current musicology

spring 65

Austin Clarkson 
EDITOR

ASSOCIATE EDITORS:
Eleanor R. Kulleseid
Ira Lieberman
Maria Rika Maniates
Nancy E. Sartin
Susan Thiemann

Claire Winn Marshall 
EXECUTIVE SECRETARY

ASSISTANT EDITORS:
Lois Brenner
John Broman
Jamie Croy
Raymond Kennedy
Gordana Lazarevich
Ingram Marshall

Edward A. Lippman 
FACULTY ADVISOR

PUBLISHED
UNDER THE AEGIS OF
The Music Department
COLUMBIA UNIVERSITY
New York
CORRESPONDING EDITORS

Ervin J. Dunham
Joseph Dyer
Thomas R. Walker
Bonnie J. Blackburn
Barbara Hampton
Rose Rosengard
James Bossert
Henry Gibbons IV
Vivian Safowitz
David A. Sheldon
Rita Egger
Günter Massenkeil
Rodney S. Hall
Theodor Göllner
Lawrence Bennett
James Chamblee
John Carroll Collins
J.D. Bergsagel
Frank Traficante
Robert Freeman
Mark Lindley
Axel Helmer
Wesley M. Vos
Cecil B. Wilson
Betsy C. Farlow
Jay Holland
John G. Brawley
Hans Conradin

University of Arizona, Tucson, Ariz.
Boston University, Boston, Mass.
University of California, Berkeley, Calif.
University of Chicago, Chicago, Ill.
City College of New York, New York, N.Y.
Columbia University, New York, N.Y.
Cornell University, Ithaca, N.Y.
Harvard University, Cambridge, Mass.
University of Illinois, Urbana, Ill.
Indiana University, Bloomington, Ind.
Universität Innsbruck, Innsbruck, Austria
Johannes-Gutenberg-Universität, Mainz, Germany
University of Maryland, College Park, Md.
Universität München, München, Germany
New York University, New York, N.Y.
University of North Carolina, Chapel Hill, N.C.
North Texas State University, Denton, Texas
Oxford University, Oxford, England
University of Pittsburgh, Pittsburgh, Pa.
Princeton University, Princeton, N.J.
Queens College, Flushing, N.Y.
Uppsala Universitet, Stockholm, Sweden
Washington University, St. Louis, Mo.
Western Reserve University, Cleveland, Ohio
University of Wisconsin, Madison, Wis.
University of Wyoming, Laramie, Wyo.
Yale University, New Haven, Conn.
Universität Zürich, Zürich, Switzerland

Communications to corresponding editors should be addressed care of the music department of the university.

Copyright © 1965, Department of Music
Columbia University, New York
Printed in U.S.A.
contents

EVENTS

5 lectures and seminars
38 appointments
39 announcements

EDITORIAL

Austin Clarkson 41 Argument
Paul Henry Lang 45 In Remembrance Erich Hertzmann, 1902-1963
49 The sketches of Beethoven and Verdi: a radio interview with Erich Hertzmann

ARTICLES

Edward A. Lippman 55 What should musicology be?
Hendrik Van der Werf
The trouvere chansons as creations of a notationless musical culture
James McKinnon 69 The meaning of the patristic polemic against musical instruments
David A. Sheldon 83 The philosophy of Theodor Adorno
Alfred Mann 92 Report from Salzburg: the present state of Mozart research

DISSERTATIONS

Roger Kamien 95 Rita Benton
Nicolas Joseph Hüllmandel and French instrumental music in the second half of the 18th century
Peter Bergquist 97  Arthur Michael Daniels  
The *De musica libri septem* of Francisco de Salinas

Dika Newlin 100  Wallace C. McKenzie, Jr.  
The music of Anton Webern

Frank J. Gillis 104  Launcelot Allen Pyke, II  
*Jazz, 1920 to 1927: an analytical study*

Barbara Russano Hanning 105  Joseph Emilio Rotondi  
Literary and musical aspects of Roman opera, 1600-1650

William C. Holmes 111  Robert L. Weaver  
Florentine comic operas of the 17th century

Sirvart Poladian 114  Miriam Karpilow Whaples  
Exoticism in dramatic music, 1600-1800

118  dissertations from abroad

120  dissertations received for review

*BIBLIOGRAPHICA*

Articles concerning music in non-musical journals, 1949-1964
WHAT SHOULD MUSICOLOGY BE?

Edward A. Lippman

The recent book Musicology, written by Harrison, Palisca, and Hood, contains a valuable summary of the development and state of musical scholarship in the United States. The authors acquaint us with our tradition, make known our achievements, expose our failings, and come to grips with important problems of method and purpose. It has been apparent for some time that musicology would not easily take root in this country. The discipline has been expanding, but hardly flourishing, making its way, but winning few friends. At the 8th Congress of the International Musicological Society, which met at Columbia University in 1961, our success in the eyes of the world made it all too clear that we lacked recognition at home.

With the objectivity naturally possessed by an outsider, Harrison examines our dilemma with great discernment. He is appalled at our inability to secure publication both for monographs and for scholarly editions, and points to our resultant failure to communicate with one another and with any larger public. He also finds that we have erred in neglecting the less pretentious varieties of music such as jazz and folk music, and indeed in neglecting the history of American music in general. Most of all have we overlooked the larger social connections of music. We must broaden our concern, he counsels, and turn from style, taken as an autonomous phenomenon, to man and culture. Musicology will then, we may hopefully expect, be more meaningful to both the world of scholarship at large and the general public.

As Harrison realizes, this view is quite consonant with that of the ethnomusicologist, and it is not at all surprising to find it in the foreground of Mantle Hood’s discussion. The history of this field tends to emphasize the same duality of approach, the Germans concentrating upon specifically musical description and the Americans more upon culture and the role of music in society. But style and structure must not only be supplemented

Edward A. Lippman is professor of music at Columbia University.
by study of the culture, Hood maintains, they need also to be accompanied by the actual performance of whatever music we undertake to investigate. Certainly this will broaden our conception of stylistic analysis, which has too often been restricted to a description of scalar systems and of those features of music that were most amenable to notation.

Again in agreement with Harrison's view, Alan Merriam sees in the wider social and cultural significance of music the key that will release musicology from its isolation and make it meaningful to the general community of scholars. His book *The Anthropology of Music*, which is unfortunately full of jargon such as "culture history" and "music sound" that paradoxically makes it unclear and somewhat offensive to outsiders, is otherwise an interesting attempt to explore all the varied anthropological aspects of musicology. The ideal he holds up, however, is once more a combination of the social with the specifically musical approach.

The same desire to encompass the two major traditions in ethnomusicology also underlies Bruno Nettl's conception of the field, and in his book *Theory and Method in Ethnomusicology*, he proceeds systematically through the various phases of research, from the collection and analysis of data to the final questions of social meaning. To an ingenious organizational scheme he adds a fine grasp of each division of the subject. The first chapter presents an excellent summary of the history and changing definitions of ethnomusicology; and the pedagogical value of the work is increased by an appended series of exercises that illustrate every stage of the discussion.

It is from an attitude in some sense "ethnomusicological", then, that new perspectives for musicology as a whole would seem to arise. Even the apparently conventional introductory manual by Lincoln Spiess, entitled *Historical Musicology*, gives evidence of the same influence, particularly in short added sections that touch, however inadequately, on the linguistic problems of Chinese, Japanese, and Slavic musicology. This is essentially a bibliographic work, but it again contains useful lists of problems for the student which may well suggest different kinds of research that would not otherwise occur to him.

More generally, the divergent attitudes we find within ethnomusicology—those of the anthropologist and the musician, of the cultural investigator and the stylistic one—have their counterpart within musicology in the distinction between the general
and the specifically musical historian, between the cultural approach and the positivist or analytic one. But ethnomusicology does more than merely sharpen our understanding of this duality: it makes possible a world view of music in both its stylistic constitution and its human significance, and thus helps us to come to any particular investigation, such as that of European art music, not only with the added insight produced by the comparative study of any phenomenon, but with the widest possible conception of what music is as a whole. The ways in which this will affect the work of the historian of Western music are subtle, but far-reaching. His evaluation and understanding of every manifestation he studies will be changed. But there will be concrete benefits as well as intangible ones, when matters of the diffusion of musical instruments are involved, for example, or of the impact of distant cultural areas; or of the interaction of folk music and cultivated music, of vocal and instrumental styles, of notation and performance practice.

Our task, then, is to broaden our vision, and especially, to pursue specific problems that are informed with larger issues. We must study music in the context of the whole of society and culture and of all mankind. In contrast, however, Palisca argues for a more specific conception of musicology, and maintains that acoustics, physiology, and psychology should be excluded; our concern is really with music as a humanistic manifestation, and not with physics or the psychological laboratory. The natural sciences are in any event too difficult and technical to be learned by the musicologist; they call for special laboratories and equipment; and it is a fact, as Palisca points out, that our musicological journals simply do not include articles on such supposed branches of the discipline. Thus the original American acceptance of the grandiose German plan for musicology, which can be seen in Glen Haydon’s *Introduction to Musicology*, has given way to increasing specialization and a dangerous centrifugal tendency. The restricted range of most of our scholarly studies sharply contradicts the ideal of a cultural and world perspective, and it is to just such a perspective that physical and biological science will be found most relevant.

Other suggestions have been made from time to time, with the intention of bettering the fate of American musicology. Of these the most popular recipe for success is that musicologists undertake to prove their value by showing performers how to
realize musical embellishments properly. Such a humble role would of course neatly support the frequent criticism that our musicology is too positivistic, too occupied with the collection of data and the determination of detail. On the other hand, more concern with musical significance, with social factors, with basic conceptions of music, and with larger patterns of stylistic change would certainly secure our subject more respect and attention. There would be help to performers in this too, for a deeper understanding of each composition and its place in history would seem at least as valuable as a knowledge of correct ornamentation.

But any course that may be advocated by theoretical considerations must depend for its implementation upon capable and talented students. Yet we cannot expect to attract undergraduates to a field neither they nor their teachers have any knowledge of, especially if its values and achievements are in fact not worth their attention. If musicology cannot enhance musical experience and understanding, it can hardly call for notice either from musicians or from scholars, but only from those of routine intelligence and little imagination, and we should not be surprised if students of superior mentality seem to wander into the field more by accident than design, or in default of any other pursuit more appropriate for them. We also must not overlook the obvious fact that musicology is an unusually demanding discipline for an American, for education in language and foreign cultures is pitifully small in this country, and even when a student possesses a high degree of musicality he often must spend a discouraging amount of time and energy in mastery of adjunct studies in language and general history.

Our major complaint must then be addressed, as it so often turns out, to earlier education, and even more correctly, to the whole temper and attitude of the society in which this education has its place. As a pragmatic culture, we are willing heirs to the English outlook that makes music an ornament of life, somewhat like food and wine, and we have traditionally regarded it, in a still more negative light, as a distraction and a thief of time. When we concern ourselves with history at all, it is with political and economic history—with values that seem important because they make sense to us in the present. In particular, the average American is peculiarly unable to grasp music as a cultural-historical expression in the way in which
he understands painting and literature. As a result, while these latter arts take on a certain measure of significance and dignity, musical works are essentially gross stimuli without specific stylistic quality. In the response to music, historical awareness is absent, and the listener takes the indulgence of his feelings as the sole source of meaning. Musical understanding similarly consists of a circumscribed tracing-out of repetition or sonata-form, or of harmonic and polyphonic structure, all under the head of “appreciation” or “analysis”. Even the college curriculum in music is made up almost exclusively of courses in “music literature” and “theory”. “Musicianship” is accompanied by “ear-training,” and followed by elementary harmony, intermediate harmony, advanced harmony, chromatic harmony, and keyboard harmony, and for those with strength to continue, by elementary counterpoint, advanced counterpoint, double counterpoint, free counterpoint, orchestration, form, and so on. It is as though the undergraduate student in French or German, for example, were to devote his academic career solely to language mechanics, taking spelling as a freshman, elementary grammar and dictation as a sophomore, and then intermediate grammar, advanced grammar, and composition as an upper classman. But a non-humanistic attitude is not far removed from an anti-humanistic one, and the “liberal arts” music student will naturally find no fault with the juke-box popularization of Mozart or the whistled subway versions of Beethoven’s late quartets. Indeed the desecration of musical works is often the product of good will and a democratic philosophy, although a mistaken notion of the accessibility of art provides the true basis.

We can make natural science part of musicology or exclude it. We can undertake interpretive studies or confine ourselves to the cataloguing of facts. We can produce more and more editions of music and even secure a wider influence through the medium of newspapers and record companies, or radio and television. Whatever course we adopt will be of relatively little effect on the ultimate place of musicology in the United States; it will not in itself provide respect or jobs or an audience for musicologists, nor will it make possible the publication and sale of serious books on music. Even the enlightened revision of the curricula of primary and secondary schools and of colleges, and the encouragement of actual playing and singing will not make us experience music as a significant expression of culture in the
face of public attitudes and educational ideals that are deaf or hostile to musical values. The underlying social determinants of the place of music and musicology resist change with a discouraging stubbornness; we can guess only that music and musicology have a common fate, and that a simple increase in the amount of musical activity will be of no avail if it is not accompanied by a deepened understanding and a new respect. Our wisest course, for reasons of strategy as well as the advancement of knowledge, is to keep our discipline as wide and diversified as possible. But what musicology should be is less important than what American culture should be if musicology is to exist.
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THE TROUVERÈRE CHANSONS AS CREATIONS OF A NOTATIONLESS MUSICAL CULTURE

Hendrik Van der Werf

The trouvères occupy a curious and bifarious position in the cultural history of the Middle Ages. According to tradition they were both poets and composers, which leads us to ask whether they were poets first and musicians second, whether their poems existed by grace of the melodies, or whether they attained the apogee of lyrical art: complete unity of poem and melody. Whichever is the case, the trouvères stand apart from their fellow poets, and especially from their fellow composers, in their predilection for monodic chansons which are often esoteric in content. Some medieval authors such as Chrétien de Troyes, Richard de Fournival and Jean Bodel, who are primarily known for literary works, also wrote chansons, but the famous trouvères, except for Adam de la Halle, produced chansons exclusively. Adam seems to have been exceptionally venturesome in his choice of literary and musical genres. As far as we know, no other trouvère composed polyphonic music, and he and Guillaume d'Amiens were the only trouvères to write chansons in fixed forms.

Hundreds of trouvère chansons have been preserved.¹ They evoke colorful images and arouse great curiosity about the personalities of the trouvères and the circumstances in which the chansons were created and performed. The scarcity of information has stimulated rather than dampened this curiosity, making it difficult sometimes to distinguish fact from fancy. In the last analysis, knowledge of the conditions surrounding the chansons remains quite incomplete.

