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Abstract
This study demonstrates how a particular discourse was adopted in Western Europe in the early 1950s to explicate musical practices of the avant-garde. Developed by Theodor W. Adorno, René Leibowitz, and Herbert Eimert, this discourse presented New Music as the universalisation of formal techniques which, these theorists argued, demonstrated the most advanced, unflinching engagement with the objective historical condition of musical material. The result, so the story goes, was that young generation of composers broke with the past in toto to write a rigorously anti-intuitive music inspired solely by the work of Anton Webern: the Darmstadt School. At the point of writing, the inadequacies and outright fabrications of this discourse have been repeatedly detailed by an increasingly rich body of scholarship. But this discourse nevertheless continues to ground the available historical understanding of New Music of the post-war era. In an effort to discover the reasons for its remarkable longevity, this study scrutinises this discourse with a particular attention to how it explicates the practices of composers it describes. Through this analysis, it becomes clear that this discourse is not so much concerned with composition proper but rather with the universalisation of technical processes. The question, then, becomes which practices supplied such techniques that were universalised as the ‘Darmstadt School’, and at what cost? Accordingly, this study also evaluates works of ‘total’ serialism – those of now-marginal composers such as Karel Goeyvaerts and Michel Fano – within an alternative, self-sufficient tradition, thereby describing how such an avant-garde was constructed on the aesthetic foundations of composers and practices which were excluded from it.
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A friend of mine, years ago, after a first trip to Mexico, was deeply impressed by the Mexican Indians. He had read The Plumed Serpent and tripped over it. What most struck him was the image, bright in his mind, of these Indians, squatting by the side of the road, impassive, “their eyes like black stone, onyx, sitting there as if waiting for death.” In his speech, “death” came out “Death.” Another friend, who was a Mexican, said that they were waiting for the bus to come along and didn’t feel like standing. So Lawrence and a dozen movies were shaken to their foundations. The first friend was outraged and wouldn’t speak to the Mexican friend for two weeks. His Plato was impugned. The world is NOT what I want to make it? He returned to Lawrence in a rage. Those Indians! A bus? A bus!? He was personally attacked, he felt. They were waiting for Death!

The reader will see that what I am driving at is that these words that he is reading—are words.

— Gilbert Sorrentino, Imaginative Qualities of Actual Things
Introduction

Subject and scope

This study is about the relationship between two topics, both of which are familiar. The first is the Darmstadt School as it is deployed as a discursive formation in an extremely broad range of texts, both general and specialised, but most prominently and consistently in English-language textbook accounts of the post-war musical avant-garde. These accounts give descriptions and explanations for an austere, crypto-mathematical music – the post-Webernian, pointillist serialism of the Darmstadt School – which predetermined every imaginable aspect of musical composition out of some blinkered obsession with technical progress. But a look at the scores (or, more rarely, the hearing of a performance) of the music these accounts do mention reveals almost no relationship to the description given. How did these historians arrive at such a description, then, and what music might it have described? This situation leads onto the second topic, of a somewhat more recent vintage but nevertheless fairly well established: the vivid multiplicity of practices attributed to various composers, musicians, and theorists operating within the context of the post-war avant-garde. More often than not, these two topics have appeared posed against each other as polemic rejoinders, arguments from ‘pro’ and ‘anti-Darmstadt’ factions: the unifying discursive totality of the Darmstadt School and its doctrine of ‘total serialism’ operates as a condemnation of elitist, ‘anti-human’ music meticulously crafted to repel audiences, while more detailed studies on the irreconcilable differences of ideology, aesthetics, and technique manifested in the compositions of the so-called Darmstadt School are often framed as a corrective to persistent myths about Darmstadt. Among these studies, the work of Martin Iddon, M.J. Grant, Mark Delaere, Inge Kovács, 


2 This characterization, widely attested in textbook accounts, is perhaps most vividly expressed in Taruskin, *Music in the Late Twentieth Century*. For a more detailed synopsis of its deployment in historiographical accounts of the post-war avant-garde, see the Conclusion of this study.
Christopher Fox, Björn Heile, and Paul Attinello may be cited as the most rigorous and far-reaching. The question, then, is how was this vivid multiplicity reduced to the simple, misleading story of the Darmstadt School? Moreover, if the textbook descriptions do not match the music, where could they have come from in the first place? Where did this story come from, and what does it actually describe?

As an intervention in these scholarly and discursive traditions, this study makes two contributions to a critical understanding of New Music. The first contribution is straightforward, and neatly fits into the existing ‘vivid multiplicity’ tradition of scholarship outlined above: this study presents and analyses works by composers who have been marginal to the historiographical unfolding of European New Music in an effort to re-classify and re-trace the development of aesthetic and ideological commonalities between composers of this era. In so doing, it implicitly re-casts notions of historical avant-gardism by drawing attention to the ways in which these marginal figures and practices could be and indeed were seen at the time as vitally central to the evolution and practice of New Music. The marginality of these figures then, is a product of retroactive history; they turned out to have been marginal. If this effort nevertheless betrays something of a Linnaean pretention, this is hopefully qualified by the study’s second major focus, which is concerned with how these compositional practices were assimilated into a unitary, stable discourse of international New Music that has prefigured how they are received and understood to the present. That is to say, the dual topics of this study have not been adopted in the service of a completionist history looking to fill in the gaps left by textbook accounts, but rather seek to explain, on a discursive level, how certain key points of reference themselves arose in iterative negotiations between those who developed these practices and influential cultural commentators who made sense of them. What this study

---

demonstrates is that the current available understanding of the post-war avant-garde in general and the ‘Darmstadt School’ in particular is reliant on descriptions of marginal practices. Such marginal practices are used to explicate the music of certain figures who would, in subsequent historical accounts, occupy the centre of New Music: Karlheinz Stockhausen, Pierre Boulez, Luigi Nono, Bruno Maderna. Descriptions which in fact describe the work of ‘marginal’ figures – Karel Goeyvaerts, Jean Barraqué, Jef Golschekff, Josef Matthias Hauer, among others – are given to explicate the work of ‘central’ figures. As such, this discourse is both iterative and dynamic: the figures in the model change, but the model remains the same. This discourse reinscribes itself onto practice in three ways that are demonstrated in this study. First of all, as mentioned above, descriptions of work by ‘marginal’ composers are taken to explicate the work of ‘central’ composers. Secondly, this discourse is applied teleologically, so that the work of subsequent practitioners is necessarily in dialogue with this specific tradition of New Music. Thirdly, the iterative deployment of this discourse is taken up and reproduced as an *a priori* ground by accounts seeking to problematize and critique the operation of New Music. The contention of this study is that in each of these three cases, the same discourse is at work. It ensures that New Music is prefigured as a stable, coherent, self-evident formation whether the speaker is arguing for the artistic legitimacy of the Darmstadt courses or against their undue cultural hegemony.

Such a prefiguration is, in essence, what is at stake for this study. It delimits the discourse of New Music and grounds how works and practitioners are understood. More to the point, it circumscribes what may be said of New Music, and sets the terms of its critique. Historically-framed critique, like that of Richard Taruskin, replicates the discourse described above in a neat and obvious manner. But this discourse also prepares the ground for critiques arising from more nuanced and seemingly empirical methodological orientations, suggesting that the understanding of New Music that it provides is far more rooted within the study of music than a simple revision of the historical record might correct. To take an example of one such nuanced account, *Rationalizing Culture*, Georgina Born’s ethnographical study of the IRCAM studio, remains the best-known critique of the European avant-garde and its institutionalisation. Building on the sociology of Pierre Bourdieu and Raymond Williams, Born’s study rejects what she refers to as ‘instrumentalist and evolutionist perspectives’ in an effort to ‘look behind the discourse to de-idealize the various claims made on behalf of the technologies, scrutinizing the role of technological research and development in musical
“progress” and tracing the actual social and cultural character of the technological practices and research process to ultimately work towards a ‘social semiotics of music’. Yet Born’s rejection of discourses of musical progress already concedes quite a bit of the conceptual ground that her empirical approach is intended to complicate. Indeed, the perceived consistency, stability, and ubiquity of these discourses operates as the historical grounding of her ethnography:

The serialist composers of the ’50s tried in different ways to generalize serialism in order to produce a new, universal method of composition. Following their reading of Webern’s late technique, they extended serialism to the rationalist and determinist control not only of pitch but of all other parameters of composition: rhythm or duration, dynamics, and timbre. This became known as “total,” “integrated,” or “generalized” serialism [...] serialist composers attempted to purify the correct, rigorous direction of the avant-garde – a direction that was posed as absolute and inescapable. Of course, Born’s study is ethnographic and anthropological in its orientation, methodology, and outcomes; the writing of history is only an emergent concern. But her work is nevertheless grounded by this narrative of history, and its frame perniciously undercuts the scope of her findings in its assertion that such a molar configuration of the post-war avant-garde had a stable, extra-discursive presence; for Born, the Darmstadt School is and has always been real. In her effort to challenge the discourse of progress, she stabilises that very discourse and represents its assumptions as the coherent and self-consistent enunciation of a direct teleology: ‘There may have been nothing necessary about the later developments [of serialism after Schoenberg], but that they occurred is certainly, after the event, “predictable”’. Thus, a unified ‘high modernism’ establishes ‘a powerfully legitimate and universalized interpretation of music history’. Indeed, this interpretation is the ground for Born’s study, which explains why composers who had little to no presence at the Ferienkurse, such as Berio, Carter, and even Boulez himself, are described within a coherent Darmstadt-to-IRCAM pipeline. In opposition to this ‘high modernism’, Born’s critique hinges on certain practices on the periphery of

---

5 Ibid, 50–51. Born subsequently expands this discourse to explicate the ‘hegemony’ of the avant-garde and its concomitant ‘total serialist project’ (although, confusingly, she mentions a ‘fracturing’ of this project which, evidently, had only epiphenomenal significance) that ultimately underlies the creation and daily operation of IRCAM (ibid, 54–56).
6 Ibid, 55.
7 Ibid, 174.
8 See ibid, 172–174.
Darmstadt-IRCAM modernism and interprets this marginality as an imminent threat to the operation of the centre. Yet, as Born herself notes in passing, these ‘dissident concerts’ of ‘musics – jazz, improvisation, and rare references to pop – not deemed legitimate’ were themselves curated under the auspices of IRCAM, meaning that their dissidence was, at the very least, a conscious and active production of their cultural overseers as much as the dissidents themselves.9 Margins and centre alike are enunciated and performed coherently, consistently, and even complimentarily, two sides of the same discursive coin. The critique makes one of the classic dialectical blunders: it reads negation where there is only affirmation. What is affirmed is, in Born’s phrasing, the familiar ‘discursive bricolage’ which voices ‘concerns characteristic of modernism in general: above all, an obsession with science and technology as forces for progress in culture.’10 But whose concerns are these, and how were they manifest in such a singular fashion? Indeed, how can they be said to have ‘developed’ at all? Must critical scholarship take the claims made by this discourse at face value?

To be sure, at the time of Born’s research, there were very few published accounts that could present anything other than the broad-strokes narrative she deploys, the ‘genealogy centered on the Schoenberg school’ whereby Schoenberg begets Webern who begets Stockhausen, with a few intermediary stages of marginal importance.11 As mentioned above, the situation has changed in the intervening decades, and a growing body of research is now available that seriously questions the stable conceptual unity of the discursive concepts of ‘Darmstadt’, ‘serialism’, and ‘New Music’. Still, such research appears to have done little to nuance the assumptions of subsequent critical studies, and indeed, the available narrative understanding of New Music after World War II has remained remarkably consistent. Sharing with Born a renewed concern for ‘social history’, Taruskin’s Oxford History of Western Music similarly replicates the grim monolith of post-war modernism described by Born, wherein blinkered composers devised the most mathematically rigid and austere music the world has ever known, reflecting the ‘desperate antihumanism [sic] of the early atomic age’.12 More specialised accounts that also fall under the umbrella of ‘social history’ recapitulate this same narrative of serial orthodoxy and, as a result, use their various sociological toolkits largely as a

---

9 Ibid, 176–179.
10 Ibid, 55.
11 Ibid, 57. For an example of one source available to Born at the time of her writing, see Trudu, Darmstadt.
12 Taruskin, Late Twentieth Century, 43.
means to provide background explanation for this metanarrative. Jennifer Iverson’s *Electronic Inspirations*, to take perhaps the most recent example available, is framed as an Actor-Network Theory-inspired reconsideration of the electronic music studio at the WDR. Like Born’s study, which is cited in passing, Iverson is concerned with questioning the production of prestige and cultural capital within institutions of avant-garde music, repeatedly positioning her work against a ‘framework’ of ‘great men and great works’. Yet the same homogenous historical framework used by Born decades prior again operates as the primary reference point for Iverson’s research and severely limits the scope of her argument and findings. At the beginning of her chapter on ‘Collaboration’, she briskly asserts: ‘As is well known, composers in the early 1950s obsessively developed serialism, a compositional paradigm that sought to unify all aspects of the composition in a coherent, objective structure.’ Remarkably, she cites Martin Iddon’s *New Music at Darmstadt* to support this statement. Iddon’s book spends considerable time, effort, and detail on disputing precisely such a commonality of practice among ‘composers in the early 1950s’: ‘In truth, the similarities are so limited as to make it difficult to imagine a model which usefully encompassed these practices. What links the composers is little more than the existence of pre-compositional work which includes independent consideration of more than one parameter, typically pitch and rhythm.’ Iverson also cites here M. J. Grant’s *Serial Music, Serial Aesthetics*, which is even less equivocal in its findings: ‘[T]here is no such thing as ‘total’ serialism.’ Again, like Born, Iverson is clearly sceptical of both the claims and the effective operation of this narrative – one of the goals of her study which chimes especially well with Born’s anthropology is to make visible certain ‘actors’ hiding in the background, like studio technician Heinz Schütz, and valorising their contributions – but, once again, this is merely a local reversal, a contextual re-evaluation of foreground and background, of centre and

---

15 Ibid, 75.
It nuances rather than challenges the metahistorical claims of New Music. As such, the scholarship of Iddon and Grant can only function as fine-grained ballast against this immutable metanarrative, just as research on music in Nazi Germany is referenced merely to reassert an essential commonality between the 'lush, late-Romantic tonal music of Richard Strauss, Richard Wagner and Carl Orff.' Either Iverson has not actually read the works she cites, or something deeply rooted is at work preparing the ground for this scholarship before it has even reached the archive. In sum, the standard narrative historiography of serial music presents a conceptual unity towards or (more often) against which scholarship positions itself. Even the most sceptical, most critical, most committedly anti-hierarchical and deconstructionist scholarship begins its task with a received template: total serialism, Cold War malaise, the Darmstadt School, Karlheinz Stockhausen, Pierre Boulez. The ‘great men and great works’ are still fundamentally there: coherent, enunciated, consistent, stable, real, same. What the present project undertakes, then, is a discursive ungrounding of New Music.

Methodology and goals

In keeping with the binary organisation of this project, the methodology it adopts is twofold: discursive analysis and musical analysis. The latter is predominantly concerned with sketch studies. These are undertaken in a fairly textbook fashion: sketches, notes, and writings are systematically consulted and compared to ‘completed’ scores in order to draw conclusions on the composer’s working method. As might be anticipated from a study of serial music, the analyses here are concerned with process, form, and technique – how the pitches, dynamics, rhythms, articulations, octave registers, and so on, came to be where they are on the page and in performance – as deployed and discussed by the composers while writing music. The focus on sketch studies aims to offer up a general sense of what these practitioners considered to be the most significant methods of creating and organising music, going on to suggest how these

---

18 See especially the fascinating investigation of a composition of Schütz that functioned as something of an Urmittel for the earliest compositions of Eimert and others, ‘Incarnations of Morgenröte’, in Iverson, 40–47.
19 Ibid, 3. Flattening a full century of musical production, this is a rather more egregious historical elision than that of a unified ‘serial music’, and suggests that perhaps Darmstadt is not the only source of discursive tension for this metanarrative.
methods were transmitted and developed from composer to composer and what sort of ideological significance informed their use.

The discursive analysis broadly takes the shape of what Foucault would term archaeology, genealogy, or effective history.\(^{21}\) It takes up a discourse – that of New Music in Europe after 1945 – and examines its consistencies and inconsistencies by focusing on its iterative reproduction of positions where unstable subjects emerge and the traces of power which both generates and insecurely attempts to smooth over these cracks. The musical analyses feed into this by mapping what may be found in those cracks, what sort of practices, ideologies, subjects, instabilities. In order to apply this Foucauldian paradigm to the writing of history more effectively, this study takes up the work of Hayden White and Keith Jenkins as a critical framework.\(^{22}\) White’s concept of ‘emplotment’ – the organisation of historical events into an explicating metanarrative – is used to describe how composers and their attendant practices are assimilated and arranged within this discourse.\(^{23}\) ‘Ex-centricity’, a term used by Peter Sloterdijk to describe a structural position wherein a subject upholds a universal system while being simultaneously radically excluded from it, is used to describe the positions of these ‘marginal’ composers.\(^{24}\)

The reason for adopting these dual methodologies is an effort to dislodge scholarship on New Music from its reliance on a single, teleological discourse which has been reliably enunciated since the early 1950s. While the musical focus of the study clearly builds (and relies heavily) on the work of Iddon, Grant, and others, its discursive investigation tries to adopt a different tactic. If Iddon, Grant, and other specialised scholars have argued, reliably and persistently, that ‘Darmstadt’, ‘serialism’, and ‘New Music’ are unstable categories encompassing mutually contradictory aesthetic traditions and practices, broader sociologically-oriented critical scholarship has just as reliably and persistently deployed these same categories to ground further research into New Music. The major research question underlying the current study, then, is not so much ‘what is serialism?’ or ‘was there a Darmstadt


\(^{24}\) Sloterdijk’s reference point is the Farnese Atlas, who upholds a celestial globe. See Peter Sloterdijk, *Globen: Sphären II* (Frankfurt: Suhrkamp, 1999), 59–62.
School?’ but ‘why have these categories continued to be used and re-used so consistently and effectively?’.

As might be expected, the question of a point of origin is not a particular concern of this investigation. It is focused instead on points of transformation, on slices of historical narrative time where something or someone cannot be consistently explicated into a stable discourse. In keeping with the Foucauldian frame, these points might be termed ‘events’, which Foucault defines as ‘not a decision, a treaty, a reign, or a battle, but the reversal of a relationship of forces, the usurpation of power, the appropriation of a vocabulary turned against those who had once used it, a feeble domination that poisons itself as it grow lax, the entry of a masked “other.”’

Building on Nietzsche’s critique of cause and effect, Foucault argues that the practice of history has been hobbled in its methodology in relying on an a prioric understanding of available artefacts. Nietzsche’s point is not that cause and effect are forever ineffable, but that our understanding of them is necessarily reversed, since causes are only deduced after the fact. A Foucauldian ‘event’ then, evades this paradox of causality by focusing on power relations and intensities rather than linear cause and effect. Placed within a historical framework – as it is in this study – this paradigm returns to Nietzsche’s critique, demonstrating the metahistorical ‘inevitability’ of post-war New Music arises from a single, repeated discourse which structurally confuses what is being described and what is being practised. This discourse precedes not only this supposed inevitability, but the described events themselves. The narrative of New Music as it has been reproduced over more than half a century is not an effect, it is a cause. Its explanations for practices precede the practices themselves.

The most significant ‘event’ of this study – in the sense that it is both major, well-defined, and obvious in its conformity to Foucault’s definition – is the story of Karel Goeyvaerts and Karlheinz Stockhausen confronting Theodor W. Adorno in his composition seminar at the 1951 Darmstädter Ferienkurse (for the story itself, see Chapter 3). But less spectacular, less definite, less concrete, minor ‘events’ can be seen to play just as crucial a role in the iterative

---

26 ‘We want historians to confirm our belief that the present rests upon profound intentions and immutable necessities. But the true historical sense confirms our existence among countless lost events, without a landmark or a point of reference.’ (ibid, 125).
27 As paraphrased by Barthes: ‘There are no facts in themselves. It is always necessary to begin by introducing a meaning in order that there can be a fact.’ See Roland Barthes, ‘The Discourse of History’, in The Postmodern History Reader, 121.
reproduction of New Music discourse. The successive interventions of Herbert Eimert (see here chapters 3 and 4) fall into this category of minor events, as do the ecumenical reforms of Josef Rufer and the International Twelve-Tone Congresses to international dodecaphony-as-new-music (see chapter 1). Again, discursive analyses run hand in hand with musical analyses here: these ‘events’ are concerned with taking a musical practice or practices and rendering them stable, legitimate, logical, and explicable in discourse. As stated at the outset, the subject of this study is the negotiations which occur between music and discourse.

But this is not some rear-guard post-post-modernist provocation where everything that is solid dissolves into air, at least not wholly. These composers and their works did surely exist, and coherent, even broad commonalities may indeed be drawn between their practices, some of which are suggested in what follows. Indeed, the commonalities detailed in this study are certainly not surprising, emerging from shared religious faith, aesthetic interests, friendship, and love. The argument is not that these practices are forever incommensurable, rather simply that they existed on terms which are irreducible and often irreconcilable with the explicating, legitimising discourse within which they have traditionally been emplotted. Nor is stability in every case an undesirable quality for a discourse or a practice. The issue is not so much stability in itself but the univocity of stability which ensures that both affirmations and critiques assume a preconditioned enunciative form easily assimilated into the discourse of New Music. This same-ness is precisely what delimits studies like Born’s and Iverson’s, for which critique only emerges from the coherent reproduction of the discourse critiqued. To adopt Latour’s polemic terms, then, this is the discourse of the ‘critical sociologist’:

> To insist that behind all the various issues there exists the overarching presence of the same system, the same empire, the same totality, has always struck me as an extreme case of masochism, a perverted way to look for a sure defeat while enjoying the bittersweet feeling of superior political correctness. Nietzsche had traced the immortal portrait of the ‘man of resentment’, by which he meant a Christian, but a critical sociologist would fit just as well.28

This might seem an odd passage to cite in a study arguing for a fundamentally consistent identity of New Music discourse for the better part of a century. Indeed, if this study confined itself to discursive analysis, it might well be read within this tradition of resentment, presenting

---

an account of ‘how things got to be the way they’ve always been’. But throughout this study, discursive analysis is juxtaposed with descriptions of events which, while emplotted within this same discourse of New Music, exceed and undermine its coherency and stability. Similarly, attention is periodically drawn to the chronicle – a list of performances, lectures, etc., arranged in the temporal order of their occurrence without broader narrative explication – of the Darmstadt Ferienkurse.29 With reference to this chronicle it may be clearly seen that this discourse only maps onto a tiny portion of musical practices on display at Darmstadt, and even then with difficulty. Such a discourse, then, is in no way representative of anything outside of its own structural logic, nor is it representative of the subjects it treats. Its explications of music and history are simplistic, boring, and wrong.

The goal of this study, consequently, is to provide a way out of the Darmstadt of the historians as much as that of the critical socio-musicologists, where the same composers use the same tools to uphold the same Cold War empire. It’s not a new goal by any means – it’s one shared by the scholars listed at the outset of this introduction who have enriched, complicated, and pluralised the study of New Music after World War II. Much of the above remarks stake out a territory which overlaps with Iddon’s article ‘Darmstadt Schools: Darmstadt as a Plural Phenomenon’.30 Indeed, this study as a whole might not unhelpfully be thought of as picking up where Iddon’s article leaves off when it identifies ‘centres around which other things revolved’ but ‘does not solve the problem of how to define these centres, how they came into being, how they dissolved’ and so on.31 But, crucially, it problematizes Iddon’s project of studying a Darmstadt that ‘is simultaneously one network and several schools’ by foregrounding the negotiations which occurred between practice and enunciation, between music and discourse.32 Iddon is correct, then, in positing that the ‘true foundations’ of Darmstadt are ‘neither compositional nor strictly musical at all,’ but muddies the waters by claiming that they can instead be found in ‘small-scale individual friendships’.33 True, such relationships are indispensable in understanding the aesthetic, technical, and ideological commonalities and traditions which informed nascent musical practices, and indeed, much of

29 This specific sense of ‘chronicle’ is described in White, Metahistory, 5–6. The chronicle referred to throughout this study is the Chronik found in Gianmario Borio and Hermann Danuser, eds., Im Zenit der Moderne: Die Internationalen Ferienkurse für Neue Musik Darmstadt 1946–1966 (Freiburg: Rombach, 1997), III.511–638.
31 Ibid, 7.
32 Ibid, 8.
33 Ibid, 7.
this study is devoted to tracing through one of the foundational friendships Iddon mentions, that of Stockhausen and Goeyvaerts, between 1951 and 1957. This is not to suggest that this specific friendship was particularly central to the development of either New Music or its explicating discourse (although it is, of necessity, central to this study). It does, however, offer a fruitful case study of precisely how a shared ex-centric practice is assimilated into a pre-existing discourse, and how the practitioners negotiate a place for themselves within this discourse, or fail to do so. The appearance of centres and peripheries, the inside and outside of New Music, only results from a tentative, unstable, and ongoing negotiation between these practices and a discourse which precedes and neutralises them. This study demonstrates that New Music is constantly re-founded through these negotiations.

Division

Through an overview of the writings and teachings of René Leibowitz and Theodor W. Adorno, the first chapter traces the stabilisation of institutional New Music in the immediate post-War years. For clarity’s sake, this stabilisation is divided into four separate moves:

1) Schoenberg, Berg, and Webern become the Second Viennese School;
2) the Second Viennese School becomes dodecaphony (/twelve-tone music);\textsuperscript{34}
3) dodecaphony becomes New Music;
4) New Music becomes historically determined, universally valid, and institutionally supported.

