello, which many interpret as a joke to the patron, Wilhelm II of Prussia, though Laszlo Somfai points out that many quartets begin with the cello (many quartets, strangely, are also commissioned by cellist patrons, particularly Russian ones). Sutcliffe sees a clear narrative in this work from the seriousness of the first movement (which he describes as an extreme in monothematicism and I already examined in my previous essay) to the jollity of the last. He even describes the last movement as a parody or simplification of the first one’s obsession with a single motive. In the last movement, a single motive is repeated so many times as to become ridiculous, and multiple false recaps haunt the development section.

One more intriguing example in Opus 50 appears in Opus 50 No. 4’s slow movement, labeled “Ein Traum.” The movement is a wistful, sad solo for first violin with periodic support

from the other instruments. In this movement Haydn gives the first violinist center stage, as analyzed by Floyd Grave in “Concerto Style in Haydn’s Quartets” and Nancy November’s recent analysis of Haydn’s Op. 9 and 17 quartets. As suggested by November’s article, this solo stage is seen by Landon and other earlier Haydn scholars as something characteristic of Haydn’s earlier works that he would overcome with his maturity, but he does not entirely give it up later. Grave argues that he continues to see “concerto style” as a viable form throughout his career, rather than an early extravagance.

Haydn’s Opus 76 shows great variety of form and mood, and a clear example of Sisman’s tertiary rhetoric played out within the span of an opus set. Opus 76 No. 3, the “Emperor” Quartet, sets Haydn’s hymn for the emperor (better known today as “Deutschland, Deutschland über alles”) as a set of cantus firmus variations in the slow movement. The melody of the hymn remains respectively intact as it is surrounded by a variety of gracious variations. Sisman argues that this movement is parodied in the variations that start Opus 76 No. 6, in which a ridiculously banal and repetitive theme is accorded the same respect. (A similar theme can be heard in the last movement of Beethoven’s Opus 74 “Harp” quartet, but it contains a few more harmonic turns beneath its placid and repetitive surface.)

Elsewhere in Opus 76, we hear topical play. In the first movement of the “Fifths” quartet, based on a motive of repeated fifths sometimes compared to the opening of Mozart’s Quartet K. 421, a somewhat unexpected episode of Turkish-sounding festivities breaks out in the unusually long coda. In an article in *19th-Century Music*, Paul Christiansen argues that this section indicates a Lacanian crisis of the self. I would like to again evoke tertiary rhetoric and mention the episode of the droning accompaniments suggesting a rustic style in Opus 76 No. 3’s first movement development section. And there are ample other examples of Haydn’s trickery with topic,

particularly in developments and codas. Christiansen's description of this episode as uniquely important within the set does not convince, and his interpretation of the Orientalism as necessarily foreign and unusual to the quartet ignores the appearance of Orientalisms in other Haydn quartets, symphonies, or piano trios. Without a greater context, or an impression that the quartet as a whole is intended to indicate a coherent self, the episode seems more like an eccentricity than anything else.

One persistent theme among analyses of Haydn quartets or movements thereof is to claim that they are "about" something or concerned with solving a problem posed early in the set. Opus 33 No. 5 is said by Tovey to be "about" the problem of a cadence in the opening gesture, for James Webster in *Haydn's Farewell Symphony and the Idea of Classical Style*, the monotonal Opus 20 No. 2 is about the contrast of galant and strict styles, and so on. Perhaps a better way to frame this would be in terms of rhetoric, and Sisman's expansion variation model. For example, the rhetoric of Op. 76 No. 3's slow movement is "about" preserving the hymn theme while surrounding it by variations. There often seems to be a disconnect between ahistorical diagnoses of a movement's "problem" and sometimes music-less descriptions of rhetorical technique (I am referring here mostly to Bonds's *Wordless Rhetoric*), but this boundary does not seem at all insurmountable.

The Origins of Ballet, 1580-1800

Long Essay: Reconstructing the early ballo and ballet: treatises and notation

Modern choreographers who wish to reconstruct various forms of early dance have access to a variety of source material, but the information is by no means complete or unambiguous, and opinions as to the optimal form of reconstruction vary widely. The evidence of early choreography consists principally

of dance treatises, dance programs, choreographic notation, engravings and paintings, and written accounts. However, the availability of each of these forms of evidence varies widely for different periods and locations, and very few accounts can be said to be complete. I will proceed to describe the sources more or less chronologically, beginning in Italy, and then conclude with perspectives on the reconstruction of various styles of dance.

In “Breaking Down Barriers in the Study of Renaissance Dance,” Barbara Sparti describes the period between 1450 and 1580 as a “dark age” of dance history, for which we have virtually no extant sources. But starting in 1580, a number of treatises on dance were published in Italy, including two by Caroso (*Il ballarino* and *Nobiltà di dame*, c. 1580 and 1600), one by Cesare Negri (*Le gratie d’amore*) and a few others. All three of these treatises are primarily oriented towards social rather than theatrical dance. Out of the three, *Nobiltà di dame* has been given the most study, and is available in a modern edition edited and introduced by Julia Sutton (she describes it as an expanded and more complete version of *Il ballarino*). Caroso begins by describing the etiquette of a ball and how to conduct oneself, and then goes on to enumerate, in exhaustive detail, each dance step and its manifold variations. These are described solely in words. In Part 2 of the book, Caroso gives several examples of dances, mostly “*balletti*” but a few named dances such as galliards, canaries, and pavans (Sutton speculates as to what a *balletto* is—there are also *balli* so it is not simply that—but with little success since the term does not appear in other sources and the dances have few unifying features). The music appears at the head of the page, and the choreography is again described in words, keyed to the music by punctuation (this lacks a certain degree of precision). Most of the dances are for either a couple or a small group. It is unclear if the couple dances were performed solo or by multiple couples at the same time.

To what degree was the dance described by Caroso similar to that of the early *ballo* seen in court spectacles and eventually opera? In her *Dance Chronicle* article, Jennifer Nevile argues that they were in

fact quite similar. The professional dancers were probably more virtuosic, and the dances somewhat more complex, but for the most part, she argues, consisted of the same step vocabulary. Her evidence is one of the very few surviving choreographies of this period, a spectacle for a wedding entitled “O che nuovo miracolo,” choreographed by Cavalieri in a basic kind of notation combining stage diagrams and narratives in words that is nonetheless capable of showing 27 dancers onstage at once (who are rarely all dancing at the same time).

Another one of the few surviving choreographies is contained in *Le gratie d'amore*, Negri's treatise, and is analyzed by Barbara Jones in “Spectacle in Milan: Cesare Negri's Torch Dances” in *Early Music*. The choreography is for a short dance for multiple dancers holding torches, the occasion was yet another wedding celebration. She compares the sequence of dances to sequences found in Negri's treatise, though she notes an important difference is that the dancers in theatrical productions dance onstage instead of walking to position, and are always facing front. And, naturally, the torches held by the dancers added a major spectacular element to the performance. She agrees with Nevile that the choreography for these spectacles is largely similar to the social dance described in the treatises.

Unfortunately, only a few choreographies survive from this era, and another dark age of treatises begins at this point in Italy, not ending until the publication of Lambranzi's treatise in 1716. For the glory days of Venetian opera, we have no choreographies or treatises, only an anonymous treatise on opera production, *Il corago*, that describes dance in only the most general of terms, and describes the dance of Caroso as out of date while declining to specify what was then in date. Irene Alm's dissertation casts light on many aspects of the role of dance in public Venetian opera, but no choreographies or treatises survive. Most dance, she concludes, was taught to dancers by demonstration just as it is now, and, like the music of the operas themselves, not considered an important artifact to be preserved for posterity. With the exception of a Florentine spectacle of the 1660s dealing with Hercules that contains engravings picturing

dance along with the music (described by Sparti in “Hercules Dancing in Thebes,”) little else records Italian dance of the seventeenth century.

At the time of Caroso’s first treatise, *Il ballarino*, Thoinot Arbeau published in French his own treatise, *Orchesographie*, published right around the era of France’s first major dance spectacle, the *Balet comique de la royne* of 1581. This is the best record we have of this era of French dance. Written in dialogue form between a master and student, it unfortunately focuses more on aesthetic issues than specific steps. Unfortunately little evidence survives for the next decades of French dance, and we must rely on written accounts and, increasingly, the elaborate programs given to audience members (often written by major poets such as, eventually, Benserade) at ballets.

The notational breakthrough would come in the 1670s with Louis XIV’s occasional dancing master Beauchamps, who invented the most important and widely used notational system of this era. However, it was published not by Beauchamps but by Raoul Feuillet, and is thus known as Feuillet notation. (Beauchamps sued Feuillet over this.) Many choreographies exist in Feuillet notation, mostly social dances dating from after the 1700 publication of the system. Feuillet published several volumes of dances himself in this notation, as did the dancing master Pécour and, eventually, Kellom Tomlinson in England in 1733.

Feuillet notation is elegant and lovely on the page (particularly considering the geometrical shapes that dominated dance at this time). The music is displayed on the top, and the floor from a bird-eye view on the rest of the page, the downstage edge of the stage at the top. The *chemin*, a line, traces the floor pattern of the dancer or dancers (Feuillet notation for over two dancers at a time can become clumsy). Foot movements are indicated on either side of this line in a variety of symbols, with lines connecting them indicating their timing. A small line across the *chemin* indicates each measure of music. So the large outline of the steps with the music is clear, but the details of each step’s coordination with the music can be tricky. Additionally, the system contains no provision for the movement of the arms, something

modern reconstructors disagree about (though some treatises describe the arms' movements in general terms).

Another, apparently competing, system was also in use. This survives in only one example and is known, after its inventor, as Favier notation. The example is a short comedy combining ballet and singing from 1661 known as *Le mariage à grosse Cathos*, Fat Kate's Wedding, which was preserved in remarkable detail and reconstructed by Rebecca Harris-Warrick. Favier notation, instead of one picture of the entire dance, offers tiny snapshots of each moment of the dance corresponding with each bit of music, including different sets of diagrams for each dancer. The notation is entirely different but provides the same basic information, albeit with greater precision as to the timing of steps and somewhat less detail as to their location (because one must compare frame to frame to trace a dancer's path). The system in fact much better suited to dances with larger numbers of dancers than Feuillet notation, though the exact placement of dancers relative to each other can be difficult to determine. Harris-Warrick was able to read the notation after discovering an explanation of it in Diderot's encyclopedia as compared to Feuillet notation, which suggests that it was in more widespread use at the time than the surviving evidence indicates.

Like the Italian treatises, the dances in Feuillet notation are predominately social dances. While this is completely understandable—social dance would appeal to a large audience while notations of theatrical dances, particularly large royal ones that could not be recreated without great expense and skill would not—it again raises the question of social versus theatrical dance. Wendy Hilton does not underline this distinction and reconstructs a single style, the one described in the treatises, for her dancers (the context she advocates for this performance is unclear). Edward Fairfax, in *The Styles of 18th-Century Ballet*, criticizes her harshly for this, arguing that she does not recognize the differences between styles. However, he is working from different evidence (mostly accounts and later treatises rather than notations) than her, and while she could be clearer that she is illustrating social dance treatises, they are largely treating

different material.

The later ballet that Fairfax deals with is again sketchily documented. Pantomime began to play a larger role, which posed a major challenge to Feuillet notation. Some survive, particularly those of Angiolini, but the majority of this ballet is lost, and present only in the increasingly long programs given to audiences describing the dances. However, there are again treatises, this time dealing with specifically theatrical dance. In the 1750s, Noverre published his polemical *Lettres sur danse*, outlining his aesthetic theories of the narrative action ballet (his 1772 public exchange of letters with Angiolini gives us much more detail about their respective aesthetics, though no choreographies). In 1716, back in Italy, Lambranzi had published his *New and Curious School of Theatrical Dancing*, giving us a picture of the evolving virtuosic Italian style, which relied to a greater extent on leaps and other feats of athleticism.

One would hope that a vivid description of this style would be found in Gennaro Magri's 1779 treatise, as is suggested by the collection of essays, *A Grotesque Dancer on the Eighteenth-Century Stage*. Magri was a *grotteschi(o)*, a specialist in the grotesque style of caricature, virtuosity, and wild feats rather than the graceful, dignified, grounded *danse noble* of France. Unfortunately, his treatise deals mostly with social dance, containing an encyclopedic selection of steps and a description of the duties of a dancing master but no dances or much detail about theatrical styles. While the consideration of his life, career, and milieu offered by the book is fascinating, the scholarship contained therein offers much more information about the grotesque style, gathered from sources other than Magri's treatise, than Magri does himself.

No matter what period he or she wishes to reconstruct, the modern reconstructor of theatrical faces a daunting task (unless, perhaps, they wish to tackle *Fat Kate's Wedding*). They can reconstruct from general descriptions and a general knowledge of the style (as Kate van Orden's horse ballet project), or from notation if it exists. Available materials indicate how ambiguous the evidence really is: videos featuring Wendy Hilton and Paige Whitsell-Burgess both dancing some Pécour choreographies show

obvious differences in their interpretations of arm movements and the timing of steps. As instructors, both want to present a complete style to their students (rather than just holding their arms still at their sides), but their solutions to the gaps are different.

Mark Franko presents the most (self-proclaimedly) radical formulation of a reconstruction aesthetic. His work focuses primarily on dances for which there are no surviving choreographies, so working from notation is not an option (mostly sixteenth- and early-seventeenth century French dance, particularly the burlesque ballet of the 1620s), and his sources seem to be primarily programs, accounts, and some earlier treatises. His reconstruction is less reconstruction than recreation, when the creation is something new entirely and the “re” quite negotiable. He advocates for the modern choreographer to not hold his or her creative impulses back and to reinterpret the historical ballet in a new way comprehensible to modern audiences. From the images in his book, *Dance as Text*, it seems that this does not bear a close resemblance to the original dance. Franko contends that the recreation of a historical ballet is not only impossible but a pointless, dead sign, and that new choreography is the solution. For the choreographer, this is surely rewarding, but for the scholar in search of a conception of what historical ballet may have been like it has very limited use.

Choreographer Shirley Wynne presents a middle ground, in which an educated dancer and audience can “revive the gesture sign,” without being thrown into a foreign choreographic world uninformed. For the scholar and researcher, this seems the more helpful option. Jennifer Nevile and Wendy Hilton advocate for a more strict reconstruction based on notated dances by Feuillet and, for Nevile, Cavalieri, something that is useful but the number of extant choreographies is very limited.

Practically every article or book on baroque dance begins by noting that dance is an ephemeral art, and that most of it has vanished. Unfortunately, for many of these eras this is largely true, but through careful scholarship, fortuitous discoveries such as that of *Fat Kate* (which was followed by careful

scholarship), the picture is coming into greater focus.

Short essay: *Genre and politics in French theatrical dance*

“French theatrical dance” is difficult to define. Dance until the 1660s was a production of the nobles, choreographed by a dancing master and danced by a mixture of nobles and professionals (the professional dancers mostly also served as musicians—for example, Lully danced in the 1653 *Ballet de la nuit*). After the founding of the Academie royale de la danse in 1661, dance was increasingly professionalized, though nobles still performed in the *ballet de cour*. After the advent of the *tragédie-lyrique* and later, the boundaries became sharper, and opera and ballet was performed by professionals for an audience. At this point it also became more distanced from the court. However, this did not mean that politics never intruded, particularly in regards to comedy.

