

Por ocasião do III Congresso da TeMA realizado conjuntamente com o IV Congresso Internacional de Música e Matemática, organizados pelo Programa de Pós-Graduação em Música da UFRJ, foram realizadas duas entrevistas com convidados palestrantes do evento. A primeira foi conduzida pelo prof. Liduino Pitombeira e o entrevistado é o prof. Patrick McCreless da Yale University, EUA. McCreless tem uma vasta atividade como teórico e analista musical. Entre suas inúmeras publicações destacam-se *Wagner's Siegfried: Its Drama, History, and Music* (1982); "An Evolutionary Perspective on Semitone Relations in the Nineteenth Century" em *The Second Practice of Nineteenth-Century Tonality* (1996); "Music and Rhetoric" em *The Cambridge History of Western Music Theory* (2002). Sua atuação e interesses são na música dos séculos XIX e início do XX; sobre cromatismo na música tonal; história e atualidades da teoria musical, e conceitos de retórica e gesto como ferramentas analíticas. Tem sido convidado como principal conferencista em diversos países, tais como: Grã-Bretanha, Espanha, Dinamarca, Holanda, Brasil e China.

A segunda entrevista, conduzida pelo prof. Carlos Almada, foi realizada com o professor Edgardo José Rodríguez da Universidad Nacional de La Plata, Argentina. Rodríguez tem atuado nas áreas da teoria e análise tonal generativa, da linguística musical, e pesquisado sobre a música atonal livre e dodecafônica da Segunda Escola de Viena. Tem uma atuação importante na música popular argentina e no tango contemporâneo, em especial como violonista com os quartetos "La rodriguera" e "Tango chino".

## **1. Entrevista com Prof. Patrick McCreless, conduzida pelo Prof. Liduino Pitombeira**

*LP* How do you evaluate the developments on the study of chromaticism since the publication of your 1983 paper "Ernst Kurth and the Analysis of the Chromatic Music of the Late Nineteenth Century"?

*PM* I can answer only from the point of view of a theorist working in North America in the early 1980s. At the time, the reigning approach to tonal music was Schenkerian analysis, which certainly offered important insights into chromaticism, but also had its limitations. Schenkerian theory was splendid for



showing how chromaticism, even quite extreme chromaticism, in tonal pieces could be explained by the combination of linearity and prolongation. For example, in analyzing a lengthy passage in  $\flat$ VI in a major key, a Schenkerian theorist would show how the  $\flat$ VI fits coherently into the linear-contrapuntal workings of a piece, and explain the measures on that key as a prolongation of it, so that the contrapuntal event in a sense generates the harmonic one. Such analyses can be valuable and perceptive, and Schenkerian theory continues to be a useful tool for analyzing chromatic music.

But Schenkerian theory misses some important chromatic techniques that developed in the nineteenth—and even the late eighteenth—century. Here are two straightforward examples. The first technique involves what we call “real sequences” —that is, repetitions of a musical passage at a given interval that are exact transpositions of the original, such as the statement of a phrase successively in minor thirds (e.g., C major–E $\flat$  major–F $\sharp$  major–A major) with no diatonic adjustments. An American theorist, Gregory Proctor, was the first scholar to address this phenomenon, which he called the *transposition operation*, in detail. His 1978 Princeton dissertation was a must-read text in the early 1980’s, and extensive work by other theorists in the past 35 years has carried the idea forward, demonstrating how such “equal divisions of the octave” function in a wide range of repertoires, from Mozart to Schubert to Tchaikovsky to Fauré. The second technique involves the associative use of keys in dramatic music, as in Wagner’s *Ring*, where the river Rhine is in E $\flat$  major, Valhalla in D $\flat$  major, Nibelheim in B $\flat$  minor, the Sword in C major, and so forth. This technique even occurs in instrumental music, in the form of the *pitch-class motive*: a particular chromatic note, such as the D $\flat$  in the first movement of Beethoven’s *Eroica* Symphony, or the C $\sharp$  in the finale of his Eighth, is posed as a problem, a “sore note,” as Joseph Kerman called it, that must be dealt with and resolved for the piece to end. Both of these techniques are ubiquitous in nineteenth-century music, and theorists have addressed them in dozens of pieces since the early 1980s.