It is often pointed out that there were many noblemen among the troubadours, the earliest authors of vernacular lyric poetry; the ranks of the trouvères, on the other hand, included

¹For a list of the trouvère chansons with complete information about their sources, see Spanke 1955.
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burghers as well. We may further assume that the troubères, whatever their social status, were in general not professional authors or musicians. It is widely accepted that the troubères left the performance of their chansons to professional performers, the so-called jongleurs. Everything considered, it is easier to establish the characteristics of a trouvère chanson than of a trouvère or a jongleur.

A trouvère chanson is often preserved in more than one manuscript, but the melody of the chanson is seldom identical in all sources. In some cases the versions differ only slightly, whereas in others there does not seem to be any relationship between them, even though the text demonstrates that we deal with the same chanson. Nevertheless, there is usually no doubt about the common parentage of the preserved melodies even if the discrepancies are considerable. Thus editors of trouvère melodies are confronted with the problem of establishing the original melody, while wondering how so many significant changes could occur.

Nearly all editors of trouvère melodies appear to have been guided by the principle that most of the discrepancies in the sources are deteriorations caused by scribal inaccuracy or by inadequacies of the oral tradition. Friedrich Gennrich, the acknowledged authority in the field of secular medieval monody, formulated the following simple and seemingly undebatable principle for deriving the critical version of a medieval song from its various versions: correct the recognized errors and record the variants (1937:33). He explicitly rejects the opinion of those, notably Pierre Aubry (1909:XXVII), who warn that attempts to reconstruct the original melody of the trouvère chanson may well result in the creation of a new composition. Instead, Gennrich claims that “at present we are able to establish a critical version of the melody with equal if not greater certainty than the text” (1955:XIV). At first sight Gennrich’s principles seem quite acceptable even though he seldom mentions the corrections he makes in his own editions. But a closer examination reveals a number of aspects that are questionable to say the least. Gennrich’s method of editing medieval monody is extensively explained by Werner Bittinger (1953), who gives the careful reader the impression that this method consists of a set of directions for distilling the best possible melody from a number of different versions of a chanson, and for proving that the versions we find in the chansonniers...
are scribal deformations of this best version. Aubry's observation—certainly startling for its time—that the discrepancies were legitimate variants rather than errors goes unheeded. He regarded the indistinct melodies and the imprecise notation as the chief causes of the variants (1909:XXIV).

Philologists who publish the poems of the trouvères encounter problems similar to those of the musicologists who edit the melodies. Since very few of the melodies but nearly all of the poems have been published, it is worthwhile examining the philologists' approach. We find that the 19th- and early 20th-century editions of poems were based upon the principle that somewhere under a blanket of scribal errors and other deteriorations lay the original poem in all its charm and beauty. Accordingly, the editors set out to correct all errors and emend all changes made by later hands. However, they gradually concluded that their basic principle implied some questionable assumptions, such as, that the scribes were extremely inaccurate and made scores of mistakes, and that the chansons could only deteriorate during the process of being performed and copied. According to these assumptions, each chanson was sent into the world as a good chanson which the performers and scribes corrupted and forgot parts of, offering a poor substitute for the original poem. Realizing these implications, some editors came to the conclusion that efforts to reconstruct the original had produced only a new version.

A hallmark of the old editorial policy can be seen in the following announcement on the title page of a collection of chansons by the Chastelain de Coucy: Die Lieder des Castellans von Coucy nach sämtlichen Handschriften kritisch bearbeitet (Fritz Fath, ed. 1883). In a later edition by Arthur Langfors we see the emergence of a new approach. He remarks that "by making a small number of corrections [in a certain version] one obtains an excellent text; we shall indicate only the principal variants in the other manuscripts" (1917:65). The new editorial method invited discussion among scholars concerning the nature of the small corrections one should make, but in general there were no more attempts to reconstruct the original.

The philologists came to the conclusion that for a long time studies of medieval literature were influenced by "prejudices and prepossessions which years of association with printed matter have made habitual... If a fair judgment is to be
passed upon literary works belonging to the centuries before printing was invented, some effort must be made to realize the extent of the prejudices with which we have grown up, and to resist the involuntary demand that medieval literature must conform to our standards of taste” (Chaytor 1945:1). In the study by H. J. Chaytor just quoted we find revealing information about medieval reading and writing habits, about oral tradition, and about the methods of copying texts, and we are made aware of the enormous change in attitude towards language in general, and the written or printed word in particular. This change has come about mainly since the invention of printing.

If the findings of the philologists are applied to the study of the melodies, the discrepancies in the manuscripts become sources of abundant information about the compositional technique of the trouvères, the performance habits of the jongleurs, and the scribal methods of copyists.

Our first and probably most important conclusion is that, in general, the different versions of a chanson present that chanson as it was performed by different jongleurs who had learned the chanson by rote either directly or indirectly from the trouvère himself. In other words, the chansons were in the first place disseminated by oral tradition and not by copies made from the trouvère’s autograph. Only towards the end of the trouvère era did the chansons become “collectors’ items,” and only then was the chanson written down as it was performed at the time. It follows that we should not judge the melodies from their appearance in notation, but rather we should sing them while thinking of an audience; instead of basing the analysis of a chanson upon one melody reconstructed from several sources, we should analyze all the melodies as they appear in the sources. Then, when comparing these different versions we should realize that it was not compulsory for a performer always to sing a chanson with exactly the same melody. For him a chanson was not an untouchable entity with a sacred “original form” to be respected and preserved. It was normal for a jongleur to perform in the way he thought that particular chanson ought to be performed and we should not pass judgment on a jongleur who invented part of a melody or even an entire one. Thus the differences in the versions are not necessarily infractions of the rules for performing someone else’s composition, as present-day audiences would be inclined to think;
neither should they be considered as conscious improvisations upon a given theme in the modern sense of the word. On the contrary, according to the jongleur’s concept, he was singing the trouvère’s melody even though, according to our concept, he was varying it. The difference between these concepts reflects the fact that our attitude towards printed music differs considerably from the jongleur’s attitude towards the poetry and melody of a chanson learned by rote.

As a second conclusion from the work of the philologists, we must stress the important effect of oral tradition on scribal copying methods. There may be insufficient documentary evidence for the oral tradition of the melodies, but without dissemination of this kind the discrepancies among the versions of a given chanson would have been different, unless it is assumed that the scribes either did not know anything about music or that they continually did their best to change the original as much as possible without writing a new chanson. A chanson may have been notated on different occasions after performances by one or several different jongleurs; each such notation may have been copied several times, and the version which we find in a manuscript may be a first notation or a remote copy of it. We may safely assume that the scribes (those who first notated it and those who made copies) did make changes but that only an infinitesimal number of these changes are caused by real scribal inaccuracy; instead, they are the consequence of the attitude towards a chanson transmitted by oral tradition and of the medieval methods of copying. I do not wish to imply that medieval methods of copying were primitive, only that in several respects circumstances were different from those of today. There was no one prescribed way of performing a certain chanson, nor was there the uniformity in musical notation that we now know. Monody was much less uniformly notated than the measured polyphony of the period, though they were perhaps notated by the same scribes. Furthermore, we may conclude that the scribes did not copy at sight symbol for symbol. Instead, certain manuscripts show clearly that a scribe must have sung to himself

2We are not trying to establish the extent to which oral tradition affected the dissemination of the text. Since there are empty staves above the words of so many chansons we may conclude that it was more difficult to obtain the music than the words, and that there may well have been more copying of the poems than of the melodies.
a section from the manuscript in front of him—not necessarily the melody of exactly one entire line—and then copied from memory what he had heard rather than what he had seen. Consequently he put himself in the position of a jongleur notating his own performance. In this process he could make deliberate changes and corrections, but he may also have unconsciously varied the melody more or less extensively by changing the distribution of the melody over the text, by ornamenting the melody, or by simplifying it.

Furthermore, it may be assumed that many of the notators and copyists had respectable educations and knew more about the theory of music and the rules of rhetoric than many a trouvère or anyone jongleur did. Consequently, we have to take into account a tendency on the part of notator and copyist to correct the trouvère and jongleur. Thus in some cases the changes made by the scribe are in accordance with performance practices, but in other cases the scribe’s objective was to make the chanson conform to the theories. In some chansons he may even have transformed free rhythm into modal.\(^3\)

Of course, it is conceivable that among the many jongleurs who knew a given chanson there was one who performed it in its original form; subsequently, this chanson may have been written down exactly as the trouvère had created it. Thus we may possess the original melody for some chansons, but we cannot be sure of our ability to distinguish the original from among the recorded versions. We cannot simply assume that the version we think is best is the original, for it is quite possible that the jongleurs, who were experienced singers, were better musicians than many trouvères and improved upon the latter’s creation. More important, even if we could determine the original version, we should not discard the others, because in most cases the chansonniers present us with various fully acceptable melodies in the best manner of the period.

\(^3\)In light of this knowledge we observe that most of the chansons in the manuscripts K, L, N, P and X were copied directly or indirectly from one common source. On the other hand, many of the chansons in the manuscripts M and T are related in a different fashion: they were probably not copied from one common source but notated from different renditions, which, however, may have come from the same performer. Furthermore, we may conclude that the scribe of the Chansonnier Cangé was thoroughly familiar with motets, chansons in fixed form, and the like, and that this strongly influenced his opinion of the notation and the performance of the true trouvère chansons. (The manuscript sigla are those used in Spanke 1955.)
Rather than accepting the above observations as premises for further examination of the trouvère repertoire, we should regard them as two aspects of one complex theory. Other aspects of this theory concern rhythm, tonal structure, melodic form, and the position of the trouvères in medieval culture, aspects which I shall discuss fully in future articles. Here I will briefly mention their major features:

1. Careful examination of the variants discloses that only a very small number of the chansons were meant to be performed in a strict, a modified, or a mixed modal rhythm. If all the chansons had been performed in modal rhythm, as is generally assumed, the variants would have been quite different. In fact, the variants are such that they could originate only in declamatory performances of which the rhythm is free in two ways: first, accented and unaccented tones and syllables may come at irregular intervals, and second, there is not necessarily a simple ratio between the duration of one tone or syllable and that of another.

2. It also becomes obvious that there is no reason to assume that the trouvères were guided by the system of the so-called church modes in composing their melodies, or that they wrote in major or minor scales with tonics, dominants, and leading tones, as has sometimes been suggested. Nor is there always the close interdependence between versification and melodic form which Gennrich describes. Instead, the melodies give the impression of being “remembered improvisations” with little design and a rather loose organization.

3. The chansons in fixed form, the French motets, and the Spanish cantigas stem from the world of learned musicians, whereas the chansons of the trouvères originated and circulated in a notationless musical culture in which notation and theory exercised little or no influence, but in which the rules of rhetoric were well-known and faithfully observed. Instances of border-crossing are only occasional; therefore, a trouvère chanson resembling a monophonic motet is a rare exception. But it is just these exceptions that mislead so many musicologists who approach the chansons as intricate musical settings of a text. Instead, a trouvère chanson is a poem to be declaimed to an unobtrusive melody which leaves the performer ample freedom for a dramatic rendition of the text and sometimes for showing off his beautiful voice.
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THE MEANING OF THE PATRISTIC POLEMIC AGAINST MUSICAL INSTRUMENTS

James McKinnon

The antagonism which the Fathers of the early Church displayed toward instruments has two outstanding characteristics: vehemence and uniformity.

This vehemence is truly striking. "Where aulos-players are, there Christ is not" (PG 62:389), said St. John Chrysostom (died 407), and on another occasion he referred to cymbals and auloi along with dancing, obscene songs, and drunkenness as "the devil's heap of garbage" (PG 61:103). Rhetorical outbursts by Church Fathers like Chrysostom were accompanied by strict ecclesiastical legislation. There was a widespread legal tradition that denied baptism to aulos and kithara players unless they renounced their trade,¹ and a fourth-century Alexandrian law set excommunication as the penalty for a cantor who learned to play the kithara:

If an anagnost [cantor] learns to play the kithara, he shall confess this. If he does not return to it, his punishment shall be for seven weeks' duration. If he persists, he shall be dismissed and excluded from the church (Canones Basilii 74).

The vehemence of the polemic against instruments is primarily accounted for by the association of musical instruments with sexual immorality,² an issue on which third- and fourth-century Church Fathers were extremely sensitive. This was especially true of fourth-century Fathers like Chrysostom and Jerome who wrote after the political establishment of Christian-

¹Constitutiones Apostolorum VIII:31; Epiphanius PG 42:829-32; Canones Hippolyti 12.

²The theme had already appeared in classical literature; see Sallust Bellum Catalinae 25:1-3; Lucian De saltatione; Livy 39:vi.7. But the Church Fathers went far beyond the classical authors in the intensity of their concern with the sexual morality and in the explicitness with which they singled out the musical instruments for condemnation.

James McKinnon completed the Ph.D. in musicology at Columbia University this year.
ity and were thus confronted with the moral problems posed by mass conversions. Instruments were, also associated with pagan rites, which helps to explain the antagonism towards them expressed by the third-century Fathers in particular. The polemical writings of Tertullian, Arnobius, and Novatian reflected the bitterness of that century of severe persecutions. Yet even then it was the association of instruments with prostitution, luxurious banquets, and the obscenities of the theatre that provided the major emotional impetus for the patristic condemnation. Arnobius, for example, wrote:

Did God send souls [to earth] so that these members of a holy and noble race should here practice music and the arts of the piper...that they should sing obscene songs...? Did he send them so that as males they become pederasts and as females they become harlots, harpists, and kitharists, giving their bodies for hire? (Adversus nationes II:42).

If the casual reader of patristic denunciations of musical instruments is struck by their vehemence, the systematic investigator is surprised by another characteristic: their uniformity. The attitude of opposition to instruments was virtually monolithic even though it was shared by men of diverse temperaments and different regional backgrounds, and even though it extended over a span of at least two centuries of changing fortunes for the Church. That there were not widespread exceptions to the general position defies credibility. Accordingly, many musicologists, while acknowledging that early church music was predominantly vocal, have tried to find evidence that instruments were employed at various times and places. The result of such attempts has been a history of misinterpretations and mistranslations.4

4Johannes Quasten in his generally excellent study (1930: 108, 174) has contended that the Fathers condemned instruments primarily because of their association with pagan rites rather than with immorality. The assertion is incompatible with the obvious meaning of the patristic passages. In addition to the passages quoted see Gregory of Nyssa PG 37:1438; Pseudo-Basil PG 30:381; Chrysostom PG 60:300.

4A misunderstanding of the Church Fathers' allegorical exegesis of the instruments of the Psalms accounts for most misinterpretations; see McKinnon 1965:Chapter VI. With respect to mistranslations, see Quasten (1930: 105-106) where he deals with certain mistranslations which appeared in numerous German histories of music from the late nineteenth and early twentieth centuries. A recent mistranslation is that of Bruno Stäblein, who takes cum palmis to mean with psalms rather than with palm branches (1955:1047).