The fortunes of ballet in the court depended on the tastes of the nobles who served as patrons. The fluctuations in the 1600s through 1610s between the plotted *ballet mélodramatique* and the plotless *ballet à entrées* was due to the differing tastes of different patrons. Dance grew in visibility, stature, and ambition during the reign of Louis XIII and especially that of Cardinal Richelieu, who saw in the ballet several political opportunities (at that time the burlesque ballet and the early *ballet de cour*). As Margaret McGowan describes in *L’Art du Ballet de Cour* and her piece in *Dance, Spectacle, and the Body Politick*, ballet was a place where the nobles could show their cultured tastes and dancing abilities to the king or Richelieu, and most importantly for Richelieu, he could keep an eye on them. While this is an aesthetic most commonly ascribed to Louis XIV, McGowan argues that his policies were a direct continuation from his predecessors. Foreign visitors to the court were impressed by the splendor of the ballet, and according to Richelieu all this apparently useless expense was actually worth every penny.

This aspect of discipline is further examined in Kate van Orden’s *Music, Discipline, and Arms in Early*

Modern France, in which she argues that the order of dancing bodies was a replacement in peacetime for the wartime discipline of drilling armies. In terms of slightly later ballet, Jennifer Neville considers the symbolic role of geometries and shapes as ordered patterns in her piece in *Dance, Spectacle, and the Body Politick*. Both argue that the order imposed on the nobles in their dancing at the court was a metaphor for the order of France, and even helped the king to keep his often-unruly nobles in line. This is even seen in the first major dance spectacle, the *Balet comique de la royne*, in which Circé's forces are eventually calmed by the king's power.

Except dance was not always quite so orderly. In *Dance as Text*, Mark Franko explores the subversive possibilities of the burlesque ballet versus that of the early comédie-ballets of Molière's company. The burlesque ballet of the 1620s, Franko argues, privileged the individual over the group and avoided geometrical patterns. This disorder was superficially resolved at the end with the king's imposition of order in the finale dance (much as in the *Balet comique*), but the subversion of the earlier portion remained. However, it is difficult for me to determine if these ballets were actually interpreted as or intended to be subversive, or if they were merely frivolous, "baroque" in the eccentric sense, and not given the symbolic significance of later works.

Nonetheless, the *ballet de cour* certainly became more serious, and grew in stature and symbolic weight as it shed its burlesque irregularities in favor of spectacle, order, and grandeur. The degree to which it was politicized, though, remains somewhat unclear. Some examples are obvious, such as Louis XIV's role as the sun god lighting the world, but he danced many roles without obvious symbolic significance. Scholars such as Franko and Georgia Cowart (in *The Triumph of Pleasure*) seek evidence of political messages, but hard evidence is scarce and subversion nonexistent. This is partly due to the close supervision of the royal ballets, in which nothing shocking was allowed to get through. The ballet became a carefully watched propaganda machine, as described by James Anthony in his Early Music essay on Lully's

1668, *Ballet des Muses*, an elaborate spectacle designed to keep the nobles occupied in a dazzled stupor for hours on end, night after night. Sometimes their roles seemed to be symbolic, but sometimes not. Most importantly, they were dancing on stage rather than plotting against the king elsewhere. After the conflict of the wars of religion in the 1590s (including the War of the Three Henriess), the French kings had learned what danger scheming courtiers could cause.

The new genre of the comédie-ballet provided a lighter contrast to the endless pageantry of the *ballet de cour*. Molière's 1661 comédie-ballet *Les Fâcheux* is resolutely lighthearted, and noted by Franko as one of the first professional productions not arranged by nobles—a change he says cuts down on the potential for competition and subversion by courtiers, and let the royals take more direct artistic control. Cowart examines the 1672 *Le bourgeois gentilhomme* and finds light satire of nobles and social climbers alike, and certainly not the king in particular. Similarly, the satire and parody Harris-Warrick finds in *Le mariage à grosse Cathos* is generally aimed at the rustic characters, such as the attempts of country bumpkins to engage in the *danse noble* of the royalty, or attempts to do Italian-style leaps while somewhat inebriated.

Towards the end of the seventeenth century, the dynamics of the court underwent a dramatic shift. The 1670 through mid 1690s were dominated by the *tragédie-lyrique*, a serious-minded genre that had little in the way of political connotations, and did not include the participation of nobles in the cast. The mature Louis XIV had stopped dancing in 1670, and after 1690 under the sway of Madame de Maintenon turned increasingly towards religious pursuits. Meanwhile, the professionalized dance and music industries began to reach a wider public. The boulevard theaters reached a popular audience with outrageous lowbrow productions (which were banned by law from sharing a genre with the royal theaters), and their rivalry with the Comédie-Italienne eventually ended with to the latter's expulsion from Paris in 1697 due to an excess of offensive satire. Unfortunately, there is little detail as to what this satire

consisted of, but the usual tricks probably involved moderately obscene commedia dell'arte high jinks, and Madame de Maintenon is usually described as easily offended.

The “official” theater found this lighter tone as well with the rise of the opéra-ballet, which began with Campra’s *L’Europe galante* in 1697, which was followed by *Les fêtes vénetiennes*. The tone was hedonistic and minimally satiric, and, Cowart argues, a return to the earlier days of the *ballet de cour*. The ballet had begun to take on a life of its own outside the court, developing over the course of the century its own star system and set of conventions in increasing independence from royal supervision. The important aesthetic developments of the 18th century, such as Rameau’s stylistic shifts, the advent of the action ballet, and Gluck’s eventual arrival in Paris, seemed to have occurred largely independent of politics. While the comédie-ballet marked a return to the hedonistic world of the earlier era, it was one without the previous era’s subtext of discipline, and now existed as independent spectacle.

Naturalisme, Verismo, Realism

1. What counts as Truth in Opera?

At its inception, opera struggled to exist within the aesthetics of verisimilitude. Contemporary aesthetics had it that any art, no matter how creative, must faithfully represent life. This aesthetic

retarded the advent of opera in France because the French population's approach to "reality" in art differed from the Italians'. Eventually, however, opera caught on in both Italy and France, and ultimately made its way to Germany, Russia, and England as well. The Italian model was often upheld as the avant-garde, the measure of contemporary taste, although at varying times Gluck and Mozart were also recognized internationally for the success of their operatic conventions. And, although operas became increasingly dramatic, fanciful and symbolic (in fact, Catherine Kintzler has recognized that even in French Baroque opera, music could serve the ends of the *merveilleux* in opera), the ideal of the representation of Truth has never fully gone out of fashion. Perhaps, Carolyn Abbate might argue, opera's mode is most successful when it points to the unspeakable truths of existence. These truths are given voice in opera in a way utterly impossible elsewhere. Perhaps the aspirations toward truth have been an ever-present element of discourse around opera because of artists' preoccupation with being taken seriously, both as composers of music and as intellectual thinkers. In any case, however, every operatic age has harbored an unquenchable desire to see "life" onstage, whether it be that "life" that we all experience daily or a "life" imagined by us to have been part of a wondrous past.

Truth received a new, energizing kick in the second half of the nineteenth century, and this for many reasons. Although individual musicologists have sought particular origins for the renewed interest in truth, a general social and intellectual current is probably more acceptable as an impetus. As the nineteenth century progressed, new positivist approaches to knowledge began to inform every scholarly discipline. In France, for example, August Comte initiated the field of Sociology, which would use scientifically rigorous methods to take stock of populations, analyzing measurable elements that defined their existence (wealth, income, number of children, etc.) The widespread interest in philology at the time (Edward Said has written about this trend in *Orientalism*) produced echoes in many domains including art, literature, and music. Specifically in opera, Richard Wagner's long theoretical tracts on aesthetics alluded to the importance of seeking truthful representations of emotions and the soul. Although his operas seem to be the height of mythological representation, he was in fact preoccupied by the importance of seeking "Truth." Thus, as the goal of Truth was a constant presence in both specifically operatic aesthetics and general intellectual life, the definition was subject to constant change and attenuation.

In relation to the operatic movements of Realism in Russia, Verismo in Italy, and Naturalisme in France, Truth certainly came to be defined by region and audience expectations. The first example of this is within the Russian school, which itself was divided between two camps about realism and how to achieve it in opera. During the 1860s, according to Richard Taruskin, Russian opera witnessed a renaissance of sorts, after having been at a standstill during the decades after Glinka's second opera, *Ruslan and Ludmilla* (1842). Taruskin approaches the aesthetics of realism through study of the critical debates occurring in the Russian musical press at time and the way in which these informed later styles of composition. He identifies two leading figures of the age, Alexander Serov and Vladimir Stasov, who wrote often aggressive and vicious diatribes either in negative critique of Glinka's opera or in positive praise of it. According to Taruskin, the debate was spawned because of the drastic distinction in style of Glinka's two operas. The first, *A Life for the Tsar* (1836) was a historical opera that treated themes from Russia's own past. The narrative was straightforward, and the music mimicked the *opera seria*

style that was popular at the time. Glinka's second opera, *Ruslan*, on the other hand, had gone in a completely different direction. In this work, Glinka approached magic and sorcery, presenting his story in a more chaotic, loosely-organized way. Since Glinka did not live to compose another opera and had left no protégé to continue his style of composition, the Russian musical society was at a loss for the way in which to proceed, stylistically speaking. While the composer was alive, no one dared to criticize too harshly the elements of his second or first works, since he was the preeminent composer at the time. But after his death, and into the 1850s, the criticisms of one or the other of his operas became very strongly pronounced. Serov came down on the side of *A Life for the Tsar* while Stasov defended the creativity in *Ruslan and Ludmilla*, even stating that he wished that the work were even more fluid. While Serov and Stasov's critiques about the operas eventually devolved into *ad hominem* arguments, they also bred new compositions and a more vibrant artistic life in Russia during the 1860s.

Serov himself was a composer, and he created three operas, *Judith* (1863), *Rogneda* (1865) and *Vrazha Sil'a* (*The Power of the Fiend*, which he left incomplete, and was orchestrated and presented for the first time in 1885). Serov's compositions followed very much the model laid out by Glinka's *A Life*: they involved historical scenes, heroism, important arias, and, especially, large ensemble scenes. *Judith* in particular contains very powerful music for the scenes of war and celebration by the Hebrews.

Stasov, on the other hand, was a professional music critic—he did not compose. Rather, he served as godfather to a group of younger artists that had a sort of nationalist bent: the *Moguchaya kuchka*, or “the mighty handful,” also called “the Five.” These composers were Modest Musorgsky, César Cui, Nikolai Rimsky-Korsakov, and Balakirev. These composers had a somewhat clique-ish reputation, often standing up for each other because of ideological blindness rather than any significant feelings toward a particular piece.

Interestingly, both of these “camps” held truth or realism to be important aesthetic goals, but they created different standards for themselves and then criticized the other side for not meeting their own personal goals. For Serov, Realism had to do with the sincerity of emotion, the truth of the libretto, and the seriousness of the tone. For the “five,” realism was defined by specific processes, notably librettos either that were not divided into “numbers” (i.e. aria, recitative) or that were entire adaptations from prose sources; musical settings of these texts characterized by a continuous speech-like tone, the “*récitative dialogué*,” in Cui's appellation; declamation that mimicked Russian speech, especially in the “mute endings” (which were believed to be best translated into music through a pair of eighth notes at the end of a phrase followed by a rest on the next down beat); and a privileging of the Russian people whenever possible, which could best be achieved through a large crowd scene.

The Five had a very specific set of musical compositional elements that were required of a “realist” work, but, as Taruskin went through great pains to demonstrate in his 1975 dissertation, not all of these pieces were always present or served the explicit ends of realism. For the Five, works ended up moving in a more fanciful direction, which can be observed in Rimsky-Korsakov's late operas, *Sadko* and *The Golden Cockerel*.

One of the works of Russian opera that upholds in some ways the most of the elements of Russian realism is Musorgsky's *Boris Godunov*. This opera takes as its subject the Russian “time of

troubles” at the turn of the 17th c. that occurred between the end of the reign of Ivan “the Terrible” and the beginning of the Romanov dynasty (the first Romanov was elected by the *zemsky sobor* in 1614). During this time, as Carol Emerson has explained, a non-hereditary Tsar, Boris Godunov, had been elected by a restless peasant population when the last living heir to Ivan the Terrible, his son Alexi, had died. Boris Godunov was the brother-in-law to Alexi, and apparently a wise leader, but he did introduce serfdom to Russia, both giving structure to, but ultimately repressing, the peasants in the countryside. Boris’s reign came to an end when a “Pretender” presented himself as an heir, and a military engagement supported by the King of Poland and the Pope required Russian forces to defend their capital. In the opera, which opens with the coronation of Boris, the peasants come to play an important role in the determining of the country’s future. In choosing this subject, Musorgsky was carefully following a trend in Russian (Realist) opera of choosing works by Pushkin to convert into musical, staged dramas. Rimsky-Korsakov had similarly set a piece during the time of Ivan the Terrible at the same time when Musorgsky was composing *Boris*, called *Pskovitanka*, or *The Maid from Pskov*. Musorgsky’s work eliminates the “numbers” of traditional opera, and although it does not engage solely with the *récitative dialogué* in the style of Dargomyzhky’s *The Stone Guest* (a literal setting of the Pushkin play about the Don Juan story), it does contain many passages of this style.

The story of *Boris Godunov* well demonstrates the conflict between the aesthetic tenants of Russian Realism and the demands of normal opera as well as those of history, pinpointing the problem of perspective in discerning what is “real.” As both Taruskin and Michael Oldani have written, Musorgsky created two versions of this opera, the first of which he completed in 1869, and the second of which premiered in 1874. The most blatant distinction between these versions constitutes the fault line between “Realism” in practice and in theory. After sharing his work at Stasov’s *dacha* in 1869, Musorgsky received mixed feedback from his colleagues. They could not discern whether the work was meant to be a tragedy or a comedy. In the realist aesthetic, too much of either mode constituted excess and unrealistic treatment, so for them, this work was not a failure. For Musorgsky, though, a generically unspecific work was not the goal. Musorgsky set to work revising the opera, focusing on the principal cause of generic ambiguity, the crowd scene in front of St. Basil’s cathedral. This scene included crowd recitative, a technique that was apparently common only in comic operas. Of course, Musorgsky’s libretto, adapted directly from Karamzin’s official history of Russia necessitated such treatment. Thus, according to Taruskin, Musorgsky cut this scene and wrote text for a new scene, which would take place at a different part in the drama: whereas the old crowd scene had its place just before the death of Boris, the new scene would take place after. The new crowd scene took place in the Kromy Forest, and Taruskin had compared its composition to a model by Rimsky-Korsakov, the *veche* scene in *The Maid from Pskov*. The most fundamental structural difference between the two crowd scenes was that the new one featured sectional divisions: there are seven discrete parts of the Kromy Forest scene. These divisions reject the “realism” of the Five, but they served to distinguish the scene as undeniably tragic. Instead of receiving mixed reactions, Musorgsky’s 1874 version of *Boris Godunov* was well received and toured Europe. Taruskin has recently identified the source of the text for the Kromy Forest scene as Kostomarov’s history of Russia. The original text, from Karamzin, constituted a section from an official, tsarist view of Russia’s past. The new scene, from Kostomarov,

represented a “bottom-up” view of history, one that gave agency to the peasants in the rioting that occurred in the countryside after Boris’s death. In exposing this source, Taruskin was attempting to demonstrate that the new text did not come from Musorgsky himself and thus that it was not necessarily a personally important aesthetic choice but rather one that served formal ends. However, I believe that in identifying this source, Taruskin has demonstrated Musorgsky’s persistent commitment to some kind of realism, that which would not re-write history, so to speak, but that instead looks to other authorities for narration.

Although the new, 1874 version of *Boris Godunov* separated Musorgsky from the Kuchka in some respects (Taruskin has called it the initiation of Musorgsky’s mature period as an independent artist), it also represents Russian artists’ continued engagement with the aesthetic of Truth. This is a mercurial category, dependent upon, as mentioned before, perspective.

