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DISSEPTIONS

BIBLIOGRAPHICA
Early 16th-Century Manuscripts at Piacenza: A Progress Report

Collected and Edited by Jane B. Weidensaul

The musical holdings of the Archivio del Duomo at Piacenza, Italy, were fully catalogued by Francesco Bussi in a volume published in 1967.1 Attracted by the early 16th-century items, Prof. Martin Picker obtained microfilms from the library and began a personal investigation of the material.2 This investigation was widened considerably when he decided to make the filmed part-books the subject of his doctoral seminar held at Rutgers University in the spring of 1972.

The repertoire contained in the manuscripts was divided by genre, and the research was conducted by the group as follows: Patricia Virga investigated the motets, Stephen Fisher the Masses, Jane Weidensaul the polyphonic hymns, and Benito Rivera the lamentations. Miss Weidensaul collected the results of the work and edited the following progress report for publication in this journal.

As described by Bussi,3 the early 16th-century material includes four part-books containing:

(1) *Passioni, messe, salmi, magnificat, motetti* . . .
(2) *F. R. F. e anonimi: Messe, messa di requiem, antifone, inni, motetti* . . .
(3) *Adriano Willaert e altri: Messe, inni, lamentazioni, motetti* . . .

(2 volumes).

Because Bussi did not assign numbers to the holdings of the library, the numbers given in parentheses above have been adopted in this report to facilitate the identification of the material discussed.

From the titles, it is obvious that the books contain a large and varied repertory of sacred music suitable for the various seasons of the church year, for the celebration of the Mass, and especially for Vespers worship. Only one secular work appears: the dialogue madrigal *Quando nacesti Amore?* of Verdelot (MS. 3, both volumes). Of the original six voices, just two are present, and these sing not the opening text, but rather the first response, *"Quando la terra."*

Most of the pieces of the Piacenza repertory are incomplete owing to the lack of correspondence among the four part-books. Only small portions of MSS. 1 and 2 belong to the two closely related volumes of MS. 3, or to each other, for that matter. Just two works (motets) were found in all four part-books. This suggests that the books were bound from various fascicles, most of which were independent originally.
Just how this music made its way to Piacenza is one of the many mysteries uncovered by the investigation. The most notable early 16th-century musician from the Piacenza region was Girolamo Parabosco, born there in the 1520's, later a pupil of Willaert, cocontributor with the master to the instrumental Musica nova of 1540, active traveler (three visits to his native town are documented during the fifth decade of the century), and, finally, first organist at San Marco. Parabosco could well be the link between the Piacenza holdings and the pieces of Venetian origin, but no hard evidence has emerged to support this thesis.

I. The Motets:

Motet literature dominates the Piacenza manuscripts and comprises some 149 pieces in all. The works call for a variable number of voices, according to the designations, and at least one piece carries the words “Chorus II,” thus indicating a polychoral setting. The second chorus section begins with the text “Donec ponam,” verse 2 of Psalm 109, Dixit dominus (MS. I, 66’-67). The composer has remained anonymous to date.

The provenance of much of the music is clearly northern Italian, and the substantial number of works attributed to Willaert suggests ties to Venice. In addition, there is some affinity with manuscripts of Florentine origin. These are Rome, Biblioteca Vallicelliana S. Borromeo E. II, and Chicago, Newberry Library MS Case VM 1578 M 91. Of the two, the Vallicelliana MS. shows a remarkable relationship to the Piacenza collection: twenty-six motets are concordant, and five motets identified as unica in the Rome inventory have now lost their solitary status: Simile est regnum/Deus qui (Willaert), Virgo prudentissima (Jachet), Sub tuum presidium (L’Héritier), Estote fortes/Vos amici mei (Arcadelt), and Mundi christo/Sancti martyres (Maître Jan). Seven concordances were found between the Piacenza collection and the Newberry manuscript, and here, too, a second source turned up for one of the unica: Salve rex pater/Eya ergo (MS. 2). In addition, eight concordances were discovered between the Piacenza manuscripts and Vatican City, Cappella Giulia XII, 4, a choirbook dating from 1536.

The part-books studied by the seminar contain only a slim handful of composer attributions; unmasking the anonymous writers of some 149 motets therefore presented the greatest problem. To date, fifty-eight, or about one-third, of the pieces have been traced to their creators. Nine motets have been tentatively identified from inventories and catalogues lacking musical incipits; more positive attributions await the examination of source materials not presently available. The predominance of composers active in northern Italy appears evident from the list which follows.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Composer</th>
<th>Motets Identified</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Willaert</td>
<td>15</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Verdelot</td>
<td>8</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Jachet</td>
<td>6</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
II. The Masses:

The Piacenza part-books contain several sets of Mass ordinaries; only six of the Masses are present in as many as three parts—there being evidence to suggest that one additional part is missing—and the remaining nine works have been preserved in but one part, usually the bassus. The identified Masses include the following works:

Févin or Divitis:

*Missa Dictes moy toutes vos pensées, a 4 (= Missa secunda, MSS. 2 and 3),* a parody of a chanson by Compère. The Mass following is by Févin, a point which might swing the evidence for attribution of this work in his favor.

Févin:

*Missa O quam glorifica luce, a 4 (= Missa tertia, MSS. 2 and 3),* probably a paraphrase Mass based on an untraced melody which Clinkscale has been able to isolate.8

Jachet Berchem:

*Missa super Altro non e il mio amor, a 5 (MS. 3b),* a parody of a madrigal by Verdelot.

Festa:

*Missa Se congie pris, a 5 (= Missa octava, MS. 2),* based on a chanson melody as cantus firmus.

The only previously-known source for this last piece was Wolfenbüttel MS. A. The Piacenza version confirms Alexander Main's suspicion that the German source is incomplete,9 for three sections have now come to light for the first time: a second *Osanna*, a first *Agnus*, and a second *Agnus* for a reduced number of voices. The sole *Agnus* setting in Wolfenbüttel corresponds to the third *Agnus* in the Piacenza version. The Piacenza voice corresponds in most sections to the *vagans* of the German manuscript, although in two sections in
which the tenor does not have the cantus firmus, the Piacenza voice takes over the part assigned in Wolfenbüttel to the tenor, an arrangement showing greater logic.

There are many differences in textual setting between the two copies, with associated rhythmic variants. The most interesting of these is at the *Et incarnatus*, which in the Piacenza source begins with seven breves, while the Wolfenbüttel version breaks some of them up into semibreves, obviously sacrificing number symbolism for the sake of better declamation. All the evidence suggests that the German manuscript contains a heavily edited version of the work and that the Piacenza source probably gives the original version.

The work in MS. 2 headed "F.R.F. e anonimi Missa pro defunctis," copied complete in four voices, is one of the more intriguing puzzles of the Piacenza manuscripts. It is apparently unique, and possibly the most complete polyphonic setting of the Mass for the Dead written in the first half of the 16th century. Both the texts and the melodies are those of the standard Roman rite, which was current in Italy long before it spread to the North as a result of the reforms of the Council of Trent. Most of the polyphonic settings written before 1540 employ a rite drawn partially from the Sarum usage, in which the gradual and tract are different and the sequence is omitted. All of the Requiem Masses published before 1540, except the Brumel setting (Antico, 1516), use the northern version, and Brumel set fewer sections than "F.R.F." The style is quite homophonic, perhaps even naive; the use of chant melodies in the polyphonic sections is minimal, consisting mostly of an allusion in the first notes of the cantus.

Immediately following the *Missa pro defunctis* is a work designated "F.R.F. *Dies Irae*" [sic]. The clefs are rather different from those used in the main body of the Requiem, but not so different that this movement could not be substituted for the *Dies irae* in the Mass itself. This work could also have been intended to serve in connection with movements of another polyphonic Requiem which did not include a setting of the *Dies irae*. The appearance of "F.R.F." over two works in similar style in the manuscript suggests that these are the initials of the composer rather than those of the dedicatee, although the matter is not settled. The Requiem, with one or the other of the two sequence settings, is the only Mass complete in all parts in the Piacenza collection. Just why the copyist adopted choirbook format for this work is yet another mystery.

Bearing in mind the simplicity of the notation, the lack of concern for motivic unity, and the near lack of significant imitation and rests, one can contrast the Requiem with all of the other Masses, even those present in only one voice. None of the other Masses shows this same naïveté: almost all of them have some sort of obvious motivic structure, and many of them show imitation or rests which signify imitation, the use of ligatures and of notes longer than a semibreve, mensural changes, canons, expansions or reductions of the original texture, and other devices typical of the more sophisticated
composers of the period. It thus seems likely that the Requiem was one of a few pieces of local origin copied into a set of manuscripts which contained, basically, an imported repertory.

III. The Polyphonic Hymns:

The two polyphonic hymns contained in MS. 3 contain, by happy chance, all four parts of a polyphonic hymn cycle, substantially by Willaert. This is apparently the only manuscript source for the master's hymns yet discovered. Two printed collections, the *Hymnorum musica* (Scotto, 1542) and *I sacri e santi salmi* (Gardane, 1555), both issued during the lifetime of the composer, contain all of Willaert's previously-known works in the genre. Three pieces attributed to Willaert in the manuscripts are certainly *unica*: *Conscendit jubilans* (*Festum nunc celebre*), *Impar ancilla* (*Maria mater domini*), and *Sumens illud* (*Ave maris stella*). In addition, no concordances have been discovered for the four hymns of anonymous authorship, two of which are unistrophic and two of which, following Willaert's custom, are designed for *alternatim* performance with new music for each polyphonic strophe. The first strophe of most Willaert hymns is assigned to the chant choir, a matter which leaves the scholar in possession of the texts to only the even-numbered verses. A page-by-page search of the *Analecta hymnica* finally revealed the proper titles of all of the hymns in the Piacenza manuscripts.

After one puts aside the two unistrophic hymns, pieces well separated from the Willaert cycle, there remain twenty-one works of which nineteen are attributed to Willaert by the scribe, sixteen being concordant with the settings of the *Hymnorum musica*. The concordances bear out the accuracy of the attributions without exception: there is thus no reason to doubt the ascription of the three *unica* to the master.

A lucky find among the hymns offers some worthwhile clues regarding the dating and history of the cycle. Hymn No. 6, *Quo sanctum Marchum* (*Hodie festum pie celebremus*) is musically identical with Willaert's multistrophic setting of *Ut queant laxis* in the *Hymnorum musica*. Since the hymn honors St. Mark, the patron saint of Venice, and since the only source for the text is given by Dreves as "Cod. Marcian L II 93," a holding of the Biblioteca Marciana of the same city, it seems fair to conclude that the cycle under consideration was brought to Piacenza at some point following Willaert's employment at San Marco in 1527. Notational differences between the manuscripts and the printed *Hymnorum musica* demonstrate that the former was not copied from the latter. Assuming that a scribe working in Venice after 1542 would have had access to the more accurate printed part-books (the manuscripts contain many errors) and would have used them, one may tentatively date the hymn cycle, at least, as having been copied between 1527 and 1542.

Surely much manuscript material has been lost since the 16th century, material which might offer assistance in the establishment of a chronology of Willaert's works. That such manuscripts existed in 1533 is documented in
the correspondence on theoretical matters between Spataro and Aron in August of that year. Spataro states in his letter that he owns many hymns of Willaert and wonders whether Aron could induce the master to compose three strophes of a hymn to honor St. Petronio, whose feast was to be celebrated at the end of September.13

The weight of all of the evidence suggests that the hymns in the Piacenza manuscripts form an earlier corpus, perhaps composed and compiled by Willaert for St. Mark's within a few years of his appointment there, then revised—some pieces added, others dropped, and one given another text—for publication in 1542. Several of the pieces must predate Willaert's Venetian tenure. Festum nunc celebre, for instance, was the standard Ascension hymn in the North; it was rarely, if ever, set by Italian composers. A search for stylistic clues yields little of a concrete nature: Willaert's mastery is evident in all of these pieces, even in those suspected of being youthful works. In any case, it would be illogical to think that he suddenly turned to hymn composition only in the fourth decade of his life.

IV. The Lamentations:

Two part-books of the Piacenza collection (MS. 3) contain, respectively, the tenor and bass parts for three separate lamentation settings for Holy Week. Scoring of these parts has demonstrated that at least two more voices would be required to complete the music. No concordances have resulted from a search of catalogues, early prints, and manuscripts available to the writer.

The first set contains a nearly complete lamentation cycle for the three Holy Week services. The full cycle includes three lessons for each day: this set lacks only the third lesson for Friday. Whether the omission is the fault of the composer or of the scribe is difficult to determine. There are signs of great carelessness in the copying of the text throughout these works. One cannot defend these errors as text variants allowed before the Council of Trent. Indeed, there was room for variety, but this variety involved the choice of verses only. Devices for unification of this cycle are apparent: only two modes are used, the same music is reintroduced at each "Jerusalem" refrain, and the melodic material sometimes shows an affinity with the standard lamentation tone. The latter relationship often ends quickly, however, and is frequently absent altogether.