The only genuine exception to the universal patristic position is Clement
The assumption that there must have been exceptions to the general rule of vocal performance seems founded on the basic misconception that there was a controversy over the use of instruments in the early Church. This reasoning implies, if not expresses, the following familiar line of argumentation. It is frequently asserted, and with good logic, that ecclesiastical criticism of or legislation against any particular abuse implies the existence of that abuse. Thus, if a 13th-century Council forbade goliards to sing tropes upon the Sanctus and Agnus Dei (Mansi 33:33), it is probable that this is precisely what some goliards were doing. Similarly, if Chrysostom found it necessary on numerous occasions to forbid exciting instrumental music and the singing of obscene songs at weddings, we may reason that certain Christians were perpetuating these pagan practices. Now a careful reading of all the patristic criticism of instruments will not reveal a single passage which condemns the use of instruments in church. The context of the condemnation may be the banquet, the theater, or the festivities accompanying a marriage, but it is never the liturgy.

For example, Clement of Alexandria (died before 215), under the chapter heading "How to Conduct Oneself at Banquets" wrote:

If people spend their time with auloi, psalteria, dancing and leaping, clapping hands like Egyptians, and in other similar dissolute activities, they become altogether immodest and unrestrained, senselessly beating on cymbals and drums, and making noise on all the instruments of deception. Obviously, it seems to me, such a banquet has become a theater of drunkenness (PG 8:440).

of Alexandria’s apparent toleration for the lyre and kithara (PG 8:444). Whereas the passage may be allegorical, it may equally well be taken literally. If it was meant to be a real toleration of these instruments, it was intended for extra-liturgical devotion rather than for liturgical singing and probably to accompany a non-Biblical metrical hymn rather than a psalm. See McKinnon 1965:Chapter III, and also the discussion of Synesius of Cyrene in Chapter IV.

See, e.g., Stäblein (1955:1047), and also Joseph Gelineau (1964:150). The latter generally shows a high degree of sophistication when dealing with patristic sources.

For other passages involving instruments at a banquet see Pseudo-Basil, PG 30:372-81; Chrysostom, PG 62:306; Isidor of Pelusium, PG 78:433; Ambrose, PL 14:751; Jerome, PL 22:874. For the Old Testament background of this patristic theme see Isaiah v:11-12. For a rabbinical passage similar to the patristic passages, see Sotah 48a.
Tertullian (died after 220) told Christians that they were to hate the instruments of the theater:

That immodesty of movement and dress which especially characterizes the theater is consecrated to Venus and Bacchus, both of whom are wanton, the one by her sex, the other by his robes. What is taking place in voice and song, and by instruments and lyres, is at the service of Apollos and Muses and Minervas and Mercuries. You must hate, O Christian, those objects whose authors you execrate (PL 1:717).7

Chrysostom in particular stressed instruments in his harsh criticisms of marriage celebrations:

Auloi, syrinxes and cymbals, and drunken leaping, and the other contemporary disgraces were entirely absent then [at the wedding of Jacob and Rebecca]. But now among us they dance and sing this hymn to Aphrodite...and hymns full of obscenity on the very wedding day (PG 51:210).8

One might be tempted to make the simple logical distinction that the Church Fathers were not condemning the instruments themselves but rather their abuse. Nevertheless, it should be obvious from the passages just quoted that the Fathers made no such distinction. Clement blamed the debasement of the banquet on the instruments, not vice versa; Tertullian said that instruments were to be hated, not that they were merely neutral symbols of the pagan deities; and Chrysostom said that auloi and syrinxes were contemporary disgraces, not that they often appeared in conjunction with certain contemporary disgraces. The same way of thinking can be observed in most patristic references to instruments. Therefore, to argue that instruments might have been tolerated if disassociated from evil circumstances and baptized, so to speak, for use in the liturgy may be logical in the abstract but is incompatible with the real attitude of the Church Fathers. To them the instruments were evil in themselves.

What ought to interest the music historian about the three passages is that the instruments appear in situations outside the church, not within. The patristic polemic against instruments was a matter of morality, not of liturgy, which explains why it was so uniform. One expects diversity of usage in ex-

---

7For additional references to instruments and the theater see Novation (Pseudo-Cyprian), De spectaculis; Gregory of Nazianzus, PG 35:708; Augustine, PL 36:279; PL 34:49.

8See also Chrysostom PG 54:486; PG 60:300; Gregory of Nazianzus PG 37:376.
ternal liturgical practices, but uniformity of attitude on a basic moral issue. Thus, both the uniformity and the vehemence of the patristic attitude are due to the fact that the Church Fathers' opposition to instruments was a moral issue, specifically an issue closely related to their views on sexual immorality.

The implication for the performance of early Christian music is obvious. Not only was it predominantly vocal, but it was so exclusively vocal that the occasion to criticize the use of instruments in church never arose. The truth of this will be more fully appreciated after an inquiry into the origins of Christian song.

The absence of instruments in the Christian liturgy has been interpreted by some liturgical historians as a conscious rejection of the instrumental cult music of Israel, but a close look at the transition from Jewish to primitive Christian worship reveals an altogether different situation. The unaccompanied psalmody and the cantillation of Scriptural readings which constituted the earliest Christian liturgical singing was a continuation of the practices of the Synagogue. Unlike the Temple, the Synagogue made no use of instruments in its unique service of Scriptural readings, discourse, prayers, and psalmody. The primitive Christians while carrying on the rite of the Synagogue had no thought of opposing the instruments of the Temple, but simply continued a form of worship which happened to have no need of cult instruments. Similarly, the Synagogue had not dispensed with instruments out of opposition to the instruments of the Temple, nor, as Eric Werner maintains, out of opposition to the instruments of the Hellenistic cults (1959:334-35). Rather the typical cult functions of instruments in antiquity—accompanying sacrifice or orgiastic dance—were irrelevant to the revolutionary rite of the Synagogue. The service of the Synagogue was revolutionary and unique because it consisted in reading and meditating upon a book

---

9It is unfortunate that Werner's impressive contributions to the important task of demonstrating Judaic influence upon early Christian liturgy and song are marred by insistence on this point, which to my mind actually obscures the positive achievement of the Synagogue. His chief item of evidence that Judaism was antagonistic toward instruments "well before the fall of Temple" (70 A.D.) is a quotation from Book VIII of the Sybilline Oracles, a work universally acknowledged to be Christian, and to date from the second half of the second century A.D. See McKinnon 1965:Chapter II for a full discussion.
rather than in the primitive rites of bloody sacrifice, orgiastic
dancing, incantation, and divination, all of which employed
instruments. Conscious opposition to instruments came later
in both Judaism and Christianity. It resulted from an inevitable
comparison between a rite that did not use instruments and
the pagan or gentile rites that did. And in the case of Christi-
anity the issue of sexual immorality contributed to and even
overshadowed the motivations stemming from a comparison of
cults.

Christianity inherited the psalmody of the Synagogue and
fostered it with remarkable enthusiasm. Paul said "when you
come together each of you has a psalm" (1 Cor. xiv:26), and
Ambrose three hundred years later called a psalm "the blessing
of the people. . . the applause of all, the language of the assem-
bly, the voice of the Church, the melodious confession of
the faith, the devotion full of authority, the joy of freedom,
the cry of rapture, the echo of bliss" (PL 14:968). Note that
during the first two centuries of this development there was
only praise for psalmody and no mention of the instruments
of pagan society or cult. The Christian attitude developed
independently; it was not a reaction to pagan cults or to any-
thing else.

A doctrine of opposition to instruments did not develop
until the third and fourth centuries. By then Christians were
comparing their spiritual worship to pagan cults. But more
important was the rise of asceticism in both the East and the
West. Patristic asceticism was particularly severe with respect
to sexual matters which, as we have seen, accounts for the
vehemence of the opposition to instruments. Now it is not at
all surprising that eventually certain Church Fathers placed
Christian psalmody in rhetorical juxtaposition to the immoral
instrumental music of pagan society. Among the several fourth-
century examples of this is a passage by Ephraem of Nisibis,
the famous Syrian composer of Christian hymns:

Today, to all appearances, they sing psalms as God has ordained, and
tomorrow they will eagerly dance as taught by Satan. . . Let it be far
from you that today you listen attentively to the reading of the divine

---

10 For the positive attitude toward psalmody in the first two centuries see
Eph. v:18-20; Col. iii:15-17; Justin, PG 6:345-48; Oracula Sybillina VIII,
497-500. Third and fourth century encomiums of psalmody are too numerous
and too well-known to be cited, but a particularly striking one is Cyprian,
PL 4:222-23.

74
Scripture as one loving Christ, and that tomorrow you listen to lyre-playing as a criminal and a hater of Christ (Quoted by Quasten 1930: 140).

It is evident that Ephraem was not speaking out against instruments in church, but rather contrasting the Scriptural readings and psalmody of the Christian liturgy with the lyre-playing and dancing that takes place on occasions of forbidden amusement. A distinction between two separate locations, implicit in Ephraem’s remarks, is made clear in a passage from Chrysostom, who contrasts the table of the dissolute rich with that of poor monks:

There indeed are auloi and kitharas and syrinxes, but here there is no dissonant music; but what is here? hymns and psalms. There the demons are hymned, here the Lord God of all (PC 62:306).

Similarly, Ambrose was criticizing those who go to eating and drinking places instead of gathering in church to praise God when he wrote: “hymns are now being proclaimed, and you take up the kithara? The psalms are being sung, and you grasp the psalterium or the tympanum?” Already in the morning, Ambrose continued, they wander about seeking wine in taverns instead of coming together to greet the Sun of Justice (PL 14: 751-52). This series of passages contains no hint of a controversy over instruments in church, but it does confirm the impression that psalmody is essentially different from the contemporary music that employs instruments.

The patristic passage that might be construed more easily than any other as a condemnation of instruments within church is found in the Quaestiones et Responsiones ad Orthodoxos of Theodoret of Cyprus (died around 466). The text poses the question whether or not singing in church is a continuation of a concession granted by God to the immaturity of the Jews under the Old Law. The reply begins:

It is not singing in itself which is characteristic of immaturity, but singing to lifeless instruments and with dancing and rattles. Therefore, the use of these instruments is excluded from the song of the churches, along with other things which characterize immaturity, and there is simply the singing itself (PG 6:1353).

11 For other passages presenting a rhetorical contrast between psalmody and pagan instruments see Chrysostom, PG 62:576; Gregory of Nazianzus, PG 35:708; PG 37:376.

12 This treatise was formerly attributed to St. Justin; see Johannes Quasten (1960:549).
A superficial reading of the passage might prompt the conclusion that Theodoret had in mind a controversy over the use of instruments in some contemporary Christian church. However, the instruments he mentions are the instruments of the Old Testament which is clear not only from the explicit reference to the Old Law in the text of the question itself, but also from several other patristic passages referring to how God tolerated the use of instruments by the Jews because of their spiritual immaturity. The Church Fathers constantly commented upon the Old Testament which was for them the inspired word of God, and thus were forced to reconcile their own antagonism toward instruments with the embarrassing fact that God allowed instruments in the worship of the Temple. Most Church Fathers avoided the issue by interpreting the instruments of the Old Testament according to the method of allegorical exegesis. But the exegetes of the School of Antioch, of which Theodoret was a member, were compelled to confront the issue directly because they adhered to a more literal and historical type of exegesis. Their explanation took the form of a sort of theory of religious evolution by which the immature (népios) Jews were allowed certain material aids for their piety, such as the practice of bloody sacrifice and the use of instruments, both of which are incompatible with the spiritual worship of the New Testament. As Isidore of Pelusium (died around 435), another member of the Antiochene School, expressed it: “If God accepted even sacrifice and blood because of the immaturity of men at that time, why are you surprised at the music of the kithara and the psalterium?” (PG 78:628).

Writing at about the same time in the West, Niceta of Remesiana (died after 414), in his remarkable sermon De psalmodiae bono, gave an explanation similar to that of the Antiochene exegetes:

Only what is material [from the Old Testament] has been rejected, such as circumcision, the sabbath, sacrifices, discrimination in foods; and also trumpets, kitharas, cymbals, and tympana, which now understood as the limbs of a man resound with a more perfect music. Daily ablutions, new moon observances, the meticulous inspection of leprosy, along with anything else which was temporarily necessary for the immature are past and over with. But whatever is spiritual [from the Old Testament],

13See Chrysostom, PG 55:494; PG 55:495; Theodoret of Cyrus, PG 80:1996. See also the reference to Isidore of Pelusium below.
such as faith, devotion, prayer, fasting, patience, chastity, and psalm-singing has been increased rather than diminished.\textsuperscript{14}

Obviously Niceta, like Theodoret, was not referring to a profanation of the Christian liturgy by instruments; rather he was comparing their absence under the New Law with their use under the Old Law.

There is one more rhetorical device certain Church Fathers used when referring to instruments. They spoke of an otherwise laudable institution being transformed by the presence of instruments into the hated theater. For example, Isidore of Pelusium interpreted the word carousel (kōmos), which appears in Paul’s epistle to the Galatians (v. 21), in the following manner:

That is a carousel, my dear friend, where intoxicating aulos and prolonged drinking arouse passion and change the symposium into the obscene theater, as cymbals and other instruments work a magical fraud upon the guests (\textit{PG} 78:433).\textsuperscript{15}

According to Isidore the noble symposium of classical Greece has been transformed by instruments into a carousel which is no better than the theater. Chrysostom warned against the marriage ceremony being changed into a theatrical performance (\textit{PG} 62:387), and Gaudentius of Brescia (died after 405) predicted the same fate for the home which admitted instruments: “Where the lyre and the tibia sounds, where every type of musician makes noise along with the cymbals of the dancers, those houses are unblessed and in no way different from the theaters” (\textit{PL} 20:890).

It is significant for my argument that no Church Father ever complained of the church being turned into a theater. If it had ever occurred to Christian communities of the third and fourth centuries to add instruments to their singing, indignation over this would have resounded throughout patristic literature and ecclesiastical legislation. One can only imagine the outburst the situation would have evoked from, say, Jerome or Chrysostom. There is a striking contrast between the situation in the patristic era and in the early 16th century when

\textsuperscript{14} Translated from the text of C.H. Turner (1923:237). The sermon appears in an outrageously bowdlerized version in Gerbert, \textit{Scriptores} I:9-14, where it is attributed to Nicetius of Treves, a sixth-century bishop. In my opinion, the brief sermon offers a balanced summary of the whole attitude of early Christianity toward its music.

\textsuperscript{15} See also the passage from Clement quoted above.
there were exceptions to the predominantly vocal character of liturgical music. Erasmus, for instance, excoriated instrumental music very much in the tradition of the Church Fathers but with one significant addition. According to him one's ears were assailed with instrumental music "even in the holy temple just as in the theater!" (1705:731). That no similar complaints can be found among the numerous patristic references to instruments is the strongest possible evidence that they simply were not used in the early church.