In his *Realism in Nineteenth-Century Music*, Carl Dahlhaus studied various instances of the “realist” aesthetic across Europe and in different musical genres, not opera only. According to Dahlhaus, music has always been associated with the aesthetics of reality. There are six ways in which music has historically been used to represent truth: (1) truth of emotions, (2) truth of local cultures, (3) truth of mimesis, (4) truth in the expression of words/rules (i.e. canons and other musical expressions) (5) truth of the sense of hearing, and (6) truth in that both music and nature are governed by mathematical proportions. Dahlhaus comes down rather hard on the quest for “realism” in music, but he favors the idea of Truth. Music is fundamentally not a language of reality, but it can express higher or hidden truths for different times and places. What constitutes “truth” in opera depends, again, on the time and place and people by and for whom it was composed. There are many examples of Truth and its discourse in opera, and these demonstrate the shifting emphasis of perspective. [N.B. Applicable also are Alfred Bruneau’s assertions of what constitutes “life” in opera, especially in his praise of Adam de la Halle and Charpentier—another example of nationally-oriented “truth.”]

3. Puccini and Verismo

Perhaps more than other strains of “realism” in nineteenth-century opera, the Italian *verismo* style has proven itself to be an attractive and yet elusive object of study. It seems to tantalize musicologists by offering a vague whiff of “something there.” And yet while it seems as though it would be enough to define that redolence—who doesn’t know reality when they see it?—one of the more difficult challenges has been locating exactly what pieces are meant to possess this representation of reality. The view in the 1990s was certainly that “verismo” in opera was best exemplified by Pietro Mascagni’s *Cavalleria Rusticana* of 1890 and Ruggero Leoncavallo’s *Pagliacci* of 1891. These, indeed, may be the closest Italian opera ever got to a totalizing aesthetic of realism. The association is particularly apt in the case of *Cavalleria* because of its literary origins: Mascagni relied heavily on the text of Verga’s story *La mala Pasqua* for his libretto. In fact, the public originally believed that he had set the play word-for-word, but in fact his libretto was an adaptation meant for operatic use, and Mascagni kept only some characteristic elements such as

yelling interjections. In any case, I must approach the question of whether or not Puccini's works—any of them, or which ones precisely—should be included in an account of verismo with a summary of the literature on verismo. This finished, I will provide examples from two of Puccini's operas, *Tosca* and *La Fanciulla del West*, in which Puccini makes realistic, naturalistic, exoticist references to specific times, specific places, and real situations that provide the foundation for the possibility of their being designated "verismo." But the term itself first.

Verismo was first used in Italian, apparently, in reference to a literary style developed in response to Emile Zola's naturalist approach in French literature. Zola was characterized in his own time as walking "on all fours," and as scouring the gutter for the source material of his novels. Zola's principle literary concern was the depiction of the real life of individuals, and his sociological impulse led him to develop a particular interest in the lower social classes. He loved to write about Paris and was instrumental in contributing to the "monumentalization" of the city, treating it in *Une page d'amour* as a character itself that expressed moods and desires. The importance of visual description, specific places, and characters that had been previously forgotten about by litterateurs all contributed to Zola's innovative narrative technique.

In his own time, Zola was recognized for his distinctive literary style, and in some ways he became a trend-setter. Although perhaps no other writer can be said to have truly taken on Zola's technique, many authors attempted to incorporate elements of his style into theirs. According to Andreas Giger, the Italian authors of the *scapigliatura* community felt sympathy with Zola's style. They inaugurated an Italian version of Zola's *naturalisme* that they called "verismo," basically a translation of the sentiment. Verga and Capuana were the principal leaders of the style, and they held six tenets for verismo literature: (1) Depiction of the weak (not necessarily the poor) (2) Characters led by blind passion (3) Disinterested commentary on political, social, and cultural milieu, (4) Language should reflect the character's situation (dialect, accent, etc.), (5) depiction of specific locales, preferably in the author's own backyard, and (6) narration that is sufficiently distinct from the action as to provide an intense pace.

Giger's view on the relationship between operatic and literary verismo is a revision of Andrea Corrazol's classic view, published in an English translation by Roger Parker as "Operatic and Literary Verismo: A Regressive Point of View." Corrazol's argument was that, although the operatic and literary verismo trends were certainly related, especially in their dissolution of the divide between the object and the form of its representation, this was accomplished in different ways in literary and operatic verismo. Whereas literature could make space for the new huge subject/object of its art by allowing characters to speak in their own dialects and forcing the narration to move along more quickly, opera had to use different means. Corrazol notes the rise of the orchestra as a narrative force in the operas of the later 19th-c. She connects this fact not to Wagner, whose leitmotiv technique received much attention, but to the need for more immediacy in verismo opera. Corrazol contends that verismo opera quickly became a popular art because of its mixture of styles and registers. The "purest" examples of verismo in opera are short and did not demand extended attention or means to stage them.

When Giger reassessed the connection between literary and operatic verismo some 15 years after Corrazol's attempt, he takes a more "meta" view, pointing out the fact that the discipline of literary history has recognized the nineteenth century's two distinct periods:

romanticism and its reactions to it. Musicology, on the other hand, has upheld the view of the whole nineteenth century as the age of romanticism. Although he does not single out particular scholars for having adopted this approach, he does demand that musicologists consider the second half of the nineteenth century (especially beginning around 1860) as a reaction to realism. Giger offers examples of Verdi's technical and aesthetic advancements that strongly distinguish him from his predecessor Donizetti. Musically, there is the moment in *Otello* where an enharmonically-spelled augmented sixth chord does not resolve to the dominant but rather is subjected to a series of chromatic shifts until it ends on an open fifth. Visually, the Cairo staging of *Aida* set a new standard for the specificity of detail required of opera sets and costumes. According to Giger, Verdi's last operas, *Don Carlo*, *Mefistofele*, *Otello*, and others should be counted as a new move toward something more related to the verismo trend that would officially be christened with Mascagni's *Cavalleria*. Contrary to previous scholarship on operatic verismo (by Matteo Sansone) that identified the first use of the word "verismo" in relation to an opera to be in 1895, Giger contends that it was actually used even before *Cavalleria*. The trend was something already afoot in Italian opera. Although Verdi himself publically denounced the term and the idea, it is clear in his banishment of numbers, his sympathy with literature, and his interest in the blind passion of both brusque and weak characters that Verdi was showing his hand and the fate of Italian opera.

Thus it seems that verismo was more of a *Zietgeist* and less of a specific operatic movement. In a similar way to the later, early 20th-century "isms" verismo may be a term that can be very aptly applied to one or two works, but that has a certain number of elements that can be located in a nebulous collection of other pieces, each of which demonstrate a different kind of engagement with the aesthetic.

In the case of Puccini, verismo was certainly a force that motivated some of his operatic choices. The "shock-and-awe" element of his style of dramaturgy has often been noted, especially with regards to *Tosca*, with its on-stage firing squad. The large narrative role that Puccini accorded to his orchestra conforms with some of the elements of Corrazol's definition of verismo. The specificity of locale is another element that plays a significant role in this opera. Arman Schwartz has recently explored the truth content of Puccini's bells in *Tosca*, that is, specifically the geography of sounds and the particularity of pitch for the great bell at St Peter's basilica in Rome. According to Schwartz, Puccini insisted on converting the names of churches from the original play into names that would have offered a more realistic scenario for all of the running back and forth between them that the characters were asked to do. Similarly, the vague hints of politics and the distinction between Scarpia's and Tosca's dialects contribute to a kind of authenticity that is perhaps redolent of verismo. But other elements seem to hint at a stylistic evolution, a moving beyond the immediacy of the original verismo. For example, the historical setting of *Tosca* is suspect. Although *Tosca* takes place in a location fairly familiar to Puccini, the time period creates too much distance for the audience to experience the narrative as an immediate succession of passionate encounters. Similarly, the opera's extended length separate it from the earliest examples of verismo that took place in the course of one compact act.

These elements that diverge from the nexus of verismo are similarly present in *La Fanciulla del West*, Puccini's 1910 opera set in gold-rush era California. Although this opera has its origins in

a naturalist play by Belasco, who was known for his commitment to verisimilitude, Puccini still perhaps gilded the lily in this work, unable to restrict himself to the confines of the nascent, but pure, verismo style of Mascagni. In this work, the simplicity of the characters is counterbalanced by the vastness of the setting: the Sierra Nevada mountains. Likewise, the opera's premiere at the Met necessitated an enormous orchestra and a huge set design including live horses on stage. The use of both musical and verbal leitmotifs in *La Fanciulla* ("lontano, redenzione, tonare") offer some of the fusion of form and content to which Corrazol made reference, but also take on a life of their own. As for the focus on the "weak," Minnie is the strongest, most self-assured of all of Puccini's heroines, and although she makes some naïve mistakes, she also has a nose for what she is getting into. Other than the precision and realism of the visual details, perhaps the strongest argument for the classification of this opera as a work of verismo is that Puccini advocated for a changed finale compared to the one in Belasco's play. The original play, *The Girl of the Golden West* is in four acts, and the last act does not create the opportunity for a quick, direct dénouement. Puccini demanded that the final two acts be combined so that a heroic moment could succeed the tense near-hanging of Jake Rance. This brutality and quick pacing are both reminiscent of the verismo aesthetic, although "classic verismo" would probably never have featured a "happy ending," that being too convenient and not leaving a lasting enough impression of the passion of life on the audience.

It seems that Puccini's aesthetic is certainly related to that of verismo, but whether or not his works would fairly be placed in the category would be determined by the exact expectations of verismo works—expectations that have never been and likely never will be explicitly defined.

Requiem

1. Mozart

Mozart's requiem is one of the most haunting of all examples of symphonic requiems, as well as one of the single most powerful displays of choral and orchestral writing. Combined with a box-office biographical episode—consisting of (1) a secret commission delivered by a dark figure (2) that arrived as Mozart's health was failing and his personal finances were in shambles and (3) the stories that Mozart composed as he knew his last days were near, (4) scribbling the last notes from his bed since he was too weak to climb to his desk—the work has been assured a place in the classical repertory as one of the highlights of human achievement. ETA Hoffman famously praised the sublimity and terror of this work, proclaiming it an example of the most grueling encounters between man and the infinite. The work has meant many things to many people, and its fame cannot be attributed to any one element of its history. Recently, of course, it received much attention as the principal dramatic conflict of Peter Schaeffer's *Amdadeus*. But its popularity with orchestras and choirs as a concert piece has remained consistent since its composition—or, since the completion of its orchestration.

One of the biggest scholarly "problems" with the Mozart requiem is with attribution. Mozart was unable to complete his commission, which probably came from a close friend who was unwilling to reveal his identity to Mozart for social reasons. When he died, in December 1792, his widow Constanze worked carefully and professionally to secure possible composers to complete its unfinished movements and orchestrate the passages for which Mozart had

composed the vocal lines only. Constanze was “careful” because she wanted the work to be completed quickly and secretly, apparently fearful that if the commission was not fulfilled in a timely manner, it would become known that her husband had not done all of the work and thus she, as his widow, would not be legally eligible to receive the full payment for the commission—money she desperately needed to care for her two children. Thus, the orchestration was carried out swiftly and secretly, and no one knew that the work was not entirely Mozart’s on its first performance at a memorial service for the composer in 1793.

For this reason, Christoph Wolff has called Mozart’s Requiem the first substantial case of paper studies, stylistic analysis, and other tools of historical musicology. The case began to unfold more publically in the 1830s when sketches for movements that were clearly not in Mozart’s hand turned up at the public library in Vienna. As the reigning ideology at the time could not support a reversal of attribution, these sketches were suppressed. However, when Constanze died, the case was opened again and has variously been investigated by many scholars, not the least of whom is Christoph Wolff, who published an extensive documentary study, complete with transcription of the sketches, in both German and English. Forthcoming is a book by Simon Keefe on style and reception of the work, elements that have been to some degree forgotten by the ruling hegemony of source studies in this field.

The finished product, a true *mélange* of material by Mozart, Süssmayr—the most famous of the orchestrators—and his other students, (Süssmayr’s contribution is now known to have been very significant), has stirred the voices of discontentment in some scholars. The first to comment on this in the modern era of scholarship was Nichols, in “A Requiem but No Peace.” He raised to the musicological community the concerns about attribution and the restless character of the sketches themselves, describing the process as not yet having been put to rest. Later scholars have critiqued Süssmayr’s orchestration, especially once sources made the true scope of it known to the public, arguing that it has detracted from the artistic purity of Mozart’s style. In the 1990s, Maunder created his own orchestration for the requiem, proposing it as a solution, ridding the work we have taken to be Mozart’s of the detrimental influence of a lesser contemporary. Maunder claimed to have studied Mozart’s style and to have taken more time to prepare a more thoughtful version that would better reflect the aesthetic aims of the famous composer.

Brauner has critique Maunder’s work, as have Mosely and Keefe. Keefe’s criticism reflect a new cultural approach to musicology, informed by the desire to represent in scholarship more than just the form of an object. Keefe’s perspective points out the importance that Süssmayr’s orchestration has had historically, despite whether or not people knew what his contributions were. According to Keefe, Süssmayr was working within the same musical milieu as Mozart, and we have records that he studied the same pieces that Mozart had, as well as having carefully observed the style Mozart dictated in the parts of the Requiem that were more complete. The work attained respect and admiration long before Süssmayr was recognized as a collaborator, and thus his work cannot be so easily discounted. Similarly, Keefe points to Mozart’s other religious music from his later period (including the “Ave verum corpus) arguing that the piece indicates a new direction in Mozart’s style that he was unable to develop because of his untimely death. Although Mozart does not seem to have been particularly religious, he did however respond with seriousness and gravity to his religious commissions.

Other studies on the reception of Mozart's Requiem have similarly demonstrated that the work bore an important force, maybe in part because the public did believe that Mozart had composed it. In the case of the English reception of the work, Rebecca Cowgill has observed that the work was played often, but rarely in a religious context. More often, it was performed in theaters as a concert piece. This was largely due to the English animosity toward Catholic doctrine, and Cowgill even describes the times at which the reception of Mozart's Requiem was "coldest" were the times of conflict with Northern Ireland, a Catholic nation. Even despite its catholic character, Princess Caroline chose this work for her own funeral service, perhaps because she had such a love for Mozart's other work.

That the work bore Mozart's name was certainly of importance for Beethoven, according to Bathia Churgin. She has shown that Beethoven studied Mozart's choral fugues in the Kyrie, using them as models for his own fugues in the Credo of his *Missa Solemnis*. Indeed, Mozart's fugues contain a certain example of what Churgin has called the "pathotype," a descending tetrachord that has often been associated with death and mourning.

For Stephen Rumph, the "Lacrimosa" of Mozart's Requiem is one of the most rhetorically satisfying pieces of the whole classical period. This piece contains not one disjunction between the form and content that would make its meaning less intelligible to listeners: its mood is consistent throughout.

With the modern interest in the sources and attribution of sections and parts of Mozart's requiem having occupied such a huge place in the scholarship on this work, explorations of style, influence, and affect have only more recently been appearing. Mozart's Requiem deserves an enduring place in the repertory because of its monumental, affecting character and form.

3. Representations of Judgment Day

The tract "Dies irae" was officially added to the Catholic mass for the dead in the 16th century at the Council of Trent. The text is of a biblical nature, and it offers a vivid depiction of the individual faithful person's supplications to God for salvation on the final judgment day. This view is important in light of the continuing Catholic doctrine of purgatory (which was officially established in 1215 by the fourth Lateran council. Purgatory is the liminal afterlife that the Catholic doctrine asserts will be not the final resting place for souls, but rather a stopping place for them in their journey towards everlasting pleasure. The doctrine of purgatory was established to attenuate fears about the afterlife. Catholics believed that a just and loving God would not send souls to eternal damnation if they did in a state of mild sin. However, such a state of impurity was believed to retain a soul from entrance into heaven. In order to lessen the stark contrast of the two alternatives, Catholic leaders established the theological notion that souls would go to a joyless waiting place from whence they could be released to heaven through the prayerful intercession by saints and living family members. But purgatory was a most powerful image in connection with the Judgment day, or the "day of wrath." This time, set to happen at an unpredictable moment in the future, has also been called Christ's "second coming." On this "day"—it is believed that time would stop moving, so the term 'day' hardly seems adequate here—God would judge all living and dead souls for acceptance into heaven or eternal

punishment in Hell. In the Catholic doctrine, this day represents one of the purest demonstrations of the absolute, beyond which the mind cannot fathom.

