
Letters to the Editor

From Richard Derby

I have just read Robert Reilly's article 'The Recovery of Modern Music: George Rochberg in Conversation' in *Tempo* No.219. In interview, Mr Rochberg says that his composition students were once unable to sing the opening tune from Schoenberg's Fourth Quartet from memory. He goes on to say 'The poor kids couldn't remember Schoenberg's tone row! Serialism is the denial of memory. You can't internalize it; you can't vocalize it; it can't live in you.'

I have sung the opening of Schoenberg's Fourth Quartet from memory more than once, in public. Substantial passages from it sometimes 'play' themselves in my head as spontaneous musical expressions. Contrary to Mr Rochberg's assertion, it is possible to sing Schoenberg, to comprehend and remember the mutual relationships of the pitches and intervals, and to hear it for what it is: real music, not an aesthetic archetype.

Perhaps not everyone has the musical ability to appreciate the beauty of Schoenberg's atonal music (just as many may not have the musical ability to appreciate the beauty of Beethoven's, Schubert's, or Brahms's tonal music), but that is their misfortune and not the inevitable recognition of an artistic absolute. Surely we can move our discourse beyond simplistically equating 'atonality' with 'ugliness' and 'tonality' with 'beauty'.

18922 Jane Circle
Santa Ana
California 92705

From Karl Miller

In the introduction to his interview with George Rochberg (*Tempo*, January 2002) Robert R. Reilly writes, 'If it is now safe to return to the concert halls, it is largely because Rochberg's courage helped to free the next generation of composers from the serial straightjacket to write music that was once again comprehensible to audiences.' It is not my intention to diminish the contributions of Mr. Rochberg, for I believe he is one of great creative musicians of our time. However, reading this I wondered to myself, is Mr. Reilly so unaware of the many composers

who never abandoned tonality? Further, is he suggesting that composers like Penderecki, Blackwood, *et al* would never have turned to tonality were it not for Rochberg's creative choices? Mr. Reilly's rhetoric reminds me of the myopic hyperbole of Charles Wuorinen when he wrote, 'But while the tonal system, in an atrophied or vestigial form, is still used today in popular and commercial music, and even occasionally in the works of backward-looking serious composers, it is no longer employed by serious composers of the mainstream. It has been replaced by the 12-tone system' (*Simple Composition*, New York: Longman Press, 1979).

Further, is Mr. Reilly suggesting that 12-tone music is incomprehensible to audiences? I would guess that it might depend upon the listener, for there are those who believe they comprehend 12-tone music. Finally, as to his statement, 'It is now safe to return to the concert halls' Why would it ever be unsafe? If one finds some aspects of modern music a threat to their safety, why worry, for 12-tone music is, relatively speaking, rarely performed. On the other hand, is 12-tone music the problem or is the problem with the expectation of the audience? Reflecting on that notion I am reminded of a quote from Serge Koussevitzky. During a speech he commented on the impact of the mass media on the art of music. 'This spreading of music in the masses, at too rapid a pace, resulted in a profound misconception of music as a means of entertainment and enjoyment to be passively consumed by the listener.' (1947). If an audience feels 'unsafe', I cannot help but wonder if perhaps their expectations are a significant part of the equation.

(lyaa071@uts.cc.utexas.edu)

From Halli Cauthery

In his substantial article 'The True Relationship' (*Tempo* 219), Mark Doran mentions in passing the thematic and sub-thematic connections in *Verklärte Nacht* proposed by Andrew Porter, and points out merely that he finds 'not all of them convincing'. No doubt he is being charitable – and quite reasonably: Porter's article has its creditable aspects, especially considering its date

(1957) and the anti-Schoenbergian climate in which it was written. Nevertheless, the analytic observations in question (in contrast to Mr Doran's own) are so problematic that it is surely worth discussing them in more detail.

The thematic material which Porter gathers together is found in his Exx.2, 3 and 4 (see p.394 of *Chamber Music*, ed. Alec Robertson):

Ex. 2: *Schr langsam*, *pp immer leise*. Musical notation showing a melodic line with a descending sequence of notes.

Ex. 3: (a) *Etwas bewegter*, (b). Musical notation showing two variations of a motif.

