

Danish Yearbook of Musicology

41 • 2017

© 2017 by the authors

*Danish Yearbook of Musicology* · Volume 41 · 2017

Dansk Årbog for Musikforskning

*Editors*

Michael Fjeldsøe · fjeldsoe@hum.ku.dk

Peter Hauge · ph@kb.dk

*Guest editors of the Carl Nielsen articles*

Daniel M. Grimley · daniel.grimley@music.ox.ac.uk

Christopher Tarrant · christopher.tarrant@anglia.ac.uk

*Editorial Board*

Lars Ole Bonde, *University of Aalborg*; Peter Woetmann Christoffersen, *University of Copenhagen*; Bengt Edlund, *Lund University*; Daniel M. Grimley, *University of Oxford*; Lars Lilliestam, *Göteborg University*; Morten Michelsen, *University of Copenhagen*; Steen Kaargaard Nielsen, *University of Aarhus*; Siegfried Oechsle, *Christian-Albrechts-Universität, Kiel*; Nils Holger Petersen, *University of Copenhagen*; Søren Møller Sørensen, *University of Copenhagen*

*Production*

Hans Mathiasen

*Address*

c/o Department of Arts and Cultural Studies, Section of Musicology,  
University of Copenhagen, Karen Blixens Vej 1, DK-2300 København S

Each volume of *Danish Yearbook of Musicology* is published continuously in sections:

- 1 · Articles
- 2 · Reviews
- 3 · Bibliography
- 4 · Reports · Editorial

Published with support from the *Danish Council for Independent Research* | *Humanities*.

ISBN 978-87-88328-32-5 (volume 41); ISSN 2245-4969 (online edition)

*Danish Yearbook of Musicology* is a peer-reviewed journal published by the Danish Musicological Society on <http://www.dym.dk/>

## Conference

### The Ninth European Music Analysis Conference, Strasbourg, June–July 2017

The Ninth European Music Analysis Conference (EuroMAC 9) took place in Strasbourg from 28 June to 1 July, 2017. Let it be said from the beginning of this report: The conference was an extremely well-organized, well-visited and in many ways welcome event in the field of music theory and analysis.

EuroMAC is a collaboration of music theoretical and analytical societies based in several European countries. This year's EuroMAC was a collaboration between *Gesellschaft für Musiktheorie* (GMTH), *Gruppo Analisi e Teoria musicale* (GATM), *Polskie Towarzystwo Analizy Muzycznej* (PTAM), *Société belge d'analyse musicale* (SBAM), *Society for Music Analysis* (SMA), *Russian Society for the Theory of Music* (OTM), *Vereniging voor Muziektheorie* (VvM) and, of course, *Société française d'analyse musicale* (SFAM), the latter being the main organizers of the event together with *Groupe de recherches expérimentales sur l'acte musical* (GREAM) of the University of Strasbourg. The majority of speakers were from Europe and North America, but the remaining came from all over the world.

Xavier Hascher and Nathalie Hérold opened the conference, touching upon the two themes that were stated in the conference's call for papers. Theme 1 was called 'Extrinsic issues, intrinsic challenges: What is the future for music analysis?', and theme 2, directly related to the research of GREAM, was called 'Music analysis and music in act'. As theme 1 had received most proposals they talked about this at some length. The 'extrinsic issues' were, amongst other things, concerned with the growing financial pressure on academics; a pressure that prioritizes research with immediate societal utility, thus questioning the necessity of music analysis as a discipline. The 'intrinsic challenges' addressed the extreme richness that characterizes the discipline in spite of the extrinsic issues: Do the myriad of methods, theories and philosophical standpoints from which we conduct our music analyses amount to a Babel Tower of irreconcilable approaches? How do we strengthen the discipline, when we are so diverse – is there, indeed, a unified discipline as such? These questions also entailed what seems to be the refrain for reflections on music analysis, namely the question of the relation between music analysis and music theory.

A few interesting statistics of the conference were also presented. No less than 77 per cent of the proposals had been accepted, of which a large part were authored by 'young researchers'. In their rather broad definition that meant anyone who was currently a Ph.D. student, had finished their degrees within the last five years, or who were

younger than 40. In an overall perspective, the high acceptance rate turned out to have both advantages and disadvantages. One positive aspect was that many young researchers had the opportunity to receive qualified and valuable feedback from established and experienced scholars – surely a good investment in ‘the future of music analysis’, as theme 1 addressed. However, with up to ten parallel sessions, the programme became immense and a bit confusing. As Hascher said at the closing recital, the quality of a conference can never exceed that of its papers. One did wonder, when looking through the 440-page programme book, whether the butter was spread too thin.