A reason why I became interested in the work of Ernst Kurth is that he recognized both of these procedures, which were central to the musical language of the *Ring* (I had just completed my dissertation on Siegfried), and he discussed them in detail, with many examples. Kurth’s work was not well-known at the time, and I was excited about making North American theorists aware of it. My

article was perhaps flawed, to the degree I was projecting current analytical ideas back on Kurth. But his ideas did line up well with what was happening in music analysis at the time, and we would soon have a much more thorough account of his work in Lee Rothfarb's 1989 book, *Ernst Kurth as Theorist and Analyst*. Rothfarb's achievement in bringing Kurth's writings—especially those on nineteenth-century chromaticism—to light can serve as an example of another important development in the study of chromaticism in the past 35 years: the return to earlier music theories to contextualize and illuminate current theories. The title of a 1994 book by Daniel Harrison illustrates this phenomenon perfectly: *Harmonic Function in Chromatic Music: A Renewed Dualist Theory and an Account of Its Precedents*. In the book he returned to nineteenth-century German theorists (theorists who in the early 1990s seemed irrelevant to modern music theory) to develop a theory of his own using the ideas on harmonic dualism (the idea that the minor tonal system is the exact inverse of the major system) of Moritz Hauptmann, Arthur von Oettingen, and Hugo Riemann, as well as the harmonic functionalism of Riemann. His book also inserted into scholarship on chromaticism a renewed concern with chord-to-chord progression, using dualistic ideas that many theorists considered misguided, even ludicrous and not worth bothering with, at the time.

Concern with chord-to-chord motion, and concern with the work of earlier theorists, have also guided the influential ideas of the late David Lewin and Richard Cohn. Lewin's article on Wagner's *Parsifal* in 1984 was strongly influenced by Riemann, and is still the *locus classicus* how we can evaluate chromaticism within a tonal context. Also crucial is his mathematically-based transformation theory (1987), which is as involved with tonal music and its chromatic problems as it is with atonal music. And Cohn, using techniques from contemporary atonal theory, developed in the 1990s some important insights into chromatic practice—insights that he initially thought he was deriving from Riemann, but which, by the publication of *Audacious Euphony: Chromatic Harmony and the Triad's Second Nature*, in 2012, he realized he was in a long line of late eighteenth- and early nineteenth-century German theory, including the tradition that led to Riemann, and (interestingly!) the almost unknown theorist Carl Friedrich Weitzmann. Briefly stated, Cohn's work deals with properties and voice-leading connections of major and minor triads, and the fact that even though they function perfectly well in conventional diatonic tonality, they can

function equally well in a totally independent system of harmony—a system that he shows to have been quite robust in the nineteenth century and beyond—based on parsimonious (that is, as small as possible) voice-leading. Much recent work on tonality in general, and chromaticism in particular, is related, directly or tangentially, to these ideas: David Kopp's *Chromatic Transformations in Nineteenth-Century Music* (2002), Steven Rings's *Tonality and Transformation* (2006), Dmitri Tymoczko's *A Geometry of Music* (2011), and work by Julian Hook and others. The study of chromaticism in tonal music remains a lively area of research in music theory.

*LP* You have written a very comprehensive chapter on music and rhetoric in the *Cambridge History of Western Music Theory*. How would you see the use of musical-rhetorical tools both in the analysis of contemporary repertory as well as in the compositional planning of new works (including electroacoustic music)?

*PM* My chapter on rhetoric in the *Cambridge History* was entirely concerned with the history of the concept rhetoric as it has been used in Western music, and with a small number of sample musical analyses that illustrated its main points. This historical background is, of course, related to your question, but in answering it, I'll be more interested in an approach to rhetoric that pairs it with the concept of musical gesture, since both terms are so common in our discussions of new music. *Musical rhetoric* and *musical gesture* are expressions that we contemporary musicians—whether composers, performers, theorists, ethnomusicologists, or historians—use all the time, often unthinkingly, as a kind of default. They are terms that are indispensable to our musical discourse, in that they say something that a more rigorous theoretical language cannot, and thus we are reluctant to give them up.

