

Germany.⁸ If it offers few contributions to the fundamental question of the relation between aesthetics and politics, it nevertheless provides a starting point for approaching the question where it can be most fruitfully engaged.

SANNA PEDERSON

The Second Practice of Nineteenth-Century Tonality edited by William Kinderman and Harald Krebs. Lincoln and London: University of Nebraska Press, 1996. ix, 279 pp.

The title of this volume is somewhat misleading in that “practice” implies a common set of compositional strategies, while the nine essays chart a great diversity of tonal procedures among mainly Austro-German composers from Beethoven to Schoenberg. (Chopin is included—an honorary German, as always—but French, Russian, and other repertoires are not treated, an omission that the editors acknowledge and reasonably defend.) The conference at which most of the essays originated, held at the University of Victoria in 1989, was called “Alternatives to Monotonicity,” which, though clearly less sexy than the Monteverdian conceit now in the title, may reflect better the actual contents of the resulting book.

The central questions occupying the authors are: What happens in the later nineteenth and early twentieth centuries to the principle of a single tonality governing a piece of music? And when, where, and how does this principle begin to break down? *The Second Practice* is remarkable not least for getting between two covers music historians and theorists—they are in about equal measure here—who focus on issues that up to now have not been adequately addressed by either *Fach*. As would be expected from a multiauthor volume, the result is not unified or consistent, not a “second practice” of tonal theory, but a stimulating collection of analyses, ideas, and hunches.

Even formulating the questions has been difficult in this area. What is “tonality” really? Does the term imply the centrality of a single key, and is it as such really synonymous with “monotonicity”? Or is monotonicity itself a chimera, given how complex, compositionally and perceptually, even works that begin and end in the same key can be?

8. The German-language literature on this topic is formidable (Dennis does not provide a bibliography). Two recent, wide-ranging and thought-provoking studies are Martin Geck and Peter Schleuning’s reception history of the *Eroica*, “*Geschrieben auf Bonaparte*.” *Beethovens “Eroica”: Revolution, Reaktion, Rezeption* (Reinbeck: Rowohlt Taschenbuch Verlag, 1989); and Ulrich Schmitt’s *Revolution im Konzertsaal: Zur Beethoven-Rezeption im 19. Jahrhundert* (Mainz: Schott, 1990), which proposes a history of the “psychology of perception” to account for the ability of Beethoven’s music to incite political sentiments.

William Benjamin, in the introductory remarks to his thoughtful essay on Bruckner's Eighth Symphony, is one of the few authors in the volume to grapple with monotonicity at this very fundamental level. He suggests that a listener can often "intellectually construct" a large-scale monotonal framework for many late Romantic works but "perhaps not experience it as such" (p. 238). (The intellectual construct would be something analogous to what Fred Lerdahl has called pitch space, the experiential "reality" similar to event space.)¹ Benjamin goes on to observe that a late Romantic piece that begins and ends in the same key, although strictly speaking monotonal, might be perceived only as returning to, but not necessarily prolonging or remaining within, a tonic. If this is so, then music theory in its "traditional role of exploring and anchoring the experience of tonal coherence" would be less suited to explain what is happening than are other realms of "late-nineteenth-century musical semantics" (p. 238).

These "other realms" concern many of the contributors to the volume. It is odd, though, that no author in the collection quite defines "monotonicity" or gives the term proper attribution. Schoenberg coined the name, or at least provided its classic formulation, in his *Structural Functions of Harmony*, completed in 1948 and published posthumously in 1954: "According to this principle, every digression from the tonic is considered to be still within the tonality, whether directly or indirectly, closely or remotely related. In other words, there is only *one tonality* in a piece, and every segment formerly considered as another tonality is only a region, a harmonic contrast within that tonality."² Schoenberg himself acknowledged in his earlier *Theory of Harmony* (1911) that even before atonality there were many exceptions to this principle, works in which the centrality of a single tonic is seriously challenged or obscured. He wrote about the possibility—and reality—of "schwebende" (fluctuating) or, more extremely, "aufgehobene" (suspended) tonality.³

