

NEW VALUES IN
MUSIC APPRECIATION

BY LAURENCE ADLER



ROERICH MUSEUM PRESS

NEW VALUES IN
MUSIC APPRECIATION



THE ARCHIVE OF
NICHOLAS
ROERICH
MUSEUM

NEW VALUES IN
MUSIC APPRECIATION

BY LAURENCE ADLER



ROERICH MUSEUM PRESS
NEW YORK

MCMXXXV

COPYRIGHT, 1935
ROERICH MUSEUM PRESS, NEW YORK
PRINTED IN THE UNITED STATES OF AMERICA

THIS BOOK IS
AFFECTIONATELY DEDICATED
TO
MY MOTHER

FOREWORD

IN THIS short work on music appreciation, Mr. Adler has compressed into a short space a wealth of valuable suggestions. Starting with a conception of his subject which is at once more serious and more intelligent than is always the case in a discussion of this much-abused subject, he offers an approach which is both provocative and stimulating.

This volume should be of especial value to those educators who see in the non-professional study of music a field of rich possibilities never before adequately embraced, touching the whole æsthetic and spiritual development of man.

HOWARD HANSON,
Director, Eastman School of Music

CONTENTS

	PAGE
INTRODUCTION	11
I. ÆSTHETIC THEORY AND THE APPRECIATION OF MUSIC	20
II. METHODS OF EVALUATION AND THE TESTS OF THEMES AND MELODIES	30
III. THE MIDDLE ROAD IN HARMONIC POSSIBILITIES	41
IV. THE INTRINSIC MEANING OF STYLE	48
V. THE LARGER MEANING OF PERIOD IMPORTANCE	55
VI. PRESENT POSSIBILITIES FOR THE AMERICAN COMPOSER	62
VII. EDUCATION AND CORRELATIVE AND COMPARA- TIVE VALUES IN THE ARTS	68
CONCLUSION	78

INTRODUCTION

THIS little volume is written for those teachers and students of music in our colleges and conservatories who are seeking new insight and understanding of their art and who are perhaps just a bit dissatisfied with conventional methods of presentation.

It is written under the hypothesis that each follower of music in our system of higher education, be he professional or general student, has a right to a vivid understanding of the art, not as an isolated set of phenomena, but in its relationship to the kindred arts, and as part of the root and fabric of living itself.

How many of our students carry away from their university or conservatory courses such understanding? How many performers appearing today on our concert platforms have something real to say in art, have something more to give than technique? Too many have been moulded as exhibitionists rather than as artists, just as too many of our students are made "receptacles of stray knowledge" rather than independent thinkers and sensitive interpreters of life.

What is the remedy? Education,—and then again more education,—education for the would-be artist in the cultural background, in the knowledge of all that which sheds reflected light on his art,—education for the student and teacher in the crafts-

manship of the technique of music, in the intrinsic meaning of style, in the overtones of music, especially as regards the kindred arts, and in the ultimate meaning of his particular art as a part of the general æsthetic hypothesis.

This is an exhaustive field of study, and sometimes one wonders whether those who so glibly profess to teach music appreciation have even begun to grasp the many-sided challenge of their subject. Above all, one wonders whether these people who are endeavoring to awaken in others the multifold consciousness of a thousand subtle and even intangible phenomena, such as music consists of—are themselves active users of their imaginations. For the imagination is not something to be put away with one's Sunday bonnet, only to be donned as special occasion demands—it is something that must be an active part of one's daily thinking, and certainly in this materialistic age an active part of one's art experience. There are those indeed who think that we have today lost the generous impulses and the emotional vibrancy of romanticism, simply because we have allowed daily living to blunt our imaginations. Be that as it may, we certainly cannot gauge the novel and multifarious notes in the music of today unless we are not only users but builders of imagination. It is this quality, as well as the ability to start thinking as an independent enterprise among students, which is often conspicuously lacking in our teachers.

There is probably no subject more difficult to teach than that of music appreciation. What is

intangible and inconcrete must be made as tangible as possible to the student. For this reason, as well as others, the importance of the element of form in music has been exaggerated by teachers. It is, to be sure, one of the most stable and permanent aspects of art, and as Clive Bell so often tells us, it is perhaps the most vital essential of understanding art. We will certainly not dispute the premise that form is the binding element that gives stability to all art. We will certainly not undervalue the teaching and explanation of form as a part of a course in music or art appreciation of any kind. But for the very reason that the form and forms of music have been so amply treated and explained in other volumes on this subject, we propose here to go into other aspects of the subject which we consider not of less but of equal importance.

In the first place there is the relationship of the general æsthetic hypothesis to the study and understanding of music as an art. The teacher and the student of music appreciation must have some kind of æsthetic gospel. Without such an anchor he will flounder in his own emotional and intellectual reactions to the hearing of music. Matthew Arnold has emphasized the doctrine of what may be called the guideposts of beauty theory,—in other words the understanding of what the world's consensus of best critical opinion has set up as works of art. Matthew Arnold's theory is one of great value, but it does not go far enough. We must have a standard of judgment within ourselves that depends on something more than comparison with great models.

In other words, we must make a searching investigation in many ways and by diverse methods as to what art and beauty really mean. Indeed, how can one inculcate the love of beauty in others unless one has some idea of what it actually means. I do not affirm that we must needs arrive at a conclusive definition in such an elusive investigation; but I do claim that it is necessary for both students and teachers to use their best thought and best experience, as well as the best thought and experience of others, in order to come to some sort of working hypothesis, which we may call the æsthetic hypothesis. True sincerity in understanding the work of art can only be attained by such means. You may not appreciate Beethoven; you may not wish to follow Matthew Arnold's precepts as far as your opinion of this master is involved,—but you must know why you do not like Beethoven. And here the general æsthetic hypothesis once more comes into play. We cannot decide problems merely on random judgment. Many of the vexatious questions that are inherent today in modern music are perhaps unsolved for lack of a stable æsthetic gospel or judgment on the part of those critics and evaluators who are trying to lay down present maxims for posterity. Never, indeed, have we been more in need of the right sort of æsthetic guidance. And the very direction towards which music is to turn after the rather stormy chaotic experience of the last decade or so is in the balance. Where are those who possess a determined as well as a determining æsthetic gospel? It has often been inferred or declared that a study of this nature is

too abstract or separate from the actual problems that music offers, whereas in reality it is the very basis of all such study. We shall endeavor in our chapter on this branch of the subject to make clear how much general æsthetic study may become the basis of a more intelligent understanding of the art of music.

When we consider the absolute lack of musical background and knowledge that most laymen and general students profess, we can better understand the difficulties of the teacher of music appreciation. He cannot in the time at his disposal usually make his students really conversant with musical theory, harmony, etc., nor should he be willing to leave them in a state of absolute ignorance, musically color-blind, so to speak, as are the bulk of humanity. Between these two poles, however, there is indeed a middle road possible, giving glimpses at least into the color-world of music, while not attempting to develop students of harmony. In this same fashion the wise teacher will also impart certain necessary knowledge about the orchestra and orchestral instruments.

We shall likewise consider the correlation, inter-linking and comparative values of the arts. We hear often enough that the translation of one art into terms of another is of little value, that the better understanding of one's own art through the comprehension of another is but a fallacious delusion. Nay, there are those who all but turn up their noses at Debussy because of his close communion with the spirit of impressionistic painting and sym-

bolistic verse in France. Let us add, however, that these scoffers are to be found most often in the ranks of those who are themselves lacking in imagination. The subject is one of infinite possibilities and merits intensive treatment, more so than it is possible to give in this present enterprise.

A question often asked is: how shall we begin with the average student, as well as the average layman who has great difficulty in arriving at standards of judgment and evaluation? He must be given some guidance, some balance wheel, which will help him in forming an opinion. Now themes or melodies form the kernel of every composition in the larger form, be it in the realm of absolute or program music. One of the chapters in our book, therefore, will deal with a series of tests for determining the worth of melodies and themes. These tests, it must be added, are in no way definitive or absolute. They are simply guideposts out of the realm of the intangible into the tangible, hints and helps toward arriving at opinion. After all, is this not the most important function of the teacher of music appreciation, namely, to lead the student into the way of independent evaluation, rather than thrust before him knowledge in tabloid form as to the style and work of composers? Too often we find the superficialities, the hallmarks of a composer's style, emphasized. Musical sophistication rather than appreciation is the result, and we find clever students actually able to differentiate between a Bach fugue and a Chopin valse. The students in a class of advanced music appreciation should be

treated indeed as if they were to be professional critics and connoisseurs, and then we should have an end of amateurism, diletantism and sentimentalism in this department.

When all is said and done, some will affirm that we are oversupplied with critics and connoisseurs, and that the important thing rather is the emotional reaction one gets from music. Have these people, however, considered that the emotional enjoyment is heightened by the knowledge of its craftsmanship, the sort of knowledge indeed that intuitively and automatically recognizes and analyzes these elements of craftsmanship, and at the same time synthetically experiences the emotional enjoyment to the fullest extent. Indeed, analysis and synthesis must forever be partners in any program of æsthetic progress. We must forever be gaining in knowledge and understanding by analysis, and at the same time we must build that knowledge and understanding into experience by synthesis.

After going a bit afield into these various phases of the subject, which perhaps to many will seem a bit apart from the kernel of our investigation, the question may pithily arise: How about the study of the career, works and style of composers of various schools and periods? That study indeed is generally considered the most important element of courses in music appreciation. Here our answer must be: all these phases which we have been discussing are intended as the necessary background to such study. Our students will only be in a position to understand the real meaning of a composer's

work when they have to some degree mastered this background, which would include in addition the usual study of form and forms. It will perhaps be objected that all this preparation would mean a long course. But we are taking it for granted that the college and conservatory will give due emphasis to this important subject, and not grant it merely the beggar's place at the end of the list. A two years' course is essential for an advanced study of a subject of this kind, with possibly a single year's survey course for those who are not interested in going so deeply into the subject.

