1.1. Analysis of a Work written before 1750. Write an essay on one of the two following works:

#1 Johannes Ockeghem, Missa Prolationem, Kyrie. This is a Renaissance mass; what role does mensuration play in the counterpoint of the movement? What style characteristics distinguish it from the medieval past and baroque future periods?

#2 Henry Purcell, “Yes Daphne” from Orpheus Britannicus. What do the numbers and accidentals above the bassline indicate? Mark all key areas and cadences in the song referring to measure numbers. Taking mm. 1-4 as an introduction, what is its form? From what period does this work derive? Identify the features that are characteristic of that style.
Johannes Ockeghem, Missa Prolationem, Kyrie. This is a Renaissance mass; what role does mensuration play in the counterpoint of the movement? What style characteristics distinguish it from the medieval past and baroque future periods?

The Kyrie in Ockeghem’s Missa Prolationem employs a different type of mensuration in each voice. The two upper voices (superius and contratenor) create a canon with each other in tempus imperfectum cum prolacione imperfectum [2,2] and tempus perfectum cum prolacione imperfectum [3,2], and the lower voices (tenor and bassus) also form a canon in tempus imperfectum cum prolacione perfectum [2,3] and tempus perfectum cum prolacione perfectum [3,3]. The contrasting mensurations of the two different canons create the majority of counterpoint interest throughout the Kyrie.

Because the superius and tenor voices are in a faster mensuration than their respective voice pair, they each finish their canon early and have “free counterpoint” that rapidly moves the Kyrie to the final cadence on F. The superius voice therefore finishes its canon after m. 15 on the first note (whole note F) of “eleison.”1 The tenor voice moves to free counterpoint after m. 15 on “-son.” Interestingly if the tenor part has “free counterpoint” from mm. 16-18, this means that Ockeghem is not strictly following a cantus firmus in the tenor, or he would have had to end the Kyrie as soon as the tenor finished its canon.

---

1 The free counterpoint begins on the half-note G, however it is worth noting that measure numbers are something of an anachronism here as the superius is actually on its 22nd “measure” at m. 15 in the score. Given pieces in multiple simultaneous mensurations, editors must choose to apply measure numbers to each voice or choose to ignore the different mensurations and notate measure numbers from the tenor voice only, as is the case here.
The displacement of rhythmic values from the different mensurations creates the rest of the counterpoint in the Kyrie. Each pair of voices is in a contrasting tempus mensuration that leads to an uneven rhythmic displacement. Rather than a simple doubling or tripling of the proportions where the slower voice would have double or triple the duration, the contrast of tempus imperfectum and tempus perfectum leads to something more complex.

At first glance, one might think the relationship is one of 2:3 where each superius or tenor note is two-thirds the duration of the longer contratenor or bassus note value, but this is not the case. At the level of measure, 2 measures of bassus or contratenor equal 3 measures of the tenor or superius respectively, and the differences in tempus leads to uneven displacement within the measure. Take the first four pitches of the tenor and bassus: the first note takes up a full perfection in both voices and creates the contrast of 2:3. However, according to the rules of perfection, the second two notes (probably breves in the score) must account for another perfection since a longa follows them. This means that while the tenor part is notated as two dotted whole notes, the bassus creates a recta and altera pair to account for the rules of perfection, and so the duration is a dotted whole note followed by the dotted breve—not equal to a straight 2:3 augmentation.

Ockeghem does not use the displaced mensuration the whole time; on the seventh note of the tenor and bassus, he adds coloration to the notes (the brackets above these notes in the score show this), which effectively strips away the differences in mensuration and places the tenor and bassus into a strict canon at the same rhythmic values. This change to a strict canon leaves the tenor and bassus offset by a 2 measure displacement. The same process happens in the superius and contratenor, although Ockeghem does not
need coloration to force equal rhythmic durations. After the sixth note of the superius and contratenor, they move to a strict rhythmic canon and the contratenor remains 2 measures (of the contratenor, 3 of the superius measures) behind the superius until the end of the movement.

Several style characteristics set this piece apart from polyphony of the medieval ages and baroque. This Kyrie has several differences that one would never see in medieval polyphony. One of the main differences is that in the music of Machaut or Landini, one would always see the *cantus firmus* or tenor voice in the bottom. One of the main steps forward into the Renaissance was the introduction of a bass voice that slowly begins to outline something of a “functional” bass-line with leaps by fifth, especially at the end of the piece at cadences. And speaking to cadences, medieval polyphony never ended with a third, as this Kyrie does very clearly with the A in the superius voice at the end. Although Machaut and Landini were creating isorhythmic motets, the degree of rhythmic structure seen in the Kyrie would have been highly innovative. Not only are all the voices in canon but also each voice very intentionally carries a separate mensuration sign. If Machaut was attempting this degree of mensural complexity, he would have hidden it slightly or not made it so obvious, but the title of Ockeghem’s mass betrays his intention. It is as if Ockeghem is leaving it right out in the open, saying, “my mass is called the prolation mass; look at all the cool mensural games I have in here!” The strict pairing of voices—top two and bottom two—is also a feature that one would not have seen in medieval polyphony.

---

2 Apologies to Ockeghem, who probably would never have actually said that.
There are several stylistic features of the Kyrie that one would not find in the baroque. Most importantly, in the baroque, it would be rare to see this high degree of rhythmic invention in all of the voices. Rather than designing the complex web of rhythmic displacement, someone like Bach would have instead worked on a web of carefully woven counterpoint and focused on independently beautiful melodies in each voice, and not on a rhythmically complex canon with strict imitation. The rhythm of the baroque would rarely use the long note values found in this Kyrie, and of course the harmony would be much different; the bass voice would focus much more on clearly defining a key center of F and would use frequent cadential motions throughout. Here in the Kyrie, the music does not seem to cadence until the very end, and even then the cadence is hardly prepared in the way someone like Bach would have done it with a predominant to dominant to tonic harmony. Also, in the Baroque, it is much more common to move away from the key center of F in order to help define it more clearly, and this would involve many accidentals beyond the Bb’s of the Kyrie. This Kyrie simply does not wrestle with the idea of leaving a key and returning to that key as a baroque piece would. Also the baroque style much more clearly defines chords with a regular harmonic rhythm; the Kyrie happens upon triads, but the triads seem to be more of a coincidence of counterpoint movement, rather than a goal as it would be in the baroque. There is no sense of harmonic rhythm, and a baroque piece would almost never have so many open fifth sonorities (or start with only octaves as this piece does).
Analysis of a work after 1750

See the two works attached:

1) Brahms Intermezzo Opus 117, no. 2. Discuss the musical language of the work focusing on form, small and large-scale harmony, voice leading, in addition to other matters you find salient.

2) Berg, Opus 2, no. 4 “Warm die Luefte”. Discuss relations between music and text, the structure of the music in terms of atonal pitch-class set theory (pitch structure; pitch-class structure; and set class structure) in addition to other matters you find salient.

Write an essay on ONE of these pieces.
III.

Langsam.


Wärmt die Lüfte, es sprießt Gras auf sonnigen Wiesen,
Horch!

Horch, es flüstert die Nachtigall.