The second set of lamentations covers only the Wednesday service. The entire work is in the fourth mode with an occasional Bb; and connection with the lamentation tone, which is in the sixth mode, is thus impossible. The "Jerusalem" refrain is again set to the same music, and a melodic motif which ascends to C and then returns to B pervades the work. A trait common to the present set and the first set is the use of the corona, not only at the end of acrostics and verses but also within verses. This sign occurs on the average of about every eighth measure. While this may merely represent a scribal mannerism, it points up the highly sectional character of the phrasing.
Both sets also omit a final sentence of the Jeremiah verse, "Facti sunt hostes." This is the only case of an incomplete verse setting and may indicate common authorship or at least common local provenance.

The third set has a complete cycle in the tenor part for three days of Holy Week. The bass part is incomplete in two respects: the scribe stopped copying the music after the first lesson for Thursday, and he never copied the text at all. The similarity of choice of verses indicates that the third set may belong to the same local group as the first two. New music is used, however, for the "Jerusalem" refrain, and many sections of the Wednesday service show a relationship to the standard lamentation tone, particularly in the stepwise ascent from F to B♭. This is the principal unifying force of the music: the same material is merely transposed and expanded for the Thursday service.

* * * * *

What began as a seminar exercise in preliminary manuscript examination concluded with the disclosure of much new information of considerable scholarly interest. The possibilities for discovery could in no way be exhausted during the course of one semester. Not all concordances, for instance, could be determined, partly because of the unavailability of certain microfilms at the time they were needed, and partly because of the prohibitive expense of obtaining every film the students might have wished to see. It is hoped that these initial findings will spur further research on the Piacenza holdings.

NOTES

2 A paper discussing two works was read by Prof. Picker at the International Josquin Festival-Conference of 1971. Entitled "Josquiniana in Some Manuscripts at Piacenza," it will appear in the conference Proceedings scheduled for future publication.
3 Busi, Piacenza, pp. 139–51.
6 An inventory of this manuscript was in preparation by H. Colin Slim at the time of the seminar.
11 *Analecta hymnica*, vol. 22, p. 175.


Gesualdo: Misguided or Inspired?

Faye-Ellen Silverman

Gesualdo remains to this day one of the most controversial composers in the history of music. Critics have accused him of poor writing, excessive and disorderly chromaticism, and the indiscriminate use of chords, and they have pointed knowingly to the fact that he had no followers. Adherents, on the other hand, have admired his craft and pointed to his spiritual affinity with 20th-century atonality. The obvious question arises: Which side is right?

An analysis of Gesualdo's works reveals that both of these extreme positions tend to ignore the essence of his music. His work is contemporary in sound due to its highly chromatic, nervously fluctuating, and extremely fragmented melodic lines, and its short contrasting sections. Yet it could not have been written at any other moment in history, for it is firmly rooted in the traditions of its own century. The counterpoint, with its careful treatment of dissonance, and the use of thirds and fifths in local as well as longer-range motions (yet without implications of harmonic movement), the employment of a modal center rather than a free use of the twelve-tone scale, and the constantly shifting rhythms and textures are the best examples of these roots.

The genius of Gesualdo, then, comes from his ability to integrate all of these elements into a unique system, one which enables him to use freely cross relations and fragmented lines while retaining the underlying coherence and unity which are essential to good art. His system seems to arise from a preference for a three-note chromatic motif, such as CC#D (sometimes reordered CDC#, DC#C#, etc.), used especially to express musically such emotionally charged words as "morire" or "torcete." This motif is occasionally extended to four, five, or even six notes. These notes may be stated in direct succession or may be separated by intervening notes. In the former case the motif is sometimes obscured by rests or by octave transference within a voice. In addition, there is occasional transference between voices, especially (a) in instances of intervening rests (Ex. 1);

EXAMPLE 1

Luci Serene e Chiare (Sopranos I & II), mm. 19 - 20

Non do-lor nel-la pia-ga, ma

Non do-lor nel-la pia-ga, ma
(b) in homophonic passages; (c) where the chromatic motif is transferred locally but stated in the original line by long-term references (Ex. 2);

**EXAMPLE 2**

Ardita Zanzareta (Soprano II and Alto), mm. 45 - 49

```
Pro-van-do in quel bel sen dol-ce ve-la-no, dol-ce ve-la-no

Pro-van-do in quel bel sen dol-ce ve le (no)
```

or (d) where a complete statement of the motion in one voice is not necessary since that voice or a neighboring one has stated the same progression a few measures earlier. In cases where the motif is interrupted by intervening notes, a single voice part is divided into two vocal levels, one of which states the chromatic motif (Ex. 3).

**EXAMPLE 3**

Dolcissima Mia Vita (Soprano I), mm. 8 - 11

```
La bra-ma-ta a-l-ta, a-l-ta? Cre-da-te for-se
```

(Note the perfect symmetry between the ascending and descending levels.) The chromatic motif often leads to the juxtaposition of major and minor chords.

Other chromaticisms arise from Gesualdo's preference for the chromatic neighbor note rather than its diatonic counterpart. Gesualdo treats the neighbor note in a manner similar to his way of handling the three-note chromatic line. He postpones the return to the original note, through rests, until the start of the next phrase; he intersperses notes at a separate vocal level; and he sometimes transfers resolutions to another voice, especially when such a transference would sound like a continuation of the original line. Thus, this neighboring motion is really a variant on the three-note chromatic motif.

When Gesualdo's juxtaposition of chromatic triads does not arise from such motivic considerations, it is generated by the harmonic movement of a third or a fifth. A harmonic analysis of Gesualdo's music (which does not use functional harmony of the Classic-Romantic tradition but does fore-shadow certain harmonic tendencies of the Baroque) shows that most chords, both chromatic and diatonic, move by thirds and fifths (Ex. 4).

50
The movement by thirds is sometimes an extension of the basic tonal area, for example, GBD–EGB, and sometimes an independent gesture, e.g., GBD–EbGB. Occasional stepwise motions are used to create symmetry: when F–A is balanced by B–G, the A–B progression is stated. Local motions are supported by long-range ones. The intervals from the beginnings to the ends of phrases are usually statements of a third or fifth or movements of a second which are then followed by a third or fifth at the starts of subsequent phrases. Homophonic sections, however, sometimes move by seconds for contrast. The long-range motions of Io pur respiro⁰ are (Ex. 5):

EXAMPLE 5

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>PHRASE</th>
<th>INTERVALS</th>
<th>TEXTURE USED</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>(1) mm. 1–12:</td>
<td>E → E</td>
<td>polyphonic</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>(2) end m. 12–16:</td>
<td>(E)A → D</td>
<td>polyphonic with increased rhythmic motion</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>(3) mm. 17–18:</td>
<td>D → C #</td>
<td>homophonic</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>(4) m. 19-beg. m. 22:</td>
<td>A → E</td>
<td>polyphonic</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>(5) mm. 22–23:</td>
<td>A → G</td>
<td>homophonic</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>(6) mm. 24–27:</td>
<td>G → F #</td>
<td>polyphonic with three chordal changes per measure and many repeated notes</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>(7) mm. 28–33:</td>
<td>B → D</td>
<td>polyphonic but only two chordal changes per measure.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
(Note the textural contrasts outlined in the chart above. These will be discussed later in this essay.) There is no modulation, although an occasional progression which we would nowadays label V7 of V resolving to V is sometimes used, as well as the transposition of motivic material. Yet no new tonal area is ever established.

Such a systematized use of chromaticism may have been overlooked by other theorists who have had a bias toward tonal motion and/or have tended to regard each verticality as a chord. Gesualdo’s music, however, stems from a pretonal, highly contrapuntal tradition and uses many notes purely as voice-leading dissonances. He employs, for example, incomplete as well as complete neighbor notes, anticipations, chromatic and diatonic passing tones, and suspensions and suspended passing tones, and will sometimes add a sharp or flat in order to smooth out a line by avoiding intervals such as the augmented second. An analyst, therefore, must look at metric stresses and think in terms of chordal areas which encompass more than one verticality.

George Ruffin Marshall is one of the many theorists who have dealt with Gesualdo’s works. I disagree with his conclusions, however, because I feel, for the reasons described below, that his focus is too narrow. He limits himself to the Hindemith system of analysis (whereby the lowest note of the strongest harmonic interval, in any combination, is taken as the root of the chord). In so doing, he treats the music as tonal, classifying chords by tonal functions, e.g., “the various types of chords used,” rather than examining the unique system of a pretonal composer.

Moreover, since Gesualdo’s chords are related by a preference for harmonic thirds and fifths, it is also hard to agree with Daniel Rowland, who says that unrelated chords from the chromatic gender [genus] are juxtaposed. While the chords may or may not be from the chromatic genus (I tend to think, however, that they are not but are built up anew by thirds), they are logically chosen in order to achieve an expressive effect rather than being merely juxtaposed.

For similar reasons Alfred Einstein’s conclusion that all chords are tested and all transpositions are permitted seems to overlook Gesualdo’s system. New chordal combinations were certainly tried. But Gesualdo’s purpose was not to test every chord (in contrast with some modern compositions which are written to “test” or demonstrate new instrumental effects). He chose his chords most carefully.

The position of some of Gesualdo’s admirers is equally naïve. For, in spite of the modernness of sound, Gesualdo is not, as Lowinsky believes, an
atonal composer (see Note 4, below). He lived in a period of musical transition, an era similar to the Ars Nova and to the 20th century. He was a composer who, writing at a time when the current style had reached its limits, had to create his own system.

This transitional position in history led him to find solutions to the problems of creating contrast, a process which parallels the experiments of our own transitional era. Gesualdo's music "works," therefore, for many of the same reasons that 20th-century compositions "work." Timbral and rhythmic contrasts (see Example 5, above) rather than harmonic motion propel his pieces and prevent stagnation. Each composition creates its own form. Gesualdo alternates polyphonic and homophonic sections, brings forth rhythmic differentiations between polyphonic sections, varies the rhythm of repeated words, constantly changes metric stresses and the ordering of the entering polyphonic voices, and uses contrasting motives. In addition, he employs other original solutions, such as the use of distinct phrases which move locally away from the modal center and have differing rates of chord changes, and his use of expressive dissonances, which create cross-relation tension and also contribute to the vital, nonstagnant quality of his music.

This transitional position also seems to explain the fact that Gesualdo had no followers. Scientists had just proven that the earth was no longer the center of the universe. This discovery had upset current philosophical and theological beliefs. Man, therefore, had to reestablish his sense of unity and sense of self. The development of tonality, which actually had its roots in the 16th century, seemed to answer this need for a unified system. Gesualdo, then, could have no successors, since, in order for such composers to carry further the implications of his music, they would have had to break with the traditional intervals of the third and the fifth, use tones independently, and fragment melodic lines completely. This step was taken at the beginning of the 20th century, where fragmentation occurred in everyday life and where, consequently, dissonance in music seemed expressive of the times.

Nevertheless, the very uniqueness of Gesualdo's music has led to its being admired and accepted hundreds of years after it was written. This acceptance may be linked to a change in aesthetics which has led to the use of a musical language which finds dissonance expressive and melodic fragmentation comprehensible. Tonal music was motion-oriented; music "worked" if it flowed from beginning to end, propelled by the resolution of chordal tensions. In the 20th century, however, there is a tendency to evaluate each piece in terms of self-consistency, rather than according to a set of predetermined rules. Each piece sets up and, when successful, adheres to its own rules. Gesualdo's music fulfills this criterion; with its unique but consistent use of chromaticism and its careful craftsmanship, it should continue to enjoy the appreciation it deserves.
NOTES


3 Stravinsky's admiration of Gesualdo may be seen in the former's composition Monumentum pro Gesualdo di Venosa and in his discussion of this homage in Conversations with Igor Stravinsky by the late composer and Robert Craft (Garden City, L.I.: Doubleday & Company, 1959), pp. 33–34.


5 All musical examples and measure numbers are taken from Gesualdo's Sämtliche Madrigale für fünf Stimmen, comp. Wilhelm Weisman (Hamburg: Ugrino Verlag, 1962).

6 In Oliver Strunk, Source Readings in Music History: The Renaissance (New York: W. W. Norton & Company, 1965), p. 40, there is a passage from Zarlino which says: "The third [condition of what is sought in every composition] is that the procedure of the parts should be good, that is, that the modulations should proceed by true and legitimate intervals arising from the sonorous numbers [e.g., the unison, octave, twelfth, fifteenth, seventeenth, and nineteenth], so that through them may be acquired the usage of good harmonies." This shows that movements by thirds and fifths, which later became systematized in the Baroque, were very much accepted by 1558, the year of Zarlino's Istituzioni armoniche.