When we speak of the intrinsic meaning of style, we come to something that has been the subject of much inconclusive consideration. In our chapter on style we shall try to make clear an aspect of this discussion which is often evaded or disregarded.

Finally, we must be able to impart to our students a proper sense of what may be called period importance in art. There is much cant and artificiality in the process of over-cataloguing that has become part of the work of musical evolutionists. We need to draw a fresh breath, to get a new perspective on the panorama of the musical planet. Above all, to draw up new perspectives of period importance. If we take the cyclic element as the keynote of our exposé in this direction, our suggestions will at least avoid the stereotyped conception and, we hope, be provocative.

Thus, when we glance over the realm of music appreciation, we see how wide is the field, how full, how rich in merely suggested possibilities which, if

fully explored, cannot but vastly enhance the understanding of music. In these pages to follow we shall endeavor to explore a few of these possibilities, with the hope that many other kindred avenues of suggestion will be opened up to the minds of our readers.

L. A.

that the matter of evaluation and opinion especially as to modern music requires such study as a *sine qua non*. Just what this requirement is, though it is not all of it imperative, we shall attempt to demonstrate a bit further on in our discussion.

In the second place, it will be wise to give our students some authoritative volume on æsthetic theory as a guide book and basis of discussion. Personally, of all the volumes on the subject which I have examined, I prefer Santayana's "Sense of Beauty." It is profoundly thought out, and comes from the mind of a man whose plane of thought is of philosophic, and yet at the same time practical quality. We shall see by a few examples that Mr. Santayana's conclusions lend themselves admirably to application to the problems of music, even though planned on a universal line of argument. To be sure he goes into æsthetic theory in plenteous detail, and with a great wealth of subtle variation. For the average student, therefore, we must present a resumé of his thought, or choose a number of selected passages for reference and discussion. We may be sure, however, that a certain percentage of our class will want to read the book from cover to cover.

There are other volumes which we shall want to use for occasional reference, and among these may be mentioned Clive Bell's "What is Art?" Mr. Bell's thought is extremely valuable in certain directions, but his conclusions, it seems to me, suffer through his apparent sympathy with and knowledge of the plastic arts at the expense of the others. When he

I

ÆSTHETIC THEORY AND THE APPRECIATION
OF MUSIC

THIS chapter, let it be said at the outset, is written for the teacher and student primarily. It is not in any way an exhaustive inquiry into the byways of æsthetics, nor on the other hand is it an attempt to solve the riddles of æsthetic philosophy. We have already in our introduction indicated that the road to the solution of these problems points in no one direction, that the student can derive his premises from no one solution or set of definitions, or even system of psychology. His conclusions must come rather from multifold experience, from searching thought and self-examination, and from the study of various attempts at æsthetic conclusions.

As teachers, however, it is our difficult job to help him towards such conclusions, and to guide him through the somewhat unnecessary labyrinth of elaboration with which even valuable contributors have thought fit to clothe their thought.

How shall we approach such a line of aid, and what shall be our method of guidance? In the first place we must make our students aware that emotional reaction to music is not in itself sufficient, that genuine understanding of an art demands thought as to the underlying phenomena and causes, and also

belittles the rôle of representative music and representation in art as pandering to the human rather than the æsthetic emotions, we are ready to debate these differentiations. And when in addition he tells us that there is a difference between the reaction of a musician for pure music and that of the average concert goer, we would like to reply that it is his business as an æsthetician to lessen and nullify this apparent gulf.

But having chosen Mr. Santayana as our guide for the time being, our main thesis will be to show the relationship of his thought to the problems of art in general and music in particular. How shall we best bring about this liaison of interest? Let us first examine Mr. Santayana's conclusions, especially as they may affect the consideration of musical phenomena and conditions. Santayana's final definition, which he gives us as the summation of an entire volume of inquiry, is as follows:

"Beauty is a pledge of possible conformity between the soul and nature, and thus a ground of faith in the supremacy of the good."

We shall do well to take this final definition as the beginning instead of the epilogue of discussion. Let us note first of all that the emphasis of this definition is on the "supremacy of the good." Beauty with Santayana depends unequivocally on the element of the good. This does not in any way imply the non-recognition of evil and suffering, for such a premise would of course be vacuous. But, on the other hand, if we regard art as the expression

of beauty, (and this premise is implied in Mr. Santayana's volume as well as in our own thought and experience), then this element of the good, which includes objective pleasure in appreciating beauty, is all-important in our definition and final theory. And perhaps at this point it may be important to re-emphasize that we are considering the root and kernel of Mr. Santayana's theory, and not attempting to go into the ramifications of his thought. What then is his idea of the supremacy of the good, or just the Good? In an earlier paragraph he tells us that

"Beauty seems to be the clearest manifestation of perfection and the best evidence of its possibility. If perfection is, as it should be, the ultimate justification of being, we may understand the ground of the moral dignity of beauty."

In other words, perfection and the Supremacy of the Good are equivalent phrases, and art being the expression of beauty must likewise be included in their meaning.

To what extent then shall we countenance evil and the expression of ugliness in art. Santayana here is very definite in his delimitation.

"If ever (he says) the charm of beautiful presentation sinks so low, or the vividness of the represented evil be so high that the balance is in favor of pain, at that very moment the whole object becomes horrible, passes out of the domain of art, and can be justified only by its scientific uses."

Here we have a vital statement that affects our whole æsthetic doctrine. But before applying it, let us raise an intermediate question: If beauty in

its simplest analysis, according to Santayana, is pleasure objectified, will not ugliness naturally be the reverse? What then is the excuse for ugliness? "Truth," says Santayana, "is the excuse which ugliness has for being," and by this he means the satisfaction, scientific or otherwise, of the curiosities of human beings, which form a part of the make-up of this universal term. It is under the ægis of Truth or naturalism, as it was called, that Zola went in for his voluminous delineation of the gutter, and it is under this same realistic banner that some of our ultra-modernists are crowding their canvases with excrescences of ugliness of every sort and description.

How much of this sort of blatantism shall we allow and still call the composition a work of art? It is just at this point that Santayana's theories come definitely to our aid, and thus what seems of merely general import becomes exactly apropos in application. "When the represented evil is so high that the balance is in favor of pain then the object passes out of the domain of art and can be justified only by scientific uses." Here we have an absolute rule or lever for determining the artistic delimitations of musical composition, especially those examples of today in which the balance between art and realism is doubtful. Indeed how many of this category could undergo such an acid test? Even with the advantages of relativity in their favor, would not the world's concensus of best critical opinion today, not to mention the future, decide that the balance, in many of these tangles of atonality and dissonance,

lay in the representation of ugliness, and thus exclude these works from the domain of art? Naturally, the matter of weighing this balance between opposing elements is one of nice judgment as well as of insight and vision. It is to help in fostering such much needed qualities that Santayana has developed his finesses of analyzation,—and we as students and teachers cannot be sufficiently grateful for the fine-grained quality of his research. As to the amount of evil or pain permissible, he goes on to elaborate:

"Indeed one of the chief charms that tragedies have is the suggestion of what they might have been had they not been tragedies. The happiness which glimmers through them, the hopes, loves and ambitions, these fascinate us and win our sympathy so that we are all the more willing to suffer with our heroes, even if at the same time all the more sensitive to their suffering. Too wicked a character or too unrelieved a situation revolts for this reason. We do not find enough expression of good to make us endure the expression of evil."

Now, like the paragraph previously noted, this last sentence is of luminous import for many of our present day questions of evaluation. If critics and writers would only be content to take these conclusions of Mr. Santayana as definitive in value, we should have a much surer gauge of judging what is art and what is not.

When we think of the difficulty presented in appraising programme music and realism of any kind, we must see the advantage of laying this sort of tangible example before our students.

Of course there may be endless quibbling among

the critical brethren as to what is ugliness and evil and what is not in a given piece of art. But our young people need not be too much bothered by this debate. With the help of their own experience and insight, and with such excellent general theories to guide them, they should avoid some of the pitfalls which often seem to ensnare the sophisticated. Not that we can absolutely decide between elements of good and evil in the art of today—we can merely make the attempt, and the future will have to square the equation. And naturally there will be a good deal of divergence in these discriminations. We would not even have it otherwise. What will appear as ugly and unpleasing to one individual will affect another differently and *vice versa*.

Taking everything into account, however, such an interpretation of basic æsthetic principles as Mr. Santayana gives us cannot help being of marked aid, not only in attempting the solution of problems in modern music, but also in giving perspective to the achievement of yesterday and the past. By true perspective we mean something far wider than is generally implied, namely, what one would perhaps term catholicity of understanding. Such catholicity allows perception of the "glimmerings through tragedy and ugliness" which Santayana mentions,—which glimmerings are compensations that may change the balance from evil to good. Thus, in our discussion of ultra-modern music, we shall find examples of destructivism and starkness of content which may appear as reëchoes of Zola's naturalism or scientific realism, as it has been called,—examples

which it will be hard to reconcile with our conceptions of the laws of beauty and art. But, nevertheless, below the surface, deep in the vital pulse of these compositions, there may be elements which, if not in themselves beautiful, have an associational relationship to beauty of a sort, descriptions perhaps of beauty that is typical of the age we live in. Perhaps we may think in this fashion of certain pieces of machinery. In themselves they are not beautiful, but we know that when set going there will be vital beauty of motion and rhythm. Thus, contrariwise, we might argue of certain examples of destructivism in music such as Stravinsky contributed. In actuality or in motion, with their atavistic rhythms, they appear wholly nihilistic, and yet there are undoubtedly elements of static beauty present, if we could stop the wheels of the composition and in so doing satisfy Santayana's law of compensation. Such subtleties of judgment the actual application and study of his principles induces. And this point must also be stressed: we cannot judge a great deal of the music of today without these subtleties and finesses of perception. There are few ultra-modern compositions that lend themselves to immediate valuation. They must rather be heard and reheard before one attempts to pronounce opinion. In spite of all this, the wonder remains that so many apparently intelligent guides and teachers seem still to suppose that opinion can be determined on the basis of immediate musical values only, without in any way going back to what is at the root of all the arts.