Those controversies involving liturgical music that did actually take place are reported in patristic literature because the liturgy was at the very center of early Christian life. There were, for example, some fourth-century Christians, possibly influenced by Neoplatonism, who thought that the psalms should be recited rather than sung, or at least sung in a manner that eschewed pleasant melody, although the majority maintained the traditionally positive attitude towards psalmody. There was an important fourth-century controversy over the use of non-Biblical hymns and also considerable disagreement over whether or not women in the congregation ought to sing aloud. But the issue of instruments in church was never raised. Musicologists have therefore made a fundamental mistake in thinking of the patristic polemic against instruments as part of a struggle to keep the liturgy free of them. That struggle came later, probably much later than is generally assumed.

Music historians ought to conceive of the psalmody of the early Christian Church not as a method of performance that excludes instruments but as a particular type of music for which instruments were stylistically irrelevant. The song of the Synagogue and the early Church was, as Walter Wiora observes, the only cult music of antiquity that did not use dancing, instruments, and regular meter (1961:75), three ele-

16See also Erasmus (1926:420). Any re-evaluation of the Renaissance a cappella question, which has been lying fallow for the past few decades, would have to take into account the revival of the Church Fathers by Christian humanists of the 15th and 16th centuries.

17We know of this controversy primarily from the refutations written by those maintaining the positive position, e.g., Nicetas, De psalmodiae bono and Augustine, Retractiones, II, 11, Contra Hilarem. Both treat opposition to psalmody as heresy. The less extreme position of Athanasius according to which psalmody ought to be nearly as plain as speech is sympathized with by Augustine but ultimately rejected (Confessions 10:33).
ments that have always been closely related both in the music of antiquity and in later Western music. In being free from these elements, psalmody was as unique musically as the rites of the Synagogue and of early Church were unique liturgically from the normal ancient and primitive cultic types such as animal sacrifice and orgiastic dancing. This is not to say that psalmody was not influenced melodically by contemporary Roman and Hellenistic music; in fact it seems reasonable to assume that it shared a sort of tonal common denominator with all the music of the Mediterranean area. But its proselike rhythm and its dissociation from dancing and instruments were sufficient to isolate it stylistically. There is also the testimony of the Fathers who unreflectingly referred to psalmody again and again as a distinct kind of music. It is revealing that the term "musica" was very rarely used with reference to Christian song; "psalms" and "hymns" were the normal terms.19

For all practical purposes the death of Augustine in 431 signals the close of the creative period of early Christian musical thought. After him there was not a gradual decline of originality but a sharp drop. For the Middle Ages the outstanding authorities on liturgical music were fourth-century Church Fathers such as Ambrose, Jerome, Augustine, Basil and Chrysostom, with Benedict and Gregory playing a somewhat intermediary role.20 The influential ecclesiastical scholar Rhabanus Maurus (died 856), for example, simply quoted the Fathers verbatim when discussing liturgical music (PL 112: 117, 454; 107:362). This reflects the overwhelming dominance of patristic thought in the early Middle Ages. Eventually, the scholasticism of the high Middle Ages overshadowed the patristic influence. Yet the patristic tradition remained an important secondary stream of thought throughout the late

18See the excellent article by Heinrich Besseler (1954:223-40).

19 The terms were roughly interchangeable and do not correspond to our distinction between Biblical psalms and non-Biblical hymns. In most cases both terms designate what we would refer to as psalms. See, e.g., Chrysostom, quoted in Gerbert (1774 I:64).

20 This refers to the tradition of liturgical music not to the tradition of ars musica, the fourth member of the quadrivium. The distinction, which is of great importance for an understanding of medieval musical thought, has not always been observed by musicologists who understandably tend to concentrate on the so-called theoretical treatises in which the two traditions tend to merge.
Middle Ages, flourishing especially among mystical groups and having an important revival among the reform-conscious Christians of the 15th and 16th centuries.

The great influence of the Church Fathers on the Middle Ages suggests that conditions at the close of the patristic era are of crucial importance for subsequent centuries. With regard to musical instruments the situation was characterized by two related but distinct features. First, an intense moral antipathy for musical instruments was sufficiently common in patristic literature and in ecclesiastical legislation to justify our calling it a doctrine. Secondly, instruments were in practice absent from liturgical music. To trace the doctrine and the practice through the Middle Ages and into the Renaissance, and to follow the changing relationship between the two would be the fitting subject for a book, not for the closing remarks of an article.

Yet, with respect to the doctrine it is safe to say that it was remarkably persistent without trying to specify just how persistent it was. The early Christian refusal to baptize instrumentalists reappears in the medieval doctrine that jongleurs are ministers of Satan with no hope of salvation (Honorius, PL 172:1148). The familiar warnings against the immodest entertainments at which instruments were prominent were heard again and again. However, the following regulation from the Council of Sens in 1528 reveals a significant change: "We prohibit actors or mimes to enter the church for playing on the tympanum, lyre, or any other musical instrument; let them play their instruments neither in nor near the church" (Mansi 32:1190). Even if they had not penetrated the choir screen and entered the sanctuary where the actual liturgical singing took place, the jongleurs were evidently doing some playing in church by this time. It has yet to be shown whether there are similar criticism of instrumentalists in church prior to this time.

---

21 For several examples, see the compilation in Edmund Faral 1910:272-327.
22 The supposed denunciation of instruments by the twelfth-century Cistercian Ethelred is frequently quoted in a misleading English translation which appears in William Prynne (1633:280-81). A reading of the original passage, Speculum caritatis, II, 23, Max. Bibl. Pat. 23:118, reveals with certainty only that Ethelred disapproved of the organ and polyphony. What he meant by the phrase tot cymbala is by no means easy to determine.
More important than the doctrine of opposition to instruments is the absence in practice of instruments from the early liturgy. It is an axiom of the history of religion that rites are extraordinarily conservative; they carefully preserve the externals of cult long after the ideas originally associated with them are forgotten. In the dynamic society of the Western Middle Ages liturgical developments were inevitable, but they did not take place unnoticed. The complaints of those who considered any modification of ancient forms to be sacrilegious and the enthusiasm of the innovators assured that the event was documented. Therefore, it cannot be gratuitously assumed that instruments were freely employed in the medieval liturgy. It is better to suppose that the early Christian practice continued and to require positive evidence for any exceptions or new developments. Musical innovations such as polyphony, sequences, and the organ are documented well enough to show that they did take place. But one still awaits positive documentary evidence supporting the widely held assumption that a great variety of instruments were freely employed without clearly defined functions in the medieval liturgy.23
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THE PHILOSOPHY OF THEODOR ADORNO

David A. Sheldon

Music today is managed, controlled and mass produced by a monstrous culture industry which dispenses its goods to an anonymous public whose unconscious values have been predetermined and conditioned by the technology of a conformist society. New music, whose function is continually to contradict and oppose, through its own inner tensions, the society from which it springs, is in danger of becoming too widely separated from this society and at the same time of losing its tensions by regressing to neutral, lifeless, overformalized arrangements of notes. This, in essence, is the philosophy of Theodor Adorno, professor of sociology and philosophy at the University of Frankfurt. Just who Adorno is, his reasons for this pessimistic view, and his significance in the world of contemporary music are questions which this paper will attempt to answer.

Theodor Wiesengrund Adorno was born in Frankfurt, Germany, on September 11, 1903. As a sociologist he has had a long association with the Institute for Social Research in Frankfurt, of which he has been managing director since 1953. During the second World War he was forced to leave Germany and come to the United States where he was musical director of the Princeton Radio Research Project from 1938-41. After returning to Germany following the war, he again came to this country in 1952-54. During this time he collaborated in the research and writing of The Authoritarian Personality, the first of the five volumes in Harper’s “Studies in Prejudice” sponsored by the American Jewish Council.

Adorno’s position as a sociologist, as represented in this work and in his activities with the Institute for Social Research in general, seems to be one haunted by two basic fears: first, that sociologists will create a sociology that is based on the radical empiricism of clever mathematics and nose-counting which
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has gained so much ground in the social sciences in recent years (Adorno argues that statistical information derived from these means can only give us a somewhat generalized classificatory scheme and does not enable us to understand society); second, that the horrors of the totalitarian regimes, especially those of the Hitler variety, will be forgotten and thereby return. Adorno's sociology has been explained as a curious mixture of Marxian ideas of economic determinism and of Freudian psychological methods. He fears totalitarianism and the idea that historical processes can best be explained as a result of production and consumption; and he fears the loss of individualism and claims that society is kept together by the threat of personal physical violence. To Adorno, sociology must become a critical discipline. It must show up society for what it is and what it can do or destroy. To do this, sociology must have a doctrine or philosophy; indeed, Adorno, who has been called an intellectual Marxist, argues many of his points with agile dialectical reasoning.

In addition to his professional activities as a sociologist and philosopher, Adorno is a prominent figure in the field of music criticism. As a young man he studied composition with Bernhard Sekles and Alban Berg, piano with E. Jung and Eduard Steuermann, and musicology at the University of Vienna. During this time he was engaged as a music critic, and in 1928-31 he was editor of the music periodical *Anbruch* in Vienna. While he was musical director of the Princeton Radio Research Project in America, he advised Thomas Mann on certain musical matters in the writing of *Doktor Faustus*. Since 1950 he has regularly given lectures and courses in composition at the Kranichstein Institute summer session, Darmstadt, and in 1954 he was awarded the Schönberg Medal. Adorno's output as a composer includes mostly songs, but he has also written two movements for string quartet, three women's choruses, six short orchestral pieces, arrangements of French folksongs and orchestrations of Schumann piano pieces (Gurlitt 1959:9). His writings on music include: *The Philosophy of New Music* (1949), *Essay on Wagner* (1952), *Dissonances* (1956), *Klangfiguren: Musical Writings I* (1959), *Mahler* (1960), and many articles. As a music critic, Adorno is alternately praised as a person of sharp, penetrating insight and damned as an idealist whose negative attitude and vague theorizing cannot cope with the realities of modern music.

As a sociologist and musician both, Adorno's favorite and
most characteristic area of expression is that of music-sociology. In reality most of Adorno’s musical writings, especially those of a general nature, can be grouped in this area, for when he speaks of music he speaks of it in the context of his social theories. In the same way that his sociology is imbued with a critical philosophical basis, Adorno’s music-sociology represents a critical scheme of aesthetics. His aesthetics seems to be influenced for the most part by Hegel’s dialectical reconciliation of contrasts, as his sociology is influenced by Marx’s dialectical reconciliation of class differences. In Adorno’s aesthetic creed the element of tension between opposites is the absolute criterion for qualitative evaluation and also for formal unity.

As in his sociology, Adorno’s music-sociology goes far beyond mere statistical analysis. He views music history basically in terms of collective behavior guided by the laws of consumption, with only occasional appearances of significant individuals who by themselves affect the progress of music. Because of the abstract, non-material nature of musical sound, the society can hear in the music what it wishes and can even use music for ideological purposes. In this way music can not only be misused as an ideology for the immediate means of power control but can also regress to a state of unawareness of itself and its role in society. Adorno feels that the role of music, especially serious music, is to reflect in its own materials and content the contradictions and tensions of the society which produces it. In this way, serious music, to be true to itself and its society, must be conceived in a continual state of dialectical opposition and dissatisfaction. The synthesis of this opposition is, according to Adorno, social and aesthetic truth. This is what Adorno means when he says, “the social sense of the musical phenomenon is inseparable from its truth or untruth, its success or failure, its contradiction or agreement.”¹ Because of this, music-sociology, for Adorno, cannot limit itself to empirical investigations based on listener reaction but must work to discern the real social position of music and its real essence within society.

The urgency of some critical aesthetic evaluation in these terms of music today is reflected in Adorno’s views of the present musical situation. He believes that there is becoming less

¹”Der gesellschaftliche Sinn musikalischer Phänomene ist untrennbar von ihrer Wahrheit oder Unwahrheit, ihrem Gelingen, oder Misslingen, ihrer Widerspruchlichkeit oder Stimmigkeit” (1959b:11).
and less difference between the so-called extremes of popular music on the one hand and serious music on the other—in fact, between all types of music along this continuum. Much of his criticism in this respect is directed toward the monolithic “culture industry” which, according to Adorno, controls the production and distribution of the culture products. The unconscious acceptance of this control by the manipulated and conditioned listener is reinforced by the sensuous and seductive nature of the music—music which is characterized by a lack of tension and is therefore socially and aesthetically false. Parallel to this is the destruction of meaningful form; and meaningful form, in Adorno’s opinion, can only be achieved by the clear articulation of the contrasts or tension-producing elements in relationship to the whole. The listener regresses to the point of hearing only the charming, isolated moments of a composition or focusing his attention on the performer, and he thereby destroys his perception of the whole.

This tendency toward “atomized” listening has its effect on the size of the standard repertory of accepted classics, which through a steady shrinking process is narrowed to a selection which has nothing to do with quality. A “pantheon of best sellers” arises from this process. They become popular not because of striking individual features but because they successfully conform to a narrow and predetermined standardization achieved by the neutralization of dissimilar features. Culture goods are produced according to a formula, a formula which copies and perpetuates the fetishistic aspects of the listener’s regression. The ultimate result of this leveling process is that the personal judgment of the listener is today completely eliminated from the marketability of the “art” product. When Adorno makes the statement that “the liquidation of individualism is the real signature of the new musical situation,” he is in essence referring both to the music and to its audience as well.

Schönberg seems to Adorno to be the epitome of modern musical innovation. Admittedly a member and supporter of the Schönberg school of the 1920’s, Adorno, in his Philosophy of New Music, portrays Schönberg and Stravinsky as the two protagonists of a new age. But whereas Stravinsky glorified the

\[^{2}\] “Die Liquidierung des Individuums ist die eigentliche Signatur des neuen musikalischen Zustandes” (1956b:683).
liquidation of individualism and dehumanized music to a phenomenon of mere sound, Schönberg, according to, Adorno, expressed the bitter resentment of this liquidation and opened up an entirely new world of expression through the freeing of music from the supremacy of the triad (Mayer 1961:236-40). Schönberg’s successors, however, have lost sight of the real significance of the 12-tone row by using it as a means of creating neutral and static forms rather than by using it as he did, as a means of binding together contrasting and more or less explosive musical forces.

Adorno condemns “prefabricated” musical forms which substitute technique for composition. He argues that the “ultraconstructivists” are using technical manipulation as an end in itself. This total rationalization of form, which is mistaken for musical architecture and which denies music its essential feature of unfolding in time, results in an absence of form. The doing away with subjectivity, the fear of expression and the neutralization of musical material to rigid self-contained formulas are the symptoms of an aging modern music living off the remains of the innovations made forty-odd years ago. In short, there is a loss of dynamic tension.