7 This madrigal may also be found in Archibald T. Davison and Willi Apel, Historical Anthology of Music, vol. 1 (Cambridge, Mass.: Harvard University Press, 1963), no. 161 pp. 182–83.


9 Ibid., pp. 48–51.

10 See his Mannerism—Style and Mood, pp. 17, 27, 36, 37.

The Evolution of Variation Form in the Music of Webern

Kathryn Bailey

In tonal music, variation is possible merely through changing the inversion or spacing of chords. What has twelve-tone technique to set against this?

—Webern, as recollected by Willi Reich

It is difficult to come to terms with variation form in the context of the twelve-tone system, a system which employs to such a high degree variation as a musical procedure. Before all other considerations it is necessary to distinguish between variation form and variation techniques, to discover what it is that justifies calling one serial work a set of variations, while other works not so designated also follow those procedures which in traditional music are characteristic of variation form.

The most essential element in variation form is a constant factor which, although it allows the possibility of a continually changing complexion, maintains a recognizable presence throughout the work. Traditionally, this factor has been a melody or, less often, a harmonic progression, but the very nature of the twelve-tone system excludes both these possibilities. The tone row does not act as a melody; and harmonic progressions, in the older sense, no longer exist. For the variation form to be feasible in the twelve-tone system, it was necessary to replace the tonal constant factors with new ones. Anton Webern was particularly inventive in this respect. In his variations the constant element—the unifying factor—is in the nature of a principle (the word is Webern’s) rather than a melodic or harmonic phrase. Thus he employs at various times the palindrome, augmentation and diminution, and rhythmic canon as bases for his movements in variation form.

Melody-hunting seems to be a popular sport with those who analyze the music of Webern. But in the case of his variations—none of which are variations on a melody—this approach is fruitless. It is the belief of this writer that Webern’s motives are not, generally speaking, melodic in nature. His melodies are rarely repeated in exactly the form in which they first appear. Octave displacement, fragmentation among various instruments, inversion, retrogression, and recasting so that repetitions of a rhythmic pattern encompass different segments of the row are some of the devices Webern consistently employs. In his music it is some nonmelodic element of the musical fabric—rhythm, organization (i.e., the palindrome), timbre, or articulation—which takes on the traditional function of melody.

A further, perennial problem associated with variation form is that of giving some sort of symmetry and proportion to an intrinsically open-ended form. Composers have met this difficulty in various ways, often by combining
a closed form with the iterative one.6 Webern’s first experiment in combined forms was his *Variations for Piano Solo*, Opus 27.

This work has been an enigma to analysts because of the difficulty of explaining the first two movements as part of the variation form.7 But there is, in fact, no reason to insist on this analysis. Webern, in a letter to Hildegard Jone, said of this opus: “The completed part is a variations movement; the whole will be a kind of ‘Suite.’”8 The present writer suggests that “the completed part” was the third movement, that portion of the work which is obviously in variation form. The difficulties in explaining the rest of the piece disappear when it is viewed as “a kind of suite.”

The first movement is in three sections of equal length, all exploiting the palindrome created by simultaneous statements of any row-form and its exact retrograde, with the voices crossing at mid-point. The internal proportions are the same within all the sections; however, the two outer sections are so strongly similar and the middle section so contrasting that the aural effect is certainly that of an ABA form. An interesting feature of this movement is the sequential treatment in the middle section. The material from mm. 19–23 is stated again but in inversion in mm. 23–26, and it appears a third time, upright once more, in mm. 26–30. The same thing happens in mm. 30–36. This sort of treatment, which does not occur in the outer sections, is reminiscent of what one expects in a development section. This movement may be thought of as a theme and two variations, as Leibowitz has suggested,9 but there are also unmistakable implications of the tripartite structure of sonata form.

A similar situation exists in the second movement. It is divided exactly in the middle by the traditional double bar and repeat sign, and it exploits a mirror of another sort: the reflection caused by the nearly simultaneous statements of a row and its exact inversion. Although the two sections are precisely equal in length, it would be difficult indeed to see the second half as a variation of the first. It makes much more sense to view it as a continuation. Here, then, is a simple binary form with the unmistakable character of a scherzo or lively dance (passepied?), a type of movement traditionally employed as an inner movement and one particularly suitable in a suite.

The third movement of Opus 27 adheres carefully to all the external requirements of variation form. It is in six sections, each eleven bars in length. This movement—analyzed in considerable detail by Armin Klammer, who describes it as an arch form10—is Webern’s only variation movement in which no rhythmic or organizational idea acts as a constant factor.11 It is paradoxical that the outward appearance of this movement makes it the easiest of the three to categorize, for it is in truth the most revolutionary: it does away with that element of the form which had previously been thought fundamental. The only constant here is length.

The idea of combining a set of variations and a closed form, first seen in Opus 27, where one movement still pays obvious homage to traditional variation structure while the other two movements are more plausible when
interpreted simply as closed forms, is consolidated in Webern's next opus, the quartet for strings. Although no part of this work is called "Variations," Webern wrote in a letter to Erwin Stein:

The first movement is a variation movement; but the variations embody an Adagio form, and that is the primary point. That is, the formal construction is based on that, and the variations have been designed accordingly. . . .

It can be seen right at the beginning that thematic shapes appear in augmentation and diminution. . . . This has been raised to a "principle" for all variations. It will be found to be the basis of every variation.¹²

The particular notion of incorporating a theme and variations into an adagio form must have intrigued Webern, because such a union occurs again, in an expanded and more complex version, in his Variations for Orchestra, Opus 30. In letters to Willi Reich, Webern described briefly the pattern he had followed in this work:

In basic principle my "overture" is an "adagio" form; but the reprise of the main theme appears in the form of a development: therefore, this element is also present. . . .¹³

Also,

The theme of the variations reaches to the first double bar; it is periodic but has an "introductory" character. Six variations follow (each to the next double bar). The first presents, so to speak, the main theme of the overture (andante form) more fully developed; the second, the transition; the third, a second theme; the fourth, the reprise of the main theme—for it is an andante form!—however, in the manner of a development; the fifth, repeating the manner of the introduction and transition, is followed by a coda: variation six.¹⁴

Thus, the piece exists on two formal planes. As a closed form, it is of balanced proportions. As a variation form, it is—unlike the first movement of Opus 28—extremely free, with variations ranging in length from 11 bars containing the equivalent of 38 eighth notes (Variation 5) to 35 bars containing the equivalent of 135 quarter notes plus 11 eighth notes (Variation 6). This irregularity immediately sets the work apart from all of Webern's other variation movements.

The fact that the variations are of widely differing lengths makes it obvious that these are not variations on any sort of "theme" which implies a particular time dimension. Rather, they are variations on the two four-note rhythmic motives (henceforth to be referred to as A and B) which are stated at the beginning of the piece. The "Theme" is a continuous series of these
motives in ever-changing forms.\textsuperscript{15} Thus, the length of any given section of the piece (i.e., any variation) is determined by the closed form and not by the proportions of the theme.

In the 3 May 1941 letter to Willi Reich quoted above, Webern continues his description of Opus 30:

Everything, then, that occurs in the piece comes from one of the two ideas which are stated in the first and second bars (double bass and oboe!). However, it is reduced even further, as the second figure (oboe) is already in itself retrogressive: the second two notes are the cancrizans of the first two, but rhythmically augmented. There follows in the trombone another statement of the first figure (double bass), but in diminution! And in cancrizans as to both [motives] and intervals.\textsuperscript{16}

Example 1 illustrates this procedure.\textsuperscript{17}

\textbf{EXAMPLE 1}
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The second two notes of the second figure do not produce an exact retrograde ("Krebs") of the first two melodically, but an inverted retrograde (Krebsumkehrung). The real retrograde, produced with the alteration Webern mentions, is rhythmic. Therefore it is clear that Webern's "Gestalt" is primarily rhythmic in nature. When he says of the third figure, "Und im Krebs der Motive und Intervalle," "Motive" can refer only to rhythmic disposition. Robert Nelson would seem to be in error, then, when he says,

The theme . . . consists of a succession of \textit{melodic} [my italics] motifs drawn from the row. Two of these are basic, according to Webern, each formed of four notes, widely spread. . . . From these fundamental motifs
spring the other figures that make up the theme and the six variations that follow.18

The configuration of the rhythmic motives stated in mm. 1–3 is, of course, exactly analogous to that of the tone row (see Ex. 2).

EXAMPLE 2

![Rhythmic Motives Diagram]

However, succeeding statements of the rhythmic motives do not consistently utilize the same segments of the row. This can be seen as early as the second bar of the piece, where the second voice (viola) enters with the first four notes of the row, stating the second rhythmic motive. If Nelson's approach were correct, this figure would have borne a close melodic resemblance to the oboe statement of the same rhythmic motive in the same bar. However, it does not. The element which does remain constant throughout the variations is the rhythm.

A few general statements should be made at this point concerning Webern's manipulation of rhythm in Opus 30. The aspect of the rhythmic motives which retains its identity through sundry variations is the rhythm of attacks. Durational patterns vary continually within this framework.

Motives A and B are both subjected in the course of the piece to augmentation, diminution, and retrogression. Although these devices are applied similarly to both motives, each is also treated in a unique way. In the case of A, Variations 4 and 5 exhibit a form which bears a positive-negative relationship to the original (see Ex. 3).

EXAMPLE 3

Motive A  
\[
\begin{align*}
\text{negative: } & 1 & 1 & 1 & 1 \\
\text{AR } & 1 & 1 & 1 & 1
\end{align*}
\]

\(\text{mm. 139-140, harp, celesta.}\)

\(\text{mm. 140-141, vln. I; celesta, oboe.}\)

Motive B  
\[
\begin{align*}
\text{negative: } & 1 & 1 & 1 & 1 \\
\text{AR } & 1 & 1 & 1 & 1
\end{align*}
\]

\(\text{mm. 116-117, vc.}\)

\(\text{m. 141, celesta, harp.}\)
Motive B does not lend itself to this process. It undergoes a different sort of variation—reordering, or inversion of its basic elements. The halves of the motive remain intact, but they are arranged in different ways. Besides the simple prime and retrograde, there are six other combinations possible: Webern makes use of all of these (see Ex. 4).

EXAMPLE 4

\[
\text{Motive B and BR } [\text{example of variations}].
\]

[EXAMPLE 4]

Two very important derivative motives make an appearance in Variation 3. These motives—here labelled C and D—are derived from B and A, respectively, and are used in the manner of a second theme. They are not subjected to inversion (see Ex. 5).

EXAMPLE 5

\[
\text{Motive C: } \text{(B reordered = example of variations).}
\]

\[
\text{Motive D: } \text{(second form of A shown in Ex. 3, in retrograde = example of variations).}
\]

Retrograde forms are produced in two ways. Most often the series of durations between attacks is an exact retrograde of the corresponding series of the prime form. However, a second method leads to a further degree of variation. When the series of note-values of one of the forms containing rests is reversed, it produces a new form which is not the same as the pure retrograde, since an attack after a rest will occur "late." The first such instance occurs in Variation 1. Measures 32–34 contain the following statement of BR (see Ex. 6):

EXAMPLE 6

\[
\text{Example of variations.}
\]

The exact retrograde of this occurs in mm. 40–42 (see Ex. 7).
Instead of producing the original form of B, this retrogression of the retrograde produces a variant in which blocks of time are preserved but in which the final attack occurs late within its allotted space.

This principle can be extended to allow the appearance of such variants without the prior appearance of the generative form. This procedure gives rise to new forms, of which the following will serve as illustrations (see Ex. 8):

**EXAMPLE 7**

```
\[ \ \ \ \ \ \ ]
```

A rhythmic analysis of Opus 30 follows.

The Theme (in "an introductory character") is twenty bars in length. Two rows are present at any given time, with no overlapping or shared notes, and they yield a series of canonic statements of motives A and B. The piece opens with one voice alone, and through m. 9 the texture alternates between one and two voices in a pattern which is reversed in mm. 10-20. Four-note chords occur at three points.

Aurally the Theme is perceived in three sections, internal cadences occurring at mm. 8-9 and mm. 13-14. These cadences have in common a ritard in the langsamer tempo (followed at the outset of the ensuing section by a subito lebhaft) and statements of motive A divided between the harp and a string instrument. (These are the only appearances of the harp in the Theme and also the only times that a statement of one of the motives is split between two instruments.) There is a clean division of rows at each of these points.

The dynamic pattern coincides with these cadences: m. 1 < m. 9 > m. 14 > m. 20. Instruments are doubled (tripled, in one case) on the rhythmic motive at the places where punctuating chords occur, except at the final chord, which has the role of heralding Variation I.

