

South Central Music Bulletin

ISSN 1545-2271

Volume VI, Number 1 (Fall 2007)

Refereed Journal of the South Central Chapter – The College Music Society

Editor:

Dr. Nico Schüler, Texas State University

Music Graphics Editor:

Richard D. Hall, Texas State University

Editorial Review Board:

Dr. Paula Conlon, University of Oklahoma
Dr. Cina Crisara, The Starlight Symphony Orchestra
Dr. Stacey Davis, University of Texas – San Antonio
Dr. Lynn Job, North Central Texas College
Dr. Kevin Mooney, Texas State University
Dr. Dimitar Ninov, Texas State University
Sunnie Oh, Texas State University
Dr. Robin Stein, Texas State University
Dr. Leon Stefanija, University of Ljubljana (Slovenia)
Dr. Paolo Susanni, Clavier Werke School of Music (Austin)
Dr. Lori Wooden, University of Central Oklahoma

Subscription: Free

This Journal can be downloaded from <http://www.music.org/southcentral.html> or from
<http://www.txstate.edu/scmb/>

Publisher:

South Central Chapter – The College Music Society
% Nico Schüler, Ph.D.
Texas State University-San Marcos
School of Music
601 University Drive
San Marcos, TX 78666
USA

Table of Contents

Message from the Editor by Nico Schüler ... Page 3

Visit the CMS South Central Website ... Page 3

Visit the South Central Music Bulletin (SCMB) Website ... Page 3

Articles:

Hindemith, Schenker, and the University of North Texas: Early Comparative Studies Supervised by Robert W. Ottman During the Mid-1950s by Michael Lively ... Page 4

The Question of Autonomy of Musical Reviews in Slovenia After World War II: Between Aesthetic Judgment and Political Construct by Jernej Weiss ... Page 11

Book Reviews:

Popular Music Censorship in Africa by Kelly Thurmond ... Page 23

An Anthology for Sight Singing by Anne Weaver ... Page 24

Message from the Editor

Nico Schüler, Texas State University, E-Mail: nico.schuler@txstate.edu

This past year, we experienced a delay in publishing our journal, but we hope to be back on schedule by summer 2009. We anticipate the following publication schedule: Fall 2007 issue (this issue!) in January 2009; Spring 2008 issue in February 2009; Fall 2008 issue in April 2009; and the Spring 2009 issue in June 2009. From then on, we should pick up our original publication schedule, all Fall issues being published in October and all Spring issues being published in April.

As always, I would like to sincerely thank all members of our peer-review board for their hard work and excellent suggestions for improving each article. A very special thanks goes to our Music Graphics Editor, Richard D. Hall.

All issues may contain articles and announcements in the following categories:

- **articles with a special focus on local music traditions;**
- **articles** that deal with issues related to the mission of CMS and / or with our region (generally, all music-related topics are being considered);

- **opinion articles** that are part of, or provide the basis for, discussions on important music topics;
- **composer portraits** that may or may not include an interview;
- **short responses** to articles published in this or previous issues;
- **bibliographies** on any music-related topic, especially (annotated) bibliographies related to the mission of CMS and / or to our region;
- **reviews** of books, printed music, CDs, and software; and
- **reports** on recent symposia, conferences, and concerts.

I would like to call for submissions that fit any of these categories. Submissions by students and / or by non-CMS South Central members are, as always, very welcome. All submissions are expected via e-mail with attachments in Word format or in Rich Text Format. For detailed submission guidelines visit

<http://www.txstate.edu/scmb/>

Visit the CMS South Central Website:

Go to <http://www.music.org/southcentral.html>

Visit the *South Central Music Bulletin (SCMB)* Website:

Go to <http://www.txstate.edu/scmb/>

Articles

Hindemith, Schenker, and the University of North Texas: Early Comparative Studies Supervised by Robert W. Ottman During the Mid-1950s

by Michael Lively

E-Mail: michaellively@prodigy.net

Shortly after Robert W. Ottman joined the full-time music faculty of North Texas State College (now the University of North Texas), he became involved with the supervision of two very unusual, and perhaps remarkably forward-looking, Master's degree theses.¹ These student projects, Grace E. Knod's *A Comparison of the Hindemith and Schenker Concepts of Tonality* (Knod 1955) and Nathan Miron's *The Analytical Systems of Hindemith and Schenker as Applied to Two Works of Arnold Schoenberg* (Miron 1956), were submitted to the university in 1955 and 1956 respectively, narrowly in advance of the revised edition of Heinrich Schenker's *Free Composition* and well ahead of the important body of English-language investigation of the Schenkerian system that appeared in the late 20th century. Amazingly, the primary analytical focus of these works was devoted to the analysis of either pre-tonal music, including the analysis of works dating from as far back as the 13th century, or to the analysis of post-tonal and atonal music from the 20th century. In many ways, the work of Ottman's students seems to have pre-figured the extreme avant-garde of Schenkerian thought that developed several decades after the theses were written. The idea of systematically integrating the analytical methods of Heinrich Schenker and Paul Hindemith remains as compelling today as it must have seemed

to Robert W. Ottman and his students during the mid 1950s, yet this important and still relevant area of research is largely unexplored by both the scholars of Hindemith as well as by Schenkerian music theorists.

David Carson Berry's recently published bibliography of Schenkerian literature includes the subject heading "Schenker and Hindemith" (Berry 2004, 310-311). Under this category, Berry has listed several significant and relatively sophisticated attempts to reconcile the theoretical systems and perhaps more importantly the implied analytical principles, of both Schenker's and Hindemith's techniques for the reductive graphical representation of musical structure. The earliest sources described in this section of the bibliography are the Master's theses of Knod and Miron.

Not listed in Berry's bibliography, and perhaps justifiably so, is an additional and even earlier thesis from the University of North Texas, Dorothy Robert's *Modern Theories of Tonality* (Robert 1946).² Accepted by the university in 1946, this work also discusses the analytical theories of Hindemith and Schenker, but tends to review the theorists' ideas more than it attempts to compare or to synthesize their analytical methodologies. The historical significance of Robert's thesis derives from its very early date, especially considering the nascent state of American scholarship at this time regarding the theories of Heinrich Schenker.

² Dorothy Robert's thesis summarizes the work of several 19th and 20th century music theorists, principally focusing upon the methods of musical analysis proposed by Hermann Helmholtz, Heinrich Schenker, Arnold Schoenberg, Paul Hindemith, and Joseph Yasser, but also including brief discussions of the theories of Henry Cowell and Howard Hanson. Robert's thesis reviews and comments upon the analytical writings of these theorists, but rarely attempts to provide original or detailed music analysis itself. Although Robert's thesis may not have demonstrated the same level of creative or analytical synthesis as the two later student works described in this essay, Robert's discussion of Heinrich Schenker in a published source, such as her university thesis, may represent the earliest public reference to Heinrich Schenker to have been recorded within the State of Texas.

¹ Robert W. Ottman, professor emeritus of music theory at the University of North Texas, is remembered for the vital role that he played in establishing the music theory program. He became a professor of music in 1955, after several years of teaching at the university, and retired in 1981. He passed away in the fall of 2005, at the age of 91.

It may be necessary for 21st century musical scholars to be reminded that the analytical works of Paul Hindemith and Heinrich Schenker only gradually became accessible to the world's population of English-speaking music theorists during the mid- and late-20th century. Although Hindemith's theories were perhaps adequately represented by the 1937 publication of the composer's *Unterweisung im Tonsatz* (Hindemith 1937) and its subsequent English translation as *The Craft of Musical Composition* in 1942 (Hindemith 1942), many English-speaking theorists were only able to learn about Schenker's approach to the analysis of tonal music during these years by reading the very small number of secondary-source descriptions of Schenker's theory that were commonly available. The first edition of Schenker's *Free Composition*, published posthumously in 1935, quickly went out of print and regrettably contained so many obvious errors and noticeable omissions that a number of scholars simply rejected the entire volume out-of-hand.³ It was not until the publication of the second and significantly revised edition of *Free Composition* in 1956 that Schenker's work became truly accessible to an international audience for the first time.

During the period when Knod was completing her thesis, she would have had very little difficulty in locating primary or secondary source materials related to Hindemith's analytical theories. Both the German and English editions of the *Unterweisung* were generally available, and a large num-

ber of technical and critical secondary-source reviews of Hindemith's analytical principles had been published before 1955. Primary source materials associated with, or published by, Heinrich Schenker, however, were much more difficult to obtain. Knod lists her primary sources for Schenker's method of analysis as the following: the *Tonwille* series,⁴ *Neue musikalische Theorien und Fantasi- en*,⁵ *Das Meisterwerk in der Musik*,⁶ and *Der freie Satz* (Schenker 1956, revised edition). A footnote in Knod's thesis explains that none of these sources were available in English at the time the project was prepared (Knod 1955, iv). Since formal or complete bibliographic citations for any of Heinrich Schenker's primary sources are not provided in the thesis, it is likely that Knod did not benefit from direct access to these materials, including the first edition of *Free Composition*. Secondary English-language sources related to Schenker's analytical theories are listed as Felix Salzer's *Structural Hearing* (Salzer 1952), Adele T. Katz's "Heinrich Schenker's Method of Analysis" (Katz 1945)⁷, and Michael Mann's "Schenker's Contribution to Music Theory" (Mann 1949). The notational technique displayed in Knod's graphic analyses reveals an absence of familiarity with, or possibly a conscious decision not to adopt the notational system of Schenker's last and most comprehensive theoretical writings, such as *Free Composition*. The notational practice found in Miron's thesis departs even more profoundly from the manner of analytical notation that late 20th- and 21st-century Schenkerians would generally expect to encounter in published analytical scholarship.

³ The first edition of *Free Composition* received almost unanimous condemnation from academic reviewers, both in English and German language publications. Roger Sessions' review of Schenker's book included the following observation: "Heinrich Schenker's *Der freie Satz*, subtitled *Das erste Lehrbuch der Musik* (Universal Edition, 1935), is difficult and unfortunately, in large part, repulsive and sterile reading. It is, in the first place, pathological in the most obvious sense; unfortunately its author lays great store by the general pseudo-philosophical assumptions which form the background of his thought, and these are in the most self-revealing manner the outcomes of personal frustrations and fantasies. His megalomania alienates even the patient and open-minded reader by its constant effort, a tendency all too frequent in contemporary German writing, not to convince or illuminate, but to intimidate him." Sessions' review of Schenker's treatise was by no means the most negative to appear in an English-language journal. See Sessions 1938, 192.

⁴ Between 1921 and 1924, Heinrich Schenker published ten volumes of *Der Tonwille* as a periodical. A new English-language edition of the series has recently been produced by the Oxford University Press, edited by William Drabkin.

⁵ For a complete citation of Schenker's *Neue musikalische Theorien und Phantasien*, see the listing in the bibliography of this article.

⁶ *Das Meisterwerk in der Musik* was published in three volumes (1925, 1926, and 1930). An English-language edition has been published by Cambridge University Press (1994, 1996, and 1997).

⁷ One of Knod's most important sources was Katz 1935. Knod also refers frequently to Katz's *Challenge to Musical Tradition* (Katz 1945).

Although *Free Composition* may now be considered by many to represent Heinrich Schenker's most important published explication of his analytical system, in 1955 the work was still generally inaccessible to American scholars and suffered from its accepted reputation as an error-ridden, incomprehensible, and unsuccessful attempt at describing Schenker's theory of musical analysis. In other words, Schenker's theory may have been held in significantly higher esteem – at least by the small but growing number of adherents to his theory – than was enjoyed by the author's last important treatise itself. Mid-century descriptions of Schenker's theory often tended to almost entirely avoid direct reference to Schenker's *Free Composition*, instead providing numerous citations to earlier secondary sources; this practice is certainly reflected in Knod's decision to discuss Schenker's theory primarily through quotations from the work of Adele Katz and Michael Mann.