Who will deny that this process of going back to

basic principles gives us a larger perspective as well as a more finely balanced sense of judgment? More than this, one ventures to assert that critics of the past as well as of the present would perhaps have omitted occasional blunders had they more carefully studied such material as Mr. Santayana so ably presents in his volume.

As for our students, we must constantly remember to regard them as potential critics and connoisseurs, not as individuals before whom we are to present a mass of facts and detailed knowledge for absorption. The application of even a few of these admirable deductions of Mr. Santayana cannot but add to the student's powers of independent thinking. And once he has learned to handle his own reactions in this fashion, he is on the road to becoming a serious evaluator of, not one, but of all the arts. Moreover, he will find that with experience, and with knowledge of craftsmanship and technique, and with the genuine basis of judgment which we have been indicating, his emotional enjoyment of art will constantly be heightened rather than lessened.

If performers could likewise be induced to put themselves into a similar enlightened state of being, we should perhaps have less of purely ephemeral value set before us for serious consideration. Artists would refuse to perform what was of meretricious quality, even though alluring in its novelty, and composers would thus be given new standards for endeavor.

Some educators will probably argue that this sort of study would be apt to go over the heads of the

average college or conservatory student. From personal experience, however, I can bear witness that, if wisely presented, it must have sensitive and far-reaching results.

"If (says Santayana) a man demands light, sound and splendor, he proves that he has æsthetic equilibrium. We have but to vary his observation, to enlarge his thought, to multiply his discriminations—all of which education can do, and the same æsthetic habit will reveal to him every shade of the fit and the fair."

But let us not wait for our young people "to demand light and sound and splendor," let us give it to them, and see at the same time that we "multiply their discriminations." And thus in the light of beauty will come the revelation which means the actual understanding of art.

II

METHODS OF EVALUATION AND THE TESTS OF
THEMES AND MELODIES

ALL of us, even the experts and professionals, are too apt to be influenced by random impressions. Reactions and ideas hit us in a certain way, and it is difficult not to conceive prejudices and to be entirely rational and balanced in judgment. If the way of evaluation is difficult for the sophisticated, how much more so for the inexperienced! How shall we convert these beginners into connoisseurs and careful critics? Experience of listening and analyzing and the following of Matthew Arnold's guideposts of beauty theory, of thoroughly understanding the great masterpieces—all these will do much. But with knowledge, the controversial looms in importance, and the forming of independent judgments becomes more difficult. A work of music demands much afterthought, much sifting and weighing of impressions, and this will be aided by the aural studies suggested in the next chapter.

However, the student demands certain tangibilities to aid his thinking powers and developing judgments, and these we must strive to give him. Any series of apparent aids we may be able to work out will have their deficiencies. We must go to the root of the matter, and take compositions, not as a whole,

but from their integral units upward. Now the basic units of any composition in the larger forms are its themes or motives, used and worked up in diverse fashion according to the nature of the composition itself. Let us therefore suggest a series of tests which may be taken as aids or guides in determining the serious worth of themes, either in absolute or programme music.

1. *Themes in absolute music.*

- a. Interest value of the theme, as far as the melody-level goes (sufficient variety in pitch, etc.)
- b. Does the theme lend itself well to development or variation? (This can be proved out in the larger forms, such as the sonata or the symphony.)
- c. Does the theme wear well when often heard?
- d. Is the theme able, in a few bars, to epitomize an emotion or idea, something that comes from the naked soul of the composer?

2. *Themes in programme or illustrative music.*

- a. (Same as above.)
- b. Is the composer able in a few bars to suggest the heart or essence of an idea, a mood, or to create a certain atmosphere?
- c. Do the individual themes in their summation or in transformation work out successfully the program which he has set for himself?

3. *Applicable to both absolute and programme music.*

Is the harmonic and orchestral setting and the rhythmic accompaniment such as to enhance or detract from the intrinsic quality of the themes or melodies tested?

As seen in the above table, we are making a distinct line of cleavage in our treatment here. Let us first take up the realm of absolute music. Our

initial test holds also for programme music. Is the intrinsic character of the theme interesting as far as its melody level goes? Has it variety in pitch, or does it linger too much on a dead level? All melodies can of course be diagrammed according to their variation of pitch, and even a short theme may change several times in direction. Variety in pitch is one of the most important attributes of a good theme, and very often there will be a single climax of the theme in higher or lower register. There are exceptions, however, to this statement. Occasionally in a symphony or sonata the composer may appear to have given a mere fragment for his initial theme, as in the opening of Beethoven's Fifth Symphony. Usually, however, as in this case, the composer gives an answering phrase which complements and completes the fragment. A good melody must likewise be something expressive in itself without any framing or background. The way to prove this axiom is to remove the harmonic setting and play or sing the melody by itself. In a song this requirement is absolutely demanded, and by trying the same experiment in an instrumental number we shall be helped in making our estimate of which themes hold water, so to speak, and which do not.

Our second test in absolute music demands whether in the symphony or sonata the individual themes are sufficiently eloquent and pregnant with the essence of germination to lend themselves successfully to development or variation. This can of course be proved by watching the development of a given theme, and the ultimate test in this regard

comes at the finale or coda of a movement (or of a symphony if it is a motto theme), when the composer is very apt to sum up or restate the theme as epilogue. The question then arises, has a theme, after all the treatment given it, still charm and appeal for us, or has the intrinsic character of the melody not been able to undergo successfully exhaustive elaboration? Here, of course, the composer's taste comes into play. He must be able to judge just how much elaboration the given theme will endure. And just at this point also a good many composers fall down. (Among this number we must place Brahms, who in his lesser moments overloads his themes with more development than they can bear, and hence weakens rather than enhances the original character of his musical idea.) It is somewhat analogous to taking a simple folk tune and giving it so elaborate a harmonic setting that all the naïveté and charm of the original strain is lost. Brahms was perhaps too ambitious as a tonal architect, and for this reason he sinned at times in torturing his themes with over-elaboration. This failing, which allows us to smell the lamp in his writing, as well as his occasional apparently directionless groping during the connecting passages of his work, —all this, however, does not detract from the mastery and divine inspiration of a large proportion of his utterance. Tschaikowsky sometimes makes us weary of a theme before he gets through with it, but this is because of the exotic character of his motives rather than any structural defect in elaboration.

While we are discussing the subject of thematic

treatment, Beethoven naturally comes to mind as one whose mastery in this direction seldom failed him. Very rarely, if ever, do we find that his final summing up of a theme or coda at the end of a movement fails to give absolute satisfaction. He usually proves his propositions. The opening themes of his sonatas and symphonies are often of challenging eloquence, and after going through development, or variation, they become all but transcendentalized in final utterance. One has only to glance at the beginning and ending of the variation movement of Sonata Opus 109, or at the opening of the first movement of the Waldstein Sonata, or the first or second movements of the Fifth Symphony, to check this statement. Beethoven's relationship to the best in the classic spirit was such that only rarely, and then in his last years, did the eloquence of his utterance interfere with his flawless handling of themes, as well as the perfection of their intrinsic character.

This leads us to the third test, which is indeed a simple one, namely, does the theme itself wear well when often heard? Why is it that certain melodies of Puccini, Massenet, etc., for example, charming as they at first appear, lose savor in repetition, whereas the themes of Bach, Beethoven, Schubert, Brahms, Chopin and many others that might be mentioned gain constantly by the same process?

This very question hinges upon the final test: Is the theme able in a few bars to epitomize or incarnate the naked soul of the composer? And we might add, is the soul of the composer such as to immortalize the theme itself? This latter test of

course implies some fundamental knowledge of the life and work of a given composer. Nor will we find all masters evenly gifted in this regard. Some will require more space for enunciating their thought. Not every genius, like Beethoven, has the faculty of looking down into the root and heart of life and experience, and giving back his reaction to the world within the limits of a few bars.

Turning to programme music, however, we find this supreme ability as important as in the realm of the absolute. After our test of melody levels, which is the same in both categories, we come upon the second question, having its kinship to the problem just discussed. Is the composer able, within a few bars, to suggest the heart or essence of a given idea or mood, or to create a certain desired atmosphere? This is perhaps the most vital test involved in programme music. For the composer is well nigh obliged, since he is illustrating an idea or story, or a conception of some sort, to capture the imagination of his hearers at the very start. His initial theme must give the keynote at once.

Strauss is a masterhand in this process. Note with what skill in the opening prologue of "Till Eulenspiegel" he creates just the right degree of "Once upon a time" atmosphere, which fits in so admirably with the spirit of the narrative to come.

Again in "Don Juan," what could more full-bloodedly realize the devil-may-care career of the hero than the opening measures? But Strauss goes farther than this—being a programmer par excellence, every corner and cranny of his narratives

must have a tonal counterpart. And this brings us to the final test: do the individual themes in summation and transformation work out successfully the programme which the composer set for himself? Again turning to "Till Eulenspiegel" we can prove the latter test. The individual themes are each of such salient appropriateness that in summation they give us just the picture of composite characteristics which Strauss intended to conjure up for that merry rogue, *Till Eulenspiegel*. As for theme transformation, we have only to glance at the prologue theme rhythmically translated by the aid of the clarinet into the theme of the rogue himself.