Ich will singen. Droben hoch im düstern Bergforst, es

schmilzt und glitzert kalter Schnee, ein Mädchen in grauem Kleide lehnt an feuchtem

spitz

Noch langsameres Tempo

Der Vorschlag ruhig und langsam zu nehmen.
Erklimm, kranke sind ihre zarten Wangen, die grauen Augen fiebert durch
Däster-riesenstäme. Er kommt noch nicht.
Er läßt mich warten. Stirb, der Einzelne
stirbt, daneben der Andere lebt. Das macht die Welt so tief schön.
Warm die Lüfte

Language: German

WARM DIE LÜFTE, es spriicht, GRAS auf sonnigem Wiesen; MIRCH: Mach es, flötet die Nachtigall... Ich will singen; Proben hoch im düstern Bergrast, es schlinket und (gilt) kalt Schnee, ein Höhchen im grünen Kleide lehnt an feuchten Bachers, Krank sind Ihre Zarten Wangen, die grünen Augen flehren durch wässerleinenstämme. 

"Er kommt noch nicht, er liegt sich warten... Stirb!" Die Eine stirbt, daneben die Andere lebt, das macht die Welt so tiefesoch.

Translation(s): NOR ENG FRE ITA

View original text (without footnotes)

1 one source gives "sickert"

Input by Jakob Kellner

Authorship

- by Alfred Mombert (1872-1942), title unknown
- by Alban Maria Johannes Berg (1885-1935), "Warm die Lüfte" op. 2 (Vier Gesänge) no. 4 (1910).

Available translations, adaptations, and transliterations (if applicable):

- NOR Norwegian (Bokmål) (Marianne Beate Kielland), title unknown, copyright © 2008, (re)printed on this website with kind permission
- ENG English (Jakob Kellner), "Warm die breezes", copyright ©, (re)printed on this website with kind permission
- FRE French (Guy Laffaille), "L'air est doux", copyright © 2009, (re)printed on this website with kind permission
- ITA Italian (Ferdinando Albeggiani), "Tiepide brezze", copyright © 2010, (re)printed on this website with kind permission

Text added to the website between May 1995 and September 2003.

Notes about green, red, and white dots

Warm the breezes

Language: English

WARM THE BREEZES; GRASS grows in sunny meadows; LISTEN! The one dies while the other lives: The one dies while the other lives: 

FRE French (Guy Laffaille), "L'air est doux", copyright © 2009, (re)printed on this website with kind permission

Text added to the website between May 1995 and September 2003.
Brahms’ Op. 117, No. 2 in Bb minor

In many of Brahms’ pieces, certain motivic elements established at the beginning of a work can be developed and transformed throughout the course of a movement (or an entire piece). In his piano intermezzo, Op. 117, No. 2, this occurs on multiple levels.

The opening of the intermezzo begins with an anacrusis to the first bar, which involves a curious ii⁰⁶ – I⁰⁶ motion, instead of a more conventional V-I motion. The top voice sounds an important descending third motive, Db-C-Bb, shown in Example 1. Because Brahms left the opening measure without a root position tonic (only first inversion), one might think that the Bb achieved in the bass at the end of measure 2 would be support for tonic harmony, but he subverts this sense and puts a seventh over top of it, and it turns out that it’s true function is not really to establish a root-position tonic, but to initiate a falling 5ths sequence (that uses motivic fragments of the descending 3rd motive). This is shown in Example 2 (root motion: Bb-Eb-Ab-Db). When the sequence is discontinued, Brahms moves to the dominant seventh in m. 6 (the pre-dominant is the C half-dim. seventh chord, which functions as super-tonic (ii) half-dim7 that becomes ii half-dim. 65, through a voice exchange in m. 5). The resolution of this dominant is not to tonic in m. 8. Instead, Brahms uses enharmonic spelling in a deceptive resolution to VI. The VI chord might normally be spelled Gb-Bbb-Db, but in this case it is actually spelled enharmonically and un-triadically: Gb-A-Db.

Following the deceptive resolution, the opening material comes back in measure 10, still with no root position Bb minor to begin it. In m. 11 a C natural is
introduced in the inner voice (a different element from the first presentation) that
smoothes over the transition into another falling fifths sequential motion, this time
it is raised up a step from before (root motion: C – F – Bb – Eb). Then in mm. 13-14,
instead of following a pre-dominant to dominant cadential preparation like mm. 5-6,
Brahms moves through a German Augmented Sixth chord (m. 14) to get to a
cadential 864-753 (mm. 15-16) with C in the bass, see Ex. 3 for voice-leading sketch.
This does not resolve to F, but in fact, moves back to Db, and Db is confirmed at m. 23. A striking feature of this section is the use of the Neapolitan of Db, which is
emphasized at m. 21 with a ritardando, and spelled as Ebb-Gb-Bbb. Thus, this could
be termed an Auxiliary cadence into Db through N6 – V7 – I progression.

The descending third motive re-appears transposed (F-Eb-Db) at m. 23 to
initiate the B section, which is in the key of Db major (III in the larger scheme). The
B section can be divided into B1 and a B2 sections which span m. 23 (with pick-up)
to 30, and 31 (with pick-up to 38, respectively. In the B section at m. 29, another
Augmented Sixth chord occurs, this time with Gb in the bass and E natural in the top
voice. The augmented sixth could move us back to Bb minor, but instead, after it
resolves to F, the F really acts as part of a bass-arpeggiation F – Ab – Db, and the B2
part of B section stays in Db. The B section finishes with a V7 – I cadence in Db (m. 38). Retrospectively, one might add that the B section’s Db key area was
foreshadowed by the V7/III to III motion that was part of the falling fifths sequence
in mm. 3-4.

The next section lasts from m. 39-51, it may be termed “C,” but in reality
many elements originate from the A or B sections. For example, the top voice uses
different transformations of the descending third motive (Ex: mm. 38-39, Db-C-Bb, mm. 40 F-Fb-Eb, etc.) while the bass voice presents it in inverted form! For example, in measure 39, there is an ascent from E natural to F to Gb. This actually initiates a chromatic ascending sequential motion that leads from the bass voice E- F- Gb through G natural, Ab (m. 40) through A natural and Bb (m. 41) through B natural and C (m. 42) to Db in m. 43. Although this is spelled out like a Db dominant 7th chord, it is really what some would term an “apparent” dominant seventh. In reality, the Cb actually functions as a B natural!! This means that it really acts as an augmented sixth chord because the Cb rises to a C, and the C dominant harmony is prolonged in m. 46. This section strikingly highlights a connection to the initial motive, which involves the C-Bb motion, with the Cb acting as a mutation.

The C dominant actually does resolve to F major (m. 48) which, in the larger sheme, might be interpreted as a V7/V to V. In measures 49 to 50, an A diminished 7 harmony unfolds in the bass (A-Gb-Eb-C) and this harmony leads back into the re-statement of A section material at measure 52.

One important element of the A section that comes back at the pick-up to m. 52 is that the rogue Cb that acted as B natural earlier now moves down to Bb (pick up to m. 52). Also, in the bass voice, instead of a Db like in m. 1, m. 52 contains a D natural! In this case, one must ask whether this is a true tonic return. Really, this could certainly be interpreted as a V/iv and not tonic, not only because Brahms is a master of tonic delay, but also because the Ab comes in the top voice as the seventh and resolves in m. 54 to Gb, which is supported by the iv harmony.
Just like the first A section, this A section can be divided into two sections, the first being m. 52-60, and the second being m. 61-72. In the first section the falling fifths sequence is still present (Bb-Eb-Ab-Db root motion from 53-55) and the ii half-dim 7 to V motion is still resolved deceptively to an un-triadically spelled VI chord (Gb-Bbb-Db = Gb-A natural-Db). However, in the second statement (61-72), some changes are worthy of note. For example, in measure 62, the Cb comes back again, but this time as the root of the Neapolitan 6th chord (Cb-Eb-Gb with Eb in the bass). This Neapolitan is prolonged across the neighboring 43 chord (m. 62 second part) into m. 63.) At this point, one salient feature to note is the chromatic descent in the bass line from the Gb in m. 63: Gb- F – Fb- Eb- Ebb- Db – C –B (m. 67). This passage begins with a fairly straightforward V/III to III6 motion (Db6 on downbeat of m. 64), but then Brahms, from the Eb dominant 7 chord in m. 65, moves through an augmented sixth chord (Ebb in the bass, C natural in the inner voice) which “resolves” to Db dominant 7 in m. 66. Yet again, Brahms uses an augmented sixth chord (C in the bass and A# above in the inner voice) which now “resolves” to B dominant 7.