These three sections are, however, of very unequal lengths, the first being as long as the second and third combined. Although there is no cadence, the first large section divides into two halves at the point where the first row ends and the third begins (m. 4). Rhythmically, the two halves of the Theme are parallel, insofar as section IIa states the motives of section Ia in reverse order,
and section IIb does the same with the motives of section Ib. This relationship is strengthened by the fact that these reversed statements are accomplished by the exact retrograde of the rows which formed the first statements: i.e., P₀ in section Ia is answered by R₀ in section IIa, and I₀ in section Ib is answered by RI₀ in section IIb. A second cancrizans situation exists within each half of the Theme. Section Ib presents a rhythmic cancrizans of the A motives used in Ia, but the B motive remains in its forward position, becoming augmented rather than reversed in Ib. A parallel situation occurs between sections IIa and IIb. Altogether, the second half of the Theme presents all the motives of the first half in reverse order, with one exception: wherever a motive is diminished or augmented in section I, it appears in its original form in section II, and vice versa. Texturally, the two halves of the Theme form an arch. So, of course, do the row statements: P₀, RI₀, I₀, R₀, I₀, RI₀, P₀. The following diagram shows the rhythmic structure of the Theme (see Ex. 9):

**EXAMPLE 9**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>P₀</th>
<th>RI₀</th>
<th>I₀</th>
<th>RI₀</th>
<th>P₀</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>A</td>
<td>Ad</td>
<td>A</td>
<td>Ad</td>
<td>A</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>B</td>
<td>B</td>
<td>B</td>
<td>B</td>
<td>B</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>10</td>
<td>15</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Variation 1 ("main theme . . . more fully developed") is thirty-five bars in length. The texture is that of melody and accompaniment throughout; greatly augmented forms of A and B are accompanied by repeated quarter-note chords in four parts. The melody notes are occasionally reinforced by doubling.

This variation divides into nine sections which form a perfect arch as illustrated in the following diagram (see Ex. 10):

**EXAMPLE 10**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>mm.21-23</th>
<th>24-26</th>
<th>27-31</th>
<th>32-34</th>
<th>35-39</th>
<th>40-42</th>
<th>43-47</th>
<th>48-50</th>
<th>51-55</th>
</tr>
</thead>
</table>
| *This B is the exact rhythmic retrograde of the BR in mm. 32–34. (See examples 6 and 7.)

Sections 1, 2, 4, 6, 8, and 9 of the arch are similar and contain one four-note melodic fragment each. Sections 1 and 2 and sections 8 and 9 stand like pillars at either end of the variation and state between them all four forms of A and B; 8 and 9 present the retrograde forms of the motives which
appeared in 2 and 1, respectively. The melody in section 6 is an exact rhythmic retrograde of that in section 4. The remaining three sections are more complex and very similar to each other. Section 3 contains a six-note fragment, with motives A and AR dovetailed. Sections 5 and 7 both have two such fragments stated simultaneously (see Ex. 11).

**EXAMPLE 11**

Variation 2 ("transition") is eighteen bars long and in a character quite different from that of Variation 1. There are no melodies here. The texture is very thick and not apparently contrapuntal; the entire variation is a succession of four-note chords, with eight notes sometimes sounding at once.

Upon close inspection, the second variation reveals itself to be a two-voice rhythmic canon, each "voice" proceeding in four-note chords. (In discussing this variation, *voice* is used to refer to one part—i.e., row chain, succession of stacked tetrachords—of the canon. This is not to be confused with the use of *voice* elsewhere to refer to a linear progression of one note at a time.) The rows in this variation form two chains, both of which progress to m. 63 and subsequently retrogress through m. 69. As always in Opus 30, the rhythmic voices proceed within the boundaries of these row chains. The material of the canon consists of four statements of A—all produced by a 3:2 augmentation (the *sesquialtera* of the Burgundian composers)—and the first statement of C, in preparation for the variation to follow. Example 12 illustrates the forms taken by A in this variation (see Ex. 12).

In both voices the first two motives overlap one note, the last two do not.
The central juncture is treated differently in the two voices in order to preserve the correct order of pitches in the serial palindrome referred to above. The voice which reaches the axis (m. 63) last must also be the first to proceed onward. Therefore, the voice which leads at the beginning of the variation, having reached the axis first, rests and begins the next motive anew, while the second voice ends its second motive and begins its third on the same (central) note. The voices proceed at the interval of an eighth note throughout. The following diagram will serve to illustrate this point (see Ex. 13).

**Example 13**

![Diagram](image.png)

Variation 3 ("second theme") is thirty-six bars long. The texture is again very thin—only two voices. Two rows progress simultaneously throughout. As might be expected, the structure of this variation presents a marked contrast to that of the preceding ones. It appears to be through-composed in four sections, each of which is roughly symmetrical in itself, as shown in the diagram below. At the center of each section stands a statement of motive G in both voices (see Ex. 14).

**Example 14**

![Diagram](image.png)
Variation 4 ("reprise of the main theme . . . in the manner of a development") is twenty-five bars long. It is, as Webern indicates, a very complex version of Variation 1. It forms an arch exactly parallel to the one in the earlier variation (see Ex. 15).

EXAMPLE 15

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>mm. 110-113</th>
<th>113-115</th>
<th>115-119</th>
<th>118-121</th>
<th>121-125</th>
<th>125-128</th>
<th>126-130</th>
<th>130-132</th>
<th>131-134</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Ruhig</td>
<td>Ruhig</td>
<td>[Ruhig]</td>
<td>Ruhig</td>
<td>Lebhaft</td>
<td>Lebhaft</td>
<td>Lebhaft</td>
<td>Lebhaft</td>
<td>Ruhig</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>$f , p , f$</td>
<td>$f , p , f$</td>
<td>$f , p , f$</td>
<td>$f , p , f$</td>
<td>[high]</td>
<td>[high]</td>
<td>[high]</td>
<td>[high]</td>
<td>$f , p , f$</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>one complete statement</td>
<td>one complete overlapping statements</td>
<td>one complete overlapping statements</td>
<td>one complete overlapping statements</td>
<td>one complete overlapping statements</td>
<td>one complete overlapping statements</td>
<td>one complete overlapping statements</td>
<td>one complete overlapping statements</td>
<td>one complete overlapping statements</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Again, as in Variation 1, the two sections at either end of the arch are very similar to inner sections 4 and 6. Each of these sections contains one statement of each of the simple forms of motives A and B (A, AR, B, and BR). These statements are for the most part unaltered and do not overlap. Sections 3, 5, and 7, however, are dense masses of overlapping double statements and palindromes of the sort originally presented in sections 3, 5, and 7 of Variation 1 (see Ex. 16).

EXAMPLE 16

Section 3:

mm. 115-117, clar.:  

mm. 115-117, harp, vc.:  

mm. 116-119, horn, tpt.:  

mm. 116-118, vln.I, harp, vla.:  

Section 5:

mm. 121-124, vln.I, tymp., tromb.:  

mm. 121-124, vln.II, cb., tuba:  

mm. 122-125, vla., oboe, harp:  

mm. 122-124, vc., clar.:
EXAMPLE 16

Section 7:

mm. 127-130, ww., vln.II:

\[
\begin{align*}
& G D G D B \quad \text{inv. B} \\
& B G B G D
\end{align*}
\]

mm. 126-131, vln.I, vc.:

\[
\begin{align*}
& \text{AR} \quad \text{B} \\
& B \quad \text{inv. B} \\
& \text{BR}
\end{align*}
\]

mm. 128-129, vla., cb., vln.I:

\[
\begin{align*}
& \text{AR} \quad \text{A} \\
& \text{palindrome}
\end{align*}
\]

mm. 128-130, vla.:

\[
\begin{align*}
& \text{A} \\
& \text{Bb} \\
& \text{Db} \\
& \text{e}
\end{align*}
\]

The similarity between corresponding sections of the arch is not so clear here as it is in Variation 1. Variation 4 is continuous, and the sections overlap in nearly all cases. (For example, section 6 is comprised of four statements—cello, high woodwinds, viola, and violin II—the last of which ends on the first note of m. 128. Section 7, however, has at this point already begun in violin I on the final beat of m. 126.)

Variation 5 (“repeating the manner of the introduction and transition”) is only eleven bars in length. The first five bars are very similar to the opening of the piece. They contain four statements parallel to those in mm. 1–3, as shown below (Ex. 17):

EXAMPLE 17

\[
\begin{array}{c|c|c|c}
\text{mm. 0-1} & \text{m. 2} & \text{m. 2} & \text{m. 3} \\
\hline
\text{A:} & \text{B:} & \text{B:} & \text{AR:} \\
\text{Bass} & \text{Oboe} & \text{Viola} & \text{Trombone} \\
\text{\text{Lehntaf \( (A = 160) \)}} & \text{\( f = 112 \)} & \text{\( f = 112 \)} & \text{\( f = 160 \)} \\
\text{\text{\( B \quad D \quad E^b \quad G^b \)}} & \text{\( B \quad B \quad D \quad C^\sharp \)} & \text{\( F \quad E \quad G \quad A^b \)} \\
\hline
\text{\text{Var.5:}} & \text{\text{AR:} \quad \text{B:} \quad \text{B:} \quad \text{AR:} \\
\text{\text{Viola} \( (A = 160) \)} & \text{\text{Flute} \( f = 112 \)} & \text{\text{Celesta \& str.} \( f = 112 \)} & \text{\text{Violin I} \( f = 160 \)} \\
\text{\text{\( B \quad E^b \quad C^\# \quad F \)}} & \text{\( E \quad G \quad C^\# \quad B \)} & \text{\( B \quad B \quad C \quad C^\# \)} \\
\text{\text{mm. 135-136}} & \text{\text{mm. 137-138}} & \text{\text{mm. 137-138}} & \text{\text{mm. 139}}
\end{array}
\]

It can be seen that the similarities between parallel statements become less marked as the variation proceeds. By the fourth statement only the note-values and the row-segment remain parallel to the statement in m. 3. This gradual leave-taking of reminiscences of the Theme allows an easy entry into transition (Variation 2) material beginning with the statement in m. 139. The remaining seven bars of the variation (mm. 139–145) have at their center (in m. 142) the exact chord (same pitch level) which acted as the axis for the palindrome in Variation 2. Two separate rows and two row chains proceed simultaneously throughout these seven bars; they state in mm. 139–141 a flurry of A and AR motives in diminution (\( \bullet \) and \( \spadesuit \)) which are so close
together as to produce staccato pianissimo chords on every sixteenth note of the bar, reminiscent of the second variation. Following the central chord, the celesta, harp, and strings play in four-note chords on every sixteenth note of the bar the same progression of chord shapes that appeared at the end of Variation 2 (mm. 70–71) but on different pitch levels. Motives B and D are each stated once—by the celesta and trumpet and by the first violin—and the variation ends with a four-part canon on A and AR. The AR is very similar to that which opened the second half of the Theme in mm. 10–11; here, the pitches are in exact retrograde two octaves higher.

The two chains in mm. 139–45—I\textsubscript{10}–I\textsubscript{3}–I\textsubscript{8} and R\textsubscript{10}–R\textsubscript{8}–R\textsubscript{8}—progress in rhythmic canon with two exceptions. In m. 141 the harp should have $\gamma\delta\gamma\delta$ instead of $\gamma\delta\gamma\delta$ in order to preserve the rhythmic imitation; and the four notes B, C, A, and A\textsuperscript{♭} have been inexplicably omitted in m. 142. A chord containing these notes is demanded by both the row structure and the rhythmic canon on the first beat of this bar, and it would seem likely that its absence is due to some error between manuscript and printed score.

Variation 6 ("coda") is the longest of all. In Webern's brief description of Opus 30 quoted earlier, he gives some clue as to the content of the preceding sections, but none whatever concerning the content of the coda. It is very difficult to see the relationship of some sections of this variation to the rhythmic motives which have generated the rest of the piece. Bearing in mind Webern's statement that "all that now occurs in the piece comes from one of the two ideas which are stated in the first and second bars (double bass and oboe)," the only conclusion possible is that the coda is constructed by some asymmetrical (but, judging from the rest of the piece, surely systematic) means of augmentation. Note-values divisible by 3, 5, and 7 figure very prominently in this variation; for this reason, it seems likely that the sustained brass chords at the opening (\textsuperscript{\textordfNP{2}}\textsuperscript{\textordfNP{3}}\textsuperscript{\textordfNP{2}}\textsuperscript{\textordfNP{3}}) announce the key to the system used subsequently. The key, however—if indeed it is one—is so subtle as to have eluded this writer to date.