Thus, the “Dies Irae” tract within the requiem mass is of special doctrinal significance. It has often been singled out as the most fearful moment of the requiem, and it is this element that has earned the Catholic requiem a reputation for terror, seriousness, and a tone that is generally unsympathetic to the individual, fallible listener/singer. Since the tract was added so belatedly, Andrew Kirkman has argued that its addition prompted the seemingly sudden increase in the composition of polyphonic requiem masses in the 16th c. Before this time, although there are some examples of requiems (notably Ockeghem’s, which has the distinction of being the oldest extant requiem), mostly this mass maintained the aesthetic of plainchant. Scholars such as Rob Wegman have asserted that the reason for this choice was the particular attitudes toward polyphony at the time. Polyphony was considered both too celebratory and too frivolous for the serious occasion of a requiem mass. In any case, there is a chronological association between the increase in number of polyphonic requiems and the addition of the Dies irae chant—causality has yet to be proven one way or the other.

Possibly the most famous example of a symphonic “Dies irae” is in Berlioz’s *Grande messe des morts*. This piece was commissioned for the occasion of an important state funeral to be held at Les Invalides in 1837. Although Berlioz apparently scrambled to complete the work in time, the ceremony was ultimately called off due to continuing military offenses. Instead of being premiered at an official occasion, Berlioz’s work was premiered in the same year at a Parisian concert society. Edward Cone has analyzed and interpreted this work in a landmark essay from 1980. In the introduction to this study, Cone contends that entire requiem masses are not often enough studied—more frequently scholars choose one movement or element to investigate. Thus Cone attempts to find a narrative in Berlioz’s *messe des morts*, and does so in a possible allusion to the tripartite structure of Dante’s *Inferno*: Hell, Purgatory, and Paradise. In Berlioz’s requiem, paradise is never reached. This is because, in Cone’s reading, the narrative unfolds from the listener’s perspective. As the listener has not yet passed away, the mass ends with a return to Earth—literally a more mundane interpretation of the work’s structure.

The most remarkable aspect of Berlioz’s requiem is the “Dies Irae,” which he “stages” in a certain measure with four brass choirs meant to surround the already enormous orchestra. The trombone blast at “tuba mirum” is the most imagistic part of the whole piece, interpreting the sign of the intermediation between heaven and Earth (the trumpet was seen as the instrument that could give voice to God’s calls in the Baroque period) in a way that literally overwhelmed the listener. Berlioz’s talent for orchestration and for original uses of harmony (Cone outlines the Requiem’s journey through the most far-flung key relations, from B-flat M to C M to e m to E-flat M) made him able to depict the Judgment day as something truly terrifying from the perspective of the average listener.

Two requiems that avoid depicting the day of wrath in any major way are Fauré’s and Brahms’s, and these reflect the religious ambivalence both of their composers and of the audience in view of whom the pieces were themselves composed. Brahms’s requiem, op. 45, is especially significant in this respect because it highlights an important theological distinction between Catholicism and various Protestant faiths. Brahms’s *Ein deutsches Requiem*, while making use of

the Catholic term for the Mass for the dead, is in no way such a piece. Brahms composed his work for the Bremen Cathedral, to be performed there on Good Friday. This institution is not a Catholic cathedral but rather a protestant one, subscribing to the centuries-old resistance to Catholic theology that has characterized northern Germany. For his work, Brahms drew on the traditions of German Protestant burial services. Robin Leaver has recently written about these in *The Journal of Musicology*. Rather than focusing on the souls of the dead, the German Protestant tradition emphasizes their memory. In 1517, Martin Luther published his 97 theses, and among these were many that criticized the doctrine of purgatory, the practice of indulgences (and especially the corruption related to the sale of them), and the belief that any action by man could affect the salvation already bestowed upon him through Christ's death. Accordingly, when Luther published a collection of texts for use in funeral services, in 1543, these did not emphasize terror, but rather comfort. Similarly, Moller's *Manuale ad mortae* of 1592, from which Prince Heinrich, the dedicatee of Heinrich Schütz's *Musikalisches Exequien*, drew many of the texts that he had inscribed on his coffin and later composed as memorial music were of a personal nature and did not reflect the Judgment that God would pass on his soul.

Accordingly, Minear has analyzed the Biblical texts that Brahms used in his *Deustches Requiem*, noting that reference to death makes an appearance only late in the work, in the seventh movement. Here, Brahms sets the words "Blessed are the dead that die in the Lord." Rather than evoking the fear of judgment, these words indicate praise and thanksgiving for death—thus Brahms sets these in a peaceful chorale style that resonates with the rest they evoke. Leaver has shown this passage to relate to both Bach's funeral cantata no. 21, BWV 106, and to *Das Gedächtnis der Entschlafenen*, a piece composed by one of Brahms's contemporaries for *Totensonntag*, the Protestant day of remembrance for all dead.

Gabriel Fauré also composed one of the most famous requiems known to modern audiences, and, like Brahms, gives no terrifying depiction of the Judgment Day. For him, however, in contrast to Brahms, the absence of terror has sometimes been deemed a lack of rigor and commitment to the Catholic doctrine. For, unlike the Protestant Brahms, Fauré was Catholic, and he began work on his requiem when he was employed as the organist at the Parisian Eglise de la Madeleine. Carlo Caballero has written about Fauré's requiem specifically in relation to the things it reveals about the religious sentiment of its composer. Caballero has described Fauré's faith as a kind of progression from "apathetic Catholic" to questioning theist to atheist. In line with the contemporary intellectuals in Paris, Fauré ultimately rejected the notion of a God and a spiritual, moral ordering of the universe. Thus, as he approached the requiem, which he claimed to have composed for "no one in particular," he did so with a lack of energy and rigor that led to a kind of composite of requiem motets, in Caballero's esteem. Fauré treats the text of both the ordinary and propers loosely. For example, he does not repeat the phrase "Kyrie eleison" the doctrinally appropriate three times before moving on to the "Christe eleison." Similarly, he skips the Dies irae tract, preferring to set as the final movement the "in paradisum" that he borrowed from the funeral service, which is not technically a part of the Requiem Mass. In making such changes to the text of the mass—and, moreover, by including none of the original Gregorian chant melodies—Fauré reveals what could be called apathy to Catholic theology. One of the most important theological aspects of Catholicism is the rigor of its rituals, coupled with the fact that

these are controlled by a central Church authority. Interestingly, Fauré's changes did not seem to ruffle too many feathers in the Parisian catholic community. Caballero explains that the musical aesthetic of the Eglise de la Madeleine corresponded more to the opéra comique than the austerity of Roman practice. Even the rites of that church were not fully in agreement with those of the Vatican. The Eglise de la Madeleine retained the Gallic rite, which arose in the medieval period as a natural part of the regional specificity of liturgical practice. Although this church was meant to have converted to the Roman rite in the 1880s, it did not make a full conversion until the early 20th century.

Although an imagistic depiction of the Dies irae can contribute to a "catholic" feeling of smallness in the terrible face of God, such a musical element is by no means necessary for the aesthetic—or even, in some cases, the religious—success of a Requiem composition.

Stravinsky

1. Stravinsky defended against Adorno.

In 1949, Theodor Adorno published his *Philosophie der neue Musik*, which included an essay about Stravinsky, one of the leading composers of the 20th century. In this essay, "Stravinsky and the Restoration," Adorno indicted Stravinsky for creating music that was fundamentally inhuman. Adorno directed his charge against Stravinsky's neoclassical approach broadly speaking, arguing that it defamiliarized material, fetishized the means, and rejected notions of aesthetic beauty in art. In the article, he came down most critically against *The Rite of Spring*, a ballet that aestheticized an imagined Russian pagan ritual of sacrificing a virgin at the onset of spring.

The original ballet was produced in 1913 by Diaghilev's *Ballets russes* company, and Stravinsky spent over two years preparing the score, the first portions of which he claimed to have composed in the summer of 1911 at Ustilug, in Russia. The ballet itself was likely dissimilar from anything the French public had ever seen, featuring choreography by Vaslav Nijinsky that purposely forced bodies into disfigured postures and that, by all accounts, seems to have contradicted the rhythmic patterns of the music. But by 1949, when Adorno published his essay, Stravinsky had long since denounced the balletic aesthetic that had accompanied the piece's premiere. By 1921 the work was never again performed with choreography (at least not the original, and at least not until Millicent Hodgson's 1987 attempt at a reconstruction). Stravinsky preferred by this time to think of the work as pure music, needing no extraneous explanations, the type of which he explicitly published in a special article in *Montjoie!* the day before the premiere. However, despite Stravinsky's disengagement from the programmatic element of the work, this was a central element of Adorno's critique. In his view, the pagan ritual pit the individual against the collective. The individual's agency was removed (by Stravinsky) and she was forced to succumb to the brutal, primitive desires of the elders. Instead of fighting for herself, the young girl is danced to death in an unavoidable, insurmountable challenge to the Will. Adorno compared the image of the "community" in Stravinsky's ballet to the fascist politics that arose in Europe about a decade and a half after the work's premiere. Although Stravinsky himself never professed any engagement with politics, perhaps it was this apathy itself that Adorno found as legitimizing evidence for his claims. In any case, the view of Stravinsky the inhuman, mechanistic, unsentimental composer remained a significant one.

Igor Stravinsky seems never to have commented on Adorno's essay—a surprising fact, given the volume of his own discourse about his music and his attitudes toward various events that occurred during his life. Adorno's later essay in *Quasi una fantasia*, "Stravinsky," seems to have evoked no response, either. It has thus been the work of musicologists to investigate and refute Adorno's claims. Various modernists have hoped to resurrect Stravinsky from the death of morality that Adorno pronounced so vehemently—they likely have sought to protect themselves from such claims by association.

There have been at least for direct attempts to challenge Adorno's critique from within musicology. Two scholars who have defended Stravinsky from a somewhat similar angle are Richard Taruskin and Pieter van den Toorn. Both have attempted to offer analyses of both cultural and musical products in order to prove that Adorno had it all wrong and that Stravinsky's music does not act the way he said it did, much less meaning what he said it meant. Jonathan Cross has defended Stravinsky from a different perspective, offering the traces of Stravinsky's lasting impression on music composition and art broadly speaking, proving that in this instance, Adorno's argumentation did not quite go far enough. Finally, a scholar with a dance background, Tamara Levitz, has also confronted Adorno's criticisms, this time arguing that Adorno's analysis of the dance choreography was not complete, and that he and Taruskin have missed important elements that define the young virgin's agency.

One of Richard Taruskin's most unshakable theses about Stravinsky is that through-and-through, forever-and-ever, Stravinsky was Russian above all else. Taruskin's 1700+ book, *Stravinsky and the Russian Traditions*, resounds with this claim at every turn. Where Stravinsky tried to make himself look cosmopolitan, Taruskin argues, he was really just doing what Russians do. Where he tried to deconstruct Russianness for the international audience, he was only doing what other Russian composers have always done when they have confronted the West-East divide that has long separated Russians and their culture from the rest of Western Europe. In the case of *The Rite of Spring*, the patchwork of Russian folk melodies (Taruskin once identified over 40 of these in *The Rite*, where Stravinsky had claimed there were none), the brutal depiction of Russian paganism, and the static character created by the rhythmic ostinati were all typically Russian qualities. Taruskin has identified *drobnost'* as a key element to Stravinsky's style: this is the static, block construction common in Russian art and music. Thus, from the start, Taruskin would be ill-disposed to accept Adorno's criticisms of Stravinsky, because they would signal criticisms of all of Russian art. In his 1995 article "A Myth of the 20th Century," Taruskin analyzes Adorno's language, determining that the claims are not out of line with the musical style, which, through its simplicity, has the ability to smash the subjectivity of the individual. This, however, was not a negative quality expressed only in Stravinsky's music. Taruskin contends that the impulse to rid humans of their subjectivity was an important element of late-19th-c. thought, and he cites Nietzsche as an example of a philosopher who desired an end to individual subjects. Taruskin claims that his argument hinges on "the music itself," although this claim can hardly be substantiated by any examples he provides. Instead, he encourages that scholars who undertake future studies of *The Rite* spend more time with the music, observing its simplicity, and less time with the discourse, battling with its brutality.

A scholar who has similarly advocated for a return to the music in the discussion of Adorno

and Stravinsky is Pieter van den Toorn, whose studies on rhythm and harmony in *The Rite of Spring* have been influential to the way we understand octatonicism. In a 2004 article about the Adorno-Stravinsky problem, van den Toorn begins by attempting to locate all of the musical examples that Adorno does not provide in his essay, as his habit was to not insert musical texts. This done, van den Toorn assesses the degree of stasis and repetition in the piece, finding that the stasis is not as static as Adorno would have us believe. Rather, ostinati can be shown to undergo slight changes (similarly, Gretchen Horlacher's entire theory of Stravinsky's music is predicated on these subtle changes to seemingly repetitive cells that spell development). van den Toorn suggests in his article that the individual—group dynamic does not necessarily have to reflect the kind of subject—state relationship that characterized the fascist regimes of the 20th century. He asks if it is possible to read the division in light of different kinds of contrasts, such as the one between individual person and all-powerful spiritual force (i.e. God). Van den Toorn thus criticizes Adorno not only for his lack of precision in his musical analysis but also for his fabrication of arguments, making a hermeneutic analysis out of thin air.

Jonathan Cross's engagement with Adorno has been of a different kind than Taruskin and van den Toorn. First, his primary contribution comes as the closing chapter to a book that very sympathetically assessed the degree to which Stravinsky can be said to have had musical "followers" despite the fact that he rarely had composition students and never aspired to creating a "school" of composition even in the loosest sense. Cross thus analyzes the music of Birtwhistle, Messiaen, Boulez, and others in search of compositional techniques that originated with Stravinsky and were explored by his later admirers. Thus, when he reaches the extremely negative view of Stravinsky that Adorno offered, Cross must tread carefully. Instead of critiquing Adorno's reading of musical features of *The Rite*, Cross prefers to study Adorno's argumentation, which is founded on a proposed dialectic between Stravinsky and his contemporary, Arnold Schoenberg. Schoenberg, the founder of the second Viennese school and the initiator of all manner of 12-tone composition, had a sympathetic listener in Adorno, who found Schoenberg's anti-expressive technique to be an adequate response to the challenges of modern life. At every turn, Cross argues, Stravinsky does not match the standard set by Schoenberg. But according to Cross, Adorno's reasoning is flawed, because he does not maintain the dialectic he constructed. If he had done so in the Hegelian sense, he would have had to recognize a synthesis between Stravinsky and Schoenberg: they were not so entirely different in Cross' view. This is because Cross favors an understanding of Stravinsky as a "cubist" artist, especially in his early period (although *Symphonies of Wind Instruments* is another example and *Pulcinella* the most classic example). The aim of the cubists, in contrast to the expressionists, was to dismember the object in such a way as to represent it in an emotionally detached way, without emphasis. In Stravinsky's cut-and-paste, simple block-like construction, he does just that, Cross argues. Never mind that some of the sonorities Stravinsky uses—especially those that feature major-seventh and minor-second half-step clashes, or tritones—are dissonant. Schoenberg had already "emancipated" these by the time of *The Rite*. Cross concludes that if Adorno had taken his own reasoning to its logical conclusion, he would have reversed his opinion on Stravinsky.