By the end of this chapter, this Adornian-Leibowitzian discourse can reliably account for almost the entirety of musical production, with the exception of certain unstable, ex-centric practices. To be clear, this is not the presentation of an origin story. Unfortunately, this chapter does not trace the concept of New Music beyond the traditional historical Grenzstein of 1945, and, as such, Adorno’s and Leibowitz’s theorisations are largely read in isolation rather than in reference to

\textsuperscript{34}The widespread terminological confusion between ‘dodecaphony’ and ‘serialism’ in English music historiography (the distinction between these terms is much more significant in French and German reception) is symptomatic of precisely the elision between Adornian-Leibowitzian aesthetics and that of the ‘Darmstadt School’ composers which concerns the present study. Again, for the sake of clarity, ‘dodecaphony’ is used throughout this study to refer to a musical practice that systematically employs all twelve tones of the chromatic scale, and ‘serialism’ is something that is seen to have happened afterwards.
or in dialogue with earlier influential theorisations, particularly those of Paul Bekker, who is surely notable in his absence. Nor does it do the heavy lifting of tracing how the institutional apparatus of New Music developed in fits and starts in the aftermath of World War II; it merely demonstrates how this apparatus was enunciated discursively. More concretely, this is not about how Darmstadt functioned, it is about on what terms Darmstadt could be talked about. This chapter is about the establishment of this discourse to the point where it becomes securely sutured to institutional-international New Music. The remainder of the study deals with the challenges and mutations of this discourse.

By way of providing a prefiguration of these sorts of challenges and mutations, the second chapter examines the difficult defection of Pierre Boulez from the practice and discourse upheld by his teacher Leibowitz. Drawing heavily from Kovács’s work, this chapter advances the argument that, throughout the 1950s, there is precious little technical or stylistic ground to categorically differentiate the music or musical thinking of Boulez from that of his despised teacher. Boulez’s rebellion, then, is a purely discursive one, which forces incoherent and unstable emplotments into the narrative of New Music, particularly with the insertion of the Jeune France composers into its teleology. This chapter, then, defines what sort of negotiation between practice and discourse could allow composers to re-negotiate how their works are heard and understood. It also provides something of a rejoinder to any ‘friendship’-centred model of musical production that might subsequently arise by demonstrating that enduring hatred can be every bit as foundational to the iterative transformation of New Music.

The third chapter traces the development of the eccentric and ex-centric practice shared by Jean Barraqué, Karel Goeyvaerts, Michel Fano, and, finally, Karlheinz Stockhausen between 1950 and 1952, and how this practice was absorbed into the discursive Darmstadt School within a particular institutional project blueprinted by Herbert Eimert. This is where the real analytical meat of the study resides. The negotiation between this practice and Eimert’s take on New Music is a particularly fraught one: of the four composers mentioned, only Stockhausen managed to secure a lasting association with Darmstadt. But this practice presented something that neither Eimert nor Boulez could: a technical understanding of composition irreducible to and unassimilable with the subject-position allotted by the Adornian-Leibowitzian iteration of

---

New Music, and, crucially, a reading of Anton Webern significantly different from the one advanced by this discourse.

There are two important ‘events’ described in this chapter. The first, as mentioned above, is the confrontation between Stockhausen, Goeyvaerts, and Adorno over the matter of the second movement of Goeyvaerts’s Sonata for Two Pianos at the 1951 Darmstädter Ferienkurse. This is a moment of extreme discursive instability. Goeyvaerts’s music, which had previously generated steady, stable, professional interest, suddenly appeared as something at once existentially and metaphysically threatening to established New Music (and its avatar, Adorno). Press and critics were at a loss, falling back on metaphors of total annihilation, death and transfiguration, cosmic ice and fire, and diabolic alchemy, all describing a sparse two and a half minutes that does not rise beyond a dynamic level of f. But this initial bewilderment was stabilised by Eimert, who quickly presented this practice as the logical evolution of technical processes found in the music of Anton Webern. Indeed, Eimert proposed, these technical processes were precisely those demanded of the established teleology of New Music, which could be clearly seen if only its advocates like Adorno were not so blinkered and reactionary. This moment – where the devoutly Catholic, neo-Platonic practice of these composers is made into the historical-materialist, technical, and scientistic discursive formation of Eimert’s Darmstadt School – is the great stabilising event of New Music discourse. The assimilation of this practice is directly described through Eimert’s deployment of a musical example modelled on Goeyvaerts’s Sonata in the second edition of his Lehrbuch für Zwölftontechnik to illustrate the ‘fulfilment’ of the dialectical history of New Music.36 Within this discursive formation, Stockhausen negotiated a secure subject position for himself and his practice, reproducing and refining Eimert’s emplotment of technical, scientistic progress. When Stockhausen’s Kreuzspiel – which, on a technical level, as this study argues, is more or less an extended exegesis of Goeyvaerts’s Sonata – was presented at Darmstadt the following year, the press and critical reaction was far more stable. To be sure, their response to this music was still uniformly negative, but they now knew how to deal with it, and the apocalyptic alarmism of the previous year was retired in favour of detached historicist observation. Stockhausen’s piece was simply another manifestation of the united practice of the ‘younger generation’, post-Weberian

‘pointillism’, more fruitful variations of which might be found in Luigi Nono or Bruno Maderna. It was distasteful but inevitable.

But it was not inevitable for everyone, not even those who had developed it. While technical facets of the musical practice shared by Barraqué, Fano, Goeyvaerts, and Stockhausen had been reproduced and assimilated into the discourse of New Music (as ‘punktuelle Musik’) by Eimert, such assimilation demanded careful negotiation from these practitioners before they could occupy stable subject positions. The alternative was marginalisation and ex-centricity. The fourth and final chapter charts the discursive marginalisation of Goeyvaerts, which informed a professional and interpersonal marginalisation. Goeyvaerts’s failed negotiation between his practice and the discourse of New Music is juxtaposed with Stockhausen’s successful negotiation. In the simplest terms, the relative efficacy of these negotiations hinged on the degree to which the composer was willing to reproduce a singular, stable discourse of New Music. To underscore this discursive stability and its consequences, Goeyvaerts’s subject position is examined through subsequent texts by Adorno, Heinz-Klaus Metzger, and Herman Sabbe, all of which attempt to reconcile his practice with a stabilised narrative of New Music discourse. At this point the scholarly camera zooms way out, and the study concludes with a synoptic account of this discourse and its iterations standardised through half a century of scholarship. It ends with a suggestion that engagement with New Music and its attendant practices need not rely on these same terms of self-fulfilling prophecy. Indeed, so this study suggests, the propositional and irreducible work of these practices demands a more rigorous, attentive, and de-centred scholarship capable of appreciating what this music is doing, how it might be more fruitfully researched, performed, heard, understood, and enjoyed.
Chapter 1: From Schoenberg to Darmstadt

From 1943, the French reception of twelve-tone technique arose almost entirely from the work of René Leibowitz, a fact that Leibowitz himself seems to have particularly relished.¹ His position as a composer and aesthetician is explicated in the book Schoenberg et son école, published in 1947 but comprising writings from as early as 1940, which – broadly summarized – describes the development of twelve-tone composition by Schoenberg, Berg, and Webern as an ineluctable historical imperative, the result of a linear succession of musical progress which began with the emergence of polyphony.² As such, Leibowitz’s reading of the Second Viennese School consistently emphasises those structural qualities in its compositions which demonstrate a continuity with historical forms in Western art music. Leibowitz extrapolates this continuity as organic evidence that the twelve-tone music of the Second Viennese School is ‘the only genuine and inevitable expression of the musical art of our time.’³ This objective historical justification is linked to an objective expressive justification:

The way in which the musical past is realized in Schoenberg’s consciousness during his early works, forming a premise of which the acquisitions evidenced in the later works are but the logical sequence; these new acquisitions themselves, as well as the evolution which they determine – all this will make us understand how the contemporary art of music has succeeded in finding a form of expression which grants it a legitimate and indispensable place in musical tradition.⁴

This is also the position Theodor W. Adorno takes in Philosophie der neuen Musik, first published in 1949. A binary opposition between Schoenberg’s practice and that of Igor Stravinsky, implicit in Schoenberg et son école but explicit in a number of Leibowitz’s other

---

³ Leibowitz, Schoenberg, x.
⁴ Leibowitz, Schoenberg, xiv.
writings, and present in the writings of numerous other critics, is elevated to a dialectic by Adorno: his entire book is structured as a juxtaposition between ‘Schoenberg and Progress’ and ‘Stravinsky and Restoration’. According to Max Paddison, Adorno’s thinking in general ‘sees the activity of art as part of a historical process of change which involves art at the same time in a process of constant redefinition of itself, both as reflection of, and in opposition to, the world outside.’ For Adorno, ‘the philosophical interpretation of music also constitutes a philosophy of music history.’ As such, in the conclusion to the Philosophie der neuen Musik, Adorno argues that, in contrast to the feigned ‘authenticity’ of his reactionary antipode, ‘Schoenberg draws the consequences from the dissolution of all binding forms in music, which was present in the law of its development: the emancipation of ever wider strata of musical material and the musical mastery of nature which progresses to the Absolute.’

Going further, and echoing the dual historical-expressive legitimation of Leibowitz, Adorno postulates that ‘[Schoenberg’s] dark impulse lives on the certainty that art is bound by nothing except the historical state of consciousness which determines its own substance by its

---

5 A passing chordal analysis of Petrouchka (1911) and Le Sacre du printemps (1913) is made to demonstrate ‘that Stravinsky’s concept of harmony, despite all its seeming boldness, operates with obsolete ideas’ (Leibowitz, Schoenberg, 71). For a more sustained examination, the reader is referred, as on previous occasions, to ‘a recent article consecrated to Stravinsky’ by Leibowitz in Le Temps Modernes, No. 7 (Leibowitz, Schoenberg, 54). See also the ‘heated exchange’ between Leibowitz and music critic Maurice Jaubert prompted by the former’s polemical denunciation of Jeu de cartes (1936–1937) in the Catholic journal Ésprit, recounted in Mark Carroll, Music and Ideology in Cold War Europe (Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 2003), 118–119. As might be expected, Leibowitz responded by digging in, ‘[a]ttacking Jeu de cartes with greater vitriol than he had done initially,’ and positioning Schoenberg specifically as ‘Stravinsky’s antithesis’ in a further article published in the same journal in February 1940 (see Carroll, Music and Ideology, 120).

6 A polarity between Schoenberg and Stravinsky was first proposed by French critics Boris de Schloezener and Andre Coeuroy in 1923, which neatly inverts the value judgements of Adorno and Leibowitz by juxtaposing the supposed ‘neoclassicism’ of Stravinsky (French, objective, healthy, good) to the ‘expressionism’ of Schoenberg and, more particularly, Debussy (German, subjective, decadent, bad); see especially Marianne Wheeldon, ‘Anti-Debussyism and the Formation of French Neoclassicism’, Journal of the American Musicological Society, 70.2 (2007), 433–474, and Scott Messing, Neoclassicism in Music: From the Genesis of the Concept Through the Schoenberg/Stravinsky Polemic (Rochester: University of Rochester, 1996). Within this context, both Leibowitz and Adorno’s writings on Schoenberg can be read as a polemical reversal of a previously established opposition. I am grateful to Sam Ridout for drawing my attention to this discourse.

7 Besides an ‘Introduction’, these are the two sections comprising the book. See Theodor Adorno, Philosophie der neuen Musik, in Gesammelte Schriften XII, ed. Rolf Tiedemann (Frankfurt am Main: Suhrkamp, 1975).

8 Max Paddison, Adorno’s Aesthetics of Music (Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 1993), 3. However, Paddison appears to confuse cause and effect when he goes on to assert that ‘Adorno’s philosophy of art is also an aesthetics of modernism, in that it seeks to understand the fragmentation and alienation which characterizes Western art in the twentieth century.’ It is rather that, in Adorno’s emplotment, the authentic work of modern art can only be fragmented and alienated.

9 Paddison, Adorno’s Aesthetics, 62.

“experience” in an emphatic sense.\textsuperscript{11} Thus, as Paddison succinctly puts it, ‘the “philosophy of new music” is also a philosophy of history.’\textsuperscript{12} Adorno, drawing on Max Weber, sees the development of Western music as presenting a ‘process of progressive rationalization’ that ‘is shared both by the immanent formal/structural processes of music and by the processes of the social totality itself.’\textsuperscript{13} Of course, such a process of progressive rationalization is in effect little more than a world-historical justification for a very specific musical phenomenon: the musical practice of Arnold Schoenberg and two composers who received instruction from him. Dahlhaus echoes a broad scholarly consensus that ‘one of the basic patterns of [Adorno’s] philosophy of history is to reconstrue aesthetic norms into historical trends to form a basis for a pre-history of the twelve-tone technique.’\textsuperscript{14} For his part, Leibowitz undergirds this Adornian prehistory through an exhaustive genealogical narrative which identifies the organum Rex coeli Domine maris of the Musica Enchiriadis from the late ninth century as initiating a quasi-dialectical dynamic process which broke ‘musical consciousness’ free from the ‘petrification of monadic forms of musical expression’ which had previously determined all musical activity in the occident.\textsuperscript{15}

That both Leibowitz and Adorno’s books simultaneously serve as artistic manifestos and instructionary tracts corresponds to the dual ideological and pedagogical projects of their authors. Indeed, such pedagogical ambitions are foundational to the argument of Schoenberg et son école. Here Leibowitz identifies a singular, coherent school, a unified collective in which ‘the fidelity to the teachings of the Master, never betrayed by the younger men, is deeply significant,’\textsuperscript{16} in three composers who might well have been interpreted as three distinct figures with occasional stylistic and geographic connections and little connection to a contemporary avant-garde. This was the emplotment offered by Claus Neumann, who in 1933

\begin{footnotesize}
\begin{itemize}
\item \textsuperscript{11} ‘Sein dunkler Drang lebt von der Gewißheit, daß nichts an Kunst verbindlich gerät, als was vom historischen Stande des Bewußtseins, der dessen eigene Substanz ausmacht, von seiner »Erfahrung« in emphatischen Sinn, ganz gefüllt werden kann.’ Adorno, Philosophie, 193.
\item \textsuperscript{12} Paddison, Adorno’s Aesthetics, 27. Subsequently, Paddison draws a connection between Adorno’s historicism, especially in Philosophie der neuen Musik, and the works of Georg Lukács and Walter Benjamin, contrasting the former’s ‘second nature’ with the latter’s ‘fall of nature’ (Paddison, Adorno’s Aesthetics, 31–35), which Adorno synthesized later through Ernst Bloch’s Geist der Utopie (74–78). While Paddison here insists that ‘[Adorno’s] view of history is not teleological, in spite of impressions to the contrary’ (Paddison, Adorno’s Aesthetics, 35–36), such impressions can be very convincing.
\item \textsuperscript{13} Paddison, Adorno’s Aesthetics, 138.
\item \textsuperscript{14} Carl Dahlhaus, Foundations of Music History, trans. J. B. Robinson (Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 1983), 31. Cited, alongside similar remarks from Michael de la Fontaine and Lambert Zuidervaart with the purpose of challenging such a consensus, in Paddison, Adorno’s Aesthetics, 224.
\item \textsuperscript{15} Leibowitz, Schoenberg, 5–7.
\item \textsuperscript{16} Leibowitz, Schoenberg, xv [capitalization sic].
\end{itemize}
\end{footnotesize}
described the two poles of ‘modern music’ as comprising an older generation of Richard Strauss, Hans Pfitzner and Max Reger, and a younger generation whose foremost figures were Paul Hindemith, Karl Marx, and Kurt Thomas.\(^{17}\) ‘In between these,’ in Neumann’s reckoning, ‘transitional figures line themselves up, such as Schönberg, Toch, v. Webern, Alban Berg, Honegger, Křenek, etc.’\(^{18}\) While the idea of Kurt Thomas (a composer, like many of those implicated in the Nazi regime,\(^{19}\) mostly remembered for his church music) edging out Schoenberg, Berg, and Webern as the lodestar of twentieth-century music is virtually unthinkable by more recent precedent of music historiography, this now-canonic model of New Music had not yet achieved such a fixity in the aftermath of World War II. A somewhat more familiar emplotment may be found in Adolfo Salazar’s account, which describes Schoenberg’s ‘most fervent disciples’ as ‘Alban Berg, Anton von Webern, the future conductor, Heinrich Jalowetz, Erwin Stein, and later Egon Wellesz’\(^{20}\). But already these further figures complicate an Adornian emplotment, since Wellesz represented an example of ‘bad modernity’ polemically opposed to Schoenberg in Adorno’s mind.\(^{21}\) Salazar also presents a far more variegated description of twelve-tone technique, considering its use and codification to run parallel in the works of Frederico Busoni, Ernst Krenek, Webern, Berg, and Hauer.\(^{22}\) Within this range of practices, Salazar draws connections which would be inimical to Adorno and Leibowitz. Noting the tendency of Berg and Hauer to derive tonal relationships from their rows (or ‘tropes’), Salazar groups them together with the return to functional tonality of Hindemith and (to a lesser extent) Milhaud.\(^{23}\) Salazar takes this as evidence that ‘[c]omposers who began practicing atonalism [sic] gradually separated themselves from it to the degree in which they wished to obtain a greater freedom than that which the Zwölftontechnik permitted them.’\(^{24}\) Not only was ‘the young Viennese school’ far more expansive in both its members and its methods, but most of its composers demonstrated only

\(^{17}\) Claus Neumann, ‘Moderne Musik – Ein “Ja” oder “Nein”?’, in Zeitschrift für Musik, 100.6 (1933), 544–548.
\(^{18}\) Ibid.
\(^{19}\) To name a few others: Gottfried Müller, Ernst Pepping, Joseph Haas, Franz Philipp.
\(^{22}\) Salazar, 240–247.
\(^{23}\) Ibid, 246–247.
\(^{24}\) Ibid, 247. Significantly, it is unclear whether Salazar is using ‘Zwölftontechnik’ to refer to Schoenberg’s compositional methods or Hauer’s.
a tangential relation to a systematised twelve-tone method – and even then, the association was a passing one. Indeed, Salazar seems to think that some theorists have read rather too much into such a system, commenting ‘according to Willi Reich, it is not a system but a means of facilitating the work of the atonal composer yet, for Theodor Wiesengrund, it is not even an expedient but “the true historical preformation of the material with which the composer is to work”’.  

The discursive formation of this ‘school’ conceptually consolidates what Adorno had proposed in an article published in English in 1931 entitled ‘Berg and Webern – Schönberg’s Heirs’: that the practices of Berg and Webern were in essence a demonstration of the historical validity of Schoenberg’s practice. The two composers are now ‘heirs’ and ‘pupils’; their music can be understood only with reference to its supposed source. As Leibowitz puts it: ‘Without the teaching and the example of Arnold Schoenberg, the very existence of the art of Berg and Webern would be inconceivable.’ Rather, the practices of Berg and Webern enact a sort of world-historical apotheosis in which ‘the powerful and integral personality of Arnold Schoenberg takes on a higher meaning and a more universal significance through the contributions of those whose genius he was able to discover and to guide.’ In Adorno’s reckoning, ‘Berg unites [Schoenberg] with Mahler on the one hand and on the other with the great music drama and legitimizes him from this point’ at the same that Webern ‘pursues to its furthest extreme the subjectivism which Schönberg first released in ironic play in *Pierrot*. The figure of Mahler is also emplotted as handmaiden to New Music by Salazar, but on a far more general scale: Mahler’s progeny include not only Schoenberg, Berg, and Webern, but also Alexander Zemlinsky (Schoenberg’s brother-in-law and erstwhile counterpoint instructor), Richard Strauss, Siegmund von Hausegger, Josef Venantius von Wöss, Oskar Posa, Karl Weigl, and Rudolf Hoffmann. It is precisely such a condensed, directed, teleological, trinitarian emplotment that acts as the genetic element of Adorno and Leibowitz’s discourse of New Music, producing those ‘basic essentials’ of a musical language

---

25 Ibid, 236.
28 Ibid.
29 Quoted in Paddison, *Adorno’s Aesthetics*, 50.
30 Salazar, 232.
‘which are valid for our time.’ The works of Berg and Webern, in Adorno and Leibowitz’s telling, are the first demonstration of the validity of Schoenberg’s method; the difference in their approaches reaffirms at once the universality and the singularity of the New Music while simultaneously modelling a living tradition (likewise universally valid) for contemporary practitioners to follow.

In keeping with his world-historical frame, Adorno’s projections of how Schoenberg’s practice would develop and be applied in its emergent tradition of New Music are, for the most part, methodological speculations (Paddison: ‘Adorno’s sociology of music is essentially speculative rather than empirical in its orientation’). Leibowitz, characteristically, is rather more intrepid, paradoxically establishing universality as both an immanent quality of twelve-tone technique and a goal to be obtained through pedagogical dissemination, since ‘a musical language, if it is to be properly so called, must not be spoken by only a few isolated individuals, but must be accessible to all musicians who want to make use of it.’ Such a language, moreover, must rehearse and reproduce both its cohesion and commonality: ‘In fact, if all twelve-tone composers handle a common technique in a common way, the techniques acquires a collective quality, a universality, which is indispensable to every real language.’ Here Leibowitz draws practical and professional consequences from Adorno’s premises, describing the creative development of a gifted young composer for whom ‘the perfect assimilation of the laws of the musical syntax of the past brings the would-be master to this syntax of today – the only one in which his mastery may be expressed.’ With bracing self-assurance, he continues:

Therefore, there is no reason to be surprised at the relatively small number of twelve-tone composers; after all, the number of completely lucid musical minds has always been very small at any given time. This means that nearly all those who are now composing in the new technique are on a higher level than other contemporary composers.
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31 Paddison, Adorno’s Aesthetics, 50.
32 Ibid, 61; repeated 184.
33 Leibowitz, Schoenberg, 264. This is a dialectical statement within Leibowitz’s argument, since he has previously gone to great lengths to describes the specificity of the Western polyphonic tradition.
34 Paddison, Adorno’s Aesthetics, 266.
36 Ibid.
Bombast notwithstanding, there is nothing in Leibowitz’s argument that proposes anything more than an interventionist dimension to the dialectical music history described by Adorno (think Lenin to Marx); it simply clarifies how Adorno’s discourse maps onto professional musical practice and defines the subject-position of the avant-garde composer within a pedagogical apparatus. Indeed, Leibowitz’s argument takes up Adornian theory specifically from a pedagogical perspective, describing the ultimate ‘synthesis’ of twelve-tone technique as ‘a moment of polyphonic evolution at which the present fluctuations have subsided, in one way or another; from then on it will be possible to teach strictly according to the laws of twelve-tone polyphony.’ That these systems – on the one hand, Adorno’s historicist philosophy and on the other Leibowitz’s historicist pedagogy – are complimentary is implied by Leibowitz, who describes himself thus: ‘I am no historian or esthetician, and I profess theories only insofar as they result from my activity as a composer.’ Yet Leibowitz is careful to frame this activity as both a timely and communal one which develops organically (that is to say, historically) from Adornian premises, and generates subject positions for a unified movement of New Music. It is for this reason that, at the end of his *Introduction à la musique de douze sons*, Leibowitz describes ‘the new generations of ‘dodecaphonic’ composers’, the international breadth of which spans from the exiles ‘Hans [sic] Eisler and Théodore Wiesengrund-Adorno [sic]’ to ‘the Viennese Ludwig Zenk, [Leopold] Spinner, K. A. Deutsch, [Hans Erich] Apostel; the Germans Erich-Itor Kahn, [Winfried] Zillich [sic], [Walter?] Goerr [sic]; the Romanian Norbert von Hannenheim; the Hungarian [Mátyás] Scheyber; the Swiss Erich Schmid, the Spaniard [Roberto] Gerhardt [sic]; the Argentine Juan Carlos Paz and the author of these lines [i.e., Leibowitz himself].’ Moreover, in addition to these figures – the majority of which were, according to Leibowitz, ‘direct disciples of Schoenberg, Berg, and Webern’ – he gives special attention to those ‘who have been brought to twelve-tone technique by more diverted routes.’ If the Pauline overtones of this formulation may at first appear incidental, Leibowitz proceeds to make them rather more direct:

This previous observation provokes me to speak of three composers of a real importance – who I have refrained from mentioning above to draw attention more

---

37 Ibid, 268 (emphasis added).
38 Ibid, 269.
40 ‘...certains ont été amenés à la technique de douze sons par des voies plus détournées.’
particularly to their case – composers who, after having been rabid adversaries of Schoenberg and his school, have finally felt the profound need to submit to the twelve-tone discipline. They are (by chronological order of their adhesion to the new technique): the Viennese Ernst Krenek, the German Paul Dessau, and the Russian Wladimir Vogel. All three had already acquired a certain renown before their switch of style; yet the integrity and the rigour of their musical spirit obliged them, at a given moment, to adopt what they had previously fought. I do not know of the twelve-tone works of Vogel, but I can affirm that with their works in the new style, Krenek and Dessau have attained a superior musical level than their previous works. We can even say that these two composers, extremely talented, have managed to rank among the most interesting musicians of our epoch.41

In contrast to these converts to Schoenberg’s school, Leibowitz observes that there have been almost no ‘defections’, and he mentions that only one young composer he knows of – Deutsch – has ‘abandoned’ twelve-tone composition, although even this is not a case of ‘definitive abandonment’.42 Leibowitz’s delineation of converts and defectors here seems somewhat ironic, since at this time Schoenberg would himself have certainly qualified as abandoning twelve-tone composition to produce unambiguously tonal music. In 1948, Schoenberg defended these tonal compositions – he specifically mentions ‘the Band Variations op. 43b, the Second Chamber Symphony, and the Suite for String Orchestra’ – in terms which echo his earlier defence of Gurrelieder, claiming that ‘a longing to return to the older style was always vigorous in me; and from time to time I had to yield to that urge.’43 As for the significance of this backsliding, Schoenberg accords it rather less attention than Leibowitz, simply stating that ‘stylistic differences of this nature are not of special importance.’44

Such a discrepancy belies a fundamental discontinuity between how these two composers understood and articulated their music practice. If Schoenberg was

41 ‘Cette dernière constatation m’incite à parler de trois compositeurs d’une réelle importance – que j’ai omis de citer plus haut afin d’attirer l’attention plus particulièrement sur leur cas – compositeurs qui, après avoir été pendant longtemps des adversaires farouches de Schoenberg et de son école, ont finalement ressenti le besoin profond de se soumettre à la discipline dodécaphonique. Ce sont (par ordre chronologique de leur adhésion à la nouvelle technique) : le Viennois Ernst Krenek, l’Allemand Paul Dessau et le Russe Wladimir Vogel. Tous les trois avaient déjà acquis une certaine renomme avant leur changement de style; pourtant la probité et la rigueur de leur esprit musical les ont obligé, à un moment donné, d’adopter ce que jusque-là ils avaient combattu. Je ne connais pas les œuvres en douze sons de Vogel, mais je puis affirmer qu’avec leurs œuvres de nouveau style, Krenek et Dessau ont atteint un niveau musical supérieur à celui de leurs œuvres antérieures. L’on peut même dire que ces deux compositeurs, extrêmement doués, ont réussi à se classer ainsi parmi les musiciens les plus intéressants de notre époque.’ Leibowitz, *Introduction*, 251–252.
42 Ibid., 252.
44 Ibid., 110.
unquestionably both prominent and active as a teacher, it is much less certain that this activity was directed at producing the converts of Leibowitz’s telling. In fact, in a manuscript from 1948, Schoenberg describes his pedagogical work as diametrically opposed to the universalizing discourse of Adorno and Leibowitz:

[A]ll my pupils differ from one another extremely and though perhaps the majority compose twelve-tone music, one could not speak of a school. They all had to find their way alone, for themselves. And this is exactly what they did; everyone has his own manner of obeying rules derived from the treatment of twelve tones. While I was not able to teach my students a style – I admit I was not able to do it, even if I would have overcome my dislike of so doing – there are other teachers who can do this and only this. Thus we see a great number of composers of various countries and nationalities who compose about the same kind of music – music, at least, of such a similarity that it would be difficult to distinguish them from one another, quite aside of the question of their nationality. Advice for composing is delivered in the manner in which a cook would deliver recipes. You cannot fail; the recipe is perfectly dependable. The result is: nobody fails. One makes it as well as all the others. It is the true internationalism of music in our time.45

There are, to be sure, numerous passages in Schoenberg’s writing which suggest an understanding of musical history that is superficially congruous with Adorno and Leibowitz’s discourse. However, Schoenberg’s history is most often background rather than foreground, and it shirks the dialectical, materialist, teleological, social, and political foundations put forward by Adorno and Leibowitz. While Leibowitz and Adorno affirm the essential historical character of musical ‘material’ (Leibowitz: ‘To understand any musical element is to be conscious of its historicity, to take it as something which does not simply occur in history, but is completely historical.’),46 Schoenberg gives a naturalistic explanation for the creation of the tonal system, describing its structural foundations as emerging from the essential characteristics of the overtone series.47 Dissonances, therefore, were simply more distant overtone relationships; their ‘emancipation’, in Schoenberg’s reckoning, was purely formal and metaphorical, arising from the nature of sound itself rather than any historical or social

46 Leibowitz, Schoenberg, 261.
contingency. Schoenberg’s appeals to history, when they do occur, are always grounded in the subjectivity of the genius. Indeed, it is precisely such dialectical-materialist sociohistorical interpretation that is emphatically denied in Schoenberg’s thinking, which is why Adorno was hugely apprehensive of Schoenberg encountering his *Philosophie der neuen Musik*: ‘My relations with Schoenberg have become very friendly, and I am very happy and grateful for that. It will be disastrous if, through the grapevine, he finds out about certain formulations in the essay, e.g. the ones regarding universal genius, but many others too. He would never forgive me.’ Sure enough, this was more or less Schoenberg’s reaction when the book was finally published: ‘[Adorno] knows everything about twelve-tone-music, but he has no idea about the creative process.’