This variation is in some ways reminiscent of Variation 1. The material in mm. 146–68 divides into seven sections which form an arch bounded by pairs of four-note brass chords. These chords are an immediate aural reminder of the accompaniment in the first variation.\textsuperscript{10} Also, the content of the remaining five sections alternates between B and A, as was the case earlier. Motive B stands at the center of this arch, however, and the motives on either side appear to be very irregular, although their derivation from A is indisputable (see Ex. 18).

The brass chords which close the arch in mm. 167–68 at the same time begin a new and very complex section, also circumscribed by brass chords, and ending in m. 173. This section and the one following (mm. 174–77) are difficult to explain formally, as they seem to occupy the position of a closing section, but without in any way summing up what has come before.\textsuperscript{20} Within this section Webern's row structure becomes more difficult to follow.
than anywhere else in the piece. The final two bars act as a coda to the variation and to the work, the canon on A referring to the opening of the Theme.

A comparison of the instrumental variations of Webern shows Opus 30 to be unique. Only here is there a radical departure from what variation form had been throughout its history. A form that had previously depended on successive reiterations suddenly takes on a completely new meaning in this work, uniting the complex rhythmic and metric procedures of the Burgundians with the formal sense of the 19th century. Webern says of Opus 30 in the letters to Willi Reich:

Indeed there is again the synthesis: the presentation is horizontally, but vertical in all other respects. . . .21

. . . it would be fundamental to say that here (in my score) a quite different style is set forth. Yes, but what sort? It doesn't look like a score from pre-Wagnerian times—Beethoven, for instance—nor does it look like Bach. Should one then go back still further? Yes—but then there were no orchestral scores!

And yet it should still be possible to find a positive affinity with the type of presentation one finds in the Netherlands. . . .

Now it would have to be said unequivocally: this (mine) is certainly music that's based just as much on the laws at which musical presentation arrived after the Netherlands. Which doesn't reject the development that came then, but on the contrary desires to continue it into the future. . . . Thus a style . . . in whose formal construction both possible types of presentation are combined.22

And to Hildegard Jone he wrote:

. . . this theme with its six variations finally produces, from the formal point of view, an edifice equivalent to that of an "Adagio", but in
character—in content—my piece isn’t that at all—only formally. —So even though I have given the piece the title “Variations”, yet these for their part are nonetheless fused into a new unit (in the sense of a different form).  

The affinity of the Opus 30 style with the Burgundian school of the 13th and 14th centuries cannot be overlooked. The roots of Webern’s style are not to be found in that other golden era of counterpoint, the Baroque, in which dense fugues grow out of themes representing the fusion of a harmonically-based melodic figure with a metrically-determined rhythm. One must look back beyond the Doctrine of the Affections and the age of improvisation and ornamentation to the intellectual processes of an earlier period, one in which it was common to think of rhythm and melody separately and during which one of the important compositional procedures consisted of combining predetermined rhythmic and melodic patterns of disparate lengths. It is this age of rhythmic complexities and puzzles, this age of predetermined coincidence, that we must examine if we are to understand the rhythmic manipulations of Webern, for it is this style, coupled with the linear forms of the 19th century, which produced Webern’s “new style.” It was a marriage of pure genius.

NOTES

1 Weg zur neuen Musik, ed. Willi Reich (Vienna: Universal Edition, 1960), p. 63. All translations from this source are by the author.


3 “The twelve-tone row is, in general, not a ‘theme,’” according to Webern. Reich, Weg, p. 59.

4 The most striking use of the palindrome as a basis for variations is the second movement of the Symphonie, Opus 21. For analyses, see H. Wiley Hitchcock, “A Footnote on Webern’s Variations,” Perspectives of New Music 8, no. 2 (1970):123–26; and, from the same issue, Mark Starr, “Webern’s Palindrome,” 127–42.

5 Robert Nelson, in his article “Webern’s Path to the Serial Variation,” Perspectives of New Music 7, no. 2 (1969):77, speaks of “a gently swaying melody played by the clarinet” as the theme of the Opus 21 variations. He appears to be unconcerned both by the fact that this melody is a transposed statement of the inverted row and would therefore presumably have to be considered a variation itself, and by the complete disappearance of this “melody” after its initial statement.

6 See Brahms’s Fourth Symphony, final movement; the finale of Beethoven’s Ninth Symphony; and Act II, Scene I of Berg’s Wozzeck.

7 See René Leibowitz, Schoenberg and His School, trans. Dika Newlin (New York: Philosophical Library, 1949), pp. 226–38, for one analysis of these movements.


11 “... the variations reproduced no thematic aspect of the ‘theme’. This means that in this work everything is variation, or, to put it another way, everything is theme. ... Webern’s piano
variations are, then, a basic contribution to the 'athematic' method of composition.” Leibowitz, Schoenberg, p. 241.


13 Reich, Wege, p. 67 (letter of 3 March 1941).

14 Ibid., p. 68 (letter of 3 May 1941).

15 “Such and such a number of metamorphoses of the first shape constitute the 'theme'. This, as a new unit, passes again through such and such a number of metamorphoses; these, again, fused into a new unit, constitute the form of the whole.” Polnauer, Letters, p. 44 (letter of 26 May 1941).

16 Reich, Wege, p. 68. The original German reads:
Alles nun, was in dem Stück vorkommt, beruht auf den beiden Gedanken, die mit dem ersten und zweiten Takt gegeben sind (Kontrabass und Oboe!). Aber es reduziert sich noch mehr, denn die zweite Gestalt (Oboe) ist schon in sich rückläufig; die zweiten zwei Töne sind der Krebs der ersten zwei, rhythmisch aber in Augmentation. Ihr folgt, in der Posaune, schon wieder die erste Gestalt (Kontrabass), aber in Diminution! Und im Krebs der Motive und Intervalle.

17 All musical examples are by the author.


19 It should be noted here that the four-note chords which opened and closed Variation 1 were also stated by the brasses.

20 Serially, however, the material in mm. 167–80 is a partial summing-up of previous events. Variation 6 consists of two pairs of parallel row chains. One pair of prime chains proceeds with a consistent overlapping throughout the variation. The second pair of chains—one prime and one retrograde—proceeds similarly up to m. 167, at which point the system of overlapping is changed so that each chain retrogresses through its series of transpositions to end on the same level as that on which it began.

21 Reich, Wege, p. 67 (letter of 3 March 1941).


A Sonata Offering for the Prince of Tuscany

Malcolm S. Cole

Item 73 in Bianca Becherini’s Catalogo dei manoscritti musical della Biblioteca nazionale di Firenze is a set of twelve sonatas. The title page of the manuscript reads as follows:

Sonate à Violino, e Violoncello|Dedicate|
All’ Altezza Reale di Gio: Gastone de Medici|
Principe di Toscana/dà|Giuseppe Maria Fanfani.

There is an abundance of information on the dedicatee, Giovanni (Gian) Gastone de Medici, the last Medici Grand Duke, who reigned from 1723 to 1737. Almost nothing is known, on the other hand, about the composer. His name appears in none of the standard reference works; no mention of his compositions, manuscript or printed, occurs in the catalogues of collections in other Italian libraries. Indeed, it had begun to appear as if Fanfani had sunk into almost total oblivion, leaving only this set of sonatas. Recently, however, the Veracini scholar John Hill notified me that he has unearthed biographical information about Fanfani which he plans to incorporate in a note on the composers at the court of the last Medici Grand Duke. Since Prof. Hill can demonstrate that Fanfani’s activities extended well into the 18th century, it seems appropriate to examine in detail the Florentine collection of early sonatas.

The manuscript contains six works (labeled Sonate) in the mold of the sonata da chiesa and six others preceded by the designation Sonate da Camera. Although the precise year of origin cannot be established, the sonatas must have been composed between 1713 and 1723, because the title page is addressed specifically to the “Principe di Toscana.” Such a date would place Fanfani in the period immediately following Corelli, thus making him roughly contemporaneous with more celebrated figures such as Veracini, Vivaldi, and Tartini.

A few notational characteristics of the manuscript should be mentioned. Although the standard G and F clefs are used almost exclusively, on three occasions Fanfani or his copyist, to avoid an excessive number of leger lines, no doubt, has either substituted a different clef sign (tenor clef, Court Sonata II/2 and VI/3) or placed a familiar symbol on another line of the staff (G clef, lowest line, Church Sonata VI/2). Fanfani frequently, but not consistently, indicates in his key signature one sharp or flat fewer than dictated by the chosen key (Court Sonata II, A major, two sharps). The absence of a reference to a keyboard instrument and the lack of figures in ten of the twelve sonatas suggest that these compositions are simply string duets without continuo. A few figures do appear, however, specifying in all but one instance a seventh chord in 6–4–2 position (Church Sonatas III/2, 71
3, 4, and IV/1). In all probability, a continuo instrument participated in each sonata, but because the harmonic vocabulary used was, on the whole, self-evident, figures were not deemed necessary. Dynamic indications occur in five sonatas and involve a total of eight movements (Church Sonatas IV/4, VI/2, 4; Court Sonatas II/1, 2, III/1, V/1, 2). Normally, the term piano appears in conjunction with a restatement of a two- to five-measure block of cadential material. In Church Sonata VI/2, on the other hand, the echo principle is applied to motivic fragments (Ex. 1).³

**EXAMPLE 1: Church Sonata VI/2, mm. 20–22**

![Musical notation](image)

Fanfani constructs the six church sonatas in the four-movement sequence which was standard with many of Corelli's contemporaries and immediate successors.⁴ In the six court sonatas, on the contrary, he offers three designs (see Appendix). Cyclic relationships between movements are not in evidence. In the matter of tempo markings, Fanfani favored adagio and allegro in the church sonatas while admitting a broader selection in the court sonatas. Although a specific dance term (Giga) appears only in the finale of the first court sonata, it is evident nonetheless that dance models frequently furnished the stylistic basis of individual movements.

The proportions of the individual movements and, consequently, of the sonatas as a whole are considerably smaller than those suggested by Newman for Corelli: church sonatas, 112 measures versus 150; court sonatas, 70 measures versus 100.⁵ In fact, Fanfani exhibits a certain discomfort in longer movements, especially in a first allegro. The choice and sequence of meters derive from Corelli (see Appendix). Fanfani selects the minor mode for four of the church sonatas and only two of the court sonatas. Unlike Corelli, who either placed all the movements of a sonata in the same key or, at most, wrote one of the slow movements in the relative minor, Fanfani demonstrates a marked preference for the dominant as the tonal area of the third movement of the church sonatas (five of the six). Within none of Fanfani's individual movements is there an interpenetration of contrasting meters, tempos, or styles. Even short, essentially transitional movements invariably begin and end in the same key; Fanfani thereby eschews the connecting device of a Phrygian cadence on the dominant of a key.

Fanfani's music is clearly tonal, his modulations customarily do not range far from the main key, and his harmonic vocabulary is limited; the primary progressions are enlivened occasionally at cadences by a Neapolitan sixth or, even more rarely, a diminished seventh. Technical demands are limited as well, since the composer rarely requires the performer to go beyond the third position. One major exception occurs in Church Sonata VI/2, where
he calls for the fifth position (the only time in the collection), as violin figurations inexorably climb to a \(\ddot{a}^\prime\prime\)\(^6\). Similarly, only in this same movement does Fanfani write an extended passage in double stops.

As in the works of numerous contemporaries, the character of the individual movement is determined by its position within the sonata. The slow, introductory movement that opens each of the church sonatas often displays dotted rhythms of the kind familiar in the French overture (see III/1, V/I). Division of these movements into regular phrases and periods is not possible. Only Sonata I/I is imitative at its beginning. At later points in these movements, Fanfani offers several passages in which the violin and violoncello imitate one another motivically, the descending line producing in this instance a chain of suspensions (Ex. 2).

**EXAMPLE 2:** Church Sonata VI/I, mm. 3-5

![Example 2](image)

Primarily, however, the texture is homophonic, and the violoncello provides the harmonic foundation in quarter- and eighth-note motion, with the melody unfolding above, sometimes lyrically (I/I), sometimes pompously (III/I, V/I). Because these opening movements are so brief (nine to fourteen measures), they remain in the chosen key as a rule, with perhaps a momentary departure to the dominant. The more adventurous opening movement of Sonata III provides the sole exception.

The ensuing allegro, almost always the longest movement of the composition (thirty-one to sixty-seven measures), is customarily treated fugally, at least initially. The subject matter is at times rhythmically and melodically striking, displaying a distinct profile (as in I/2); at other times, it is simply a figurative idea of the perpetuum mobile type (as in III/2; see Exx. 3a and 3b).