Finally, Tamara Levitz has taken a distinctive approach to this argument, one that reconsiders the role of the program in the debate. While other scholars have insisted that

Adorno's musical argument or logical flaws led him astray, Levitz brings her knowledge of choreography and dance culture to the fore in her argument. She begins by presenting facts about Nijinsky's career as a choreographer, specifying, in particular, that he had a habit of cross-dressing for roles. It is significant, Levitz claims, that Nijinsky opted not to do this for the role of "The Chosen One." Rather, he asked his sister Nijinska to dance the role (which she did until she fell ill). In opting to control another body, Nijinsky rejected his own chameleon-esque ability to morph into any character. He preferred that the virgin's body be a real woman's, and according to Levitz, this makes all the difference because it does not control women: it offers women the opportunity to see themselves in the role, to see themselves choosing the gift of sacrifice to the community. Levitz points out that both Taruskin's and Adorno's arguments had made erroneous references to the original choreography. Taruskin in particular wrote about a spinning dance that he imagined would have taken place just before the "Chosen One" danced herself to death. Rather, Levitz contends, sketches and accounts of the choreography depict another picture. The Chosen One always acts with agency, not losing control in a centrifugal, "spinning out" effect. The Chosen One acts with deliberation, never resisting the community of elders but rather accepting the important role she is asked to fill and asserting her individuality before she does so. Thus, the idea that Stravinsky composed music to accompany a ballet that depicts a vicious community overwhelming the individual power of a young girl is simply untrue, according to Levitz. Adorno's criticisms can be rejected outright.

If Adorno chose to pick on Stravinsky for modeling an unhealthy attitude towards humanity in his musical compositions, he may just as well have done the same for a whole community of artists working in Paris and elsewhere at a time when the relevance of art was actively being called into question. As Stephen Walsh would have it, Stravinsky was in some ways the ideal member of this cosmopolitan community, interested in rejecting the frivolity of the "necessity" of consumer culture while at the same time reveling in the beauty and joys of the machine and the ability to automate that which takes effort. Stravinsky's insistence on control, precision, and inexpressivity has been shown to relate in a fundamental way to his style of composition, which was so densely particular already that it could tolerate no tempo fluctuations, unwritten dynamics, or "misplaced" accents. If he exerted rigor on the "executors" of his music, it was because he had composed it so thoroughly. To my mind, this includes even extra-musical associations such as the program for *The Rite of Spring*. If Stravinsky wrote it initially, it was because he thought it bore significance to the musical structure, the simplicity and immediacy of which do not evoke the egoism and maniacal fear embodied in fascist politics but rather the characteristic fascination and disgust for the materials of modern life.

2. Serial Techniques in Late Stravinsky

After the 1954 premiere of *The Rake's Progress* failed to attract a new public audience for Stravinsky, the composer apparently felt conflicted about the direction of his career. Although he had spent years preparing the most thorough of all his neoclassical works, engaging in a meaningful artistic relationship with his librettist W.H. Auden, the 62 year-old composer was not satisfied to see that work taken apart by critics and deemed irrelevant by the public audience.

After what was apparently an emotional, tear-filled car ride with Robert Craft, Stravinsky decided to adopt a new approach to composition. Rather than maintain his cut-and-paste, harmonically abstracted style of composing, Stravinsky chose to do the unthinkable (for anyone who had been paying attention to his public status on the matter): compose using a serial method. Serialism was the rigorous American version of Schoenberg's 12-tone compositional method. Practiced primarily by Milton Babbitt, serialism involved a precise ordering of all of the pitches, as well as processes that controlled the ordering of other musical parameters as well, such as note lengths, dynamics, etc.

Stravinsky's decision came as a surprise because he had previously spoken vehemently against serialist and 12-tone methods, contending that they were inartistic and impersonal. Stravinsky had a long-standing disdain for German music, and his interest in American serial music did not even increase when he became close friends with Babbitt.

Joe Straus has provided the most extensive documentation of Stravinsky's turn to serialism, which forms an important theme in his 2001 book *Stravinsky's Late Style*. In this book, and in Straus's articles on Stravinsky's musical techniques, Straus argues that Stravinsky's turn to serialism did not constitute in itself a major stylistic revision of his earlier processes. Rather, he argues, certain compositional techniques remain important in the structure of all of Stravinsky's music, namely pattern-completion. Although Stravinsky did not maintain the process of constructing a "tonal axis" in his later period, he did still use important centering pitches (Taruskin suggests that F was one of these).

One of the most important elements of stylistic continuity amongst Stravinsky's various compositional periods was symmetry. For Taruskin, who writes about this feature of Stravinsky's music in the epilogue to *Stravinsky and the Russian Traditions*, symmetry was an irresistible musical tool because of his exposure to the octatonic and whole-tone scales, both of which exhibit this principle. Taruskin takes it as no surprise that the pitch class sets [0135] and [0235] and later [0369] and [048] were important to Stravinsky. All of these can be found within the octatonic scale, and thus it was natural for Stravinsky to return to them. In fact, Stravinsky's last works evince some of his most "Russian" qualities, according to Taruskin.

In Joe Straus finds compositional continuity throughout Stravinsky's works, it is certainly not because of a belief that Stravinsky's national origins played an important role in his approach. Rather, Stravinsky was an idiosyncratic composer who was drawn to mathematical principles of music and who enjoyed constructing pieces out of solid structures that could not easily be deconstructed through traditional methods of music analysis. Straus's musical examples reveal his own ingenious attempts to find these structures. For example, Straus studies a passage from *A Sermon, a Narrative, and a Prayer* in which the vertical arrangement of pitches can be derived in multiple ways from the prime form of the row. Although Straus presents a table with all of the possible ways to understand these, he argues that the simplest way to understand is as pairs of inverse-related sets, e.g. P&I and R&RI. The verticals demonstrate a pragmatic approach to serialism, as opposed to the more rigorous one demonstrated by Babbitt's *A Widow's Lament in Springtime*.

In fact, Straus is careful to argue that Stravinsky was not interested in Babbitt's process of musical composition. Taruskin has argued that Stravinsky might have eventually felt flattered by

the rigor with which serialists such as Babbitt and Boulez (and later the analyst Allen Forte) approached his music. This might provide one hint as to why he eventually ventured to compose in a new manner. Straus, on the other hand, has argued just the opposite: although Stravinsky might have appreciated the formalist approach to his music, which he saw himself as having encouraged, he did not have much interest in it, and was not at all familiar with Babbitt's music.

Furthermore, the appearance of rigor in Stravinsky's serialist compositions was not enough for the aging composer. Straus has argued in his article on Stravinsky's serial "mistakes" that the composer cared about the accuracy of his serial processes. He did not generally attempt to control the aesthetic results of the computations (except for possibly in one case). Straus tells stories of Stravinsky's "glee" at having corrected scores with errors, including one in which Babbitt visited Stravinsky's New York hotel room where the older composer was working on scores while in his bathrobe. On this occasion, Stravinsky praised Babbitt's ability to recognize the errors, and Stravinsky asserted that the correct score "sounds better that way."

Other scholars have similarly approached Stravinsky's serialist works with an eye on his scores. Lynn Rogers has determined that an opening passage from *The Flood*, Stravinsky's TV ballet, originated as a bit of diatonic music polarized between C and F#. David Smyth has analyzed sketches for *Threni* looking out for similar slippages between diatonic and serial organization.

Agon, Stravinsky's first piece with an entirely serial movement, demonstrates well that in Stravinsky's mind, the mix of serial and diatonic processes could take place within a single piece. Straus has argued that the most interesting part of the piece comes in the finale, in m. 820, where the final forty measures chart a course through the serial and diatonic realms. Stravinsky provides ten measures to the serialist procedure reigning in the previous movement, then ten measures of a transition, which features both styles, and finally ten measures in a diatonic idiom to conclude the piece. Straus's view is that the ordering of pitches was attractive to a composer who had already spent most of his career creating patterns of intervals (Kofi Agawu has noted the disjunction between specific pitches as organizing principles versus intervallic patterns within Stravinsky's "Mass," a pre-serialist composition). Although his serialist works may not display the rigor traditionally associated with that method (Straus has tabulated all serial mistakes Stravinsky's music, producing a thirteen-page list!), they are certainly important in the context of continuing stylistic evolution that Stravinsky evinced throughout his career.

Notre Dame Polyphony

1. What are clausulas for?

Clausulae are short pieces of organum generally composed in discant organum (that is, note-against-note) style. For over a century, musicologists have believed that these short fragments of music could stand in for sections of organum purum (that is, unmeasured two-, three-, or four-part polyphony wherein the tenor line holds the chant notes while the upper voice(s) create(s) melismas overtop). For this reason, clausulae have variously been called “discant clausulae” and “substitute clausulae.” However, while the former definition relies only on stylistic judgments, the

latter requires insight to performance practice. As far as is known, no source contemporary to the performance of organum mentions the clausulae; we have no direct account of these pieces being switched in for other passages. Moreover, the word “clausula” itself is somewhat misleading, since in grammar it denotes the end of a phrase or a whole phrase independent unto itself, whereas in 12th- and 13th-century French polyphony, these pieces seem to be incapable of functioning independently (except for one known example referenced by Hans Tischler, the four-part clausula on “Mors,” which seems to have no concordances in organum and could well have been performed as a separated piece of music). We do know, however, from stylistic comparisons, that clausulae that appear in some manuscripts also appear within the context of organa in others (or, in some cases, in the same manuscripts). Additionally, many clausulae have been found to be concordant with early motets—where the clausulae have melismatic notation, the motets have syllabic notation. The uses for clausulae are not known for certain, but there are many possibilities.

Clausulae have variously been studied by musicologists, although recent work has not yielded any new insights into this repertory. They were the subject of two dissertations, by Norman Smith (1969) and Rebecca Baltzer (1975). In Smith’s dissertation, the question of clausulae is treated with regards to their use as insertions into organum. Hans Tischler has remarked that Smith’s dissertation did not problematize instances where clausulae are not appropriate to performance within the context of other pieces.

More pertinent to this essay is Rebecca Baltzer’s dissertation, which considers the notation and style of Notre Dame clausulae. In two parts, her dissertation considers the stylistic traits of the various kinds of clausulae—she divides them by the rhythmic quality of the tenors: first, second, third, and fifth modes, plus tenors with duplex longae and tenors with triplex longae—and offers transcriptions of all of the approximately 600 two-voice clausulae transmitted in the three principal manuscript sources for Notre Dame polyphony, W1, F, and W2. In her discussion of the style of clausulae with first-mode tenors, Baltzer hits upon a central question for the repertory, that is, the purpose of them. For, among the 37 clausulae with first-mode tenors transmitted in manuscript F, 21 have irregular notation of rhythm. William Waite examined these 21 pieces in his *The Rhythm of 12th-Century Polyphonic Music*, concluding that they had a unique purpose. While it has generally been accepted since the time of Ludwig that clausulae came first and then were used as the basis for early motet composition, Waite proposed that these 21 clausulae with irregular first mode notation were evidence of the reverse process. In his view, the irregular clausulae must have been transcribed from motets, as a way for scribes to demonstrate more precisely the rhythm they had invented for the motets but could not convey with the syllabic notation (at this time, modal rhythmic notation was such that rhythm could be expressed in writing only through the conjunction of notes into binary, ternary, and quaternary neumes, which, when appearing in a certain pattern, would convey organized, repeating cells of rhythmic relationships). As such, Wait argued that in some cases, the motets could serve to clarify the rhythm of the clausulae, since the text underlay of the notes, when compared with the unusual neumes, would have clarified the rhythmic innovations.

Waite’s hypothesis was challenged in 1970 by Gordon Anderson, who had a hard time swallowing the notion that scribes would have transcribed into notation that was unfamiliar to them pieces

that they had already written down elsewhere. Additionally, Anderson found that none of the 21 “irregular” clausulae had rhythms that were truly indecipherable. As an example, he compared the clausula “Mons” with the motet “Chanter m’estuet sans delai,” demonstrating that the rhythm of the two was completely identical except for the end, where the clausula had a melismatic figure. He argued that the melisma was evidence of original, new composition, such that the clausula could not have been copied from the motet. Furthermore, Anderson contended in his 1970 study and subsequently that rhythmic freedom in the clausulae was evidence of stylistic innovation. Anderson explains that at the time when first mode clausulae were composed (Baltzer suggests this time to be 1210-1220), rhythmic innovations were being carried out through the procedure of *fractio modi*, that is the breaking up of modal rhythmic patterns for a brief sections in music. This procedure allowed a composer (or scribe) to write more notes than usual in the space of one perfection, thereby temporarily disturbing the rhythmic regularity. Anderson explained that in the hypothetical case where three breves occupy one perfection in a clausula, they could be variously interpreted in order to accommodate different numbers of syllables. For example, they could suit two syllables if transcribed as (1) two tied eighth notes and one independent eighth note or (2) one quarter note and two tied sixteenth-notes. For three syllables, the pattern could be transcribed as three independent eighth notes, and for one syllable, we could interpret three tied eighth notes. There would be no reason to create these different interpretations of one same rhythmic figure if there were no words. Thus, Anderson argues, the variation between motet and clausulae rhythm in the case of “irregular” clausulae does not forcibly mean that the clausulae were copied from the motets.

To return to Baltzer, in her dissertation, she took issue with Anderson’s rhetoric, but similarly argued that there is no reason to see the clausulae as transcribed motets. She gives an example of a (virg)o clausula for the organum M32, which produced a French double motet transmitted in W2 and Mo as well as a contrafactum of the same as a Latin double motet in W2. In this clausula, at m. 6 of her transcription, the tenor and duplum voice should create an octave. However, in the three motet versions, at this instance the two create a major 7th. She notes that, additionally, there are strong rhythmic irregularities in her mm. 15, 18, and 19, but that in every case the clausula seems to suggest consonance between the tenor and duplum. Baltzer’s solution is to consider the style and consonance/dissonance pattern of the clausulae. She argues that this group of irregular clausulae demonstrates the scribal impetus toward rhythmic innovation that actually outstripped the capabilities of the notational system.

Norman Smith revisited the question of transcription in a 1989 article, “The Earliest Motets: Words and Music.” In this paper, Smith contends that although Ludwig’s traditional view of the clausulae providing the material for the earliest motets had been contested, no scholar had provided enough evidence to disprove it. Smith himself offers examples of four organa and their accompanying clausula to demonstrate that not every clausula derived from or was transformed into a motet. He offers (1) M33 Alleluia *Hodie Maria* with 20 clausulae on “Regnat,” only 7 of which exist as motets, (2) M14 Alleluia *Pascha Nostrum* with 12 clausulae on “Immolatus,” 3 of which are motets, (3) M13 Responsory *Hec Dies* with 12 clausulae on “In saeculum” with only 2 motets, and (4) O2 Gradual *Christe descendit de celis* with 12 clausulae on “tanquam,” 6 of which are motets. These examples prove, for Smith, that among a group of clausulae that are perfectly

suitable to become motets, less than half actually did. This evidence is meant to refute Ernest Sanders' notion that the clausulae were a transitional feature that served the ends of the motet, paving the way to its rhythmic precision. Smith admits that his view is traditional, but he denies the existence of any reason to refute it.

Sanders' view of the clausulae as a stepping-stone to the motet is likely influenced by his own interest in that later genre; he has written more extensively about the 13th- and 14th-century English motets than about any other genre. He has described the clausulae as an intermediary feature that allow for the possibility of increased embellishment of plainchant through the addition of multiple voices and texts. He compares motets, for example, to the filigreed decorations in later medieval manuscripts, in line with the tendency to decorate and elaborate that which is important.