In my opinion, this motion is so striking in the context of the piece. In a motivic sense, the Db – C- B is a transformation of the initial descending third motive! But ALSO, Brahms could have spelled this as a Dbb to Cb motion. Why? The Cb is really the Neapolitan in the key of Bb minor. This may be the true significance of Cb, which has been through quite a bit of drama in this movement.

Therefore, the B dominant 7 chord at m. 67, I take to really mean a Neapolitan in a deeper sense, even though it is re-spelled. Another reason to
support the notion that it is a Neapolitan is because it moves to the V. Well, one might say that the V at m. 69 is a V43, but the chord there really unfolds as part of the V7 in root position that occurs at m. 72. This is yet another delay of the expectations that Brahms weaves into this intermezzo.

Measures 73-end act as a coda, in one sense, but yet again, ubiquitous elements from the rest of the movement are nonetheless present. For example, the descending third motive is now D natural-C-Bb going into m. 73. There is a prominent dominant pedal F through m. 73 to 82. Over top of this pedal, there are augmented sixth motions. One in m. 77: Db in the bass and B natural in top voice—both move to C, and C harmony occurs over the pedal F. This augmented sixth might represent a verticalization of the manipulated D/Db and B (Cb)/Bb in the movement. Another augmented sixth occurs in m. 79: Cb in the bass and A natural in the top voice move to Bb, and the Bb harmony occurs over the F pedal). Not only does this Cb behave like it “should” and go to Bb, but the overall motion from Db –C, and Db-Cb- Bb that occurs within the dominant pedal here is a stunning summary of salient elements of the movement.

Overall, Brahms’ Op. 117, No. 2 is representative of his style in many ways. In one sense, it reveals his ability to transform and manipulate small motivic ideas throughout a movement. But also, it highlights his tendency to delay expectations and cunning enharmonic re-valuations (absence of a root-position tonic at the onset, Cb transformations, enharmonic spellings). The overall form of the piece might be summarized as follows, but the whole is really more important than sectional divisions in this case. If I had more time, I would explore the motivic
enlargements that go beyond the foreground level in this piece, but that will have
to be done later because of time limitations.

Formal divisions: (pick-ups/anacrusis counted as part of the following measure)

A section: mm. 1-22
   A1: mm. 1-9
   A2: mm. 10-22

B section: mm. 23-38
   B1: mm. 23-30
   B2: mm. 31-38

“C” section:
   C1: mm. 39-51

A’ section: mm. 52-72
   A3: mm. 52-60
   A4: mm. 61-72

Coda: mm. 73-end.
EXAMPLE I:
descending 3rd motive
(inner voice motion)

Ex 2: mm. 2-4

(chord movement: B♭ E♭ A♭ D♭) connects B♭ and D♭ (motivically connected to the motive of the descending 3rd)

Ex 3

(later bass motion: led to D♭ (Ⅲ))
Repertory: Write short essays on four of the following eight passages/pieces. While not “identifying” the pieces, include information on the style, nature of musical language, era of composition, and perhaps the work's composer, and date of composition.
Miserà humana prole, Sia pur d'ogni ben col-
ma, Men-tre qui du-ra la tua vi-ta, ò co-me Nulla ti sti-mo. Poi che
quem huom ma-i Vis-se fe-li-ce quan-to Piu bra-mar si po-tes-se,
Et d'ogni suo desio pago, et contento, Che di fortun'al fine Ne le rapaci, et turbide procel-le Non si trovi sommerso.

Quinci à l'esempio tuo mirando, à Edipo; O mi-
ser-rim-o E-di-po E-al va-rio sta-to in-cer-to Di tua sor-te pen-san-
do, Tra mor-ta-l'huom non ten-go Ve-ra-men-te be-a-to.

Po-scia che tù, nel mag-gi-or col-mo giun-to De la fe-li-ci-
ta-te, Da-o-gni un te-nu-to à pien be-a-to fu-sti.

Music engraving by LilyPond 2.12.3—www.lilypond.org
Cantus

Veni Creator Spiritus, mentes tua-

Altus

Veni Creator Spiritus, mentes tua-

Tenor

Veni Creator Spiritus, mentes tua-

No rum visita: implo superna gratia-

Veni Creator Spiritus, mentes tua-

No rum visita: implo superna gratia-

A, que tu creastipectora.

Veni Creator Spiritus, mentes tua-

No rum visita: implo superna gratia-

A, que tu creastipectora.
Si-cut lo-cu-tus est ad pa-tres no-stros, A-br-a-ham et se-mi-ni

Si-cut lo-cu-tus est ad pa-tres no-stros, A-br-a-ham et se-mi-ni e-jus in se-cu-la, si-cut lo-cu-tus est in se-cu-la, si-cut lo-cu-tus est ad pa-tres no-stros, A-br-a-ham et se-mi-ni e-jus in se-cu-la, in se-cu-la, in se-cu-la, si-cut lo-cu-tus est ad pa-tres

Editado con LilyPond
Si - cut lo - cu - tus est ad pa - tres no - stros, A - bra - ham et se - mini
se - cu - la, A - bra - ham et se - mini e - jus in se - cu - la, si - cut lo - cu -
tus
se - cu - la,"
Abraham et semini e-jus in se-
e-jus, Abraham et semini e-jus in se-
e-jus, Abraham et semini e-jus in se-
e-jus, Abraham et semini e-jus in se-
e-jus, Abraham et semini e-jus, semini e-jus, semini e-jus in secula, sic ut lo-
cula, in secula, Abraham et semini e-jus in secula.
cula, in secula, Abraham et semini e-jus in secula.
cula, in secula, Abraham et semini e-jus in secula.
cula, in secula, Abraham et semini e-jus in secula.
cula, in secula, Abraham et semini e-jus in secula.
cula, in secula, Abraham et semini e-jus in secula.
cula, in secula, Abraham et semini e-jus in secula.
cula, in secula, Abraham et semini e-jus in secula.
cula, in secula, Abraham et semini e-jus in secula.
cula, in secula, Abraham et semini e-jus in secula.
cula, in secula, Abraham et semini e-jus in secula.

cutas est ad patres nostros, Abraham et semini e-jus in secula.

Copia: Nancho Alvarez
Oh Solitude! Oh Solitude! my sweetest Choice!

Oh Solitude! Oh Solitude! my sweetest, sweetest Choice!

Choice! Places devoted to the Night, remote from Tumult, and from

Noise, how ye my Restless Thoughts delight! Oh Solitude!