Correspondingly, Schoenberg’s writings display a consistently dismissive or negative attitude towards socio-political historical frameworks. Writing in 1947, Schoenberg mocks ‘a habit of late to qualify artistic subjects in terms borrowed from the jargon of politics. Thus mildly progressive works of art, literature or even music might be classified as “revolutionary” or “left wing”, when they only evolve artistic possibilities.’ Juxtaposing this tendency with Paul von Klenau’s justification of twelve-tone composition as a musical enunciation of the *Führerprinzip*, Schoenberg concludes that the ‘concept’ of twelve-tone technique ‘certainly [...] has nothing in common with “Liberty, Equality and Fraternity” neither with the bolshevik, fascist, nor any other totalitarian brand.’ Paddison appears to minimize Schoenberg’s divergence from Adorno on this point – anticipating objections by citing ‘Schoenberg’s fractious comment’ that ‘[m]usic has no more to do with society than a game of chess’ – suggesting that ‘[i]t is irrelevant whether composers are aware’ of the social and historical mediation which objectively determines musical material. But there is something more crucial at stake here: Schoenberg is not ‘unaware’ of social-historical development, he simply proposes a different sort of music history entirely, one where ‘musical material’ is not

---

48 See, for example, the 1926 essay ‘Opinion or Insight?’, in *Style and Idea*, 258: ‘But this [increasing use of dissonance] has placed the tonal centre of gravity in jeopardy (something already perceptible in Wagner), and problems have arisen which are not to be solved by partisan belief, but only though insight.’
49 Adorno to Rudolf Kolisch, 26 June 1942 [capitalization sic], after Kolisch inadvertently gave Schoneberg’s son-in-law an early draft of the Schoenberg section of *Philosophie der neuen Musik*; quoted in *The Doctor Faustus Dossier*, 59 (fn. 79).
50 Schoenberg to Josef Rufer, 5 December 1949, in *The Doctor Faustus Dossier*, 194.
52 Ibid, 250.
generated by social conditions but a combination of the immanent potential of the musical elements themselves and their progressive revelation to the composer of genius – a process that for Schoenberg was explicitly transcendental. Again, this is not to say that Schoenberg’s understanding of musical development and the value judgements contained therein does not share many distinguishing features with the ideology of Adorno and Leibowitz, but rather that his later exegetes provide a categorically different framework for Schoenberg’s emplotments. For example, the figure of C.P.E. Bach and style galant is frequently recurring foil for all three men, deployed to demonstrate the musical poverty that reigned after the supreme polyphonic achievements of J.S. Bach. Going further, all three characterise this period of the High Baroque as a break in the immanent evolution of musical language (for Leibowitz) or musical material (for Adorno). But whereas for Schoenberg the failure of style galant was quite simply a case of mediocre musical talents who composed ‘like cooks obeying a cookbook,’ Adorno characterises it as representing ‘the shadow side’ of musical progress, ‘the inexorable growth of the commodity-character of music, a process which was linked to its subjectivization,’ which J.S. Bach dialectically resisted so as to better realize the historical Enlightenment project of the emancipation of the subject. While Schoenberg is in agreement with his later

---

54 An illustrative passage may be found in the ‘Conclusion’ to Schoenberg et son école, describing the future trajectory of music: ‘[I]t is evident that such a renewal cannot take place without a violent reaction. In this respect, too, our time is exactly like the period which immediately followed [J. S.] Bach. His work, together with the theoretical formulations of Rameau, marks the culmination and the codification of the acquisitions of several centuries of musical activity – principles which were to determine the entire musical evolution of the future. But let us remember the extreme impoverishment of music which then took place. Between 1750 (Bach’s death) and 1780 (burgeoning of the true genius of Haydn and Mozart) what has music to offer? On the one hand, a few successors of Bach, among whom only Johann Christian Bach, on account of his concessions to depraved public taste, acquired a certain reputation; on the other hand, some ‘local’ schools like that of Mannheim, where, just as in the work of K. P. E. [sic] Bach, there are developed certain forms which perform the useful and necessary (if thankless and obscure) task of bridging the gap between Johann Sebastian Bach and Mozart. But what these thirty years principally have to offer us is that eyesore, the ‘style galant,’ which depends on a number of pleasant and sterile formulae, and which therefore commands the entire allegiance of most musicians and music-lovers.’ See Leibowitz, Schoenberg, 286–287. The narrative device of a creative sterility immediately following the emergence of a universal musical genius (e.g. Bach or Schoenberg) is taken up once again by Adorno in his polemic ‘Das Altern der neuen Musik’; see Adorno, Gesammelte Schriften, ed. Rolf Tiedemann, XVI: Musikalische Schriften I–III (Frankfurt: Suhrkamp, 1973), 143–167. (In an instance of either astonishingly bad faith or wilful misreading, Taruskin has taken Leibowitz’s prediction of ‘a violent reaction’ here as entailing actual violence directly analogous to Nazi atrocities rather than a brief period of renewed appeal in banal art music. Cf. Taruskin, Oxford History, 18; see also Michael Gallope, ‘Why Was This Music Desirable? On a Critical Explanation of the Avant-Garde’, Journal of Musicology, 31.2 (2014), 199–230).


56 See Adorno, ‘Bach gegen seine Liebhaber verteidigt’, quoted in Paddison, Adorno’s Aesthetics, 226–229, which not unfairly characterizes Adorno’s logic as ‘somewhat tortuous’. Adorno’s logic here might be also read as transforming Bach into the Palestrina of Hans Pfitzner’s imagining: a solitary, morally righteous composer who resists the social degeneration of his art. As will be seen, precisely such a connection between Adorno and
interpreters that style galant ‘was not a natural development; it was not evolution, but man-made revolution,’\textsuperscript{57} (cf. Adorno: ‘[style galant] is not to be accounted for in terms of musical logic, but in terms of the logic of consumption, in the needs of a bourgeois class of customers’),\textsuperscript{58} its man-made character is purely superficial, one that Bach had no need to actively resist, since its social ephemerality was divorced from the pure immanence of music itself. Schoenberg’s often fiery rejection of Adorno and Leibowitz, therefore, does not simply arise from misunderstanding or their purportedly poor analysis or slapdash execution of his works,\textsuperscript{59} but from a fundamental ideological conflict. Such a conflict is doubly ironic, since, by deploying J.S. Bach as a historical model for Schoenberg and twelve-tone composition, Adorno and Leibowitz were simply enacting the same historic legitimation that Schoenberg himself frequently deployed,\textsuperscript{60} but in service of a historicist project inimical to Schoenberg’s musical practice as he understood it – same emplotment, different teleology. At any rate, Schoenberg’s insistence on compositional genius above ineluctable historical necessity was not a significant conceptual obstacle to the establishment of Adorno and Leibowitz’s paradigm of New Music. Far more prominent were rival contemporary methods of composition with twelve tones.

From Schoenberg’s school to dodecaphony – Hauer and the barren subject

While it is unclear to what extent each was influenced by the other, the fundamental compatibility of Leibowitz and Adorno’s thinking was mutually recognized. This compatibility is expressed in a letter sent from Adorno to Leibowitz in 1948: ‘There is no doubt that your pieces represent the highest compositional niveau that can be found anywhere today – of a purity, determination, and intractability, and simultaneously a complete mastery over

\begin{footnotes}
\footnotetext{57}{Schoenberg, ‘Brahms’, 409.}
\footnotetext{58}{Quoted in Paddison, Adorno’s Aesthetics, 227.}
\footnotetext{59}{As suggested by Paddison, Adorno’s Aesthetics, 170. This is not to say that Adorno and Leibowitz’s presumed musical incompetence was not a potent factor in Schoenberg’s passionate animosity (see especially his 3 March 1951 letter to Ross Russell, the director of Dial Records, upon the release of Leibowitz’s recording of his Ode to Napoleon, https://www.schoenberg.at/index.php?option=com_content&view=article&id=983&lang=en), rather that it was not the only factor.}
\footnotetext{60}{To the extent that in a lecture dating from 1933, Schoenberg twice maintains that, while ‘there is a great similarity between the two epochs,’ he does not mean to suggest a purely self-aggrandizing parallel: ‘I am no Bach’. See Schoenberg, ‘New Music, Outmoded Music, Style and Idea’, in Style and Idea, 119–120.}
\end{footnotes}
the material in all its dimensions, that they could all be upheld as a mandatory paradigm for anyone who presumes to compose today.61 Mutual sympathy notwithstanding, there was little in the musical culture of the immediate post-war period to suggest any broad recognition of Adorno and Leibowitz’s musical practice as the acme of available niveaux, nor would the practice itself have been particularly coherent. Indeed, ‘dodecaphony’ (or ‘twelve-tone music’) was itself hardly a singular, self-evident category at this point: Leibowitz and Adorno’s Schoenbergilinear conception of the practice was distinct from – and often in open conflict with – that of Josef Matthias Hauer, Herbert Eimert, Juan Carlos Paz, Hermann Heiß, Othmar Steinbauer, Hanns Jelinek, Ernst Krenek, Stefan Wolpe, and several others.62 The most deliberate and concentrated challenges to their model came from the Hauer students Hermann Heiß and Othmar Steinbauer. As Gianmario Borio puts it, Heiß in particular ‘stood polemically against Schoenberg and the Viennese School’, whose ‘depiction of an emancipated dissonance delimited rather than expanded the total sound-space.’63 Already in 1946, at the inaugural session of the Darmstädter Ferienkurse, Heiß was describing Hauer as the primary theorist of ‘the idea [Gedanken] of twelve-tone music’, followed then by Schoenberg and, subsequently, ‘[o]ther composers like Alban Berg, Krenek, Webern, [Paul von] Klenau’.64 In Heiß’s reading, ‘the idea of twelve-tone music’ is precisely that: an idea, an abstract formal procedure arising from abstract formal concerns:

At the time of the apparent dissolution of tonality – I say ‘apparent dissolution’, for in reality it was not tonality itself that dissolved but the perception [Vorstellung] of tonality, which for us was far too narrow and proliferated out from narrowness into narrow-minded complexity, while tonality itself experienced a not yet identified...

---

61 ‘Es ist kein Zweifel daran, daß Ihre Stücke das höchste Kompositions-niveau repräsentieren, das heute überhaupt gefunden werden kann – von einer Reinheit, Unbestechlichkeit, und Konzessionslosigkeit, und zugleich einer so vollkommenen Verfügung über die Mittel in allen ihren Dimensionen, daß man Ihre Stücke allem, was heute zu komponieren sich unterfährt, als ein verpflichtendes Paradigma vorhalten möchte.’ Adorno to Leibowitz, 24 November 1948. Quoted by Sabine Meine in liner notes to René Leibowitz: Chamber Music / ensemble aisthesis, Divox CDX 29303, 1996, 6.

62 E.g. Fritz Heinrich Klein, who developed a distinct system of composition he termed ‘extonal’ which was influential on Alban Berg; see Arved Ashby, ‘Of Modell-Typen and Reihenformen: Berg, Schoenberg, F. H. Klein, and the Concept of Row Derivation’, Journal of the American Musicological Society, 48 (1995), 67–105. It should also be mentioned in passing that Schoenberg himself was extremely hostile to Adorno and Leibowitz in particular and their exegesis of his works in general. For the most concise single source of divergent interpretations of twelve-tone practice, see Lukas Haselböck, Zwölftonmusik und Tonalität: Zur Vieldeutigkeit dodekaphoner Harmonik (Laaber: Laaber-Verlag, 2005).

63 Gianmario Borio, ‘Kontinuität der Moderne?’, in Im Zenit der Moderne, I.181.

64 Hermann Heiß, ‘Einführung in die Zwölftonmusik’, in Im Zenit der Moderne, III.26. It is tempting to read the mention of Paul von Klenau as a polemical swipe at Schoenberg, since, as noted above, Klenau had described twelve-tone music as a systematic aesthetic enactment of Nazi doctrine.
expansion – in that indeed not-to-distant time of dissolution, quite naturally, desires to bring chaos into some sort of order made themselves evident.65

Hauer’s practice, then,

has attained a position which overcame the hubris of overly-complex tonal theories and appeared to have attained a consolidation and clarity. Always, chaos can only be controlled through simplification and returning – better transitioning – to a clear denominator.66

Within Heiß’s model, this historical operation of ‘returning/transitioning’ is not dialectical/progressive but cyclical. ‘But,’ he clarifies, ‘twelve-tone music is not the last denominator. The last will always be the first, here namely the tone and its implication in tonality.’67 Indeed, the sort of teleological-dialectical legitimation given to twelve-tone composition by Leibowitz and Adorno seems to be exactly what Heiß has in mind when he warns of ‘the danger of the emancipation and mechanization of the spiritual [des Geistigen].’68

Heiß uses Schoenberg to illustrate this point, describing his desire for a ‘genderless angel’ – in the form of the chromatic scale – to transcend the binary of major and minor as a failure to understand the emergent Gestalt present in ordered tone-rows. Schoenberg’s practice, Heiß asserts, is ‘a flight of Icarus’ which has come unmoored from established musical practice: ‘The goal of the creative musician cannot be anarchy, their deepest longing is always for euphony [Wohlklang]. Yet euphony is spiritual attainment, that is, taming and shaping natural events.’69 Judging from a review of the 1946 courses by Edwin Kuntz, Heiß’s talk was resonant, if not fully convincing. Schoenberg’s music, according to Kuntz, ‘is today seen as fruitless and fully overcome,’ whereas the ‘prospects given’ by Heiß’s practice ‘cannot yet be foreseen.’70

65 ‘In der Zeit der scheinbaren Auflösung der Tonalität – ich sage ‚scheinbare Auflösung‘, denn in Wirklichkeit hat sich nicht die Tonalität, sondern die für uns viel zu enge und aus der Enge in eine engstirnige Kompliziertheit ausgewucherte Vorstellung von der Tonalität aufgelöst, während die Tonalität selbst eine damals noch nicht erkannte Ausweitung erfuhr – in jener gar nicht allzu fernen Zeit der Auflösung also machten sich, ganz natürlich, Bestrebungen bemerkbar, das Chaos in irgendeine Ordnung zu bringen.’ (Heiß, ‘Einführung’, 26).
67 Ibid, 29.
68 Ibid.
In parallel with such attacks, Adorno and Leibowitz responded with a stark (re)assertion of Schoenberg as the originary figure not only of the twelve-tone system but of New Music. To this end, Leibowitz’s portentous introduction of his subject in his lecture ‘Über Schoenbergs Musik’, given at the Ferienkurse two years after Heiß’s, can be seen to function simultaneously as a proselytizing declaration and a directed polemic: ‘73 years ago, Arnold Schoenberg was born, the greatest composer of our time, one of the greatest composers of all time.’ For his part, Adorno appears to have anticipated the Hauerian challenge in his *Philosophie der neuen Musik*, describing Hauer’s rival ‘method’ as producing ‘results of the most barren poverty.’ Adorno goes on: ‘Conversely, Schoenberg radically absorbs the classic and still more archaic techniques of variation into the twelve-tone material.’ In Adorno’s telling, then, Schoenberg’s ‘radical gesture’ is precisely one that allies his musical ‘material’ with historical formal procedures, thereby maintaining the dialectic. Hauer’s practice, on the other hand, is neither radical nor reactionary but simply and superlatively barren.

Adorno’s emplotment here is worth unpacking further, particularly in dialogue with Heiß, since both composer-theorists seem to be making a very similar point. In an effort to clarify the correct, fruitful applications of twelve-tone technique, they present archetypical examples of its use and misuse. The good, proper composer reconciles the new technique with the immanent creative demands of historicised musical material, producing music which satisfies the needs of their epoch. The bad, ex-centric composer invents the technique as an end in itself and pursues it with ahistorical, pseudo-alchemical abandon, producing barren esoteric formulae utterly detached from historical-material progress. Thus the technique itself, which otherwise provides the ground of his historical authenticity – think of Leibowitz’s three ‘converts’ – is at first enunciated as an empty cipher, something beneath the threshold of historical notice. It is only after a real composer, one attuned to the demands of historical-material progress, reconciles the technique to the objective historical condition, that the

---

71 ‘Il y a 73 ans naissait Arnold Schoenberg, le plus grand compositeur de notre temps, l’un des plus grands de tous le temps [emphasis Leibowitz’s].’ Leibowitz, ‘Über Schoenbergs Musik’, in *Im Zenit der Moderne*, III.40. While the specificity of the venue is indeed remarkable, the specificity of Leibowitz’s message should not be overestimated, since such hagiography is a perennial feature of his writing (*Introduction à la musique de douze sons* is in fact dedicated ‘to a genius composer, to an incomparable master: Arnold SCHOENBERG.’)

72 The phrase in question here is ‘von ödester Dürftigkeit’ (see Adorno, *Philosophie*, 63). Hullot-Kentor’s translation obscures both the superlative and the indication of fruitlessness: ‘the results are tediously meagre’; *Philosophy of New Music*, trans. and ed. Robert Hullot-Kentor (Minneapolis: University of Minnesota Press, 2006), 50–51. What is at issue here for Adorno is not aural interest but historical authenticity.

73 ‘Demgegenüber nimmt Schönberg die klassischen und mehr noch die archaischen Techniken der Variation radical ins Zwölftonmaterial auf.’ Adorno, *Philosophie*, 63–64.
technique acquires its position as the most advanced, universal method of reckoning with musical material: New Music. Thus, the practice which initially provides the technique is subsumed so that the technique may be universalised in the discourse. Schoenberg’s gripe about Adorno – that he ‘knows everything about twelve-tone-music, but he has no idea about the creative process’ – reveals precisely what is at stake for this discourse. It is never concerned with the practice of composition, only the universalisation of technique. If Stravinsky’s music was the obvious antipode to Schoenberg’s in the dialectic underpinning Adorno’s Philosophie, the Hauerian practice of dodecaphony cannot be so easily accommodated within this emplotment. Hauer – and his ‘method’ – are therefore allotted an unstable, foundationally ex-centric subject position within Adornian-Leibowitzian discourse: neither progressive nor regressive, but outside historical development altogether. Of course, this ‘outside’ is vouchsafed within the law itself, a category delimited to subjects granted neither affirmation nor rebellion, but only the most barren poverty, subjects which nevertheless provide the technical grounding of the discourse.

Polemically opposed as they may present themselves to be, the emplotments deployed by Adorno and Heiß overlap rather neatly, and can be read as reproducing the same coherent discourse of New Music. The Swedenborgian Schoenberg that Heiß conjures is directly analogous to the ahistorical Hauer described by Adorno. Both are chastised for failing to understand the relation between twelve-tone practice and musical necessity and have subsequently relinquished their respective places in the unfolding of historical development; both are characterised as fatally naïve. The disagreement between Adorno and Heiß, then, is strictly ontological: Adorno advocates a historical-materialist interpretation of musical development while Heiß appears to be putting forward a more traditionally idealist one. The discourse they use to make sense of music history and their place within it are largely compatible. Accordingly, there is nothing fundamentally Hauerian about the ex-centric subject position Hauer occupies in Adorno’s emplotment, since Schoenberg occupies an equivalent position in Heiß’s. As such, Leibowitz’s polemical assertion is only a local reversal: the characters have switched places, but the plot is the same. This ex-centric subject position, therefore, is not constructed in relation (either semiotic or descriptive) to any extant musical practice or attendant ideology, but arises from the structural logic employed by this discourse in order to legitimate a New Music.
From dodecaphony to international-institutional New Music

Although Leibowitz and Adorno’s interpretation of New Music was certainly not the only one available after World War II, it was quickly established as authoritative in an institutional and pedagogical capacity. By the end of the decade, the roster of composers, practitioners, and theorists associated with the Adorno-Leibowitz project of international dodecaphony included Luigi Dallapiccola, Camillo Togni, Riccardo Malipiero, Karl Amadeus Hartmann, Rolf Liebermann, Wladimir Vogel, Ludwig Zenk, Leopold Spinner, Max Deutsch, Hans Erich Apostel, Erich-Itor Kahn, Winfried Zillig, Norbert von Hanneheim, Mátyás Seiber, Erich Schmid, Roberto Gerhard, Josef Rufer, Humphrey Searle, Richard Hoffmann, Peter Stadlen, André Souris, Pierre Froidebise, Mario Peragallo, Wolfgang Fortner, Friedrich Wildgans, Hans Joachim Koellreutter, and numerous others.

If this inventory appears to be almost overwhelmingly broad, it suggests the degree to which Adorno and Leibowitz were willing to claim pre-existing, international, and mutually differentiated practices as manifestations of their own historicist reading of musical development. Indeed, it appears that, for many of these figures, the adoption – however post-hoc – of just such a historical legitimation for their independently developed practice was a matter more of mutual benefit and professional expediency than ideological conviction. This was certainly the case with the numerous Italian composers who had used dodecaphonic techniques in their works prior to any encounter with Leibowitz or Adorno. Peter Roderick describes the post-war resumption of the Venice International Festival of Contemporary Music – ‘the most important Italian festival for new music’ – as ‘a seminal moment in the history of Italian serialism’ which attempted to elide, at least within its organisational framing, dodecaphonic composition as a form of humanist antifascism. This repositioning was only partially successful, however: while Dallapiccola’s Canti di Prigionia (1938–1942) was ‘triumphant’, the reception of Webern’s Symphony op. 21 (1928) in the same concert was ‘overwhelmingly negative’, and a further concert billed as il giovane scuola that included dodecaphonic works by Malipiero, Togni, and Guido Turchi was ‘disastrous’. Here the critics

74 These six figures are grouped together with Leibowitz in Borio, *Im Zenit der Moderne*, I,180.
75 These ten figures are listed by Leibowitz in *Introduction*, 251 (Zenk died in 1949).
77 Ibid, 93–94.
were utterly unconvinced by the purported humanism of dodecaphony, describing instead a ‘squalid soirée, representing one of the most sore failures of the festival’ wherein composers ‘appropriated whosoever’s formula and with it set about to resolve the creative problem.’

Against this hostile critical rejection, Adorno and Leibowitz’s claim for the universal creative validity of dodecaphony was a crucial resource for composers seeking to defend their practice.

Leibowitz’s first article in Italian, published in 1947, neatly recapitulates much of his argument in *Schoenberg et son école* (published in Italian a year later), declaring that dodecaphonic music ‘has unexpectedly resumed a position of topical significance in various countries of Europe, since many of the most significant composers of the younger generation have declared themselves followers of the Schoenbergian ideal.’ Whether or not such an explicit declaration had actually occurred in Italy, Leibowitz’s particular discourse of New Music became an important model for Italian musicians discussing dodecaphony. Already in 1948, Carlo Jachino’s book *Tecnica Dodecafonica. Trattato Pratico* presented an introduction to dodecaphonic composition ‘in the same Leibowitzian vein in its abstraction of concrete necessary laws from selective history’, which ‘was taken up avidly by Italian composers in this era.’ But this was far from an uncritical adoption – many Italian dodecaphonists chafed at some of Leibowitz’s emplotments, especially the supposed Schoenberg/Stravinsky polarity.