In terms of codicological evidence of the practical use of clausulae, there exists very little. In manuscript F, most clausulae are in the second fascicle, grouped together with like compositions but nowhere near the organa to which they correspond. If clausulae were used in performance to "substitute" for passages of organum (Tischler is one proponent of this theory—he believes that there were some clausulae, for example, that were designed to shorten organum, providing bridges between two disparate sections), they could not have been read from the book. Rather, singers would have had to memorize them and somehow make decisions off-the-cuff about which ones to use and when.

Although it is unlikely that we will ever find conclusive evidence as the function of clausulae, it is clear that they served many purposes to the medieval musician: they demonstrated and provided a testing ground for the newest rhythmic innovations; they provided raw material for the composition of paraliturgical music that was to become the most preeminent genre of the later middle ages, the motet; they may have offered performance possibilities for the organum repertory; and they demonstrate the principle of repetition in the form of *colores* that was a defining feature of the earliest organum (as Stephen Immel has demonstrated with regards to the *Vatican Organum Treatise*).

2. How does the source situation inflect our understanding of the Notre Dame repertories?

Polyphonic music was a feature at Notre Dame cathedral for many centuries. Although the actual records of performance of this music are scant, we know with certainty that it was performed at least by the end of the 12th c. In 1198, the Bishop Eudes of Sully pronounced an edict limiting the performance of organum to the major feasts at the cathedral, namely Christmas and Circumcision. We also have the account of the history of the polyphonic repertory from the anonymous author (number 4 in Coussemaker's catalogue, thus affectionately dubbed "Anonymous IV" by contemporary musicologists) of the treatise *De musica*. In this treatise, which is generally a tract on notation and rhythmic modes, Anonymous IV describes the tradition of composing polyphonic music in Paris. He is the sole source of any names associated with composers, Leonin and Perotin, who were supposedly the most preeminent practitioners of their craft. However, from these two accounts, by Eudes of Sully and Anonymous IV, do little to clarify the rest of the picture. In order to understand the style and needs of the polyphonic repertory at Notre Dame, scholars turn to the three principal manuscripts that were, in the time of Coussemaker and later Ludwig, believed to

contain the music for Notre Dame.

These three manuscripts have attained perhaps mythic status for musicologists working on 12th-c. polyphony, because of their quixotic and unyielding nature. They are W1 (Wolfenbüttel, Helm. 628), F (Biblioteca Laurenziana Pluteus 29.1) and W2 (Wolfenbüttel, Helm. 1099). These three manuscripts transmit the repertory of organum, clausulae, motets, conductus, and rondellus that are believed to have been in use at Notre Dame cathedral, not only because the edifice was the central secular religious institution in Paris at the time, but also because it was finished in the final quarter of the 12th c., making it an ideal location for the preservation of manuscripts of music.

The source situation has been questioned and challenged over time, and we are no longer too sure of the use (intended or actual) of these books. First, it was recognized early on that W1, which is stored in the library at St. Andrews in Scotland, contains not only repertory related to Notre Dame cathedral but also prayers and hymns associated with the local traditions. This book has been studied by Mark Everist, who was eager to prove that it was not of strictly Parisian origin and that it never resided at the cathedral. Rather, he argues, the bishop Guillaume de Monvoisin was interested in French music and had likely made trips to Paris just around the time of the Bishop of Sully's edict that would have put him in a prime location to hear polyphonic music in action. Everist engages in more historical than paleographic work to argue that it was possible for Bishop Monvoisin to have sent away for new polyphonic music and may even have had some excerpts copied in Paris.

The diffusion of the repertory outside of the cathedral, Paris, and France suggested by the existence of W1 points to what has long been considered the most important characteristic of the Notre Dame polyphonic repertory: it is the first "international" style of music, which gained significance in England, Spain, Germany, and Italy. The music did, likely, travel, as the manuscripts themselves suggest. Manuscript F does not evince, perhaps, the international acclaim of Notre Dame polyphony, but according to Barbara Hagg and Michel Huglo, it does suggest the political and aesthetic significance of this music. In a 2004 article published in the *Revue de Musicologie*, Hagg and Huglo suggest that manuscript F was prepared for the dedication of the Sainte Chapelle in Paris, in 1248, on the eve of Louis IX's departure for the seventh crusade. Hagg and Huglo build on Rebecca Baltzer's earlier study of the illuminated miniatures of F. Baltzer had attempted to use art-historical evidence to prove a mid-13th c. date for the manuscript, between 1245 and 1255. She contends, for example, that the foliation in the manuscript is much more timid than that of the Saint Louis Psalter, a much later manuscript from the end of the 13th c. She analyzes the depiction of hair, hands, and faces to show that those in F are slightly more rigidly rendered than they would later be in manuscripts produced by the atelier of Saint-Honoré. In the argument of Hagg and Huglo, these art-historical considerations occupy merely the first few pages; they add that the consistency of the miniatures (the first and last both suggest a group of dancing, joyous monks) evinces the cohesion of the book, that it was likely compiled with a specific end product in mind. The sway of their argument rests in the historical events of Saint Louis's reign. They first invoke the king because of the evidence in the fleur de lys decorations in the first miniature. This symbol, they point out, first became associated with French royalty during Louis IX's reign, and its special relation to him is pointed out in the use of them as decoration on the total available wall

space within the Sainte Chapelle. In the article, they also confront propositions made by Craig Wright concerning the liturgical specificity of the manuscript's music. While Wright had taken issue with Heinrich Husmann's questioning of the appropriateness of certain pieces in F for Notre Dame, arguing that some might have been more relevant for use at the nearby church of Saint Germain, Wright handily (and confusingly) attempted to demonstrate that each and every piece had a place within the normal and extraordinary celebrations at the cathedral. Hagg and Huglo again challenge this notion, pointing out that many pieces seem to accord with the local traditions at the Cathedral of Sens. This cathedral had special significance for Louis, since he not only celebrated his wedding there, but he also deposed the holy crown there in 1239, on his return from the holy city. The crusades play a large part in the musical selections of F, especially in the collection of conducti. Hagg and Huglo locate no fewer than eleven conducti that make reference to the crusades (whether through allusion to the holy city, the terror of warfare, or God's covenant with his holy people). They also find evidence for the celebration of Richard the Lion Heart, music that would only have been politically appropriate after the end of the conflict with the English, in 1247—an official truce was signed in 1248. Hagg and Huglo identify at least three pieces that would have been appropriate to the dedication of a church (including *Terribilis locus est*), while at the same time proving that Notre Dame cathedral likely never had an official dedication ceremony. Hagg and Huglo also provide some clues about the transfer and storage of F, since it is well known that F was already in Florence by the end of the 16th c. Despite the fact that no dedication plate is found in the manuscript, they believe it is likely that Pierro de Medicis, who had a deep interest in music, may have received F as a politically significant gift from François I.

Thus it can be seen that perhaps not all manuscripts containing music believed to have been performed at Notre Dame were necessarily created for or even used at the cathedral. The Montpellier manuscript, famous for its old and new corpuses of motets has been demonstrated to have a “central” provenance despite its association with the “peripheral” city in the south of France.

Similarly, the Las Huelgas manuscript has long presented confusion for scholars, since many of its works have concordances with the “central” repertory, but it also contains many unica and works that concord only with other Spanish sources, for example Ma(drid).

The use of the manuscripts has also been a topic of concern for scholars. Manuscript F seems to be a presentation copy that saw little use (although Michel Huglo has suggested that the corners of all pages show signs of wear, not for reason of their browned hue but rather because of the added “souplesse” of the parchment). W1, on the other hand, seems to have been roughly treated, and was perhaps left unbound for many decades before finally receiving the treatment of secure and protective covers. W2, a more enigmatic source, still reveals little about whether or not singers would have used it in practice. Many have noted that the layout of pieces in the various manuscripts either prevents or promotes their use in actual performance. For example, motets copied in F are written with the parts laid out in successive order. If three different people were trying to share the same book, they would have been unable to all see their parts. In contrast, Mo seems to be propitious to performance from the book. The multiple parts of a motet are copied on a single opening (two facing pages, i.e. the verso side of one page and the recto side

of the following one), and the parts are laid out in columns such that the notation is easier to follow. However, it may be the case that even these would have been tricky to read in a performance, since the multiple lines of a motet might contain more or fewer notes, and the singer of the triplum line of a three-voice motet may be craning his neck to see over the singer of the motetus line, since the triplum line would continue onto the next folio, whereas the duplum would be contained on a single folio.

In an unpublished conference paper, Rob Wegman has pointed out many of the practical challenges that these manuscripts would have presented to singers: (1) their small size would have made it necessary to be incredibly close to the book in order to see, (2) the thickness of the book would have made it necessary to put it on a stand, thus even farther away, and (3) the notation is often very small, even in relation to the already diminutive size of the manuscript (the margins are quite wide in these books). Wegman has suggested that perhaps singers read off of scrolls or scraps of parchment, traces of which would have obviously been lost long ago because of their fragile nature.

Turning back to the physical evidence of the book, Edward Roesner has investigated the relationship between the manuscripts themselves and the practice of singing that must have been associated with them. In his 2001 article “Who ‘Made’ the Magnus Liber?” Roesner addresses the notion of transmission and the copying and performance of music. He argues that the old-fashioned idea that the older books contain the older repertory is too simplistic. (This idea originated with Ludwig, who noticed that discant organum seemed to have developed chronologically later than organum purum. Ludwig noticed that W1 had the highest portion of the organum purum repertory, so he suggested that the oldest repertory is contained in the oldest books). Roesner studies the cross-transmission of two related organa, M12 Alleluia *Adorabo ad templum* and M51 Alleluia *Posui adiutorum*. These two organa are both found in all three central manuscripts. Roesner notes that M12 was believed to have been composed first, for liturgical reasons. He demonstrates, however, that as the pieces were copied and transmitted, they changed and interacted with each other. For example, M12 and M51 are dissimilar as they appear in W1, but they can be divided into sections that demonstrate independent paths of transmission. (Hans Tischler similarly studied these same two organa, also dividing them into sections.) Roesner shows that ultimately the two organa can be seen as two versions of the same composition, since the version of M51 in W2 is exactly the same as the version of M12 in F. Thus, he argues, they can be further seen as evidence of the practice of composing *confracta*, which was widely in use at the time. Roesner contends that such examples of interrelationships among different organa can serve as traces of the plurality of influences on the transmission and practice of the whole repertory. Roesner has long been interested in singers (having written articles on the performance of organum duplum informed by the 13th-c. theorists and having transcribed all of the polyphonic music of the “magnus liber” in modern notation, a work that covers 7 volumes). He believes that singers had a hand in shaping individual performances and that scribes had control over what specific version of a piece was copied at a given location in a book.

Based on the tradition of the *Vatican Organum Treatise*, a book believed to predate any of the primary Notre Dame sources, scholars have come to believe that improvising polyphony was a significant part of performance practice. This treatise, as expounded by Stephen Immel, contains

at least three chants that are common to the Parisian repertory, including M44 Gradual *Hic Martinus*. This organum provides an opportunity to compare the notation of the two periods (the VTO is believed to be at least 30 years older than the oldest ND source), which itself is a testament to the evolution of the style. Immel notes the presence of mistakes in the VTO version, as well as different cadential figures.

Cadences are a good place to end this essay, given their function in music. Together, they constitute the clearest evidence that some freedom was expected in both the transmission and performance of organum. In the study by Roesner, mentioned above, the six versions of M12 and M51 have six different cadences. There are many more such examples, including the comparison of O10 *Non completerentur* and O11 *Dum conturbetur*, which, like M12 and M51 are believed to be contrafacta of each other, appearing in all three central manuscripts, and yet displaying different cadences in each appearance. Cadences were perhaps the last vestige of the improvisatory and “ecstatic” performance of plainchant. Guillaume Gross has most recently praised this tendency toward improvisation in the performance of otherwise more or less rigorously composed music. He writes that improvisation in the 12th and 13th-c. polyphony of Paris demonstrates both beauty and intellect, the flexibility of artistic interpretation combined with the rigor of memorized performance. It is a testament to the richness of this repertory and practice that such inferences can be made from the testimony of books alone.

Versailles

2. How tragic is the *tragédie lyrique*?

Generally speaking, the artistic policies promoted under Louis XIV were designed to promote cheer and happiness. They played an important role in the definition of sovereignty that characterized the government even as early as 1651, when the dauphin made his first public appearance as a dancer, in the *Ballet des fêtes de Bacchus*. In this ballet, staged during the Fronde when the nobles were still rebelling against the government and its taxation policies, the allegorical character Want, Need, and Sobriety are depicted as banished from the kingdom. From this moment, the goal of staged works during Louis XIV's reign was to support the king by demonstrating his magnanimity and culture.

This first example comes from a ballet because ballet typified the staged entertainment during Louis XIV's reign for twenty years. The *Ballet des fêtes de Bacchus* was, in some sense, a concession made by Cardinal Mazarin in order to appease the nobles. He had tried to offer them entertainment in the form of the newly christened Italian opera, but this genre offended the French sensibility. Audiences and critics found it to be too false; they disdained the singers' artifice and the fact that they were professionals; and they found the separation between aria and recitative jarring. Rather than give singers an excuse to perform their virtuosic talents, the French preferred more democratic styles of artistic entertainment, both in the salon and at court. It is important to note, for example, that the early ballets were danced nearly entirely by amateurs—nobles from the court who enjoyed dance. In comparison with Italian performers, French singers were praised for their humility and *politesse*, as was, for example, Pierre de Nyert, according to George Fader who has written about the influence of the mondain salon society on the

aristocratic art aesthetics. Moreover, the first court ballets under Louis XIV did not follow a linear narrative—they weren't expected to. Rather, they provided opportunities for large groups of nobles to parade in costume, exemplifying some loosely-presented theme.

Ballet remained the primary court activity until its decline was initiated in 1661. At this time, Louis XIV gave authorization to a thirteen-member group to create the *Académie Royale de Danse*, which he charged with the task of increasing the professionalism of dancing and preserving the courtly ballets in a system of notation that they were to develop. As an eventual response to this group, Pierre Perrin petitioned Louis XIV for *Lettres patentes* giving him the right to establish the *Académie Royale de Musique*, which would provide him the copyright protection and therefore funds he would need to inaugurate a new, French, style of opera. Pierre Perrin was one of the most lucid writers on musical aesthetics at the time. It is illuminating for the study of these aesthetic principles to know that he was a poet, not a composer. If it seems contradictory that a poet should be the leading authority on music, this is because the French valued above all at the time a mimetic conception of the arts, one that followed Aristotle's naturalistic goals for art. "Le Naturel" has been investigated as a significant concept at the time, a notion that privileged the free organization of material, unimpeded by artificial rules. Instrumental music was seen as an inferior form of art to poetry because of its limitations on meaning.

Thus, Pierre Perrin, a poet, headed the first Académie Royale de Musique. With his *lettres patentes*, he was permitted to charge admission to performances of his works and restrict other composers from creating similar products. Patricia Ranum has written about the following events: in 1670 Perrin presented his first operatic work, *Pomone*, a pastoral comedy with music by Michel Cambert. The work was an enormous success in Paris and earned huge quantities of money. A kind of pastoral pastiche, the piece had no coherent dramatic action and was a celebration of beauty and youth. Perrin, unfortunately, saw very little of the receipts of this work—he had foolishly put the financial organization of the project in the hands of Guichard and Sablières, colleagues from his time at the court of the Duc d'Orléans. Thus, after a short time, Perrin was overwhelmed by debts; he sold portions of the académie to his two financial advisors and was sentenced to debtors' prison. While in prison, Perrin was visited by Lully, who had an interest in the rights to the Académie. Lully obtained authorization from Louis XIV to buy the rights, and in 1672, Louis XIV issued new *lettres patentes* to Lully that granted him the sole privilege of creating and presenting the new genre, *tragédie en musique*.