Oh Solitude! my sweetest, sweetest Choice!
Oh Heav'ns! what Content is mine, to see those Trees, which have appear'd, from the Nativity of Time; and, which all Ages have revered, to look to day as fresh and green, to look to day as fresh and green, as when their Beauties first were seen? Oh! Oh how agree-a-ble a Sight these hanging Mountaines do appear, which th'un-hap-py wou'd invite, to fin-ish all their Sorrows here; when their hard, their hard
Fate makes them endure, such Woes, such Woes, as only Death can Cure.

Oh! Oh how I Solitude adore! Oh!

Oh how I Solitude adore, that Element of

noblest Wit, where I have learn'd, where I have learn'd A-

pol-lo's Love, without the pains, the pains, to study it:
For thy sake I in Love am grown, with what thy fancy, thy
fancy does pursue; but when I think upon my own, I
hate it, I hate it, for that reason too; because it needs must
hinder me from seeing, from seeing, and from serving thee.

Oh Solitude! Oh how I Solitude adore!
Score Identification/Repertory Exam

8) The last score in the packet, No. 8, is representative of the Second Viennese School. By analyzing the first few measures, it becomes evident that the composer is using the twelve-tone method. Without taking time to do a full analysis, because the piece is quite long and complex, a few examples might provide evidence enough for this response essay. The first three sonorities articulated in the piece are stated by the 2nd violin, viola, and cello in the same rhythm. The first consists of F, C, G, D (F in the cello, C in the viola, and G and D in the 2nd violin). The second consists of F#, B, A, E (F# in the cello, B in the viola, and A and E in the 2nd violin). The third consists of Eb, Ab, Db, Bb (Eb in the cello, Ab in the viola, and Db and Bb in the 2nd violin). These three sonorities complete the full chromatic, employing all 12 tones (C, C#, D, Eb, E, F, F#, G, G#, A, Bb, B or their enharmonic equivalents).

For a composer such as Schoenberg, this series of 12 notes could serve as a basis for structuring a piece. Inverted, transposed, and/or retrograde forms of the row might well be employed in the piece. Starting in the second measure, the first gesture in the first violin part (until m. 3 beat 2: F, E, C, A, G, D, Ab) grouped with the other strings in the first part of the third measure (Db and Eb in the cello, and the Gb (viola) and Bb (2nd violin) a collection of 11 out of 12 tones can be found. The missing tone is B natural. However, sometimes row forms/presentations can overlap, and the B natural is the final note of the 2nd violin at the end of the first measure.
Comparing composers of the Second Viennese School, this piece seems a bit too long and not “pointilistic” enough for Anton Webern, and the rows do not seem to be purposely triad-like, as in some Berg pieces. Therefore, I would suggest Schoenberg as a possible composer of this piece. Also, Schoenberg wrote more chamber music as his career moved on. I would propose late 1920s as a date for the piece.

6) The sixth excerpt in the packet is a movement from a mass that represents the style of the late Medieval period. A chant melody is placed in the tenor part, but the tenor is not the “lowest” written voice. A contra-tenor voice is also written out, bringing the total number of voices four.

One finds many elements in this mass movement that would sound antiquated to later composers. Tinctoris stated in 1477 that one should not write parallel fifths and octaves; this was part of his eight rules of counterpoint. Since parallel octaves and/or fifths are evident at the end of Kyrie I, Kyrie II and Kyrie III, I would suggest that this composition comes before 1477. There are repeating rhythmic segments in the tenor, but it appears to not be strict repetitions of a talea pattern. Thus, it is unlike the motet I analyzed on Monday (S’il estoit nulz, by Machaut).

One device employed in this piece is “hocket.” One example of hocket between the triplum and the contratenor is evident in the eighth measure of the piece (See Example 1). Hocket was indeed used by Machaut, but it was also used in many works by DuFay in the earlier 15th Century.
The cadences in this piece can also offer evidence towards a particular style. These cadences include stepwise motions in all voices, with some parallels that were mentioned previously. Some observations that make me think this piece is actually a bit later than Machaut is because of the voice “crossings” that occur in the cadences, where the lowest written voice is not actually the lowest sounding voice. In addition, in the last cadence of the 2nd Kyrie, the top voice sings G-F-G-A. This so-called “filling in” of the Landini figure occurred sometimes after Machaut in the beginnings of the 15th century. In the cadence at the end of the first Kyrie, the top voice motion A-G# is a suspension over the E (lowest sounding note, but in the tenor). However, the note of “resolution” (G#) sounds with the A in the contratenor part (contratenor)! This would not happen in later styles that employ more strict counterpoint.

This mass movement, although showing some characteristics that bleed over from later Machaut/14th century styles (Double leading tone cadence motion, parallel fifths/octaves at cadences), I would suggest that it is actually a 15th century piece (4 voices with contratenor part, some more dissonant and curious suspension figures, voice crossings at cadences, filled in Landini embellishment) during the beginning time period of DuFay (1425).

3) The third excerpt, “Veni Creator Spiritus,” has many stylistic features of the mid-14th Century, especially composers like Machaut. The cadence in measure 6-7
contains the “Landini” embellishment in the top two voices, and also since the F is raised to F#, the “double leading tone” figure.

The ending cadence is also especially worthy of note. The top two voices again contain the “Landini” figure, which was an “under-third” embellishment typical of the style. Also, both of the top two voices are raised notes (F# really goes to G, C# really goes to D) which creates the “double leading tone” effect that is very typical of Machaut’s time period. Furthermore, all of the voices move by step because the tenor steps down from A to G. This motion distinguishes this piece from the later Burgundian-era cadence motions, in which sometimes one voice would move by leap (sometimes creating, through voice-crossing, an aural effect of what we would now call V-I!). However, since the ending cadence in this piece is NOT like this, that is further support that is is mid-14th century (1350).

The piece also has only three voices, and the tenor is the lowest written voice. Also, the piece begins and ends on an open fifth (no third). Dissonance is not used very frequently, in an effort to keep “strong” beats consonant. For these reasons, and those stated above, I suggest that this piece is mid-14th Century, perhaps by Machaut or one of his contemporaries.

4) The fourth excerpt in the packet is a Renaissance piece, and it is quite different than No. 2 in the packet. This piece has a sacred text and has a total of five voices. From the onset, one might note that the piece makes use of quite pervasive imitative lines! In beginning Renaissance music, sometimes imitations were short-lived, but in this piece, that is definitely not the case! All five voices start with the
“Sicut locutus est...” text and follow imitatively at pitch levels D and A (D, then A, then D, then A, then A).

As an example of the long, pervasive imitation, the Bajo part from m. 1 to the first beat of m. 9 is imitated an octave higher in the contralto from m. 9 to the first beat of m. 17. (Obviously the tenor comes in with an imitation at the fifth in between those two, but the point I am trying to make here is that the imitative lines are quite pervasive and cover longer stretches of the music than in earlier Renaissance works.)

Also, unlike piece No. 2, this example has some beautifully prepared dissonances, especially in the chain of 7-6 suspensions from mm. 41-44. The Soprano I part has a half note G in m. 41 above a B in the bass (marked “Bajo”), which resolves to F# in the next measure as 7-6 suspension over A in the bass. This trend continues because the F# simultaneously serves as a resolution and also a preparation for the next suspension F#-E over a G in the Bajo part. (This is written out in musical example 2).