Adorno explains the reasons for this on two different levels: that of the relationship of the artist and his work to society, and that of the relationships of the musical materials themselves. On the first, or broad, level, Adorno clearly states, “The symptoms of the aging of modern music are, sociologically, the reduction of freedom and the disintegration of the individual, which are accepted, endorsed and copied in private life by people who have lost their sense of direction and their individuality” (1956a:28). He seems to feel that the same thing is happening to modern music that is happening to popular music, classical music, and music in general. At the same time, however, Adorno strongly implies that the reason that modern music suffers so and fails to fulfill its function of expressing tension and dissatisfaction is that it has become too far removed from society. In speaking of the “third program” and special art theaters for modern radical music Adorno says, “as necessary as such segregation might seem to be in order to protect artistic progress from the rage of the compact majority. . . the work [in this way] begins to lose its inner tension, and the wallpaper patterns and arithmetic problems which are threatening to render the aesthetic avant-
gardism of today harmless are not to be separated from the renunciation of the dialectic with the public, a dialectic which should not function as adaptation but as opposition."

On the level of the musical material itself, Adorno explains his criticisms in essentially the same terms. He constantly speaks of the necessary dialectical opposition of content and form, of means and end, and of performer and music. The synthesis of these contrasts is, according to Adorno, perfect form, a form which grows out of these elements alone and which is not superimposed upon them. "The course of music in time. . .itself contradicts predeterminability." "...the primary musical impulse should produce at any given time the principle of its construction." In this respect it is only natural that Adorno regards the free atonality of Schönberg as his ideal, and denounces the complete serialization of today's modern music. He also observes that in addition to a lack of perfect form the idea of the completely predetermined is an illusion because music in this way can neither be constructed in absolute clarity nor does such construction coincide with the resulting actual music (1959c).

Interestingly enough, Adorno's view of such serialized music is applied in the same manner to chance music. "Music which is abstractly and mathematically dictated from without and which has no subjective mediation has an affinity to absolute chance. It is not unlikely that the youngest 'aleatoric' experiments manifest just that very thing." Adorno is also of the opinion that "the depreciation of the determined in favor of determinants appears especially flagrant in the area of

---

3"So notwendig solche Segregationen zuweilen sein mögen, um den künstlerischen Fortschritt vor der Wut der kompakten Majorität zu schützen, . . . so beginnt die Sache in sich selbst ihre Spannung zu verlieren, und die Tapetenmuster und Rechenexempl, die den ästhetischen Avantgardismus heute drohend verharmlosen, sind nicht zu trennen von dem Verzicht auf eine Dialektik mit dem Publikum, die nicht in der Anpassung, sondern in deren Gegenteil bestehen müsste" (1959d:68).


electronic music.” Speaking of the music of the ultra-constructivists he states, “All this exaggerated articulation of the actual raw material of music is not inspired by any artistic aspirations; on the contrary the manipulation becomes an end in itself. . . . It results too, in the regression of music to the pre-musical pre-artistic stage of raw sound; it is only logical that the next step be concrete or electronic music” (1956a:25).

In accordance with the concept of perfect musical form created by contrasting elements, Adorno is very much concerned with the clear articulation of these elements in musical performance. Among his criticisms of performances of new music, and also his reasons for its unintelligibility to the public, are: not enough attention to melodic continuity and differentiated tone color; too-fast tempos; inadequacy of musical education on the part of the conductor and performers; and not enough rehearsal time due to the demands of unionism. Adorno claims that very often the non-understandability of the listeners is willfully confirmed by non-understandable performances (1959d:66). By non-understandability, Adorno is referring to the listener’s inability to conceive the entire form because of the neutralization of the contrasting elements and the unclarity of the inarticulate performance. Indeed, according to Adorno it is only through the clear representation of the opposing elements and their perfectly balanced relationship that the true form can be perceived. This explains, at least in part, his early objections to the use of radio for the broadcasting of serious music so delicately conceived. This transmission of music only distorted its fine shadings and nuances and thereby destroyed its form (1941:110-139). Writing in 1958, however, after improvements were made in electronics, Adorno urges the use of the radio as a means of breaking the “intellectual monopoly of the cultural machine.” With regard to new music he now urges that even rehearsals be broadcast so that the listener can hear the evolution of the musical form through the interpretation of the conductor (1959d:69-70).

Linked closely with his admiration for Schönberg’s free atonality is Adorno’s own concept of musical means—a sort of idealized counterpoint which is, again, characterized by the

6” . . . die Entwertung des Determinierten zugunsten der Determinanten scheint besonders flagrant im Bereich der Elektronik” (1959c:361).
unity of contrasts. "As a synthesis of manifold elements the idea of counterpoint essentially is, in the truly Hegelian sense, identity of the non-identical." The end result for Adorno is a form which is Durchkonstruiert and which is free of all exterior and abstract form. The form grows out of the musical process itself and exists as a sectionless whole. In this way Adorno’s concept of unity is realized. He is always quick to qualify this unity, however, by stressing that the individual voices must still maintain their independence. This explains some of his objections to the 12-tone technique, which he praises for its freeing of counterpoint from overt harmonic implications, while he at the same time points out its inherent dangers. "The 12-tone technique in which the spirit of counterpoint is accomplished contains also the potential of its death. The perfect determinability of voices, which are placed independently opposite one another [but] which are completely complementary, denies their own independence." The perfect determinability of voices, caused by their origin from a common source, i.e., the row, tends to diminish the contrasts to mere complementary relationships, with the antithetical nature of counterpoint perishing in the synthesis. The resulting unity of such material is a false one which Adorno calls "secondary form," the product of neutralization and liquidation of individuality.

We may smile at the bombastic way in which Adorno categorically condemns the music situation of today. However, as a sociologist, philosopher, writer, and musician his opinions certainly deserve attention, even though they are on a rather abstract, idealized plane. Whether or not we agree with his dark picture of a totalitarian state, whose inhabitants are both conditioned and driven by Freudian fears to repression and regression, we cannot deny Adorno’s significance and accomplishments. Criticized by some as the arch-enemy of music, Adorno in many respects may be truly the most progressive


musical figure in the world today by virtue of his abhorrence of apathy in art.

While Adorno is dissatisfied with modern music as represented by Stockhausen and Boulez, he is even more opposed to the idea of turning back to history, as do the Neo-Classicists, in order to copy techniques and forms which grew out of past societies. Nor would he advocate turning back to the practices of Schönberg. For Adorno, progress is only forward, a constant dialectical process of change and motion. Although to sum up his basic philosophy in a phrase would certainly do him injustice, Adorno’s ideas do seem to revolve around a central theme, namely, the unity of contrasts. Not only is the dialectical opposition of art to society a necessity for social truth, but the opposition of music to itself is a necessity for artistic truth. Only by opposing and expressing dissatisfaction with itself can music attain validity and unity. New music today is threatened by a relaxation of this essential ingredient through the loss of individuality and the fetishism of technique. Modern music is indeed growing old.

REFERENCES

**Adorno, Theodor**

1956a Modern Music is Growing Old. The Score, No. 18, December, pp. 18-29.

**Gurlitt, Willibald, ed.**


**Mayer, Harry**

Rita Benton
Nicolas Joseph Hüllmandel and French instrumental music in the second half of the 18th century

Ann Arbor: University Microfilms (UM order no. 61-4019), 1961. (384p., pos. film $5.05; State University of Iowa diss.)

Roger Kamien

Nicolas Joseph Hüllmandel, composer, author, pianist, teacher, and virtuoso on the glass harmonica, was one of a number of Alsatian musicians who worked in Paris during the second half of the eighteenth century. Most of his compositions are keyboard sonatas with violin accompaniments. Similar in style to the sonatas of Johann Christian Bach, his works show real compositional skill. Dr. Benton’s dissertation is the first full-length study of Hüllmandel, and it substantially adds to our knowledge of this musician.

The chapter dealing with Hüllmandel’s life is particularly rich in new information. Dr. Benton shows that he was born not in 1751, as was previously believed, but in 1756, and that he was the son of Michel Hüllmandel, a musician at the Strasbourg Cathedral. N.J. Hüllmandel was highly regarded in his own day and frequented aristocratic circles in Paris. Like many musicians in the late 18th century, he apparently was not regularly in the service of the


aristocracy. He seems to have earned his living as a piano teacher. Among his students were Georges Onslow and Hyacinthe Jadin, who was one of the first professors of piano at the Paris Conservatoire.

Two chapters relate Hüllmandel to the period in which he lived. One is a brief but useful discussion of French attitudes towards instrumental music. The other, entitled "Historico-Musical Factors in Hüllmandel's Background," summarizes the findings of previous research dealing with the following topics: music in Alsace, Carl Philipp Emanuel Bach, French keyboard music, the transition from harpsichord to piano, Hüllmandel's Parisian predecessors, the accompanied clavier sonata, and concert activity in Paris during the second half of the 18th century.

The dissertation contains other valuable features. There is a thematic index of Hüllmandel's works, and a list of original and early editions that is more complete than any previously available. The appendix to Dr. Benton's study includes both the original French text and her annotated translation of Hüllmandel's article, "Clavecin," which appeared in an edition of the Encyclopédie méthodique in 1791. This interesting article shows the viewpoint of an 18th-century pianist who regarded the harpsichord as an outmoded instrument. A musical supplement to the dissertation contains the Divertissement in F major for piano or harpsichord, Op. 7, No. 6, a selection from the Petits airs for harpsichord or piano, Op. 5, and two sonatas (Op. 4, No. 3 and Op. 8, No. 3). The Sonata in C minor, Op. 8, No. 3, has a very important violin part and is a fine work that is well worth performing.

Studies dealing with the 18th century are frequently least helpful when it comes to the analysis of musical style. As Jan LaRue has recently observed, "the techniques of style analysis...are neither widespread nor fully developed." It is not surprising, then, that the sections treating Hüllmandel's music are somewhat less informative than other parts of the dissertation. There is no thorough discussion of thematic material, thematic contrast, or developmental procedures. However, there are some perceptive observations about individual works, and the relationship between the keyboard and violin parts is well-described.

In this dissertation, as in many other studies, one is not often given
the precise frequency with which certain style characteristics occur. Instead, expressions like "sometimes" or "quite often" are employed. For example, Dr. Benton observes that "sometimes [italics mine] the second theme-group begins with material similar to that of the first group but in a related key and treated differently" (p. 155). She then gives two musical examples which illustrate this procedure. One would like to know exactly how frequently this does occur. Then one could determine whether Hüllmandel employs this procedure more or less often than other composers. There are other advantages in tabulating the precise frequency of the style characteristics studied. One is that such a tabulation tends to oblige the writer to define the characteristics with greater care. Another is that it assures the reader that the writer has not relied merely upon his general impressions when making statements of frequency.

My last two paragraphs should not obscure the fact that Dr. Benton has written a good book that is of real value to students of 18th-century music.

Roger Kamien teaches at Queens College. He completed his dissertation on problems of 18th-century musical style at Princeton, 1964.
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of Francisco de Salinas

Ann Arbor: University Microfilms (UM order no. 62-6046), 1961. (535p., pos. film $6.80; University of Southern California diss.)

Peter Bergquist

Arthur Daniels' dissertation is a detailed study of Salinas' De musica (Salamanca, 1577; facsimile reprint, ed. Kastner, in Documenta Musicologica, Bärenreiter, 1958) based on a complete translation from the original Latin. De musica is a massively learned treatise on harmonics and metrics by a blind organist who was also one of the most eminent musical scholars of his day. In this work Salinas is concerned with music only as a mathematical science and touches on problems of composition and performance peripherally as they impinge on harmonics and metrics. Yet, he is not so doctrinaire as to reject the testimony of the ear; he emphasizes throughout that sensory perception must join with reason in the study of music. Reason is the ultimate authority and must supply proof for what the senses perceive as correct, since the unaided senses may judge
the precise frequency with which certain style characteristics occur. Instead, expressions like "sometimes" or "quite often" are employed. For example, Dr. Benton observes that "sometimes [italics mine] the second theme-group begins with material similar to that of the first group but in a related key and treated differently" (p. 155). She then gives two musical examples which illustrate this procedure. One would like to know exactly how frequently this does occur. Then one could determine whether Hüllmandel employs this procedure more or less often than other composers. There are other advantages in tabulating the precise frequency of the style characteristics studied. One is that such a tabulation tends to oblige the writer to define the characteristics with greater care. Another is that it assures the reader that the writer has not relied merely upon his general impressions when making statements of frequency.
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Arthur Daniels' dissertation is a detailed study of Salinas' De musica (Salamanca, 1577; facsimile reprint, ed. Kastner, in Documenta Musicologica, Bärenreiter, 1958) based on a complete translation from the original Latin. De musica is a massively learned treatise on harmonics and metrics by a blind organist who was also one of the most eminent musical scholars of his day. In this work Salinas is concerned with music only as a mathematical science and touches on problems of composition and performance peripherally as they impinge on harmonics and metrics. Yet, he is not so doctrinaire as to reject the testimony of the ear; he emphasizes throughout that sensory perception must join with reason in the study of music. Reason is the ultimate authority and must supply proof for what the senses perceive as correct, since the unaided senses may judge
defectively. But reason should not lead one to take a position that is completely opposed by the ear.

This attitude is the rationale for Salinas' preference for justly tuned consonances rather than the harsher Pythagorean intervals; not only do the just intervals sound better, but their numerical description and derivation is simpler and more logical. Salinas' classification of the perfect fourth is also affected by this attitude. He insists that the fourth is consonant because its numerical ratio is simple, because the simplest division of the octave $(2:3:4)$ produces the fifth and fourth, and also because it is almost always found at the end of compositions as part of a fully consonant sonority. But he does acknowledge that the fourth can seldom stand alone and ordinarily requires the support of the fifth below. Thus he arrives at the same position taken by composers and most practical theorists of the period.

*De musica* is divided into seven books, the first four on harmonics, the last three on metrics. Book I, as Daniels describes it, is "one of the most comprehensive expositions of neo-Pythagorean number theory ever written by a music theorist." In Book II Salinas studies the numerical ratios which define intervals and classifies the intervals as consonant or dissonant. Salinas here begins to expound his preference for just intervals, a central concern of the books on harmonics. Daniels suggests that Salinas reflects the increased interest of 16th-century composers in the full triad. Similarly, the account of the diatonic, chromatic, and enharmonic genera in Book III reflects the greater interest of composers in chromaticism. This section culminates in Salinas' ideal tuning which includes 24 tones to the octave and achieves just harmony throughout the circle of fifths. Book III also contains detailed descriptions of three meantone temperaments for keyboard instruments and one equal temperament for fretted instruments. The three meantone temperaments reduce the perfect fifth respectively by $1/3$, $2/7$, and $1/4$ of the syntonic comma. The first was invented by Salinas, the second by Zarlino, and the third was first described by Pietro Aaron. Salinas intends that all should be applied to an octave of 19 tones in order to equalize the greater and lesser tones of just tuning, an adjustment which he recognizes as a practical necessity for keyboard instruments since they cannot achieve the perfect tuning and fine gradations of which the human voice is capable. The work on tuning and temperament is one of Salinas' major claims to fame. He is credited with the first precise mathematical definition of equal temperament, and his 24-tone division of the octave is one of the earliest and best multiple division, according to J. Murray Barbour.