**EXAMPLE 3a:** Church Sonata I/2  
**EXAMPLE 3b:** Church Sonata III/2

![Example 3a and 3b](image)

In either case the strict initial contrapuntal entry and those that occur after significant points of articulation soon give way to freer treatment; the bass eventually ceases all imitative activity and assumes a purely supportive function for the violin figurations, often in conjunction with that overworked device of the Baroque, the sequence. Sonata II/2 provides a representative example of Fanfani's preferred method of constructing a fugal movement.
but each church sonata allegro contains noteworthy details. The close point of imitation in Sonata IV/2 results in an intense beginning of a movement which, for its first eighteen measures, is a surprisingly compact example of contrapuntal writing. In Sonata V/2 the violoncello participates actively in the figurative work, at times in motivic imitation with the violin, at times in a relationship that amounts almost to invertible counterpoint. Brief passages that approach stretto (m. 11) and canon (mm. 38–39) make this the most adventurous contrapuntally of the fugal movements in the church sonatas. From measures 9 to 13, the soloist plays two real parts, in which motivic imitation and suspensions are prominent (Ex. 4).

EXAMPLE 4: Church Sonata VI/2, beg. m. 9

![Example 4](image)

The relatively brief third movements are usually in saraband rhythm. No. III/3, in French overture style, is an exception. Save for the imitative opening of No. VI/3, the movements are homophonic, the bass supporting unornamented melodic lines that consist primarily of whole notes, halves, and quarters. In all probability, these outlines are merely skeletons that were embellished in performance, as in Corelli’s Opus 5. This theory is supported in Sonata V/3 by a particularly awkward upward leap of an augmented fourth in the solo that occurs in conjunction with a stepwise ascent of the bass (Ex. 5).

EXAMPLE 5: Church Sonata V/3, mm. 18–20

![Example 5](image)

Although he shuns strict ground basses, Fanfani exhibits some preference for a bass line that descends by step and half-step, the practically identical lines of Sonatas I/3 and IV/3 providing illustrations of this (Exx. 6a and 6b).

EXAMPLE 6a: Church Sonata I/3

![Example 6a](image)
Characteristically, chains of suspensions unfold above such passages.

The six finales are of the giga (3/4) or gigue (6/8, 12/8) type. No. II/4 is undivided; the remaining five are in bipartite dance form, with the two sections being of approximately equal length. In the second section of No. IV/4, five of the eight "extra" measures may be attributed to an echoed restatement of immediately preceding material. Invariably the harmonic goal of the first section is the dominant. Favorite goals of tonicization within the second section are the subdominant and the submediant. Two of the five bipartite movements display a relation of head motives (III/4, VI/4), and three show a similarity of cadential formation (I/4, IV/4, VI/4). No. V/4 exemplifies the Baroque predilection for spinning out material, but several other finales exhibit relatively regular phrase and period structure, which is not surprising in view of their dance heritage. For example, the first twelve measures of the second section of Sonata I/4 consist of one block of four measures in A minor that is simply transposed to D minor and then to G minor, the sequential arrangement accentuating the regularity of the phrase structure (Ex. 7).

EXAMPLE 7: Church Sonata I/4, mm. 23–26

Among stylistic details that may be mentioned are: (1) the interruption of a steady flow of eighth notes with triplets to accentuate a final cadence (III/4); (2) the acceleration of motion in the bass to accentuate the drive to the final cadences of sections (V/4); and (3) the use of the diminished seventh to approach the final cadence (V/4, VI/4). Also in VI/4, voice-leading occurs that probably would not have pleased those critics who had censured Corelli some years earlier7 (Ex. 8).

EXAMPLE 8: Church Sonata VI/4, last 3 mm.
Of the eighteen movements in the court sonatas, sixteen are constructed in bipartite dance form, the only exceptions being a Largo in saraband style (V/3) and the fugal Allegro of VI/2. Modulatory goals and sectional proportions conform generally to the practices noted in connection with the dance movements of the church sonatas. Although the second section of No. III/2 is considerably longer than the first (fifteen measures), the bipartite structure is not affected. Sonata II/2 most closely approaches ternary form when, in the second section, the main theme appears complete in the dominant and again, as a kind of recapitulation, in the tonic. In thirteen of the sixteen movements, a palpable relationship of head motives exists. Court Sonatas II/1, III/1, and III/2 are the only exceptions, and they account also for three of the nine movements that display no relationship of cadential figures. (The others are II/2, 3, V/1, 2, and VI/1, 3.)

Stylistically the character of the individual movements is once again determined by their position in the sonata (see Appendix). With the exception of No. III, the court sonatas have an allegro or spiritoso second movement. The Allegro of No. I is in 6/4; the others employ common duple meter, suggesting the allemand perhaps. Of greatest interest is Sonata VI/2 (B minor), which is the only allegro not in dance form. Of the fugal movements in the complete collection, it is the most complex and the most continuously imitative (Ex. 9).

EXAMPLE 9: Court Sonata VI/2

![Musical notation](image)

A countersubject unfolds in conjunction with a fugal subject, which itself appears not only in tonal areas (E minor, A minor) other than the tonic and dominant, but also in canonic relationship at the octave. As with the bipartite dance design used as finales in five of the church sonatas, the fugal movements and saraband in the court sonatas illustrate the overlap of church and court styles.

The preceding survey of Fanfani's twelve sonatas, it is hoped, adds yet another piece of information to the history of sonata evolution in the late 17th and early 18th centuries. In spite of the composer's often stereotyped approach to form, which relied upon formulas and mechanical figurations, there are moments of great interest and beauty, especially in the shorter movements. Fanfani's chronological position in the evolution of the sonata makes it useful pedagogically to compare his works with those of his more illustrious contemporaries. When the forthcoming note of Prof. Hill establishes authoritatively the period of Fanfani's activities, future research might
well unearth subsequent compositions that reflect the fascinating transitional period from Baroque to Classic in Italy.

**APPENDIX: THE TWELVE SONATAS**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Church Sonatas</th>
<th>Court Sonatas</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>Tempo</strong></td>
<td><strong>Key</strong></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>I</td>
<td>1 Adagio</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2</td>
<td>Allo.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3</td>
<td>Adagio</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4</td>
<td>Allo.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>II</td>
<td>1 Grave</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3</td>
<td>Adagio</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4</td>
<td>Allo.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>III</td>
<td>1 ____</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2</td>
<td>Allo.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3</td>
<td>Adagio</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4</td>
<td>Allo.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>IV</td>
<td>1 Adagio</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2</td>
<td>Allo.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3</td>
<td>Adagio</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4</td>
<td>Allo.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>V</td>
<td>1 Adagio</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2</td>
<td>Allo.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3</td>
<td>Adagio</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4</td>
<td>Allo.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>VI</td>
<td>1 Grave</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2</td>
<td>Allo.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3</td>
<td>Adagio</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4</td>
<td>Allo.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

* Denotes a movement in bipartite dance form.

**NOTES**

1 Kassel: Bärenreiter, 1959, p. 79. The title is taken from the author's photocopy of the manuscript.

2 I am deeply grateful both to Mr. Emanuele Casamassima, director of the Biblioteca Nazionale Centrale in Florence, for communicating to me Prof. Hill's interest in composers at the Florentine grand ducal court and to Prof. Hill himself, with whom I have enjoyed a warm and lively exchange of correspondence. Prof. Hill, who is on the faculty of the University of Pennsylvania, has prepared a "Fanfani" entry for the sixth edition of Groves. Two broader studies devoted to Fanfani's more illustrious contemporary F. M. Veracini are in progress.

3 All musical examples are by the author.

Percy Grainger composed and arranged music for winds from virtually the beginning to the end of his creative life. The fruits of these labors are the subject, at first glance, of the dissertation under review. In fact, however, Thomas Slattery’s thesis is more than a study of the wind music: in both scope and length it is the first major attempt to deal with Grainger’s life and work. The wind music provides an apt vehicle, for its remarkable range of idiom, genre, and intention allows us to explore the gamut of Grainger’s productive life from almost every angle; the finest exemplars of this repertory reveal most immediately his striking ear and fastidious craftsmanship. Indeed, Grainger’s largest essay for winds, *Lincolnshire Posy*, is a handbook of band orchestration and arguably the most idiomatic and sensitive composition ever written for large wind ensemble.

The table of contents reveals both the scale of Dr. Slattery’s investigation and its cogent organization. The six chapters include an extended bibliographical summary; music for wind band; the chamber music for, with, and arranged for winds; Grainger’s wind scoring; his innovations; and a summary of sources. Three appendices—a catalogue of selected works, the locations of autograph manuscripts, and a list of Grainger’s recordings—and a bibliography conclude the dissertation. Musical examples and illustrative and analytical tables are numerous. The presence of broadly chosen source materials, the long list of acknowledgments, and quotations from Grainger’s writings give evidence of the wide ground covered.

Pioneering and admirable in its breadth, the dissertation is nevertheless deeply flawed and terribly uneven. It seems to have gone wrong at its very inception, for Dr. Slattery failed to select an angle from which to approach his subject. Instead, he attempted an account of Grainger’s personal and creative life, an exposition of his works for winds, a bibliographical study,
a catalogue raisonné of his music, an analysis of the influences upon the composer and of his influence upon others, and an interpretation of his far-flung theories. Overwhelmed by this material, Dr. Slattery has ended up with a collection of myriad bits and pieces, strung together in a random manner that gives the appearance of authority and scholarship but the substance of neither. Furthermore, the writing is unrelievably gray, effectively stripping the composer of his crazy-quilt, contradictory, and vibrant character. Still, the size of this work places it apart from the rest of the Grainger bibliography, and close examination of it yields much of value.

Dr. Slattery states in his preface that he set out to “survey certain facets” of Grainger’s creative life and to “examine in detail” the wind music, as well as to give “more than a cursory examination of [Grainger’s] life as a composer and performer” (p. v). For this task he had “unlimited access” to the composer’s manuscripts and private papers (p. iii). The “Bibliographical Summary” occupies fully one-third of the body of the text, and related information springs up throughout the manuscript. In effect, Dr. Slattery seems to have presented his summary as an outline for a projected comprehensive biography, and as an outline it is defective and misleading. He notes the two facets of the composer, “his private life and his public image,” yet does not attempt to reconcile them or to examine their influences upon the music. The various streams of Grainger’s life did issue forth, however, from one source; unless we recognize this fact, nothing will fall into place in a psychologically credible way. True, we must impose certain restrictions for the moment. Some personal material remains too sensitive for public dissemination; it must await the passage of time and present circumstance. Still, much can be discussed, for the problem at hand is not so much to unearth as to illuminate, penetrate, balance, and understand. Even the briefest exposure to Grainger’s writings impresses us with the fact that he was far more alive to the wellsprings of his own character than are those who have known and written about him.

The first task is to establish the facts of Grainger’s life. Dr. Slattery’s occasional reliance on inadequate secondary sources and on some of Grainger’s later statements tends to unbalance the biography and lead him astray. On the most elementary level he lacks familiarity with the published material. For example, discussing Grainger’s experiments and innovations, he quotes the following passage from a recent article by Herbert Fred:

[Grainger] was not an evolving artist, but one who branched out more than actually grew. One cannot listen to his works and reflect, ‘This is of his late period, and that is of his early period.’

But this nugget of good sense does not originate in Fred’s dismal little essay. It was taken almost bodily, and without acknowledgment, from a statement made fifty years earlier, while Grainger was in his thirties and might have been thought still capable of musical growth; its insight could have come only from Cyril Scott.
Or take the vital moment when Grainger left Australia with his mother, Rose, in order to begin serious musical study in Frankfurt am Main. Secondary sources offer more confusion than aid in ascertaining even the approximate date of his arrival. Dr. Slattery properly rejects (p. 7) the date of 1892 given by Percy Scholes and Thomas Armstrong, and that of 1894 given by Nathan Broder and Nicholas Slonimsky. He also rejects Grainger's own date of 1895, given in a letter written in 1958. In that note Grainger mentioned that he had gone to Frankfurt to study with Clara Schumann but that she had died a few weeks after his arrival. Since Mme. Schumann died on 20 May 1896 (as the author notes on the basis of the little entry in the New College Encyclopedia of Music!), Grainger must have arrived in Frankfurt in the spring of that year. He recalls that the young pianist's farewell concert had taken place on 14 May 1895 and wonders how to account for the gap of a year's time; but he sees no way to reconcile the problem. Now it is certainly possible that an old man's memory will play tricks on him, and in any case Grainger was no stickler for trifles such as childhood dates; in another late letter he wrote that he had arrived in Frankfurt after Mme. Schumann's death! But the date 1895 given in the 1958 letter is correct. In the introduction to the volume of Photos of Rose Grainger, printed privately thirty-five years earlier, Grainger dates his departure for Germany as "Middle of 1895," and his arrival in Frankfurt as "Summer 1895." An early letter from his father corroborates this date. Written on 13 November 1895, it acknowledges Percy's letters from Frankfurt and ends with "Remember me kindly to your Master & thank him for me," indicating that Grainger had already enrolled at the Hoch Conservatory there. The sequence of events now becomes clear: Grainger left Australia soon after his farewell concert in May 1895, arrived in Germany and settled in Frankfurt during the summer, and enrolled at the Conservatory that fall. As for the plan to study with Clara Schumann, that must have been a hope of Rose Grainger's rather than a firm arrangement; prospective students of the great lady had first to spend a year of training with one of her daughters, after which she would take on a small number of the most promising. But from the moment the Graingers set foot in Frankfurt, they must have known that even this possibility was beyond reach, for by 1895 Mme. Schumann's health was failing rapidly. She was losing her hearing and her strength, practicing became increasingly difficult, and playing virtually impossible. By the time Grainger enrolled, she was in no condition to continue with her old students, much less accept new ones. For the little boy from Australia, then, she was in effect "dead." The confusion in the letters of his old age recalls the psychological, if not the actual, truth of this dimly-remembered incident.