This piece also employs an alternation of imitative counterpoint style with what is called the “familiar” style. The “familiar” style is largely homophonic, and at times, imitative pieces can have sections that are homophonic in nature. In this piece, at m. 37, all of the parts sound the same text (“Abraham...”) in the same rhythm. Although the Sop. I voice takes some liberties in the ensuing measures, the point here is that the piece alternates with familiar style and imitative counterpoint, which was common in the 16th Century style. It would be my consideration that this
may have been a composed in the mid-late 16th Century by Thomas luis de Victoria or a contemporary.
Example 1:
Musical Example of "hocket"

Example 2: suspensions, prepared dissonance in piece No. 4 mm 41-44 (reduced for the point of the example)
Take a look at the attached three pages from a text written in Italian. It's the first three pages of a text that runs about 10 pages. Without translating the text, write an essay in which you paraphrase its contents, the issues (cultural, historical, musical) that underwrite its prose, and its context in any terms you find salient.
Siamo soliti oggi chiamarlo Landini o Landino, con prevalenza della prima forma, da intendere non come patronimico, figlio di Landino, ma come designazione di un gruppo familiare. L’appartenenza ai discendenti di un Landino di Manno, rintracciabile a Pratovecchio in Casentino nel 1289, ci è però attestata soltanto dai tardivi ricordi familiari di un pronipote, dagli Elogia de suis maioribus del noto quattrocentista e commentatore di Dante Cristoforo Landino, il quale umanisticamente preferiva la forma aggettivale del cognome. Ai contemporanei fiorentini bastò aggiungere al primo nome l’aggettivo «cieco», o la qualifica di organista, «degli orfani», o anche la loro unione. Più solennemente il codice laureNZiano Palatino 87, anche noto come Codice Squarcialupi, intesta le molte pagine che riportano sue composizioni con la dicitura «Magister Franciscus coeexus horghanista de Florentia».

Il semplice primo nome bastò a designarlo a Filippo Villani, che l’annoverò con gran rilievo tra i musici nel suo Liber de origine civitatis Florentiae et eiusdem famosis civibus, fonte principale e altamente laudatoria della maggior parte delle notizie biografiche a noi pervenute. Brevemente citati sono in precedenza un Bartolo che per primo avrebbe fatto cantare un Credo polifonico nel Duomo fiorentino, Giovanni da Cascia, del quale Villani pungentemente ricorda l’aver gareggiato con altri musici alla corte di Mastino della Scala, «aizzandoli il tiranno con doni», e infine Lorenzo Masini, che forse, ma Villani non lo dice, fu maestro a Landini.

Su Francesco Villani si dilunga, indicandone anzitutto il padre, un Jacopo pittore, certamente da identificare con Jacopo del Casentino, allievo di Taddeo Gaddi, del quale Jacopo trovo infatti registrati in un vecchio repertorio l’anno di nascita 1310 e il cognome Landini. Ciò è rilevante perché mi consente di confermare il mio suggerimento che Francesco nacque intorno al 1335 e non, come di solito asserito, intorno al 1325. In
precedenza avevo fondato la mia ipotesi sul fatto che l’attività e la fama di Francesco appaiono a me aver cominciato ad affermarsi negli anni ’60 di quel secolo e che inoltre la maggior parte delle sue composizioni è costituita di ballate, che appunto in quegli anni iniziavano ad essere trattate come un genere polifonico, rapidamente prevalendo sui generi più antichi del madrigale e della caccia.

Villani ci dice Francesco esser nato a Fiesole, non cieco, ma accaccato già nell’infanzia da una affezione di vaiolo; aiutato tuttavia dal cielo ad alleviare la cecità corporale col conforto del canto. Traduco un po’ liberamente dal latino del Villani:

Fatto poi più grandicello, compreso dalla dolcezza della melodia, cominciò a far musica per arte, daprima con la viva voce, poi con strumenti a corde e con l’organo; e progredendo meravigliosamente nella conoscenza dell’arte, maneggiava prontamente, con stupore di tutti, strumenti musicali che non aveva mai visti, come se potesse servirsi degli occhi; e con mano velocissima, che tuttavia osservava la misura dei tempi, cominciò a suonare l’organo con tanta arte e tanta dolcezza da superare senza dubbio senza confronto tutti gli organisti dei quali si potesse aver memoria.

Al ricordo dell’incomparabile virtuosità sullo strumento Villani aggiunge il merito di una straordinaria coscienza del suo essere composto di tante canne e tanti delicati meccanismi, facilmente indotti da mani meno esperte ad emettere suoni striduli e dissonanti. Né soltanto all’organo si applicava tanta facilità e conoscenza, ma anche a tutta una serie di altri strumenti: alla lira, al liuto, ad una cosiddetta ‘quintaria’ (forse antenata della chitarra), alla ribeca, al flauto, alla tibia. Egli stesso infine aveva inventato, dandogli il nome di «Serena Serenarum», un proprio strumento, combinazione di un liuto con un meno noto mezzocanone, disposta in modo, parrebbe, che le corde dell’uno producessero il risuonare di quelle dell’altro con effetto soavissimo.

Per ultimo (ma qualcosa ho omesso su cui presto ritornerrò) Villani aggiunge al cumulo delle laudi di lui che «trattava di grammatica e dialettica e praticava l’arte poetica col metro e con invenzioni». Né fu il solo a lodarlo. Cino Rinuccini, del quale egli aveva messo in musica almeno una ballata, Con gli occhi assai ne miro, lo disse «cieco degli occhi, ma dell’anima illuminato, [...] nel suo tempo fu migliore modulatore di dolcissimi canti, d’ogni strumento sonatore, e massimamente d’organi, co’ quali con piacevole dolcezza rieceava i stanchi». E Guido del Palagio, anch’egli poeta, ne ricordava il «tanto intelletto divino, che in ogni parte più astratta mostrava le sottilessime proporzioni de’ suoi musicabili numeri e quelle con tanta dolcezza col suo organo praticava». Non poeta, ma dotto già
indirizzato verso l’umanesimo e già cancelliere della Signoria fiorentina, Coluccio Salutati lo raccomandava al Vescovo di Firenze in una lettera del 10 settembre 1375 per un qualche beneficio collegato all’ospedale di Santa Reparata, dicendolo eminente «non come un cieco, ma come più occhiuto di Argo, dal quale cieco vien lume, vien nome glorioso alla nostra città e luce alla chiesa fiorentina».

Con minore eloquenza ci danno dati più precisi le notizie d’archivio, dalle quali risulta che già nel 1361 suonava l’organo per il Monastero di Santa Trinità; accertata poi almeno a partire dal 1365 e durata fino alla morte fu l’associazione con la chiesa di San Lorenzo, della quale è detto in più documenti essere stato cappellano e organista in anni in cui vi era canonico il Lorenzo Masini che io ritengo essere stato suo maestro. Altri documenti lo ricordano per aver collaborato con un altro organista e compositore di ballate polifoniche, frate Andrea dei Servi, nel soprastare alla costruzione di un organo per la chiesa dell’Annunziata e nel progettarne un altro per il Duomo fiorentino nel 1389. Gli ultimi documenti riguardano la morte avvenuta il 2 settembre 1397 e la sepoltura, due giorni dopo, in San Lorenzo, al cui popolo egli aveva appartenuito. Sulla sua bella pietra sepolcrale, rimossa nel corso dei secoli, ma poi ritrovata a Prato e riportata in San Lorenzo, la sua immagine è accompagnata da una scritta che dice (traduco ancora): «Privo dei lumi, Francesco, che la Musica pose innanzi a tutti per la mente capace nei canti organici, lasci qui le ceneri, l’anima sulle stelle».