What is it about *rhetoric* and *gesture* that seem so powerful in helping us to understand all sorts of music? What can they do, if anything, that more formal, explicit music theory does not? I propose to approach this question by asking a different question: how do they relate to one another? Since they share both their ubiquity and their lack of formalism, and since they overlap in ways (one uses gestures to make rhetorical points), it may be productive to consider them together rather than separately. In fact, stepping back for a moment, we see an interesting paradox. On the one hand, rhetoric seems to be the broader, more

general term, such that gesture is an element of rhetoric. This has been true of rhetoric from the beginning: classical treatises on rhetoric treat gesture as one of a number of techniques that can make one's rhetoric better, not as an art in itself. This is why Quintilian, whose *Institutio oratoria* (c. 100 CE) gives us the quintessential Roman pedagogy on rhetoric, puts his chapter on gesture at the very end of his book—Chapter 11 out of 11 chapters. Once all other skills are mastered, gesture is the final touch to make an orator, or his oratory, persuasive. *Gesture* is thus the icing on the rhetorical cake. Considered in these terms, rhetoric governs the whole communicative act and its content—the whole speech, the whole poem, the whole piece of music—and gestures may be used to inflect, emphasize, and dramatize that content.

When we consider the rhetorical shaping of New Music (which for present purposes I will define as post-1950s art music that is not tonal or tonal-centric, may or may not use discrete pitches, and may use any sort of noise or unpitched sounds), *gesture* is a term that we can hardly do without. Not only do we, as listeners and analysts, perceive many phenomena in the music as gestures, but the language of gesture permeates discussions of contemporary musical composition—from composition studios at music conservatories, to interviews of composers, to reviews, and to the analysis of new compositions. In composition studios, at least in the USA, teachers offer comments to young composers such as “you should do more with this gesture”—“you need a stronger gesture here to articulate this important point of arrival”—“I like these gestures, but the way you string them together doesn't make any musical sense to me.” Similarly, the concept of the musical gesture is often at the heart of how composers describe their compositional process: “I didn't compose this piece from start to finish, but rather found a gesture that I really liked, and built the piece around that.” Not that composers consciously choose this expression over others; rather, *gesture* seems intuitively and intrinsically musical, and it conveys a sense of physical motion through time that these other terms do not. It is for this reason that it often dominates conversations of composers about their work. The term also useful, even necessary, because the actual pitch and rhythmic details of recent music are often so complex that they resist description in more specific terms. We can hear and describe a musical event as a gesture even if we cannot accurately perceive the exact pitches and rhythms of a passage.

*Gesture* is also a word that we hear constantly in the world of electroacoustic and computer music. An important aesthetic task in at least some electroacoustic music is to impart a sense of physical motion in an idiom that does not involve bodily gestures of performers at all. For example, in an essay about the notation of electroacoustic music, one composer has recently written, “In concerts of acousmatic pieces, no performers are involved apart from the sound projectionist. This type of music is designed for loudspeaker listening, where the audience does not have visual access to the gestures of sound-making.” The familiar term *gesture control*, as I understand it, is about making sounds that are not directly produced by human physical motion, but seem as though they are so produced. It is also about developing and engineering technologies whereby actual physical motion with a touchpad or joy-stick—or a T-stick—translates naturally into the illusion of moving sound. Or, conversely, that hearing such sounds produced electroacoustically will stimulate in us the feeling of a physical gesture, perhaps the one we would have to use were we to have to produce a similar succession of sounds on an acoustic instrument. It is a challenge to analysts to think systematically about musical gesture, but in my view, this is entirely possible, and can lead up into important insights about the music with which we are dealing.