Perhaps the most intriguing aspect of Knod's thesis is its chronological, one might almost say synchronic, method of organization. Knod's ambitious collection of musical examples represents "roughly [one example from each] fifty-year period in history from the late thirteenth century to the present day" (Knod 1955, v). The first example is taken from Adam de la Halle, while the last example is Igor Stravinsky's "Dodo Wiegenlied," from *Berceuses du chat*. In what may seem to 21st-century scholars as a surprisingly bold disregard for tonality as a generic – if not technical – delimiter, Knod's thesis includes a series of analyses that contrast the results of both the Hindemith and Schenker systems of analytical reduction for a wide range of non-tonal musical examples.

For each selected passage, Knod first provides an original analysis following Hindemith's method of graphical reduction, her Hindemith-derived graphs very closely resembling the analytical reductions found in Hindemith's *Unterweisung*. In most instances, only the "degree progression" and "tonality" segments of Hindemith's system are included in Knod's graphical reduction, allowing an almost direct comparison between Hindemith's idea of "tonality" and Schenker's concept of tonal prolongation. The "reliability" of Knod's Hindemith-

derived analyses, in terms of direct comparison between her results and those produced by a strict application of Hindemith's procedures, as described in the *Unterweisung*, is extremely close, revealing either a strong affinity for the principles of analysis that Hindemith so carefully described in his text, or else demonstrating a tendency to intentionally avoid an excessively subjective manner of interpretative analysis.

Knod's analyses following Schenker's method of graphical reduction, on the other hand, depart significantly from the methods of representation and symbolic nomenclature that were to become increasingly standardized among Schenkerian scholars during the second half of the 20th century. Knod's method of reductive notation also differs in many important aspects from the mature work of Schenker himself. The most noticeable element of contrast between Knod's reductive analyses and the method of graphic analysis that was later to become the *de facto* standard is the absence of a single large-scale unifying tonal progression or *Ursatz*. Although Knod describes the concept of "fundamental structure" in her introduction, it is lacking in her graphic reproductions, where only small-scale progressions are indicated and the notational symbol of the half note is not attached to any systematic element that might imply either tonal functionality or long-range structural progression. The notational practice found in Knod's thesis may be derived in part from an attempt to model or to re-create the graphical depiction of tonal structure provided in some of Schenker's early publications, such as the *Tonwille* series, but Knod's graphical technique probably stems from the prose description of Schenker's theory found in Adele Katz's explanation of structural voice leading.

Perhaps the most remarkable aspect of Knod's graphic and comparative method of analysis was her ambitious attempt to apply highly complex theories of tonal organization to music literature that is often considered to either pre-date or to post-date the historical period normally associated with common practice major-minor tonality. In recent years, several scholars have explored the idea of projecting Schenker's analytical theories of tonality onto either pre-tonal or post-tonal musical exam-

ples, but these pioneering efforts have often resulted in dubious or at least controversial results, due to the technical and theoretical challenges inherently incurred by any attempt to develop consistent or generally applicable procedures for the translation of tonal analytical techniques to atonal music.⁸ Knod's systematic application of both Hindemith's and Schenker's analytical methods to musical examples that range historically from Adam de la Halle to Igor Stravinsky implies a confidence in the fundamentally conservative organization of pitch, at least as it may have been demonstrated in the works of Western composers. This view, in turn, might have been originally derived from naturalistic theories of harmonic generation, similar to those expressed by Hindemith in *Unterweisung im Tonsatz*.

A detailed examination of the graphic reductions provided in Knod's thesis may help to illustrate her method for creating a combined and comparative analytical technique. Knod's analysis of Adam de la Halle's rondeau *Tant con je vivrai* very closely follows the method of analysis that may be observed in Hindemith's graphical reduction of Guillaume de Machaut's ballade *Il s'est avis* in *Unterweisung im Tonsatz*. Knod's Schenker-derived analysis of the rondeau seems to follow the tonal pattern of her Hindemith-derived analysis, thereby suggesting that Hindemith's technique for designating the "tonality" of a musical passage, a process that largely develops from the identification of important chord and interval root combinations, may be transferred to the Schenkerian graph of "tonal prolongation." By attempting to unify the analytical graphs produced from these two very different methods of musical analysis, an element of comparative or blended analytical systematization is suggested, namely the significance of foreground-level chord-roots is emphasized much more than would normally be the case in the Schenkerian graph, and the significance of secondary-level voice leading sonorities, i.e. contrapuntal harmony, plays a greatly more significant role in the Hindemith-derived graph than might ordinarily be in evidence.

As I have previously mentioned, Knod's method of Schenker-derived analytical notation departs significantly from modern analytical notation in a number of important aspects. In regard to Knod's Schenker-derived graph of the rondeau, perhaps the most important symbolic departure from standard Schenkerian notation may be the absence of any large-scale tonal progression in the graph, Knod's analytical reduction describing only a static and unchanging tonal prolongation. A pre-tonal composition, such as the musical work that is here the subject of analysis, may in fact not contain a true tonal progression or "structural cadence," and therefore a Schenkerian reduction of the musical source-text should not artificially attempt to portray such an anachronistically tonal structure. As I attempted to produce an original Schenkerian reading of this passage myself, I discovered several aspects of the work's tonal design that seem to support Knod's somewhat unusual graphical reduction. Firstly, the upper voice must begin on A, since no significant *Kopfton* is systematically achieved or even emphasized, yet the "final" pitch of the structural upper voice very much seems to be F, a situation that implies parallel octaves in the background level outer-voice counterpoint. In order to avoid parallel octaves in the outer-voice structural reduction, it is necessary to describe the "final" cadence as structurally inferior to the initial "A-minor"-sonority, thus suggesting a static "A-minor"-prolongation instead of a single background-level cadence. Even the casual listener would probably agree that this rondeau does not exhibit a traditional 18th-century-style tonal organization at the background-level, and accordingly an accurate Schenkerian graph should not attempt to impose this type of formal or pre-compositional device. Knod seems, either as a very intuitive and iconoclastic Schenkerian, or perhaps simply in the interests of preserving the "tonality" progression of the Hindemith graph, to have concluded, perhaps not surprisingly, that this 13th-century rondeau composed by Adam de la Halle must be analyzed as a non-tonal progression.

Knod's analysis of Bach includes a chord-chart, similar in some ways to the foreground-level chords found in some of Schenker's early analytical

⁸ See for example Fuller 1986 or Stern 1990. For an application of Schenkerian principles to post-tonal music, see Baker 1990.

reductions, such as those published in the *Tonwille*-series. The Hindemith-derived analysis is very similar to Hindemith's analysis of Bach's three-part invention in F found in *Unterweisung im Tonsatz*. Once again, Knod's Schenker-derived analysis seems to be missing some of the graphical elements that later generations of Schenkerian theorists would consider to be of critical importance. Most significantly, the graph fails to provide a reduction of the essential outer-voice harmonic progression. In addition, the graph omits any representation of the acquisition of the structural dominant in the upper voice. Here again, Knod has apparently attempted to reconcile the Schenkerian and Hindemith-style graphs by privileging the "tonality"-progression of the Hindemith-derived analysis, but the absence of a true structural cadence in the Schenkerian graph must be considered something of a detriment to the conceptual validity of Knod's graphic analysis.

The analysis of Stravinsky's "Dodo's Wiegenlied" from *Berceuse du chat* represents one of Knod's most direct attempts to confront some of the analytical issues that seem to very often confound those who attempt to apply Schenker's theories to atonal music. In this analysis, the primary issues are the apparent bi-tonality of Stravinsky's musical texture and the harmonic implications of consecutive foreground parallel fifths. Stravinsky's *Wiegenlied* is scored for voice and three clarinets, with the upper clarinet part almost heterophonically following the vocal line, while the lower two clarinets tend to move in consecutive parallel fifths with each other. Knod very correctly observes that Hindemith's theory of tonality requires a pitch center of F-sharp (Knod 1955, 77), although the upper voice strongly suggests the dorian mode in its traditional d-minor key area. Knod discusses the importance of a I-V-I progression for the Schenkerian reduction, but does not actually describe either the acquisition or the resolution of the necessary structural dominant in her graphic analysis. It seems as though Knod once again attempted to reconcile the Hindemith and Schenker-derived graphs by requiring the Schenker graph to conform to the harmonic structure of the Hindemith graph, even though Stravinsky's music in this case does not allow an

elegant solution to be derived from such a process of analytical reconciliation. In a miniature work, such as the current example, a possible method for producing a Schenkerian reduction might have been to privilege the dorian mode of the upper voice, together with its associated melodic linearity and implied harmonic progression. This analysis allows the V-I-"cadence" in the bass to function as an ironic or paradoxical harmonic gesture of closure.

Nathan Miron's thesis, *The Analytical Systems of Hindemith and Schenker as Applied to Two Works of Arnold Schoenberg*, was submitted to the university in 1956. The early chapters of Miron's project, perhaps somewhat surprisingly, display an unusually pessimistic approach to the analysis of Schoenberg's music through Schenker's method of analytical notation. Miron's introduction and first chapter extensively question the validity of Schenker's method of analysis, including both considerably more numerous and more substantive arguments against Schenker's theory than arguments in favor of it. Indeed, Miron provides no defense whatsoever of Schenker's theory in terms of its applicability to atonal or post-tonal music, despite the fact that Miron's thesis ostensibly requires the author to provide exactly such an analysis of Schoenberg's music. It is, therefore, not entirely unexpected that Miron must eventually conclude his thesis by demonstrating that atonal music cannot be meaningfully analyzed through Schenker's graphical system of reductive notation.

Hindemith's analytical theories receive significantly more sympathetic treatment in Miron's thesis than do the theories of Heinrich Schenker. Several arguments against Hindemith's analytical method are discussed in the thesis, primarily criticism of the "unscientific" derivation of Series 1 and Series 2, which of course Hindemith himself admitted in *Unterweisung im Tonsatz*; Miron's thesis, however, includes a forceful and energetic defense of both the theoretical validity of Hindemith's system as well as its value for the study of music literature. Miron describes the merit of Hindemith's hierarchy of dissonance, for example, as follows: "If the results obtained from Hindemith's analysis of tonal music agree closely with those obtained from conventional analysis, it may be explained by the fact

that Series 1 and Series 2 have, in effect, long been felt instinctively by musicians and theorists; if Hindemith's derivation is unscientific, nonetheless the results agree with traditional teachings of harmony." (Miron 1956, 3.) In Miron's view, apparently, Hindemith's theoretical system is "instinctive," while Schenker's system is "dogmatic" or even "coerced," and that following Schenker's method requires the analyst to "force ... the music to fit the analytical system" (ibid., 4), while the ear is expected to "prolong other harmonies until it reaches such chords already familiar as cadences" (ibid., 7).

Miron ends his thesis with an extended list of specific points in support of his conclusion that Schenkerian analysis may not be applied to atonal music, including arguments that "the structural member is not immediate and therefore liable to inaccuracy," that protagonists of Schenker's system "must merely skip over the harmonies they cannot explain and call them 'prolongations' or 'contrapuntal chords,'" and that Schenker's analytical system attempts to "force the music into a pre-conceived mold rather than to explain the phenomena which actually take place in the music" (ibid., 36-38).⁹ Miron fulfills the literal obligation that he set for himself at the beginning of his thesis by including a vestigial Schenkerian graph of Schoenberg's *Fourth String Quartet*, but this graph is more of an argument against the application of Schenkerian analysis to atonal music than it is a practical example of such an analysis itself. From a historical perspective, it may be observed that Miron's thesis, despite its apparently pro-Schenkerian title, is in fact an excellent example of the hostile reception that Schenker's theory encountered in American universities during

the decade of the 1950s. In agreement with the prevailing academic bias against Schenker, Miron seems to have written a reasonably coherent and convincing demonstration of the perceived limitations and inadequacies of Schenker's analytical system.