Strano è che tra tante lodi soltanto Rinuccini appena accenni all’attività di compositore fertilissimo, al quale dobbiamo circa un quarto delle composizioni a noi pervenute di quella che io amo pur sempre chiamare, per l’assonanza con stil novo, *ars nova* italiana. Arte polifonica, legata alla notazione e percì giunta fino a noi, ma ai suoi tempi soprattutto praticata da ecclesiastici e conosciuta e apprezzata da ristrette minoranze. Sappiamo poco come la nuova arte cominciasse ad affermarsi e le prime notizie a noi giunte si riferiscono alla forma poetica dei suoi testi. Il madrigale, citato verso il 1315 da Francesco da Barberino tra i generi poetici «qui de novo emergunt», è dallo stesso definito sdegnosamente «rudium et inordinatum concinium», un cantare insieme, senza ordine, di cose rudi. Meno severo, un trattatello anonimo di una decina d’anni più recente, ne parla come di parole applicate a più canti, il più acuto dei quali deve «ire melodando» ed è dunque più accentuatamente melodico; vi si accenna poi anche a qualche norma metrica e ai temi preferiti: «villanelle, fiori, ghirlande, frutta e simili». Su ciò concorda il noto trattato di Antonio da Tempo che, scritto nel 1332 descrive la forma del madrigale quale noi la conosciamo, la dice da cantare da almeno due esecutori e suggerisce
Language Exam

Italian text on “Landini”

The text is about the Italian Ars Nova, specifically including a discussion of the composer we commonly refer to as “Landini.” A lot of information about Landini can be obtained through the writings of Villani, and the author notes some of Villani’s writings about Landini and his contemporaries. The text begins with a discussion of the origin of this name “Landini,” that we commonly use in our musicology/theory courses.

Landini belonged to the descendants of Landino Manno, but only the memories of a great grandson can be used to refer to a “Dante Cristoforo Landino,” who preferred to go by the adjective form of his family-name (surname) Landini.

The pages of some compositions in the Squarcialupi Codex refer to him as “Magister Franciscus coecus horghanista de Florentia” (Master Franciscus, organist in Florence). (It was not uncommon to associate a name of someone with his or her profession). Filippo Villani, a contemporary of Landini’s, actually wrote in one of his books a lot of biographical information and anecdotes from the time period. He mentions other Florentine contemporaries including Giovanni de Cascia, and recounts a history of competing with other musicians at Mastino (a court). Villani also suggests a teaching connection between Lorenzo Masini and Landini.

Villani continues by mentioning Jacopo the painter, who may have found in an old directory that birth year for Landini’s father was 1310 (*That sentence is very long). This is relevant because it confirms the author’s assertion that Landini
was born in 1335 and not the usually mentioned 1325. The author founded his
research/thesis that the fame of Francesco Landini was really in the 1360s. Many of
his compositions are ballatas, which were rapidly coming to the fore (in comparison
to the madrigal and caccia, which were still present at the time, but the author
suggests they were perhaps viewed as older).

Villani tells us that Landini was born in Fiesole and that he was blind as a
child, because he had smallpox. A Latin text, freely translated by the author, states
that as he got older, he began to make music, first with his hands, then other
instruments (strings?) and the organ. Then he began to play organ very sweetly, in
a manner unparallel by any other organists Villani can remember.

Villani adds that Landini knew the mechanistic aspects of the organ (reeds,
e tc.) and also other instruments (lute, lyre, flute, an instrument that may be an
ancestor to guitar, etc.). He also invented some instrument that combined lute with
a mezzocannone, which produced the “sweetest” effect in the sound of its strings.

Villani adds even more praise about Landini from contemporary
grammatists, or poets. Cino Rinuccini and and Guido del Palagio said Landini was a
better musician (modulator/modulation does not mean modulation in the modern
sense) than many, and he was especially gifted at the organ (sweetness of
proportions, etc.). Coluccio Salutati, former chancellor of Florence, said in a letter
that Landini brought glory to the city and light to the Florentine church not as a
blind man, but as a sharp-eyed Argo/Argus.

Other documents mentioned show that he played organ at a Monastery in
1361, then was associated with the church of San Lorenzo. Again, the author
mentions that he believes Loranzo Masini to be Landini’s teacher. Also, he may have worked collaboratively with Andrea Servi, another organist to write polyphonic ballatas. Documents relating to his death indicate September 2, 1397 and that he was buried a couple days later in San Lorenzo (the church/parish he belonged to).

The last bit of the reading refers to the strange fact that Rinuccini hints of the beginning (fertile?) compositional activity from whom only a quarter of the compositions have survived of what can be called the Italian Ars Nova style. In his time, this style was only really practiced by priests and a select few minorities. The madrigal is referred to in 1315 by Francesco Barberino with disdain. Another anonymous treatise that came 10 years later, is a bit less severe. A 1332 treatise actually describes the madrigal as we know it.

In the larger context of this reading, perhaps we need to question the legitimacy of citing 1325 as Landini’s birth year, and also consider that in the Italian Ars Nova perhaps the Ballata as a genre rose to prominence a bit later than the madrigal or caccia. Also, there was collaboration between composers and across different churches as musicians moved around. Also, compositions were maybe only for a select few people in this time period.
History of Music Theory

Select one out of the three topics and write an essay on this topic.

1) “Musica poetica” is a category of music that came into being during the 16th century. To which school of thinking is it related, how does it relate to the other categories of “musica”, and which consequences does the musica-poetica concept have for the later music theory, particularly of the 18th century?

2) Heinrich Christoph Koch developed a system of phrase structure in his treatise of the late 18th century. Describe his concept, its context at the time (including other authors concerned with phrase structure), and its relationship to the “Formenlehre” of the 19th century.

3) Ernst Kurth is well known for his concept of energetics in Music, a concept he developed after the First World War. Which of his books do particularly deal with the concept of energetics. Define energetics and name other theorist’s relationship to this concept (Schenker, for instance).
Ernst Kurth is closely associated with the concept of “energetics” as applied to the history of music theory. Despite the fact that some claim that the term was actually coined by Rudolph Schäfke in 1934, Kurth’s “energeticist” thought is based on the notion of force, kinetic energy, and dynamic motions in music.

Ernst Kurth’s Grundlagen des linearen Kontrapunkts (Foundations of Linear Counterpoint), published in 1917, is a preliminary example of Kurth’s energetic approach to music. Many concepts in this text form the beginnings of “energetics.” For example, Kurth refers to the ‘spinning forth’ or ‘Fortspinnung’ of a melodic line. The “Fortspinnung” contains an intrinsic element of flowing, underlying, kinetic energy in the melodic line. Kurth uses musical examples from the Baroque period including Johann Sebastian Bach because Bach created many flowing lines in his solo string pieces and preludes that sometimes even create compound melodies.

Kurth observes how ascending (or rising) and descending (or falling) motions of a melody line can create curvilinear apexes. He takes examples especially from sequential passages in Bach’s preludes or solo string pieces, because these passages have more distinct shapes to their melodic lines that repeat at different pitch levels, each creating an apex of the line. Kurth notes that finding the apexes can combine to form an ‘overriding line.’

Kurth also published Romantische Harmonik (und ihre Krise in Wagner’s ‘Tristan’) around 1920. In this later work his text is even more “energetic” in nature. Kurth explicitly states that music is a “symphony of energetic currents.” For Kurth,
the kinetic flow of melody is *primary*, and harmonies are a *secondary* consequence of the interactions of the melodic lines. For this reason, Kurth’s analysis was also inspired by the music of the Romantic period. Kurth expressed a quite different opinion regarding the Classical period. For him, it was comprised of too many melodies that arose from *harmony*, and thus *suppressed* the linear, kinetic motion of the melody lines. (One might note Kurth’s opposite stance to Rameau’s statement in the early 18th century that all melody is derived from harmony).