Luigi Magnani, described by Roderick as ‘a prominent critic for *La Rassegna Musica* and a supporter of the serial movement’, while broadly and enthusiastically welcoming Leibowitz’s position and its attendant value judgements in *Schoenberg et son école*, worries that Leibowitz’s strict deferral to Schoenberg on formal matters might cause dodecaphony ‘to have

---

79 Roderick notes that, while Leibowitz’s work ‘quickly became available in post-war Italy,’ and *Schoenberg et son école* was ‘widely read’, Adorno was not as well known in Italy during the immediate post-War years – ‘his influence was really only felt in Italy in the mid-to-late 50s, and especially after the publication of Giacomo Manzoni’s translation of *Philosophy of Modern Music* in 1959’ (Roderick, 96–97, fn. 26). Nevertheless, the German edition of *Philosophie der neuen Musik* was discussed in the journal *La Rassegna Musicale* in 1947 and formally reviewed in 1950 by Roman Vlad (Roderick, *Rebuilding a Culture*, fn. 26). See also Stefano Marino, *La Ricezione dell’Estetica Musicale di Th.W Adorno in Italia*, unpublished PhD thesis, University of Bologna, 2001.
81 While North America is both geographically and conceptually outside the scope of this study, it is worth noting that Shreffler proposes a similar reception of Leibowitz’s writings and ideas in America; see ‘The Myth of Empirical Historiography’, 34–36.
83 This was the position taken in articles by Alberto Mantelli in 1947, Roman Vlad in 1952, and Guido Turchi in 1953. See Roderick, fn. 26.
84 Roderick, 98.
itself locked into definitions. Dallapiccola, himself the subject of fairly unqualified praise from Leibowitz, reads Leibowitz’s polemics in a (somewhat strained) non-dogmatic light, proposing that ‘he does not presume to have exhausted his subject, but only to have shed first light.’ As such, Leibowitz and Adorno’s discourse did not so much convert composers but provide for them a legitimizing framework for their already established, but critically embattled, practices.

As such, the specific historicist thrust of Leibowitzian-Adornian discourse was adopted as a decisive legitimating paradigm for Italian New Music. Organised by Malipiero and Vogel, the first Congresso Internazionale per la Musica Dodecafonica took place in Milan on 4–7 May 1949. Despite the fractious political differences which erupted among the delegates – Serge Nigg, a member of the organising panel and a faithful Leibowitz student who, after a brief dalliance in socialist realism, continued to write strictly dodecaphonic music throughout his creative life, resigned publicly in solidarity with the 1948 Prague Manifesto – the congress advanced an unmistakably Leibowitzian-Adornian discourse of dodecaphony, which, as Roderick puts it, ‘universalis[ed] its principles according to Leibowitzian priorities.’ Indeed, the conference booklet, written by Malipiero, succinctly replicates the same legitimising argument that Leibowitz had made in his Italian article two years previously, albeit with some more carefully worded stylistic allowances: ‘The spreading of such a [twelve-note] theory in many forms, in different countries according to civilisation and sensibility, often

---

89 The entirety of his Sonata for Piano and Violin (1996), for example, is based upon a single twelve-note row.
90 See Carroll, Music and Ideology, both generally and in particular 120–126, which notes that Leibowitz himself initially supported the Prague resolution, although later objecting that socialist realist ideologues were ‘in a state of fervor, without ever arriving at the need to formulate a plan of action’ and fixated on ‘purely social’ concerns. Leibowitz’s initial support firmly places the Prague resolution within his and Adorno’s own discourse, however, and Leibowitz takes the opportunity to denounce Stravinsky’s music (with Jeu de cartes, again, as his specific target) for ‘intellectualism’. As Roderick acutely observes, this fallout in no way maps onto the ‘formalist–antiformalist’ binary occasionally proposed by music historians of the Cold War period (see Roderick, 104, fn 47).
91 Roderick, 103. Roderick’s characterization of this as a ‘de-historicizing approach’ is rather odd, not least since he himself had previously emphasized the role of historical necessity in Leibowitz’s understanding of twelve-tone music.
spontaneously germinating amongst the young, should demonstrate the dodecaphony is something which has a logic and necessity of its own.\textsuperscript{92}

Of course, such a carefully cultivated ‘spontaneity’ operating through ineluctable historical laws was precisely the self-legitimising frame of this discourse. Accordingly, despite the occasionally polemically opposed aesthetic and political convictions of these practitioners, not to mention the fact that most of them had known and utilised twelve-tone techniques before encountering either Leibowitz or Adorno, Leibowitzian-Adornian historicism became the operative paradigm of the discourse of New Music in Italy. Even the Trinitarian genesis of this ideology made its formal influence felt on the culture of Italian New Music: the crowded field of \textit{il giovane scuola} – Togni, Turchi, Malipiero, Bruno Maderna, Valentino Bucchi,\textsuperscript{93} Luciano Berio, Roman Vlad, Luigi Nono, Adone Zecchi, and others – would be quickly whittled down to the familiar triumvirate of Nono, Berio, and Maderna. Indeed, in hindsight, it appears as if those Italian composers whose music demonstrates a tenuous connection to dodecaphonic practice as it was understood in 1949 were precisely the ones who became the avatars of an international New Music.\textsuperscript{94}

In Germany, the emergence of a similarly new consensus, as well as its social and institutional consequences, was noted by the press. Reporting on the 1948 Darmstädter Ferienkurse, Fritz Bouquet wryly observes

\begin{quote}
One can make oneself ‘radical’ and oh so ‘modern’ by rejoicing at documents of formal destruction and experiments by Arnold Schoenberg and Anton von Webern that twenty-five years ago (or more) were cutting-edge to the point of causing scandal. And today’s epigones of this style are considered dernier cri.\textsuperscript{95}
\end{quote}

\textsuperscript{92} Quoted in ibid, 104.

\textsuperscript{93} These are the five composers whose works were performed at the \textit{il giovane scuola} concert as part of the Venice International Festival of Contemporary Music in 1946. Roderick notes that, of their five compositions, only Maderna’s was not dodecaphonic (Roderick, 94).

\textsuperscript{94} Of course, a thorough investigation into this observation exceeds the scope of the present article; for a fascinating study in a similar direction, see Veniero Rizzardi, ‘The Tone Row, Squared: Bruno Maderna and the Birth of Serial Music in Italy’, in \textit{Rewriting Recent Music History: The Development of Early Serialism 1947–1957}, ed. Mark Delaere (Leuven: Peeters, 2011), 45–65.

Despite his cynicism, Bouquet appears to have adopted a distinctly Adornian-Leibowitzian frame for his description of the courses, juxtaposing the ‘worldview and design [Weltschau und Gestaltung]’ of ‘on one side, Stravinsky’s fluidly striking and rhythmically emphasized classicism or Hindemith’s transparently balanced mastery, and on the other side Arnold Schoenberg’s early and late, thematically scattered twelve-tone style’. Remarkably, after deriding the ‘totally uninspired music-mathematics’ of Leibowitz, Bouquet connects him with a general ‘amalgamation of constructivist radicalism and ideological romanticism, which was also disseminated by the younger Schoenberg, Alban Berg, and A. v. Webern’, which also explicated works by Hans Erich Apostel, Karl Amadeus Hartmann, and even Hermann Heiß, who, despite being ‘influenced from Matthias Hauer’s “atonal” [sic]’, is nevertheless placed within Leibowitz’s aesthetic category. While Leibowitz’s practice is rejected on aesthetic ground, its legitimising discourse and concomitant universal scope is affirmed.

Moreover, the presence of such an ‘amalgamation’ that (by Bouquet’s account) incessantly professes its own radicality had certainly not been identified by commentators on the prior iterations of the Darmstadt courses. On the contrary: writing on the 1947 courses, Hans Heinz Stuckenschmidt characterises the attitude of ‘today’s German youth’ as ‘sceptical about revolutionary ideas; in the realm of the intellect they prefer to content themselves with the traditional, make the world just a bit more comfortable and do not care all that much for the eternal mysteries.’

Echoing the Nachholbedarf concept prevalent in the immediate post-war years in German artistic culture and seminal in the foundation of the Darmstadt courses, Stuckenschmidt goes on to define the courses in general as a ‘restoration of contact between people’, an evaluation echoed by Kuntz in his review of the 1946 courses. This discrepancy in accounts is not purely a case of diverging interpretations on the part of the critics: writing in 1960, Stuckenschmidt describes Karlheinz Stockhausen as exemplifying ‘the

96 Ibid., 385.
97 Ibid., 385–386 (Bouquet oddly uses ‘atonal’ as a noun).
99 For an overwhelmingly thorough account of this concept and its effect on the institutionalization of art music in Germany after the war, see Ian Pace, The Reconstruction of Post-War West German New Music during the early Allied Occupation (1945–46), and its Roots in the Weimar Republic and Third Reich (1918–45), unpublished PhD thesis, University of Cardiff, 2018.
100 For a succinct account of the material, cultural, political, and ideological concerns that informed the creation of the Darmstadt courses, see Iddon, New Music at Darmstadt, 1–32.
“angry young man” of the post-war years’, part of a ‘young generation [...] in revolt against convention and tradition’, an iconoclastic modernist antithetical to the traditionalist German youth Stuckenschmidt reported on in 1947. Indeed, Stuckenschmidt already described an entirely different sort of Darmstadt in his review of the 1949 courses, one where ‘the weeks were thoroughly marked by a decisive Avant-gardeism,’ and dominated by Leibowitz, the ‘fanatical follower of Schoenberg and his method’. By the 1950 courses, this orientation had been made official, with Steinecke describing the work and thought of Arnold Schoenberg as the ‘pedagogical foundation’ and ‘primary departure point for work within the courses’ in the programme booklet for the Ferienkurse. Yet for the first two years of its existence, there was little to indicate that the Darmstadt courses had any distinct association with twelve-tone music, nor was there even any impression that Darmstadt as an institution was essentially concerned with modernity in either a singular or discursive sense, only with a (supposedly) renewed internationalisation of musical practice. Since Adornian-Leibowitzian discourse insisted on a single, universally valid musical vocabulary, Leibowitz was able to handily usurp the foundational principle of the Darmstadt courses – internationalisation – as an institutional organ for the dissemination of his ideological discourse: if dodecaphony is the only internationally legitimate method of composition, and the Darmstadt courses were established to promote international New Music, then naturally the Darmstadt courses must become a pedagogical institution of twelve-tone music. That in a single year the discursive formation of Darmstadt was inverted, and has remained so for the greater part of a century, appears to be one of the most spectacular ideological coups in the history of music.

This is not to suggest, as Taruskin does, that Adorno or Leibowitz officiated with near-dictatorial power over the institutional apparatus of post-war New Music. They articulated a compelling and convincing series of corollaries to a discourse which was already broadly reproduced and understood in the early post-war years. Adorno and Leibowitz’s particular brand of this discourse was adopted by both mature, established composers and their students

106 Kuntz singles out Hindemith as ‘the greatest creative young musician of our time’ (Kuntz, ‘Zeigenössische Musik’, 378).
107 He not infrequently attributes this sort of power to composers and theorists of the post-war avant-garde; see Taruskin, 1–54.
for aesthetic, ideological, and professional reasons. By his own account, the Swiss composer Jacques Wildberger (b. 1922) was self-taught until, in 1947, he discovered the sprawling oratorio *Thyl Claes* (1938–1945) by Wladimir Vogel. This motivated him to take lessons with Vogel – Wildberger emphasizes that Vogel remained his sole composition teacher – who instructed him in twelve-tone music. Leibowitz himself was characteristically proactive in this respect, teaching composition both privately in Paris, free of charge, and at the Darmstädter Ferienkurse (where his students included Hans Werner Henze). In practical terms, this resulted in a kind of entourage: the invited French contingent at the 1949 International Dodecaphonic Congress comprised Leibowitz and his students Nigg and Jean-Louis Martinet. In his report on the 1949 Darmstadt courses, Stuckenschmidt coolly observes that ‘René Leibowitz, *chef d’école* of the French dodecaphonists, had brought some students with him,’ among them Antoine Duhamel, Jacques Monod, ‘and a Greek named Petronides.’ Of course, a direct genealogy of twelve-tone ‘schooling’ is fundamental to Adorno and Leibowitz’s historicism, and Leibowitz’s outline of ‘the new generations of “dodecaphonic” composers’ operates as both a primer and a proof of concept. Structurally, then, Stuckenschmidt’s bitter dismissal of Leibowitz and his students is in fact a validation of Leibowitz’s project, since, for the first time, there is both an *école* and a *chef* in Darmstadt. As was the case with Bouquet one year earlier, the music is rejected while the discourse is affirmed.

The standardization of the New Music discourse – the universalisation of dodecaphony

Despite differences in compositional approaches and even musical interpretations within this group of practitioners, the legitimising discourse consistently reproduced to explain their

---

108 Anton Haefeli, ed., *Jacques Wildberger oder Die Lehre vom Andern: Analysen und Aufsätze von und über Jacques Wildberger* (Zurich: Hug Musikverlag, 1995), 261. Vogel’s knowledge of Schoenberg and his circle must have been largely indirect since he never formally studied with any composer of the Viennese school, but was closely involved with the avant-garde while he lived in Berlin, from 1918–33.


110 Meine’s chronology has Leibowitz in Darmstadt from 1946–1949 (liner notes, 10–11); however, he is only listed as composition faculty for 1948 and 1949. See *Im Zenit der Moderne*, III.527–539. Leibowitz returned as composition faculty in 1955, teaching a course with Adorno (Meine, liner notes, 11; though credited solely to Adorno in *Im Zenit der Moderne*, III.572–576).

111 Piccardi, ‘ragioni umane’, 218.

practices is structurally reliant on Adorno and Leibowitz’s model. Josef Rufer, a student of Schoenberg, appears to retain his teacher’s cagey attitude towards Adorno and Leibowitz in his book *Die Komposition mit Zwölf Tönen* (published in German in 1952 and translated into English by Humphrey Searle two years later): he goes rather out of his way to point out that Schoenberg personally corrected Leibowitz’s analysis of his music, while Adorno is not mentioned at all. Nevertheless, in a section titled ‘The Antecedents of Twelve-Note Composition in the Compositional Technique of Classical and Pre-Classical (Polyphonic) Music’, Rufer presents what is essentially an embellishment of Leibowitz’s teleology, using examples from Brahms, Beethoven, and Bach in order ‘to set forth the principles of development and form in classical and polyphonic music, as formulated, taught, and used in his own music by Schoenberg, at least in their basic characteristics; for to know them and be able to handle them is a necessary precondition for composition with twelve notes, in which they are actively at work, and of which they constitute an integral part.’ Furthermore, although the primacy of Schoenberg’s achievement is never seriously questioned, Rufer identifies twelve-tone tendencies in the music of several composers who are dismissed or ignored in Adorno and Leibowitz’s emplotment: Richard Strauss (Rufer specifically provides examples, rather unexpectedly, from *Also Sprach Zarathustra* (1896) and *Arabella* (1933)), Max Reger, Paul Hindemith, and Béla Bártok. Even more significantly, Rufer closes his book with an appendix of ‘Contemporary Composers on their Experiences of Composing with Twelve Notes’, which, Rufer writes, ‘attests, in the most impressive way, the far-reaching importance which Schoenberg’s idea has acquired for musical development, and it also shows the spiritual and artistic breadth which is contained in its totally undogmatic and deeply musical character. For method was always of less importance than the higher idea, to which this

\[113\] Josef Rufer, *Composition with Twelve Notes Related Only to One Another*, trans. Humphrey Searle (London: Rockliff, 1954), 38. The issue, as both Rufer and Schoenberg acknowledge, is a trivial one: whether or not Schoenberg used ‘secondary series’ in composition (according to Schoenberg, he did not).

\[114\] Ibid, 38. Rufer’s theoretical model is somewhat less dynamic than Leibowitz and Adorno’s: despite his description of the historical development of musical ‘principles’, he maintains it is possible and ‘convenient’ to ‘give a unified presentation of the concept of form, without regard to the stylistic changes which music has undergone in the course of time’ (ibid, 25). Adorno in particular would no doubt object to the lack of dialectic in such a statement; nevertheless, this is something of a minor point, since, despite his particular historic/aesthetic understanding, Rufer fundamentally describes the same musical continuum (with its attendant a prioric precedents) as Adorno.

\[115\] Ibid, 17–20. Rufer is nevertheless careful not to let these comparisons to other composers infringe on Schoenberg’s importance: ‘They obeyed a law which was present, though not yet formulated or openly pronounced; it was to Schoenberg that its power of creating order and unity revealed itself’ (ibid, 21).
master [i.e., Schoenberg] subordinated everything – that of making.\textsuperscript{116} Just as Leibowitz repeatedly had done, Rufer goes on to stress the universal quality of this method: ‘These composers belong to the most diverse countries, cultural circles and generations.’\textsuperscript{117} Naturally enough, much of this appendix reads like a who’s who of international dodecaphonic congresses: Luigi Dallapiccola, Wolfgang Fortner, Roberto Gerhard, Richard Hoffmann, Rolf Liebermann, Humphrey Searle, Mátyás Seiber, Winfried Zillig.\textsuperscript{118} However, Rufer here is even more at pains than Adorno and Leibowitz to demonstrate the universal validity of Schoenberg’s method, leading him to include not only composers of a younger generation (Hans Werner Henze) but also those whose method of ‘composing with twelve notes’ differed considerably from Adorno and Leibowitz’s – Krenek and particularly Hanns Jelinek – and others without any consistent association to twelve-note music whatsoever, such as Boris Blacher and Rudolf Wagner-Régény. If the ecumenical breadth of Rufer’s gesture exceeds Leibowitz’s previous provision only for ‘pure’ converts (Krenek, Vogel, Dessau), it certainly does not suggest any theoretical slackening within the Adorno/Leibowitz ideological and pedagogical project. On the contrary: the Adornian-Leibowitzian discourse of New Music was by this stage so established that even those practitioners who deviated from its teleology did so on its terms rather than theirs. To this end, Jelinek is almost apologetic in describing his departures from a strictly Leibowitzian exegesis of Schoenberg’s compositional legacy:

But all these things – limitation to single forms of the series, or to modes or ‘quaternions’, use of groups of primary numbers, formation of bridges, processes of tonicalisation and many other things – which I have described in detail above, should be regarded not in any way as an ‘expansion’ of twelve-note writing, but only as additional ideas of construction which may be usefully employed on occasion.

If one regarded them differently, the probable result would be a poverty-stricken eclecticism, which would cause the gradual drying up of what the unsurveryable richness of the creative world opened to us by Arnold Schoenberg has brought us: Fruitfulness, Multiplicity, Breadth of Experience.\textsuperscript{119}

In similar fashion, Rudolf Wagner-Régény – a composer whom Adorno earlier described as belonging to ‘the younger generation of more or less fervent believers in the Nazi ideology’ whose music ‘largely amounted to a feeble and diluted imitation of some of the

\textsuperscript{116} Ibid, 177.
\textsuperscript{117} Ibid.
\textsuperscript{118} Ibid, 177–201. The alphabetical organization is Rufer’s.
\textsuperscript{119} Ibid, 188 (capitalization sic; the German edition centers these words as a motto).
better known composers of the Weimar era’ – adopts the historicist party line at the outset of his contribution, albeit with some qualification: ‘It is possible that in the theory of music today a similar process is taking place to what happened when the major and minor scales were formed out of the six ecclesiastical modes.’ In Wagner-Régeny, a figure who, by Adorno’s own account, appeared to be utterly removed from Schoenberg’s practice, the total subsumption of New Music under Adorno and Leibowitz’s discourse becomes apparent. If, in Rufer’s ecumenical form, Leibowitz and Adorno’s discourse of New Music is able to accommodate musicians who did not strictly subscribe to the precise formal interpretations of Adornian-Leibowitzian twelve-tone music, this is only made possible when these musicians defer to its historicist content which describes twelve-tone music as the necessary end result of a dialectical process which has defined Western art music since the birth of polyphony.

Accordingly, the gravest admonitions within the Adornian-Leibowitzian discourse are directed at ex-centric practices, particularly those derived from Hauer. Richard Hoffmann devotes the entirety of his response to a warning against the poverty not only of Hauer’s ‘system’ but its ‘mystical’ – i.e., non-dialectical and non-historicist – foundations:

the inexperienced composer should not emulate the ‘sophistic’ twelve-note composer who would have little – if anything at all – to say if his powers of invention were not goaded on by complicated tables of permutations of the series. In fact the over-emphasis on the logic and ‘magic powers’ which certain faithful adherents of this kind of composition have introduced into it has exceeded all bounds. Even the layman, to whom the real function of a twelve-note series is completely unknown, will have false musical impressions implanted in him – chiefly thanks to the overwhelming powers of invention of a great contemporary writer – and in the next few decades it will be impossible to eradicate these from his all too naïve intellect.

It is my warm hope that intelligent musicians will not rely too much on the automatic unity which arises from a series of this kind, or rely too strongly on the mystical relations between the notes themselves, in order to increase the value of their compositions. Composition with twelve notes is not a profession of faith, but an art. The composer should not be an apostle who clings strictly to formulae which have been laid down in advance; he must be an artist who shapes his own ideas independently and undertakes a risk when he enters unknown territory.122

121 See Rufer, Composition with Twelve Notes, 198.
122 Ibid, 186.
While Hoffmann’s warning is in many ways a typical recapitulation of Adornian-Leibowitzian historicism – particularly in the dual historical/aesthetic legitimation realised by the ideal composer – it is far more direct in its description of the concrete cultural consequences of this model. The danger here is not the musician who refuses or ignores twelve-tone composition, but one who adopts its formal procedures without the appropriate discursive explication. The ‘great contemporary writer’ mentioned who has led the ‘naïve layman’ astray is certainly Thomas Mann, whose ‘overwhelming powers of invention’ in this case have a significant historical pretence, since the novel Doktor Faustus (first published in 1947) was written in close consultation with Adorno, particularly an early draft of the Philosophie der neuen Musik. In the chapter describing twelve-tone technique, the narrator, Serenus Zeitblom, recalls an argument with his friend, the composer Adrian Leverkühn, in which he voiced his concern that Leverkühn’s ‘system’ of composition ‘looks to me as if it’s more apt to resolve human reason into magic.’

This line of questioning irritates Leverkühn: ‘He put a closed fist to his temple. “Reason and magic,” he said, “surely meet and become one in what is called wisdom, initiation, in a belief in the stars, in numbers...”’ Significantly, this chapter draws, sometimes verbatim, from the section of Philosophie der neuen Musik which juxtaposes the historical necessity of Schoenberg’s methods with the ‘barren poverty’ of Hauer’s.

In the character of Adrian Leverkühn, the ex-centric subject-position already allotted to Hauer in Adorno’s writing is given narrative elaboration as a tragic figure. While this does indeed harmonise with Adorno’s tragic emplotment of history, Hauer’s position is still necessarily unstable, since its very presence threatens to negate the dialectical-historical premise of the ideology – it resolves human reason into magic. Furthermore, the Leverkühn-Hauer figuration deflects whatever appears un-historicist in Schoenberg’s writings on his own practice (e.g. the numerous references to Balzac’s Séraphîta on which Heiß capitalized) by assigning them to a separate, ‘bad’ twelve-tone ideology characterised by barrenness,

---

123 It is worth noting, however, that Hoffmann might also be referring to Das Glasperlenspiel by Hermann Hesse, whose protagonist presents a somewhat less fatalistic emplotment of the mystical systems-composer (he still dies, but quietly, and not of syphilis).


125 Ibid.

obsession, and madness. While a musical practice that refuses both the formal and historicist components of this discourse would be harmlessly irrelevant (and thus easily contained), one that adopts its formal logic while denying its historicist logic – like that of Hauer or the theosophist Schoenberg – is rather more hostile, since such a practice proposes that the formal logic of its musical material, which is the same as Adorno’s and Leibowitz’s, does not arise from the dialectical process that explicates and legitimates the Schoenberg of Adorno, Leibowitz, Rufer, et al. Indeed, savvy contemporaries observed that Mann’s historicist understanding of twelve-tone music could only have been gleaned from Adorno himself: ‘I noticed’, wrote Manfred Bukofzer to Mann, ‘not without smiling, that in your characterization of the twelve-tone method, Wiesengrund’s choice of words, his speech and thought processes “break through” repeatedly [...] The dialectical conception of the twelve-tone method is for Schoenberg a book with seven seals, and thus much more a typically Wiesengrund-like thought process, which would not even be possible without a good dose of Hegel, Kierkegaard, and Marx.’ Such a non-dialectical practice, therefore, not only challenges the projected necessity and universality of Schoenberg’s technique, but the very system of knowledge that this discourse deploys to make sense of the aesthetic world of ‘musical material’.

While this discourse can neither reconcile nor eliminate ex-centric subject position occupied by Hauer, it can, conversely, expand the reach of its available categories to include a plurality of musical production in the Western art tradition. This is precisely what the pedagogical project of Adorno and Leibowitz achieved in its assembling of multiple generations of musicians from international backgrounds who, while their actual compositions often bore no more than a tangential structural resemblance to anything produced by Schoenberg, adopted the historicist premise of Adorno and Leibowitz. Thus, in Rufer’s book, the lesser threat of divergent practices (like those of Blacher or Wagner-Régeny) or alternate historical precedents (the twelve-tone tendencies of Strauss, Hindemith, or Bartók) are reconciled as a deterrent to the greater threat of a discourse of New Music which is formally compatible with twelve-tone composition but refuses to explicate itself on either dialectical, historicist, or materialist grounds. International dodecaphony is made to accommodate more compositional subjects, but New Music remains a closed system.

127 Manfred F. Bukofzer to Thomas Mann, 20 January 1949, in The Doctor Faustus Dossier, 164.
Talking About New Music

As a historicist discourse, Adorno’s and Leibowitz’s develops a reading of the past which is directly mapped onto the present and future – in this case, the future of New Music, the category handily reinvented by Adorno from its interwar theorisations and whose subject-positions were filled by his and Leibowitz’s pedagogical project. In effect, the discourse developed by Adorno and Leibowitz, in its generalised form (that of, for example, Rufer), adapted the legitimising logic of dialectical historicism to advance a totalising blueprint for the musical avant-garde. In its predictive capacity, Adorno and Leibowitz’s historicism operates as a self-fulfilling prophecy, since it has already defined the criteria used to identify what New Music is, how it came about, who makes it, and why they make it.

