to have expressly forbidden the use in composition of triplets against duplets was the Italian Giannantonio Banner, Maestro di Cappella in Padova, in his *Compendio musico* of 1745.

The real reason for rewriting the piece by Zannetti seems to have been overlooked by Mr. Hills. It has nothing to do with Brossard or Walther, but with the nature of the piece itself. It is labelled a Corrente, and one might expect it would be in triplet meter like other correntes, but it is duple on every level. Yet it bears in every part the sign 3 of triple meter. I conclude, therefore, that the sign is an indication that the piece is actually ternary.

I heartily agree with Mr. Hills that the definitive work on performing 17th-century triplets is still to be written. I submit that it is not a refinement of method that is needed, but more information, from treatises or from the music itself. Should anyone be able to supply me with such evidence, I shall be more than happy to refine my present conclusions.

University of Rochester

Donald M. Mintz—*The sketches and drafts of three of Felix Mendelssohn's major works*

Ann Arbor; University Microfilms (UM order no. 61–16), 1960. (Vol. I, 497 pp. text; Vol. II, 151 pp. music, Cornell University diss.)

Arnold Salop

As the title indicates, this dissertation consists of a study of early drafts of three well-known works by Felix Mendelssohn: *Elijah*, the D Minor Trio, Op. 49, and the A Major Symphony, Op. 90. Thanks to a Fulbright, Dr. Mintz was given the opportunity to visit the Deutsche Staatsbibliothek in Berlin and examine the volumes of the Mendelssohn Nachlass containing these drafts. His findings are reported here.

Dr. Mintz goes about his task by first discussing any matters of background that seem relevant to the work or movement in question, then describing in more or less detail the published versions of the various movements—i.e. those of the Breitkopf & Härtel Gesamtausgabe (GA), and finally drawing comparisons with the versions found in draft form (MS). In doing this, Professor Mintz demonstrates complete familiarity with the pertinent literature, with the versions of these works contained in the GA, and also presumably with those of the MS—I say presumably because only isolated passages of the early drafts are presented as musical examples. Indeed, he has demonstrated something more than mere familiarity; he has gone into these works in their various versions with a fine-toothed comb. He has studied what makes them tick motivically, thematically, harmonically, and dramatically, and has applied this knowledge, and that gained from comparing the versions, to the

end of drawing conclusions regarding Mendelssohn's position in the familiar antithesis between Classic and Romantic practice.

As a result, he is able to make a number of interesting, sometimes even illuminating, observations about the style. Thus, for example, an excellent description of a harmonic change may be found on pp. 222–223. Dr. Mintz suggests that the more Romantic (i.e., Schumann-like) quality of the GA version can be traced to the fact that what was a direct, even prosaic, move from tonic to dominant in the MS comes to center around the mediant degree in the GA and only slips away to the dominant at the very end of the phrase. This, of course, touches upon one of the major innovations of early Romantics: the richer harmonic practice, particularly the tendency to slip in and out of keys very easily and frequently. Since this tendency has not been much discussed by theorists or historians, I would suggest that Professor Mintz performs a valuable service by calling it to attention. In another passage (pp. 234–235), he asserts that what was a development in the MS has been replaced by a contrasting middle section in the GA, in support of which he offers a photocopy of the entire passage in question. One may take issue with his conclusion, or his grounds for reaching it, but one can only be grateful for the opportunity to examine so large a section of the MS and for the at least plausible interpretation offered. It is also worthwhile knowing that Mendelssohn's original conception of the last movement of the symphony involved a recapitulation, but that this was deleted from the later draft on which the GA version is based (p. 446).

The dissertation also contains a number of secondary studies of considerable value. Interesting discussions of the various manuscripts may be found on pp. 41ff. and 316ff., where attempts are made to establish the chronologies for the sources of *Elijah* and the "Italian" Symphony. Some 19th-century views on pedalling are presented on pp. 216ff., with evidence drawn from the writings of Kalkbrenner, Thalberg, and Moscheles. In a series of notes an attempt is made to use the information gained from study of the earlier versions to arrive at a more authoritative text of the symphony than is presented in the GA, specifically with regard to indications of dynamics, phrasing, and attack. Added to this is a style of writing that is often breezy and contemporary in usage and metaphor (pp. 28–29):

> Obadiah and the people never engage one another, for Obadiah walks barefoot down Fifth Avenue carrying his message on a placard—and is ignored.