Ex. 4: *pp*. Musical notation showing a melodic line with a descending sequence of notes.

Immediately, one notices that the fourth note of Ex.3(b) and the corresponding note in the following bar are shown as C natural instead of B flat. This error (uncorrected in the various reprints) then makes its way into Porter's analytic diagram (Ex.6), where the misquoted motif is transposed in order to show its supposed relationship with the other material: see the first of the two staves labelled 'Ex.3(b) trans.', given below:

Ex. 6: Analytic diagram showing Ex. 3(a), Ex. 3(b) trans., Ex. 2, Ex. 4 trans., and Ex. 3(b) trans. with vertical lines indicating relationships between notes.

As will be seen, with the G erroneously shown as A, Porter must notate the preceding F sharp as a G flat (ouch!) in order to have access to a note on the staff's second line which (if the accidental is then disregarded ...) can be held to relate to the G in his Ex.3(a); had the motif been copied accurately, this enharmonic manipulation would not have been necessary (though there would then have been a left-over F# to deal with!).

In addition, one notes the treatment of the C's and C#'s with which four of the extracts end. Not only are we again expected to ignore accidentals (Ex.3(a) and Ex.4 trans.), but we must allow another inappropriate enharmonic shift in order to obtain a C# from what would correctly be a Db (compare Ex.4 trans. with Ex.4).

And then there is the line deriving from the

original Ex.2. Porter claims that the 'diverse themes' are 'developments from the basic shape of Ex.2' – yet to obtain a seven-note descent down to the desired C he must not only reach forward to the shape as it appears in bb.6-7 (shown in the second section of the original Ex.2, though with the opening semiquaver erroneously doubled in length), but also ignore the uppermost voice of the passage in favour of that which doubles it at the third below!

correctly:

Corrected musical notation showing three staves with a descending sequence of notes.

As for the relationship demonstrated between Ex.4 trans. and the second Ex.3(b) trans., one readily admits its reality. On the other hand, given that the two figures are intervallically identical and rhythmically highly similar, the discovery of their relationship hardly qualifies as an act of analysis.

One would not be making a meal of this decades-old example were it not for the fact that such unconvincing attempts have tended to bring

the search for sub-thematic unity into something approaching disrepute; happily, Mr Doran's own examples remind us that this remains a valuable and thought-provoking area of enquiry.

43 Belvedere Rd,
Upper Norwood,
London SE19 2HJ

From Donna Marie Rolling-Proctor

I was fascinated to see in a recent issue, an article by Mark Doran ("The 'True Relationship': Schoenberg's Analysis of 'Unity' in the Op. 9 Kammer-sinfonie", *Tempo* 219) which referenced Hans Keller's 'creative principle of reversed and postponed antecedents and consequents'.

A long-time student of Keller's work, I have noticed that his analytic writings seem to contain no examples of this structural principle from the post-classical repertoire.

Considering that the astute Mr. Doran has revealed one in a work at the borders of atonality, I am wondering if he has discovered additional 20th-century examples which also merit recognition.

4126 Southwest Freeway
Suite # 1616
Houston, TX 77027
U.S.A.

Mark Doran replies:

It is very gratifying to find that recent writings of mine have elicited such thoughtful and indeed



thought-provoking reactions. First, of course, I must thank David Matthews for his substantial response (in *Tempo* 219, pp.29-30) to my suggestion (see *Tempo* 218, p.55) that he produce 'as tonal an analysis as his ear will permit' of the end of Schoenberg's *A Survivor from Warsaw*. That suggestion, not in any sense mischievous, was in fact made in the aftermath of an evening when both myself and a gifted musical friend had looked up and exclaimed 'C major!' upon hearing a tape of the *Survivor*'s final bars; I hope it pleases Mr Matthews as much as it does me to find that our respective analyses are identical in all essential respects.

Inevitably, his extra-analytic assertion that the hexachord-supplying woodwind tremolando in b.98 is 'musically somewhat questionable' has me somewhat bothered – but then, it would seem to have him bothered too: in his very next sentence he points out that 'the slight tonal ambiguity' it produces 'is in any case right for the piece!' In such happily frictionless circumstances I am loath to risk actual disagreement by launching into a disquisition on why we ought not to be surprised that Schoenberg – as Mr Matthews's final paragraph reminds us – never quite grasped in theoretical terms all that he is now seen to have been doing creatively; but on this, too, there would probably be agreement that composers whose music is more sophisticated than they think it is are infinitely to be preferred over those who have it the other way around. In short, it seems that Mr Matthews and I will have to agree to agree.