Book IV concludes the study of harmonics with an extensive account of the Greek tonal systems, containing what is still one of the clearest explanations of the difference between *harmoniae* and *tonoi*. Salinas was one of the first musical scholars to obtain an extensive knowledge of the original sources of Greek theory, and his lucid presentation shows how well he mastered this material. He acknowledges also the
confusion among the sources on some points and states that not
everything in these writings can be clarified completely, an admission
which only increases one's respect for his ability to unravel as much
as he did. Book IV concludes with a detailed critique of several
ancient and contemporary theorists, especially with regard to their
adherence to or deviation from just intonation. Salinas does not hesi-
tate to criticize the most eminent figures; the Pythagoreans, Aristox-
enus, Ptolemy, Gafori, Glareanus, and Zarlino are among those who
suffer his closely reasoned censure.

The three books on metrics present their material in a largely
traditional and uncritical manner. Book V defines and classifies
rhythm and poetic feet, Book VI treats meter, and Book VII explains
verse construction. This last book contains the examples of Spanish
and other folk music which have been Salinas' chief claim to fame.
Daniels asserts that the inclusion of these tunes is not the most
valuable feature of Salinas' treatise, because they are intended only
as illustrations of poetic meters and are not studied from any other
point of view. Moreover, many are fragmentary. Although they are
valuable as examples of 16th-century folk music, Salinas was inter-
ested in them not as such but only as accessories to his humanistic
aims. The most important part of the treatise is certainly the section
on harmonics. Daniels says as much, devotes the bulk of his study
to the first four books, and passes over the last three almost com-
pletely except for transcribing and commenting on the examples
of folk song.

Daniels' study is admirably thorough, very well written, and ex-
remely readable, despite the technical nature of much of it. The
extensive quotations Daniels has included, frequently entire chapters,
add even more to the value of his work. No major errors of fact are
apparent. The only mis-statement I found was the observation on
p. 414 that Gafori's "treatise in the vernacular" must be lost. In
fact, Salinas was referring to Gafori's Angelicum ac divinum opus
musicai (Milan, 1508), of which all but the title is in Italian. This
is plainly a small matter and hardly a serious reflection on Daniels'
work.

In his opening chapter Daniels develops the idea that music and
the other arts of the Renaissance reveal a common belief in the mys-
tical power of number to express universal truth. This explains why
Salinas emphasized harmonics rather than practical music in De
musica. Daniels cites later examples of a similar attitude, in Helm-
holtz for one, and ties it further to the growth in the 20th century
of interest in mathematical acoustics, in Hindemith's theories, in
serial music, and in writings of such people as Milton Babbitt. He
closes with a quotation from Lord Kelvin to the effect that what we
can measure numerically we know, and only what we can measure
do we know. Salinas' approach surely has something in common with
the other figures Daniels names, but to go so far as Kelvin perhaps
overstates the intention of Salinas and the other musicians mentioned.
Other modes of knowledge than the numerical are possible, and in

99
an art such as music, perhaps preferable. One can measure endlessly and still fail to understand the nature of a work's musical language or esthetic value. Numerical measurement unquestionably has its uses, but a book like De Musica, that concentrates exclusively on measurement, is somewhat limited in value and interest when compared with the work of other theorists from the same period such as Zarlino, who treat more immediately and extensively the design of the art-work and the methods of its composition and performance. Writers such as Zarlino and Gafori say much more about what musicians now want and need to know regarding Renaissance music than Salinas.

These reservations aside, Salinas still deserves our attention as a distinguished musical humanist, for the light his work sheds on the history of music theory in general, and possibly for what he might contribute to present attempts to find alternatives to equal temperament. Daniels' study is an ideally thorough treatment of Salinas' work and can be heartily and unreservedly recommended to anyone concerned with music theory of the Renaissance.

Peter Bergquist completed the Ph.D. in musicology at Columbia University in 1964, and is presently assistant professor at the University of Oregon. His dissertation treats the theoretical writings of Pietro Aaron.
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Dika Newlin

Reading this thesis reminded me anew how much progress we have made in accepting contemporary musical trends as fit subjects for musicological research. Such was not always the case. I vividly remember the furor caused twenty years ago when it was announced that my Columbia thesis subject would be Bruckner, Mahler, Schoenberg. What! a thesis partly about a still living composer? Horrors! Thus the reaction of a sizeable portion of the musicological world. Thanks to enlightened advisors, the project was nonetheless fulfilled, and I like to think that this pioneer work helped prepare for the greater liberality of today in this respect.

When reading this work, it is necessary to remember that it was finished in 1960. Of course, more Webern material has come to publication since then. There are the Webern essays Der Weg zur neuen Musik, the Jone-Humplik correspondence, Kolneder's study in the 100
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When reading this work, it is necessary to remember that it was finished in 1960. Of course, more Webern material has come to publication since then. There are the Webern essays Der Weg zur neuen Musik, the Jone-Humplik correspondence, Kolneder’s study in the
series Kontrapunkte, and that most fascinating "whodunit" in musicological literature, Hans Moldenhauer's The Death of Anton Webern. Many previously unknown compositions of Webern have come to light through Moldenhauer's researches. Therefore, in McKenzie's thesis one will find omissions which are not his fault.

The work begins with a brief account of Webern's life, drawn mainly from Robert Craft's leaflet accompanying his record album of Webern's complete works, from Rognoni's Espressionismo e dodecaphonia, and from Wildgan's biographical table in the Webern issue of Die Reihe. In this section, there is one curious error. McKenzie speaks of the 1907 Piano Quintet as not having been finished. Actually it was finished and has been recorded in the Craft album. Elsewhere McKenzie mentions this but not the blueprint publication (Boekle-Bomart).

In Chapter II, the general movement of Expressionism is discussed. Good use is made of Robert Wiedman's unpublished N.Y.U. thesis on this subject, and the appropriate literary and artistic sources are adduced. In this section, I think McKenzie makes one bad mistake in equating Neue Sachlichkeit and the twelve-tone "technique." If anything, the Neue Sachlichkeit is closer to such things as Hindemith's Gebrauchsmusik. (I know he repudiated the term in later years, but the thing did exist.) For a better perspective on all this, read Schoenberg's wonderful essay, "New music, outmoded music, style and idea," in Style and Idea.

A word here concerning the use of the term "twelve-tone technique" which McKenzie (and many other writers) employ a great deal. Schoenberg himself objected to this term because he thought it suggested an undue rigidity. He always preferred to say "method of composition with twelve tones." I think we should respect this preference and use his expression (or, for greater brevity, "twelve-tone method"). The point may seem subtle and pedantic but I think it is meaningful. (Incidentally, the cacophonous mouthful, dodecaphony, I can do nicely without.)

Chapter III deals with Webern's music between Opp. 1 and 16—i.e., the pre-twelve-tone works, and is by far the bulkiest section of the thesis. This is probably as it should be, for the twelve-tone works have been more frequently and exhaustively analyzed (especially Op. 24, the Concerto for nine instruments, has become a classical subject for analysis and, as I have experienced, is even accessible to the undergraduate novice in this field). Starting out with the Passacaglia, Op. 1, McKenzie convincingly compares its theme to representative Bach and Beethoven motifs that were certainly well-known to Webern (basic motif of Beethoven's Grosse Fuge, theme of Bach's B minor fugue, WTC I).

Before tackling the works that abandon a tonal center, McKenzie discusses the vexed question of the term "atonality." As is well-known, Schoenberg objected violently to the negative connotations of this word, preferring "pantonality." But other writers (cf. Rudolf Reti) have used the latter term with a quite different meaning. What
to do? McKenzie does plump for "atonality" (which I would not) but at least he gives us the benefit of a full discussion of all problems involved.

Naturally, in discussing the group of works now under considera-
tion, McKenzie has to pay a great deal of attention to the importance of the individual intervals. Here he ignores enharmonic notation, e.g., he calls a diminished fourth a major third and an augmented second a minor third. I think this is very unwise. After all, Webern certainly had a very precise reason for notating each interval as he did—therefore these notations must be taken into account.

In this whole section, there is a great deal of purely "academic" analysis of motifs, canonic treatments, etc. I feared at first that McKenzie would give insufficient attention to the expressive ends which these means serve—would speak too much about how the work is "made" and not enough about what it "is" (as Schoenberg said). However, he does discuss expressive details, especially in the songs. Sometimes his interpretations are very convincing; sometimes he really reaches for them (e.g., in Op. 19 we are told that in the setting of the word "Grün" the sound "actually suggests the color green." Why? How?). Here we enter dangerous waters, for, as Mendelssohn said, there are certain things that are not too vague to be said in words, but too definite. Thus, there are times when verbal interpre-
tation might hinder rather than help.

McKenzie did make one very interesting discovery. He calls this "signature phrase," which he finds in all of Webern's songs. It is characteristically a small interval (minor second, major second, or minor third) followed by a large interval (often a sixth or seventh) —both descending. The third note is in chromatic relation to either the first or the second note. This phrase is often set off by rests, or occurs with sudden changes of dynamics, rhythm, or tempo. McKenzie often points out this motif in the course of his text, and also devotes an appendix to its many appearances.

This is potentially an important discovery. The method could be refined still further by asking consistently the following questions:
1. Does it make any difference which intervals are used, or are only the descending direction, differing size of the intervals, and chromatic relation as described above significant?
2. Do the texts to which the motif is set show any type of inter-
relationships?
3. If the motif is used in non-vocal music, is there any character-
istic emotional connotation which may be detected from the musical context?

Research of this nature would form a valuable contribution to the type of investigation desired by Deryck Cooke as set forth in the challenging preface to his The Language of Music:

If this state of affairs (the frequent misapprehension of 'the new lan-
guage of music') calls forth a clear and convincing outline of the express-
ive aims of the new language, with an account of some of the terms
of its vocabulary and some of its forms of expression, to offset ever so slightly the present welter of aridly technical, not to say purely mathematical exegesis, no one will be more pleased than the present writer, who whole-heartedly admires such of this music as he has found expressive of emotion.

More power, then, to the present and future scholars who will take part in this important enterprise!

Chapter IV discusses (rather briefly) the twelve-tone works. Of course, a brief presentation of the rudiments of the method is made. As always, simplification may lead to some misunderstanding as in this sentence: "The only way a particular tone may be repeated, before the completion of the series, is immediately after it sounds the first time" (italics mine). What about repetitions of successive groups of tones? (cf. the beginning of Schoenberg’s Third String Quartet, first theme of his Piano Concerto).

McKenzie certainly hits the nail on the head when he says of Webern’s total oeuvre, "The musical expression is essentially lyrical This is not constructivist music" (italics mine). This sentence ought to be engraved in bronze somewhere as an antidote to articles like Stockhausen’s “Structure and Experiential Time” (Die Reihe, Vol. II, Webern issue).

Some may not agree, however, with the statement that Webern is "in many ways the most easily approachable of the group for the uninitiated listener." How about Berg’s Wozzeck, which shattered the "uninitiated listener" at the Met to such an extent that the day after its premiere the number of lost objects reported to "Lost and Found" was the largest in the history of the house! In this connection, Leibowitz’ article "Alban Berg; the seduction of truth," in a British Horizon issue of the late forties is of interest.

A technical aside: I must fault Mr. McKenzie, or his typist, or his adviser for letting pass too many careless mistakes in spelling of names and citing of titles. Thus I read about Rogers Sessions, Wallingford Rieger, Paul Gaugin, Kandinsky’s Über die (!) Geistige in der Kunst—and I cannot forebear to mention that the title of my Bruckner, Mahler, Schoenberg received a supererogatory and. Such errors could so easily be avoided with a little more proofreading care. They are so irritating (even sense-interrupting) to the careful reader.

There is certainly much worthwhile research still to be done on Webern. (We look forward to the fine work-in-progress of Hans Moldenhauer.) Let us hope that such research will not take off from Boulez’ notorious sentence "Schoenberg est mort," (with the implication "and a good thing, too.") Rather, Webern must be seen as the heir of the grand Viennese Classic-post-Beethovenian-contemporary tradition. In this way his true greatness will be seen. And his name and work will not be misused for tendentious purposes which he would—in my belief—have been the first to repudiate.

Dika Newlin is professor of music at Drew University.
Launcelot Allen Pyke, II
Jazz, 1920 to 1927:
an analytical study
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Frank J. Gillis

This doctoral dissertation, filled with a miscellany of errors of fact and judgment, points out the need for academic advisers qualified to direct scholarly papers dealing with jazz. It is unfortunate that as colleges and universities become increasingly aware of the interest and importance being attached to jazz, few faculty seem to be available for guiding those researching and writing on this vital aspect of American culture. Whereas much of the carelessness is the fault of the author, his advisers apparently lacked knowledge of the musical and esthetic values of jazz, and of the available reference works. Whether this condition can be attributed to the failure of music departments to recognize the validity of jazz as a significant musical phenomenon, and fit for scholarly enquiry, or to a shortage of qualified teachers, it is a rather sad situation that should soon be rectified.

Pyke's work, a study based upon ten transcribed jazz tunes recorded during what might be called the classical period of New Orleans improvised ensemble jazz, is divided into two parts. Volume I, comprising the text, deals with the background and musical characteristics of jazz, and Volume II contains a transcription of the ten tunes with the melodic instruments notated in score. Before one gets too far into the text, several serious errors turn up. First, it should have been brought out in the title that the study is restricted to Negro jazz. Second, one of the recorded versions transcribed and analyzed, Bunk Johnson's Original Superior Band playing "Down by the River", was recorded in 1942, not 1922, as stated, and thus should not have been considered in the study. Third, in his treatment of "a representative selection of New Orleans jazz" the author fails to include even one of at least a dozen significant recordings made by Jelly Roll Morton's Red Hot Peppers in 1926-27, a group that many jazz critics, writers, and enthusiasts would quickly name as one of the two outstanding jazz units—the other being King Oliver's Creole Jazz Band, represented in the dissertation by four selections—playing in the New Orleans ensemble style.

The entire work—the sections on the historical background of jazz and on musical analysis, the bibliography and the transcriptions themselves—is carelessly done and contains many errors. Some are simply
due to negligence. It is unforgivable for anyone writing on jazz to notate the blues scale with a flatted sixth instead of a flatted seventh, and this incorrectly from a source (p. 78). Some are undoubtedly typographical, and some are due to mistakes of fact. They are too numerous to bring out in any great detail here. Furthermore, many of the ideas presented are not clearly stated and show the author to be without complete command of his subject. Finally, a good deal of the important literature in the field has been neglected. A study in which King Oliver and his recordings play such a major role should have utilized, or at least cited, King Joe Oliver, by Walter C. Allen and Brian A. L. Rust (Belleville, N.J., 1955), the definitive work on the man, his life, and recordings.

I find it hard to believe that this dissertation could have been accepted as a piece of scholarly research and writing. Its basic idea—the transcription and analysis of tunes taken from a certain style period of jazz—is good. Such an undertaking, however, requires a broad knowledge of the music, historically, esthetically, and theoretically, and a fine hand to develop it. Pyke was weak in the majority of these requirements. Yet, with more care, and with proper guidance, he could have done much better.