The contents of the papers were diverse: Plunges into the history of music theory stood alongside computational and experimental approaches; and well-established analytical methods – Schenkerian, Neo-Riemannian, sonata theoretical and form functional to name but a few of the most frequent – stood alongside methods that were new and scarcely named. The repertoire under consideration was equally varied and included classical, popular as well as non-western music. This report can hardly do justice to the entire EuroMAC, knowing that the total amount of parallel papers that we missed really adds up to several other conferences. Some highs and lows, however, shall be referred in the following.

The title of the session on ‘Modal and Tonal Organization in Polyphonic Compositions from the Late Middle Ages to the Early Baroque’ resembled many similar ones presented at many previous conferences. Likewise, the outset was well-known – but still very appropriate – in that some of the most important theoretical landmarks of the 1960–90s, namely the ones established by Edward Lowinsky, Carl Dahlhaus, Bernhard Meier and Harold Powers respectively, served as points of reference. As quite rightly described in the session’s heading, ‘the question whether Renaissance polyphonic compositions can be described as modal has been the subject of much controversy’, and even more rightly that ‘now that these disputes seem settled, the time is ripe for a reconsideration of the whole matter’ (p. 29).<sup>1</sup> Chaired and thematised by Nicolas Meeùs (SBAM-IREMus, Belgium), the session included three papers, and without going into any detail the outcome was predictable and meagre. It can come as no surprise that presentations spanning a period of more than two centuries can reveal nothing of real importance, and furthermore that it is – still – the modal-tonal theories and practices of the 17th century that constitute the real challenge for further research. The latter was addressed by Rudolf Rasch (Utrecht University) in his talk on ‘A Paradigm for Studying the Transition from Modality to Tonality in the Seventeenth Century’. Even though his presentation had the status as one of a few ‘semi-plenary talks’ and although he renamed it to ‘From Modes to Keys’, no real new insights were brought to light. The contents of his paper by and large resembled what can be read in Joel Lester’s enlightening presentation in *Between Modes and Keys. German Theory 1592–1802* (New York, 1989). Overall, the

1 All references relate to the programme book, which can be found at: <http://euromac2017.unistra.fr/wp-content/uploads/2017/06/Euromac-2017-Programme-Book.pdf>.

session was a disappointment regarding questions that still represent pertinent research areas. Perhaps the forthcoming book by Michael Dodds (University of North Carolina School of the Arts, US) – with a title lying close to that of Lester’s book – will bring this field in more prosperous directions. At least to some degree, Dodds’ paper on ‘A New Model for Modal Analysis in Baroque Music’ promised well.

Related to the tonalities-problems – and as tenacious as these – stand studies on the contrapuntal designs and details of the polyphonic corpuses of the 15th to 17th centuries. However, contrary to the aforementioned session, Alexander Morgan (L’université libre de Bruxelles), in his paper on ‘Suspension Theory: Codifying Late-15th-Century Ternary Suspensions and How their Use Changed in Later Repertoire’, addressed a question that actually seems solvable and manageable, at least up to a certain point. Focusing on the well-known fact that ‘almost all accounts of idiomatic dissonance treatment in period treatises as well as in modern textbooks discuss dissonance treatment exclusively in duple meter’ (p. 258), he presented the results of his analyses of suspensions in triple-meter contexts in various repertoires. Morgan’s pointing out that in 15th-century music, to name but one example, the suspensions almost always occur on beat two, seemed convincing, although the prevalence of e.g. hemiolas still needs to be taken into consideration.