It is important to note that the pedagogical project of Adorno and Leibowitz was not only educational – that is, not simply a process of propagating their particular historicist discourse and its attendant legitimising logic – but foundationally institutional. This is not to say that Adornian-Leibowitzian discourse was solely or even partially responsible for the gargantuan state-funded apparatuses that, over the course of the post-war decade, became ‘citadels of the avant-garde’; rather that this particular discourse savvily complemented the still-nascent foundational objectives of these institutions as a demonstration of their own simultaneously singular and universal validity. Adornian-Leibowitzian historicism presupposed an international-institutional system which generated and safeguarded autonomous artworks at the same time that the embryonic New Music apparatus presupposed a particular historicism which legitimated a singular avant-garde and a singular musical syntax derived from ‘the living chain of polyphonic activity from which is born the long series of masterpieces that constitutes the tradition of our musical language.’

In short, the blueprint for the avant-garde advanced by Adorno and Leibowitz is inseparable from both the institutional apparatuses of New Music and the subsequent knowledge-formation undertaken under their auspices; the discourse they amended has remained the foundational historicist scaffolding for scholarship and analysis of New Music.

128 Leibowitz, Schoenberg, xiv.
This is why theorists and practitioners who have nominally challenged this discourse have invariably devoted themselves to reclaiming the territory already staked out by Adorno and Leibowitz rather than attempt the more difficult task of devising an alternative system of knowledge formation, history, and value. This is the course undertaken by Peter Franklin, whose study *The Idea of Music: Schoenberg and Others* investigates the practices of composers and theorists in the Austro-Germanic tradition after World War II in an attempt to formalize an understanding of musical development that does not defer to the supremacy of Schoenberg’s dodecaphony. While Franklin’s scope is commendably expansive – his reading of Hans Pfitzner’s *Palestrina* (1917) is especially compelling – the anti-Schoenbergian historical practice he proposes is little more than an idealist variation on Adornian-Leibowitzian emplotment, much like Heiß had proposed in 1946: ‘The initial task must be to establish the criteria of a kind of progress that has nothing necessarily to do with linguistic or constructional innovation, but is registered initially within precisely that realm of ideas and values whose atrophy we have traced in the conceits of the orthodox modernists.’ Indeed, it is doubly ironic that, by jettisoning a historical-materialist model of musical progress in favour of a formally-immanent one, Franklin’s model in fact becomes more Schoenbergian than that of Adorno or Leibowitz. A similar effort, in a simultaneously narrower and more megalomaniacal form, has been made more recently by Kyle Gann on behalf of a practice he terms ‘totalism’, which, appropriately enough, projects a totalizing ‘new era that will take another 150 years to explore.’ As might be expected, the basis of Gann’s legitimizing claim is historicist, since the nascent minimalism that led to Gann’s ‘totalism’ is conveniently ‘just like early Baroque opera and the Rococo symphony’, just as, for Leibowitz and Adorno, Schoenberg’s practice self-evidently inaugurated a musical epoch directly analogous to the solidification of the tonal system under Johann Sebastian Bach. Unlike Franklin, Gann has

---

130 Ibid, 115.
131 Franklin is either unaware of this kinship or unwilling to acknowledge it; at any rate, it certainly does not deter his polemic against Schoenberg and his reception: ‘If Schoenberg’s hitherto unassailable position in the histories of twentieth-century music as father of technical innovation and stylistic progress must suffer ironic inversion when considered in this [i.e., idealist] light, his myriad would-be successors and torch-bearers inevitably take on the aspect of epiphenomena, of limpets and barnacles desperately clinging to a sinking ship’ (Franklin, *The Idea of Music*, 108). For his part, unfortunately, Franklin is ultimately unable to find any other available ship.
133 Ibid.
not even attempted to question this discourse; he has merely replicated it wholesale. In instances such as Gann’s, where the same story, with the same periodization, analogies, legitimations, and teleology, is reproduced in service of purportedly polemical subversion, the closed circuit of New Music discourse generated from Adorno and Leibowitz becomes dismally obvious. The argument is never about the story of New Music, it is only about the figures which populate it.

If, in its global (that is, broadest and most ecumenical) form, the Adornian-Leibowitzian discourse appears familiar from its recapitulation in New Music discourse and historiography which continues to the present day, it is curious that the ‘new generations of twelve-tone composers’ identified by Leibowitz almost exclusively comprise figures who, within the current iteration of music history, aspire to the level of footnotes. Even more significantly, those few practitioners in Adorno and Leibowitz’s école who make more sustained appearances in historical surveys – the most prominent of which is doubtless Henze – do so as figures excluded from and polemically positioned against the so-called Darmstadt School. Indeed, Leibowitz himself is given mention most often as Boulez’s early pedantic composition tutor. Clearly, the ideological and pedagogical project developed by Adorno and Leibowitz had influence beyond the immediate manoeuvrings of Adorno and Leibowitz themselves, and the institutional adoption of their blueprint for New Music and its future did not coincide with an adoption of the exact figures proposed to exist within the discourse. It is possible, then, if perhaps only cheekily, to speak of a First Darmstadt School – say, Henze, Wildberger, and Monod – which was then supplanted by the Darmstadt School of historical musicology. But this usurpation occurs within the Adornoian-Leibowitzian discourse. Indeed, it is precisely the institutional adoption of this discourse and its attendant subject-positions – the trinitarian school legitimated by material-historical progress – that allowed a mutually dissimilar collection of practices, ideologies, politics, and aesthetics to coalesce into the conceptual unity of the Darmstadt School. But this discourse does not only reproduce subject positions in trinitarian schools, it also produces ex-centric subjects, figures which are neither

---

134 Gann’s historicism is at once more literal and less dialectical than Adorno and Leibowitz’s, as emphasized by his directly arborescent argumentation: ‘...the classical music and academic establishments are still chopping away at the tree of minimalism. But that tree has deep roots, and it grows more quickly than anyone imagines. It won’t be chopped down’ (ibid).

135 See, for example, Peter Heyworth, ‘The First Fifty Years’, in Pierre Boulez: A Symposium, ed. William Glock (London: Eulenburg, 1986), 10–11, which describes Boulez approaching, for lack of better options, ‘an obscure composer and conductor called René Leibowitz’ to learn more about Schoenberg’s music.
with nor against the historicist progression of New Music, but foundationally outside. While this ex-centric subject position cannot alter the genetic element of New Music discourse (or at least, it hasn’t yet), its structural instability skews the discourse’s projected linear teleology: it can never transition from Schoenberg to Hauer, but it can turn from Schoenberg to Webern.
Chapter 2: From Schoenberg to Webern; from Leibowitz to Messiaen

The panorama of the institutional avant-garde and its attendant discourse viewed at the conclusion of the previous chapter, as it existed and functioned by 1950, is the same as that presented by music historical accounts of the post-war avant-garde with one small problem: the names are all wrong. In the first place, against the received historical narrative, they are almost all terribly obscure figures, some worthy of footnote or specialised interest (but even then most often as case studies – as mentioned earlier, Carroll’s use of Nigg is exclusively confined to his extremely brief Zhdanovite stance in 1948) but most falling well beneath the threshold of musicological notice. Indeed, the one widely recognizable name to populate this institutional ecosystem, Hans Werner Henze, is characterised by his bitter and prolonged opposition to multiple generations of ‘Darmstadt’ composers.1 Indeed, Henze himself frames his disillusionment with the Darmstadt School as a case of paradise lost:

The Darmstadt summer courses were extremely important in promoting the knowledge of modern music, at any rate during the first few years. It was the idea of the chief cultural administrator there, Wolfgang Steinecke, to bring congresses and conferences to the blitzed city of Darmstadt.2

Naturally enough, the face of this new internationalism is Leibowitz himself. Henze’s account illustrates his enthusiastic adoption of the position of an international dodecaphonic composer on plainly Leibowitzian terms:

As early as 1947 René Leibowitz took [sic] a class analysing Schoenberg. He was a marvellous teacher and, what is more, a delightful man; he taught me a great deal. We wanted to know in more detail what twelve-note composition was all about […] we very quickly realized that dodecaphony and serialism were the only viable new techniques: fresh, and able to generate new musical patterns.3

But Henze’s first person plural is soon shattered by a fateful arrival.

---

3 Ibid, 37–38.
Along came Karlheinz Stockhausen, amid much pomp and circumstance, with claims that were immediately acknowledged. He said out loud what he thought: there was nobody around who knew anything about music apart from him. This marked the end of the solidarity that had previously existed among young composers. At the beginning it had looked as though we were all working together on a humanistic project, as if we were all brothers, comrades, allies. That was now gone.4

For Henze, then, New Music existed as a positive and coherent phenomenon only before the advent of the composers associated with the Darmstadt School, when ‘the production of music that was totally mechanized and incapable of expressiveness’ triumphed. Henze presents himself as a modern Jeremiah bearing witness to a world turned upside-down on the fulcrum of Anton Webern:

My antipathy was directed not against Webern’s music, but against the misuse and misinterpretation of his aesthetic and, indeed, of his technique and its motivation and significance. Thanks to the initiative of Boulez and Stockhausen, this had become institutionalized as official musical thinking, whose maxims the body of lesser mortals now had to put into practice (allowing for seasonal variations) with religious devotion, esprit de corps and slavish obedience. The old Webernians, people who had known him and worked with him, and who were now to witness the spectacle of this aesthetic error, began to feel more and more redundant, went down in the estimation of the technocrats of Darmstadt, and were no longer ‘in’ but ‘out’.5

In Henze’s telling, the bad guys won, and the institutional subject position intended for international, historically-mandated dodecaphony had been seized by the ex-centric subjects of unhistorical, pseudo-Gnostic obscurantism: ‘The atmosphere was that of an – admittedly well-heeled – early Christian sect, and people even talked of an “Ars Nova” – a crass example of the unhistorical thinking that prevailed at the time.’6 The inside-outside of New Music had been turned inside-out. This is a disaster of the highest order. It is nearly inexplicable. Henze comes close to suggesting that the apparent popularity of this music which should properly have been confined to the margins of cultural life and discourse was the result a capitalist-popish plot: ‘The reason why this “non-communicative” tendency, which possessed a mystical, indeed an expressly Catholic element, was so vigorously promoted was, I think, the desire to prevent

4 Ibid.
5 Ibid, 43. Here and elsewhere, Henze is forgiving of Nono’s involvement in Darmstadt.
6 Ibid, 44.
people from seeing music as simple, concrete and comprehensible communication between human beings. Clearly, then, the blueprint for an international, institutional avant-garde did not go precisely as Adorno and (more instrumentally) Leibowitz had planned – they had arranged the subject positions, but failed to provide stable subjects.

The short chapter which follows gives a brief account of an event which has been widely covered in both scholarly and popular accounts of the development of New Music in Europe: Pierre Boulez’s break with his teacher René Leibowitz. It puts these accounts in dialogue with the penetrating analytical research of Inge Kovács which demonstrates that Boulez’s compositional practice was broadly indistinguishable from that of Leibowitz for more than a decade. Going some way further than Kovács, it argues that the explicating discourse adopted by Boulez particularly in his early polemical writings was also that of his teacher and Theodor W. Adorno – the discourse detailed in the previous chapter. It is key, then, that Henze is left out in the cold while Boulez becomes central within New Music, despite both composers sharing a largely identical understanding of musical practice and discourse. In light of Kovács’s research, the discursive repositioning of this key member of the Darmstadt School is examined, alongside its consequences. As such, Boulez’s very public break with one of the central figures of international New Music is treated as a case study in how its explicating discourse mutated to stabilise its subjects. The fact that practice and explication, music and discourse, are wholly separate in such a maneuver is central to the remainder of the study, which describes a practice which was not ultimately traceable to Leibowitz.

Leibowitz and his school

As might be expected, Leibowitz appears by all accounts to have been an intensely demanding teacher both abroad and in Paris. Certainly his students were remarkably zealous in their study of the Second Viennese School: Jean-Louis Martinet went to Vienna on a scholarship to copy Webern’s manuscripts by hand, and many of Leibowitz’s own handwritten copies of Schoenberg, Berg, and Webern scores were eagerly copied and disseminated among his circle of students. And it was under Leibowitz’s influence that these students, among them a twenty-
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7 Ibid, 50.
year-old Pierre Boulez, caused a minor scandal by booing a performance of Stravinsky in the winter of 1945.9

As one of Leibowitz’s pupils, Boulez was among the first musicians in France to become acquainted directly with the music of Webern, but, consequently, this acquaintance was directly mediated by Leibowitz. This mediation was not simply the passing inconvenience that Boulez would later attempt to brush it off as: Inge Kovács remarks that Boulez’s understanding of Webern ‘remained remarkably closely bound to that of Leibowitz’.10 Significantly, Boulez performed in the French premiere of Webern’s Symphony and Schoenberg’s *Herzgewächse* on 5 December 1945 under the direction of Leibowitz.11 Much later, Boulez would recall the ‘lack of competence’ involved in the performance of the music of the Second Viennese School that reigned before the advent of his *Domaine musical*.12 He does not mention that he himself participated in these early performances.

However slight, such an ellipsis is a succinct illustration of the extent of Boulez’s efforts to portray himself as both totally separate from and in opposition to Leibowitz. It would be no exaggeration to suggest that, at least in retrospect, being a pupil to Leibowitz was the most humiliating period of Boulez’s artistic life. This explains why – in an account by Peter Heyworth – Boulez is depicted as the leader of the students who booed the Stravinsky performance in 1945.13 Conversely, in this official telling, Leibowitz’s role is rather diminished, as an inconvenient middle-man between Boulez and his real creative object: ‘Schoenberg himself was a frail old man, living in distant Los Angeles. The only person Boulez knew of in Paris who had studied with him was an obscure composer and conductor called René Leibowitz.’14 Such was Boulez’s subsequent influence that even the historical position of Leibowitz – who even by 1945 was well known among Parisian artists and intellectuals, and counted Georges Bataille,
Tristan Tzara, Raymond Queneau, and Georges Limbour as close friends—15 was retroactively dictated by Boulez’s personal mythology.

The published account of Boulez’s break with his teacher—which Kovács describes as ‘disputed [umstrittenen]’—16 is found in New York Times journalist Joan Peyser’s book-length profile Boulez: Composer, Conductor, Enigma. Despite Boulez’s evident antipathy towards the idea, Peyser tracked down Leibowitz to his small apartment on the Left Bank and, after some coaxing, recorded his telling of Boulez’s departure. According to Leibowitz, Boulez had brought him a manuscript of his First Piano Sonata, which Leibowitz then began ‘marking up’ in red pen.17 This act of defacement enraged Boulez so greatly that he snatched the score back from his teacher and left with a rude appraisal of his efforts (‘vous êtes merde!’), never to return.18 Michel Fano, a lifelong friend of Boulez, finds no reason to doubt the basic premise of Leibowitz’s account as presented by Peyser.19 However, he suggests that the ‘marking up’ undertaken by Leibowitz was most likely a ‘correction’ of instances where Boulez had deviated from a strict unfolding of the twelve-note series.

An Apprenticeship and its Stocktakings

Whatever its cause, Boulez’s hatred of Leibowitz was immediate, fiery, and lasting. Indeed, this particular polemical loathing was likely the most consistent aesthetic position Boulez maintained throughout his mature creative existence. It did not take long for the first results of this fallout with his former teacher to materialise publicly: Boulez’s article ‘Incidences actuelles de Berg’, which Kovács characterises as an ‘anti-Leibowitz manifesto’, appeared in the journal Polyphonie in 1948.20 This tenor continued through the more famous polemics, such as ‘Schoenberg est mort’ and ‘Éventuellement …’, wherein Boulez’s attack was now broadened to

16 Kovács, 44.
17 Peyser, 39.
18 Ibid. As Kovács points out, Peyser displays a rather generous degree of credulity towards Leibowitz’s claims (Kovács, 44). It would appear that Leibowitz took advantage of this. For example, he also tells her that he had studied with Webern for a period of months—a claim she repeats—and gives a likely exaggerated account of Boulez becoming so enraged at his publisher asking if he wanted to keep the dedication to Leibowitz on the published score of his First Piano Sonata that he slashed the score to smithereens.
20 Kovács, 43–44. Kovács later gives the date of this article as 1947, but it is unclear if this refers to the date of publication (in which case it would be an error) or the date of writing (ibid, 47).
include all ‘dodecaphonists’. This swipe is not nearly as offhanded as it may appear now. Two important elisions are enacted here, both of which simultaneously reinforce and circumscribe Leibowitz’s practice. First, by identifying ‘dodecaphonists’ as both an international and essentially unified phenomenon, Boulez affirms the moves undertaken by Leibowitzian-Adornian discourse, like the criticisms of Stuckenschmidt and Bouquet, positioning himself within their specific understanding of New Music. Second, through his characterisation (‘playing the sniper’) of these dodecaphonists as ‘Organizing congresses – those of specialists playing at initiate ceremonies for fearful beginners – falsely doctrinaire, absurdly conservative, they lord it in stupid repletion for the greater glory of the avant-garde,’ – Boulez handily relegates Leibowitz and his school to the barren, ex-centric subject position of New Music discourse, one which has adopted the correct technical procedures without the correct understanding or justification.\(^{21}\) As a result, ‘they know how to count up to twelve and in multiples of twelve’, making them quasi-Gnostic ‘[e]xcellent spirits as apostles and disciples’, but utterly detached from the historical logic of the musical material.\(^{22}\) This double-barrelled attack would be repeated, largely unaltered, for the entirety of Boulez’s mature creative career. Towards the end of his life, in a 2012 interview for his publisher Universal Edition, Boulez marshals the same invective against his former teacher: ‘You know, with Leibowitz, the academicism of this analysis and so on, it was unbearable to me. [...] Leibowitz, you know, that was just salt on nothing. That was so dry and so unimaginative. That was only one to twelve, twelve to one, six to one, one to seven, and so on. It was really dreadful.’\(^{23}\) These complaints, largely unaltered over more than half a century, take on a sort of quasi-catechistic shorthand suggesting that hatred of Leibowitz’s ‘academicism’ is indeed the fundamental grounding of Boulez’s understanding of his artistic practice. This is certainly the case in a letter addressed to Jean-Jacques Nattiez from 1990, describing ‘the context of the period’ in Paris during the late
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\(^{22}\) Ibid, 148.

\(^{23}\) See ‘Pierre Boulez talks about his music’, https://www.youtube.com/watch?v=ie5Ore2rjhk (accessed 28.1.2018). With the exception of the ‘salt on nothing’ characterisation, which is novel (and seemingly original), Boulez’s complaint against Leibowitz has something of a rehearsed quality, especially considering that his comments on dry, unimaginative academicism had been repeated almost incessantly from his first polemics of the late 1940s. Indeed, Boulez’s parodic litany of ‘one to twelve, twelve to one, six to one, one to seven,’ is also found, spoken verbatim, in a previous interview, suggesting that he repeated this precise mockery on numerous occasions. Cf. ‘Pierre Boulez on Olivier Messiaen and René Leibowitz’, in http://exploretunescore.org/pierre-boulez-douze-notations-history-and-context-a-journeyman-composition.html (accessed 28.1.2018).
1940s and early 1950s, which suggests not only that Leibowitz is the single most significant figure in Boulez’s early development, but the singular influence within all Parisian music: ‘At that time, there really wasn’t anything apart from the asphyxiating academicism of Leibowitz.’ Boulez’s stated project of totally annihilating Leibowitz from music history (‘I will let you know again that R. Leibowitz’s credit is at low ebb and nobody, here, any longer believes in that false prophet. He has had his day, and justice is being done,’ he wrote Cage in December 1950) is thereby uncomfortably undermined by his own inability to conceive of his artistic practice from any other reference point, negative or otherwise.

It should not be unexpected to assert, then, that Boulez’s musical thinking, especially in its polemical form, is fundamentally identifiable with that of his teacher. Most obviously, Boulez wholly and repeatedly recapitulates Leibowitz’s historical teleology which ends with 12-tone composition: in ‘Schoenberg is Dead’, he describes an organic ‘development [which] starts with the post-Wagnerian vocabulary ends up with the “suspension” of tonality,’ a ‘preparatory’ phase whose works ‘we may reasonably allow ourselves to regard [...] now as above all documentary.’ The real interest commences from the fifth piece of Schoenberg’s opus 23, where ‘[w]e are here in the presence of a new way of organizing sound’.

But just as essentially, Boulez and Leibowitz (and Adorno) share an understanding of what constitutes an authentic compositional practice, one which is historically conditioned by the developing logic of the musical material. Leibowitz’s musical conviction was, throughout his mature creative life, an explicitly existentialist one, and, as such, his adoption of the twelve-tone method is framed as the discovery of an artistic form that gives meaning to both the creative act and contemporary existence. In his preface to Schoenberg et son école, Leibowitz describes such a moment of enlightenment as ‘what some would call a revelation, and what I like to call a sudden consciousness of the true meaning of the language of music.’ Leibowitz’s explanation bears quoting in full:

In the case of the composer, this sudden consciousness comes at the moment when, in the work of a contemporary musician, he discovers what seems to him to be the
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25 Boulez to Cage, 30 December 1950. Ibid, 89.
27 Ibid, 211.
28 Leibowitz, Schoenberg, x (emphasis Leibowitz’s).
language of his epoch, the language which he himself wants to speak. Up to that point, he may have assimilated, in more or less accurate fashion, the language of the past; he may have believed that he has profited from certain excursions into a style which seems to him to furnish fresh possibilities. But his real consciousness of being a composer cannot be foursquare and unshakable until some master of our time brings him the assurance, the irrefutable evidence of the necessity and the authenticity of his personal language.  

This passage is the positive antecedent, in vocabulary, logic, ideology, and phenomenology, to Boulez’s negative pronouncement that ‘any musician who has not experienced – we do not say understood, but truly experienced – the necessity of dodecaphonic language is USELESS. For his whole work is beneath the necessities of his epoch.’ In fact, Leibowitz’s discursive orientation manifests itself throughout Boulez’s early publications. His position in ‘Moment de Jean-Sébastien Bach’ that the serial language engenders new syntactical forms analogous to those which arose from the modal and tonal systems is a paraphrase of the argument in the first two chapters of Schoenberg et son école, although Boulez cannily asserts that Webern, not Schoenberg, is the true heir to Bach. Indeed, Boulez’s position towards Bach here – presenting the composer as a vital forerunner to the contemporary avant-garde against his formal mummification by naïve, conservative musicologists – largely overlaps with that taken by Adorno at the same time in ‘Bach gegen seine Leibhaber verteidigt’.

Starting with his break with Leibowitz in 1946, Boulez consciously directed his artistic development towards an annihilation of Leibowitz’s influence, an annihilation which Boulez was never fully successful in realising either discursively or compositionally. Furthermore, such a position served to confuse the reception of Boulez’s own work, resulting in, prior to the advent of the Darmstadt School, Boulez’s ‘innovations’ being likened to those of André Jolivet and Pierre Schaeffer. This confusion belies the peculiarities of the nascent avant-garde tradition in Paris. As Kovács observes, the concept of an overarching ‘polyphonie’ was something of an idée fixe in the Francophone music culture of the 1940s, attested to by the founding of the journals Polyphonie and Contrepoint. This had an indelible influence on the creative logic and rhetoric, 
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29 Ibid (emphasis Leibowitz’s).
33 Kovács, 82.
both verbal and musical, of Leibowitz and Boulez – Kovács notes, for example, that both composers throughout their writings refer to ‘vertical aggregates’ rather than ‘chords’ – and provided the latter with the figurative vocabulary with which he would frame his break with Leibowitz. It should come as no surprise that polyphony, for Leibowitz, was a deeply rooted historicist category which informed the teleological development of Western Music, the most recent authentic manifestation being the Second Viennese School. And for Leibowitz, as for Adorno, such a historical necessity was to be found not in the genius of the composer-subject (as it was for Schoenberg) but in the immanent logic of the musical material itself. Reinhold Kapp’s summary highlights the clear Adornian sympathies of this position:

The basis of Leibowitz’s every discussion was the concept of a history of polyphony (with all that term implies) considered as the main strand of art-music. As against Neoclassicism’s mistaken sense of tradition, he recommended orientation by the Viennese School [sic], where the problems of composition were accepted in the framework of the actual state of development of the musical language, and genuinely solved. This continuity must be preserved, the commitment expressed by this music must be taken up.

The ultimate objective for Leibowitzian compositional practice was the dialectical fulfilment of the historical tendency of the twelve-tone works of Schoenberg, Berg, and Webern in polyphonic terms. The competition between Leibowitz and his prodigal student in the pursuit of this goal was as vicious as it was terminologically wrought. While Leibowitz referred to ‘the constructive antagonism of “counterpoint/harmony” as the ‘conceptual pairing “horizontal/vertical”’, Boulez depicted his own practice as the fulfilment of this dialectic by his discovery of the ‘diagonal’. Yet such a fulfilment necessarily presumed the historical legitimacy, at least contextually, of Leibowitz’s own practice, an allowance that Boulez could not abide. To counteract this, Boulez argued that such a ‘new dimension’ had already been ‘created’ in the work of Anton Webern, thereby reframing his work as a direct, unmediated continuation of Webern’s and rendering Leibowitz – and his dodecaphonic contemporaries – irrelevant and superfluous. Unfortunately for Boulez, this was the exact argument, in the same Euclidean

34 Ibid, 83.
35 Reinhard Kapp, ‘Shades of the Double’s Original: René Leibowitz’s dispute with Boulez’, Tempo, 165 (1988), 5. It should be said that Leibowitz’s idea of ‘commitment’ here makes his position rather less deterministic than Adorno’s, and belies Leibowitz’s adoption of Sartre’s existentialist philosophy.
36 Ibid.
37 ‘Il créé une nouvelle dimension, que nous pourrions appeler dimension diagonale [...]’ Boulez, Relevés, 372.
terms, that Leibowitz himself had put forward when describing Webern’s creation of a meta-
relationship between ‘the horizontal plane’ and ‘the vertical plane’. Indeed, both arguments
in fact appear to be little more than an historicist gloss on a conceptual model of Schoenberg’s,
wherein “THE TWO-OR-MORE-DIMENSIONAL SPACE IN WHICH MUSICAL IDEAS ARE
PRESENTED IS A UNIT.” As such, Boulez’s attempts to eradicate Leibowitz were manifested
through the ideological premises, and, more properly, the discourse of Leibowitz himself.