Kurth viewed harmony in two categories: sensuous and energetic. Energetic harmony leads to other harmony; it could be tertian or non-tertian harmony, it could contain “leading tone” energy, but the point is that it contains an imperative to lead to, or to be on its way to, another harmony. Sensuous harmony, on the other hand, possesses a more stable element to it, and represents a *resistance* to melodic forces. Thus, as one analytical example, Kurth views Wagner’s so-called “*Tristan*” chord as “energetic” because it has a “leading tone” energy with the G# that propels the line up. Also energy is evident in the rising motion past the G# through A and A#, which goes to B in the highest sounding part. This is depicted more fully in Example 1.

Another progressive part of Kurth’s approach is that he discusses referentiality of chords. Some chords have tonal context that gives them an element of referentiality. Other chords may have referentiality only with a chord before or after them (through voice-leading, etc.). However, some chords are only self-referential, and Kurth views these chords as sensuous, not energetic, because they
stop the flow of melodic forces. This approach to harmony acts a lens through which one might note the key tenets of Kurth’s approach.

Some theorists, including Lee Rothfarb, have made attempts to compare Ernst Kurth to Heinrich Schenker, another 20th Century theorist. Although it may seem on the surface level that Kurth and Schenker are similar, their approaches are not as close as one might think.

Kurth and Schenker’s analytical methods sometimes yield the same results. For example, they may privilege the same pitches given the same Bach melody. Kurth would examine the rising/falling of the line and its apexes that result from kinetic motions, and Schenker might find the same pitches structurally significant beyond the “foreground” level. However, Schenker’s notion of structural levels (Schichte) extends much farther beyond the foreground level than Kurth’s. Schenker’s levels went all the way to the extreme of the Ursatz (fundamental structure) as an elaboration of the tonic triad, and that would not be something that Kurth do. Furthermore, Kurth’s notion of structural harmonic “pillars” is sometimes wrongly linked to Schenker’s Stufen. Kurth’s pillars are more oriented towards points of stability that serve as a framework within lines with energetic forces. Schenker viewed the Stufen as a scale “step” upon which much longer stretches of music could occur over, or be prolonged within.

Overall, Kurth’s analyses were really based on an approach that focused on the energies of linear elements, whose forces create harmonies. Schenker based his approach on historical models of counterpoint, which may have actually ended up limiting his approach to tonal masterworks (this is Schenker himself, not many of
his followers, who have since pushed the limits of his theories beyond tonal master-
works). Therefore, even though Kurth’s approach is much more focused on surface
level phenomena, some might suggest that it has a wider applicability than
Schenker’s because music does not have to be \textit{tonal} to have “energetic” forces at
work. This notion connects back to the aforementioned “referentiality” and “pillars”
concepts. These can exist in music that pushes the limits of tonality, whereas
Schenker viewed his approach from the standpoint of tonal \textit{master-works}.

It is also worth noting Kurth’s connection to August Halm, who is related to
the notion of “energetics.” August Halm presented a lecture series that may have
served as a kindling for the concepts behind Kurth’s approach. Halm made his
lectures understandable to a wide audience by limiting his use of specialized
terminology. Although Kurth actually used some terms in his method, the fact
remains that his approach was more accessible than other theorists of the time like
Schenker, whose voice-leading sketches and terminology might not be as accessible.

Consequently, even though their results of their analysis might show
similarities, Kurth and Schenker are divergent in their approaches. Kurth was
focused on surface level energetic forces and drew a connection between Baroque
and Romantic music (that bridged over some classical music). Schenker, with his
multi-leveled tiers of structure, based on historical models of counterpoint,
approached tonal “master-works” from a different standpoint than Kurth.
Outline:
Grundlagen
Romantische Harmonie

Halm and Schenker as related to Kurth
Schenker has structural levels, TONAL master-works, historical models
Vs Kurth, only first level, can be extended beyond tonality through referentiality
Example 1: Kurth analysis of 'Tristan' Chord

\[ G^\# \rightarrow A \rightarrow A^\# \rightarrow B \]

"energy" of that line

also \( D^\# \) wants to fill up

\( F^\flat \) pull down *The Augmented 6th chord has kinetic/energetic properties to it that Kurth discusses*
Devin Iler

Pedagogy Essay

I would probably introduce the concept of modal mixture after I had already discussed secondary dominants. Just as composers from Bach through Wagner used secondary dominants to introduce chromaticism and non-diatonic material to their music for expressive purposes, perhaps a greater range of expression came about around Beethoven’s time and certainly by the music of Schubert. The most important factor to remember about secondary dominant chords is that they introduce the scalar content of the key they are tonicizing in order to harmonize chromaticism. In other words, in the key of C major, if a composer wanted a secondary dominant of G, he would use the tonal collection of notes in G major to tonicize a G chord; in C major, the only foreign note would be the F#. The composer would temporarily borrow the F# from G major in order to expressively direct the music towards G.

Modal mixture involves the same sort of process. Composers wanted to add more expressive chromaticism and harmony to their music, so instead of borrowing the tonal material of say the key of IV, they borrow the material of the parallel minor or major key. What this means is that in C major, a composer might suddenly switch to harmonies, melodies, and chords that employ Eb, Ab, and Bb’s, also known as the notes that turn C major into C minor. This borrowing of the parallel major or minor key is called primary mixture; composers could freely move from say a C major chord (I in C) to an Ab major chord (bVI from c minor, with the Ab) without any preparation.

Of course the borrowing of pitch material from only the parallel major or minor tonic key did not sustain the interest of composers. Just as a composer looked to
secondary dominants for more pitch material, they looked to secondary mixture for even
greater expression. We discussed previously that composers can only use a secondary
dominant to tonicize the keys of ii, iii, IV, V, and vi in a major key, but with secondary
mixture, composers could freely tonicize the keys of bIII, iv, v, and bVI within the major
key as well. This means that if the composer wanted to tonicize scale degree 6 in C
major, an E major V/vi would be used followed by a minor (vi). With secondary mixture,
the composer can instead use the material of bVI, meaning an Eb major V/VI would
tonicize an Ab major chord (bVI). In fact, any chord can be used as long as it is borrowed
from the key of Ab major, so a Db major triad is simply IV of bVI.

Stretching the limits of tonality even further, multiple mixture involves the modal
mixture of any chord. This means that in C major, not only can you move to Ab major
(bVI of c minor), but Ab minor instead (this would produce a Cb in the key of C major!).
The possibilities are almost endless and the music of Chopin, and certainly Wagner,
Hugo Wolf, and Mahler took advantage of the ability to borrow any pitch’s major or
minor scale collection.

Lesson plan:

Goals- Overall goal is to become aurally familiar with primary mixture

• Students will be comfortable singing a melody by switching from the
major key to the parallel minor key, or vice versa.
  o We will start with the simple tonicization pattern (Do-mi-sol-la-
sol-fa-re-ti-do) and switch it to minor (Do-me-sol-le-sol-fa-re-ti-
do) see example 1. Do this for 4 minutes until they are
comfortable, then have them take out their tonal indexing sheets
and switch from parallel major/minor at every line or every time I tell them to switch. Tonal indexing will take 10 minutes (14 minutes so far).