I must admit, furthermore, that I find myself most sympathetically inclined to what is certainly Dr. Mintz's main conclusion, although this is, unfortunately, buried in the middle of his dissertation (pp. 235–236):

> Mendelssohn's first thoughts . . . tended to be traditional. The last thoughts, however, are basically romantic . . . Failure to recognize the relation of the traditional and romantic leads to the endlessly repeated fable about the romantic classicist or the classical romanticist . . . The

> manuscripts prove beyond a doubt that Mendelssohn was AND WANTED TO BE a modern, romantic composer . . .

Studies of this kind, of course, are needed, and needed badly; for despite the wealth of materials and the accessibility of the music, the 19th century seems as little understood as the 14th. Yet after going through this very long and detailed dissertation several times, I cannot but feel a little disappointed with what Dr. Mintz has accomplished. His attempts to support his main conclusion (that Mendelssohn should be considered a Romantic) are based upon an oft-repeated assertion that the draft versions are invariably more traditional, less Romantic, than those of the GA—an assertion I find difficult to accept. Part of the trouble probably can be traced to the fact that Dr. Mintz has not been particularly liberal in the use of examples. Quite often he asks us to take his word for what is contained in the MS, and his descriptions sometimes range fairly far from the factual. Thus, the following assertions are offered without benefit of illustrative example (p. 159):

> There is also entirely too much IV in the MS. . . Of course the GA version . . . does not stay clear of IV, and there is no reason why it should. In the GA, IV is handled so that the chord hints at its coming importance, which is one thing, whereas the MS gives this importance away, and that is quite something else.

I am far from certain, furthermore, that some of those examples drawn from the MS that are included in any completeness of texture or passage could legitimately be termed less Romantic or more traditional. I am more than willing to listen to Dr. Mintz's arguments concerning why they should be so considered, but he never does give any coherent rationale for his judgments. He merely reaches some sort of conclusion about the final version involving greater ambiguity (p. 173), or a replacement of structure by atmosphere (p. 153), and then goes on to say that this is surely a Romantic trait. A list of some of the other characteristics adduced by Professor Mintz may help put his method in perspective. On p. 10 the view that art is a means of subjective expression is presented as an essential characteristic. On p. 116 a passage is said to be Romantic in flavor because a repeated element is taken from within the theme rather than from its beginning; on p. 135 the Romantic quality is traced to an allegation that the two parts of a theme are not governed by the same motive; on pp. 153–154 it is linked to the use of a wider variety of textures, greater tension, and avoidance of structural clarity. The idea that constant flux of tension is a normal condition is taken as a sign of Romanticism (p. 162); so is the omission of the repeat of an exposition section (p. 171). Meaning presented vaguely rather than expounded (p. 173), disguised naïveté (p. 205), richer harmonic practice (pp. 222–223), and less purely musical, more symbolically emotional drama (p. 310) are just a few other traits associated with this artistic movement.

I think it would be most difficult to piece together a coherent picture of that cultural phenomenon known as musical Romanticism from a list of this

kind. Indeed, in the absence of a general and meaningful definition of what is understood by this term, we cannot be at all sure that these are not merely superficial differences—differences which do not really reflect a basic change in attitude.

In addition, while a number of these characteristics may be considered to hit quite close to the mark (for instance, emphasis on atmosphere, the richer harmony), others are distinctly vulnerable. The omission of the repeat of an exposition may be found in Beethoven. Disguised naïveté hardly seems a characteristic of Berlioz or Wagner. Constant intensity flux, I have suggested,[1] is an important characteristic of the music of Haydn, Mozart, and Beethoven, as well as of J. S. Bach. The same would seem to be true of the emotionality of the dramatic structure. It could easily be maintained, after all, that Bach, Haydn, Mozart, and Beethoven were writing as emotionally as they could, given their limited resources of sound, force, color, etc. True enough, they seem to have tried to evoke high emotion in a different way—preferring to build the sense of drama gradually instead of relying upon heavily charged effects—and this may be what Professor Mintz had in mind when he called the Romantic the less strictly musical approach. Nevertheless, I find it difficult to go along with what is at least an implication of lesser emotional intent on the part of these earlier composers. Indeed, I think they were often far more successful than Mendelssohn in projecting a quality of emotional drama, despite the limitations under which they worked. All this suggests that one cannot well assume that there is any kind of general agreement about what constitutes Romanticism.