A similar conclusion may be drawn through technical and musical analysis. Prefacing
her examination of the two composers, Kovács frankly describes Boulez’s output as ‘following
in the footsteps of his teacher Leibowitz’. Kapp goes some way further, referring to ‘a whole
orchestra of concepts’ introduced by Leibowitz ‘which seems to anticipate the Darmstadt
terminology, not least the actual term ‘serial’ used as the formula of generalization that implies
a whole programme. From a safe distance one almost gets the impression that there is no aspect
of Webers of importance to the serialists to which Leibowitz had not already drawn attention’. Kapp’s caution here (‘seems to anticipate’) is indicative of the state of almost total historical
oblivion to which Leibowitz had been relegated, since even his retaliatory argument cannot
imagine that Leibowitz’s terminology quite literally does anticipate the codification of the
‘Darmstadt School’. In the Chamber Symphony, op. 16 (1946–1948), Kovács demonstrates,
Leibowitz had ‘attempted to imbue the musical space with rationality by creating a systematic
availability of differentiated ‘dimensions’ of the composition – pitches, rhythms, form, timbre.’
What appears in retrospect to be a fairly self-evident example of serial pre-composition can be
seen most obviously in the relationships between the twelve pitches of his various row-forms
and the twelve instruments of the chamber ensemble. This piece was written as an exercise in
precisely those diagonal relations – interrelationships between the ‘horizontal and vertical
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38 Leibowitz, Schoenberg, 215. The idea of a ‘new dimension’ of music being revealed was itself a commonplace; David Tudor describes John Cage's music as itself adding a ‘new dimension’ beyond what Boulez himself had written (Tudor to Cage, July 1951. Quoted in Iddon, John Cage and David Tudor: Correspondence on Interpretation and Performance (Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 2013), 19). The specificity of the Leibowitz-Boulez ideology lies in its identification of a ‘diagonal’ dimension which indexes both melodic and harmonic interactions.
39 Schoenberg, ‘Composition with Twelve Tones (I)’, in Style and Idea, 20 (emphasis in original). Schoenberg here goes on to describe the horizontal/vertical binary given dialectical status by Leibowitz and Boulez: ‘The elements of a musical idea are partly incorporated in the horizontal plane as successive sounds, and partly in the vertical plane as simultaneous sounds.’
40 Kapp notes that ‘Leibowitz’s argument survives’ Boulez’s supposed dismantling; see Kapp, 9–10.
41 ‘[… ] in die Fußstapfen seines Lehrers Leibowitz trat’ (Kovács, 18).
42 Kapp, 5.
43 ‘Hier versuchte er selbst, den musikalischen Raum rational zu durchdringen, indem er die verschiedenen Dimensionen des Tonsatzes – Tonhöhen, Rhythmen, Form, Klangfarbe – einem systematischen Zugriff verfügbar machte.’ Kovács, 90.
planes’ – that Leibowitz had previously described in Webern’s Symphony and which were the rhetorical object of Boulez’s practical self-justifications. Indeed, the compositional process of Leibowitz’s Chamber Symphony appears to be precisely what Boulez is describing, about four years later, in ‘Possibly...’, namely, ‘to link rhythmic to serial structures through a common organization which will also embrace the other characteristics of sound: dynamics, mode of attack, timbre; and then to expand this morphology into an integrate rhetoric.’

Consequently, Boulez’s understanding of his musical practice during this period appears fundamentally confusing, if not simply confused. For all his polemical posturing, the only concrete compositional method he proposes had been both described and at least partially undertaken by Leibowitz several years prior. Indeed, the hard-won dialectical acquisitions of Boulez and Leibowitz hardly even appear distinctive within the artistic network of international twelve-tone conferences: at one such event in Munich in 1950, it was ‘pointed out in the discussion that, linked with the new organisation of tonal material, there must be a consequent revaluation of rhythmics [sic] and dynamics’. If – with the benefit of both hindsight and Kovács’s research – Boulez’s practice in the early post-war years appears to be directly within the lineage of Leibowitz’s school (and international twelve-tone music more generally) in both form, content, and rhetoric, it is difficult to reconcile Boulez’s iconoclastic reputation and conceptual primacy in the historical narrative of avant-garde music with this aesthetic context. What did Boulez manage to do that Nigg, Martinet, or, say, Maurice Le Roux did not?

The Realignment of Pierre Boulez

He covered his tracks. Although, in his advocacy of individuating and re-combining the various parameters of music, Boulez ultimately proposes a fairly exact copy of Leibowitz’s working method, the musical precedents Boulez himself identifies for these procedures are slightly skewed from a Leibowitzian perspective. Even within an obviously Leibowitzian understanding of music history, describing the separation of rhythm from polyphony in ‘Possibly...’, Boulez
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44 Ibid, 91.
45 Boulez, ‘Possibly...’, in Stocktaking, 115.
46 Melos 17 (1950), 361; quoted in Kapp, 10. Kapp also cites Blacher’s contribution to Rufer’s Composition with Twelve Notes (see above) and Milton Babbitt’s review of Leibowitz’s Schoenberg et son école and Qu’est-ce que la musique de douze sons? as examples of a broad tendency to apply the logic of twelve-tone composition to rhythmic organisation (Blacher phrases his contribution in terms of ‘variable metre'; Babbitt, predictably, in terms of ‘combinatoriality’).
writes: 'If we need a precedent' – and, assuredly, we do – ‘we can take the isorhythmic motets of Machaut and Dufay.' Of course, a teleological explanation for contemporary musical practice that traces its historical development from the late Middle Ages is itself familiar from Leibowitz, but Boulez’s departure from Machaut here leads elsewhere than Schoenberg or any other figure in Leibowitz’s reckoning: Olivier Messiaen. To be sure, Messiaen is not the only modern figure Boulez uses to bludgeon Leibowitz – Kapp identifies Stravinsky and Bartók as well – but Messiaen most consistently illustrates how Boulez’s understanding of music history and attendant compositional practice are supposedly irreconcilable with Leibowitz’s. In Boulez’s account, Messiaen is credited with ‘the creation of a conscious technique of duration’, a procedure that, according to Boulez, had been largely absent from occidental music since Dufay. Indeed, Boulez had already deployed Messiaen as a specific foil to Leibowitz’s myopia as early as 1948, beginning his essay ‘Proposals’ by taking Leibowitz to task for his evident dismissal of Messiaen’s assertion that rhythm and ‘polyphony’ were separable. But Boulez’s claim is rather misleading since, for both Leibowitz and himself, rhythm in fact is axiomatically inseparable from polyphony, rhythmic organisation existing simply as a further delineation of polyphonic organisation – ‘polyphony’ thus referring to relationships of pitch and rhythm. Indeed, Boulez even says as much:

How then can we coordinate and enrich these innovations of Messiaen and those of his predecessors? Accepting the principle of a contrapuntal style in which all parts must have equal importance (to explain why is beyond the scope of the present discussion), I would say that rhythm must be integrated with polyphony in a more or less independent way: must, that is, be either dependent on or independent of the contrapuntal figures according to the development we have in view.

Boulez’s musical practice is no more Messiaenic than Leibowitz’s – Kovács has clearly and repeatedly demonstrated as much – yet when he describes his practice as the only historically legitimate and fundamentally new manifestation of musical material, Boulez cites Messiaen as
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47 Boulez, ‘Possibly…’, 120. A revised translation of this passage appears in Kapp, 11: ‘To find the most rational attitude toward rhythm in our occidental music, one must turn to Philippe de Vitry, Guillaume de Machaut, and Guillaume Dufay ...’. 
48 Kapp, 8. 
49 Boulez, ‘Proposals’, in Stocktaking, 47. 
50 Ibid., 49. 
51 See especially the extended analytical treatment given to Leibowitz’s Chamber Symphony op. 16 and Boulez’s projected series of Polyphonies, of which Polyphonie X (1950–1951) is the only completed (albeit withdrawn) example, in Kovács, 82–165.
a corrective to Leibowitz and, concomitantly, Webern as a corrective to Schoenberg. In light of this, one might even suggest Boulez’s use of Messiaen’s pitch material from ‘Mode de valeurs’ for the basic series in his Structures appears less a straightforward homage than a deliberate attempt to obscure the relationship between Boulez’s compositional methods and those of Leibowitz.

At any rate, if Boulez’s attempt to annihilate Leibowitz in his own music and thought was unsuccessful, his efforts to destroy the influence of his former teacher in the discourse of new music were rather more fruitful. Throughout the 1950s, written accounts of contemporary French music devote less space to Leibowitz and his school (in particular Serge Nigg and Jean-Louis Martinet). Instead, they describe a technical lineage stretching from Messiaen and Webern to Boulez, precisely the lineage Boulez himself was promulgating. The cornerstone of this narrative was ‘Éventuellement…’, which was read roughly as a contemporary redux of Messiaen’s Technique de mon langage musical. Writing in 1953, Jean Étienne Marie, himself a former student of Messiaen, reproduces both Boulez’s arguments and his musical examples (of rhythmic augmentation and diminution and duration matrices) verbatim, describing them as extensions of the work of Messiaen.52 There are three immediate consequences of this emplotment. First, the pieces of Messiaen that Marie gives as examples to explicate Boulez’s work – the ‘Mode de valeurs’, the Messe Pentecôte [sic] (1949–1950), which was never officially premiered, and Timbres-durées (1952), the musique concrète piece realised in collaboration with Pierre Schaeffer and Pierre Henry that was subsequently disavowed by Messiaen – are almost uniquely non-representative of Messiaen’s oeuvre.53 Second, Boulez’s practice is, by nature of its supposed debt to Messiaen, now also portrayed as a continuation of the Jeune France group in toto.54 Third, because Leibowitz and his school are now immaterial to Boulez’s music, whatever serial features his music exhibited must now be accounted for by recourse to Webern. Each of these is a distortion of Boulez’s position both aesthetically, historically, and ideologically, and is irreconcilable with the material of Boulez’s music and the content of his critical writings.

Furthermore, by associating himself with Messiaen and, wittingly or unwittingly, with Jeune France more broadly, Boulez risked categorically alienating himself from the emergent
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53 Ibid, 159–160.
54 Explicitly in relation to Jolivet (see ibid, 160–161), implicitly in relation to Daniel-Lesur, who gives a short letter of preface to the study itself.
institutional logic of New Music. Positioning Messiaen’s practice between Les Six’s desire ‘to embrace a modern, egalitarian mass culture’ and ‘the pro-fascist Right, which argued for tradition and autonomy, or the transcendence of politics’, Jane F. Fulcher foregrounds the ideological foundations of Jeune France in the 1930s. While Fulcher repeatedly emphasizes that this ‘personalism’ rejected both liberal modernity and ‘the panaceas of both the Left and the Right’, the group’s rhetoric consistently frames this rejection as an about-face to the modern condition, most succinctly conveyed in Jeune France’s motto, ‘retour au lyrisme, à l’humaine’. Certainly the Messiaen of Jeune France was a deliberate riposte to a conception of modernity shared by Les Six and Weimar New Music, as an endorsement from fellow Jeune France member Yves Baudrier indicates:

We can affirm that Messiaen has a truly original temperament only through the French and musical humanism in which he is so thoroughly steeped. His God is Christian but Debussyste, his loves include Massenet and extend to Ravel, and although they pass from India, to Béla Bartók and Stravinsky, they only flourish in the harmonic climate of our deep-rooted tradition.

If the spiritualist traditionalism advocated by Jeune France arose from the rich and byzantine specificities of French aesthetic politics during the 1930s and German occupation, from an international perspective, their position appeared to be one of fairly straightforward reactionary anti-modernism. Accordingly, Messiaen’s practice was treated with a combination of apprehension and circumvention in the nascent institutions of post-war New Music. Heinrich Strobel’s lecture on contemporary French music at the 1946 Darmstädter Ferienkurse is representative, giving much attention to the composers of Les Six as the natural counterpoint to New Music (whatever that category might entail) in Germany: ‘This group Les Six embodies
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56 Ibid, 458.
57 Quoted in Fulcher, 461.
58 Yves Baudrier, ‘Les tendances contemporaines en France’, Volontés de ceux de la Résistance, 3 October 1945, 4; quoted and translated in Yves Balmer, Thomas Lacôte, and Christopher Brent Murray, ‘Un cri de passion ne s’analyse pas: Olivier Messiaen’s Harmonic Borrowings from Jules Massenet’, Twentieth-Century Music, 13.2 (2016), 235. The fact that this comment, with its tenor of ‘deep-rooted tradition’ and God against alienated cosmopolitanism, was published in a journal of the French Resistance (albeit after liberation) indicates the highly complex and seemingly counterintuitive political-aesthetic alignments of the period. Indeed, at this time René Leibowitz was a frequent contributor to the journal Esprit, which ‘sought a more sincerely religious and democratic Catholicism’ (Fulcher, 459).
in France what we in Germany term New Music – the young musicians of 1920, Paul Hindemith, Ernst Krenek, Alban Berg, Ernst Toch, Kurt Weill, Hanns Eisler. On the other hand, Strobel briefly mentions Jeune France towards the conclusion of his lecture as representing a sort of quasi-reactionary new Romanticism (‘einer neuen Romantik’), of whose artistic prospects Strobel was largely dismissive in comparison with Les Six. According to Strobel, the most representative ‘apparition [Erscheinung]’ from this new Romanticism is Olivier Messiaen, who ‘comes from the world of Catholic mysticism’, a provenance echoing Henze’s ‘mystical, expressly Catholic element’ that undermines utopian modernity. Strobel allows for the possibility that Messiaen’s practice might have more than local significance, but it is on the same ghostly-reactionary terms as a kind of musical revenant: ‘It remains to be seen whether Messiaen is a lonely apparition – or the beginning of a development.’ The complexities of Strobel’s aesthetic outlook notwithstanding, the general understanding of Jeune France-associated music as a neo-Romanticist practice generally opposed to New Music proper was commonplace within the discourse of this period. Writing on the state of New Music in 1949, Louis Saguer describes Messiaen’s practice in the same quasi-mystical Romantic terms as Strobel, citing him as the last in a historical series of elaborately scored orchestral works – ‘Wagner, Bruckner, Mahler, and still today Messiaen’ – which has its opposite in the music of

59 ‘Diese Gruppe der Six verkörpern in Frankreich, was wir in Deutschland die neue Musik nennen – die jungen Musiker von 1920, Paul Hindemith, Ernst Krenek, Alban Berg, Ernst Toch, Kurt Weill, Hanns Eisler.’ Heinrich Strobel, ‘Die zeitgenössische Musik Frankreichs’, in Im Zenit der Moderne, III.159. Here, of course, one also notices an understanding of ‘New Music’ pre-existing the first move made by Leibowitzian-Adornian historicism: Berg is mentioned as a separate phenomenon from Schoenberg and Webern.

60 ‘Denn bei der »Jeune France«, bei André Jolivet und Daniel Lesur, handelt es sich weniger um einer neue Schule als um einen Kompromiß, dem zwar hübsche Leistungen entsprangen, aber bis jetzt nichts irgendwie Richtungsweisendes. Doch will man dies auch nicht. Man bescheidet sich. Man beackert aufs neue das Feld, auf dem die originalen Leistungen eines Honegger und Milhaud gewachsen sind’ (ibid, 164).


62 ‘Es wird sich zeigen, ob Messiaen eine einzelgängerische Erscheinung ist – oder der Beginn einer Entwicklung’ (ibid, 165).

63 To briefly give a more detailed picture, his lecture on Stravinsky, given the next year at Darmstadt as part of a series on ‘Führende Meister der neuen Musik’, presents its subject as the singular authentic fulfilment of historical-musical necessity in terms familiar from Adorno and Leibowitz’s figure of Schoenberg and Heiß figure of Hauer, revitalizing the spirit of ‘humanity’ found in the music of Machaut and Ockeghem, Vivaldi and Pergolesi, and Bach and Haydn; see Strobel, ‘Igor Strawinsky’, in Im Zenit der Moderne, III.299. Somewhat ironically, despite his characteristic disparagement of Romanticism and its legacy, Strobel’s positioning is nearer to the idealism of Heiß than the dialectic of Adorno and Leibowitz: ‘Solche Humanität manifestiert sich nicht in psychologischen Erregungs- oder Depressionszuständen, sondern in der kühlen Luft des absolut Geistigen’ (ibid).
Webern, Milhaud, and Poulenc. Indeed, the central opposition Saguer employs to illustrate the irreconcilable aesthetic tendencies in contemporary music is between the Romantic mysticism of Messiaen and the clear-headed idealism of Leibowitz: ‘For Messiaen [music] is a ‘theological rainbow’ and for Leibowitz [it is] the objectification of ideal forms.’

Regardless, this presentation of Boulez as a (mostly) loyal disciple of Messiaen is in essence the emplotment adopted by subsequent Boulez scholarship with the implicit project of smoothing over these three analytical and historical discrepancies into the same unified discourse of New Music. A relatively early example of Anglophone high modernist genealogy comes from Gerald Bennett, who analyses Boulez’s earliest works (1942–1945) as case studies in the influence of Messiaen, who ‘succeeded in awakening and channelling Boulez’s extraordinary gifts in a decisive way.’ Indeed, according to Bennett, Messiaen is essentially the sole precedent for these compositions, an inspiration only ‘superseded’ in autumn 1945 when Boulez encountered Webern. Here once again Leibowitz appears as an unhappy mediator (‘a former pupil of Schoenberg’s and at the time a not-very-well-known composer and conductor’) with a single purpose: ‘it was through Leibowitz that [Boulez] became acquainted with Anton Webern; and, next to Messiaen, it was Webern who was to exercise the deepest influence on the young composer.’ As told by Bennett, Boulez’s formative journey from Messiaen to Webern concludes with the synthesis of the Second Piano Sonata, in which ‘Boulez found a sort of balance between the techniques of ordering the pitch-structure of the music to which Webern had inspired him on the one hand, and the consistent rhythmic structuring of music for which Messiaen had been the model on the other.’ In Bennett’s emplotment, the ultimate goal of Boulez’s polemics has been achieved: access to Webern as progenitor without recourse to the practice of Leibowitz and the dodecaphonists.
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64 ‘Sodann kommt die Reihe an die Werke gigantischer Ausmaße (Wagner, Bruckner, Mahler, und noch heutzutage Messiaen), die zu einem bestimmten Zeitpunkt von ihrem genauen Gegenteil abgelöst warden (Webern, Milhaud, Poulenc).’ Louis Saguer, ‘Die Krise im gegenwärtigen Musikschaffen’, in Im Zenit der Moderne, III.315–316. Saguer’s aesthetic trajectories are drawn rather confusingly – he later groups Messiaen together with Debussy, Ravel, Franz Schreker, and Jolivet on the basis of a shared tendency for unconventional chord construction; the three names of ‘our contemporary avant-garde’ he provides are Sorabji, Wyschnegradsky, and Boulez – but are nevertheless broadly representative of the taxonomical categories developed by music critics during this time.

65 ‘Für Messiaen ist sie ein »theologischer Regenbogen« und für Leibowitz die Objektivierung von ideellen Formen’ (ibid, 321).


67 Ibid, 53.

68 Ibid, 77.
Such a neat dialectic, familiar from Leibowitz and Adorno’s understanding of New Music, would be complicated by subsequent scholarship. Peter O’Hagan’s analysis of the First Sonata is similarly at pains to demonstrate Boulez’s aesthetic turn – although here, drawing from the work of Susanne Gärtner, the turn is not from Messiaen to Webern but from Leibowitz to Messiaen – to the extent that the chapter devoted to this piece is significantly framed on the premise of discovering what exactly Leibowitz would have disapproved of when Boulez presented the work to him. However, O’Hagan’s sharp analytical eye and meticulous sketch studies quickly problematize this premise. While the musical surface ‘hints at’ Bartók and Honegger, O’Hagan’s analysis demonstrates that the structural organisation of the piece is thoroughly in keeping with Leibowitzian practice; indeed, the ‘series of interlocking transpositions’ which generate the pitch material of the work are directly analogous to those used by Leibowitz in his Chamber Symphony. O’Hagan’s attempt to discern how the First Sonata was systematically opposed to Leibowitz’s practice is inconclusive, and he concludes by suggesting that the subsequent revisions Boulez made for publication, transforming the score into ‘essentially a study in two-part counterpoint’, were precisely those that Leibowitz might have suggested in the first place.

If the rooted commonalities between the practice and aesthetic understanding of Leibowitz, Boulez, and twelve-tone composers of the post-war landscape more broadly point towards a re-evaluation of Boulez’s position in textbook accounts as an iconoclastic and epochal figure (a positioning most often handily accomplished through a brief reference to ‘Schoenberg est mort’), it must be emphasized that this continuity is neither comprehensive nor inevitable. Rather, it demonstrates the particular network which shaped Boulez’s emergent musical practice, a network which gained increasing support and recognition in musical journals, international festivals, academic conferences, and other media during the post-war years not
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71 Ibid, 52–55. This precompositional strategy is thoroughly unpacked in Kovács, 82–165.
72 ‘[…] it is rather ironic that in removing the thematic elements prior to the works publication, Boulez was tacitly acknowledging what is likely to have been a principal reservation on Leibowitz’s part – unity of style’ (O’Hagan, 67).
73 Taruskin again provides the most committed example of this emplotment, calling the tract ‘the ultimate statement of the Stunde Null position’; however, he oddly neglects to give any clue of its actual contents, mentioning only in passing its supposed ‘frantically coercive and intolerant rhetoric’ (Taruskin, 18–19). For a more nuanced and less comically inept iteration of the same story, see also Burkholder, Grout, and Palisca, A History of Western Music, 917–919.
least through the tireless and impassioned advocacy of its actors. The risk, then, is that the fine contingency of Boulez’s network supplants rather than challenges a homogenising historical metanarrative of the European post-war musical avant-garde. Despite her re-evaluation of the technical foundations of Boulez’s practice in particular, Kovács suggests that Boulez’s generation ‘all worked, so to speak, towards a singular project, the new creation of an authentic contemporary language’. Here, the Darmstadt generation are all on the same team and, as such, the discovery of an aesthetic and methodological continuity between Boulez and Leibowitz simply recruits more figures to the team, working towards the same ‘singular project’, the ‘musical structuralism’ of Kovács’ title. Similarly, Kapp proposes ‘a mood of fundamental change, tabula rasa, zero hour, demand[ing] a clean break generally’, which led to musicians of the younger generation ‘attempt[ing] to create a whole new order of the musical scene.’ Kapp’s subsequent denunciation of ‘mathematical and pseudo-mathematical notions [...] instead of true expertise’ is familiar but confusing, considering that his own study has meticulously described the confluence of Leibowitz’s and Boulez’s understanding of music, a confluence that Kapp ultimately dismisses as little more than a missed opportunity: ‘The irritating thing was that there were still areas of agreement.’ However, Kapp’s sympathy for Leibowitz ultimately exceeds his apparent Adornian-Leibowitzian understanding of historical necessity. In his conclusion, he asks a ‘captious and pressing question: would, in other circumstances, a more thorough and promising line of development have been possible from Leibowitz’s position?’ Admittedly, within Kapp’s

74 ‘[...] sie alle arbeiten ja gewissermaßen an einem gemeinsamen Projekt, der Neuschöpfung einer authentischen zeitgenössischen Sprache.’ Kovács, 71. Kovács does characterise this as a ‘soziales Faktum’ (and thus not necessarily an immanent quality of the music itself), and, taken in the broadest sense, this observation could be applied to almost any ‘group’ of Western art music composers from Ars Antiqua onwards. This is exactly what is at issue, however: the ideological foundation of such a seemingly obvious historical statement already determines how the music in question is understood (in this case, familiar and historically logical).

75 Kapp, 13.

76 Ibid, 14.

77 Ibid, 15. Kapp’s article is very direct about its Leibowitz advocacy, which, to be sure, was in short supply in the late 1980s. However, this does lead him to the rather bizarre conclusion that the Darmstadt generation of serialists were, not least in their evident ambivalence to Leibowitz’s practice, simply ‘Stravinsky’s followers’ (see ibid, 15–16).

78 While he argues that ‘[h]istorical necessity, which Stockhausen or Nono invoke for direct descent, is inspired by the desire to legitimate, rather than rooted fact’, Kapp’s reasoning here does not critique historical necessity as a concept but how it sees it deployed by the Darmstadt composers. His implication is rather that the Darmstadt School’s insecurely self-justified practice was charlatanry that supplanted truly historically grounded musical development, such as that undertaken by Leibowitz (see Kapp, 13). Indeed, in his labelling the Darmstadt composers as ‘Stravinsky’s followers’ (especially the negative value judgment therein), Kapp neatly reproduces the central dialectic of Adorno’s Philosophy of New Music.

79 Ibid, 15.
argument, this question is posed rhetorically: the answer is yes, and the artistic failure of the Darmstadt generation is linked to their supposed rejection of historical necessity. Yet Kapp’s insistence that ‘Leibowitz could intervene’ in this newer New Music discourse, his proposal of ‘the discussion that never was’, suggests both the limits of the post-war European avant-garde’s conceptualisation and the potential for alternatives: a sort of ‘serialism otherwise’.