After reading Miron's thesis, the question may still remain, at least for some readers, regarding the issue of whether or not Schenker's method of analysis may be successfully applied to Schoenberg's atonal music. I would refer these readers to Felix Salzer's very important early contribution to this area of research, especially the discussion of non-tonal prolongation found in *Structural Hearing* (Salzer 1952, 264-281). More recently, the idea of extending Schenker's analytical system to pre-tonal or post-tonal music has been explored by Joseph N. Straus (1987), and Saul Novack (1990).

Although the early North Texas theses of Robert, Knod, and Miron were submitted and approved before the publication of the revised edition of Schenker's *Free Composition* and well in advance of the late 20th century's avalanche of Schenkerian research in the United States, these Master's theses included graphic reductions of both non-tonal early music and post-tonal 20th century compositions. In many ways, Knod's analyses prefigure the extreme avant-garde of Schenkerian thought that developed several decades after her thesis was submitted. These student projects represent a very early collection of Schenkerian analytical research and perhaps in some way foreshadow the important Schenkerian scholarship that was later to be undertaken at the University of North Texas as part of the university's Center for Schenkerian Studies. The idea of systematically integrating the analytical methods of Schenker and Hindemith remains a subject that has only been tangentially explored by professional music theorists, either in the mid-20th century, when these two perhaps ultimately complementary schools of analysis were first influencing the American academic curriculum, or even in the decidedly more revisionist intellectual climate of the early 21st century. As demonstrated by the report of David Carson Berry's bibliography of Schenkerian research, the rigorous comparative analysis of Hindemith and Schenker has

⁹ In the concluding chapter of his thesis, Miron lists four arguments in favor of Schenker's analytical system and eleven arguments against Schenker's theory. Regarding Hindemith's theory, Miron provides six arguments in favor of the analytical system and no arguments against it. A slight element of intellectual bias may be revealed in Miron's tenth argument against Schenker's theory: "Since the preceding analyses suggest that there are certain fields in which the Schenker analysis does not apply, universality can no longer be claimed for the system ... [had] the opposite result taken place, it would equally have been a condemnation of the system for a different reason." (Ibid., 35-43.)

been an almost entirely neglected field of research, but of an area of study for which two North Texas theses may have been the first specific contributions.

References & Bibliography:

University of North Texas Theses

- Knod, Grace E. 1955. A Comparison of the Hindemith and Schenker Concepts of Tonality. M.M. thesis. Denton, TX: North Texas State College [now University of North Texas].
- Miron, Nathan. 1956. The Analytical Systems of Hindemith and Schenker as Applied to Two Works of Arnold Schoenberg. M.M. thesis. Denton, TX: North Texas State College [now University of North Texas].
- Robert, Dorothy. 1946. Modern Theories of Tonality. M.M. thesis, North Texas State College [now University of North Texas].

Paul Hindemith (Primary Sources)

- Hindemith, Paul. 1937. *Unterweisung im Tonsatz*, vol. 1: Theoretischer Teil. Mainz: B. Schott.
- _____. 1942. *The Craft of Musical Composition*, vol. 1: Theory, trans. Arthur Mendel. New York: B. Schott.
- _____. 1939. *Unterweisung im Tonsatz*, vol. 2: Übungsbuch für den zweistimmigen Satz. Mainz: B. Schott.
- _____. 1941. *The Craft of Musical Composition*, vol. 2: Exercises in Two-Part Writing, trans. Otto Ortmann. New York: B. Schott.
- _____. 1970. *Unterweisung im Tonsatz*, vol. 3: Übungsbuch für den dreistimmigen Satz. Mainz: B. Schott.
- _____. 1943. *A Concentrated Course in Traditional Harmony*. New York: B. Schott. [Also published as *Aufgaben für Harmonieschüler*. London: B. Schott, 1949].
- _____. 1948. *A Concentrated Course in Traditional Harmony*, vol. 2, *Exercises for Advanced Students*. New York: B. Schott. [Also published as *Harmonie-Übungen für Fortgeschrittene*. London: B. Schott, 1949].
- _____. 1946. *Elementary Training for Musicians*. New York: B. Schott.

Heinrich Schenker (Primary Sources)

- Schenker, Heinrich. 1906. *Harmonielehre*. Stuttgart: Cota. [English edition translated by Elizabeth Mann Borgese and edited by Oswald Jonas. Chicago: University of Chicago Press, 1954].
- _____. 1921-1924. *Der Tonwille*. Wien: Tonwille-Flugblätterverlag. [Between 1921 and 1924 Heinrich Schenker published ten volumes of *Der Tonwille* as a periodical. An English-language edition of the periodical series was published by Oxford University Press in 2004, edited by William Drabkin].

_____. 1925, 1926, 1930. *Das Meisterwerk in der Musik: Ein Jahrbuch*, 3 volumes. München: Drei Masken Verlag. [English edition – Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 1994, 1996, 1997].

_____. *Neue musikalische Theorien und Phantasien*.

Part I: *Harmonielehre*. Stuttgart: Cota, 1906. [English edition translated by Elizabeth Mann Borgese and edited by Oswald Jonas. Chicago: University of Chicago Press, 1954.]

Part II: *Kontrapunkt*, vol. 1. Stuttgart: Cota, 1910; vol. 2. Vienna: Universal Edition, 1922. [English edition translated by John Rothgeb and Jürgen Thym. New York: Schirmer, 1987.]

Part III: *Der Freie Satz*, [see below].

_____. 1945. *Der freie Satz*. Vienna: Universal Edition. [English edition translated by Ernst Oster. New York: Longman, 1979.] [*Der freie Satz* was published with a companion volume of musical examples; Vienna: Universal Edition, 1956, revised edition; an English edition of this supplemental volume was also edited and translated by Ernst Oster. New York: Longman, 1979.]

Earlier Sources Concerning Schenker's Theory

- Katz, Adele T. 1935. "Heinrich Schenker's Method of Analysis," *Musical Quarterly* 21: 311-329.
- _____. 1945. *Challenge to Musical Tradition*. New York: Knopf.
- Mann, Michael. 1949. "Schenker's Contribution to Music Theory," *The Music Review* 10: 3-26.
- Salzer, Felix. 1952. *Structural Hearing*. New York: Charles Boni.
- Sessions, Roger. 1938. "Escape by Theory," *Modern Music* 15: 192.

Recent Studies Concerning Hindemith and / or Schenker

- Baker, James M. 1990. "Voice-Leading in Post-Tonal Music: Suggestions for Extending Schenker's Theory," *Music Analysis* 9: 177-200.
- Berry, David Carson. 2004. *A Topical Guide to Schenkerian Literature: An Annotated Bibliography with Indices*. Hillsdale, NY: Pendragon Press.
- Fuller, Sarah. 1986. "On Sonority in Fourteenth-Century Polyphony: Some Preliminary Reflections," *Journal of Music Theory* 30: 35-70.
- Novack, Saul. 1990. "Foreground, Middleground, and Background: Their Significance in the History of Tonality," *Schenker Studies*, ed. by Hedi Siegel. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press. pp. 60-71.
- Stern, David. 1990. "Schenkerian Theory and the Analysis of Renaissance Music," *Schenker Studies*, ed. by Hedi Siegel, 45-59. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press.
- Straus, Joseph N. 1987. "The Problem of Prolongation in Post-Tonal Music," *Journal of Music Theory* 31: 1-21.

The Question of Autonomy of Musical Reviews in Slovenia After World War II: Between Aesthetic Judgment and Political Construct¹

by Jernej Weiss

University of Ljubljana (Slovenia)

E-Mail: jernej.weiss@ff.uni-lj.si

Web: http://www.ff.uni-lj.si/oddelki/muzikologija/sodelavci/weiss_eng.htm

Musicological research is frequently based on several concepts set in advance that musicological science should prove and confirm. These concepts often have their ideological backgrounds or can at least be connected with them², as each time period is supposed to interpret history in its own way following an ideology, setting up its own criteria for selecting historiographic material. What is left out with a certain purpose or added, having no connection with real historical facts, is, thus, much more important. Especially characteristic of ideology is a refined manner of evaluating phenomena, especially those also having such or some other meaning for the present. Another characteristic is a substantial deviation from scientific methods. The third is a one-sided use of information. One must be aware of the fact that the above-mentioned concepts can deform the real image of music history³, therefore one must be much more careful in departing from this type of frameworks and assessing one's own conclusions. It, thus, seems important to attract new sources to the historical analysis that were traditionally not given special attention to by historians, and

to take a critical distance to some secondary music-historical sources from the recent sources.

The author of the only historical review of Slovene 20th century music, Niall O'Loughlin (1978, 1999, 2004) does not mention the term 'socialist art' in the description of the Slovene music during the period after 1945, which is different from some other authors who do define it. Lojze Lebič speaks about 'normative aesthetics' (Lebič 1993, 114), Ivan Klemenčič about 'the obligatory model' (Klemenčič 1998, 325), and Gregor Pompe about 'the doctrine' (Snoj and Pompe 2003, 141-144). Leon Stefanija determines the common denominator to various social or composition variables on revealing different interpretations of socialist realism in music-historical literature in our country and writes "that socialist realism has its roots in the direct past of 'the safe traditionalism', its climax in the views of autonomy or dependence, and its end in the musical poetics of the selective restraints" (Stefanija 2006, 39). The truth of the value of the autonomous development is denied if taking into account the last framework; the art and especially the music must from now on show the mirror to the society by force, whereby it is forced to not knowingly negate the time in which it was created (Klemenčič 1998, 324). This should mean the abandonment of autonomous aesthetics and developmental discontinuity of the Slovene music (ibid., 325). However, although socialist realism was commanded, the model of this ideologically conditioned art was never clearly defined in our country (ibid.).

The new authorities did not interfere with new concrete musical aesthetic questions, but especially controlled the managing positions from where it then demoralized any unwanted initiatives. The agitation efficiency, thus, required a change in aesthetic criteria with the practical ones. Slovene composers and music institutions, thus, largely depended on the aparatchiks⁴ in the institutional hierarchy, in charge of distributing the 'cake'. Although the Slovene composers' reactions to the repression

¹ The article is an amended version of the report given at the [Royal Musical Association Research Students' Conference, held in Bristol, UK, 2007](#) (session: 'Dichotomies: 20th-Century Voices', chair: Elizabeth M. Fairweather, University of Huddersfield).

² The national concept of the history of the second half of the 19th century exposes its concept of freedom by creating a legend about the freedom lost long ago, which, however, was won again by the nation with efforts and courage, thus getting its national integrity and sovereignty. (Rozman 1989, 1249.)

³ The concrete historic reality is adapted to the ideal presentation of a fairy tale. Thus, for example, the main protagonists in Slovene history textbooks after World War II are the 'evil' bourgeoisie on the one hand and the unconditionally 'just' party at the head of the proletariat on the other side. (Ibid., 1245.)