I think, furthermore, that Dr. Mintz tends to overstate his arguments. Often he seems to assume the role more of an attorney than of a researcher, that he was out to build a case rather than to report his findings, and that he would bend any kind of evidence he could find to the support of his position. Thus, for instance, in reaching the conclusion mentioned above that structure is replaced by atmosphere (p. 152), he seems to exaggerate the significance of some rather minute differences in figuration and use of rests—differences such as might well go unnoticed at the proper speed of performance. And the same point (that the GA presents a more Romantic version than the MS) is driven home so frequently that one cannot but wonder how much it is the result of the study of the manuscripts and how much it represents a prior conviction.

His method of motivic analysis also seems questionable. A passage such as the following (p. 122) seems to infer that motivic and melodic connections are determined by pitch alone, without regard for rhythmic configuration:

> Indeed, the rhythm, combined with harmonic functions, sometimes creates the impression that a melodic similarity exists . . . where in fact, there is no such similarity.

This inference is reinforced by the way motivic and thematic relations are indicated in many of the examples. Thus, for example, the allegation

that the two parts of the first theme of the Trio are not governed by the same motive can be understood only in the light of such an assumption. For the antecedents of these two statements are so close to being identical in rhythm and general outline that it seems inconceivable that anyone who took these factors into account could have overlooked the relationship. Then too, how else could Dr. Mintz have arrived at the following division into motives (p. 119 of the Musical Examples):

Note that this analysis goes completely against Mendelssohn's own rhythmic indications and involves making a distinction between two configurations (labeled 2 and 3), the second of which is merely a transposition of the first. To be sure, Dr. Mintz recognizes the inconsistency in this latter point and attempts to justify his procedure on grounds of "differing functions".

However, my guess is that he was motivated by a desire to play tune detective, to show how various motivic configurations grew out of the entities labeled 1, 2, 3, and 4. Mendelssohn obviously did like to make use of what might be termed a thematic or motivic matrix—a series of characteristic fragments scattered throughout a movement, which could be made to give birth to thematic sections, transitions, developments, etc., by introducing changes in their contour very gradually. Professor Mintz, then, may have been led to adopt just these motivic articulations by a desire to account for the fact that this theme is not directly related to the one so widely used in the development. His very next example, at any rate, purports to show that several of these seemingly arbitrarily defined motives are indeed incorporated into the "development theme", as he calls it.

If the study of relations of this kind was indeed behind the treatment of the motive as essentially a pitch phenomenon, there are two questions that perhaps should be raised: are the connections pointed out plausible, and what has been done about studying the "natural" divisions (i.e., the ones that would have been heard directly) of melodic lines into units. In answer to the first question, I can only venture the opinion that the relations pointed out are often quite implausible. The motives Dr. Mintz professes to see as related are sometimes merely commonplaces presented in quite different rhythmic configurations. These places, furthermore, are often quite distant from each other, in some cases separated by several intervening movements (see especially pp. 394–408 of the text). When, in addition, it is noted that the motives sometimes are defined with utter disregard for the units as they would be perceived, as already pointed out, and are even hidden in the middle of a phrase, or buried in what could legitimately be interpreted as an accompaniment figure, it becomes clear that Professor Mintz has indeed wandered far from what canons of perception and common sense would seem to require.

Indeed, the author admits that some of the relationships he points out would pass unnoticed by the listener, but he defends his observations by claiming that the relationships would be registered subconsciously (p. 398)—a claim which would seem most difficult to substantiate. Interestingly enough, he himself warns against drawing loose relationships of this kind in discussing the Trio (p. 289). I am curious to know why he did not take his own strictures to heart in dealing with the symphony.

I think Professor Mintz has failed to come to grips with the question of the motive as a readily perceived unit. Although the motive is clearly in evidence in Mendelssohn's music, the author seldom deals with it. Nevertheless, he seems to assume that Classic music is built up by repetitions of presumably perceptual fundamental units.