Lully's first example of this new genre was less than tragic, and in this way it set the tone for the subsequent tradition. *Cadmus et Hermione* was a love story, with a happy ending, involving heroes and gods, and the triumph of good over evil. In the opera,¹ Cadmus does find himself in a potentially tragic situation. In order to appease Mars, he must offer a sacrifice, quite a brutal

¹ N.B. I will use this term throughout the essay for convenience's sake. Furthermore, the term "tragédie lyrique" refers more specifically to the works of Rameau, which was out of the realm of my stated aims for this topic. Thus, I will limit my discussion to the works of Lully, with, however, one example pertaining to Rameau's work. As the example will not present a threat to the narrative I am establishing here, it should be sufficient to demonstrate the supposed paradox of the quality of these works with the modifier in their title.

action. In the third act divertissement, according to Rebecca Harris-Warrick, a quick-paced minuet in 3/8 provides the musical accompaniment to the preparations for the sacrifice. The score indicates that the singers were meant to lie prostrate as Cadmus enters, and thus the drama was heightened. Yet Mars arrives just before Cadmus can carry out the sacrifice, offering protection. Georgia Cowart has noted the continuity of the political program from the earlier ballets to the larger spectacle of opera. Rather than privilege war and the glory of the king, opera composers and libretto writers often included supplications for the protection of their own jobs and for the preservation of the arts program in general. A similar program underlies the libretto of *Atys*: the martial scenes are associated with tragedy whereas the pastoral ones are associated with peace. Quinault proposed a program of pacification in this opera, which, at the same time still glorified the king. *Atys* is often cited as the pinnacle of Lully's *Tragédies en musique*, since its dramatic coherence is unmatched by any of his other works.

Catherine Kintzler's theory of the poetic aesthetics of French opera was a landmark in theoretical explorations of the repertory, and her remarks have often been at the source of subsequent writers' critiques or expansions of the poetic aesthetics of French opera. Before publishing her extensive book, Kintzler published a much shorter article in which she explains the relationship between pastoral and tragedy and lyrique and dramatic theater.

	Dramatic	Lyric
Pastoral	Pastoral play	Tragédie en musique
Tragic	Classic tragedy (e.g. Corneille, Racine)	XXX

In Kintzler's view, then, "lyric" art, that is, art set to music, could never be truly "tragic," since it lacks the verisimilitude needed to convey tragedy. She contends that composers of *tragédie en musique* actually created a new register of expression, "Horror," which is similar to terror, but more sensuous in nature (less psychological) and therefore less affecting. Kintzler expands her theory in her book, in which she describes both only the conditions of creation and the conditions of performance. In the book, she describes music as having an "ontological" status in opera. That is to say, no one would ask "whether or not" an opera contains music. Rather, the appropriate question is "what kind" of music an opera has. She argues that there are different ways in which French composers in the 17th century incorporated music into staged works: (1) References to "normal" music, that is, celebrations, dancing, etc., where in real life music would be heard, (2) Depiction of the *merveilleux*, which, through the tradition of *ballet de cour* had already become accepted as a certain register associated with gods, sorcerers, etc., and (3) Representation of life through music. The third point is the most complex, Kintzler argues: it is not the simple principle of mimicry with which mimesis is often associated. Rather, it is the expression of sounds as music, for example the translation of bird song into scale patterns or the rustling of wind into tremolos. To use Kintzler's language, "Le passage esthétique du *bruit* au *son* fait de la musique un art classique de la caractérisation du vrai." Kintzler grounds her theory in the actual works themselves, as well as in contemporary critics and aestheticians such as Perrin and Lecerf de la Viéville.

Kintzler's view was triumphantly upheld by Buford Norman in an article on Rameau and l'abbé Péllegrin's translation of *Phèdre* into the opera *Hippolyte et Aricie*. This is a classic example of Kintzler's theory that music could not be used at the time to convey deeply tragic emotions.

Although *Phèdre* was recognized in its own time as “perfect,” Norman contends, this did not stop the operatic duo from attempting an operatic version. Their version, indeed, differs in many ways from Racine’s classic, notably in the characterization of Phèdre (she is less jealous and harried in l’abbé Péllegrin’s libretto) and in the ending, in which Hippolytus does not die. Norman explains, leaning on Kintzler’s theory, that operatic composers were not interested in the darkest elements of human character, which they thought could not be expressed through music, an art of levity and grace. The translation of this tragedy into opera is perhaps the clearest example of the lack of “tragedy” in the *tragédie en musique* and the later *tragédie lyrique*. Clearly, Rameau and l’abbé Péllegrin had an exceptional model from which to draw, but they avoided the register of the tragic.

Thomas Downing has to some degree rejected Kintzler’s notion of the poétique of the *tragédie lyrique*, arguing that the composers were not interested in creating depressing tragedies more than they were incapable of doing so. Downing examines operatic prologues most closely in his book on operatic aesthetics, since he claims that it is in these that the message of the librettist is the least mediated. In the operas proper, certain tropes and fanciful structures give way to the clear representation of a meaning, but the prologues were the place to make reference to the king, his magnanimity, and his glory. It is his reading of *Atys* that I have cited above, and this he draws primarily from the establishment of the opposing realms of martial and pastoral existence within the prologue.

The early operas were perhaps not examples of a preconceived aesthetic plan: there was no established formula for the makings of a great, popular, beautiful *tragédie en musique*. One example of this effect is that of *Isis*, Quinault and Lully’s next collaborative effort after the huge success they achieved with *Atys*. In *Isis*, Buford Norman has observed, the seemingly linear narrative that Quinault had created for *Atys* was abandoned in favor of a structure that gave more privilege to spectacle. Norman offers a highly sympathetic view of *Isis*, demonstrating its structure to be a carefully crafted palindrome that demonstrates the symmetry known to have been of such importance at the time. Its five acts hinge around the central action of a conflict between Isis and Jupiter, and the final action depicts Isis being saved from her earthly torments by being transformed into the goddess Io. Norman praises the work’s design and what must have been its spectacular stage presence, but he admits that the otherworldly conclusion to the drama must not have satisfied the audience. While they expected works that would demonstrate above all things the principle of verisimilitude, this opera offers a completely unrealistic solution.

Tragedy was not part of the aesthetic of the *tragédie en musique*. If they were so called, it is because they, like their Italian counterparts, emerged from a neoclassical aesthetic that sought to resurrect the ancient Greek arts. As these operas took their subjects from Greek tragedy, the genre was named accordingly. If there is anything tragic about the genre, it is that its rise in popularity coincided with Louis XIV’s declining interest in representational arts. His secret marriage to Madame de Maintenon in 1681 led him to frequent stage shows less often, and thus to disentangle his own image from those created by the composers of operas. But perhaps this is no tragedy: when Lully died in 1687, Louis had no interest in maintaining a tight-fisted control over the operatic scene in Paris. Thus the early 18th century saw a dramatic rise in the number of composers and performers of operatic works, including those by Marc-Antoine Charpentier and

Elisabeth Jacquet de la Guerre. The tragédie en musique grew out of a courtly and noble appreciation for simplicity, combined with a delight in visual opulence. It would be foolish to read too much into only one half of the genre's name.

3. Lully's orchestra

Jean-Baptiste Lully, *surintendant de la musique* for Louis XIV, had been credited with major innovations in musical composition. He was the first to inaugurate the real French tradition of opera, he composed music for the court, theater, and chapel at Versailles, and he was also a dancing master. His music became so popular in France that it was transcribed for performance on the newly popular harpsichord and preserved in the manuscripts of even the most dignified and original of composers for that instrument (namely, Jean-Henry d'Anglebert, harpsichordist to the king, 1662-1691). But one of the lasting imprints Lully veritably made on the larger European musical community was the establishment of a certain regular pattern of instrumentation in his works, instrumentation that corresponded to the preexisting royal institutions at the court. Catherine Wood summarizes the forces available to Lully succinctly: two groups of strings, plus woodwinds. The strings were divided into the *grand chœur* and *petit chœur*, corresponding generally to the "vingt-quatre violons du roi" and the "petits violons du roi." The grand chœur consisted of many registers of violin instruments: dessus de violon, haute-contre de violon, taille de violon, quinte de violon, and basse de violon. In contrast, the petit chœur contained only the best players, and they were often asked to play the three-part ritornellos that open scenes in tragédie en musique. At his disposal as well were the various woodwind instruments available at court: flûtes (at the time, this signified recorders), hautbois (which could have meant shwams or oboes), bassoon, horn, trumpet, and percussion.

Lully was the first to integrate all of these instruments into a single performing force. Prior to his compositions, and even, to some extent, contemporary with them, the winds and brass were considered of too rough a quality to be included in chapel and chamber compositions. They were part of the music for the "écurie," or the stables—they were for outdoor performances. To some extent, we know about this particular institution because of the manuscript MUS 1163. This manuscript contains pieces for the écurie, including at least 91 marches for oboe and drum, 4 horn calls, 2 trumpet fanfares, and an unusual piece called the *Carousel de Monseigneur*, from 1686. This piece includes parts for four oboes, trumpets, and percussion. The manuscript was compiled by Philidor, who was known to have played percussion at the court. Susan Sandman's article describing the manuscript and its contents makes mention of the fact that the "fifres and tambours" were also an ensemble associated with the écurie. Although this group had a military association, by the time of Louis XIV's reign, it was charged with more ceremonial roles, including daily performances at court.

If the institutions of music-making at Versailles were strictly rigid in the time before Lully's appointment as court composer, when Lully began integrating all of the instruments into his stage compositions, he did so in such a way as to maintain the old associations. This means that oboes and shwams carried a rustic association. Trumpets were militaristic, as were drums, which could also inspire fear. Just as Lully had converted the best players from the vingt-quatre violons du

roi—a somewhat ad hoc group, from contemporary accounts—into the petits violons du roi, he created the grand and petit chœurs to maintain the distinction between skilled and more amateur violinists.

Caroline Wood has described Lully's orchestra as fulfilling five functions: (1) introduction of singers (2) support of voices, (3) characterization of individuals (3) creation particular atmosphere, (4) local color, and (5) the establishment of textures. In some cases, especially at the performance of ballets during summer divertissements at Versailles, instrumentalists were required to be on stage. For example, performances of the 1668 ballet *Le Carnaval* have left traces of the set design, which was completed by audience chairs arranged all around the stage. For this ballet, as for many others, perhaps, the instrumentalists remained visible throughout the performance. Rebecca Harris-Warrick has noted that in some extraordinary cases it seems as though the members of Lully's orchestra would even have been expected to move around onstage while not playing.

In contrast to Lully's orchestra, Marc-Antoine Charpentier's orchestra was defined less by the royal institutions of performers and more by the forces he would have had available to him for a given work. It has been remarked that Charpentier's orchestration was characteristically French, despite him having studied with Carissimi; similarly to Lully, he employs wind instruments for special effects, such as to demonstrate contrast between Médée and Carsus in the third act of *Médée*. However, Charpentier's orchestration presents more of a challenge to musicologists (and, eventually, performers interested in restoring works) because his manuscripts rarely give precise instrumentation. It is well known that individual players frequently played more than one instrument, and in some cases, it seems that they would have been expected to do so within a given piece. Additionally, Charpentier's tragédie en musique *David et Jonathas* was left practically unorchestrated, such that only contextual clues could tell a musician what might have been appropriate stylistically speaking.

Lully's orchestra depended upon the favor he obtained from the king. Since he was able, from a young age, to earn the king's trust in almost all things (Cowart has investigated the troubling nature of this favor in contrast the Molière's personal struggles with the king), Lully was able to obtain the performing forces he needed for any composition. He was able to use winds for supernatural effects, strings for their ability, and drums for conveying overwhelming force. Lully's relationship with Louis granted him the privilege to expand the notion of the orchestra.

Classical Symphony

1. Which is more consequential for the listener: form or rhetoric?

This question supposes one notion that cannot be maintained for any music: the assumption of a single listener. This is especially the case for the classical symphony, the most public and large-scale form of music at a time that knew music as an important part of a regular social and cultural life. Stephen Rumph has published the most recent work on the ever-expanding field of musical meaning and "the listener," and in his book *Mozart and Enlightenment Semiotics*, he establishes the principle that the analytical tools with which we approach music differ drastically according to the repertory. He gives as examples the fact that we don't go looking for word painting in Bach's music. Rumph asserts that in the 18th century, composers approached music with the aim of

intelligibility in mind. For composers and listeners alike, the idea that art express something—that its viewers, listeners, and readers can understand—was of central importance. Rumph reports on Condillac’s theory of expression and readability, as well as on Lecerf’s dramatic dialogue. For Rumph, form is rhetoric, a notion he demonstrates within Mozart’s symphonic repertory with reference to his Symphony No. 40 in g minor, K. 550. This symphony, already somewhat strange for being in the minor mode, opens with a descending half step that is given without any context. Rumph argues that the threefold repetition of this chromatic sigh recalls Cherubini’s famous aria “Voi che sapete,” which likewise has three half-step sighs. Over the course of the first movement, the chromatic interval is eventually given the time it needs to be properly expressed. Belonging to the mode of pathos, a half step needs to be expressed slowly, as would befit an expression of grief. Rumph characterizes this movement as not expressing anything in particular other than the act of forming a thought into communicative language. Rumph contends that eighteenth-century listeners would have come to understand this notion through the continuation of the piece: its answers, as is true of many classical pieces, are not given straightaway at the beginning but rather take time to develop.

The notion that form unfolds through time is not dissimilar to discussions of oration and the structure of discourse that were widespread during the 18th century. Elaine Sisman has taken note, for example, of Forkel’s mapping of the parts of a sonata form movement onto the six stages of an oration: *Exordium*, *Narratio*, *Paritio*, *Confutatio*, *Confirmatio*, *Peroratio*. She writes that although these elements can be seen to correspond to the statement of themes, the transition, development, retransition, recapitulation, and conclusion, since they refer principally to the unfolding of an argument over time (i.e. Beginning, Middle, and End), that they could just as easily be mapped onto other forms with results that are just as successful. Sisman herself finds the most successful appropriation of rhetorical categories to be their effect, either predicted or actual, on listeners aware of the conventions of form and musical style. She confronts the questions of convention and audience most strongly in her article on the “Prague” Symphony No. 38 in E-flat Major. The first movement of this symphony contains an unprecedented number of rhetorical devices that Leonard Ratner has called “topics.” These topics are of a musical nature, but in Ratner’s view they often refer to things not specifically to do with the concert setting, i.e. March, Minuet, Singing, Recitative, etc. Sisman’s qualm with the idea of topics is that they concern only one element of rhetoric, that is *dispositio*. For her, topics are deployed in a certain order, and they need to be dealt with in this order if one is to make sense of them. Sisman identifies all of the topics in this movement, demonstrating the overabundance of conflicting and confusing messages. She writes that it is helpful to think of this symphony in the context of the audience for whom it was composed and first performed—the Prague public that was so endeared to Mozart and that would warmly welcome *Don Giovanni* just a short time after the premiere of this symphony. Without thinking of *opera buffa* and the physical gestures involved in the performance of those works, Sisman contends, one might be overwhelmed by the physicality of the gestures in this symphony. She makes recourse to Mattheson’s treatise on performance, in which he mentions that the performer’s physical gestures contribute to the successful conveyance of emotions. Gestures, according to Mattheson, correspond to the rhetorical category of *pronunciatio*, the actual articulation of the ideas, which must be carried out in a manner that

accords well with their message. Thus, the form, content, and performance of the “Prague” symphony seem to be the nexus of meaning, which includes the actual audience, as well.