Programme and operatic music are such near neighbors that the boundary line is easy to pass over. Opera is in reality simply programme music with a definite text that must be set. Wagner is of course the greatest expert in theme transformation. His intuition for psychologically changing the character of a theme and yet wisely holding sufficiently to the original contour, becomes at times almost uncanny. Consider, for example, the transfulgent glory of the Redemption theme that rings down the curtain in "Goetterdaemmerung" as contrasted with this same theme first sung by *Sieglinde* in the "Walkuere" in her farewell apostrophe to *Brunhilde*.

When all is said and done, however, it is the cumulative effect of these transformations which is important; for the final impression of a piece of programme music must depend on each link and chain in the story or idea being absolutely convincingly represented.

There are no half-way measures about illustrative music, and here I am taking the term in the larger sense to include opera. It must have convincing power over the imagination of its hearers or it is nothing. For our imaginations are glad to be commanded if at the same time we are convinced. When at the beginning of the "Rheingold" Wagner paints the depths of the Rhine with the lower strata of orchestral instruments and then ascends to the strings as he depicts the surface ripples (with which the singing of the Rhine Maidens becomes blended) his realism as well as his themes are convincing, and our imaginations have no impulse to paint other pictures than the composer intended. On the other hand, when we think of Scriabin's "Prometheus," we are still open to conviction, and indeed many other avenues of fancy might be suggested to our reactions beside those enumerated in the programme notes.

All this background of programmism we must make clear to our students if they are to become good evaluators, and from these deductions it becomes evident that both in programme and absolute music the picture in the large as well as the importance of the individual themes must be stressed.

Before we leave this question of themes, however, it is necessary to consider the framing of these motives as well as their rhythmic accompaniments or undercurrents. For all these elements are to a certain extent interdependent. An eloquent or distinguished theme may be marred by the wrong kind of harmonic setting; and on the other hand there

are themes which are vastly enhanced and which depend for success on the harmonic and rhythmic elements. Take for an example the initial statement of the slow movement of Beethoven's "Sonata Appassionata." The unadorned motive is a truly noble one and speaks for itself, but when harmonized in Beethoven's simple and dignified fashion and balanced by a rhythmic counter-device in the bass, the theme itself is made even more incandescently eloquent.

Another excellent example of this kind of enhancement occurs in the first movement of Tschai-kowsky's "Symphony Pathetique." The slow, sensuous, downward moving theme intoned on the violins is here opposed by a throbbingly rhythmic upward counter-movement among other instruments. By this device the emotional potency of the theme is greatly intensified. Of course it is obvious that in orchestral music the composer's degree of skill in instrumentation can make or mar his themes by just as vital a fashion as the harmonic setting chosen.

We could cite multifarious examples of the fashion in which individual themes are influenced by orchestral, harmonic and rhythmic aspects. But there are certain other phases of evaluation which belong to composition as a whole and in part which we must not neglect. The so-called basic principles of the arts are usually taken up largely in connection with the element of form, but it is quite evident that they have to do vitally with other aspects as well. Unity, coherence, variety, climax, symmetry and contrast, are not merely artificial scales of appraisal.

They have a direct bearing on artistic merit, especially in connection with modern music,—no small percentage of the music of today is lacking in unity for the reason that there is no underlying idea, and chaos reigns beneath the surface of the composition. There is too much random writing being done because so many fail to regard unity as a living reality rather than a dead issue. There are so many elements that may mar the unity or symmetry of a composition, and these must all be taken into account in our critical balance sheet. Perhaps we cannot at present keep to the Mozartian ideal of symmetry, neither do we need to indulge in pure grotesqueries of sound for the sake of sensation. Strauss' sheep-bleating incident in "Don Quixote," which some critics take with a lively sense of humor, strikes us not so much as an error of taste as one of balance. He has thrown in an ugly excrescence of sound which is not at all in proportion to the nicely adjusted delineation of the remaining episodes. Contrast is one of the most vital of our principles. And when we examine the harmonic palette we find that beginning with Beethoven there was a growing demand for dissonance in order to adjust the equation between light and shadow. There must be a proportional amount of both, however, in order to have symmetry and contrast. But with some of the ultra-modernists the balance sheet is often entirely in favor of dissonance, and the principle of contrast, for which dissonance as well as major and minor came into being, suffers perversion, and, if one may say so, loses balance.

And so we could proceed, linking these important basic principles with qualities and characteristics of individual works by composers, as well as with definite currents and period tendencies in the world of music. But the evaluator's job is to have all these factors in mind, to judge the composite picture as a whole, and then proceed to examine the details, and among these most prominently the individual themes of which the whole is composed. He must bear in mind, like a directing compass, these basic principles of all the arts if he is to be a just evaluator. He must have done some careful thinking likewise on the relative merits of absolute and programme music, not to mention the impressionist and expressionist movements, and other period tendencies which we shall take up in a later chapter. He must also be able to link the question of period significance into this composite, synthesized structure which we are building for its intrinsic value to himself and others.

No simple matter this task of a skilled critic or evaluator! But those students and laymen who desire real understanding must endeavor not only to avail themselves of these slight aids which we have outlined in this chapter, but also to discover for themselves many other ways of guidance toward knowledge and opinion.

III

THE MIDDLE ROAD IN HARMONIC POSSIBILITIES

How shall we give the uninitiated student and layman glimpses into the wonderland of the harmonic color palette, and follow the middle road between harmonic ignorance and expert knowledge?

In the first place chords and chord combinations should be studied for their actual color value, and this analyzation should be carried on with constant reference to the actual harmonic procedure of masters and of all styles and schools. Too often in the study of harmony the chord becomes colorfully important for its own value rather than for its fuller interpretative significance.

Let us suppose, to begin with, that we have a group of students whose knowledge of harmony is almost nil, and whom we wish to equip with a limited harmonic background, let us say with a recognizing knowledge of a few of the more important harmonic processes that have come into being since Beethoven's day.

In order to achieve any valuable results, we must employ something akin to laboratory methods. Our class must not be too large, so that all may be gathered about the piano, or be in a position to see the piano. Some of the students will be acquainted with the scales and the arrangement of the key-board,

but others perhaps will not. It is quite a simple matter, however, to explain these elementals and to make clear how triads of diverse modes are formed on each degree of the scale. Naturally, these triads must be heard repeatedly, and in different tonalities, before the hearer begins to understand these basic chords. This achieved, we go on to inversion and expansion of the triad and the construction of different kinds of 7th and 9th chords. With this survey completed, our group has a working idea of the fundamental harmonic vocabulary, all of course captured aurally, and without any reading of notes. We must proceed in this fashion for the reason that there will always be many who cannot read more than the simplest kind of a melody. Time is lacking to teach musical notation, and moreover we wish to appeal largely from the aural side. Much more can be achieved purely from this alone than is generally supposed, and we must take this premise for granted if we are going to further the harmonic sense of our students.

Having grasped the fundamental tonalities and their triads and 7ths, we may next go a bit afield into the fascinating land of modulation, always remembering, however, that this is an aural exercise and not demanding too much of untrained ears. Of course those in the class who play instruments can and will apply individually this preliminary knowledge gained in our group sessions.

We shall now possess a basic vocabulary for further harmonic explorations, and the question arises: which of the many important procedures and

innovations, not to say enrichments, of the color palette that have come into being since Beethoven's day shall we choose for treatment? We must limit ourselves to a few of these processes, so as not to burden the aural capacities of our group excessively, and also for the reason that this harmonic study forms but a part of the background that they must master.

The choice here is one of infinite variety, and will be determined in each case by the judgment of the individual instructor. In some of my conservatory and university courses I have selected the following as of special importance and appropriateness: altered chords, secondary 7ths and exotic chords of the 11th and 13th, chromaticism, (especially as employed by Wagner in "Tristan and Isolde"), Debussy's innovations, and finally the breaking up of tonality and the use of atonality as exemplified in the work of Stravinsky, Schönberg, Prokofief and others of the ultra-modern school.

Now most of these processes came into being no doubt to express the psycho-emotional effects that formed at the moment of inception part of the composer's conception of the moment, groping for perfect expression. And so, if we rightly understand what the composer intended, it means much more than recognizing the particular chord or process involved. It means the active use, not only of our intelligence, but also of our imagination, in thoroughly grasping the composer's conception, in vibrating with the composer's emotions as echoed in our own. This is what is meant by the psycho-

emotional significance of chords and harmonic processes.

By the analytic method of definite examples, we must synthetically build up the student's capacity for such experience.

For example, let us consider Puccini's use of certain altered chords accompanying *Madame Butterfly's* first appearance on the stage. Altered chords express heightened or intensive emotion, or effects that are purely exotic. They came into especial prominence with the Romantics for the reason that vibrant subjective emotion and "strangeness in beauty" as Walter Pater terms it, was part of the new spirit of the epoch. The alteration of the chord implies the augmentation or diminution by the chromatic half-step of one or more of the chord elements. And the adoption of this process meant a tremendous step forward in the emancipation of the color palette of music. *Madame Butterfly* is a young being of exquisite youth, not yet knowing what she desires of life, or what life is to bring her—but full of unconscious longing for the unattainable, which in her case means permanent love. How characterize this first glimpse of her entrance into a tragic drama better than by this rising sequence of altered chords here adopted by Puccini?

He intensifies the emotion of the moment by chromatically raising the pitch of his chord successions, and the character of the chords themselves indicate just the correct nuance between intensified emotion and the exotic that the portrayal of *Madame Butterfly* and her place in the drama demands.

