LETTERS TO THE EDITOR

from RUDOLF SABOR

I am working on a fairly extensive book on Richard Wagner. May I enlist your readers’ help in making available to me, on short loan, any of the following publications which may be in their possession:

Bayreuther Blätter: any vols. between 1878 and 1939.
Bayreuther Festspielführer: 1924/5, 1928, 1930/1, 1933.
Bayreuther Festspiele Programmhefte: any prior to 1954.
Other material, either unpublished or not normally available.

6 Kedleston Drive,
Petts Wood,
Kent

from HANS KELLER

I was happy to see Hans Werner Henze describe Schoenberg’s Glückliche Hand as the ancestor of Peter Maxwell Davies’s Taverner. I had drawn attention to this ancestry in Opera, November 1972. If two people make such a seemingly remote diagnosis, it would seem to go beyond impressionistic criticism.

London, N.W.3.

from PROFESSOR CLAUDIO SPIES

In responding to Mr. Eric Walter White’s letter in TEMPO 103, concerning a point about Stravinsky’s Movements, m.180, in my article in TEMPO 102, I must begin by assuring Mr. White that I concur in his estimate of the C#’s authenticity; there can be no doubt—and I never did cast any on the fact—that Stravinsky wrote it.

But just as we are obliged to differentiate between the printed and the accurate,—and not to assume any correlation (either way) between the two—it follows that the authentic (as defined by its author’s identity) is not necessarily also the correct (as definable under the specified constraints of a musical system, or technique). Mr. White, having asserted that this C# is, so far as he can judge, ‘patently correct’, must therefore be assumed to have construed the C#’s correctness; to have, in other words, a musical basis for his assertion. Since he has not, however, included that construal in his letter, I can now do no less than to submit evidence in support of the statement made in my article (p. 6, last sentence within parentheses). To this end, I need do little beyond invoking two familiar principles: (a) the discreteness of content among complementary hexachords of a twelve-tone set, and (b) the integrity of content as a hexachordal normative.
The appended example will illustrate the application of both principles to the music at hand, as follows: the content of each of the three set-forms is indicated in capitalized pitch-class denominations (cf. TEMPO 102, p. 6, Ex. 2), and bracketed above and below; complementary hexachords are designated h^a and h^b; hexachordal rotation (V) occurs in the I form; the statement of h^b precedes the statement of h^a in the IR form, and hexachordal content is in both instances presented in partial disarray (i.e., four factors of h^b occur in retrogression; the final trichord of h^a is rotated); straight lines are drawn between pitch-class denominations and their representatives in mm. 180-181; notes enclosed in a square or dotted square fail to correspond to stated hexachordal content; curved lines are drawn between such ‘boxed’ notes and likewise boxed pitch-class denominations. It may be readily ascertained, therefore, that it is not only a matter of the C^b, but also of the B^b (piano, left hand) at the beginning of m. 181; both notes should, each for their separately specifiable reasons, be B^b. And if the above should be deemed insufficient evidence, the registra\ally extreme duplication of the boxed C^b and the fourth quintolet in violas & cellos, as well as the circled, temporally adjacent, timbrally undifferentiated, 2-octave related dyads A - B^b should do the trick.

In addition, I may cite an ‘historical’ precedent: in connection with most of the works composed after 1962, I was called upon to check both Stravinsky’s manuscript-reproduced scores and printer’s proofs for oversights and errors of this kind. I might add, for Mr. White’s peace of mind, that my suggestions for numerous such corrections were invariably accepted by the composer.

And lastly, I lend weight to my argument with Stravinsky’s own words, through a (true) anecdote. Early in 1959, when he was composing Movements, Stravinsky was staying at the Hotel Gladstone in New York. Milton Babbitt paid him a visit
there one day and describes him as emerging from his work room in a state of
great excitement and elation, saying that he had just found a mistake, and had
corrected it . . . ‘and the right note is so much better.’

Department of Music,
Princeton University

ERIC WALTER WHITE replies:
It is clear to me that Professor Spies is correct about the peccant C\textsuperscript{#} in the piano
part (middle of bar 180) of Stravinsky’s Movements, while I was wrong. I am indeed
grateful to him for his clear and cogent explanation. My excuse for my lapse must
be that I was strongly influenced by the intervallic content of this phrase and
misled by the peccant C\textsuperscript{#} into hearing the interval of a fourth between it and the
preceding G\textsuperscript{#}. This led me to identify the phrase with part of the original series
transposed. That there are common features between the series (so transposed)
and the retrograde inversion of the series (not transposed) fascinates me; and I
like to think it may have fascinated the composer too and possibly tempted him
to leave this peccant note uncorrected in his score, since it may have been arrived
at by the sort of accident he referred to in his Poetics of Music where he said: ‘On
occasion [the composer] may draw profit from something unforeseen that a
momentary lapse reveals to him.’

21 Alwyne Road,
London, N. 1

AARON COPLAND

Inscape

Commissioned by the New York Philharmonic Orchestra in celebration
of its 125th anniversary season, 1967.
Scoring: 3. 3. 3. 2 — 4. 3. 3. 1 — Harp, piano, celesta, percussion—
strings.
Duration: 12\frac{1}{2} minutes.
Pocket score and full score for sale. Parts for hire.

. . . the music achieves an emotional intensity which is disturbing yet
uncannily beautiful. It is an important and powerful statement.
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