⁴ An 'aparatchik' is an activist or an official of the party apparatus, fulfilling the superior's instructions uncritically, without any consideration. (Bajec 1994, 18.)

did not only have one meaning, their endeavors in the second half of the 1950s gradually expressed the need for freedom of creation. Vocal creativity was especially subject to incessant pressures for the popular and simple. The authorities did not prevent contacts of Slovene composers with foreign countries; however, in practice, it was extremely difficult for Slovene composers to systematically establish personal contacts with the West⁵, because the financial aid for travelling abroad was very restricted and carefully granted.⁶ The Slovene music historiography had to withdraw from the live reality in the changed circumstances, and the authorities only chose from the past what they found appropriate (Lubič 1993, 112-113). The concealed facts left irreparable and nearly fatal consequences in the Slovene music. With the loss of historic memory, the upcoming generations were, thus, deprived of the required critical medium, and a dialogue with the past was disabled.⁷ Similarly, Slovene music magazines in the difficult post-war circumstances did not achieve the level of the beginning of the century.⁸

⁵ During the first decade after the War, the cooperation with some Western European music cultures was, thus, practically impossible. Yugoslav composers were sent to modern music festivals more or less carefully as delegations. (Stefanija 2004a, 139.)

⁶ In spite of strong creative personalities from the circle around Slavko Osterc (Verzej, Slovenia, 17 June 1895 – Ljubljana, 23 May 1941), none of the compositional techniques and aesthetics recognized in the world at that time prevailed among Slovene composers. The most important works can still be attributed to the composers who had found their way already before the War. This ‘shortage’ of thought has not been compensated by any of the composer generations – not even by the advanced Slovenian composers’ group Pro Musica Viva in the 1960s. (Lubič 1993, 114.)

⁷ Pavel Šivic answered actively to the voidness that occurred due to the loss of the historic memory when setting up the advanced Slovenian performance group Collegium Musicum in 1957. This music group, which was a reflection of Šivic’s international experience – especially of the ISCM (International Society for Contemporary Music) Festival in 1957 in Zürich – familiarized the Slovenes with 20th century music kept silent and unwanted up to now. (Ibid., 117.)

⁸ The Editorial Board of the Slovenian review *Naši zbori* (Our Choirs) already worried very much that the production and quality of the post-war choir creativity no longer achieved the pre-war level. Slovenian composers Karol Pahor (1896-1974) and Janko Ravnik (1891-1982) saw the reasons in the deficient composer training and a movement towards instrumentality.

Church music – partly due to a decline of the Western European ‘middle-class’ culture – had already been marginalized in Slovenia with the abolishment of Glasbena Matica⁹ after World War II. The Organ School¹⁰ and the magazine *Cerkveni Glasbenik*¹¹ were, however, abolished deliberately,¹² similarly as Glasbena Matica. One of the leading party ideologists of that time, Boris Kidrič¹³, spoke in January

However, it seems probable to also search the reasons in the most indubitable ideological exposure of the above-mentioned type of music because of the text. (Pahor 1952, 6-8; see also Ravnik 1953, 2-3.)

⁹ Glasbena Matica, the association of professional musicians and music lovers, was founded especially to cultivate the Slovene musical art. As after 1860 the Philharmonic Society served German political goals more and more and did not support the Slovene music, Glasbena Matica was established in 1872 in Ljubljana as the central Slovene musical institution. It began to collect Slovene folk songs and to regularly issue especially Slovene authors’ compositions, which encouraged the music production in Slovenia. Aware that it will only perform its message if having sufficient musically trained performers, it opened its music school in 1882. In 1891, it also established a choir, which soon increased its quality under the leadership of Matej Hubad. After 1918, the Ljubljana Glasbena Matica successfully continued its work: in 1919, it established the Conservatory and then also the Orchestra Association. At the time of the reorganization of music education and publishing in 1945, Glasbena Matica only preserved one choir, with which it still occasionally organized concerts. (Sivec 1989, 224.)

¹⁰ In order to increase the number of capable organists and church choirmasters, the Cecily’s Association established the Organ School in Ljubljana in 1877, where singing, organ, piano, harmony, counterpoint, and music history were taught. Several important musicians came from that school. After its abolishment, it was reopened in 1971 with organ courses through the Faculty of Theology in Ljubljana. (Budkovič and Sivec 1989, 228.)

¹¹ *Cerkveni Glasbenik* (1878-1945, 1976 foll.) was a newsletter of the Cecily’s Association in Ljubljana and from 1935 on the newsletter of Slovene church musicians; after its restoration, it became a monthly newsletter for church music. The book part first published articles to defend the cecilyism and later articles with general music content, whereas with Stanko Premrl, it became the leading music newsletter, describing the musical life of that time. It is also important due to historical and music-theoretical articles. In music supplements, it initially published Cecily’s compositions (also by German composers). (Škulj 1988, 48.)

¹² This magazine only began to be published again in 1976.

¹³ Boris Kidrič (Vienna, 10 April 1912 – Belgrade, 11 April 1953) was a politician, a publicist, the general lieutenant colonel of the Yugoslav Peoples’ Army, and a national hero. He

1951 about “the repeated middle class forces from the clergy” that were supposedly one of the strongest opponents of the socialism in Slovenia (Stefanija 2004b, 163.).¹⁴ Everything connected with the church was, thus, in especially unenviable circumstances.¹⁵ The fact that the presence of church music in the public was indeed unwanted, is revealed by ‘an incident’ with a priest and one of the leading Slovene church composers in the 20th century, Matija Tomc¹⁶, who was pushed away to the edge of the central music events in Slovenia due to his open catholic orientation.¹⁷

was one of the founders of the Liberation Front. Although he had a distinctive political role, he was most closely connected with the Slovene partisan army throughout the National Liberation War. As the Liberation Front’s political secretary, he was its actual leader; among other writings, he wrote editorials for its newsletter *Slovenski poročevalec*. On May 5th, 1945, he became the President of the Slovene National Government in Ajdovščina. (Prunk 1991, 62-63.)

¹⁴ It was the “petit bourgeois blind forces” that Kidrič emphasized at the above-mentioned meeting as the main problem of the Slovene cultural environment that the communist authorities of that time faced. (Drnovšek 2000, 257.)

¹⁵ Performing artists also only exceptionally performed church compositions. Among them, we find: a benefit concert for the Red Cross on November 4th, 1946, when the violinist Zlatko Baloković played Schubert’s *Ave Maria* as an encore; *Ode on St. Cecilia’s Day* by H. Purcell, played by the Ljubljana Radio Orchestra at the concert on February 11th, 1947, conducted by Alen Busch at the Union Hall; an academy dedicated to J. S. Bach on March 30th, 1950, where the conductor D. Švara performed two Bach airs with the Academy of Music orchestra (one was from the *St. Matthew Passion*); solemn concerts dedicated to Jacobus Gallus from November 7th to 12th, 1950, where the composer’s motets were performed. (Stefanija 2004a, 140.)

¹⁶ Composer Matija Tomc (Kapljišče, 25 December 1899 – Domžale, 8 February 1986) graduated from the Faculty of Theology in Ljubljana in 1924, and in 1930 with a degree in organ performance in Vienna; there, he also studied composition. From 1930 to 1945, he was a teacher of music at the Šentvid Bishop’s Institutes in Ljubljana, then, from 1946 to 1973, a vicar or a parish priest in Domžale. From 1932 to 1947, he taught organ at Glasbena Matica, the State Conservatory and the Music Academy in Ljubljana. (Škulj 1999, 279.)

¹⁷ Although Tomc is also the author of a series of works for various instrumental compositions, at the center of his creation are his vocal works. Slovenian composer Marijan Lipovšek wrote in *Slovenska glasbena revija* in 1957: “Without any doubt, he is our first choir composer after [Emil] Adamič.” (Lipovšek 1957, 15.)

As one of the best Slovenian choirs, the Tone Tomšič Academic Choir¹⁸ celebrated its 10th anniversary¹⁹ in 1956 with a jubilee concert, at which, if possible, one of the original Slovene all-evening compositions would be performed, instead of a long series of individual compositions, as it was usual at similar concerts (Škulj 1997, 19). It was back in October 1954 that the choirmaster of that time, Radovan Gobec²⁰, visited Tomc, asking him to set a poem to music for that occasion.²¹ Tomc, who was an Honorary Member of the Academic Choir, felt special affection for the choir and accepted Gobec’s invitation. At the 100th anniversary

¹⁸ The Academic Choir is an amateur student choir, established in Ljubljana by France Marolt (1891-1951) in 1926. During the Wars, it was one of the best choirs in Slovenia, with its high artistic and technical level. Its work is being continued by the Tone Tomšič Academic Choir, established in 1946. (Kartin-Duh 1987, 34.)

¹⁹ It was the 10th anniversary of the work of the Akademski pevski zbor (APZ), conducted by Radovan Gobec during the above-mentioned period. It seems that authors for Slovene daily newspapers understand the post-war formation of the choir as the beginning of the work of the APZ, as they do not mention the 30th anniversary of the beginning of the men’s choir of the APZ, conducted by France Marolt from 1926 to 1941. Soon after World War II, Gobec continued the tradition of Marolt’s APZ; however, he mostly included new singers in the choir and changed the choir to a mixed one. In fall 1953, it was, thus, decided at the general meeting that Gobec’s APZ take over the name of Marolt’s choir and modified it to APZ “Tone Tomšič”. (Moličnik Šivic 2006, 28.)

²⁰ Radovan Gobec (Podgrad, Ilirska Bistrica, 1 June 1909 – Ljubljana, 14 April 1995) was a composer and a choirmaster. He was a teacher in various places at Štajerska, then he actively participated in the National Liberation Fight. After the liberation, he completed the study of composition at the Music Academy with B. Arnič and L. M. Škerjanc, and of conducting with D. Švara. He held, among other positions, a grammar school teacher position in Ljubljana (1945-1948), the headmaster position of the Music School in Moste (1953-1964) and, last but not least, a Professorship at the Academy of Pedagogy (1964-1972). He led 20 choirs, the longest of which were the ‘Tone Tomšič’ Academic Choir (1946-1956) and the Partisan Choir (1953-1980). (Rijavec 1989, 255.)

²¹ Gobec allegedly addressed his request for setting the piece to music to his “old friend of the Academic Choir and Marolt’s colleague and their honorary member, composer Matija Tomc.” (Anonymous 1955, 4.) He also allegedly attempted to persuade some other composers, but did not succeed – with the exception of Tomc – to make them enthusiastic about his idea. (Škulj 1997, 19.)

of Slovene poet Anton Aškerc's²² birth, the composer decided, at Gobec's request, to set the poem *Stara pravda* (Old Justice) by Aškerc to music.

Before composing the music, Tomc saw several difficulties to solve problems connected with the extreme length of the poem,²³ the staging apparatus,²⁴ and especially with frequent metric changes in Aškerc's text,²⁵ which dissuaded com-

posers to write the music for this monumental work by Aškerc for nearly 70 years after its creation. The poem symbolizes a heroic epic in ten parts of Slovenian-Croatian peasant risings, the sad climax of which was represented by 'the coronation' of Matija Gubec in Zagreb (J. P. 1956, 9). Concerning the music expression, the composer wrote that he wanted "to combine the sound of Aškerc's realism with the contemporary, not exaggerated music expression." He had written already before: "It would certainly not be appropriate to go 70 years back, to the time when the poem *Stara pravda* was created, that is back to the time of reading societies. Nor was it appropriate to compose the music intended for as vast an audience as possible, within the frameworks of contemporary extremes, let us say atonality. To join the sound of Aškerc's realism with the contemporary, not exaggerated music expression: this is the goal I had in my mind." (Tomc 1980.) However, the work does not show modern composition-technical approaches that would be outstanding in any manner from the way of thinking in the more traditional aesthetics of 19th century music, and could, thus, be disputable for some of the most orthodox spokesmen of the popular and simple in music.²⁶

The critique²⁷ in Slovene daily newspapers announced "a majestic cantata" (J. P. 1956, 9) for choir, soloists, reciter, and piano before the jubilee concert "at the 10th anniversary of the successful work of the Academic Choir" (Anonymous 1956a). The latter would supposedly mean "a rich contribution to the Slovene choir literature" (J. G. 1956, 4) and belong to the composer's "most important creations" (J. P. 1956, 9). The task undertaken by the choir, however, required "the climax of the choir interpretational potentials without any doubt" and "revealed all of its qualities and also any potential shortcomings" (ibid.). Except for a praise of

²² Anton Aškerc (Globoko, Laško, 9 January 1856 – Ljubljana, 10 June 1912) was a poet, translator and editor. Already as a student of divinity, he developed as a freethinker, doubted religious dogmas more and more, and had conflicts with his profession and superiors. He felt the consequences so that he was constantly transferred from one remote parish to another. Because of an increasing conflict with the church order, he retired earlier (in 1898) and then worked as a municipal archivist in Ljubljana until his death. (Kocijan 1987, 126-127.)