According to William Kinderman's introduction to *The Second Practice*, the principal methodological inspiration for the authors lies not in the Schoenbergian categories; it "derives above all" from the notion of the "double tonic" or paired tonics as adumbrated by Robert Bailey in his work on Wagner and other late nineteenth-century composers (pp. 1–2).⁴ To be sure, several of the authors are former Bailey students or protégés and draw on his theory. Kinderman's own essay, an impressive and sensitive study of the dramatic dimensions of tonal pairing in *Tristan and Parsifal*, is emi-

1. See Fred Lerdahl, "Tonal Pitch Space," *Music Perception* 5 (1988): 315–49.

2. Arnold Schoenberg, *Structural Functions of Harmony*, ed. Leonard Stein, rev. ed. (New York: Norton, 1969), 19.

3. Arnold Schoenberg, *Theory of Harmony*, trans. Roy Carter (Berkeley and Los Angeles: University of California Press, 1978), 128–29, 383–84.

4. See especially Bailey's analyses in *Richard Wagner: Prelude and Transfiguration from Tristan and Isolde*, ed. Robert Bailey, Norton Critical Score (New York: Norton, 1985).

nently Baileyan in spirit. Yet the variety of methodologies within this volume seems to belie Kinderman's claim. (It is to be regretted that although Bailey gave a paper at the original Victoria conference, he is not represented in this volume.)

The late Christopher Lewis employs theories of narrative to help explain tonal procedures in symphonies by Bruckner and Mahler, and songs by Schoenberg and Pfitzner. Drawing on work by the literary critic David Higdon, Lewis adduces four kinds of narrative time: process, retrospective, barrier, and polytemporal, for which he proposes analogies in musical works. The distinctions between these categories, at least in Lewis's explanation, become somewhat hard to follow when mapped directly onto music. But the analyses are suggestive, perhaps especially that of the Adagio of Bruckner's Seventh Symphony, which for Lewis comprises three different musical streams that are "interwoven and mutually interruptive." Complex chromatic passages are actually generated, he maintains, from the "combination of two or more independently coherent progressions" (pp. 124–27). Lewis proposes an analogy to interlocking but independent narrative strands in film, specifically Maurizio Nichetti's *The Icicle Thief*. Lewis suggests that both these works are examples of "retrospective time," in which two or more different strands become folded back on one another and are then reconciled at the end (p. 129).

Kevin Korsyn also ventures far outside conventional music theory to the dialogics of Bakhtin and the influence theory of Bloom. Korsyn explores intertextual relationships between two unlikely pieces, Chopin's Second Ballade, Op. 38, and the slow movement of Brahms's String Quintet, Op. 88. Both pieces end in keys a third away from where they begin; in both, rondelike forms keep the two keys in constant alternation. But, according to Korsyn, Chopin allows the final key (A minor) completely to dislodge the initial one (F major), while Brahms manages to keep the opening key (C# minor/major) a strong presence up until the final bars, which close the movement in A major. Korsyn claims that "if Chopin deconstructs classical tonality, Brahms deconstructs Chopin's deconstruction. . . . Brahms anti-thetically 'completes' Chopin, using Chopin's procedures to explore a different, and in some ways a more radical, alternative to monotonicity" (pp. 77–79).

Patrick McCreless turns to the neo-Darwinian anthropologist Stephen Jay Gould to help develop an evolutionary perspective on tonal relations across the nineteenth century. For Gould, features that originate in one context and for one purpose (such as bones on the sides of the heads of the earliest fishes, used for breathing) are "preadapted" for another function that they only later assume (jaws for chewing). The process is gradual, and the end result could not have been foreseen. McCreless applies this scenario imaginatively to chromaticism in nineteenth-century music. Expanding on distinctions made by Lerdaahl, he proposes a distinction between diatonic

and chromatic “space.” McCreless argues that across the nineteenth century there occurred “a gradual and almost imperceptible progression” from a situation in which journeys into chromatic space are rationalized by composers (Beethoven and Schubert) and thus heard by a listener within the framework of diatonic space, to one in which “the demand to hear in chromatic space is so pervasive that we must hear on its terms rather than on the terms of diatonic space” (pp. 102–3). It is in the works of the later Wagner, Bruckner, Mahler, Strauss, and early Schoenberg that this shift becomes complete.