- Students will be able to listen to harmonic progressions and recognize modal mixture.
  - I will start by having them sing arpeggiated chord progression in the major mode followed by minor mode. For example I – ii – V – I will then be sung i – iio – V – i see example 2. After doing several progressions for 4 minutes (18 minutes) I will play progressions and have them raise their hands when they hear modal mixture (e.g. see ex. 4). At every chord of modal mixture I will have them sing the notes of the chord. This will be another 4 minutes (22 minutes).

- Students will be able to annotate simple diatonic harmonies of modal mixture with harmonic dictation.
  - After the singing and recognition of chords, I will have them take out a sheet of paper and do harmonic dictation with the same sorts of harmony (Ex. 4). Either the bass of soprano will have scale degrees 3, 6 or 7 in them in order to assist dictation. This will last 12 minutes (34 minutes). I’ll have brave students come up and write their answers on the board after we go through them.

- Students will be able to sight sing melodies that contain primary mixture.
I will find sight singing examples with primary mixture in them and have the students sing the melodies (see ex. 5). This will be for 6 minutes (40 minutes).

- Students will be able to notate primary mixture in melodies through melodic dictation.

- I will have them take out staff paper again, and dictate melodies with modal mixture (like Ex. 5 again). This will take the last remaining 10 minutes of class. I will collect their answers (harmonic and melodic dictations after class) and grade them for attendance. This will also allow me to see how well they are picking up the concepts and see how much more work they might need.

I already mentioned how I would collect their dictations after class to see how they are picking up the concepts, but I would also have other metrics during class to see how well they are doing. Starting out with the tonicization/tonal indexing would allow me to see how easily they can switch between major/minor mode and I’ll be able to aurally hear how well they are receiving it; the same applies during the sung harmonic progressions. When I play the progressions and have them raise their hands and sing the notes of the modally mixed harmonies, again I will be able to tell how easily they are picking it up. I’ll want them to be fairly fluent with it before I start the harmonic dictation. After the dictation, again I’ll be able to judge how well they are singing with
the sight singing examples, and when they are achieving success I’ll know it is ok to give them the melodic dictation.
Doctoral Exams in Music Theory: Music Theory Pedagogy

Write an essay in which you discuss the concept of modal mixture as it applies to the tonal music of Western Europe. Define the terms mixture (or primary mixture), secondary mixture, and multiple mixtures. Then construct a detailed class plan for a 50-minute aural skills class session that introduces commonly-used primary modal mixtures.

- Specify the goal of the class session. Identify the outcomes that you expect to achieve by the end of the class.
- Provide at least four examples, ranging in length from four chords up to a four measure phrase that you would use to guide the students through recognizing the various mixture chords and their functions. The examples can be in chorale or instrumental style.
- To justify the effectiveness of your class plan, indicate the number of minutes that you would allocate to each step in your class plan.
- Specify a rubric (i.e., a grading metric) that would enable you to determine whether student performance during the class demonstrated that you had achieved the outcome that you specified.
combinatoriality

Combinatoriality is a property of a pitch class set wherein it may be combined with some transformation of itself to produce an aggregate, which is a larger pitch-class set and most often a form of the twelve-tone chromatic scale. While combinatoriality can be found in works preceding its theoretical formulation, such as many of Schoenberg’s serial compositions, Milton Babbit was the first to formally codify the concept as a compositional process. In twelve-tone composition combinatoriality can be based on pitch-class sets of various cardinality, with trichordal, tetrachordal, and hexachordal combinatoriality being the most common types. An example of hexachordal combinatoriality would be the first hexachord (H1) of a twelve-tone row’s primary form (P-0) that when combined with the second hexachord (H2) of, for example, the row’s inverted and transposed up a fourth form (I-5) would create a complete version of the row. In other words neither of the hexachords would contain doublings of any of the pitch-classes of the overall row. The combinatoriality of a row is dependent upon the intervallic structure of its subsets and composers in the 20th century investigated many ways of deriving combinatorial rows, perhaps culminating in Babbitt’s own “all combinatorial row” in which all H1 hexachords are combinatorial with some H2 hexachord.
prime form

Prime form is a term used in musical set theory to denote an abstract depiction of the simplest and most compact intervalllic arrangement of a group of pitches. The term is based in Allen Forte’s work in musical set theory put forth in his book *The Structure of Atonal Music*. Forte conceived of prime form as a way to allow cataloguing and labeling of pitch collections regardless of their particular arrangement within a musical work. The prime form is found by making the most “closely packed” formation of the pitch-class set. This formation has the smallest interval between the outermost pitch-class sets and the smallest intervals possible between contiguous pitch-classes on either side of the set. In the process of analysis a segmentation of pitch-class sets is performed after which the sets are put into a *normal order* that is the most closely packed ascending formation. If the set cannot be inverted to achieve a more closely packed left-to-right ordering then the pitch-classes are distilled to set-class numberings that begin with ‘0’. Some sets have an inverted prime form and so are ordered in descending left-to-right order as in the example below.

![Music Normal Order Prime Form](image)

Prolongation

An analytical term rooted in Schenkerian analysis that describes a process by which a note, harmony, or even another musical process such as a chordal succession may be prolonged over time. In this sense the term can be used to mean that such musical
elements may be understood to exist at a more remote level of structure even while they may not exist at a particular moment in the foreground of a musical work. Heinrich Schenker’s term *Auskomponierung*, commonly translated as “composing out”, is understood as a primary compositional procedure by which prolongation is achieved. An example is the composing out of a chord that may be achieved through an arpeggiation of that chord. At the deepest structural level, Schenker conceived of the prolongation of the tonic triad throughout the length of a tonal work by means of a fundamental structure (*Ursatz*) that consists of a melodic linear descent and a bass arpeggiation. The melodic descent outlines all or most of the notes of the tonic triad with intervening scale steps belonging to subsidiary harmonies. The bass arpeggiation outlines a fundamental I-V-I harmonic motion throughout the course of the piece that serves to prolong the tonic harmony. Prolongation can also apply to musical processes themselves such as the prolongation of the motion from I to V through the use of predominant harmony.

*Tonnetz*

The *Tonnetz* is a diagrammatic conception of tonal space introduced by Hugo Riemann and further developed in Neo-Riemannian theory that depicts a network of chords related by their place in diatonic keys. Similar types of diagrams had been proposed earlier in the 19th century such as Gottfried Weber’s chart depicting chords within parallel major and minor keys and their extensions to closely and distantly related keys. Based on the idea of all harmonies belonging to three primary tonal domains of tonic (T), dominant (D), and subdominant (S), the *Tonnetz* is an extension of this theory that is essentially a map of harmonies that shows their interrelations among different
keys. Such a “map” can be traced to reveal modulatory relationships among chords and key areas.

**subposition**

Subposition is a concept put forth by Jean Philip Rameau that posits that chords may be generated by assuming notes below the fundamental bass of an existing chord. For Rameau the fundamental bass represented the functional identity of a chord so any chord with a root generated below the fundamental bass of another chord was considered functionally equivalent to it. A chord generated in this manner would then be considered to have a “supposed” bass either one or two thirds below the fundamental bass. Rameau used this in his *Traité de l’harmonie* (1722) to explain chords with tones that extended beyond the 7th.
Write very short essays / paragraphs on FIVE of the following TEN terms. Define them and discuss their heritage, what they mean, what they don’t mean, how they are used in music theory within specific musical-theoretical practices, etc.

1. combinatoriality
2. *musica recta*
3. prime form
4. *Stufe*
5. Prolongation
6. *Tonnetz*
7. Topoi
8. liquidation
9. subposition
10. enharmonic genera