Boulez’s contention with Leibowitz – like Kapp’s with that of the Darmstadt composers – was never a matter of the historicist discourse deployed to legitimate musical practice but the figures which populated it. Crucially, Boulez consistently argues that dodecaphonic ‘academism’ was not a fulfilment but a betrayal of precisely the historical necessity that Leibowitz and Adorno had claimed for the practice. Against the metastasized aberration of the dodecaphonic school, Boulez depicts his own practice as the realisation of a music that authentically addresses the needs of its epoch. In 1951, Boulez’s argument would have been problematic on two counts. First, as indicated above, it is far from clear what exactly, if anything, Boulez was doing compositionally that was a radical departure from Leibowitz’s practice, or, for that matter, those of the dread ‘dodecaphonists’ more broadly. Second, if Boulez’s practice was the product of an ineluctable historical process, why was he the only composer to have recognized such a necessity? It certainly would not have been lost on Boulez that, by publicly allying himself with Messiaen, he had invited critics like Marie to identify him with Jeune France, broadly considered to be a conservative and outmoded movement within the institutional hubs of New Music that had emerged after the war.

Boulez’s realignment, then, was one simultaneously of reversal and continuity – the continuity of the Leibowitzian-Adornian discourse of New Music with a reversal of the figures contained. The figure of Webern here is the fulcrum of Boulez’s model: precisely because Boulez is saying nothing new about Webern – certainly nothing that couldn’t be found extensively in Leibowitz’s and (less extensively) in Adorno’s writings during this period – he is able to maintain his connection with international New Music. It must be remembered that Boulez’s position in even his most searing polemics is that the ‘dodecaphonists’ were correct in all but their compositions. Schoenberg is taken to task not because he was wrong but because he failed to realize just how right he was and pursue his methods further. Indeed, after accusing
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80 For example: ‘Throughout all its transformations and derivations, the school of Schoenberg always regarded polyphony as composition with tones – by no means a closed perspective – while the serialists of Stravinsky’s party were willing to sacrifice the tone as a guarantee of continuity and as the material of music in favour of more general conceptions’ (ibid).
dodecaphonists, among many other things, of ‘frenetic arithmetic masturbation’, Boulez goes on to issue perhaps his most explicitly Leibowitzian proclamation, the notorious assertion that there is either authentic experience of dodecaphony or abject uselessness. Within this reversal, Webern is the avatar of the work still to be done, an avatar familiar from Leibowitz and Adorno’s discourse. Through the continuity of Webern, Messiaen’s practice is no longer reactionary, Romantic, mystic, and above all eccentric (and ex-centric), but within the direct lineage of historical necessity. Boulez thus diverted this lineage from Leibowitz and the dodecaphonists, but, in 1951, it was unclear where exactly a historically legitimate, authentic New Music practice could be found, aside from Boulez himself. For Boulez’s rerouting of the Leibowitzian-Adornian discourse to be plausible, a new international standard of composition must emerge which aligned with this new teleology; he needed to find a new technique. Such a technique was not to be found in Boulez’s own practice, but in that of Karel Goeyvaerts and Karlheinz Stockhausen.
Chapter 3: From Machaut to Webern

In 1951, Boulez’s Webernian pivot did little more than muddy the discursive waters. It was unclear what, exactly, this practice was doing and where (more precisely: who) it came from. More importantly, it was unclear how a Webernian succession would look any different from international dodecaphony as it already existed in 1951. If Boulez had been more or less frantically and Oedipally attempting to position himself outside of the Leibowitzian sphere of influence, his attempts were unable to provide a discursive reference point for a practice that was not, on its own terms, either dodecaphonic or reactionary. But Boulez’s historical emplotment is neither that of a devoutly dodecaphonic Leibowitz pupil nor a late-blooming Jeune France acolyte. Instead, he is a core member of the Darmstadt School. In the intervening time, a new practice, one that could claim the mantle of historical-material legitimacy without recourse to Leibowitz or Adorno, provided a conceptual means of explicating exactly what these composers were doing that was different – and newer – than what had come before. The following chapter describes that practice, its development through Karel Goeyvaerts and Karlheinz Stockhausen, and how it was leveraged to create the discursive formation of the Darmstadt School.

In essence, then, this chapter is more or less a fine-grained version of the one immediately preceding: it juxtaposes the technical nuts and bolts of a musical practice with how this practice was presented by both those who practiced it and those who became its institutional advocates. The historical argument here is not so fine-grained as to be properly Latourian, although its ambitions are certainly in a similar direction. It traces the personal, professional, and artistic contingencies of a small group of musicians through a close focus on their writings and surroundings. Unlike Boulez and most other young composers in Europe, these musicians developed a systematic reading of Webern's music which was minimally mediated by the discourse developed by Adorno and Leibowitz. The consequences of this reading are examined through a technical analysis of several scores produced by these composers from 1949 until 1952 along with detailed examinations of how this network functioned and disseminated its ideas. Such microhistory (for lack of a better word) is again augmented with discourse analysis. On the one hand, there are the retrospective historical accounts from specialised scholars, which emphasise technical features of these compositions which supposedly demonstrate the influence of Webern. These accounts are taken to task not
because they are at pains to demonstrate such influence, but because they have assimilated the Webern of these composers with that of Adorno, Leibowitz, and Boulez.

This confusion – the question of who is buried in Webern’s tomb – is precisely what is at stake in the major event of this study, the confrontation between two of these practitioners and a representative of institutional New Music at the 1951 Darmstadt courses. This event is very neatly an inverse of the one described in the previous chapter: it is not a student rejecting the language of his teacher, but a teacher rejecting the language of his students. But it is also more than this. Adorno does not simply reject the music of Goeyvaerts and Stockhausen, but is bewildered by it. He cannot assimilate it into any coherent discourse of New Music. The best he can do is relegate it to the ex-centric subject position of Hauer as a practice that is fundamentally outside of historical development. If, in the case of Boulez, the discourse of New Music struggled to coherently explicate and contextualise a subject position and attendant practice that publicly rejected Adorno and Leibowitz, in the case of Goeyvaerts and Stockhausen in 1951 it collapsed completely.

While press reports from the 1951 courses use metaphysically cataclysmic language to describe this practice, by the performance of Stockhausen’s Kreuzspiel at the 1952 courses, the response was far more self-assured. What happened in the intervening year was a remarkable initiative undertaken by Herbert Eimert, with institutional assistance from Wolfgang Steinecke, to take this practice and centre it as representative of the whole of the young avant-garde. This stabilisation is what has prepared the ground for the subsequent analytical readings of this practice, analytical readings which smoothly assimilate its technical procedures into the familiar textbook narrative of New Music, whereby Schoenberg begets Webern who begets Stockhausen. More pointedly, the Second Viennese School begets the Darmstadt School. The cataclysm is elided into a smooth, stable continuity.

There is one further, more oblique juxtaposition, between these negotiations and the programming of Darmstadt as it actually happened, which, in this case, is a repeated emphasis on the sheer bulk of performances devoted to figures which have been almost entirely overlooked within narrative of New Music, especially those fêted by the Third Reich. While it is outside the scope of the present study to investigate more closely why and how this music was repeatedly foregrounded in a programmatic capacity but repeatedly absent in a discursive capacity, it is within its scope to point out that, even when it had been generalised by Eimert, what is at issue for this discourse remained an infinitesimally small portion of the music on
offer at Darmstadt. If the frame is expanded beyond Darmstadt to include musical premieres in the whole of West Germany, any recognisable form of New Music is almost entirely absent. To take a brief representative example: *Melos*, which printed a short article by Stockhausen analysing the first movement of Webern’s op. 24 in its December 1953 issue,¹ also ran in the same issue a profile devoted to Werner Egk, who was head of the composers’ section of the *Reichsmusikkammer* from 1941 until 1945.² In addition, four separate performances of Egk’s works were reviewed in *Melos* during its 1953 run.³ Indeed, three of these performances are of large-scale stage works that were hugely successful under the Nazi regime: *Peer Gynt* (1938), *Columbus* (1933/1942), and *Joan von Zarissa* (1940). Four separate performances of Egk were also reviewed in *Melos*’s 1954 run, alongside even less ambiguously NSDAP fare, such as a symphonic premiere by Max Trapp, who had joined the party in 1932.⁴ If the historical narrative of European musical life insists on an arid landscape dominated by totalitarian serialists, a glance over any chronicle reveals it was rather more dominated by confirmed National Socialists. All of this to say that the fine-grained history and discourse analysis of this chapter should be seen within bigger picture: in real terms, these subjects represent an infinitesimally small subculture of New Music in West Germany during the 1950s. It is one of the most urgent objectives of this study to explain how they have come to represent almost the entirety of musical production of their time.

**Goeyvaerts and Barraqué at the Paris Conservatoire, 1948–1951**

Karel Goeyvaerts moved to Paris from Antwerp in October 1947, lodging at the Belgian colony at the Cité-Universitaire.⁵ In early January 1948, he had his examination for Messiaen’s newly created ‘Cours d’esthétique’ at the Conservatoire National Supérieur de Musique, playing his Prelude and Fugue for piano himself.⁶ Despite his self-proclaimed shortcomings as a performer, Goeyvaerts was accepted as a pupil. This was, as Goeyvaerts puts it, ‘quite

---

⁴ Ibid, 125–126.
⁶ Ibid. According to Goeyvaerts, Yvonne Loriod had previously refused to perform it because she could not memorize it in time.
something’ since each class at the Conservatoire National is limited to twelve: ten French nationals and two international students. While not himself a student at the Conservatoire, Jean Barraqué enrolled as an auditeur in Messiaen’s Cours d’esthétique in the autumn of 1948, which is most likely where he met Goeyvaerts, who was four years his senior. By the summer of 1950, they had established a romantic relationship. Neither Barraqué nor Goeyvaerts ever studied, or attempted to study, with Leibowitz, although both were familiar at least in passing with his publications. Conversely, both shared their teacher’s devout Catholicism and interest in medieval formal procedures; many of their earliest compositions set sacred texts.

During the period of his study at the Conservatoire, Goeyvaerts quickly ensconced himself within Parisian musical life. According to his recollection, he ‘spent two half-days a week in the Conservatoire attending Messiaen’s class, two half-days with Milhaud at his home and one evening at Maurice Martenot’s house.’ This routine gave him opportunities for performances and critical exposure which would have been impossible in Antwerp. Writing to his friend Karel Druwé in Antwerp, he describes Milhaud’s apartment as ‘a true center of artistic life’ where he had the opportunity to meet Honegger, Georges Auric, and Poulenc. The earliest concrete result of this new environment was the First Violin Concerto, written for the violinist Marcel Debot whom Goeyvaerts had befriended at the Cité-Universitaire.

Through Milhaud, Goeyvaerts was also introduced to the prominent critic and musicologist Paul Collaer, who was so enthusiastic about Goeyvaerts’s Violin Concerto that he ‘immediately offered to organize a radio broadcast’. This programme, conducted by Daniel Sternefeld and broadcast internationally, would prove to be the first major success of
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7 Ibid, 36.
9 The surviving evidence of Goeyvaerts and Barraqué’s relationship are contained in the letters sent by Goeyvaerts to Barraqué which are held by the Association Jean Barraqué. Since both men remained in Paris during their early relationship, the first letters already suggest a substantial romantic attachment. Portions of this correspondence have been published in Selbstlöse Musik: Texte • Briefe • Gespräche, ed. Mark Delaere (Cologne: MusikTexte, 2010), 274–293.
10 According to Laurent Feneyrou, Barraqué most likely read Schoenberg et son école in 1949; a newspaper advertisement for the book from this date exists within Barraqué’s papers (conversation with the author, 18.01.2018). There are no Leibowitz writings contained within Goeyvaerts’s estate (The Artistic Legacy of Karel Goeyvaerts, KU Leuven; henceforth ALKG).
11 See the catalogue of Barraqué’s ‘juvenilia’ in Griffiths, Barraqué, 209–210.
12 Ibid.
13 Goeyvaerts to Karel Druwé, 28 January 1948. Goeyvaerts also notes that Messiaen’s class is ‘no less interesting’ than his encounters in Parisian society (‘Niet minder interessant zijn de cursussen van Messiaen in het Conservatorium.’) See Selbstlose Musik, 272–273.
Goeyvaerts’s career, securing his reputation in Belgium – Lodewijk De Vocht, Goeyvaerts’s former teacher, interrupted a meeting to listen to the broadcast, rapturously commenting ‘It sounds like nothing on earth’ – and establishing him as a name to watch in Paris.15

Immediately following the composition of the first Violin Concerto, Goeyvaerts “moved on to develop a rather loose polyphonic style, in which every voice was equally important.”16 His first piece to demonstrate this development, written again for Marcel Debot, was *Music for violin, contralto and piano* (manuscript dated August–October 1948).17 During the January exam session of 1949, the piece was awarded the Lily Boulanger Prize, which earned Goeyvaerts an invitation to Nadia Boulanger’s ‘famous Wednesday afternoons’, further establishing him in the world of Parisian music (despite Goeyvaerts’s reservations that his music ‘went against all her ideas of sobriety’).18 The piece, as Goeyvaerts succinctly puts it, did ‘not require the hard sell’, and was broadcast soon after on both French and Belgian radio, with Paul Collaer himself performing the piano part.19

Goeyvaerts’s next significant composition was *La Flûte de jade*, a song cycle for soprano and piano based on French translations of Chinese texts finished on 25 November 1949. Again, the piece ‘enjoyed a certain success’: it was performed during the first concert organized by UNESCO with Goeyvaerts himself playing piano.20 Subsequently, the piece was presented on a French Radio programme curated by mezzo-soprano Jane Bathori alongside a piece by Poulenc.21 From a technical standpoint, *La Flûte de jade* is notable for being Goeyvaerts’s sole experiment with dodecaphony. The word ‘experiment’ is crucial: only one section uses the method, and both the construction and deployment of the row involved are hardly recognizable as strict dodecaphony – the intervals are largely triadic, phrases are repeated multiple times, and the chromatic total is occasionally absent – and largely in line with Goeyvaerts’s ‘loose polyphonic style’ of the time. Goeyvaerts himself draws emphasis to this fact, describing the ‘fragment’ of the piece he showed to his teacher Milhaud as ‘virtually the only dodecaphonic
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15 Ibid.
16 Ibid, 37.
17 ALKG, 32b.
19 Ibid.
20 Ibid, 42.
21 Ibid.
piece I had ever composed." Indeed, the use of twelve-tone writing in the piece was so thoroughly disguised that even the conservative Milhaud found it pleasant.\(^{22}\)

The summation of Goeyvaerts’s ‘loose polyphonic style’, in both a technical and career-oriented sense, were the *Tre Lieder per sonare a venti-sei*, first presented in July 1949 at Goeyvaerts’s composition exam, with Roger Desormière conducting the Conservatoire orchestra (Les Cadets du Conservatoire).\(^{23}\) Pierre Henry played percussion.\(^{24}\) On the recommendation of Maurice Martenot, Goeyvaerts recruited Pierre Boulez to play the Ondes Martenot part. Goeyvaerts’s impression that Boulez acquiesced ‘partly because his friend Desormière would be conducting and partly, I suspect, to get me off his back,’ at first seems to be consistent with popular accounts of Boulez’s personality.\(^{25}\) However, bearing in mind that Boulez was, in 1949, extremely private (Goeyvaerts himself says Boulez ‘lived like a hermit’ with only a ‘small circle’ of friends, including a cousin who ‘lived in the same building and provided him with food’), and equally selective of the public performances he did make, his assent to perform in Goeyvaerts’s piece may be read as a significantly greater endorsement than Goeyvaerts might retrospectively have thought. It is more likely, then, that Goeyvaerts is here thinking of Boulez’s later categorical dismissal of him rather than Boulez’s attitude towards him and his music in 1949. Goeyvaerts’s chronology furthermore captures the reclusive composer’s volatility: ‘Boulez had cut off his ties with Messiaen, ran after Leibowitz for a while but severed contact with him too.’\(^{26}\) This framing is largely backed up by the historical record, and is certainly far more accurate than many of Boulez’s own recollections of his student years.\(^{27}\)

With a certain wry hindsight, Goeyvaerts points out that, ‘in terms of sound’, this piece is ‘very like certain post-serial works’ in its complex and even flamboyant instrumentation, with potential parallels to gamelan music: ‘extensive percussion (one player) with vibraphone and a

\(^{22}\) Ibid.
\(^{23}\) Ibid. The exact response Goeyvaerts attributes to him is ‘You see, the system used doesn’t matter much. One can make music even employing dodecaphony.’ (‘Vous voyez, que le système employé n’a rien à voir. On peut faire de la musique même en faisant appel à la dodécaphonie.’)
\(^{24}\) Ibid, 38.
\(^{25}\) Ibid, 40.
\(^{26}\) Ibid.
\(^{27}\) Ibid.
\(^{28}\) For a concise overview of ‘the historical record’, see Dominique Jameux, *Pierre Boulez*, trans. Susan Bradshaw (London: Faber & Faber, 1991), 10–16. Jameaux’s emphasis on the ideological differences between Boulez and Messiaen, especially her contention that ‘Boulez does not and never will subscribe to the idea of using imports from the Far East in Western music’ (ibid, 12), seem to be a bit overstated, as the following paragraph will demonstrate.
whole range of metal and wooden instruments’. Goeyvaerts’s mention of ‘certain post-serial works’ no doubt refers in particular to Boulez’s Le Marteau sans maître (1954), or perhaps the later Pli selon pli (1957–1960, rev. 1962/1990), but it is worth mentioning that, at least ‘in terms of sound’, the Tre Lieder also have much in common with many pieces of pre-serial music, most notably Boulez’s own Le Visage nuptial (1946–1947, rev. 1951–1952/1989) and the contemporaneous Le Soleil des eaux (1947–1950, rev. 1958/1965). While Boulez’s harmonic language is certainly more astringent than Goeyvaerts’s was in 1949, the complex instrumental textures (favouring pitched percussion and ‘gamelan’ sounds) and cellular rhythmic construction (Messiaen’s ‘monnayage’) are immediately obvious shared features between the composers, and are furthermore directly traceable to the teaching of Messiaen. While Goeyvaerts’s comment seems to position him as somehow “ahead” of the trajectory of twentieth-century music, the reality is that, in 1949 at least, he was in very good stylistic company.

The career momentum Goeyvaerts experienced through his previous efforts exponentially increased with the first performance of Tre Lieder. After the first performance, Collaer presented it on the radio, conducting the piece himself. Soon after, the jury of the International Society for Contemporary Music (ISCM) selected the work for performance at the ISCM World Music Days of 1950 taking place in Brussels. As it so happened, this festival also was the site of the world premiere of Webern’s Second Cantata (1941–43). Goeyvaerts was at this performance, and his retroactive evaluation of it contains none of the revolutionary or epoch-transformative claims one might expect from a composer soon to be considered a founding member of the Darmstadt School: ‘The impression it made on me was the same as I was to experience a few years later when, in the company of Karlheinz Stockhausen, I first laid eyes on a Mondriaan [sic] canvas in the Kröller-Müller Museum: those things, of which I had acquired an extremely intimate knowledge, came across as crude and unfinished when seen in reality.’ Oddly, a letter written to Barraqué after the festival implies an exactly inverse reaction, that Goeyvaerts had little experience of Webern yet was deeply moved by the performance: ‘a
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30 Goeyvaerts, ‘Paris – Darmstadt’, 39. A significant portion of the second chapter of this study is devoted to the musical-taxonomic argument that the differences in the harmonic language of Goeyvaerts and Boulez can in large part be traced to the latter’s familiarity with and adherence to the work of Leibowitz, especially his historical arguments for aesthetic legitimization.

music of crystal purity which makes all human sentiments and emotions appear ridiculous; hieratic calm that allows the conception, perfectly balanced, of a new, higher sensibility... But all of this is just words.32 This sounds rather more to the tune of what one might expect of a (future) Darmstadt composer, and indeed, ‘crystal purity’ became precisely synonymous with the Webern brand – Stravinsky’s oft-quoted opening epigram, dated June 1955, for the Webern issue of die Reihe pays homage to a composer who ‘inexorably kept on cutting out his diamonds, his dazzling diamonds, the mines of which he had such a perfect knowledge.’33 Indeed, such a mineralogical interpretation of Webern remains almost exclusively dominant in musical culture: a notice of an upcoming performance of Webern’s complete works in the 11 September 2017 issue of The New Yorker advertises ‘The Gemlike Music of Webern: The complete crystalline works of the Austrian composer, at Trinity Church Wall Street.’34 Yet it is important to note that, in 1950, Goeyvaerts would have been one of the first to find such a ‘crystal purity’ in Webern’s music. Certainly no such ascetic calm or purity are present in Webern’s own writing and lectures, stressing above all the dynamism present both in the unity of his musical conception and the aesthetic trajectory which it resulted from; he describes moving beyond tonality as ‘a fierce struggle; inhibitions of the must frightful kind had to be overcome, the panic fear, “Is that possible, then?”’35 Indeed, he even draws parallels between the ‘cancrizans’ of his Symphony, op. 21 – often depicted as the high point of Webern’s compositional austerity in textbook accounts –36 and the ‘alliteration and assonance’ of Shakespeare and Karl Kraus.37 Furthermore, the pre-Darmstadt dissemination of Webern, small as it may have been, wholeheartedly adopted Webern’s discourse of dynamism. In Schoenberg et son école, which after its publication in 1947 became instrumental in disseminating knowledge of the Second Viennese School, René Leibowitz asserts that ‘[t]he work of Webern, from its very beginnings, is directed towards the conquest of a language dominated by the idea of perpetual variation.’38

Pianist Peter Stadlen’s annotations to Webern’s Piano Variations, op. 27, which were made

32 ‘[…] une musique pure comme le cristal qui fait paraître ridicules tous les sentiments et émotions humaines; calme hiératique qui permet de monter, parfaitement équilibré, à un niveau supérieur de sensibilité… Mais tout cela ne sont que des mots.’ Goeyvaerts to Barraqué, 25 June 1950. See Selbstlöse Musik, 274–277.
33 See die Reihe, II, vii.
35 Anton Webern, The Path to the New Music, trans. Leo Black (Bryn Mawr, PA: Theodore Presser, 1963), 44.
36 See David Ewen’s interpretation, describing ‘ideas reduced to fragments, ideas so pulverized they have become atoms.’ Modern Music: A History and Appreciation – from Wagner to the Avant-Garde (Philadelphia: Chilton, 1962), 277.
37 Ibid., 56.
38 Leibowitz, Schoenberg, 209.
under Webern’s directions for the premiere, stipulate that the piece should have a lilting, almost sensual character.\(^{39}\) To conclude: Goeyvaerts’s conception of Webernian crystal purity at this stage could not have come from – and in fact were inimical to – a previous knowledge of Webern’s music or ideas, but rather derived from a personal, idiosyncratic reading informed by theological and aesthetic considerations.

Goeyvaerts additionally gives a historically tantalising detail about the concert: ‘I had a score. I cannot recall who gave it to me, yet I do remember how happy Herbert Eimert was to follow it with me during the performance.’ Being in possession of a copy of a Webern score in 1950 was no small feat: in October of the same year, Edgar Varèse claimed that all scores of Webern were unobtainable throughout Germany.\(^{40}\) While it is unclear exactly how Goeyvaerts procured this score, there is really only one realistic possibility. It certainly could not have been a published score, since the Second Cantata was first published by Universal Edition in 1951.\(^{41}\) Goeyvaerts may have copied the score (as his aside about having an ‘extremely intimate knowledge’ seems to suggest), but transporting a handwritten orchestral score from Paris to Brussels would have most likely been unfeasible. In his autobiographical account, Goeyvaerts seems to imply that the score was given to him by one of the performers of the concert, since these were members of the BRT choir who ‘had been my colleagues five years before.’\(^{42}\) Conversely, in the letter to Barraqué, Goeyvaerts says that it was Belgian composer and conductor André Souris who gave him a handwritten copy of the score.\(^{43}\) This is very probable, since Souris was in fact a member of the ISCM festival jury.\(^{44}\) It therefore appears that Goeyvaerts did not need to put much effort into finding a reading copy of the score, and his possession of it was not the result of a Webern devotion (or indeed, even a Webern affinity) but a simple side-effect of reconnecting with old friends. All of this is to say that it was highly unusual that anyone would have a score of Webern’s Second Cantata to follow along with during the premiere and, especially to an interested German, such a position would appear to be very privileged indeed. Furthermore, it is very probable that Eimert would have interpreted

\(^{39}\) See facsimile edition, UE 16845.
\(^{40}\) Quoted in Iddon, *New Music at Darmstadt*, 40–41. Iddon points out Varèse’s hyperbole, but sustains his main contention.
\(^{41}\) UE 11885.
this as indicating a far livelier interest in Webern than Goeyvaerts actually possessed at the
time. Indeed, this initial encounter, combined with the successful performance of his *Tre Lieder*,
no doubt left a lasting positive impression on Eimert, whose relationship with Goeyvaerts
became closer and more complicated in the succeeding years.

The ISCM performance of the *Tre Lieder* proved to be Goeyvaerts’s greatest success to
date. Goeyvaerts gives a concise account of the reception: ‘The 1950 performance was a triumph.
Conrad Beck [Swiss composer, formerly of the École de Paris] wanted to have the piece
performed in Switzerland. Daniel Lesur came to tell me that my composition was the revelation
of the Festival.’ If the First Violin Concerto put Goeyvaerts’s name on the international map, *Tre Lieder*
cemented his reputation as one of the leading composers of the post-war generation.
Thus, by the beginning of 1951, Goeyvaerts arguably had the most prominent international
profile of any of the composers who were later grouped under the Darmstadt banner.