Melanie Lowe had published recently on the idea of the listener in the eighteenth century. She contends that the symphony was a genre for entertainment, and the principal goal of symphony composers was to please their audiences. She also investigates the notion of “meaning,” taking a (Stanley) Fishian stance that meaning is a constructed product of an interpretant’s interaction with both the text and the context in which the text is presented. In the case of eighteenth-century audiences, Lowe argues, listeners in the plural were very much empowered to find their own meanings in music, whether political, social, or personal. Lowe pushes the notion of individual listeners to its most logical—and yet radical—conclusion in her book when she offers three “hypothetical” hearings of Haydn’s symphony No. 88, commissioned for Paris. She contends that the symphony could well have been heard by both men and women, in Vienna, Austria, and London, from noble, popular, and merchant classes. Her listenings are cheeky, demonstrating that not all that we think of as formal excellence was necessarily thought to be such by its original audiences. She indicates that what she imagines would have been the most salient part of this symphony was its topics. For her imaginary count in Vienna, the “noise-killer” effect at the beginning of the symphony is a reminder to speak up so his acquaintances in the box can hear him, for the lower-class woman in Paris, the pastoral topic in the trio of the minuet is a reminder of how busy and complicated her life is in contrast to the rural peasants in the Provinces. All three listeners are put ill at ease by the military topic, since they all seem to have personal connections and incipient patriotic sentiments regarding the seriousness of military force. Such imaginative engagement was proposed but outright rejected by Charles Rosen who, in *Sonata Forms*, argued that since we could never know what individuals were hearing at the time, we can and should respond to what we hear and know now. I think that while the notion of imagined listening diaries (of the kind that music appreciation courses often ask from their students) is a very creative way to engage with a repertory and with the knowledge of cultural contexts, it seems also like a dead end. By pointing out the genuinely popular nature of the classical symphony’s original audience, and even asserting that one of its most characteristic features likely served only their desire for entertainment, the notion itself completes its whole task. I can barely imagine anyone else providing more readings of symphonies that would provide new light into their nature. What the notion does is attempt to destabilize the hegemony of composer and score-based studies within musicology, acting as a vocal minority defending the performative and received nature of music. In terms of answers to the question whether form or rhetoric was more consequential for the (eighteenth-century) listener, however, I can think of no more exhaustive answer than Lowe’s book, *Pleasure and Meaning in the Classical Symphony*.

If the listeners we are interested in are not the popular attendees of society concerts, however, but are rather the intellectuals who approached music from a philosophical standpoint, the answer to the question can no doubt be that rhetoric was the more important element. For aesthetic theorists such as Georg Sulzer, it was clear that music was meant to conform to notions of beauty that could be attained through rhetoric. Similarly, for Mattheson, rhetoric was the secret weapon for music’s effectiveness. According to Sisman, Mattheson has written, “If music is to serve God and the virtues, and the virtues are to be approached in the Cartesian manner by

means of the passions, then the arousal of affects is to be the means and ends of music.” The arousal of affects is not likely to be done through form, but rather through the spirited and clever delivery.

Similarly, in the last decade of the eighteenth-century and into the first two of the nineteenth, philosophers became increasingly concerned with music’s function. If the Enlightenment precluded the function being the service of God, at least music could serve the sublime, or the infinite, as postulated by Kant. It was common for writers to refer to music as relating to rhetorical devices, according to Bonds, because many aesthetic philosophers were not musicians. Even newspaper critics seemed to give little concern to specific details of pieces, including even titles and dates of performances. Their account of musical features is scant, but their discussion of the effects of music is lofty. For critics, the form of music was barely perceptible—they held that music could express the infinite, and I would wager that a standard definition of sonata form would have given ETA Hoffmann a new and drastically less expansive view of music.

The preceding discussion is not meant to discount the importance of form for some listeners, even—and especially—those in the 18th c. Although formal organization does not refer only to harmonic plans, in the last fifty years, the harmonic structure of sonata form has become an important discussion point for musicologists and music theorists. Leonard Ratner first proposed a call to order within descriptions and analysis of sonata form movements because of what he saw to be the overwhelming favor bestowed upon thematic considerations in such analysis to the detriment of formal investigation. In “Harmonic Aspects of Classic Form,” Ratner surveyed 18th- and 19th-c. theorists including Koch, Momigny, Kollman, and A.B. Marx in order to establish the contemporaneity of the harmonic element of formal organization in sonata form movements. In this article, Marx is the straw-man whose insistence on contrasting thematic character demonstrates just what was least important in Classic style. What Ratner holds to be essential is the contrast of keys in the exposition, a drama that is heightened during the tonally unstable development, and is then triumphantly restored in the recapitulation in which material that had been presented in the dominant now made an appearance in the tonic. In *Classic Music*, Ratner characterizes this process as the confirmation of a “foregone conclusion,” that the tonic would be reestablished as preeminent.

Form concerns other elements than harmony, and William Caplin’s recent theory of formal functions also serves to enlighten us on the structuring of sonata form movements. Caplin believes that a hierarchical structure supports sonata form, and that individual segments of music can easily be identified as fulfilling a given, expected function. In this way, his theory of beginning, middle, and end functions faintly recalls Sisman’s criticism of Forkel’s attributing of rhetorical categories of opening, continuing, and closing to sonata form movements. In outlining his theory, Caplin is not concerned with comparisons between music and other arts, unlike those many aesthetic philosophers whose writings have been taken as evidence that music was expected to fulfill certain functional roles.

Other writers have attempted to bridge the gap between formalist analysis of music and the associative mapping of extramusical functions or meanings. David Schroeder and James Webster come to mind. Schroeder, in his book *Haydn and the Enlightenment*, has postulated that

the Enlightenment constituted a major social and epistemological change in Europe, and that Haydn himself was poised to receive its new ideas and engage with them as his own. For Schroeder, Haydn's Paris symphonies present the clearest examples of the composer's reckoning with principles with equality, tolerance, and intelligibility. His first Parisian symphony (at least in terms of chronology of composition), No. 83 in g minor presents a good example of the tolerance and formal processes Schroeder presents. In the first movement of this symphony, the "problem" is expressed in the first two measures: the outline of a tonic triad is succeeded by the fourth scale degree, which thwarts the satisfying return to the tonic, either grounded on the starting pitch or more expansive at the top of the octave. This problem is not resolved, according to Schroeder, until $\frac{3}{4}$ of the way through the piece, in the recapitulation, where the violins complete the triad with the tonic note. In their resolution of the tension, they actually recall a parallel moment in the exposition, articulated by the oboes, that had passed unnoticed because of texture. Schroeder contends that the expression of Enlightenment values of tolerance, balance, and equality could be found within Haydn's music, and in his analyses he makes reference to both large-scale form and local articulations of detail. He theorized that meaning in the classical period resided within an "equipoise of tonal, melodic, motivic, rhythmic, and metric aspects and that any theory that creates a hierarchy of these will miss the spirit of the music." Thus, for the sensitive listener, it seems that both form and rhetoric were of the utmost importance. Perhaps casual listeners in the 18th-c. were more likely to grasp the surface rhetorical devices (especially topics), but that does not preclude others from finding satisfaction in the completion of tonal schemes, the momentary confusion of direction, and the eventual humor that some have found to be characteristic of Haydn's style. Indeed, as rhetoric itself implies a certain measure of form, it seems as though the two could not reasonably be separated for any listening subject.

2. Anxieties of Influence?

Symphonic composition in the 18th century was something of a popularity game. Melanie Lowe has demonstrated, for example, that the symphony was primarily a genre destined for use as entertainment, and the success of a composer depended on his ability to create works that spoke meaningfully to the audience. We can witness that during its half-century long rise to prominence, the symphony exhibits signs of the personal imprints left on it by the composers who practiced it. These composers felt the desire to impress audiences and best their competitors, so there was certainly a degree of emulation, borrowings of style, and adaptation of musical devices.

In the earliest stages of development of the symphony, we do not speak of "anxiety of influence" as much as we do of the notion of stylistic transfer. The period from 1740-1750 demonstrates fewer strong individual actors and more of the notion of "schools." Although Sammartini, for example, has been singled out for the autonomy of his *sinfonias* from the operatic milieu of their performance, he is still characterized as a representative of the "Italian" school. Likewise, J.C. Bach and C.P.E. Bach are taken to represent North Germany, and a whole list of composers including Cannabich and members of the Stamitz family all collectively represent the Mannheim style. The one composer of this symphonic pre-history whose works may have weighted the conscience of our two main protagonists in the story of "anxiety of influence" is

Michael Haydn, whose works were popular in Vienna. Mozart is known to have copied some of these, as Peter Brown has demonstrated.

Although Mozart now knows much more widespread recognition than his older contemporary, Haydn, at the time of their maturity, Haydn was by far and away more popular and successful than Mozart. For example, when the Comte d'Ogny and the Chevalier Joseph de Boulogne de Saint George commissioned the "Paris" symphonies from Haydn, they offered 25 louis d'or per symphony. In contrast, Mozart received only 5 louis d'or for his Paris symphony, K. 297. Additionally, Haydn was the loyal "servant" of the Esterházy court for over 50 years, a privilege that signaled his popularity with court audiences and his sympathetic relations with the Prince Paul Anton. Mozart never had such stable employment and thus probably felt some pressure to create even grander works than those by Haydn. Perhaps the mere fact that Haydn composed such a huge number of symphonies may have made Mozart a bit less sure of himself—when he had the opportunity to fulfill a symphonic commission, he did not have nearly as much practice as Haydn did.

There is, however, also some reason to believe that Haydn would have felt threatened by the rising star from Salzburg. Although there is no documented evidence that Mozart and Haydn ever met, there is some belief that they may have crossed paths in the early 1780s. Haydn was certainly interested in Mozart's symphonic music, and Malcolm Cole has suggested that Haydn took a page out of Mozart's book in composing rondo finales for his symphonies.

Yet the fact remains that, Mozart's last three symphonies aside, Haydn's 100 symphonies were taken as the paradigm of form at the time, and his ability to distort the expected form and general symphonic procedure made him a hit with concert audiences. Mozart is known to have copied the incipit from the presto of Haydn's symphony No. 75, which begins with a chromatic ascent, D-D#-E. Mozart worked this passage into the overture to *Don Giovanni*, and James Webster has argued that that whole symphony was the most pristine example of classical symphonic form, including contrast, variation, repetition, and humor.

Nowhere has Haydn's influence on Mozart been perceived more than in the collection of Mozart's last three symphonies, No. 39 in EbM, No. 40 in gm, and No. 41 in CM. This collection was likely composed with a view of performances in Paris, as Haydn had secured in the same era for his own symphonies. David Wyn Jones has suggested that Mozart had hopes of earning money through the publication of these symphonies and that the plans fell through at the last moment, since symphonies were not an easily marketable genre to the music-buying public, who would have preferred chamber works. Reasons for the belief that in these symphonies Mozart was channeling Haydn and hoping to extend and best him include the teleological organization of them. The idea of a three-symphony collection that contains symphonies that become progressively grand was even a larger display of compositional ability than Haydn's composition of collections of three-symphony cycles in themselves. Mozart added increasingly high levels of drama and organization into these symphonies, climaxing with the most famous and most transcendent 'Jupiter' Symphony in CM. Although Elaine Sisman's claims that this symphony itself moved the closest that instrumental music had yet done to the expression of the sublime have been challenged by Simon Keefe and Peter Brown who have more down-to-earth theories about the work's potential meaning, the central notion of her argument, that the CM symphony

expresses in its mastery of the fugal topic an apotheosis of instrumental music is still an attractive one, especially in view of the “anxiety of influence” and the need to shake all previous examples of symphonic form. Although some of Haydn’s symphonic finales include fugal sections, none attains anywhere near the synthesis found in the ‘Jupiter’ finale, wherein the five themes of the movement come together in a fugal conclusion. The grandeur of the fugue is perhaps counter-intuitively heightened by the reintroduction of the brass chorale in the coda, at m. 388—their theme recalls the simpler texture of the earlier homophonic brass fanfare interjections.

Again, Elaine Sisman has called the ‘Jupiter’ finale a representation of the sublime, what was sure to be an important aesthetic goal of the time. She claims that Quintilian’s description of the sublime was often quoted at the time. His definition consists of five parts: (1) the ability to form grand conceptions, (2) stimulus from powerful and inspired emotions, (3) the appropriate use of figurative language, (4) noble diction and imagery, and (5) the assembly of words into speech that communicates elevated and lofty sentiments. And yet, the same movement can be read, as has been done, in less lofty terms, that is in the context of the ongoing offense against the Turks (this is Peter Brown’s interpretation) and as a display of dramatic dialogue (Simon Keefe would have it this way). In the various hermeneutic readings of the symphony, the tradition of the CM military fanfare has been raised, the notion of the CDFE chant theme, that would have been strongly associated with Alleluias, has been addressed, and contemporary theories relating fugue to conversation have also been parsed. But interestingly, no truly musical approach has posited correspondences between the ‘Jupiter’ Symphony (or any of Mozart’s last three symphonies) with any particular symphony by Haydn, other than that the keys are emblematic of Haydn’s most successful Parisian symphonies.

In reality, the musical evidence for the “anxiety of influence” could not be more difficult to pin down. The anxiety barely seems to have been there. But modern musicologist continually attempt to distinguish Haydn’s music from Mozart’s, as if they themselves were the ones with the anxiety. Wallace Berry noted in 1960, for example, that the textbook definition of sonata form was based solely on Mozart’s use of it, and that the layout should be refined or expanded in order to encompass Haydn’s contributions as well. I would argue that the whole cottage industry of locating instances of Haydn’s humor has been the product of a certain kind of scholarly anxiety, as well. It seems that when Triest first commented that Haydn demonstrated “humor” in his music, a term that he felt was not fully translated by the German word “laune,” he created a critical legacy that has been hard to avoid in latter-day works. Gretchen Wheelock struggles with the notion of humor in Haydn’s music because the composer seems to never have referenced jokes or jest in any of his writings on music or in any letters to friends. For Wheelock, the humor resides in the reception of works, in the way that audiences “get” the formal jokes that seem so clearly to be embedded in the music. For Scott Burnham, as well, humor seems to be a defining element of Haydn’s music, and something that serves to definitively distinguish it from Mozart’s. When Burnham describes the formal joke in the finale to Symphony No. 102 in B-flat major, he makes much of Haydn’s repurposing of harmonic functions. He writes that the instigation of the recapitulation, four-measures early, on F Major suddenly shifts that tonality’s function from the mediant of d minor, which had been set up as the dominant minor of the surprise key AM in the development, to the dominant of B-flat major, the very harmony needed at that moment.

Burnham characterizes this as “the trivialization of the means of profiling” and the “means of profiling the trivial.” Yet Burnham reveals his anxiety related to writing about Haydn in the conclusion of his article in the *Cambridge Companion to Haydn*. There he admits that Haydn was never known to produce the ravishing excess of beautiful melodies that we associate with Mozart. Too bad for him, since “the ability to form grand conceptions” was an important element of the rhetoric of the sublime in the 18th century! Rather, Burnham contends, Haydn gets the door prize of being recognized for his intelligence. What great art is built on intelligence more than on sense and emotion? Of course, in order to be great, art should also be intelligently composed. But to compare Mozart and Haydn so starkly in a paratactic juxtaposition seems not only unfair to Haydn but also out of place in an article that purportedly investigated his humor.

If there is any anxiety of influence to be found in the classical symphony, it has maybe been uncovered by Carl Schachter in his article “Mozart’s Last and Beethoven’s First.” In this article, Schachter identifies the highly unusual pattern of modulations in the first movement of Mozart’s ‘Jupiter’ Symphony and demonstrates that the same pattern is found in Beethoven’s symphony, albeit in a less original fashion. The argument becomes even more convincing when the texture of the opening of the two symphonies is taken into account—the same ruffling in the lower register can be heard. Perhaps the “anxiety of influence” was more of a concern for later composers who were brought up with the ideal of unique subjectivity. For Haydn and Mozart, although direct comparison of their music has rarely been the topic of scholarly work, the “anxiety” seems to have been in more practical concerns than in the aesthetic appeal of individual compositions.