Yet a session followed the thematic paths outlined above, but concerning a somewhat later period. Although each of the four papers gathered under the heading ‘Counterpoint and Composition in Europe during the 17th and 18th centuries’ merits a lengthy summary, only the key points will be mentioned. In his paper ‘Ein Mönch, zwei kurze Regeln und drei Stimmen zum Fundament: Untersuchungen zur Modellhaftigkeit von Cantionalsätzen und den daraus resultierenden Implikationen für deren Klanglichkeit’, Stefan Garthoff (Leipzig) presented a systematic, analytical model ‘zum Aufsuchen der Intervallschichtungen’ (p. 347) in the Cantionalsätze of Calvisius, Praetorius and Schein, among others, including impressive three-dimensional visualizations. In his paper on ‘Zacconi, Banchieri and the counterpoint species: reconstructing the *Klanglichkeit* of the *contrapunto compagnia*’, Florian Vogt (Musikhochschule Freiburg) put forward the hypothesis that the traditional concept of species counterpoint – especially from J.J. Fux’s renowned treatise *Gradus ad parnassum* (1725) and onwards – was preceded by a practice of improvised counterpoint, also to a certain degree functioning ‘species-like’. Two presentations centred on specific Russian issues. The first was Evgeny Vorobyov’s (Russia) paper on ‘Tonal Space in Terms of Practical and Theoretical Approaches in Westernised Choral Idiom in Russia from 1670s to mid-18th Century’, the focus of which was the concept of *Ton* in a handbook in Polish from c. 1675. Secondly, Natalia Plotnikova (Moscow State Tchaikovsky Conservatory, Russia) gave a paper ‘On the Technique of Canon in Russian Baroque Music (on the Example of Polychoral Works by Vasilii Titov)’. Supplementing the issues emphasized in the title of the paper, Plotnikova drew attention to the Russian composer and writer N. Diletsky’s treatise *Musikiyskaya Grammatika* (‘Music Grammar’, 1679), a work that Richard Taruskin in his *Oxford*

*History of Western Music* (2010) points out as the earliest to visualize the full circle of fifths. Diletsky's treatise remains till now untranslated, and the same goes for the Soviet musicologist Leo Mazel's 1937 monograph on Chopin's Fantasy op. 49 that Ellen Bakulina (University of North Texas, US) centred on in her paper, 'Exploring Linear-Analytical Elements in the Writings of Leo Mazel' (included in a session on 'Schenkerian, Riemannian, and Neo-Riemannian Theories'). Although these papers along with others document the continuing – and imperative – interest in and subsequent research into the music cultures of Russia, Central and Eastern Europe, they underline the problematic absence of accessible sources. Thus, a great need of translation to one of the more mainstream academic languages and subsequent publication of many theoretical works from diverse Eastern regions still remains.

Few presentations focused on music pedagogy. One exception – indeed an excellent one – was Meghan Naxer's (Kent State University, US) 'Choose your Own Sonata Form'. Opening with a figure showing a subway chart (!) and the statement that 'students are often only taught one primary template for Sonata Theory' (p. 388) – a literal experience of many teachers, I think – she extracted the different approaches to sonata form in the publications by Donald Francis Tovey, Leonard Ratner, Charles Rosen, William Caplin, and James Hepokoski and Warren Darcy. Beethoven's String Quartet op. 18, no. 4, and Piano Sonata op. 10, no. 3, were singled out as 'random samples'; and Naxer made a persuasive argument for a pedagogical approach that includes exposing 'students to a variety of different analytical techniques' aiming to help them 'in their daily tasks as musicians in multiple ways, including learning and memorizing repertoire, writing about music, and teaching music' (ibid.). What else can one hope for?

As is always the case at conferences some sessions are well attended but turn out somewhat disappointing, and vice versa. With the attendance of only five listeners, Per F. Broman's (Bowling Green State University, USA) interesting introduction to the spectacular Swedish composer and intellectual Jan W. Morthenson must be representative of the last category, regrettably.

Any music analytical conference that takes itself seriously should of course have a paper on the three opening bars from that one prelude to you-know-which-opera. John Koslovsky fulfilled this in his excellent paper '*Tristan* and the Act of Music Analysis: Conflicts, Limits, Potentialities'. Koslovsky compared the practically unknown analysis of Horst Scharschuch – a dualist successor of Hugo Riemann who explained the *Tristan* chord as a 'Doppelleittonklang' in 1963 – with the better-known analyses of William Mitchell (1967) and Jacques Chailley (1972). Koslovsky's comparisons, as well as his presentation of Scharschuch's forgotten analysis, were of value in themselves. The real intriguing aspect was, however, his focus on the 'broader historiographical and inter-textual network surrounding the history of analyzing *Tristan*' (p. 333) and his consequent invitation to understand music analysis as a social act that always reacts to – by including or excluding – other analyses. Unfortunately, this paper was also among the

less well attended, a shame when taking into account that Koslovsky's intertextual approach and his opening of 'dialogic space in music analysis' (ibid.) seem imperative in relation to the conference's theme 1.