If Korsyn, McCreless, and Lewis plow well beyond the usual terrain of musicology and music theory, other contributors show that there is still plenty of spadework to be done in the areas as conventionally defined. A more purely historical perspective is presented by Jim Samson, who adduces Hummel, Kalkbrenner, and other figures as significant precursors to Chopin’s tonal practices. For R. Larry Todd, the theories of the mid-nineteenth-century writer C. F. Weitzmann provide a context for Liszt’s experiments with sonorities based on the augmented triad.⁵

Schenkerian theory is perhaps the prime instance of what Benjamin refers to as music theory in its “traditional role of exploring and anchoring the experience of tonal coherence” (p. 238). Since Schenkerism is tailor-made for monotonicity (and vice versa), it would seem ill-fitted to measure the great beyond. Yet it plays a large and, in my opinion, inadequately justified role in this volume, especially in the essays by Korsyn, Harald Krebs, and John Williamson.

Krebs is the only one of the three to seek explicitly to defend the employment of Schenkerian methods, and this only in a footnote. He observes: “The use of Schenkerian analysis, an approach firmly rooted in monotonic practice, in connection with nonmonotonic works may strike some readers as methodologically problematical. The application of the approach to nonmonotonic early nineteenth-century works is, I believe, justified by the adherence of these works to many aspects of the prevailing monotonic practice” (p. 32). By dealing with Schubert songs that have two conflicting or alternative tonal centers, “Meeres Stille” (C major and E major) and “Der Wanderer” (C# minor and E major), Krebs is reasonably true to his claim, which he seeks to validate by presenting monotonically oriented Schenker graphs for each potential tonic.

Williamson likewise analyzes songs, Hugo Wolf’s “Seufzer,” “Herr, was trägt den Boden her,” and “Sonne der Schlummerlosen.” He too acknowledges the “limitations of Schenker’s picture of monotonicity” (p. 219), but

5. Todd acknowledges in note 2 (p. 174) that “parts of” the present essay are “based on” his article “The ‘Unwelcome Guest’ Regaled: Franz Liszt and the Augmented Triad” (*19th-Century Music* 12 [1988]: 93–115). In fact, almost three-quarters of the text is taken word-for-word from the earlier article.

deploys a battery of Schenkerian voice-leading graphs and concepts to show how in these songs Wolf, although stretching tonal coherence to its limit, preserves “vestiges of a fundamental structure in Schenkerian terms” (p. 234) such that monotonicity is not abrogated. In “Herr, was trägt,” for example, E major appears only at the very end. But in Williamson’s hearing the E is a genuine tonic that is prepared by earlier articulations of V/V and V at major cadential points, which substitute for the traditional Schenkerian bass arpeggiation (*Bassbrechung*), I–V–I. Williamson thus aims to rescue Wolf’s songs as structurally and harmonically coherent works. Although Williamson is a very skillful analyst, a reader should go on red alert when, as often happens in *The Second Practice*, Schenkerism becomes a default mode for tonal analysis instead of a methodology to be carefully interrogated.

The only other disappointment in this valuable collection lies in Kinderman’s introduction. An editor’s preliminary remarks would be an ideal place to take a macroview of the complex epistemological, perceptual, and theoretical aspects of monotonicity and its alternatives. Instead, Kinderman begins on the defensive, delivering an attack on what he calls “deconstructionist tendencies fashionable in some recent scholarship” (p. 4). Specifically, he targets Carolyn Abbate and Roger Parker for their criticisms of formalist or organicist analysis of opera. Kinderman’s seems an ungenerous and inappropriate opening gambit, not least because he fails to acknowledge that the very premise of *The Second Practice* is “deconstructionist”: all of the “alternatives” explored here may be said to deconstruct monotonicity, in the sense of exploiting or exposing the contradictions and weak points within that apparently closed system. Korsyn’s essay is, as has been mentioned above, avowedly deconstructionist; many others are implicitly so.