Wagner is also fond of using these chords, and

employs them with marked and telling effect. Thus in that song of unearthly beauty which the Rhine Maidens sing in lament of their lost gold, Wagner the Magician evokes magical glamor by the use of this process. The light that was never seen o'er land or sea is shed over these daughters of the Rhine, and their voices become the voices of Homer's sirens that made men forget all else in the world.

Again in "Walkuere," at the moment of supreme farewell of *Wotan* and *Brunhilde*, on the crest of the tremendous crescendo, by an upward working theme, Wagner again uses just a single one of these highly emotionized chords to give the fitting climax.

Now just because this harmonic process of altered chords fits into the picture so admirably from the emotional point of view, it is especially seizable, so to speak, by both ear and the imagination of untrained laymen. There are other far more dissonant combinations used by the ultra-modernists, but they are neither so intrinsically important nor so easily adapted to recognition and absorption by the unprofessional. The resolution likewise of these chords adds not only to their effectiveness, but also to their recognizability.

Of course in all these observations we must remember that the chord processes are but a part of the color element in music, and also only a part of the psycho-emotional intentions of the composer. The character of the themes or melodies themselves, the rhythmic currents of the composition, and above all the use of instrumental combinations and effects, are all to be counted as part of the picture.

The process of chromaticism has been immortalized in Wagner's "Tristan and Isolde." From the first phrase of the Prelude to the opening bars of the Liebestod the chromatic process to a great extent holds sway. This work is indeed high testimony to the fact that when a mighty idea or conception seizes upon a composer, the most fitting means will follow automatically. Before "Tristan," nobody would have dreamed of such extensive use of chromaticism. Some of the critics of Wagner's time anathematized him for employing it. And yet what other process could so fittingly have expressed the striving and continual emotional unrest, the fateful questioning and surging passion of Tristan?

In the deep and genuine interest which each student is sure to display in these phenomena of life and emotion, we have the surest guarantee of their capacity to learn to comprehend the craftsmanship that has brought about these phenomena. Here indeed we have the premise which all teachers of art will in the end follow out if they are to have successful results. The emphasis must be placed on the underlying phenomena, and then we shall have true interest in technique.

Many students of the science of harmony lose their interest in the subject at the beginning for the reason that it is so often presented in such a way that they see nothing but a welter of technique and mathematical rules ahead of them. This might be avoided if the constant relationship between these rules and the proceedings of the great masters were more consistently stressed.

When we come to the consideration of Debussy's contribution to the emancipation of the harmonic fabric, and are given even a glimpse of the marvelous fluidity and elasticity which he added to what even with Wagner had been more or less rigid, there will be no question of lack of interest and understanding. If in addition we are able to follow this poet into the borderlands beyond the horizon line where he alone can lead us, we shall need to have no additional spur or stimulus to kindle our imaginations. It has become the fashion lately among a certain coterie of writers and critics to refer to Debussy as bloodless and anæmic in his writing, and to attempt to detract from his superlatively revolutionizing achievements in the domain of harmonic color. On the other hand, with these same people, all that is chaotic and sensational and lacking in underlying ideas among the ultra-modernists is praised to the skies, and we are warned to take note of their admirable spirit of experimentation.

However, those of us who have regarded the evolution of music with a just sense of values are not fearful of Debussy's place with posterity. Nor are we especially influenced by the senseless exaltation of what we hope is ephemeral in the music of our own generation. There are larger vistas to be regarded and wider horizons to be opened up. It is these latter possibilities that we have been dwelling upon, and may not this middle road of harmonic procedure which we have endeavored to outline be the route for our general student and music lover to follow?

IV

THE INTRINSIC MEANING OF STYLE

WHAT is that much discussed and little understood factor of style in music? Is the style of a composer simply the record of his characteristics and idiosyncrasies, the hallmarks of his work which set him apart from his contemporaries and predecessors? Does an understanding of his style imply merely a knowledge of the curves of his thought and emotion? Is it a summation of his achievement against the achievement of his compeers?—in other words, is the relative the determining element in style?

The first thought to be stressed, it seems to me, is of the entity of style. We may, if we wish, compare the styles of various composers. The style of any given composer, however, while derived in many ways from many sources is in itself an entity, something which represents his ego, his place in the universe as a finality, apart from any thought of relativity. In the larger sense it represents his reaction to Nature and life, as well as his reaction to the thought, experience, design and tradition of the past. It is his best answer to the problem of existence. But it is not a simple answer—it is blended of the finely wrought structures of infinity as well as of a hundred mundane and diverse influences that are sometimes even at variance with each other.

After this attempt at explanation and definition,

the reader will perhaps ask: can one consciously create style, or a style? And the answer must be: one can build on the experience and the teaching of the past, but one can only intuitively establish the equation between one's finite ego and this past.

Beethoven, building on the work of his immediate predecessors, forged a magnificent instrument of his will out of the Sonata Form, but only his own driving flights of life passion in all their variety and cumulative force, in conjunction with and in relation to that instrument, formed the elements of his style. And true it is that the outward and often apparently determining influences are but a part in the final attributes of style. Bach's mighty grasp of polyphony, and that child of the Reformation, the Lutheran chorale, are less important than his understanding of the movements of the cosmos and the underlying tides that are below and beyond thought and emotion.

And style is sometimes inimical to conscious planning and systems. With all the nurturing of his theories Wagner out-Wagnered himself (according to the opinion of many critics) in "Meistersinger," where he becomes racial rather than metaphysical.

And this brings us to a most important point in the study of style. The individual becomes the ego in the larger sense when he represents phenomena which are in themselves typical of the soul of a people, if not of humanity and existence in the large. Not all composers can or need follow the cosmic patterns of a Bach or Beethoven. The path of variety in art does not lie that way. For this reason, if

for no other, the nineteenth century witnessed the development of nationalism in music. Let us see how this element has so important a bearing on our main thesis, the consideration of style.

Nationalism in art developed to express the genius of a people, to typify all that was best in their soil and being. It was this conscious emblemizing of the qualities, not of an individual but of a race or people, plus the fruits of Romanticism, that brought a larger outlook on art, acting at the same time as a spur on the individual artist and composer. Thus even if his utterance could not approach the universal, he was able to represent something that went far beyond his own aspirations.

All this and something more we find in Chopin's work. The first great nationalist and the inheritor of two great national traditions, it fell to his genius not only to record the best that was in this double inheritance but also to mould this best to his own vision and inspiration in masterly fashion. This power of blending is perhaps the most potent source of charm in Chopin's style. Who has more subtly read the secrets of the human heart, and who better than he can express in tonal language the "esprit galant" of old Poland as well as that strange blending of emotion, that magical mingling of joy and sadness, which the Poles call *Zal*? But it is not only as a Pole that Chopin has been able to read these secrets for us. Indeed we may say that the two elements in his make-up became so transcendently fused that Chopin the Pole sheds but an added lustre on Chopin the Frenchman and vice versa.

However, there are other factors we must take into account in the study of his style. He was influenced by the decorative verve of the florid Italian opera, and the Romantic era found in him its most balanced spokesman. Moreover, his vibrant emotionalism still finds an echo today in a world that has become wearied with the jaded sensationalism of much of the ultra-modern school. As to his introduction of tempo rubato, his use of the pedal for tonal coloring, his amplification of the chord by means of the arpeggio, and his chiseled perfection in the moulding of the phrase, these innovations are too well known to require comment in these pages. They are all part of the technical variety which the imagination of a poet calls into being. Indeed there are few masters whose style is derived from such variant sources, desires and tendencies, and therefore merits more careful analysis.

And yet, after all this fusion of ideas in the matchless grace and élan of his idiom, there were nevertheless elements which were at variance within the boundaries of his utterance. The athletic prowess and militarism of some of the Polonaises, the sardonic might of the Scherzi, are more than a foil to those languorous arabesques of emotion, the Nocturnes, and it was Chopin's great triumph that his duality of nature and inheritance granted him duality of powers that could be blended or differentiated according to his will.

It is this control over the roots of creation that, becoming one of the fundamentals of style also enters the realm of pure genius. Just what gives this

control is something that cannot be analyzed. Knowledge, experience, emotional intuition, complete mastery of technique, all these are contributing factors, but beyond these factors there is mystery.

Style as an abstract entity, however, is cognizant of this mystery, and thus we have to enlarge our definition: Style is man's reaction to design, nature and life, plus his reaction to all the experience and tradition of the past, plus the miraculous element in his nature which cannot, and must not be explained. That some will call the latter attribute genius and others will take a different view of it, matters not at all—the important thing is to recognize the unexplainable, and not to try to analyze it.

For teachers and guiders of opinion especially must be discriminating in what they attempt to explain. Some things can be intuited or felt better than analyzed, and these phenomena we must leave guarded by a proper sense of mystery. And yet at the same time there is much that must be unraveled concerning the sources of style. In what fashion, for example, does the cosmic factor enter into our study? Why does a certain universality of utterance crowd out in the works of certain composers the individual and personal reaction? We shall note, when we make our survey of period importance that very often with the summation or apotheosis of an epoch a composer appears who has the power of summing up the detailed values of his time in terms of the universal. So it was with Beethoven, with Bach and with Wagner, each accord-

ing to his manner. And thus the factor of the cosmic in their styles becomes something completely outside of themselves, and the element of the miraculous once more enters into the picture.

Why does *Wotan's* farewell to *Brunhilde* affect us so poignantly? Because in the final analysis, it stands for the emotion of any supreme farewell rather than that only of *Wotan*. Why does the *Liebestod* strike down into the depths of our natures? Because once more it is Wagner's attempt to answer the riddle of the universe rather than *Isolde's* swansong. Wagner's theories no longer interest us as he imagined they would, but his conceptions which have been translated into the realm of the universal,—these we cannot forget, these have been dowered with true greatness of style.