Sins of commission and omission mar Dr. Slattery's text so often as to throw doubts on its general reliability. Grainger did not "incorporate portions of Rarotongan part-songs in a composition called Random Round" (p. 164). He stated quite clearly in an article which the author has apparently misread that he incorporated the principles and techniques of Rarotongan
music, not the music itself; and an examination of this work bears out that fact. The last major published composition was not the 1940 Lincolnshire Posy (p. 26) but The Power of Rome and the Christian Heart (completed in 1948, published in 1953). Grainger's interest in old music was first stimulated not by a recording prepared in 1932 by Dom Anselm Hughes (p. 41), but by the concerts of the Haslemere Festival, organized by Arnold Dolmetsch, which he had attended the previous July. No doubt Hughes played a major role in exposing Grainger to the riches of earlier ages. In fact, much of the credit Dr. Slattery bestows on Grainger for the English Gothic Music edition—calling it "perhaps the finest example of Grainger's editorial practices" (p. 41)—must be transferred to Hughes, as a careful reading of that edition makes evident. Conversely, the author fails to deal adequately with Grainger's enormous editorial accomplishments with both the Lincolnshire folk-songs and the Grieg Piano Concerto.

Equally troublesome are a number of misleading statements. It is insufficient to note that "many of Grainger's published compositions are notated with two dates, indicating the length of time between their conception and their completion" (p. 12n). For some works the second date indicates revision of a completed score, while for others Grainger gives three or more dates. The rescoring of certain compositions often stemmed not from a change in intention but merely from a desire to enhance the possibility of its commercial success and to broaden its availability to various amateur ensembles. The procedural simplification worked out in the revised "set" version of Random Round arose from Grainger's recognition that the piece in its original form remained beyond the scope of most musicians, even thirty years after its creation. One might add here that the composer's lifelong habit of tinkering with earlier works has left us with an immense and confusing pile of material in sketch, manuscript, and print. Its sorting, dating, and analysis are fundamental tasks which, to my knowledge, no one has begun.

Similarly inadequate is the treatment of Grainger's Anglicisms. True, as Dr. Slattery states, he attempted to avoid foreign words and expressions and preferred to use slangy words and phrases, such as "hold till blown," "bumpingly," and "slow off lots." But he went further (as one of the author's illustrations shows); his literary output is dense with the products of his desire to avoid compound words having ambiguous roots or Latin origins: exhaust becomes "forspend;" museum becomes "past-hoard-house;" composer becomes "tone-wright;" etc. It was hopeless, of course. Although he kept at it for fifty years, virtually every one of these concoctions had to be followed by its common equivalent in brackets. Dr. Slattery makes no attempt to understand the reasons behind this peculiar obsession. Cyril Scott did try, in his previously cited essay, noting ironically that although Grainger used English words because he thought Italian impractical, the opposite held instead—he had to use Italian to explain the colloquial English. The composer had other reasons besides the supposed impracticality of a
foreign tongue; these had to do with his notions of "musical democracy."
One must also examine his practice in the broader context of the movement
for language reform which held sway during the early years of this century.

Finally, in conjunction with the biography, one regrets that Dr. Slattery
did not make more use of primary sources. True, the inclusion of several
interesting documents (among them, the manuscript notes concerning Hill
Song No. 1, one of the late "Round-Robin Letters," and various recital
programs) gives evidence of his having visited the Grainger collections in
this country. But their presence seems the result of random pickings governed
by no clear program of research. Photos of Rose Grainger he describes as three
short accounts of her life, accompanied by numerous photographs and repro-
ductions of her handwriting (p. 36). One would never gather from this
description that the accounts are the reproductions; we must assume there-
fore that Dr. Slattery neglected to examine this vital little volume. Nor
could he have read the major autobiographical efforts and come up with
so little. Those documents brim over with reminiscences, facts, stories, and
auto-analyses. They and the letters are essential to the most elementary
study of the man and his music, and it is appalling that they remain un-
explored and untapped.

*   *   *   *   *

The discussion of the music suffers from a similarly haphazard approach.
First of all there is the matter of classification. Dr. Slattery states that there
are "two sides" to the musician Grainger, as evinced in his "light, 'tuneful,'
folk-oriented pieces" on the one hand, and his "experiments in electronic
music" on the other (p. v). But that is a misreading of the evidence: the
division, as his thesis goes on to demonstrate, is that of folk-oriented as
against original music. (In fact, Grainger's interest in mechanical and elec-
tronic music lies entirely outside the scope of this dissertation.) But this too
is a difficult division to maintain, as Dr. Slattery realized in categorizing the
folk-song-based Lincolnshire Posy, correctly, as an original work—as opposed
(he claims) to "true" folk settings. The problem is that there is no such
thing as a "true" folk setting, only a "true" folk song. Any setting, even the
barest harmonization, alters the original, and no hard and fast relationship
exists between the complexity of the alteration and its distance from the
original. Indeed, Grainger felt that the ambitious Posy lay close in spirit to
folk song, while his simpler popular settings were corruptions of it.

Within the category of folk settings, therefore, a subdivision into two
types seems necessary, whether we call them serious and commercial, or
complex and simple. That at least corresponds, we might note, to Grainger's
own differentiation of "genuine folksong" and "half-breed tunes . . . on the
borderline between folksong and unfolkish 'popular song.'" Only in this
way can we truly deal with such fascinating works as the Posy, "The Duke of
Marlborough" Fanfare for brass ensemble, the orchestral Danish Folk Music
Suite, the sea chanty Shallow Brown, and the Scotch Strathspey and Reel, and
properly measure the chasm that separates them from *Country Gardens* and the *Irish Tune from County Derry*.

A similar distinction must be made among the original works. One cannot lump together, say, such "popular" pieces as *Colonial Song* and "The Gum-suckers" *March*, whose intention was nationalistic, with the strange, mock-Oriental *Arrival Platform Humlet*. One cannot label some compositions simply as experimental and the rest as "tuneful." *The Power of Rome and the Christian Heart*, for one, is neither of these, but instead serious, ambitious, and conservative in idiom. Even the lighter works, when examined as a group, seem uneasy bedfellows. They range broadly in the source of their style and in technique and structure. Where, for instance, do we place the *Children's March*, whose simple tune and jaunty swing belie elegant, even "serious" form? To lump them together is to miss half the point and thereby to diminish Grainger.

That is exactly what happens when Dr. Slattery overlooks the crucial influence of the London music hall. Grainger insisted throughout his life that he was a "musical democrat," and his ears remained open to every kind of music, whatever its source. The legendary Harry Lauder, whose voice and style so captivated George Bernard Shaw and his colleagues, constituted one such source. To ignore the music hall is simply to invite confusion. Thus the author, faced with the tunefulness of *Mock Morris* and misled perhaps by its title, mentions that work among the folk-song settings (p. 94). But Grainger himself denied any direct association:

No folk-music tune-stuffs at all are used herein. The rhythmic cast of the piece is Morris-like, but neither the build of the tunes nor the general lay-out of the form keeps to the Morris dance shape.

*Mock Morris* is an entirely original work in pure music-hall style. The tune came to me in bed, the morning after seeing "The Arcadians" (George Grossmith as the lean miserable looking jockey . . .) & based upon the motto of the song (but not its music) sung by Grossmith: "I've got a mother, always merry & bright."

Nor is *Mock Morris* unique. *Handel in the Strand*, a reworking of material for an intended set of variations on *The Harmonious Blacksmith*, is entitled "Clog Dance." The second movement of "In a Nutshell" *Suite*, "Gay but Wistful," was described by Grainger as an attempt to write an air with a "Music Hall" flavor embodying that London blend of gaiety with wistfulness so familiar in the performances of George Grossmith, Jr., and other vaudeville artists. The musical material, composed in London, dates from about 1912, and was worked out and scored during the winter of 1915/16 in New York City and in railway trains.

The matter of classification is admittedly perplexing. In an essay limited
strictly to the wind music, one might perhaps distinguish those compositions intended specifically for winds (Lincolnshire Posy, The Lads of Wamphray, Children's March, the wind-accompanied choral songs) from those that were conceived with a variety of sonorities in mind (The Immoveable Do) or gradually evolved into wind works (The Power of Rome), and from the outright transcriptions (Mock Morris, Irish Tune, Shepherd's Hey). But whatever one's method, it must proceed from an overriding view of the music and with a clear statement of intention. Otherwise, the definitions and procedures of classification become arbitrary, and the treatment of individual works unbalanced. So it is in the dissertation at hand: Dr. Slattery's choice of extended treatment of some works and dismissal of others seems guided neither by the intention to analyze closely a major work within each category nor by the desire to give weight in accordance with the accomplishment, individuality, length, or complexity of a given work. Quite reasonably, the Posy receives twenty-five pages of discussion, the two Hill Songs fifteen, and the woodwind quintet (Walking Tune) six. On the other hand, however, Grainger's grandest single statement for concert band, The Power of Rome, is given only one page, as are the marvelous Children's March and "The Duke of Marlborough" Fanfare. Oddly, too, My Robin is to the Greenwood Gone receives extended treatment, even though it is not strictly a wind piece, while the superbly scored choral songs with wind accompaniment receive only passing mention.

Dr. Slattery's descriptions and analyses of individual works evince considerable thought, and some of them prove most convincing. His structural and harmonic analyses of the six movements of Lincolnshire Posy are excellent. Each movement, he notes, is built on an accompaniment-variation principle, with the folk song on which it is based functioning as a recurring cantus firmus. The construction of each movement and the nature of its accompaniment are derived with uncanny sensitivity from the characteristic shape of the original song and from the personality and vocal style of its singer. Quite properly, then, the author opens his discussion with expositions of the tunes themselves and then analyzes the form of each movement and its outstanding traits. His fine work in delineating the part-writing and penetrating the often complex harmonic patterns would have been aided by presentation of musical examples in full score rather than in photocopies of the lamentable compressed published score. One may question his attributions of Grainger's tonal idiom: there is no need to repeat, in connection with the composer's "obsession with intervals," Harold Bauer's dubious remark\(^2\) that Grainger made "exhaustive studies . . . regarding the analogy between the triad and the Trinity" (p. 68); and it is a gross simplification to state that the composer's "parallel chromaticism and chromatic root movements reflect the influence of Debussy" (p. 69). But these are minor matters when weighed against the achievement. Dr. Slattery's interest in structural, melodic, contrapuntal, and harmonic elements likewise illuminates his discussions of Walking Tune, which he observes is unique among
Grainger’s compositions in its proximity to sonata principle (p. 102), and the *Hill Songs*, where he buttresses his arguments with splendid quotations and cogent musical examples.

Other factors, however, less susceptible perhaps to straightforward analysis, often give a work its characteristic shape and sound. Phrasing, for one, should not have been ignored, for it is an integral component of Grainger’s fascination with irregular meters and rhythms. It is responsible in part for the sense of space achieved in *The Power of Rome* and for the delightful surprises of the *Children’s March*. An extraordinary sensitivity to the phrasing and the general temporal quality of folksong—and to the intimate relationship between these and melodic contour, ornamentation, and harmonic rhythm—lies behind the thrust of the two-piano piece *Let’s Dance Gay in Green Meadow* and is responsible for the magical contrast between the third and fourth movements of the *Posy*. On the other hand, it is the lack of interesting phrasing which so contributes to the dearth of forward motion and to the monotony (perhaps consciously sought here) in *Walking Tune* and *The Immovable Do*.