**LP** In your perspective, what is the current situation of musicological and theoretical research in music?

**PM** It seems to me that musicological and theoretical research in music is in a growth phase. This can be seen in the blossoming of scholarly societies in music theory and musicology all over the world. The two societies meeting here this week are excellent examples of new music-scholarly organizations that bring together musicians and scholars with common interests and common goals. When I entered the field in the late 1970s, the Society for Music Theory in the US had just been founded, and there was only one regional music theory society, the Music Theory Society of New York State. Now there are ten, in all sections of the US. And, as you know, there are now societies in music theory and analysis in many countries and regions of the world, and they all seem to be thriving. There are also specialized societies in the analysis of world music, popular music, music perception and cognition, and many more. With the expansion of music scholarship has come a proliferation of journals, in print and online, that produce



new work and offer places for scholars, young and old, to publish. And finally, we are seeing a dramatic internationalization of music scholarship. In the 1970s and early 1980s, young scholars—graduate students and junior professors—had little opportunity to present papers abroad. Now, with many more scholarly meetings around the world, and huge conferences like that of *EuroMAC*, a young scholar can build up an impressive international portfolio within a year or two of entering the field.

The underside of all this energy and activity, though, is that it is taking place at a time when universities and other educational institutions are downsizing and reducing the number of teaching positions available. In a word, this means that there are many more candidates for fewer and fewer jobs, certainly in the USA, but also worldwide. And so students thinking about going to graduate school and entering the rewarding field of music scholarship need to take a close look at the reality of employment possibilities that will await them a few years down the road when they finish their dissertations. One way in which graduate students can prepare themselves for the job market is to develop skills in more than one area—not only, say, publishing in two or more different scholarly fields, but making themselves marketable in administration, in technology, or in related fields in music. Technology is particularly important here; I know young scholars who have relatively low-paying teaching positions, but they are able to sell their skills with music notation software, recording engineering, or video game development and thereby make a productive living.

*LP* How do you assess the contribution of interdisciplinary studies to the field of musicological research?

*PM* Interdisciplinarity is crucial these days, in teaching, to be sure, but also in scholarship. When I entered the field, it was to my advantage to have developed a secure knowledge of the historical and literary background of Wagner's *Ring*, and to have written an article on Roland Barthes and music. But my "bread and butter," as the saying goes, was my musical skills, my knowledge of the classical repertoire, and my experience in analysis. Now, with the dramatic growth of interest in sound studies, music perception and cognition, music in society, popular culture, and much more, scholars at the beginning of their careers need to be aware of what is going on in related fields, and keep up-to-date in one or two of them. The days of writing dissertations on a particular

composer or piece seem to be diminishing. Fewer and fewer students are writing on individual composers repertoires, or pieces, and more and more are writing interdisciplinary studies, because they sell, and that's where the energy seems to be. At Yale these days, even in music theory we have very few students writing dissertations on music-analytical topics. In some ways I see this as a healthy development, but in others I see it as a loss. I'm skeptical of the idea that music studies are moving further and further away from music.

*LP* What is your advice for the professional development of a music analyst?

*PM* 1) Stay engaged with music: excellent musical skills, a trained ear, and a firm knowledge of one or repertoires are still essential to professional development and opportunity. 2) That said, be versatile. More than ever, it's common for music students to be eclectic—to practice Chopin for a while, then listen to electronic dance music on the walk to music history class, and then to jam with friends on a couple of jazz tunes in the evening. I regularly ask my teaching assistants to supply me with popular or jazz tunes that incorporate the harmonic phenomena that we study in class. Students, who seem to feel no dissonance among their wide selection of musical tastes, are always engaged by this didactic behavior. Eclecticism sells. 3) Take a broad view of your discipline, and try to understand its historical and cultural context. Be the best musician, analyst, and teacher that you can, but keep your eyes open: honor and value what you're doing, but be aware of its limitations.

## **2. Entrevista com o Prof. Edgardo José Rodríguez, conduzida pelo Prof. Carlos Almada**

*CA* Você poderia nos contar sobre o cenário acadêmico em relação ao campo da teoria musical na Argentina? Se possível, poderia também, por favor, apresentar uma breve contextualização histórica sobre este aspecto?