Just at this point some of my readers may be tempted to ask: how about some of the more technical points of style in connection with these very phenomena which we have been discussing? To this point we must reply by affirming the marked distinction between a man's idiom and his style. The style is the larger and more metaphysical aspect. The idiom is the technical expression of the former. A man's idiom to a certain degree creates his style, but it is not the style itself. There is a special need of distinction as to this matter, for the reason that we naturally consider the technical elements under the general heading, but they are conditional rather than absolute.

After this lengthy and somewhat disquisitionary ramble on the subject, more inquiry may perhaps

be forthcoming as to the cultivation of style. Can it be cultivated? Yes and no. The outward aspects, the conscious elements of style, these we may develop and nurture. Clarity of expression, lucidity of thought, vibrancy and at the same time balance of emotion, as well as the power of directly conveying ideas, these and many other elements may be attained by practice and persistence of effort; but the more subtle inner phenomena that go to make up style, the reactions to the intangible influences of the past as well as the present, these infinitudes can neither be analyzed or measured.

And yet again must the point be stressed that too much tabulation is undesirable. We can determine many of the influences that mark Beethoven's style—his *Weltanschauung*, his reaction to nature, his consummate building on the past as well as his seizing of the best in the revolutionary spirit of his day. But there we have to call a halt in our analyzing process. When all is said and done, style being so integral a part of artistic personality is analyzable and measurable and may be cultivated up to a certain point. Beyond that we enter the domain of the intangible, which defies capture or tabulation.

The task for the student and layman, in addition to analyzing what is measurable and weighable in the styles of many models of personality, remains to examine the manifestations of style in relation to their own experience, and knowledge of the past, and having done so they will be in a state of being better able to listen in to the overtones of this study and thus to understand what is untranslatable.

V

THE LARGER MEANING OF PERIOD IMPORTANCE

COMPOSERS, teachers, musical historians and cataloguists need to attain a fresh viewpoint concerning the question of epochs, especially as they are supposed to influence the trend of musical evolution.

The somewhat prevalent attitude regarding these periods as absolutely fixed and definitive seems to me an exaggerated one.

For this reason composers feel a sort of *noblesse oblige* to write wholly in the manner of their own epoch; anything else is *vieux jeu*, and to be ardently shunned. Classicism supposedly reached its apogee with Beethoven, and Romanticism with Wagner, and though we may naturally still keep to the classic models of form, and occasionally inject a bit of romantic leaven into our muse, these periods as periods are fixed and complete in themselves. But are they? Is there not such a thing as the cyclic swing of the pendulum in art as well as in history? Has any aspect of learning or beauty which was sufficiently potent to stir the imagination of humanity ever become a dead letter?

Has not Greek culture found its echo—first in Rome and then in the Renaissance? Is not the *Weltpolitik* of the modern British Empire to some extent a replica of ancient Rome? If we survey the

entire passage of civilization we shall find that no one epoch has ever entirely exhausted its vital spirit.

Why did other tendencies and movements come into being after Wagner?—not because Romanticism had wholly exhausted itself in his monumental creations, but simply because for the time being the last word had been said.

In this connection we must deplore the confusion that exists in some minds between the word Romantic with its usual implications and Romanticism as applied to the Romantic era. Romanticism in its larger sense means the rebirth of the art spirit,—a renaissance due, as in the beginning of the 19th century, to economic and social influences bringing in their wake new freedom and new vision. During the course of history this phenomenon has occurred several times before the nineteenth century—only then it was not termed Romanticism. There were even idealists to be found who prophesied such a development to follow upon the great War.

But Romanticism, it must be emphasized, according to the general conception, has certain other aspects which belong peculiarly to the nineteenth century. Of these may be mentioned—strangeness in beauty, or love of the exotic, subjective as opposed to objective emotion, emphasis on freedom of utterance and content rather than form, and finally, the beginning of illustrative or programme music. These factors are all of definite period importance, and have had momentous influence on the road of musical evolution since their inception. There is, however, a final element, which, in the larger mean-

ing of the term Romanticism, is ultimately cyclic in value. The Romantic spirit is indeed something that belongs to no one day or epoch, but is changeless and enduring as life itself. We find it in Homer, as we shall find it in the art of many tomorrows. And the essence of this spirit means the getting away from the everyday world into the realm of pure imagination, where the writer, the musician and the artist, and our own impetus alone can guide us. This is the true glamor of romance and the cyclic meaning of Romanticism.

Romanticism, then, like classicism, should be interpreted as something which, while belonging integrally to a definite period and epoch, has roots and substrata which ally it to every time and condition of mankind. The swing of the pendulum, however, is not concerned with the cataloguing propensities of evolutionists. It is something that just happens. And so we as teachers must learn to regard epochs with their wider cyclic rather than static implications. As a result, we cannot afford to specialize too intensively on a single period, lest we lose our perspective.

As composers also we must find our level, and not imagine that the flowering of an epoch has exhausted its possibilities. There are always strata remaining which have not been worked, and there is an inexhaustible fund of leads supplied by both Classicism and Romanticism which the modern era would do well to revive and not throw into the discard.

One may argue, of course, that Modernism is not so unified a movement as the preceding periods, but

that is largely a matter of relativity. To be sure Impressionism, Realism, and Expressionism in music had not yet come into their own, but there were doubtless other currents to reconcile. The composer of today may do well to look backward just a bit for his inspiration, and it is likewise probable that out of the welter of experimentation now taking place in the world of music some master will arise who, according to the cyclic law, once more will draw all these currents into the universal framework, and thus mark the apparent summation of an epoch. This, of course, is in the uncertain realm of prophecy, and meanwhile how draw oneself out of the engrossing and sometimes petty rut of today? The methods of the masters, we may say, belong to their own peculiar line of vision. Beethoven's approach to infinity, as one finds it in Sonata Opus 111, by means of constantly increasing rhythmic complexity, until the trill has been reached as its utmost boundary, cannot be ours,—nor can Bach's kaleidoscope of shifting contrapuntal melodies, nor Wagner's with his endless transformations of themes, repetition of themes in higher pitch, and devices intensifying emotion and raising it to the level of the cosmic. But a more thorough study of the psychological intent in these devices of technique may suggest to us as composers new methods of approach to universality and transcendent emotion in art. And we shall thus be revivifying what was best in the past as well as working out new formulas for the future,—even if they are but part contribution for what is to come.

As to the teachers, we have joint responsibility with the composers. The cyclic law imposes upon us that we should cease to look at epochs and movements as units to be studied and analyzed for static values only. These values are to be allied with the future equally as with the past. Nationalism, for example, is not to be regarded as a tendency fostered by the nineteenth century alone. It has its roots in forgotten folk-songs of the Middle Ages, and in some cases in the migrations of tribal hosts—and its future is only now being cast.

Examine the recent music of Albeniz, de Falla, Granados and others of the Spanish School of today. Does this music show signs of delimitation? And this we will find to be the case if we take up the most important currents and periods that have come down to us from the past. There is a beautiful fluidity and elasticity which is to be found everywhere which, if we interpret sensitively, has no actual boundary lines or barriers. Thus, while not discarding the historical element in our study of musical evolution, we shall superimpose as a basic reality the belief in a cyclic law. In other words, classicism, while given its appropriate framing, will be regarded also from the point of view of its roots in the past and its implications for the future, and Romanticism furthermore we shall examine, not only from the viewpoint of the detailed importance of its phenomena, but from what may be termed the echo-significance of these phenomena, as well as the salient thread of that romantic spirit which, running through the ages, has experienced a particularly

vital stimulus from the Romantic movement itself. Now, when we take the modern era into the picture, (and by that we mean everything from the death of Wagner up to and including the present moment), we are confronted with an even more difficult problem from the cyclic point of view. In the first place, there are so many diverse elements in this era, and secondly, on account of being still in its midst, there is no such clear outline to the period as to others. It is an epoch of individual figures rather than coördinating principles; perhaps it is a question of methods and tendencies more than principles.

We hope that the charm and spiritual subtlety of the impressionist method by which Debussy reveals the impalpable phenomena of Nature to us may find future incarnation. We are not so sure of the expressionist tendencies of which Arnold Schoenberg is the representative, nor of Scriabin's somewhat artificial mysticism; neither can we frankly envisage the future position of Stravinsky who wishes to be all things and is actually few of them, who in the "Sacre du Printemps" plays with elements of volcanic destruction in distinctly clever fashion—who is paganistic in wholly sophisticated manner, and who is neo-classic at times into the bargain. He has a bag full of conjurer's tricks up his sleeve, and is at times luminously brilliant. But how long will all this be remembered?

Thus we see, by glancing only a little way down the path of today and yesterday that we are apparently living, musically speaking, not so much in

an epoch as in a welter of diverging tendencies, influences and ideals. Some of the latter will undoubtedly enjoy cyclic revival, but as the background of true period importance unfortunately we find to-day much that seems destructive rather than constructive.

Lest, however, this conclusion seem unnecessarily pessimistic, let us also admit this possibility: that out of these diverging tendencies, out of the apparent harshness of experimentation of the present, the composer of tomorrow may build as fair a structure as the great edifices of the Past.

VI

PRESENT POSSIBILITIES FOR THE AMERICAN
COMPOSER

AFTER the brief survey we have been making of new or untried values in music appreciation, it may very pertinently be asked whether the American composer, as well as the student and layman, cannot derive benefit from these lines of exploration.

Certain it is that if by the process of education we can widen the avenues of expression and develop a more searching understanding of the art of music, by just so much we grant the composer new fields to enter and new chances of being better understood. Perhaps the very reason that our appreciation is limited hinders the American composer from venturing along certain lines of treatment and experiment. He has been accused of being too much influenced by European currents of thought; and yet there are many threads of American texture that are waiting to be skillfully adapted and woven together.