FRANK J. GILLIS is acting director of the Folklore Institute, Indiana University.

Joseph Emilio Rotondi
Literary and musical aspects of Roman opera, 1600-1650
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Barbara Russano Hanning

Any study and revaluation in English of early opera deserves the interest of musicologists, but one which promises a "unique approach" through a consideration of literary as well as musical aspects is especially welcome. For it was particularly in this formative period of both Florentine and Roman opera that the librettist played an important role in determining the ultimate shape of the work. Whether the text was written by a humanist poet, "to make a simple test of what the music of our age could do" (Rinuccini in the declination of his Euridice, 1600), or by the composer himself who chose from among those literary forms and conventions available to him, it cannot have failed to influence the musical setting. One is therefore pleased to
due to negligence. It is unforgivable for anyone writing on jazz to notate the blues scale with a flatted sixth instead of a flatted seventh, and this incorrectly from a source (p. 78). Some are undoubtedly typographical, and some are due to mistakes of fact. They are too numerous to bring out in any great detail here. Furthermore, many of the ideas presented are not clearly stated and show the author to be without complete command of his subject. Finally, a good deal of the important literature in the field has been neglected. A study in which King Oliver and his recordings play such a major role should have utilized, or at least cited, King Joe Oliver, by Walter C. Allen and Brian A. L. Rust (Belleville, N.J., 1955), the definitive work on the man, his life, and recordings.

I find it hard to believe that this dissertation could have been accepted as a piece of scholarly research and writing. Its basic idea—the transcription and analysis of tunes taken from a certain style period of jazz—is good. Such an undertaking, however, requires a broad knowledge of the music, historically, esthetically, and theoretically, and a fine hand to develop it. Pyke was weak in the majority of these requirements. Yet, with more care, and with proper guidance, he could have done much better.

FRANK J. GILLIS is acting director of the Folklore Institute, Indiana University.
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Barbara Russano Hanning

Any study and revaluation in English of early opera deserves the interest of musicologists, but one which promises a "unique approach" through a consideration of literary as well as musical aspects is especially welcome. For it was particularly in this formative period of both Florentine and Roman opera that the librettist played an important role in determining the ultimate shape of the work. Whether the text was written by a humanist poet, "to make a simple test of what the music of our age could do" (Rinuccini in the dedication of his Euridice, 1600), or by the composer himself who chose from among those literary forms and conventions available to him, it cannot have failed to influence the musical setting. One is therefore pleased to
see from the title and preface of Mr. Rotondi's dissertation that he does not plan to ignore the libretto, "the guiding principle for all the sister arts," but all the more disappointed when the expectations aroused are not fully satisfied in the body of his work.

The book is organized in two sections. The first three chapters deal with general background material and purely literary matters, and the last two with musical problems. Chapter I briefly discusses the "political and social atmosphere" in 17th-century Italy, the literary sources of libretti, and the nature of serious and comic opera. It gives special consideration to the problem of the origins of comic opera, and finally presents a section that treats of the subtitles of 17th-century opera. Chapter II narrows the scope of the discussion to Rome, the musico-dramatic production in that city from 1600 to 1650 (exclusive of any consideration of their libretti), and closes with a rather superficial judgment on the nature of the existing patron-artist relationship, a relationship that incurs the scorn of the author. After a preliminary enumeration of *commedia* elements in Roman libretti, the final chapter of this literary section (Chapter III), investigates the plots of each of five libretti, chosen precisely because of their ambiguity of dramatic genre. In an attempt to resolve their ambiguity, Rotondi applies the criteria of *commedia* established in the previous chapter, and concludes that they belong to the category of *commedia in musica*. This chapter is the most original, interesting, and in some ways provocative one of the work.

The second section moves from a consideration of the external forms of acts and scenes (Chapter IV) to the internal designs of solos and vocal ensembles (Chapter V). Here it is only for the sake of convenience that the discussion is limited to the same five works, for each is treated independently of the others, and surprisingly enough, independently of its own libretto.

The dissertation contains an appendix, consisting of 64 pages of musical examples, a short index, and a bibliography composed entirely of secondary sources. Mr. Rotondi offers very little information about the nature or whereabouts of his primary sources. Under the heading "Musical Manuscripts", he lists the five operas and in each case cites one score to which he presumably has access. Two operas were studied from the first editions of their scores, but the other three are cited only in the form of British Museum transcripts of the original editions, copied in 1915. In no case does he tell us where the first editions may be found. It is curious that Mr. Rotondi had to avail himself of 20th-century copies, for the first editions of at least two of these works are in the possession of, for example, the Santa Cecilia Library in Rome. Similarly, his sources for the libretti seem to have been either Solerti's modern editions in *Albori del melodramma*, or the musical scores themselves. Thus, any discrepancy between the original libretto and its setting would pass unnoticed.

The division into two sections, with the musical one slightly outweighing the literary in quantity, though not in depth, proves to be
a hindrance to a thesis which all but promises its readers a synthetic revaluation of the sister arts of poetry and music. In fact, Mr. Rotondi adheres to a strict dichotomy between literary and musical considerations throughout his study. He attempts no synthesis and draws no conclusions that might serve to overcome the rather artificial, if convenient, separation of the two aspects. For example, nowhere does he state or even imply that the structural placement of the chorus or the balanced distribution of solos and ensembles might be part of the librettist's art. His failure to relate the libretti to their musical settings is particularly regrettable, for these works are products of an era in which the seconda pratica and the new recitative style heralded the text as music's mistress.

The five operas selected for this study were all written in Rome within a span of twenty years: La morte d'Orfeo (1619) by Stefano Landi (1590-1655), himself the librettist; L'Aretusa (1620) by Filippo Vitali (c. 1600-1653), libretto by Msgr. Ottavio Corsini; La catena d'Adone (1626) by Domenico Mazzocchi (1592-1665), librettist, Ottavio Tronsarelli; Diana schernita (1629) by Giacinto Cornacchini (dates not supplied by the author, but given in the new Ricordi encyclopedia as ca. 1590-1658?), libretto by G.F. Parisani; and La Galatea (1639) by Loreto Vittori (1604-1670), himself the librettist. It would have been interesting to note, for example, that two of the composers, Vitali and Vittori, were of Florentine background, that the prolific poet Tronsarelli composed at least one other text for Mazzocchi (il martirio de'Santi Abundio, 1631), or that Vittori's libretto bears the same title as an earlier one by Chiabrera. In no case, however, are the composers or librettists identified in their historical context. This information would have been more than a courtesy to the unspecialized reader; it might have modified some of the conclusions drawn by Mr. Rotondi, whose preoccupation centers solely on the works themselves.

The main concern of the first, the literary, section of the dissertation is to establish the genre of the five chosen libretti as commedia. Rotondi tells us that his investigation was prompted by the disparate opinions of historians as to the origin of "comic opera" (its beginnings are placed anywhere from L'Amfiparnaso (1597) to La serva padrona (1733) with Rospigliosi's Chi soffre sperì (1639), the most frequently cited mean), and by his disagreement with the prevailing notion that serious opera was infiltrated by comic elements. Three of the five works chosen for his study are often cited as examples of this process of infiltration and, according to Rotondi, one of them (Diana schernita) is taken for a veritable comic opera by several scholars. Rotondi maintains that the problem may be clarified by considering the dramatic genre of the libretto. Thus, in the third chapter he closely examines the literary affinities of these libretti to 17th-century comedy and thereby hopes to alter the established conclusions about the early existence of comic opera in Rome.

Let us review the crucial third chapter more closely. Rotondi recognizes the Aristotelian divisions of literature as the basic categories
adopted by 17th-century poets. Consequently, his own theoretical criterion for *commedia* throughout the dissertation is supplied by the dic-
tum in the *Poetics* that comedy mirrors life at close range. He derives other criteria from the literary practice of the age and applies these also to the Roman libretti under scrutiny. Parody looms large in Rotondi’s list of *commedia* elements and accounts for modifications of plot and the satiric treatment of mythological characters as ordinary people, as well as for the frequent paraphrasing of traditional sources, for example, a canto by Dante in *L’Aretusa*. The most characteristically Roman manifestation of parody, and one intended to attract clerical patronage, was the use of allegory, “a serious aspect of *commedia*.” (Tronsarelli, for example, whose libretto is avowedly modelled on Mar-
ino’s idyll _Adone_, equates his characters with such moralistic abstrac-
tions as good, evil, reason, and concupiscence in the description of his plot, or moral, printed at the beginning of the score.) The less than idealized treatment of love and sex is another aspect of *commedia* Rotondi culled from literary practice and then discovered in some of the works studied. (In _Diana schernita_, for instance, the goddess is made to undress in front of her lover, whom she turns into a stag.) The third and most obvious manifestation of *commedia* is described by Rotondi as the popular element. This may be introduced in the form of a _ballo_ -like shepherd’s chorus, or a comical situation such as the pursuit of a young and elu-
sive lad by a shepherdess of “prudent age” (*La Galatea*).

Although these features are indeed present in the chosen libretti to greater or lesser degrees (_Diana schernita_ has few, if any, ele-
ments in common with, for instance, _L’Aretusa_), it is doubtful whether they always provide sufficient reason in themselves to justify the iden-
tification of all five libretti as _commedie_. One of the main difficulties here is the author’s failure to distinguish clearly between the terms “comic elements” and “*commedia* elements,” and between “comic opera” and _commedia in musica_. The preface and first chapter sug-
gest fleetingly that three of the operas discussed have musical as well as literary characteristics in common with _Chi soffre speri_, and therefore would be accepted by some scholars as genuine “comic operas,” but the matter is not resumed when he considers the musical settings. Furthermore, the whole question of whether “comic ele-
ments” may in fact be present in serious opera, as serious elements are in _commedia_, is ignored. Another difficulty created by Rotondi’s Aristotelian bias is his refusal to recognize the independent genre of tragicomedy, which had been greatly discussed by literary theorists since the writings of Giraldi Cinthio in the mid-16th century. In this respect, the works of Tasso and Guarini are much more important as literary sources for Rotondi’s libretti than either Trissino’s *Sofonisba* or Bibbiena’s *Calandria_. The acknowledged source for Tronsarelli’s libretto, Marino’s _Adone_, was a kind of pastoral (De Sanctis calls it an _idillico_, a genre separate from the _comico_), and one cannot ignore the link between the oft-used Orpheus legend and Poliziano’s _Orfeo_ (not cited among the literary sources), which popularized it. As for some of the other criteria set up the author—quotations 108
from Dante and others, allegorization and moralization, the introduction of "popular" elements and situations—these were conventions which can also be seen in the earlier pastoral tragicomedies and in the Florentine libretti as well. To say that some of the Roman operas use these conventions with more satirical intent than others might be tenable, but to insist that their appearance in every case makes the libretto a commedia strains the thesis to the breaking point.

Another source of confusion is the author's dogged overuse of the subtitles of the libretti in an effort to have the poets themselves support his conclusions about the nature of their works. Alas, this is not always practicable, and in the sole case (La morte d'Orfeo: tragicommedia pastorale) where the link between subtitle and genre is obvious Mr. Rotondi misses his opportunity. Three of the remaining works are called favola and two of these have the additional qualification, boschereccia. Taken together, the words mean merely "woodland tale," but Rotondi conjures up an implied opposition between a simple rustic setting and the "atmosphere of the Arcadian countryside," and then reasons as follows: since the subtitle indicates a deviation from the original model (a hypothetical favola buccolica), it therefore describes a parodic genre which necessarily belongs to comedy. L'Aretusa, however, is called simply favola, as were the pastoral poems by Rinuccini and Striggio, and here Rotondi turns to Fanfani's "comprehensive dictionary of the Italian language" to show that the word may have had comic overtones. (No date is given for his reference, but the earliest edition of Fanfani's Vocabolario appeared in 1865.) Interestingly enough, the earlier Vocabolario degli accademici della Crusca (I quote from the Neapolitan edition of 1746-48) defines the word as follows: "Falsa narrazione, Trovato non vero, talora non verisimile, come gli apologi, o le trasformazioni d'Ovidio, talora verisimile, come le novelle del Boccaccio" (an untrue story, an unreal invention, sometimes without verisimilitude, as the apologues, or the Metamorphoses of Ovid, sometimes possessing verisimilitude, as the novelle of Boccaccio), and gives as its more specialized theatrical meaning,"... o Intreccio di commedia, o di poema" (either the plot of a comedy or of a poem). In any case, if L'Aretusa is a commedia partly by virtue of its subtitle, as Rotondi maintains, then the whole question of the genre of La favola d'Orfeo and of Dafne must be reconsidered.

Although the musical section of the dissertation has fewer pitfalls, it is also less daring in its conjectures. The chapter on structural designs consists of twenty-five pages of outlines wherein are listed the various vocal and instrumental pieces in their order of occurrence within each work. No commentary is provided for these outlines, which are in themselves difficult and tedious to read, but the section is prefaced by five pages in which the author explains his terminology. Here, in addition to the relatively formless type of solo usually in recitative or arioso style, one finds the forms strophic, ostinato, and canzona described and applied either to monodic or choral stanzas. The last term, borrowed from Apel, is intended to call to mind a
sectionalized form with contrasting meters, textures, and so forth. Perhaps madrigal would have been a more appropriate term.

A certain lack of consistency in the description of choral textures is distracting. "Contrapuntal... shall be used interchangeably with 'polyphonic' and 'fugal'. . . the word 'canonic'. . . as a relief term for 'fugal' to avoid excess repetition of the latter term." The cursory survey given at this point in the dissertation could well have been expanded by an attempt to link the use of these forms to the dramatic situations and verse forms of the libretti. One could ask, Are certain stanza forms more commonly assigned to comic characters? Is the emergence of an aria style distinct from the expressive recitative in any way connected to a similar development in the libretto? Does the monodic chorus occupy a special position in the drama? On the subject of the chorus, Mr. Rotondi expresses his disagreement with those who consider it to be simply an ornamental feature of Roman opera. But he supports the assertion that it occupies a "position of great importance and [is] an integral part of the complete dramatic scheme" only by the observation that the chorus frequently repeats the texts of solos or smaller ensembles and thereby "highlights the emotional aspects" of the libretto.

In the final chapter, where a closer examination of formal types is undertaken, the departure from the Florentine melodic style is described as "not great," and the generalization that the Roman declamatory style was perhaps "more lyrical" at times or possessed "more verve" is added as an afterthought. In fact, a more thorough examination of the two schools, again with greater attention to the treatment of the libretto, is necessary before meaningful conclusions may be drawn. I should like to see, for example, a comparison of such details as the treatment of text declamation, the use of dissonance in affective passages, and so forth, as well as of the larger structural designs which are by no means absent in the earlier Florentine opera. Only in this way will it be possible to form a complete picture of the continuity and development of Baroque opera.