²³ In 1980, he wrote in the concert notes on the occasion of the second performance of *Stara pravda* at the concert of the Consortium Musicum choir concert on May 16th, 1980: "First, the length of the poem itself. Although art has nothing to do with calculations, this is useful in this case. *Stara pravda* consists of 835 verses. [France] Prešeren's *Sonetni venec*, set to music by Lucijan Marija Škerjanc, for example, only has 210 verses, i.e. 4 times less than *Stara pravda*. Compared to *Sonetni venec*, *Stara pravda*, set to music in a similar manner, could comprise 4 all-evening concerts. And, of course, it was only one that was desired." (Tomc 1980.) To make it possible to use the entire text of the poem, Tomc also added a speaker to vocal segments, as only in this manner he could present the entire text of the poem in a fairly short amount of time. As several points in the poem also required soloists, he used two soloists, and to support them he added the two piano soloists to them, where necessary. The latter was a prudent move, proven by the critique of the concert in *Slovenski poročevalec* in 1956 (signed by "bp"), saying that the dramatized recitative had an excellent effect and did not impair its music harmony. (BP 1956, 5.)

²⁴ The second problem that Tomc was faced with was whether the composition should only be vocal or vocal-instrumental as usual for cantatas. Tomc exclusively gave a priority to performances in Zagreb, Celje, Trbovlje, Maribor, and Belgrade, which finally discouraged the composer from the instrumentation of the work, as "no choir, even if financially very well situated, could not take an orchestra to performances in other towns, not to speak about a student choir" (Tomc 1980).

²⁵ Aškerc allegedly often changed the rhythm in *Stara pravda* suddenly, as if something had broken. This meant a new problem for the composer, who had found it difficult several times before to adapt the composition rhythm to the poem, as this change only lasted one or two verses in the poem. Thus, considerable effort was allegedly required that the composer adapted the above-mentioned metrical changes in the poem to the rhythmic course in the composition. (Ibid.)

²⁶ Boris Zihlerl (1910-1976), as 'the most orthodox one', saw dangers of deviations from 'the party line' at every step. The authorities' representatives were looking for them in artistic works and the persons, deviating from the declared political orientation for various reasons. (Gabrič 1994, 168.)

²⁷ It is characteristic that the authors of individual reviews always only sign with initials in the above-mentioned daily newspapers. Their identity, thus, remains concealed, and consequently also their professional qualification in the musical area remains questionable.

Aškerc's free thinking, as the latter was said "to have bravely renounced its profession – of being a priest,"²⁸ no more explicit ideological coloration is revealed in daily reviews. The latter announced a cultural event that would exceed the framework – at that time – of the 'popular' and 'simple' in music.

"Numberless practice" (Kmecl 1995, 1) was followed by the first performance in the big Union Hall on March 12th, 1956. As some leading party ideologists²⁹, led by the honorary patron of the concert, Boris Zihelr³⁰, the composer Tomc came to the first performance of his cantata "dressed in civil clothes and hid in the third row" (Kmecl 2000, 31). The success of the concert was enormous. In spite of some smaller shortcomings in the interpretation, critics were unanimous that "the choir was completely up to the demands set to the ensemble by Tomc's treatment" (J. G. 1956, 4). The critic in *Slovenski poročevalec* even speaks about "nicely

sounding sacral music intermezzos" (BP 1956, 5). Zmaga Kumer, thus, wrote optimistically that it was the composing power of Tomc's artistic personality, his peculiar music expression and tireless diligence that ranked Tomc among the most prominent Slovene composers and promised that his name would be heard on concert repertoires again and again (Kumer 1956). Unfortunately, "an incident in the Union Hall" (S. B. 1957a, 4) completely changed such expectations. The unpleasant event met sharp reactions of the orthodox party ideologists, who especially resented that the choir honored the composer's contribution of the catholic intellectual, Matija Tomc, after the concert. The choir management is said to have received an express instruction before the concert that the cultural event should go on without any personal rendering of homage to the composer. In spite of that, the current president and singer of the Academic Choir awarded a golden laurel wreath to the composer at Gobec's hint in order to thank Tomc, and he bowed to the audience, scanning twice as imperceptibly as possible. Gobec, as the party's member, had to return the party card already the following day³¹ and was later also called for 'brainwashing', because Tomc was a priest.³² They applied pressure to the choir so strongly that

²⁸ Because of his disputes with the Bishop of the Lavantian diocese, who allegedly reproached Aškerc for his obstinate interpretation of church matters, Aškerc asked for retirement after 17 years of his clerical service in 1898. Aškerc, a nationally-minded liberal, allegedly had experience in violent attacks from the clerical group. Daily newspapers believed that the reasons for some intellectuals' decision to study theology were mostly the financial circumstances that allegedly destroyed life goals of the "young capable Slovene intellectuals and brought them to the theological seminary" (ibid.).

²⁹ At the first performance of Tomc's cantata, the following were also present, in addition to the prominent representatives of the social life: the Vice-President of the Popular Republic of the PRS [Public Republic of Slovenia], Dr. Ferdo Kozak, the Vice-President of the Executive Council of the PRS, Dr. Marijan Breclj, a Member of the Executive Council, Boris Kocjančič, and the Chancellor of the University of Ljubljana, Dr. Anton Kuhelj. (Anonymous 1956b, 8.)

³⁰ Boris Zihelr (Trieste, 25 September 1910 – Ljubljana, 11 February 1976) was a sociologist and politician. In 1941, he graduated from the Faculty of Law in Ljubljana. Already in 1930, he became a Member of the League of Communists of Yugoslavia. After Yugoslavia's occupation, he was among the founders of the Liberation Front (1941). From August 1945 to May 1946, he was the representative of the Central Committee of the League of Communists of Yugoslavia in Moscow, then a holder of numerous political functions. As of 1949, he was the President of the Ideological Commission of the Central Committee of the League of Communists of Slovenia. From 1950 to 1953, he was the Minister for Science and Culture of the People's Republic of Slovenia, then he worked for the University of Ljubljana. (Pagon 2001, 183.)

³¹ According to Mitja Gobec, which was later entrusted to him by his father, Radovan Gobec, the latter had to come to the Secretary of the Ljubljana Municipality Committee of the League of Communists of Slovenia at that time, Janez Vipotnik, due to the above-mentioned 'incident' already one day after the first performance of the cantata *Stara pravda* (on March 13th, 1956). Vipotnik and Gobec were said to have known each other, and they were even on first-name terms with each other. According to Mitja Gobec, Janez Vipotnik asked Gobec at the above-mentioned meeting: "Radovan, do you have your party booklet with you [and] will you show it to me?" Gobec allegedly showed him the booklet and Vipotnik then allegedly 'deposited' it in the drawer of his desk and, thus, excluded Gobec from the party. (Personal conversation between the author of this article and Jožica Gobec, Radovan's second wife, on April 13, 2007.)

³² "Tomc was a priest, and this fact caused complications at that time, although he was said to have had a 'bad reputation' even with 'his people' already before the War because of his cooperation with France Marolt and Glasbena matica." (Kmecl 2000, 38; see also Gabrič 1995a, 189.)

the latter lost its conductor, thus nearly disintegrating in its initial, decade long post-war form.³³

The marks soon changed from a political vocabulary to an aesthetic one.³⁴ The editor-in-chief and the responsible editor of *Slovenski poročevalec* (Slovenian reporter), Sergej Vošnjak³⁵, used the farce as an occasion to attack the critics, who, in his opinion, should have merely assessed the art from artistic standpoints, without taking into account political ones. In a longer article entitled “The Review of a Review” less than a month after the incident on April 8th, 1956, he wrote in *Slovenski poročevalec* among other things: “I think that the basic weakness of our cultural review is that it does not assess each

work in its entirety, according to its general social role, but attempts to separate some ‘aesthetic’ elements, or we could even say a craft part, which is supposedly the subject of the art critique, from the general social significance of that work, with which (if possible as little as possible, of course!) ‘political’ reviews should deal. [...] The ‘Tone Tomšič’ AC celebrated the tenth anniversary of its work with chants. One would expect that, therefore, the basic thought of the review would be that such a choir should by its character and name say something new and advanced in its song. However, the critics only spoke about the sounding and harmony of voices ... It also spoke in general about the problem of composing individual song cycles, but avoided the thought that the fight for old justice did not consist of a request to heaven but was hard and cruel. Therefore, of course, such a review of the AC cannot be of any benefit at all, as the main point is not to formally praise the choir but that reviews help the choir to take a better way, to be more successful, whereby whether a sentence will be more or less fortissimo is not very important.” (Vošnjak 1956, 6)

The initial, too favorable, and not numerous enough political reviews, thus, had to give way to ‘better ones’, reproaching that such a revolutionary ensemble sang ‘chants’ and ‘requests to heaven’ at its tenth anniversary.³⁶ Tomc wanted to answer to the newspaper that there were only 18 measures of ‘chant’ music, that is of music with religious content, in the entire two-hour piece, and even these could only be marked as religious because of the character of Aškerc’s text.³⁷

With all 18 measures, which were supposedly “a manifestation of reactionary antipopular tendencies,” and the fact that the score also includes the mark ‘ironically’ and ‘imitating’³⁸, etc., he thought he would complicate the matter even more with a letter that would most likely not even be published (Kmecl 2000, 38). In his answer to *Slovenska glasbena revija* (Slovenian Musical Review), the

³³ After the performance in Zagreb, Gobec resigned from the post of the Academic Choir conductor under the pressures. Critics, however, ‘understood’ the event somewhat differently, as they connected his resignation with his acceptance of the post as the Managing Director of the Ljubljana Festival. Gobec allegedly did no longer have enough time to conduct the Academic Choir. (S. B. 1957b, 4.) In spite of that, according to his spouse, Jožica Gobec, it seems that he mostly resigned because of his disagreement with the repressive approaches of the authorities of that time.

³⁴ Slovene daily newspapers marginalized the above-mentioned incident with provincial stoicism. Thus, for example, one could find the following report: “Last November, the choir had ninety-four members, and today, its number has decreased to under seventy.” (S. B. 1957a, 4.) “After this several-month crisis, the composer Janez Bole allegedly agreed to become the choir’s conductor.” (S. B. 1957b, 4.) Critics, thus, soon showed their other face, as after that the first performance of Tomc’s cantata was mostly deliberately colored as third-class. Headlines such as “Out of the Darkness” appear in daily newspapers (S. B. 1957a, 4), “as the culture of the Slovene choir singing is said to have strongly decreased today despite strong financial supports.” (BP 1956, 5.)