A few years ago, in his rhapsody entitled "America," Ernest Bloch tried such an experiment with only partial success. Mr. Bloch is of foreign extraction, and therefore lacking in some of the background necessary for such a venture. In addition, he chose elements that were too obvious and at the same time too abstrusely subtle for this type of

permanent idealization. But nevertheless his experiment was a valuable one in that he pointed out the way of possible nationalistic development and demonstrated that, in spite of our polyglot civilization, there are many other factors in our own inheritance and tradition that might lend themselves successfully to tonal treatment.

Let us glance at some of these possibilities. Ever so often in the swing of the pendulum there is the cry "Back to Nature!" And where is there a better chance of going to Nature than in America? Cannot the imponderabilities of the Grand Canyon, as well as the wonders of the Yosemite and the far Olympian mountains of Puget Sound suggest sources of inspiration as well as Strauss' Alps? Are there not here elements of grandeur and beauty which are incomparably our own?

And are the avenues of our Indian and Negro, as well as Californian and Kentucky sources of folklore fully exploited bases of composition? These native elements, some of which are regarded as derived in origin, have nevertheless become naturalized as part of our soil and fabric. In spite of very laudable attempts in this domain, has any one composer been entirely successful in translating the essential charm of this elemental music into the larger forms of composition? Is not opportunity still pointing the way in this direction?

When we take into account the periods of American history, we see that here also there are unexploited possibilities of basic interest. Why, for example, should not the colonial period be drawn

further upon as a source of illustration? What more picturesque epoch exists in our history, combined, let us say, with a certain brocaded quaintness,—in reality a transfusion from eighteenth century Europe? And is our colorful Wild West to be represented alone by Puccini's "Girl of the Golden West"? Is no American composer forthcoming to discover a less hybrid form of representation?

These are all, of course, merely suggestions for the consideration of the composer. There are also many other subtle idealizations of the American spirit, at times of the pioneer spirit which Walt Whitman strove to emblemize, and which Mr. Bloch used as a preface to his Rhapsody. The main thesis to be envisaged is that American nationalism in Music, partially developed as it may be, is not barren of opportunity to the composer's desires.

But in spite of all these advantages specified, there are those who may raise the question: is the use of nationalism as a basis of art to be advocated? May it not smack of a certain Rotarianism? May it not be narrow and chauvinistic in scope? And in reply, we must unequivocally affirm that nationalism in its finest manifestation, instead of narrowing and drawing in horizons, as is the case in the political world, should undoubtedly widen international cooperation, and knead together nations in international brotherhood. At least we may have good hope that if we truly understand the best in another people as typified by its art, and if they understand our best, there will be less chance of war with that

people. Moreover, as we have already attempted to prove in a previous chapter, nationalism provides the outlet for the individual to escape beyond the limits of his own preoccupations, and is especially valuable for this reason.

If a composer can escape from some of the grooves which the experimentalists of today are all but pushing him into, he will indeed be lucky. We cannot all be modern Romanticists like Mr. Rachmaninoff, but at least we can cogitate on the problems as well as on the workable veins of the past, and at the same time we need not be unheedful of the opportunities of the present which have just been reviewed. Not that I mean to suggest that it is up to the American composer as an American to follow in these special avenues of nationalistic exploration. They are indicated merely as possibilities of not fully developed opportunity. Art is universal as well as nationalistic, and there is no reason why the composer should not follow any lead that his fancy desires, providing that he may also be convincing in his result. We are not thinking of criticizing personalities like Loeffler or Bloch, who have been strongly influenced in the one case by the Debussyan method, and in the other by racial values, and who have both recorded achievement of singular distinction. In our own suggestions we have rather been thinking of those who, swayed by the powerful extremist school of today, have been led into rank sensationalism, perhaps through lack of perceiving other roads to follow.

For these latter perhaps the vein of nationalism

might offer an untried inspiration. They have but to follow in the lead of Sibelius, Moussorgsky, de Falla, Smetana and many others across the sea if they desire to be in good company. And above all they must for the time being at least obliterate the craving for originality at the expense of equally important values. It is perhaps no exaggeration to affirm that much meaningless chaos in composition today might be avoided were not composers so frantic in searching for originality. Not that we would deny the supreme value of this quality. Something new under the sun is always to be welcomed. But if the element of novelty means sensationalism, as is so often the case, we should frankly prefer old wine in new bottles.

Since the war, and perhaps as a result of it, under the leadership of such men as Stravinsky, Schoenberg, Prokofiev and some of the Parisian "Six," a movement that may be almost called Destructivism in music has arisen, which is particularly baneful in its influence on young composers. For these above-named leaders of Modernism at least possess dynamic force and brilliance, and in the case of Schoenberg absolute conviction in his art. They may be in part complete Nihilists as far as tonality and other traditions of the past are involved, but at least they are to a degree forceful and highly compelling figures.

But their imitators and disciples among the younger generation, that band who are being propagated and taken under the wing of Leagues and societies, what can we say that will adequately de-

scribe their petty insufficiency and lack of ideas! Composing, with some of them, literally seems to mean "making a noise in the world." Creators worthy of the name should have a greater sense of dignity. How vastly preferable to be a musical archeologist like Mr. Werner Josten or a creator of idylls like MacDowell, or something of a dreamer like Loeffler, or an Indian rhapsodist like Cadman, or just steadfast, all-round musicians like Parker, Converse, Chadwick and a host of others!

The American composer has a rather diversified road of choice before him. He has, to be sure, no ties of brotherhood such as developed in Russia under the band of Invincibles. He has likewise no national tradition to build on or tear asunder. He may be a rank individualist or he may ally himself to kindred spirits here as well as schools of thought abroad. He has the limitation of a rather decided inferiority complex to overcome. But he likewise has as his assets, an only partially developed nationalism to foster, and best of all an ever-increasing music-loving public which appreciates his endeavors and longs for his success.

VII

EDUCATION AND CORRELATIVE AND COMPARATIVE
VALUES IN THE ARTS

IF IN our discussion of what will bring about a wider understanding of music the question be asked: What can education best do to enhance the cause of this art? I should reply—to draw music out of its comparative isolation, to knit it more firmly to the sister arts,—and this without in any way trespassing on its essential realm, or detracting from its intrinsic character.

Such an object will naturally be achieved by the exposé of essential lines of cleavage between the arts as well as by their points of linkage and parallel values. Why is this of paramount importance to the creative artist as well as the student? It is important that the creator understand his own art,—not only in relation to the basic laws of æsthetics such as we have discussed in a former chapter, but also in terms of its essential similarity and divergence from the other arts. It is important for the student likewise that he think of music in terms of its related implications,—and this of course is not easily possible if music is given too separate a niche in the curriculum of the college or university. This isolated position of music has come about for various reasons. In the first place, educators have been

too prone to regard music as a superluxury, a decorative rather than a necessary element of the educative process. (To prove this statement, the reader has only to glance at the catalogue of the average college and note the space allowed to music as compared to literature.) Secondly, it has become an *idée fixe* with educators and students that music is more difficult to understand than the other arts, and that more expert and technical knowledge is required, and that therefore the middle road between expertism and absolute ignorance is a difficult one to find. Courses in Music Appreciation, however, such as we are advocating in this present volume, should do much to provide this middle road.

In what other fashion can we in the educative world draw music away from its somewhat isolated position into closer *rapprochement* with the kindred arts and the general currents of life? The ways of suggestion in this respect are not limited. A few years ago I had the pleasure of organizing a course in Comparative Arts at one of our prominent American conservatories. This course was designed not merely to supply knowledge and background of the kindred arts to specialists in music, but also to demonstrate the binding unity as well as the lines of cleavage between the arts, and most important to point out that the evolution of music has been an integral part of all art progress rather than a separate movement in a separate orbit. If this latter truth alone was retained by the student as a consequence of two years' experience in this course, we should not consider the results unimportant.

But how was such an experiment devised in its details? A series of lectures was arranged, each aiming to give in broad outline the development of the three arts, painting, literature and music, from ancient Greek times to the modern age. In this series there were a certain number of key lectures, prefacing each important epoch in the evolution of art, followed by detailed lectures elaborating the progress of the individual arts under this epoch. In addition there were comparative and correlating lectures, which brought out differences and points of union between the arts under particular periods and in more general fashion. The series was given by specialists in the arts from many different universities and special institutes,—which plan had the advantage of great catholicity of opinion and variety of viewpoint presented; on the other hand it possessed the disadvantage of difficulty of coöperation between these specialists. In the university of today, with its numerous and diverse faculty to draw upon, this difficulty, inherent in the conservatory, could be completely overcome. In addition there are many possibilities in the university curriculum which have so far won but little consideration. Why, for example, should not the Romantic movement be studied as a whole, with its manifestations in the different arts treated in coöperative and comparative fashion? Why must literary and musical and artistic Romanticism be cubby-holed and dealt with as separate fields of phenomena, whereas in actuality they are but separate flowering of similar basic impulses. In the college or university there is

infinite opportunity for such liaison and experiment. Moreover, is there any reason why the relation of music to religion, philosophy and the social and natural sciences should not be included as part of the program of these subjects? Just how has music aided the spread and propagation of certain religious creeds? Just what is the relationship of Palestrina to the development of polyphony and the spread of Roman Catholicism? Just how far can philosophic concepts be reflected in tone? And to what degree can music act as a means of social and ethical synthesis? All these are questions that will bear reflection, and that would be more provocative were not educators so seldom inclined to take up new lines of presentation.

There are even more subtle bases of what may be called interstudy between the arts which have been barely approached. By this I mean those bases, bonds, comparisons and differences between the arts of poetry and music that might very well be followed out in coöperative courses between the departments of literature and music in the university.