Apparently Dr. Mintz recognizes that his primary reliance upon pitch similarities often got him into trouble, forcing him to deny connections where they obviously existed. Presumably to avoid this difficulty, he introduces a kind of relational process that he calls "poetic structure". To use his own definition (pp. 127–128):

> The essence of poetic structure is that one or more elements of a significant theme are detached from their original context and absorbed into another context in such a way that the process by which this is brought about remains hidden both from the listener and the score reader and can be revealed only by the expenditure of considerable analytic thought.

Upon reading this definition, I wondered what possible aesthetic effect any such relationship could have. When I saw the examples to which he applied it, however, it seemed to be a way out of the dilemma into which his artificial treatment of the motive had plunged him. He finds it necessary to invoke "poetic structure" to explain the readily apparent similarities between the first two phrases of the Trio; he resorts to it even in the case of so obvious a derivation as the following (p. 128):

The frequency with which obvious relations such as these are passed over while others, much less self-evident, are pointed out lends the whole dissertation a kind of Alice-in-Wonderland quality: the unheard-of becomes the expected. Much trouble could have been avoided simply by treating the motive as a small entity designed to be recognized, hence, as a combination of rhythmic pattern and directional profile.

The treatment of formal procedures offers additional grounds for concern. Dr. Mintz makes much, for example, of a supposed conflict in the scherzo of the Trio between sonata-allegro form on the one hand, and minuet and trio form on the other (pp. 258–262). His contention is that the expectations aroused by the belief that this will be a sonata-allegro movement are consistently

confounded by what appear to be moves appropriate for a minuet and trio, and that this conflict is largely responsible for the sense of a kind of reality different from the one we know—a kind of reality (or unreality) that seems most appropriate for this "elfin" music. But all that seems to be involved is a kind of standard set of surprises such as are often to be found in the music of Haydn and Beethoven in particular. I can only question whether the conflict of forms really has such an unworldly effect, or whether it even exists in this case, largely because I am not sure that these forms were considered such concrete things, or that common knowledge of their properties would have been assumed by Mendelssohn. Certainly it seems an exaggeration to suggest that this kind of misdirection was an innovation of the Romantics; indeed, Mendelssohn's movement seems child's play in this respect compared to the scherzo from Beethoven's Op. 59, No. 1—a movement that hardly could be considered suggestive of unreality.

At several points, furthermore, Dr. Mintz touches upon what he considers to be the essential features of sonata-allegro form. Thus, he asserts that "tonal duality is the condition that must be met" if a movement is to satisfy the sonata principle (p. 169). A little later (p. 174), he claims that the development in the first movement of the trio is less Romantic in the MS version than in that of the GA because:

> . . . it is essentially a traditional (or classical) type of development, one in which one or more themes are examined and a variety of new and surprising facts about their natures is revealed.

Without getting involved in arguments that really have no place in a review, I can only suggest that Dr. Mintz again has assumed general agreement where no such unanimity of opinion exists.

There are also some evidences of background problems that tend to undermine confidence in Professor Mintz's judgment. Thus he speaks of the conversion of the bridge into an area of relative tonal stability as being a Romantic development (pp. 139–140). But this type of bridge can be found fairly frequently in the sonata-allegro movements of Haydn, Mozart, and even occasionally Beethoven.[2] Curiously, the one exception Dr. Mintz allows, Mozart's Symphony No. 40, actually does contain a modulation within the bridge—to the dominant of the relative major. I have the feeling, however, that his view of where the bridge is may be different from mine (he does not specify its location). This, at least, is the case in another movement he discusses, the first from Brahms's Second Symphony, where the bridge is said to begin at measure 118. But this seems to me the beginning of the kind of closing drive that usually follows the second theme proper; the passage in measures 44–81 clearly functions exactly as a bridge ought to, with both modulation and an increase in excitement, while measures 82–117 obviously represent a new theme in a new key, and hence could well be designated as the second or subsidiary theme. If this section from measure 118 on is really what Dr. Mintz considers a Romantic bridge, I would suspect again that he

has compared fundamentally different types of entities in arriving at this conclusion about the stable bridge. Certainly, if he compared this passage with exactly equivalent sections from Classic movements, he could hardly reach the conclusion that tonal stability at this point in the form was a Romantic innovation.