³⁵ Sergej Vošnjak (Ptuj, 6 October 1924 – Ljubljana, 13 November 2005) was a journalist and cultural worker. He cooperated in the National Liberation Fight, worked in the Editorial Office of *Mladina* and later of *Slovenski pionir*. After World War II, he was, among other positions he held, the Editor of *Mladina* and *Pionir*, since 1947 the correspondent of *Borba* from Austria and the Editor of its Slovene edition, then the Director of the Information Office of the Government of the People’s Republic of Slovenia (1949-1951), the Responsible Editor of *Slovenski poročevalec* (1951-1959), the Editor-in-Chief of the newspaper and the Ljudska pravica publishing house (1961-1967), the Editor of the cultural section of *Delo* (1967-1973), and the Principal of Mestno gledališče ljubljansko (1973-1981). He wrote articles, songs, sketches and novelles with partisan and autobiographic motives. (Pohar 2000, 362.)

³⁶ This is an excerpt of 18 measures from the 5th sentence (Tlaka [Socage]) in Section 4.

³⁷ See Example 1 at the end of this article.

³⁸ The choir (peasants) imitates the lord of the castle in the last three measures of the above-mentioned section as a recitation.

Slovene pianist and composer Marijan Lipovšek³⁹, who was the only one to publicly condemn such a manner of political reckoning in daily newspapers that he found disputable, clearly pointed out that Vošnjak's article was a sort of Andrei Zhdanov's cultural and political reckoning: "Critics did not correctly evaluate *Stara pravda*. Unfortunately, even journalists interfered with the review, attempting not only to belittle the composition with dilettantish remarks, but also attributed 'devout' purposes to Tomc that, without any doubt, he did not have. Thereby, they talked such nonsense that it was, of course, completely clear to us, musicians, which way the wind blew. However, the broad public, having respect for music problems of the composition, and, of course, also for a journalist, especially if he was the editor-in-chief and the responsible editor of one of the two biggest newspapers, tends to believe that the situation is such as written by the journalist, especially because it is more comfortable and safer to go off with one's tail between one's legs. And this was what the majority of our critics did." (Lipovšek 1957, 15.) In the previous number, he also wrote: "As far as I know, Tomc does not have appropriate employment for his talent, diligence and the already created compositional work. To push off such a composer to Domžale [Ljubljana's suburb] to a lower grammar school, is the blindness of the first rank. Culture is not to be supported in this manner." (Lipovšek 1955, 41.)

Orthodox party ideologists, however, did not like open polemics, as, in their opinion, it was not appropriate that the fight for "the art of the national

in the form and the socialist in the content" (Shostakowitsch 1995, 30) was not appropriate to be conducted on magazine pages. Thus, Lipovšek, too, was soon compelled to be silent. It seems that the authorities interpreted the affair, in spite of the mitigated standpoints towards the catholic intelligentsia, adopted in the same year at the session of the Executive Committee of the League of Communists of Slovenia⁴⁰, as an attempt to strengthen the catholic conceptual influence.⁴¹

However, in spite of a similar sequence of events, it would be, considering the fatal consequences, difficult to compare the above-mentioned reckoning with, let us say, the destructible leading article in the official party newspaper *Pravda* ("Chaos Instead of Music")⁴² and, consequently, Shostakovich's artistic liquidation that sprang a real campaign against the so-called "formalistic" (Slonimsky 2004, 215) composers in the Soviet Union.⁴³

On February 10th, 1948, the Central Committee of the League of Communists in the Soviet

⁴⁰ At the session of the Executive Committee of the League of Communists of Slovenia on October 29th, 1956, an agreement was made that religious statements, as related to the protection of cultural monuments such as church buildings, etc., could be attenuated and released in some cases. (Gabrič 1995b, 185.)

⁴¹ The changing standpoint of Slovene daily newspapers of that time is revealed most directly in relation to the Slovenian poet Edvard Kocbek (1904-1981). With a planned attempt to discipline the catholic intellectual Edvard Kocbek through media in the first months of 1952, the consequence of which was his forced retirement, the authorities of that time considered that it was urgent to send a clear signal to any other offenders. (Gabrič 2005, 1025; see also Gabrič 1995c, 185.)

⁴² "The listener is puzzled from the first moment of this opera by the intentionally not beautiful, confused flood of sounds. Fragments of the melody, embryos of music phrases are drowned in the noise, creaking and wailing, then they escape and are drowned again. To follow this 'music' is difficult, to remember it – is impossible." (Volkov 2002, 23.)

⁴³ The opera *Lady Macbeth of the Mtsensk District* was staged as a premiere on January 22nd, 1934, in Leningrad. On January 28th, 1936, a ruining editorial was published in the party newspaper *Pravda*, which was allegedly dictated by Stalin himself. The condemnation of the above-mentioned opera should be especially understood as a warning to Shostakovich and any other 'formalist' composers that they would no further create an unhealthy climate for the development of the Soviet music with their 'chaotic' ideas and spoil the Soviet composers' younger generation. (Volkov 2002, 23.)

³⁹ Marijan Lipovšek (Ljubljana, 26 January 1910 – Ljubljana, 25 December 1995) was a composer and pianist. He graduated from the Ljubljana Conservatory in 1932 in composition (with S. Osterc) and completed his piano studies (with J. Ravnik). From 1932 to 1933, he attended advance studies at the Master School of the Prague Conservatory (composition with J. Suk and A. Hába; piano with V. Kurz). He pursued advanced studies of compositional techniques with A. Casella in Rome (1939-1940) and with J. Marx in Salzburg (1944). He taught at the Conservatory or the Music Academy in Ljubljana from 1933 to 1976, from 1961 as a full Professor. Lipovšek was the Managing Director of the Slovene Philharmonic Society (1956-1964) and the Chancellor of the Music Academy (1968-1970). He lectured music theory subjects at the Musicology Department of the Faculty of Arts (1969-1970). (Rijavec 1992, 195-196.)

Union issued a resolution in which it condemned the failure to create music of Soviet realism and attacked the composers of “formalistic, antipopular tendencies” (Slonimsky 1994, 1055-1057). The resolution, among other things, did away with the most talented Soviet composers, among them Shostakovich and Prokofiev, and condemned composers (Shebalin, Khachaturian, Gavril Popov and even Myaskovsky⁴⁴) “in whose works the formalistic overturns, foreign to Soviet people and their artistic tendencies, are especially blatant” (Slonimsky 1994, 1055-1057). The resolution, differently from the fairly loose standpoints accepted at the session of the Executive Committee of Slovenia’s League of Communists (Gabrič 1995b, 185), not only concretely gave advantage to vocal music over instrumental compositions, to program music⁴⁵ over absolute music, to popular music over elite music⁴⁶, to optimistic music over decadent music (Slonimsky 1994, 1055-1057), but also set a precisely determined hierarchy of the responsibility of aparatchiks for an efficient implementation of unanimously confirmed resolutions.⁴⁷ In spite of that, Shostakovich was not completely excluded from the public life because of his jurodiv⁴⁸ role between a protagonist

and a victim of the Soviet regime,⁴⁹ which was different from Tomc. Although his works disappeared from repertoires and although children in schools learned by heart texts about ‘the big damage’ caused by Shostakovich to the socialist art, he was given a Professor’s post at the Leningrad Conservatory already the year after the reckoning.

If compared to the brutal media terror of Soviet daily newspapers of that time⁵⁰ and considerable more direct reckoning in the central German music daily *Allgemeine Musik-Zeitung* after the Nazi takeover of power,⁵¹ music critics in the second half of the 1950s in Slovenia seem considerably more reserved to concrete political reckonings. Although it seems that this was not the ‘hard’ settlement of the ‘hostile element’ and that the Slovene variant of the totalitarianism in the musical field, thus, cannot be equaled with the circumstances and consequences in the politically comparable political systems (Stefanija 2004a, 144), it must be admitted that only more detailed research of individual actors and institutions to whom the researchers have not paid more extensive attention up to now, except for

⁴⁴ The latter was proclaimed to be one of the Soviet realism’s most representative composers. (Taruskin 2005, 777.)

⁴⁵ This is especially true for music with socialist topics depicting the achievements of the revolution. (Slonimsky 1994, 1055-1057.)

⁴⁶ The latter is said to be incomprehensible with its deviation and aesthetics of the elite modernism (ibid.).

⁴⁷ It seems that never before – not even in Nazi Germany – had composers been so directly called to epigones of the previous composers’ generations. (Taruskin 2005, 11.)

⁴⁸ A jurodivij has the talent to see and hear what others know nothing about. However, in his vision, he deliberately speaks to the world in paradoxes and codes. He plays a fool, whereas in reality, he persistently unmask evil and injustice. The beginnings of the jurodivij movement date back to the 15th century, and even further back. It existed as late as the 18th century as a noticeable phenomenon. All the time, jurodivijs could make accusations and remain relatively safe. Their influence is immense. Many intellectuals became jurodivijs because of some sort of intellectual critique, a protest. Shostakovich was not the only one to have become ‘a new jurodivij’. This behavioral pattern became relatively popular in our cultural environment. For modern jurodivijs, the world lays in ruins, and an attempt to create a new society seemed to them – at least for that time – very obviously condemned to a failure.

They thought that new ideas may only be confirmed as their ‘opposite’. A message had to be given to them through a stage of derision, sarcasm, and craziness. These artists selected unimportant, rude, and deliberately awkward words to express the deepest thoughts. Those words, however, did not have a simple meaning. They comprised double or triple implications. (Volkov 2002, 20-21.)

⁴⁹ As written by the musicologist Boris Asafjev, Shostakovich ran “[...] from some sort of internal conflict to an area where he half preached and was half a jurodivij” (ibid., 21). Although he took an active standpoint of disagreeing with the system and expressed it in a subtle way in his music, he is still considered abroad as one of the leading Soviet composers. (Taruskin 2005, 780-791.)

⁵⁰ In Slovene daily newspapers, it is nearly impossible to find headlines such as “Down with the Bourgeois Aesthetics and Formalism,” “Down with Lawyers of Chaos in Music,” “Let Music Live for Millions,” etc. (Slonimsky 2004, 90.)

⁵¹ “Arnold Schönberg and Franz Schreker, professors of the master school for composition at the Music Academy in Berlin, have been suspended by the Cultural Ministry.” (Anonymous 1933, 316.) In 1937, the marking of degenerate music called ‘Entartete Musik’ (Degenerate Music) was established in Nazi Germany, and all musicians of Jewish heritage as well as other selected composers were removed from public life. (Taruskin 2005, 754-756.)

rare exceptions,⁵² led to a more realistic image of the post-war Slovene musical arena. In any case, this was not only ‘the circumstance’ but a planned calculation of high-ranking State figures, achieving a degree of repression without any superfluous exposure by appointing in the first line politically loyal co-workers on editorial and other posts. For composers and music-performing artists, the refined manner of reckoning through the party aparatchiks that led to very similar results as a directly threatening artistic accusation, thus, seems especially dangerous: to self-censorship or to shelve the work. (Schostakowitsch 1995, 31. See also Loparnik 1984, 90-92.)

Thus, Tomc wrote in a letter dated 1973 to Radovan Gobec, which seems to have been dictated by his long-time bitterness, because *Stara pravda* was never again ranked in the concert repertoire, due to the above-mentioned scandal, at the time of celebrations of the four hundredth anniversary of the peasant rising in Slovenia: “I knew at once that this year, too, *Stara pravda* would not be staged when I saw who was in the committee, organizing all of this year’s celebrations.”⁵³ Probably, such and similar ‘political’ committees did not lack in the past either. In 1973, Tomc probably thought that ‘the qualified public’ may have realized the situation and that in all the enthusiasm to celebrate the anniversary of the peasant rising somebody might remember his music. However, this did not happen.⁵⁴

If two of the most brutal totalitarianisms of the 20th century in their roughest forms of the Soviet Socialist Realism and the German National Socialism paid special attention to the art and consequently to the artistic political review, Tomc’s artistic liquidation is an attempt of a primarily political construct. Its main purpose seems to be the reckoning with the clergy⁵⁵ and, at the same time, the disciplining of the critique, by showing ‘the correct’ guidelines of critical writing. The latter is not supposed to be capable of sufficient insight in the social uselessness of the mere ‘aesthetic’ writing and consequently not capable of a sufficient political condemnation of ‘deviant’ social phenomena.