For example, let us for a moment consider the relationship between two such intensive lyricists as Shelley and Schubert. They have this in common in their lyricism, that it is highly spontaneous and perfect in quality, and that it is also intensively emotional rather than intellectual. Neither of the artists was a great thinker. Beauty flowed into the moulds which their genius created in wholly unpremeditated fashion, to use Shelley's own words. They

both believed in the doctrine of perfectibility—Shelley as influenced by the Platonic theory and Schubert in a subconscious but nevertheless devoted fashion.

Shelley idealized emotion,—his Seraph of Heaven almost loses the semblance of woman and becomes a sort of radiancy, a complete idealization. And Shelley even at times distorts Nature to mould her to his conceptions. Schubert on the other hand etherealized emotion, so that his conceptions were hardly ever of the earth earthy, and only those should sing Schubert who can, like Shelley's Lark, soar into the ether without a downward glance. Both artists have to a remarkable degree the power of concentrating within a short space images or ideas of the elemental. We need only refer to Shelley's lines

"Life, like a dome of many-colored glass,
Stains the white radiance of eternity."

and Schubert's opening phrases of "Death and the Maiden," to be convinced of this similarity of power. And these latter are but some generalities of comparison that might be indicated.

If we wish to particularize for a moment, let us glance at the stanza from the "Skylark":

"Better than all measures
Of delightful sound,
Better than all treasures
That in books are found,
Thy skill to poet were, thou scorner of the ground."

We shall see that Shelley obtains his effects of intensified emotion line by line by heightening the quality of his figures, images and ideas, rather than by using any purely physical device. Schubert on the other hand as a musician has the advantage of actual physical pitch to aid him. If we recall his "Sehnsucht Walzer" we will remember that each musical idea is sequentially repeated in a higher pitch than the preceding one until the close with a final high-G as climax. Thus with the musician emotion can be transcendentalized in this physical fashion, as well as by the intrinsic quality of the melody itself. The poet, however, has perhaps the more difficult performance as lyricist to achieve, and of this difficulty Shelley always proves himself past master. He suggests the most exquisite music in his lines by the sheer witchery of his combination of vowel sounds, by his use of rhythm—as in the West Wind, where he becomes as powerfully imitative of Nature as Schubert in the Erl-King—and finally by his magical use of imagery, figures and ideas. And Shelley is in his own medium so pure and potent a lyricist that any attempt to heighten his lyric line by actual setting to music seems in the nature of a desecration. To a certain degree his work is the poetical complement of Schubert's, without in any way requiring fusion or translation. And they were both in a hurry in their work, from much to say rather than by method; random poets, they literally depended on the inspiration of the moment as the tribute of their muse to posterity. In this fashion we might proceed working out further cor-

relations and points of difference, between these two magnificent masters, of their individual *métiers*. But our aim here is to suggest treatment of this kind rather than in any degree to work it out fully, and we must conclude this little excursion with the apology, not of an unfinished symphony, but of something just begun, which may sketchily indicate the road of comparison in art which education might do well to follow.

We should also like to take advantage of this opportunity to decry those who are seeking to destroy the grounds of inspiration which, under the ægis of Programme Music and sometimes Impressionism have been furnished to music by other arts and influences. The expressionists of today, who wish to remould the classical model according to their idiom, would like to wipe the slate clean of these so-called foreign influences. But why is there not room for both ways in the art of music? And have they in any way proved the superiority of their new-old medium of expression. And again, what is there to prove that music has not been made infinitely more eloquent by the art-interrelating influences of the nineteenth century? Surely the music of the twentieth century so far cannot in any way vaunt a reputation for superior eloquence. It has become the fashion with some to voice skepticism as to the actual transfusion of one art method into another, —that experiment, which Debussy, perhaps somewhat against the import of his own words, is said to have carried out. And yet, if, in reality the technique or the methods of one art made him more elo-

quent in his own medium, what can be the possible grounds for objection? Just how far he adapted in music the art methods of the impressionist painters and of the symbolist poets is still a matter for debate. In his poem *L'Après-Midi d'un Faune*, Stephan Mallarmé has given especial emphasis to certain words, which he imbues with special significance, and which kindle certain ideas in the imagination of the reader, allowing the latter to thus fill out the picture merely suggested by the poet. In the same way, with the use of symbolic rather than definite expression, the poet leaves his meanings open to debate, something that the reader must complement. Now this sort of subtle suggestion rather than commanding of the imagination (as was the method of the Programmists), appealed especially to Debussy. It was thoroughly in line with his nicely nuanced sublimation of emotion. In the same fashion did the impressionist painters in their treatment of color and light appeal to him.

“Their art (says Liebich) approaches intimately that of music by reason of its research of color harmonies, causing their pictures to resemble a symphony, with the most luminous degree of light as the principal theme.”

In Debussy's music these characteristics of impressionism are prominently marked.

He employs sounds as colors, and paints them in various juxtaposition, forming them into delicate-tinted sonorous aggregations, or he invests certain chords with an existence either sufficient in itself, or renders it capable of germinating

and developing a series of shaded, many-hued chord sequences.

But Debussy does something more than this. Like Corot (who, although not counted technically among the impressionist painters, belongs there), Debussy is content to suggest outlines and moods without actually defining them. Like Mallarmé and Verlaine's use of the individual word, he makes the chord pregnant with the possibilities and actualities of echo-meanings. Now in the case of Debussy, these suggestions, which he actually derived from the sister arts of music, enhanced rather than impaired the intrinsic originality of his work. It is perhaps this craving for originality, this fear of music being enslaved by the other arts, that has brought on the actual opposite current in the expressionists and absolutists, and similar groups of today. But we needs must preserve our poise and sense of balance in these matters. Just because some of the less gifted programmists become tiresome in their demands on our sense of coördination; just because to some narrow minds Debussy's tendencies may seem anæmic or decadent, is no just reason for throwing overboard vital truths which musical evolution should have taught us. The splendor and vitality and color of the nineteenth century in all the arts has not yet been rivalled or approached in the twentieth century, and there is no actual reason for trying to slight its importance. The contribution of classicism in the eighteenth century need not for this reason be obscured. Nor, as

we have tried to emphasize throughout this volume, is there any ground to suppose that diverse methods and diverse *raisons-d'être* of art cannot hold their own simultaneously without interfering with each other.

The way of art is wide, and these limitations that currents and periods would impose are ungrounded. Above all, the essential points of union between the arts, as well as points of difference, must be a basis of study to the composer and the student. Without some understanding of the phenomena of all the arts the composer will be confined in achievement just as the student will be limited in appreciation.

Moreover, widening horizons, we hope, will bring into view the gateways between the arts, and make the special contribution of each individually important to the fuller development of the others.

CONCLUSION

AFTER examining this little volume the educator, and more especially the college president, may declare that in my suggestions I have put a somewhat heavy burden on the college student who is interested in music.

But it must be remembered that the phases of work which we have discussed are supposed to be part of an advanced two years' course in music appreciation for students who are especially interested in the arts.

For the benefit of those who like outlines, the following suggested arrangement of this course is appended:

FIRST YEAR

- a. The Relation of Æsthetics to Music Appreciation.
- b. Form and Forms, Including the Development of the Sonata and the Symphony.
- c. The Study of Harmonic Backgrounds.
- d. Methods of Evaluation, and Tests of Themes and Melodies.
- e. Musical Epochs and Periods and Their Importance.

SECOND YEAR

- a. A Study of the Meaning of Style.
- b. An Examination of the Career and Achieve-

ment of Various Composers of Diverse Periods, in the Light of Knowledge and Background Gained in the Earlier Part of This Course.

c. Discussion of Correlative and Comparative Values in the Arts.

The order here given is not absolute or definitive. It is merely suggested as perhaps a logical one in the light of our discussion. It is likewise taken for granted that a parallel or previous course in musical history is required of those who take the course in appreciation just outlined. It is urged that this complete, and at the same time advanced course be encouraged in every possible way by college teachers and advisors.

For those who would really understand there are no short-cuts. However this is not saying that a popular single year survey course in appreciation to include the more usual topics, should not be arranged for the more casual student. He will at least derive a superficial knowledge and background, which the average college and conservatory director seem to regard as sufficient.

Educators and arrangers of college and conservatory curricula are likewise strongly advised not to attempt to combine courses in music history and appreciation. The two fields ought to be distinct in treatment, even though they have natural links and bonds in common. Indeed, the attempt to combine must necessarily mean the crowding out of important aspects of both subjects, and it is in reality an affront to the importance of music to attempt such

liaison. It is to be advocated also that music history should likewise be accorded a two years' highly inclusive course, as well as a more popular single year survey. When one considers such fascinating subjects—which are all too frequently hastily treated—as the music of the Troubadours, early Italian opera, the development of plain song in the Roman Catholic liturgy, not to mention the study of diverse Asiatic music, the wonder grows that it should be considered possible to do justice to all this material within the limits of a combined course of music history and appreciation, or even within the limits of a single year's historical survey.

College ex-officios may shake their heads and assert that I am giving too great importance to these phases of music, and put in the reminder that there are likewise courses in music theory as well as the study of special periods and composers, not to mention applied music, which must all be fitted into the curriculum. Granted that this is true and necessary I all the more earnestly plead that the study of the art of music appreciation should yield place to no other curriculum subject. It is of more vital importance than all the special subjects in the music list, for the reason that it aims to win the interest of the general mass of students rather than to appeal to those already specially gifted by nature.

If it genuinely fulfills this function, if it can give the student and layman a more intensive and deep-rooted understanding of art, which in its larger sense is the interpretation of life itself, what branch of the sciences or languages or history in all the long list of the catalogue can be more important?