One session promising to address theme 1 – specifically the question of music theory's babelization – was entitled 'Schenkerian, Riemannian, and Neo-Riemannian Theories'. The title is interesting in itself, in that it lists not only two theories (as is common in references to the well-known Schenker-Riemann controversy) but three, thus distinguishing Riemannian (functional) theories from Neo-Riemannian theories – and rightly so. In fact, due to the Riemann-reception throughout Europe as well as North America, this distinction can be further qualified: One can speak of Paleo-Riemannian theory – as it is somewhat jokingly called in Steven Rings' contribution to *The Oxford Handbook of Neo-Riemannian Music Theories* (2011) – when referring to Riemann's own writings (or other dualistic function theories close to Riemann's); one can speak of Neo-Riemannian theory when referring to the branch of theories applying David Lewin's 'transformational attitude' (Lewin 1987) in various more or less mathematical ways, as well as approaches focusing on parsimonious voice leading and *Tonnetz*-representations of musical space; and finally, one can speak of Post-Riemannian theories when referring to the many different *monistic* function theories that are influential to this day throughout Central Europe, Russia, Scandinavia and elsewhere. 'Post-Riemannian' was, curiously, the term that Ludwig Holtmeier used in his article 'The Reception of Hugo Riemann's Music Theory' (2011), even though this was published in the above-mentioned Handbook on *Neo-Riemannian* theories. The umbrella term 'Riemannian', then, covers not only these branches of harmonic and tonal theory, but also Riemann's thoughts on for example metrics and agogics and the reception of these, and is, consequently, rarely appropriate.

In its widely ranging approaches, the session bore witness to the advantages of such terminological distinctions. On the Neo-Riemannian side were Hei Yeung Lai's (The Chinese University of Hong Kong) transformational analysis of Alexander Goehr's piano sonata, Walter Nery's (University of São Paulo, Brazil) presentation of a Generalized Transformation Graph that mapped both major, minor, diminished and augmented triads in the same transformational network, and two papers discussing the potentials of a synthesis of Schenkerian and Neo-Riemannian theories (Hiroko Nishida, Kyushu University, Japan, and Yvonne Teo, University of Melbourne, Australia). On the Post-Riemannian – and very well-visited – side were Ellen Bakulina's above mentioned paper and Thomas Jul Kirkegaard-Larsen's (Aarhus University, Denmark) 'Analyzing Analyses: Towards a Reconciliation of Schenkerism and Riemannism'. Bakulina's paper showed elements in Leo Mazel's writings that are strikingly close to Schenkerian concepts of which Mazel had no knowledge. For example, Mazel created harmonic reductions akin to William Rothstein's imaginary continuo (Rothstein 1991). He also described that sonorities can be structurally retained 'as vaguely perceived pedal points', thus being close to Schenker's concept of prolongation and almost 'rephrasing' the idea of mental

retention. Kirkegaard-Larsen compared Schenkerian and Post-Riemannian analyses of Brahms' Intermezzo in B minor, op. 119, no. 1, arguing – in agreement with Koslovsky's aforementioned dialogic intertextualism – that a mediation and reconciliation of these two approaches to harmony and tonality must take as its starting point not the writings of Schenker and Riemann themselves (the Paleo-perspective, that is), but rather the actual analytical practices emanating in the two traditions (the Post-perspective). The proposed 'Functional-Schenkerian' analysis of the Intermezzo exemplified the two methods' ability to speak together despite frequent disputes on the relationship between chord and voice leading, specifically by demonstrating congruencies between the concealed motive uncovered by Allen Cadwallader (1982, 1983) and the tonal inflections and consequent B-minor/D-major ambiguity brought to the fore by Jens Rasmussen's (2011) Post-Riemannian functional analysis.

In an overall view, the session 'Schenkerian, Riemannian, and Neo-Riemannian Theories' was relevant, but the papers were so different in both method and scope that they did not interact very well. One reason for this may indeed be that it makes little sense to view (Post-)Riemannian and Neo-Riemannian theories as more or less the same. The conceptual differences and similarities between these two traditions need to be clarified before they can be discussed in tandem with the Schenkerian tradition.