I am also in complete agreement with Halli Cauthery's criticisms of Andrew Porter's *Verklärte Nacht* analysis: while I will confess to certain charitable feelings concerning Porter's worthwhile effort, it was principally considerations of space that kept a detailed discussion of its failings out of my article. Mr Cauthery, then, has pretty much done the job for me – though there are perhaps one or two points which could be added. Probably the most significant of these concerns the way Porter's Ex.4 actually omits the first three notes of the theme it purports to quote, starting instead with the upbeat to the theme's second full bar – and thus creating the impression that the figure originating in Ex. 3(b) has a more 'basic' significance within this new theme than its actual arrival as a 'decorative' embellishment of a different figure would tend to allow:

Having mentioned this, I should at once explain that I come not to bury Porter, but to praise him: it seems to me that in focusing, decades ago, upon these particular themes in preference to the work's numerous others he showed an intuitive awareness of their remarkable degree of interconnectedness – and stumbled merely in his attempt to define it analytically (which may well be the hardest task but is certainly not the most important). For my submission is that the (full) 'Ex.4' theme arises as, latently, a single-voice 'condensation' (with the different elements variously transposed) of the two-part idea shown in Ex.3(b), viz:

Ex. 3(b)
(corrected)
trans.

Ex. 4
(corrected)

To my knowledge this relationship has not been properly discerned before (compare my diagram with the appropriate parts of Porter's Ex.6 as reproduced by Mr Cauthery); but the existence of the extended contour-relation between the segments x and x' would seem to establish beyond reasonable doubt that Schoenberg's heart and brain were indeed engaged on the kind of operation I have indicated – and that Andrew Porter was at least on the right track.

Donna Marie Rolling-Proctor correctly reminds us of what is certainly a severe shortage, within Hans Keller's work, of non-classical examples of 'reversed and postponed antecedents and consequents'. As part of my own examination of the various elements of Keller's analytic and

theoretical legacy, I have myself found in later music a number of what would seem to be examples of this 'latent' organising principle. As it happens, though, I am strongly of the opinion that until Keller's own work on this topic is more familiar, the bulk of these examples should be kept away from public scrutiny: it would be most unfortunate if any musical or analytic inadequacy on my part were used as a stick with which to beat a thinker whose work still arouses resistance in many musicologists.

37 Madingley Road,
Cambridge CB3 0EL

BBC Symphony Orchestra

Leonard Slatkin Chief Conductor

Spring 2002

Thursday 4 April
7.30pm, Barbican Hall

ARVO PÄRT *Orient & Occident*
(UK premiere)

GLIÈRE *Symphony No. 3,*
'Ilya Muromets'

Martyn Brabbins conductor

Friday 19 April
7.30pm, Barbican Hall

TCHAIKOVSKY
Symphony No. 1,
'Winter Daydreams'
RACHMANINOV *The Bells*

Evgeny Svetlanov conductor
Elena Prokina soprano
Daniil Shtoda tenor
Sergei Leiferkus baritone
BBC Symphony Chorus

Thursday 30 May
7.30pm, Barbican Hall

SCHOENBERG
Variations for Orchestra
MAHLER
Das Lied von der Erde

Jiří Bělohlávek conductor
Petra Lang mezzo-soprano
Keith Lewis tenor

Friday 28 June 7.30pm,
Maida Vale Studios

FREE INVITATION CONCERT

JOHN BULLER *Proenca*
GEORGE NEWSON
Symphony No. 2
'Even to the Edge of Doom'
ANTHONY POWERS *Symphony*
No. 2 (world premiere)

Rumon Gamba conductor

Barbican Hall:
Tickets £8 £12 £16

To book tickets call Barbican Box Office
on 020 7638 8891

Maida Vale Studios:

For free tickets please call BBC Audience Services
on 020 8576 1227

barbican

Box Office
020 7638 8891 (bkg fee)
www.barbican.org.uk