It seems that Tomc and Aškerc were fairly less disputable in the strictly musical or literary respect for the authorities of that time than, let us say, Shostakovich and Leskov⁵⁶. In the second half of the 1950s, the new authorities in Slovenia seemed to give a feeling that music creators took quite autonomous decisions, but consistently took care of the sufficient level of self-censure through different ‘levers’ (especially through unwritten rules, and indirectly also by awarding funds and different more or less decisive warnings; see Gabrič 1995b, 54-57). This was deliberate adaptability to preserve the power at the price of ideological consistency, and to ensure stronger support in the world for itself on ‘self-management’. In the outside, the authorities, thus, washed their hands and, at the same time, strengthened their faultless self-image. The scope of the society’s ideological supervision was, thus, seemingly restricted from the directly creative

⁵² With respect to the above-mentioned topic, the following publications could be included among the rare contributions in the musical field from the most recent period: Klemenčič 1998, Barbo 2001, Stefanija 2004b, and Stefanija 2004a.

⁵³ Matija Tomc’s letter to Radovan Gobec (Domžale, 1973) is in possession of Gobec’s spouse, Jožica Gobec.

⁵⁴ The cantata was staged again for the first time seven years later – on May 16th, 1980 – at the concert of the Consortium Musicum choir and conducted by Mirko Cuderman (*Koncert ob osemdesetletnici skladatelja Matije Tomca*, May 16th, 1980, Ljubljana) and then, on May 14th, 2006, within the vocal season of the Slovene Philharmonic Society. Again, the Consortium Musicum choir cooperated in the performance, performing the cantata together with the Slovene chamber choir conducted by Mirko Cuderman (*The Slovene Chamber Choir’s 8th concert of the Vocal season ticket*, May 14th, 2006, Ljubljana 2006).

⁵⁵ At least two of his peers found themselves in a similarly unenviable situation as Tomc soon after the end of World War II: Stanko Premrl (1880-1965) and Alojzij Mav (1898-1977). (Stefanija 2004a, 141-142.)

⁵⁶ Nikolaj Semjonovich Leskov (Gorohovo, 16 February 1831 – Petersburg, 5 March 1895) was a Russian writer. He came from a clerical family, and was later trained in Orlo. Then, he worked as a clerk in Kijev and as a representative of an English trade company. Since 1860, he was a professional journalist, living in St. Petersburg most of the time. He wrote novels and especially stories from the life of Russian people, landlords, peasants, craftsmen, clerks, and countryside priests. With the above-mentioned works, emphasizing the satirical tendency, he transformed the principles of the Russian realistic storytelling. In 1865, he wrote the story *Lady Macbeth of the Mtsensk District*. (Setschkareff 1959, 3-38.)

sphere⁵⁷; however, it remained everywhere else, both at the institutional level in culture and education and, of course, in the personnel policy.

The survey of the critique discussed in this paper is far from sufficient to set up a framework, delineating a dividing line between the artistic and political in the music critique of that time in Slovenia. It seems that by critically reviewing the sources, only the first step would be made in a series of basic music-historical tasks to determine a more realistic picture of some of the already quite distant chapters of the recent Slovene music history. However, by merely taking into account such type of research, one could probably finally be protected from ideological polemics without any facts, which, unfortunately, too often marked individuals' artistic destinies through music history.

Literature

- Anonymous. 1933. "Personal-Nachrichten," *Allgemeine Musik Zeitung* 60/23: 316.
- Anonymous. 1955. "[Stara Pravda]," *Slovenski poročevalec* 16/226: 4.
- Anonymous. 1956a. "Pred jubilejnim koncertom ob desetletnici uspešnega dela Akademskega pevskega zbora," *Ljubljanski dnevnik* 6/58: 4.
- Anonymous. 1956b. "Jubilejni koncert APZ," *Slovenski poročevalec* 17/61: 8.
- Bajec, Anton, et al. Eds. 1994. *Slovar slovenskega knjižnega jezika*. Ljubljana: Državna založba Slovenije.
- Barbo, Matjaž. 2001. *Pro musica viva: Prispevek k slovenski moderni po II. svetovni vojni*. Ljubljana: Znanstveni inštitut Filozofske fakultete.
- BP. 1956. "Pojó, pojó, da še nikdar tako ...," *Slovenski poročevalec* 17/62: 5.
- Budkovič, Cvetko, and Jože Sivec. 1989. "Glasbeno šolstvo," *Enciklopedija Slovenije*, vol. 3, ed. by Dušan Voglar. Ljubljana: Založba Mladinska knjiga. p. 228.
- Drnovšek, Darinka. 2000. *Zapisniki politbiroja CK ZPS / ZKS 1945-1954*. Ljubljana: Arhivsko društvo Slovenije.
- Gabrič, Aleš. 1994. "Zajčeva Požgana trava v očeh partijskih ideologov," *Nova revija* 13/147-148: 162-169.
- Gabrič, Aleš. 1995a. "Izključitev Teološke fakultete iz Ljubljane," *Slovenska kronika XX. stoletja: 1941-1995*, ed. by Marjan Drnovšek and Drago Bajt. Ljubljana: Nova revija. p. 189.
- Gabrič, Aleš. 1995b. *Socialistična kulturna revolucija. Slovenska kulturna politika 1953-1962*. Ljubljana: Cankarjeva založba.
- Gabrič, Aleš. 1995c. "Kocbekov Strah in pogum," *Slovenska kronika XX. stoletja: 1941-1995*, ed. by Marjan Drnovšek and Drago Bajt. Ljubljana: Nova revija. p. 185.
- Gabrič, Aleš. 2005. "Intelektualci kot opozicija," *Od programa Zedinjene Slovenije do mednarodnega priznanja Republike Slovenije 1848-1992, Slovenska novejša zgodovina* 2, ed. by Jasna Fischer et al. Ljubljana: Mladinska knjiga. pp. 1024-1026.
- Kartin-Duh, Monika. 1987. "Akademski pevski zbor," *Enciklopedija Slovenije*, vol. 1, ed. by Dušan Voglar. Ljubljana: Založba Mladinska knjiga. p. 34.
- J. G. 1956. "Jubilejni koncert ob desetletnici Akademskega pevskega zbora," *Ljubljanski dnevnik* 6/67: 4.
- J. P. 1956. "Pred jubilejnim koncertom Akademskega pevskega zbora. Aškerčeva 'Stara pravda' v novi luči," *Tedenska tribuna* 4/10: 9.
- Klemenčič, Ivan. 1998. "Glasba in totalitarna država na Slovenskem," *Temna stran meseca: kratka zgodovina totalitarizma v Sloveniji 1945-1990*, ed. by Drago Jančar. Ljubljana: Nova revija. pp. 321-333.
- Kmecl, Matjaž. 1995. "In memoriam Radovan Gobec (1. 6. 1909 – 14. 4. 1995)," *Naši zbori* 47/1-3: 1.
- Kmecl, Matjaž. 2000. "Vrtičkarjevi zimski dnevi. Dr. Matjaž Kmecl: Dnevnik (1)," *Sobotna priloga, Delo* 42/12: 38.
- Kocijan, Gregor. 1987. "Aškerc, Anton," *Enciklopedija Slovenije*, vol. 1, ed. by Dušan Voglar. Ljubljana: Založba Mladinska knjiga. pp. 126-127.
- Kumer, Zmaga. 1956. *Matija Tomc. Koncert ob desetletnici zbora in v počastitev stoletnice rojstva Antona Aškerca*, Ljubljana: [a concert sheet of APZ Tone Tomšič], March 12, 1956.
- Lebič, Lojze. 1993. "Glasovi časov (II): O slovenski glasbeni ustvarjalnosti," *Naši zbori* 45/5-6: 111-118.
- Lipovšek, Marijan. 1955. "Iz našega glasbenega življenja. Edicije DSS," *Slovenska glasbena revija* 3/1-2: 41.
- Lipovšek, Marijan. 1957. "Koncertna sezona 1955/56," *Slovenska glasbena revija* 4/1: 15.
- Loparnik, Borut. 1984. *Biti skladatelj. Pogovori s Primožem Ramovšem*. Ljubljana: Slovenska matica.
- Moličnik Šivic, Simona. 2006. *Mladi že 80 let: Akademski pevski zbor 'Tone Tomšič'*. Ljubljana: Narodna in univerzitetna knjižnica.
- O'Loughlin, Niall. 1978. *Slovenian Composition Since the First World War*. Ph.D. dissertation. Leicester, UK: University of Leicester.
- _____. 1999. "A Not Entirely Harmonious Success: The cutting edge of Slovenian music since independence," *Central European Review* 1/15 (October 4th, 1999) <http://www.ce-review.org/99/15/oloughlin15.html> (accessed on November 11, 2007).
- _____. 2004. "Slovenian music in its Central European context: The 20th-century experience," *Muzikološki zbornik* 40/1-2: 267-276.

⁵⁷ And even here, he could be supervised, for example with state awards. (Klemenčič 1998, 330.)

So sure - ly you've said nine rose - ma - ries to - day, for

you are a ho - ly man, long may you pray, now

our backs can feel the load, oh Lord now our backs can

feel the load, oh Lord. And in church yesterday how I did see you sigh, oh

I beat them too lit - tle, you seemed to cry, kneeling there in the pew near the al - tar!

Example 1: Matija Tomc's Stara pravda (Old justice), 5th sentence (Tlaka [Socage]), Section 4.