Poundie Burstein (City University of New York, USA) gave a talk, 'Striking Approaches to Galant Recapitulations', that was as enlightening as it was amusing. He showed that in music of the Galant style, the chord directly preceding the recapitulation was not at all always the expected V; in fact, he showed examples of I, ii, iii, IV, V, vi, vii *and* the dominant of every single one of these serving as the final chord before the recapitulation and the return to the home key. The musical examples proving his argument were both surprising and with 'deep implications for understanding large-scale tonal structure not only for these specific pieces, but for Galant era sonata-form movements in general' (p. 194).

Many papers presented what were simply excellent analyses of musical works. Among these were Lauri Suurpää's (Sibelius Academy, University of the Arts Helsinki, Finland) convincing analysis of the arias 'Vedrommi intorno' and 'Il padre adorato' from Mozart's *Idomeneo*. Suurpää combined both Schenkerian, form functional, metrical and narrative perspectives in an analysis that, ultimately, showed one of the many fascinating ways in which text and musical structure interact. Another paper exploring text and music relations was Robert Snarrenberg's (Washington University in St. Louis, USA) analyses of Brahms' non-strophic settings of stanzaic poems in the lieder 'Nachklang' op. 59, no. 4, 'Eine gute, gute Nacht' op. 59, no. 6, and 'Verrat' op. 105, no. 5. It would have been interesting to hear Snarrenberg compare the above-mentioned 'Nachklang' with 'Regenlied' (WoO 23), since these are Brahms' non-strophic and strophic setting of the same poem, respectively ('Regentropfen aus den Bäumen' by Klaus Groth); however, this was unfortunately not the point in Snarrenberg's still very thought-provoking paper.



As a new thing for EuroMAC, a ‘Young Researcher’s Meeting’ and a ‘Career Forum’ was organized. Both arrangements aimed at engaging the participants in, for instance, discussions and dialogues on career development, international networks, and job opportunities in formats that ranged from workshops, short talks and stands with the different societies for music analysis and theory. One can only applaud this initiative and hope that it will continue to be a part of EuroMAC. Some of the formats, however, should probably be rethought and, for example, be taken out of the auditorium and into rooms that appeal more to dialogue, discussion and actual *workshop* than to passive listening.

One very uplifting event was the Meeting of the European Societies for Music Analysis and Theory; uplifting because the enthusiasm and engagement of the societies was tangible, and because several new music analytical and theoretical societies and initiatives were presented. Among these were the Polish society (PATM) and the Croatian Association of Music Theorists (CAMT), the latter actually being 20 years old, but only recently engaged in EuroMAC. Additionally, a potential but as yet unrealized Portuguese society for music theory and analysis was presented. Finally, Nicholas Meeùs presented what he called a Loch Ness monster – an old, recurring project that has often been suggested (for example at EuroMAC 8 in Leuven, 2014) but has not yet been completed, namely the creation of a permanent European committee for music analysis and music theory with representatives from each of the national societies. This committee would promote collaboration between the individual societies and make for an easier way to co-operate with the American Society for Music Theory (SMT), for example. Potentially, the committee could also help establishing music theoretical and analytical societies in countries that do not have one. Interestingly, it was mentioned here – and this was repeated in other parts of the meeting – that the absence of Scandinavian societies was surprising. Indeed, Scandinavia was very ill represented in EuroMAC as such.

All speakers were asked to contribute to an online volume of proceedings to be published in the future. Until then, interested readers may find pre-proceedings (extended abstracts) of all papers on the conference’s website: <http://euromac2017.unistra.fr/>.

The next EuroMAC will be organized mainly by the Russian Society for the Theory of Music (OTM) and will take place in 2020 at the Moscow Conservatory. As has already been stated, a vast amount of texts and treatises from Russia and Eastern European countries remains to be translated into one of the mainstream academic languages. It will be interesting to see whether the next EuroMAC will be an opportunity to gain a deeper insight into these more or less closed music theoretical traditions.

*Thomas Jul Kirkegaard-Larsen and Thomas Holme*

*The authors:*

Thomas Jul Kirkegaard-Larsen, Ph.D. fellow, School of Communication and Culture – Musicology, Aarhus University, Langelandsgade 139, DK-8000 Aarhus C · [thomasjkl@cc.au.dk](mailto:thomasjkl@cc.au.dk)

Thomas Holme, associate professor, Ph.D., School of Communication and Culture – Musicology, Aarhus University, Langelandsgade 139, DK-8000 Aarhus C · [musthh@cc.au.dk](mailto:musthh@cc.au.dk)