There are other ways to examine a composition, of course. Sometimes a brief incisive description will do, such as Dr. Slattery’s observation that the distinctive quality of *Shepherd’s Hey* is achieved by the successive use of varied instrumental groupings to suggest dancers entering and leaving the dance, and by the timbres of fixed-pitch percussion instruments (p. 91). But some works guard their secrets more closely and must be exposed to sustained scholarly work. Here the author’s failure is telling. To read that *The Power of Rome* is characterized by parallel triads and chords built on fourths and fifths, and that its “overall structure [is] ... a series of brief loosely-connected sections” (pp. 65–66) is to learn virtually nothing of that strange work. Yet it is, after all, Grainger’s longest uninterrupted utterance for wind band, one on which he worked for thirty years, and his last major published composition. It is a perplexing work with a fascinating history, and any study, much less a dissertation, of Grainger’s wind music must at least try to treat it seriously.

* * * * *

In the remaining chapters of his thesis, Dr. Slattery reaches beyond the wind music in several directions. The fourth chapter, on Grainger’s scoring practices, includes pertinent and well-illustrated passages on the composer’s use of woodwinds and pitched percussion instruments in families, and of brass primarily as solo or supporting instruments; on his characteristic combinations and juxtapositions of instrumental choirs; on his predilection for double reeds and saxophones; and on his unusual concern for the variety, weight, and disposition of his percussion instruments. Concerning Grainger’s practice of setting out his music for “elastic scoring,” Dr. Slattery arbitrarily rejects Charles Hughes’s argument that the roots of the practice lay in contemporary theater scoring23 and relates it instead to 18th-century string
scoring (quoting Adam Carse) and even farther back to the 16th century (citing Willaert, for no reason that I can divine other than that Grainger transcribed a single motet, *O Salutaris Hostia*, by that composer). His argument must be rejected: Grainger's “elastic scoring” dates from early in his career, after his exposure to the music hall, while his acquaintance with the work of Carse and with music from before Bach’s time arose only from his contact with Dolmetsch in the early 1930’s.

The fifth chapter, on Grainger’s innovations, is decidedly a mixed bag, more valuable for its pulling together of disparate published material than for its original contribution. The passage on guitar tuning comes straight from Cecil Forsyth and should have been acknowledged as such. The discussion of Grainger’s Anglicisms is, as noted earlier, inadequate. The treatment of “Free Music” offers valuable primary material but relies heavily on Richard Franko Goldman.

Towards the end of the fifth chapter, Dr. Slattery cites a note in which Grainger claims seven procedures as “complete innovations at the time that *Hill Song Nr I* was conceived & scored” (1901–02): wide-toned scales, irregular rhythms, discordant triads, triads in conjunct motion, nonrepetition of thematic material, nonarchitectural formal procedures, and large chamber music. The author’s comments on these claims will not do. To assert that Grainger’s use of triads in conjunct motion was based on his study of organum in the 1930’s is to ignore any number of works composed far earlier—to pick two at random from the four-hand piano repertory, *Let’s Dance Gay in Green Meadow* (a Faeroe Island dance setting first sketched in 1905) and *Hermundur Illi* (sketched in 1911 and published in 1924 as the first of *Two Musical Relics of my Mother*). To find in the large chamber music “a beginning of twentieth century neo-classicism” (p. 167) is to have looked for the wrong source. Dr. Slattery correctly rejects Grainger’s claim to the innovation of “wide toned” (i.e., nondiatonic and nonchromatic) scales but then goes on to cite, as an earlier instance of this practice, the wrong example: Glinka’s overture to *Russlan and Ludmilla*. He refers here, I believe, to the descending whole-tone scale just before the coda of the overture; but that brief passage is merely tonal coloration in a thoroughly diatonic work, whereas Grainger was talking about a fundamentally new mode of composition. Concerning the composer’s early experiments in irregular rhythm, it is of little use to regret that he did not attempt “further development and refinement of these experiments” (p. 166). One may well ask whether the fifth movement of *Lincolnshire Posy* is not one such refinement, or perhaps hold that these early interests in flexible motion and accent were an important step in the more radical development towards the elimination of rhythm and meter in the “Free Music.”

The first of the three appendices, “A Catalogue of Selected Compositions,” requires some comment. Ten of the thirteen groupings of compositions into which it is divided are classifications devised by Grainger: *American Folk Settings*, *Barrack Room Ballads* (Kipling), *British Folk Music Settings*, *Danish*
Folk Music Settings, the Dolmetsch Collection of English Consorts, English Gothic Music, Free Settings of Favorite Melodies, the Kipling Settings, Old English Popular Music, and the Sea Chanty Settings. (Inexplicably, the Room-Music Tit-Bits series is omitted.) The listings under each classification are virtually complete, rather than restricted to only music with winds. They are the only comprehensive source of this material now available.

The three remaining classifications are devised by Dr. Slattery. The first of these lists Grainger’s arrangements of music (including his own) for brass choir, clarinets, saxophones, and wind choir. The second is a catalogue of chamber music with winds; to it should be added the Echo-Song Trials of 1945 (New York Public Library MS.), a version of the Scotch Strathspey and Reel for piano, flute, oboe, clarinet, bass clarinet, and bassoon (National Library of Scotland MS.), and a version of Jerusalem Shoemaker for piano, flute, trumpet, violin, viola, cello, and double bass (Library of Congress MS.). The third classification is subdivided into arrangements for band, works for brass band, choral compositions accompanied by brass or wind band, and folk-song settings. This list, however, curiously incomplete. Among the arrangements for band omitted by Dr. Slattery are The Nightingale and The Two Sisters (Danish Folk Music Settings, No. 10)20, Spoon River, Katharine Parker’s Down Longford Way (arranged for winds or band),27 Colonial Song, Harvest Hymn, and Immutable Do. One might note here that three of the four brass-band works, three of the eight wind-accompanied choral works, and five of the six folk-song settings are arrangements in the versions listed—the brass works, in fact, were arranged not by Grainger but by Denis Wright. Finally, since the author has neglected to include in the wind-band classification a subheading for original band works, nowhere in his catalogue can one find Children’s March, The Lads of Wamphray, or The Power of Rome and the Christian Heart.

If one can question Dr. Slattery’s method of classification—and it does seem responsible at least in part for the difficulties encountered here—it is quite another matter to suggest a better method off the cuff. I have offered a few suggestions above, but the entire problem must be thought out afresh after a comprehensive listing has been made of all Grainger’s music: sketches and completed works, both in manuscript and in print. For whatever method is finally settled upon, it must grow from and reflect the nature and variety of Grainger’s entire output. To amass and annotate the list of that output is a dizzying prospect. The root of the problem lies in Grainger’s habits not only of returning again and again to earlier works but also of setting them to “elastic scoring”—two practices that have left us with a bewildering number of versions for the majority of his compositions.

Take, for instance, a work that Dr. Slattery does not mention but which can be considered “wind music” in one of its guises: The Lonely Desert-Man Sees the Tents of the Happy Tribes (Room-Music Tit-Bits, No. 7) was sketched in 1911 and again in 1914 and was completed in 1949. It was published, probably in the following year, by Schirmer, in a reproduction of the com-
poser's manuscript. According to a card-catalogue entry at the Music Division of the New York Public Library, it was written for three voices (STB)—or three winds, or alto saxophones—accompanied by room-music (two guitars, one or two wooden marimbas, piano, and optional winds and strings) or by chamber orchestra or piano! The NYPL copy contains the score, piano conductor, and thirteen instrumental parts, and includes a typewritten "list of possible combinations." To think of the number of classifications under which this composition could be placed, and to remember that this piece is not at all unusual in the variety of its possible settings— it is, in fact, less problematic than some other works—is to gain some idea of the challenge of dealing with Grainger's music as a body.

* * * *

Dr. Slattery divides his bibliography of printed materials into listings of books, articles from reference works and collections, and articles from periodicals. It is an indispensable tool for the Grainger student, but once again its value is diminished by an unfortunate number of errors and omissions, and by a lack of annotation throughout. Copies with a few additional entries penciled in by Dr. Slattery are available from the Grainger Library Society (Stewart Manville, Librarian, 7 Cromwell Place, White Plains, New York). The following entries, noted in accordance with the author's three-fold classification and including material published since his dissertation was written, should be added to his revised list:

A. Books


——. *Photos of Rose Grainger and of 3 Short Accounts of her Life by Herself, in her own Handwriting.* . . [New York?:] Privately printed, ca. 1923.


B. Articles from Reference Works and Collections

Pears, Peter. Articles in the printed program-books of the Aldeburgh Festivals of 1966 (pp. 19–21) and 1970 (pp. 77–78).

C. Articles from Periodicals

Dean-Smith, Margaret. "Letters to Lucy Broadwood." *Journal of the English Folk Dance and Song Society* 9 (1960–64): 233–68. Among the letters are two from Percy and one from Rose Grainger to Miss Broadwood, along with one letter and an extract of another from Grieg to Grainger.


References to several other brief articles and to obituaries on Grainger can be found in *The Music Index* (1949–). Of especial interest is a recently published issue of *Recorded Sound* (the journal of the British Institute of Recorded Sound, nos. 45–46 [January–April 1972]). It contains notable essays on the “Free Music” by Grainger and by his associate in that project, Burnett Cross, as well as invaluable discographies by Eric Hughes ("The Recorded Works of Percy Grainger"), A. F. R. Lawrence ("Records of Percy Grainger as an Interpreter"), and Gerald Stonehill ("Piano Rolls Played by Percy Grainger"). Also to be found in this issue is a slightly abbreviated version of a doctoral thesis on the “Free Music” by Margaret Hee-Leng Tan, which will be discussed in the third part of this essay.
NOTES

5 Die Musik in Geschichte und Gegenwart, vol. 5 (Kassel and Basel: Bärenreiter, 1956), col. 673.
7 He was, on the other hand, quite exact in his dating of compositions, to the day and often to the place. Thus, in the MS. copy of Random Round of 1943 (not, as Dr. Slattery states, 1945), one follows Grainger through the score of the “random” version from Utah through Idaho and Wyoming to Denver from 23 to 28 February; the “set” version was written out in Springfield, Missouri, on 14–15 March 1943.
8 Page 3.
9 Original at the Grainger Museum in Melbourne; photostatic copy at the Library of Congress.
10 The MS. sketches for The Life of my Mother & her Son, written after the composer’s mother committed suicide in 1922, date his period of study in Frankfurt from September 1895 to March 1900 (p. 16).
14 Thus, I’m Seventeen Come Sunday was composed in 1905 and rescored in 1912, while the second Kipling setting, We Have Fed Our Seas for a Thousand Tears, was begun in 1900, completed in 1904, and rescored in 1911.
15 See note 2 above.
16 “Program-Note,” Lincolnshire Posy (New York: G. Schirmer, 1940), [p. 2].
18 Photos of Rose Grainger, p. 4. Grainger mentioned hearing Lauder several times between 1909 and 1914.
19 Prefatory note to the score.
20 MS. sketches for The Life of my Mother & her Son, p. 40.
21 Prefatory note to the score.
26 Published by G. Schirmer in 1931 with indications for military band.
27 Published by Boosey (London) in 1936.
28 Grainger’s article on Grieg in The Etude 61 (1943) is in four parts, not one, running from June to September; Sidney Cowell’s obituary note in the Journal of the International Folk Music Council 14 (1962) is followed by two others by Maud Karpeles and Poul Lorenzen. There are some errors in pagination. I have checked only random entries and suspect that other such lapses occur elsewhere.
29 The following annotation, for one, would have pinpointed the importance of Henry Finck’s monograph on Strauss: Percy Grainger, “Appreciation—Richard Strauss: Seer and Idealist,” pp. xvii–xxv, etc. Slattery gives only the title, Richard Strauss, the Man and His Works, and the publishing information.
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To trace the history of any instrument is a fascinating study for scholars with an interdisciplinary approach to culture. In the present bibliography I have tried to represent not only the concerns of the musician, musicologist, or instrument maker but also those of the historians investigating such facets of life as politics, sociology, religion, and art.

This survey of the literature on the harp until approximately 1600 is an extract from an exhaustive bibliography prepared for a Ph.D. dissertation which was left unfinished. I read and searched through each book for further literature. The result was a collection of more than 1000 items, most of which were of no use at all. Sometimes titles were misleading; for example, *Die geistliche Seelenharpf* is a booklet of pietistic songs and prayers. Other titles did not shed any light on the contents of the work. The present bibliography excludes books which mention harps only in passing, which are totally incompetent, or whose titles promise help in solving questions of broader scope but at closer examination prove to be irrelevant. Also omitted are titles which can neither be pinned down bibliographically nor found in any European library. Thus the list that follows includes about 20 percent of the original 1000 items; and some of the entries which have been kept are still of questionable reliability or importance. I have nevertheless retained these borderline cases in order to present a more rounded picture of the subject. Books which are marked o offer illustrations of harps, without accompanying texts.

Since I do not intend to pursue this project further, I would be glad to make my extensive collection of harp photographs (mainly of manuscripts and sculptures) available to any interested parties. I may be contacted through Current Musicology.—D.G.
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