In the face of questionable facts and judgments such as these, I do not see how much reliance can be placed in the analytical or cultural conclusions Professor Mintz offers us. When, for instance, he speaks of his own inability to decide whether certain passages should or should not be considered related as a reflection of "the peculiar love of ambiguity characteristic of the romantic music" (p. 121), I wonder if he has really demonstrated sufficient objectivity and analytical acumen to enable us to have much confidence in his evaluation. We might well feel that more rational standards of analysis would perhaps have done away with the ambiguity. Nor is it easy to accept Dr. Mintz's assertions about the consistently more Romantic quality of the GA. Are the early drafts really more Classic in conception than the final versions, or are they merely less polished?

I should report also that the manuscript of this dissertation was rather carelessly prepared—obviously in haste, as most probably are. There are numerous uncorrected typographical errors; examples promised in the text are nowhere to be found (p. 157); Mozart's Symphony No. 40 is listed as K. 440 (p. 140); there are inconsistencies in the measure numbers allotted to expositions, developments, and recapitulations (p. 107 and p. 237).

In the last analysis, a dissertation like this is always something of a gamble. For it is so much an attempt to prove a point—that Mendelssohn was a Romantic—rather than to present factual material and explore various inferential possibilities, that failure to support this point adequately would leave very little substance that might be of interest to the academic community. Thus, I must report that I would be hard put to think of ways in which this dissertation would prove useful in research or teaching, although, as I have pointed out, some of the individual observations are well worth study.

I hope, however, that Professor Mintz will have the courage and patience to take up this task again. He has a great and detailed store of knowledge concerning Mendelssohn and these works in particular, as well as the kind of mind that could produce a much needed re-evaluation of a badly misunderstood figure. But if he is to accomplish this, I would suggest, he must reconsider his preconceptions concerning evidence, inference, and, especially important, analysis. Should Dr. Mintz be able to do this, I would expect an outstanding contribution to musical scholarship to result.

FOOTNOTES

[1] "Intensity as a distinction between classical and romantic music," *Journal of aesthetics and art criticism*, 23:359–371 (Spring 1965).

[2] See, for instance, William W. Abbott, *Certain aspects of the sonata-allegro form in piano sonatas of the 18th and 19th Centuries* (Unpub. Diss., Indiana University, 1956) where a number of movements of this kind by these composers are listed.

Mayer Joel Mandelbaum—*Multiple division of the octave and the tonal resources of 19-tone temperament*

Ann Arbor: University Microfilms (UM order no. 61–4461), 1961. (479 p., Indiana University diss.)

John Chalmers

While some recent developments in music have tended to minimize the role of defined pitch as a structural element, there nevertheless are theorists and composers who are concerned with creating a new music in which the melodic and harmonic orders are still fundamental organizing parameters. Rejecting both the extremes of 12-tone combinatorial serialism and the psychological ambiguities of the aesthetic of indeterminacy, these musicians seek to organize sound by means which, though grounded in history, are consistent with the results of modern acoustical research. Such endeavours may be subsumed under the somewhat unsatisfactory term *multiple division*,[1] the division of tonal space into steps which deviate significantly from the 300-year-old norm of twelve equal tones. In a field as large and complex as this, no general attempt at a theoretical treatment has appeared since Bosanquet in 1876.[2] The relevant material that has appeared in the meantime has tended to suffer from relative obscurity and either unsympathetic or idiosyncratic treatment by its authors. In correcting these long standing deficiencies in the literature and in proposing a new and rational theory of composition in the 19-tone system, Dr. Mandelbaum has created the definitive work in the field.

The dissertation is divided into three sections, the first of which is devoted to the various reasons for advocating multiple division grouped under the general categories: acoustical, historical, and evolutional. The last, since it deals in part with concrete aspects of style and performance, may have the greatest immediacy for the contemporary musician although the speculative theorist, as Dr. Mandelbaum considers himself, must also build his case on traditional foundations.

Musical acoustics, or, one is tempted to say, harmonics, is developed from a consideration of tonal consonance and its relation to the ratios of small whole numbers. Dr. Mandelbaum's elaboration of these concepts through a thorough discussion of tone lattices is particularly valuable. Explained in this manner, the functional relationship of rather complex pitch ratios is made clear. The voluminous literature on this aspect of acoustics is well-covered. Nonharmonic and nonoctaval scales, fields of active interest today,