*ER* Na minha opinião, a teoria musical na Argentina, entendida como campo de estudo, reflexão e desenvolvimento específico, foi constituída apenas nas últimas décadas. Antes disso há apenas alguns exemplos isolados, dos quais os mais significativos para mim são:



(1) os trabalhos de Francisco Kröpfl (1931), entre o final da década de 1960 e início dos anos 1970. Em uma de suas abordagens, desenvolveu uma metodologia composicional baseada em ordenamentos intervalares chamados “micromodos”. Isso foi reconstruído por meio das anotações de seus alunos e em alguns artigos publicados, muito tempo depois. Em outra abordagem, ele criou uma metodologia de análise rítmica (*Propuesta para una metodología de análisis rítmico*. Buenos Aires, 1989. Edición del Departamento de Música, Sonido e Imagen del Centro Cultural Ciudad de Buenos Aires), sobre a qual, até onde eu sei, nenhum estudo musicológico foi publicado.

(2) Sergio Hualpa (1941-1990), professor de Harmonia da Faculdade de Belas Artes UNLP, nos anos 1980, escreveu dois manuais de harmonia (para circulação acadêmica) onde propôs novos conceitos que, na época, não eram redutíveis a concepções tradicionais riemannianas ou schenkerianas. Estas obras não foram publicadas e tampouco estudadas musicologicamente.

**CA** Poderia, por favor, comentar sobre sua trajetória como compositor, arranjador e instrumentista?

**ER** Desde criança estou ligado à música. Aos 7 ou 8 anos de idade participei de uma banda juvenil, onde tocava trompete. Um pouco mais tarde, ingressei no conservatório para estudar violão. Cantei em coros durante minha adolescência. Durante o curso secundário, paralelamente ao conservatório, integrei um conjunto de rock e estreei minhas primeiras composições das quais, todavia, não me arrependo hoje. Logo ao graduar-me na universidade, ingressei no sistema nacional de pesquisas e depois no sistema universitário (onde ainda desenvolvo meu trabalho).

Componho assiduamente, música para cena, tango contemporâneo, música popular argentina e acadêmica de vanguarda.

**CA** Infelizmente, temos no Brasil pouca informação sobre a música contemporânea argentina. É a mesma situação em seu país? Se afirmativo, poderia comentar brevemente possíveis soluções no nível acadêmico/institucional?

**ER** Creio que sim. Salvo a obra de Villa-Lobos, a música acadêmica brasileira em geral e, em particular, a contemporânea, é quase completamente desconhecida em meu país. Isso toma parte do desconhecimento cultural e

político, mútuo e geral (em minha opinião, as únicas exceções são a música popular brasileira, que é um fenômeno mundial e, desde muito, o futebol). As razões para isso podem ser várias. Uma delas, aliás, no caso do Brasil, é a diferença linguística, o que não explicaria no entanto a desconexão entre a Argentina e os demais países em que se fala o castelhano. Evidentemente, nossas sociedades, pela natureza de seus desenvolvimentos históricos, cresceram muito desvinculadas cultural e economicamente das sucessivas e diferentes (no caso do Brasil) metrópoles. A proximidade física de nossos países não conseguiu superar essa distância referencial original. Num determinado momento, pensou-se que o Mercosul proporcionaria uma aproximação substantiva o que, no entanto, não aconteceu.

*CA* Gostaríamos muito de ouvir sobre seu novo livro, sobre a música do século XX. Poderia, por favor, dar-nos um painel geral básico sobre ele?

*ER* O livro se limita a alguns apontamentos sobre a Escola de Viena (representada somente por Schoenberg e Webern) e o serialismo integral. É o resultado de todos esses anos de estudo e análises, um resumo, uma sistematização das fontes, uma genealogia intelectual. Em certo sentido, é um registro de nossas ideias sobre esses temas (o livro foi escrito junto com meu colega e amigo Alejandro Martinez). Ao mesmo tempo, pretende ser um suporte excêntrico, realizado por musicólogos que não participam diretamente da tradição que originou as músicas estudadas.