Barbara Hanning is presently completing the Ph.D. in musicology at Yale University.
Robert L. Weaver
Florentine comic operas
of the 17th century
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William C. Holmes

Robert L. Weaver's dissertation is, without doubt, one of the most useful additions to our knowledge of seventeenth-century opera to have appeared in recent years. Early Florentine, Roman, Venetian, and Neapolitan operas have previously been studied, at least to the extent of providing the serious student with a few basic biographical-bibliographical tools. This is not to say that, especially in the case of Roman opera, nearly enough music has been made available in order to make it possible to reach definite stylistic conclusions. On the contrary, much more work will have to be done if we ever hope to unravel the complicated web of events which led to the well-known operatic masterpieces of the late 18th century.

A certain lack of interest in the first century of opera perhaps explains this scarcity of basic studies. Interestingly enough, most of the preliminary studies in 17th-century opera (with the notable exceptions of Grout's Short History of Opera, Anna Amalie Abert's Claudio Monteverdi und das musikalische Drama, a few articles, and a handful of dissertations) were written more than thirty years ago. Prevailing musicological interests change and with these changes, middle and late 17th-century opera has suffered neglect.

One of the most important and astonishing lacunae in musical history has been Florentine opera after the middle of the seventeenth century. Rome, Bologna, Naples, and Venice—to name only a few cities—have had their chroniclers of theatrical history, with which, of course, the history of opera is so intimately connected. As Weaver points out in his preface, Florence has not been so fortunate; there are few standard reference works dealing with theatrical life in that city.

Accordingly, Weaver devotes 200 of the 366 pages of his dissertation to the Academies, academic comedy, and the greatest Florentine writer of academic comedies, Giovanni Maria Moniglia (1624-1700). The chapter headings in this section of the dissertation are as follows: The Academies; G. M. Moniglia; The Academic Comedies; The Sources and Structure of the Librettos; Comic Operas in Florence and at Pratolino; The 18th-Century Critical View of 17th-Century Drama; and The Melani Family.

The Academy of the Immobili was one of the most active of the
Florentine academies and enjoyed the patronage of Cardinal Giovanni Carlo de' Medici. 1657 marks the first performance by the Immobili of a comic opera at "their" theater, La Pergola. Between 1657 and 1662 there were 6 comic operas presented at the Pergola. The projected seventh performance in 1662 was cancelled because of the death of Cardinal Giovanni Carlo. The librettos of all of these operas were written by Moniglia.

Interestingly enough, with the exception of the professional solo singers, all dancers, chorus members, etc. were noble members of the Academy. Indeed, as Weaver remarks, "It is the stamp of the cultured amateur which in fact sets off the comic operas of Florence in the middle of the century" (p. 84).

The librettos especially of the Florentine comedies are noteworthy for their economy of means and expression. This is in marked contrast to Roman opera of the period, which relied heavily on complicated stage machinery. Weaver's many allusions to "the Roman and Venetian spectacles" can, however, be misleading, for it is precisely the more economical means that set apart, generally speaking, Venetian operas from Roman. Such a spectacle as Cesti's Il Pomo d'Oro cannot be considered in the general picture since it is a gigantic exception to the usual theatrical style of Venetian opera. And, as for Roman comic operas, both Chi soffre speri (1637 and 1639) and Dal Male il bene (1653 and many times later) are notable for the economy of means in their librettos. The intermezzi which close each act of Chi soffre speri of course introduce lavish effects that have little if anything to do with the development of the plot, but the body of the opera is essentially simple and unadorned. In Dal Male, the number of dramatic parts is considerably reduced: there is no chorus and there are no intermezzi. Weaver remarks that as Moniglia grew older his librettos became simpler; the same can be said of Giulio Rospiglosi's aforementioned Roman comedies.

Weaver's investigation of the influences of the improvised Commedia dell'Arte on mid-century comic operas is enlightening and whets one's appetite for further studies in this area. The braggart warrior, the old doctor, and the many types of comic servant found in these academic comedies can all be traced back to classical Roman types, as Moniglia himself wrote in the introduction to his works published during his lifetime. Weaver aptly remarks that it is the academic environment into which these comedies were born which was responsible for their classical orientation.

Chapter VII introduces the Melani family, that extraordinary group—almost all of which were musicians. Atto, the famous singer, has certainly left posterity the most voluminous and colorful records of his life. His brother, the composer Jacopo (1623-1676), is the Melani who most concerns us here, for he set five of Moniglia's seven comedies to music. Chapter VIII deals with the first of these musical comedies, La Tancia ovvero il potestà di Colognole, a dramma rustica, performed at the Pergola in 1657. Its extraordinary popularity can better be appreciated when one notes that its libretto was published 112
six times in 70 years and that the opera itself was revived as late as 1727. The recitative of Il Potestà is lively, especially in the comic parts. There are da capo arias, but these are assigned to other characters than the heroic lovers. Interestingly, Melani attached certain musical styles to the various types of characters, e.g., the comic parts are all in common time and major mode. I question Weaver's theory that the typical mid-17th-century mannerism of a slur "over the barline" from the leading tone to the tonic note should be performed other than as written (p. 230). Weaver suggests delaying the leading tone until the following beat in order to create a dissonant appoggiatura which resolves upward. Voice instruction manuals of this period never specifically mention this manner of performance and consequently one is left with the distinct impression that the slur should be performed as it is written on the page.

Goldschmidt long ago published some of the music from Il Potestà in his Studien zur Geschichte der italienischen Oper. A glance at these few pieces will convince any reader that Weaver does not exaggerate when he calls it "one of the masterpieces of the century."

Chapter IX is devoted to a listing of the Ballet-Operas performed at the Medici court. Ipernestra in 1658 (Moniglia - Cavalli) and Ercole in Tebe in 1661 (Moniglia - Melani) were among the first formally defined court operas of the type which were a few years later to be performed in such capitals as Paris and Vienna.

Chapter X takes up one of the great, but little-known, opera-burlesques of the 17th century: Filippo Acciajouli's Il Girello, set to music by Melani. After its first performance in Rome in 1668, it was performed in a number of Italian cities. Some of these later performances, one of them staged with puppets, may have had additional music by other composers. The Avvisi di Roma described the opera as "un po' grassetta" (translated by Weaver as "a trifle long," but probably more accurately rendered as "a trifle racy"). Il Girello boasts, among other things, two full-fledged patter songs. However, though its comedy verges on the slapstick, its musical style is not at all venturesome.

Weaver's final chapter sums up his findings under the title "The Melani Rewarded." There are two appendices: a listing of the known compositions of Jacopo Melani (both scores and librettos), and all the operas and operatic entertainments performed in Florence from 1597 to 1741 (arranged both chronologically and alphabetically by title).

The reader can see that the main purpose of this dissertation is clearly to present hitherto uncollected bibliographical data; stylistic discussions of the music are held to a minimum. As such I have found this work to be an invaluable aid to the study of opera in the mid-17th century. Let us hope that some of the scores of the Moniglia-Melani collaboration will be made available in the near future.

William Holmes is assistant professor of music at Cornell University.
Miriam Karpilow Whaples
Exoticism in dramatic music, 1600-1800

Ann Arbor: University Microfilms (UM order no. 58-7938), 1958. (415 p., pos. film $5.40; Indiana University diss.)

Sirvart Poladian

The primary objective of this study is "to examine for the first time the body of Baroque and Classical opera and ballet on exotic subjects, and to determine to what extent, if any, this subject matter influenced their music." The author defines "exotic" as "equivalent to non-European," a definition that excludes the Spanish and the East European. Nor does she consider the Florentine Camerata, although she does acknowledge their achievement in effecting one of the most far-reaching style changes in music history. A distinction is made between music for plots which take place in exotic locales and musical patterns borrowed from music indigenous to distant lands.

The principal task of the author has been the examination of approximately 100 scores, the titles of which suggest exotic topics. These are selected from about 400 such titles in standard opera bibliographies.

Opening with the "furious Moresca" danced at the wedding party given by the Duchesse de Berry on January 29, 1393, the author proceeds with a survey of the diffusion of exotic entertainments in Europe. Chapter II deals primarily with the subjects and the social philosophies implied by the librettos, among them, the "Noble Savage" and "Back to Nature." Subsequent chapters discuss the musical scores set to plots about exotic lands as well as the native music of these countries—principally Turkey, China, and the Americas. The final chapter summarizes her findings and is followed by a bibliography, valuable appendices, and a general index.

Particularly detailed analysis of Lully's Bourgeois Gentilhomme (1670), Campra's L'Europe Galante (1697), Rameau's Les Indes Galante (1735), Gretry's Le Caravan du Caire (1783), and works by Speer, Müller, Gasparini, etc., discloses little exotic music. In certain situations composers resort to minor mode, chromaticism, primitive harmony, repeated motifs, gibberish, and exotic instruments, and Gluck succeeds, to a limited degree, in imitating certain melodic formulas of Turkish music in La Rencontre imprévues (1764).

Considerable space is devoted to the patterns and instruments of Turkish music as utilized by Europeans. Whaples concludes that none of the actual exotic music brought by travelers from Turkey
and the Orient was ever quoted in these operas. Extended, monotonous repetitions and tunes based on a few tones within a narrow compass do not occur. Indeterminate pitches, microtones, ejaculations, glissandi, vibrato—all characteristic of the style—were known but not used. What passed as "stilo alla turca" was primarily "farcical in intent" and therefore utilized the musical vocabulary of the comic opera.

Whaples found no musical differentiation between the Spanish and American characters in the Montezuma operas: "None go beyond the use of primitive drone, repeated rhythmic patterns, or melodic formulas standardized for stylized incantation scenes, but without ethnomusicological authenticity." Among the rare exceptions she cites the Peace Pipe Dance in Les Indes Galante, the torture scene in Dalayrac's Azémia (1786), and the part of a runaway negro slave in a trio from Rudolph Kreutzer's Paul et Virginie (1791). She concludes: "Musical representation of primitive [Savage] peoples on the European stage contained some stylistic features for differentiation but not native music itself (p. 258). We have found no instance of musical exoticism before 1800 which uses non-European devices not also found in the European vocabulary" (p. 263).

The author calls attention to the glaring disparity between the enthusiastic acceptance of Oriental decorative arts and literature on the one hand, and the rejection of exotic musical idioms on the other. She offers several hypotheses to account for this attitude. First, aural taste and aesthetics are probably conservative psychological factors much more difficult to overcome than responses to visual arts or literary forms, hence the general distaste of Europeans for oriental and primitive music. Second, content with their "superior" musical tradition, 17th- and 18th-century composers felt no need to seek new musical resources such as those that swept Europe at the turn of the present century when the traditional vocabulary was regarded as exhausted. Third, Europe lacked adequate knowledge of actual exotic musics; there was no interest in ethnomusicology. Fourth, Whaples speculates that there may have existed a subconscious ideational conflict between the concept of the "Noble Savage" and the exotic musics which Europeans found "repellent"—a cleavage between the philosophy of the librettos, which regard the non-European sympathetically as a part of mankind, and distaste for his utterly alien musical language.

Whaples presents 56 excerpts from primary and secondary historical sources containing descriptions of the music of exotic lands. The quotations range in length from one sentence to eleven pages, and include items from the "Itinerary of Richard I and others to the Holy Land," Captain Cook's travel journals, and the writings of Dr. Charles Burney.

Early examples of exotic music are brought together from scattered sources, such as the Tupi melodies from Brazil (1592) and the Turkish tunes in Donado (1688). Among the more significant is a piece of Turkish Janissary music, mehter, reconstructed in recent years by
Turkish scholars (p. 81). She stresses the conjectural nature of the reconstruction inasmuch as it is based on literary sources and not music. "Just how much conjecture is involved we have not been able, after a year of persistent inquiries to learn." She notices little affinity between this piece and imitations of "Turkish music" in 18th-century Europe.

The author accomplishes the task she set out for herself and confirms that European music remained fundamentally unchanged by exotic subjects.

While the major thesis and conclusions of the dissertation are sound, a spot-check disclosed more errors and oversights in minutiae than might be expected.

1. The author fails to lay sufficient weight upon the difficulty of adopting alien musical idioms. In spite of our widespread and intimate knowledge of exotic musics today, only one "European" composer, Alan Hovhannes, has succeeded in making exotic idioms his own musical vocabulary after years of intensive study. Composers of the Baroque and the Classical times, even of today for that matter, could not be expected to submit to such discipline in order to absorb and compose in a foreign musical language. In any case, performance practice—one of the essential ingredients—would have eluded them.

2. Several pertinent tributary aspects of the problem have been all but ignored. Sometimes stage directions call for an exotic instrumental group for which no music is provided in the score. No attempt is made to discover what the nature of this music might have been. Differences between vocal and instrumental style do not receive due attention, particularly in view of the obvious dissimilarities between the mehter music and the 18th-century imitations of "Turkish music." Nor is a serious attempt made to trace the probable role of exoticism in the introduction to Europe of ornate, florid style.

3. Occasionally the discussion is interrupted by digression into material not directly relevant. In one conspicuous instance (p.192) the author launches into the controversy over the authenticity of some pieces ascribed to Mozart, which Fokine had used for his ballet Chung Yang and the Mandarin (1936). The involved discussion concerns errors by several persons, particularly the program annotator. The problem had been clarified already by a final footnote in Mojisovic's article on this subject (Zeitschrift für Musikwissenschaft 12:480), and in the Köchel-Einstein Mozart Verzeichnis (3rd ed.) to which she refers.

4. Some of the minor discrepancies are probably due to conciseness. The remarks within the text about the Turkish instruments Donado mentions are likely to be misconstrued if one does not refer to the fuller extract in the appendix. The same is true of Whaples' criticism of Burney's discussion of the Siege of Rhodes. Burney specifically states his remarks are based on the 1679 edition. At this point the author commits a second oversight. A footnote for this passage in the 1935 edition of Burney names John Coleman as one of the two composers responsible for the instrumental music; here his name is omitted without explanation.
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Her comments on the symbolism of keys, the nature of vocal and instrumental bass lines, reasons for unisons and octaves, and the gibberish might be revised by a broader knowledge of these topics than is evident from her statements.

In view of the considerable excerpts from several languages occasional typographical errors might seem inevitable. There are seven of these in the one page quoted from Donado. For instance, "bi e" should read "bize," meaning "to us."

Her own translation adheres literally to the original texts without attempting a literary style. Occasionally one meets passages such as "Daul, a drum somewhat larger than is ordinary, with a wooden body" (p.328), or "When they have quitted work at the sugar-works" (p.379). In the translation of "etlichen Oboen, oder Violinen," the violins are omitted (p.320), and in one case "trois" becomes "two."

To sum up, on the basis of the operas examined it is highly probable that the results of Whaples' study will remain substantially the same if the remaining 300 exotic titles are also examined. Furthermore, we should be grateful to the author for bringing together such copious excerpts from travel diaries as well as examples of exotic musics from early historical sources.

SIRVART POLADIAN is librarian in the Music Division of the Reference Department, New York Public Library.