Kinderman’s choice of a piano sonata by Felix Draeseke to introduce some of the issues central to this volume is not entirely convincing. The Draeseke is offered as an example of “a whole category of pieces that begin in one key and end in another” (p. 9), a category that, Kinderman notes, also includes some of Mahler’s symphonies. Draeseke might well be worthy of resurrection and examination, but to bring him into implied comparison with a heavy hitter like Mahler is to oversimplify, rather than problematize, the questions addressed in this book. The 486 computer on which I am writing this review could be said to be of the same “category” as Deep Blue; that fact does not provide an especially meaningful basis for comparison or further inquiry, however.

Overall, though, the essays of *The Second Practice* provide plenty of material that is, or should be, meaningful to music historians and theorists. A definitive book has yet to be written on tonality between 1850 and 1920, and one would be hard pressed to imagine a single scholar who could manage the task effectively. It is entirely appropriate that a topic like “alterna-

tives to monotony” not be treated from a single, totalizing viewpoint. Since there is no master narrative to be constructed here, we can learn a great deal from the multifaceted approach represented by *The Second Practice of Nineteenth-Century Tonality*.

WALTER FRISCH

Cross, Sword, and Lyre: Sacred Music at the Imperial Court of Ferdinand II of Habsburg (1619–1637) by Steven Saunders. Oxford: Clarendon Press, 1995. xx, 358 pp.

The music chapel of the Holy Roman Emperor Ferdinand II (r. 1619–37), the focus of Steven Saunders’s elegantly written *Cross, Sword, and Lyre*, has remained for more than a century “something of a phantom institution” (p. 18). Despite the documented importance of the imperial court’s patronage of music during other periods, and contemporary reports of Ferdinand II’s own fondness for music, there is a curious gap in the musicological literature corresponding precisely to his reign. Saunders traces this lacuna back to Ludwig Köchel, who in his seminal *Die kaiserliche Hof-Musikkapelle in Wien von 1543–1867* wrote that “the disturbances of the Thirty Years War made it necessary for Ferdinand II, soon after the beginning of his reign, to dissolve most of, perhaps for a time all of, his chapel.”¹ Tacitly accepted by generations of scholars, Köchel’s categorical assertion turns out to be completely erroneous.

Köchel based his conclusion on the *Hofzahlamtsbücher* or imperial court pay books, where the usual section of payments to musicians found for the reigns of other emperors was lacking in the case of Ferdinand II. But according to Habsburg convention, emperors retained title to and continued to administer their hereditary lands as archdukes even after becoming emperors. As a result, Ferdinand, who became archduke of Inner Austria in 1596, could continue to draw musicians’ salaries from the archducal treasury even after his election as emperor in 1619 and the transfer of his court from Graz to Vienna. As early as 1967, Hellmut Federhofer cited documents showing that Ferdinand’s musicians received payments through the Inner Austrian treasury after 1619,² but Saunders was the first to follow up Federhofer’s lead with extensive new research in the Viennese archives.

1. “Die Wirren des dreissigjährigen Krieges nöthigten Ferdinand II. bald nach dem Antritte seiner Regierung (1620) den grössten Theil—vielleicht zeitweise seine ganze Kapelle aufzulösen” (Ludwig Ritter von Köchel, *Die kaiserliche Hof-Musikkapelle in Wien von 1543–1867* [1869; reprint, Hildesheim: Georg Olms Verlag, 1976], 9).

2. Hellmut Federhofer, *Musikpflege und Musiker am Grazer Habsburgerhof der Erzherzöge Karl und Ferdinand von Innerösterreich (1564–1619)* (Mainz: B. Schott’s Söhne, 1967), 52.