- Pagon, Neda. 2001. "Ziherl, Boris," *Enciklopedija Slovenije*, vol. 15, ed. by Dušan Voglar. Ljubljana: Založba Mladinska knjiga. p. 183.
- Pahor, Karol. 1952. "Kriza v naši zborovski glasbi," *Naši zbori* 7/3: 6-8.
- Pohar, Lado. 2000. "Vošnjak, Sergej," *Enciklopedija Slovenije*, vol. 14, ed. by Dušan Voglar. Ljubljana: Založba Mladinska knjiga. p. 14.
- Prunk, Janko. 1991. "Kidrič, Boris – Peter," *Enciklopedija Slovenije*, vol. 5, ed. by Dušan Voglar. Ljubljana: Založba Mladinska knjiga. pp. 62-63.
- Ravnik, Janko. 1953. "Še nekaj besed o krizi v zborovski glasbi," *Naši zbori* 8/1-2: 2-3.
- Rijavec, Andrej. 1989. "Gobec, Radovan," *Enciklopedija Slovenije*, vol. 3, ed. by Dušan Voglar. Ljubljana: Založba Mladinska knjiga. p. 255.
- Rijavec, Andrej. 1992. "Lipovšek, Marijan," *Enciklopedija Slovenije*, vol. 6, ed. by Dušan Voglar. Ljubljana: Založba Mladinska knjiga. pp. 195-196.
- Rozman, Tatjana. 1989. "Ideološke vsebine zgodovine na Slovenskem," *Nova revija* 8/89-90: 1240-1257.
- S. B. 1957a. "Ven iz teme, Ob XII. občnem zboru Akademskoga pevskega zbora 'Tone Tomšič'," *Tribuna* 5/16-17: 4.
- S. B. 1957b. "Pro et contra, Peti in peti," *Tribuna* 5/14: 4.
- Schostakowitsch, Dmitri. 1995. *Chaos statt Musik? Briefe an einen Freund*, ed. by Isaak Dawydowitsch Glikman. Berlin: Argon.
- Setschkareff, Vsevolod. 1959. *N. S. Leskov: Sein Leben und sein Werk*. Wiesbaden: Otto Harrassowitz.
- Sivec, Jože. 1989. "Glasbena matica," *Enciklopedija Slovenije*, vol. 3, ed. by Dušan Voglar. Ljubljana: Založba Mladinska knjiga, 1989. pp. 224.
- Slonimsky, Nicolas. 1994. *Music since 1900*, 5th edition. New York: Schirmer.
- Slonimsky, Nicolas. 2004. *Writings on Music*, ed. by Electra Slonimsky Yourke, vol. II: "Russian and Soviet Music and Composers," New York and London: Routledge.
- Snoj, Jurij, and Gregor Pompe. 2003. *Pisna podoba glasbe na Slovenskem*. Ljubljana: ZRC SAZU.
- Stefanija, Leon. 2004a. "Totalitarnost režima in glasba," *In memoriam Danilo Pokorn*, ed. by Nataša Cigoj Krstulović, Tomaž Faganel, and Metoda Kokole. Ljubljana: Muzikološki inštitut ZRC SAZU. pp. 135-146.
- Stefanija, Leon. 2004b. "Elusive Contents: Two Notes on Socialist Realism and Slovenian Music," *Socialist realism and music*, ed. by Mikuláš Bek, Geoffrey Chew, and Petr Macek. Brno: Koniasch Latin Press. pp. 158-168.
- Stefanija, Leon. 2006. "Topologija meril o slovenski glasbi po letu 1945: tradicionalno, moderno, postmoderno," *Stoletja glasbe na Slovenskem*, 20. slovenski glasbeni dnevi, ed. by Primož Kuret. Ljubljana: Festival Ljubljana. pp. 36-43.
- Škulj, Edo. 1988. "Cerkveni glasbenik," *Enciklopedija Slovenije*, vol. 2, ed. by Dušan Voglar. Ljubljana: Založba Mladinska knjiga. p. 48.
- Škulj, Edo. 1997. "Tomčeve kantate," *Tomčev zbornik*, ed. by Edo Škulj. Ljubljana: Družina. pp. 13-22.
- Škulj, Edo. 1999. "Tomc, Matija," *Enciklopedija Slovenije*, vol. 13, ed. by Dušan Voglar. Ljubljana: Založba Mladinska knjiga, 1999. p. 279.
- Taruskin, Richard. 2005. *The Oxford History of Western Music*, vol. 4: The Early Twentieth Century. Oxford: Oxford University Press.
- Tomc, Matija. 1980. *Uglasbitev Stare pravde. Koncert ob osemdesetletnici skladatelja Matije Tomca*. Ljubljana: [a concert sheet of the Consortium Musicum Association], May 16, 1980.
- Volkov, Salomon. 2002. *Spomini Dmitrija Šostakoviča, kakor jih je slišal in uredil Solomon Volkov*. Ljubljana: Nova revija.
- Vošnjak, Sergej. 1956. "Kritika kritike," *Slovenski poročevalac* 17/83: 6.

Book Reviews

Popular Music Censorship in Africa

by Kelly Thurmond

E-Mail: kelly_thurmond@yahoo.com

Drewett, Michael, and Martin Cloonan. Eds. *Popular Music Censorship in Africa*. Hampshire, England: Ashgate, 2006. ISBN: 978-0-7546-5291-5. 228 pages, \$99.95, £55.00. <http://www.ashgate.com>

The fascinating history of Africa over the past century is full of examples of censorship. Martin Cloonan and Michael Drewett tackle this complicated subject as editors of *Popular Music Censorship in Africa*. Cloonan and Drewett felt that censorship of music across Africa had not previously been addressed in an organized way, and they were indeed successful at addressing this neglected issue. As one would expect from a collection of essays, this compilation gives a thorough overview of the many examples of music censorship in various African countries.

One aspect of this compilation that is particularly helpful is that the first and last chapters provide an excellent framework of the entire book. In the first essay, "Popular Music Censorship in Africa: An Overview," Cloonan previews the specific aspects of censorship that will be covered throughout the book. This primary chapter unifies the subjects of all of the essays, which may be more apparent and constructive to the reader upon completion of the book. The final chapter, "Concluding Comments on the Censorship of Popular Music in Africa," was written by both editors. It acts as an ideal conclusion, complete with interesting insights that had not been previously mentioned, but also reflecting on the ideas expressed collectively in the essays.

The collection of 14 essays is divided into two sections: 'Issues' and 'Case Studies'. The 'Issues' essays concern only post-colonial Africa and contemplate the concept of 'progressive censorship.' Drewett debates whether or not the cultural boycott in South Africa during apartheid should be considered defensible censorship. Diane Thram dis-

cusses media control and unofficial censorship of music in Zimbabwe, established by the Mugabe regime (from 1980 on). The 'Case Studies' section discusses both colonial and post-colonial periods and provides detailed insight into issues surrounding autonomy in African nations. Graeme Ewens examines the intriguing case of Franco Luambo Makiadi. Although Franco was a respected musician and citizen, he enjoyed provoking people, and his music was thought to include indirect criticism. In 1978, he released two sexually explicit songs that incited outrage. In order to decide his fate, the 'powers that be' played the songs to his mother and made their decision based on her reaction.

This collection expands the narrow concept of censorship to the broader concept of policing. In doing so, it displays the variety of ways music can be censored. Each essay gives examples of the methods of censorship used – ranging from promoting other forms of music, to intimidation and career damage, and to the assassination of artists. Musicians had to be cautious and clever if they wanted their music to be heard. The book also successfully displays how censorship was a factor in post-colonial as well as colonial societies. Such censorship was not limited to government entities, but was also carried out by broadcasters, vigilantes, and liberation organizations. Kelly M. Askew and John Francis Kitime, for example, describe how the artist Kali Kali was imprisoned for singing songs about political corruption, despite the fact that he had been a loyal supporter of the nationalist cause in Tanzania.

A prevailing characteristic of this book is that in discussing certain aspects of the main subject, it is also able to address broader issues, including the political upheaval in Africa in the past century, music censorship in general, and the struggles associated with freedom of expression. Dylan Craig and Nomalanga Mkhize's chapter on Rwanda focuses on the musician Simon Bikindi and the radio station RTL, and in doing so contemplate the

events that led up to the genocide in Rwanda in 1994.

Even though a few chapters focus on specific musicians, such as South Africa's Mbongeni Ngema and Johnny Clegg's groups Juluka and Savuka, they also address the context and development of censorship in the country. The reader is left with a fascinating overview of the similarities and differences in the manifestation of censorship in each country that is discussed. A little more attention is placed on South Africa, which is the subject of three essays. Otherwise, each of the 'inner chapters' discusses a different country. For those interested in the music of the artists discussed, half of the essays include a discography.

This compilation displays how musicians have, in effect, become messengers for society, acting as a voice for the people. This is most evident in the essay "Why Don't You Sing about the Leaves and the Dreams? Reflecting on Music Censorship in Apartheid South Africa" by Clegg and Drewett. The intriguing title comes from a question posed in a Juluka song. The singer's response to the inquiry explains an obligation to sing about political issues. The book advocates freedom of speech, public debate, and opposing voices, rather than 'defensible censorship' supported by the state (p. 218). The final chapter includes a section "African popular music censorship in a post-11 September age" that emphasizes similar situations in the U.S. and Africa in which politically correct censorship existed. Cloonan and Drewett believe that in both cases, the goal was to silence the voices that may disturb a

democracy in a delicate state. This notion is reflected in many of the essays, which indicate that the process of unity actually brings about forms of censorship.

The reader need not be familiar with the history and aspects of colonialism in Africa, because each essay is successful in setting up the political background and describing censorship within that context. Also, the book distinguishes characteristics of African popular music from Western popular music, namely North American, when necessary. Cloonan hopes that the insights of a broad amount of contributors, including 'outsiders,' will be beneficial. Indeed, the contributors do have a wide variety of research interests, including anthropology, political science, propaganda, popular culture, and gender studies. Many of them are active in the media as producers, photographers, and documentary filmmakers. Several of them either attended school or teach in Africa.

By documenting the struggles that many musicians faced in various African countries, this book provides a wonderful survey of the subject matter. Though each country has its own unique situation, most of them faced a difficult transition period to a post-colonial era, which presented opportunities for censorship to thrive. The essays are successful at reflecting collectively on the topic, and go beyond the subject at hand. For anyone interested in African culture, censorship, human rights, or the freedom of expression, *Popular Music Censorship in Africa* would be incredibly informative.

An Anthology for Sight Singing

by Anne Weaver

E-Mail: annecw515@yahoo.com

Karpinski, Gary S., and Richard Kram. *Anthology for Sight Singing*. New York, NY: W. W. Norton, 2007. ISBN: 978-0-393-97382-2. \$60.00. <http://www.wwnorton.com>

The new *Anthology for Sight Singing* by Gary S. Karpinski and Richard Kram is designed to support

a multi-semester aural skills program. It contains over 1200 melodies, emphasizing various aspects of music theory as it relates to sight singing and other aural skills. While the *Anthology* directly corresponds with Karpinski's *Manual for Ear Training and Sight Singing* [New York: W. W. Norton, 2007], it could easily supplement other aural skills curricula.

The *Anthology* begins with simple concepts such as skips within the tonic triad, major keys, ties

and dotted rhythms, as well as compound meters. Other concepts throughout the book include an emphasis on each of the diatonic triads, chromatic harmonies such as the Neapolitan and German augmented sixth chords, hemiolas, modulations to closely related keys, modulations to distant keys, advanced rhythms, and non-diatonic pitch collections. The melodies are organized according to their corresponding chapter in the *Manual for Ear Training and Sight Singing*, but could be studied in any order to supplement other texts.

The *Anthology for Sight Singing* is a logical complement to any well-rounded music program. The collection by Karpinski and Kram differs from other texts on the market in that it presents melodies from classical music and folk traditions in their original form. In the preface, the authors explain: "Readers should be able to take a score from the library shelf, read from an orchestral part, play an etude, study an excerpt in a harmony textbook, examine a work in a history anthology, consider a composition for sale in a music store, or look at any music and apply the skills they learn through studying sight singing. To that end, this *Anthology* strives to maintain the original 'look' of all excerpts as one of its guiding principles." (p. xii.) The *Anthology* achieves this goal in several ways. Many melodies appear on ledger lines, rather than transposed to be in the vocal range. Music students will eventually

have to read open score (i.e., for music history or conducting) and should familiarize themselves with ledger lines as early as possible. Some melodies are presented with vocal notation. Whereas instrumental music beams notes together as they relate to the rhythmic structure, vocal music beams notes according to syllabic division. All original ornaments (grace notes, trills, etc.) are included, but instructors may choose to address or omit them as they see fit. Many other aural texts and anthologies include duets, trios, and other multiple-part exercises in separate chapters, but Karpinski and Kram's *Anthology* presents them alongside single-line melodies. In this way, all melodies are presented according to their pedagogical elements, and multi-part exercises may be sung in ensemble or sung separately (one line at a time) according to the level of the class and the discretion of the instructor.

A college music professor has many choices for aural texts, but the *Anthology for Sight Singing* by Karpinski and Kram presents concepts above and beyond other available texts. With this *Anthology*, students become familiar with common repertoire as well as with notation concepts they will encounter in other areas of musical study. A teacher looking to encourage students to be well-rounded musicians will find this collection as the logical choice to supplement their aural learning program.