**Messiaen’s analysis seminar**

While the significance of Olivier Messiaen’s teaching at the Conservatoire National on the
development of twentieth-century music and aesthetics has been widely remarked upon even
in non-scholarly, general interest, and textbook sources, the content of his instruction has
attracted somewhat less notice. It was not until 1998 that Mark Delaere assembled a thorough
reconstruction and examination of Messiaen’s syllabi from the years in which Goeyvaerts
would have attended his classes. From this research, Delaere draws the conclusion that much
of Messiaen’s curriculum was remarkably constant over his teaching career, with Messiaen
even repeating certain analyses ‘unaltered over a period of half a century.’ This means that
what Goeyvaerts heard in 1949 was also, by and large, what was heard by students attending
Messiaen’s classes throughout the post-war years. A brief list of such students reveals just how
wide a reach Messiaen’s teaching had during this period: Boulez, Stockhausen, Michel Fano,
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45 To these accolades Goeyvaerts pregnantly adds, ‘Yet inside me there was something fermenting.’ (Goeyvaerts, ‘Paris – Darmstadt’, 39).
Pierre Henry, Yvette Grimaud, Maurice Le Roux, Serge Nigg, Yvonne Loriod, with intermittent visits from Luigi Nono and Bruno Maderna.\footnote{In particular, Nono’s visits to Messiaen’s classes seem to be a primary source of his information on the avant-garde. Writing to Darmstadt organizer Wolfgang Steinecke in 1954, he strongly recommends Michel Fano (who had never been performed outside Paris): ‘Michel Fano (24 years old) very good: one just needs to make a choice of which one of his pieces for Kranichstein;\ldots\ldots\ldots\ldots;\text{[sic]}’ (quoted and translated in Iddon, 107). Fano has noted that he became acquainted with Nono at Messiaen’s class, and that this acquaintance was certainly the basis of Nono’s recommendation (conversation with the author, 24 May 2016). Conversely, in the same letter Nono makes only cursory and typographically ambivalent mention of Henri Pousseur as ‘Poissier (something like that),’ telling Steinecke to ‘ask Boulez or Fano for more information.’ From this it may be concluded that in addition to its pedagogic function, Messiaen’s class served as a crucial nexus of performance and dissemination – perhaps it could even be anachronistically dubbed a ‘networking hub’ – for young composers of the avant-garde.}

Messiaen operated largely peripherally, if not independently, of the Conservatoire National. The Cours d’esthétique in which Goeyvaerts was enrolled was only conceived of in October 1947, which means Messiaen invited Goeyvaerts to its inaugural session at the start of 1948; prior to its creation, Messiaen’s official capacity at the Conservatoire was merely that of a lecturer in harmony.\footnote{Delaere, ‘Messiaen’s Analysis Seminar’, 35–36.} There is furthermore a considerable ambiguity about what Messiaen taught where: as Dominique Jameaux points out, Messiaen’s harmony classes were, starting in 1943, supplemented by informal analysis courses at the apartment of Egyptologist Guy-Bernard Delapierre.\footnote{Jameaux, 11.} It is difficult, then, to delineate what Messiaen taught as the ‘official’ Conservatoire curriculum and what he reserved for these informal lessons. Composition lessons were even further removed from Messiaen’s official duties: he was only awarded a professorship in composition at the Conservatoire in 1966.\footnote{Delaere, ‘Messiaen’s Analysis Seminar’, 36.}

The ‘official’ position notwithstanding, the bulk of Messiaen’s teaching, both formal and informal, was centred on analysis, and a more or less complete list of the repertoire which was under discussion has been assembled by Delaere, primarily through Goeyvaerts’s annotations on scores.\footnote{Ibid, 37.} In addition to already relatively canonic works (Mozart’s late symphonies, Beethoven’s sonatas, and Bach’s B minor Mass (1749) and St Matthew Passion (1727), among others), Messiaen gave analyses of many of his own pieces, Debussy’s La Mer (1903–1905) and Pelléas et Mélisande (1893–1902), Ravel’s Gaspard de la nuit (1908), Machaut’s Messe de Notre-Dame (ca. 1360), and, most notably, Stravinsky’s Le Sacre du printemps (1911–1913).\footnote{Ibid, 37–38.}

For Messiaen, Le Sacre was an opportunity to showcase many of his own compositional preoccupations. Delaere singles out in particular his description of (i) the influence of rhythm
on subjective time-perception, especially in the form of Messiaen’s ‘law of attack-duration relations’ (loi des rapports attaque-durée), (2) ‘rhythmic characters (personnages rythmiques), and (3) non-retrogradable rhythms and modes of limited transposition (rhythmes non rétrogradables and modes à transpositions limitées, respectively). All of these facets are described in detail in Messiaen’s Technique de mon langage musical, published in 1944. Deleare points out that these specific technical concepts were crucial to younger composers’ understanding of a new musical syntax. Crucial for the case of Goeyvaerts and Stockhausen was Messiaen’s foregrounding of musical syntax as a medium for conveying a ‘charm of impossibilities’, most significantly through ‘the theology and the truths of our Catholic faith’. Therefore, it would be helpful to give a brief summation of these before investigating their deployment in the works of Messiaen’s students, examined later in this chapter.

The loi des rapports attaque-durée states: ‘A short sound followed by a silence is longer for our sense of interior time – given equality of clock time – than a sustained sound held for a duration equal to that of the preceding sound and silence.’ This is roughly analogous to Messiaen’s description of ‘monnayage’, wherein a ‘large bill’ (that is, a long rhythmic duration) is cashed in for ‘small change’ (meaning multiple smaller rhythmic values adding up to the same duration). Such a conception of rhythmic divisibility is directly related to prolation in medieval notation, but, as Delaere observes, Messiaen additionally positions rests as ‘negative value’ included in the measurement of a larger rhythmic unit, rather than simply a caesura. The most immediate compositional results of this hermeneutic paradigm shift can be found in Messiaen’s ‘Mode de valeurs et de intensités’ (1949) and, perhaps more extensively, in the middle movements of Goeyvaerts’s Sonata for two pianos.

Rhythmic characters (personnages rythmiques; ‘character’ here used in the concrete, literal sense) refer to rhythmic cells which develop over time, gradually being augmented or diminished. As such, Delaere explains, these rhythmic ‘characters’ behave like figures in a
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55 Ibid, 39.
57 Quoted in Delaere, ‘Messiaen’s Analysis Seminar’, 38; translation of Messiaen’s analysis of Le Sacre within Delaere by Philip Weller.
58 Ibid. See also Olivier Messiaen, Musique et couleur: nouveaux entreteins avec Claude Samuel (Paris: Belfond, 1986), 135–146.
60 Ibid.
theatre: one takes centre stage (being augmented) while another retreats (being diminished) while a third looks on (being repeated unchanged). This is the metaphorical framework that Messiaen uses to arrive at complex, interrelated rhythmic processes. However, he stipulates that such processes are only effective within a particular perceptive window, since ‘excessive augmentations or diminutions would have drawn us into some very long or very short values’ that are ‘hardly appreciable to hearing’.  

Non-retrogradable rhythms are, in their simplest form, rhythmic units which are palindromic. However, Messiaen expands this principle to include relationships between rhythmic units: ‘all rhythms divisible into two groups, one of which is the retrograde of the other, with a central common value, are non-retrogradable.’ Complementarily, modes of limited transposition refer to a series of seven modes devised by Messiaen which ‘realize in the vertical direction (transposition) what non-retrogradable rhythms realize in the horizontal direction (retrogradations).’ Paul Griffiths draws a connection between these and Messiaen’s ‘charm of impossibilities’, suggesting that such techniques ‘might appear as images of the reversibility of time.’ Precisely this conception of a non-teleological experience of time, one arrived at through static (or, more precisely, non-dynamic) forms, was central to the aesthetic thought of Goeyvaerts and Stockhausen after 1951. But the conclusion that Delaere draws, that Messiaen’s ‘compositional principle of symmetry produces a tautness which the young generation specifically associated with Webern’s use of twelve-note technique’, requires qualification, since such an interpretation of Webern was in fact contrary to the prevailing Adornian-Leibowitzian discourse in the early post-war years.

In comparison with Leibowitz and Adorno’s readings of the ‘Second Viennese School’, which emphasised structural qualities in their compositions which demonstrate a continuity with historical forms in Western art music, Messiaen’s relationship to twelve-note technique seems to be highly idiosyncratic, as indicated in his treatment of the Second Viennese School in his analysis seminar. The pieces analysed in Messiaen’s course were Berg’s Lyric Suite (1925–1926) Schoenberg’s Pierrot lunaire (1917) and Serenade (1921–1923), and Webern’s Drei Lieder op. 18 (1925). Of these, Goeyvaerts only mentions Messiaen’s analysis of the Lyric Suite in his

---

61 Ibid.
62 Messiaen, I,19.
63 Ibid, I,20 (emphasis Messiaen’s).
64 Ibid, I,21.
autobiography, deeming it ‘a superficial treatment’, and claiming that Messiaen ‘displayed a certain stand-offish opinion of Schoenberg, Berg and Webern.’ Delaere subjects this viewpoint to further scrutiny, extrapolating what specifically Messiaen’s analysis of the Lyric Suite might have entailed through Goeyvaerts’s annotations on his copy of the score. While Delaere notes there is ‘some superficiality’ in Messiaen’s analysis, such superficiality is confined to facets of the score which would be emphasized in a dodecaphonic (or, more precisely, thematic; more to the point: Leibowitzian) analysis, rather than a serial one. These include Messiaen’s neglect of row counting, row composition, usage of ‘canons and stretti’, and a ‘discussion of the thematic aspect and form’ which goes ‘hardly any further than Erwin Stein’s foreword to the score.’ Conversely, Delaere observes that Messiaen takes ‘great precision’ in his analyses of structural aspects largely neglected by the predominant dodecaphonic/thematic reading of the piece, most notably in his investigation of rhythmic forms and row rotation, as well as his identification of a crescendo de densités in the third movement. These structural aspects are, of course, remarkably similar to ones that Messiaen had been deploying in his compositions for decades. Messiaen’s analysis of Schoenberg’s Serenade, which Delaere similarly reconstructs from Goeyvaerts’s annotated score, further confirms this point. It would seem, then, that Messiaen’s treatment of the Second Viennese School was, in essence, largely identical to his treatment of Stravinsky’s Sacre – or, for that matter, his treatment of Mozart – in that it primarily (if not exclusively) drew attention to the structural aspects of the piece in question which had direct parallels with his own compositional practice.

Tellingly, Delaere also notes: ‘It is generally assumed that Messiaen’s students were only able to acquire a thorough knowledge of twelve-note technique outside the seminar, be it from René Leibowitz or through their own study.’ It is crucial, then, that Goeyvaerts never studied with Leibowitz, nor did he make any effort to do so (and such an effort, considering Goeyvaerts’s well-connected status in Parisian musical circles, could have easily been made if Goeyvaerts
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was so inclined). Delaere’s ‘general assumption’ then insists that he could only have acquired ‘thorough’ understanding of twelve-tone technique independently. To be sure, Goeyvaerts had recourse to many of his immediate peers who had studied with Leibowitz and who had utilised dodecaphonic-thematic procedures in their compositions, not least Boulez and Barraqué. But there is little evidence in the correspondence – and Goeyvaerts’s correspondence with Barraqué is extensive during this period – that Goeyvaerts had any interest in attaining a more ‘thorough’ understanding of any aspect of serial technique. It is therefore reasonable to conclude that whatever Goeyvaerts knew of the Second Viennese School – in particular Webern – must have derived from the confluence of Messiaen’s analyses and his own study.

Messiaen’s evident ambivalence towards the Second Viennese School – or, more precisely, the dodecaphonic/thematic/Leibowitzian reading of it – has been overlooked in historical research, which tends to assimilate Messiaen, like Leibowitz or Adorno, as a knowledgeable disciple of Webern. Yet such an explanation immediately risks self-contradiction when it asserts that Messiaen had ‘learned’ from Webern certain techniques that he was already using as early as 1932. This in turn leads to formulations like the one Paul Griffiths gives in explanation of the first movement of the Livre d’orgue (1951): ‘One of the most important lessons Messiaen had taken from serialism, especially from Webern’s serialism, was a cherishing of each note as a separate event: this was something he was already handing on to Boulez and Stockhausen, but neither of them wrote anything so rigorously “pointillist” as this movement.’ Rigour notwithstanding, it is crucial to note that the (potentially) ‘pointillist’ features Griffiths identifies in this piece could only derive from the musical surface, rather than any particular compositional process. The published score clearly identifies the compositional material as rythmes hindous – which are named and identified as they appear – combined with personnages rythmiques undergoing either augmentation or diminution. Of course, Hindu rhythms and personnages rythmiques had been central to Messiaen’s compositional technique since the early 1930s, at least a decade before he would have had any knowledge of ‘serialism’ – Webernian or otherwise. Precisely because Messiaen’s reception of Webern was so idiosyncratic, the ‘lessons’ he learned were, at the compositional level, merely a confirmation of musical techniques he had already been using for two decades. The remainder of Griffiths’s

71 Cf. the symmetrical, palindromic macrostructure of Apparition de l’église éternelle (1932).
72 Griffiths, 159.
74 Like many Anglophone commentators, Griffiths here seems to conflate ‘serialism’ and ‘dodecaphony’.
commentary is at best baseless and at worst wilfully obfuscatory, not least since Stockhausen would not arrive in Paris until 1952. The character of Messiaen sketched by Griffiths – at once an expert and an ingénue, a serialist and an expressionist, a vangaurdist and a moderate, far more radical and rigorous than his students yet far more open and heterodox – is of necessity a somewhat chimerical representation, since it has been crafted post hoc to adhere to a grand musicological narrative of the post-war avant-garde – the patrilineal descent of Webern – rather than the contingencies of Messiaen’s creative existence.

To get a better sense of these contingencies, and more specifically to determine what ‘lessons’ Messiaen may have taken from ‘Webern’s serialism’, it is instrumental to examine the composition by Messiaen put forward – often to the exclusion of all others – as a seminal influence on the younger generation of post-war composers: ‘Mode de valeurs et d’intensités’, the second of the Quatre études de rythme (1949–1950) for piano. Despite the esotericism frequently attributed the piece, Messiaen has been quite transparent about its creation: the published edition of the score is prefaced by a note by Messiaen systematically outlining his compositional process. The note identifies a series of twelve articulations, seven dynamic values, three sets of twelve durations (which, due to overlap between the sets, result in twenty-four unique durations), and three sets of twelve pitches. Subsequently Messiaen indicates how these are combined to form the ‘mode’, which comprises three divisions sounding simultaneously in the high, middle, and lower register of the keyboard. Within this division, the shorter durations are reserved for the high register, the longer durations for the low register, and the intermediary durations in the middle register, a division which, as Richard Toop has noted, takes advantage of the natural resonant properties of the instrument.

Since Messiaen himself has provided an explanation of the processes at work in the piece (and since the processes described are indeed carried out in the composition), subsequent analyses – those that do more than simply repeat Messiaen’s explanatory note, as is the case in several textbooks – tend to direct their energies towards contextualising the piece stylistically, both on its own individual terms, as part of Messiaen’s compositional output, and as a foundational work of the post-1945 avant-garde. Toop’s analysis is exemplary in this regard. Using Messiaen’s prefatory note as a starting point (the example of the three modes is directly

77 ‘Mode’ is dated ‘Darmstadt 1949’, but, according to Griffiths, it was actually realized only the following winter in Paris (Griffiths, 151).
78 DF15302 (Paris: Durand, 1950). In later editions, Messiaen’s note is given in English, but with identical content.
reproduced), Toop notes that there are rich precedents for such an organisation both in Messiaen’s own output and those of composers he greatly admired. Indeed, Toop’s contention that Messiaen ‘could scarcely fail to have been familiar with the magic numbers of Machaut’s *Notre Dame* Kyrie’ is borne out by the fact that this precise piece was a subject in his analysis seminar.\footnote{Ibid, 143.} From this Toop deduces that the $3 \times 12$ pitches of Messiaen’s ‘triplum’ should be seen as ‘trinity symbols’, and furthermore, ‘though less convincingly’, Messiaen’s use of $3 \times 8$ durations, $3 \times 4$ modes of attack, and 7 attacks are also ‘not without symbolic connotations’.\footnote{Ibid.} Toop further draws attention to the stylistic features of Messiaen’s mode common with his other work, namely the “affective” cadential close with a falling tritone’, ‘rhythmic cell organisation’ (roughly equivalent to the function of *personnages rythmiques* described above), and the chromatic scale of durations, which was previously deployed in *Cantéyodjaya* (1949) and figured in several of Messiaen’s later compositions.\footnote{Ibid, 145–147.} Toop goes so far as to position the ‘pitch organisation’ of the mode as the sole ‘major innovation in Messiaen’s work’, since ‘rhythmic cell organisation is a constant characteristic of the works preceding the *Quatre Etudes* (cf. *Cantéyodjaya* [sic]).’\footnote{Ibid, 146.} But even this pitch organisation is far from thoroughly systematic, and Toop ultimate concludes that, as they appear, ‘much of the note order is arrived at on the dual basis of taste and expediency.’\footnote{Ibid, 152.}

Toop additionally stipulates that *Mode de valeurs* is in no sense a serial composition, even though it falls within the category of “durchgeordnete Musik.”\footnote{Ibid, 144.} This distinction – between serialism and ‘through-ordered music’ – is a crucial one for Toop’s historical analysis, and indeed provides a very neat framing for his investigation, which starts with Messiaen’s ‘Mode’ and ends with Boulez’s *Structures I*. Since the ‘pitch material of Messiaen’s study is not a series, but a mode of 36 notes’, the fact that Boulez’s later piece ‘converts it into a series by bringing all the pitches within an octave’ serves as an ultimate synthesis of ‘durchgeordnete Musik’ – under which Toop also classifies Goeyvaerts’s and Fano’s Sonatas and Stockhausen’s *Kreuzspiel* – and serialism. Yet despite being neither (rigidly) systematic nor serial, Messiaen’s treatment of pitch material shares much with later works of so-called total serialism. Most notably, Toop notices that ‘the “head motive” of each division tends to occur more regularly
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than any other segment’; he designates these motives as serving a ‘pivot function’. As will be shown later, the concept of certain pitches possessing a privileged value through a ‘pivot function’ is central to the composition of Goeyvaerts’s Sonata and Stockhausen’s Kreuzspiel.

Toop’s analysis, with its close attention to stylistic precedents and ideological preoccupations widely evident throughout Messiaen’s compositional work, starkly contrasts with that given by Griffiths, who is at pains to demonstrate his thesis that Messiaen’s ‘Mode’ ‘has little connection with his other music’. This thesis is immediately unconvincing, most obviously in that Griffiths is forced to admit in the same sentence that the ‘Mode’ itself ‘grew out of a section of Cantéyodjayâ’. Griffiths subsequently forgoes analysis of the piece almost entirely, merely pointing out certain ‘motivic islands’ and a suggestion of ‘folk song trying to make itself heard through a grid of random mechanical activity’. Of course, such ‘mechanical activity’ is only ‘random’ insofar as Griffiths refuses to account for it – a somewhat shady omission, considering that Messiaen has himself provided such an accounting in the published edition of the score. Going beyond simple (and obvious) stylistic objections, the attempt to write off Messiaen’s ‘Mode’ as an aberration makes little historical sense. Neither Goeyvaerts nor Fano had any knowledge of the ‘Mode’ when they wrote their Sonatas, which Griffiths claims ‘adapt’ Messiaen’s piece. If such pieces have a kinship with Messiaen’s ‘Mode’ (and, as will be shown, they certainly do, though of a far from obvious sort), such a kinship must therefore have arisen from stylistic traits evident more generally in Messiaen’s teaching, thinking, and composition. Helpfully, Toop’s analysis reveals precisely these traits, and thus demonstrates that the genealogy of Messiaen’s influence on younger composers was not purely a matter of a single piece (representative or otherwise) but rather a consistently and consciously developed aesthetic philosophy.

Just as suspiciously, Goeyvaerts’s expertise on the Second Viennese School in general, and Webern in particular, is taken for granted by almost all subsequent historical accounts. Toop asserts that, ‘[l]ike all Messiaen’s early pupils, he would have learned the work of the Viennese school through Leibowitz’. There is a certain elliptical truth to this statement, in that whatever knowledge Goeyvaerts would have had of dodecaphony would most likely ultimately
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have had Leibowitz as its source, but it passes over the fact, mentioned at length above, that Goeyvaerts made no effort to contact Leibowitz, and thus his knowledge of the Second Viennese School is of a different provenance altogether. Maconie's account gives Goeyvaerts even more credit: he is described as having 'specialized in a study of late Webern scores.' Such a reputation, while factually doubtful, nevertheless must have arisen from somewhere, or someone. One of the central aims of the present investigation is to determine precisely where, or rather, from whom the narrative of Goeyvaerts and Stockhausen as Webern apostles may have originated.

**Stockhausen in Cologne, 1947–1951**

At the same time that Goeyvaerts was experiencing his greatest success to date, the young Karlheinz Stockhausen was beginning his first formal lessons in composition at the Musikhochschule in Cologne. After several years supporting himself as a piano accompanist, Stockhausen had enrolled on a music education course at the Musikhochschule in 1947, with piano as his primary area of study under Hans Otto Schmidt-Neuhaus, but he did not enrol in a composition course until the end of 1950. His teacher was the Swiss composer Frank Martin who, according to Stockhausen’s biographer Robin Maconie, ‘seems likely to have been a cultivated, undogmatic influence, receptive to if not passionately enthusiastic or particularly knowledgeable about new musical developments.’ While Maconie appears to have based this assessment on a single published article of Martin’s, it is nevertheless a useful generalisation. In any case, Stockhausen claims to have only met with Martin ‘four or five’ times, so there is little biographical evidence for a strong stylistic influence either way.

Regardless of whether Martin’s influence was significant or not, Stockhausen became closely engaged with the music of Bela Bartók during his studies, eventually writing a 186-page analysis of the Sonata for Two Pianos and Percussion (1937) as his final examination thesis.
Bartók’s influence can be demonstrated most strongly in Stockhausen’s first acknowledged compositions, the *Chöre für Doris* (1950). In his analysis, Maconie identifies ‘a conscious borrowing from Bartók’ in many facets of the composition: a ‘recitativo rather than lyric’ treatment of the voices, in the ‘melodic construction and variation’, as well as ‘in the harmony in fourths, the textural thickening of a line by doubling at the third or sixth’, and, curiously, ‘in the persistence of the feminine ending’.

Later in 1950, Stockhausen collaborated with other students on a collective musical pantomime titled *Burleska*, which, in musical terms, Stockhausen later recalled to be ‘a mixture of Hindemith, Stravinsky and Orff’.

But Bartók, Stravinsky, Hindemith and Orff appear to be insufficiently modern influences, and Maconie’s more extensive analysis of Stockhausen’s second acknowledged composition, the Drei Lieder of 1950, is at pains to demonstrate a kinship with a more stereotypically avant-garde idiom. Indeed, Maconie is so intent on describing what he considers to be the signs of Stockhausen’s increasingly systematic serial thinking that he entirely ignores the far more obvious classical structures present in the piece. Often what Maconie takes to be some ‘essential element of serial technique’ actually has a simpler, more coherent, and more plausible explanation from an unprejudiced reading of the score. In the opening bars of the first song, ‘Der Rebell’, Maconie claims ‘the same intervallic shape is presented in seven different rhythms’. Technically speaking, he is not wrong, but the successive presentations of this ‘intervallic shape’ across instruments, shown in Figure 1, appears to be simple call-and-response structure imitative writing. Indeed, the passage as a whole might be more fruitfully compared to any number of roughly contemporary neo-classical works by Paul Hindemith, Wolfgang Fortner, Johann Nepomunk David, Ernst Pepping, Karl Höller, Harald Genzmer, or Kurt Hessenberg, recipient of the National Prize in Composition from Joseph Goebbels, whose piano music Stockhausen himself performed as a student in Cologne.
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101 Michael Kurtz, *Stockhausen: A Biography*, trans. Richard Toop (London, Faber & Faber, 1992), 29. Kurtz suggests that Stockhausen’s contributions were ‘more personal’ than this stylistic mélange implies, but, since no documentation of the pantomime has survived, the only grounds for such a suggestion would come from Stockhausen himself (the same, naturally, is also true of the comparison to Hindemith, Stravinsky, and Orff in the first place).


As it so happens, Maconie himself draws attention to the immanent call-and-response form of ‘Der Rebell’, but, oddly, his only point of reference is later Stockhausen: “‘Der Rebell’ is planned as a dialogue between the solo voice and the C trumpet, who take alternate phrases, a form later recalled in Kontra-Punkte (1952) by the alternation of ensemble and piano.” In the second edition of this analysis, Maconie’s claims for the latent serialism of the Drei Lieder are even more extravagant. He states that this composition ‘marks Stockhausen’s introduction to
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composing with a series.\textsuperscript{105} But the series that Maconie identifies as being ‘employed with evident success as a basis for melody and harmony (and also counterpoint)’ comprises eleven pitches (making it one pitch shy of being a series proper, cf. Toop’s distinction), and Maconie’s own indication of its deployment, in reference to the above excerpt, is inconsistent and largely arbitrary (he considers the cello entry to be the same set as the violin entry, but not the flute and trombone entries, despite these latter two containing the same pitch set).

Maconie’s other contentions regarding the Drei Lieder are even more tenuous. Among these is his assertion that the piece’s ‘unequal phrase lengths and metronomically distinguished tempi (i.e. numerically rather than verbally defined)’ point towards ‘a consciously structural ordering of events.’\textsuperscript{106} It is true that Stockhausen occasionally gives metronome markings, but at a frequency and specificity that is wholly unremarkable even within art music of the period, and, despite Maconie’s assertion, Stockhausen in fact far more frequently gives verbal indications of tempo. From the score excerpts Maconie gives, these verbal indications include breite, flüchtig, and langsam, verhalten, not to mention both a poco and a molto accelerando.

The parallels to the work of other composers Maconie does make are to now-familiar figures: Bartók, Stravinsky, and, most prominently, Schoenberg and Berg, of whom Maconie suggests that Stockhausen ‘made some intensive study’.\textsuperscript{107} But there is no biographical evidence of either a familiarity or interest in any of these named composers besides Bartók, and, bizarrely, Maconie himself reveals in a footnote that ‘Stockhausen in fact knew no Berg at this stage.’\textsuperscript{108} In fact, Stockhausen had first heard Schoenberg in December 1949, and the only Schoenberg score the library of the Cologne Musikhochschule possessed was Herzgewächse, op. 20 (1911), which is from Schoenberg’s atonal period.\textsuperscript{109} Therefore, there is virtually no reasonable possibility that Stockhausen could have made a study, intensive or otherwise, of the music of the Second Viennese School by 1950. Maconie’s taxonomy of influence seems to have been

\textsuperscript{105} Maconie (1990), 8.
\textsuperscript{106} Ibid, 14.
\textsuperscript{107} Ibid, 16.
\textsuperscript{108} Ibid, fn. 2.
\textsuperscript{109} Christoph von Blumröder, Die Grundlegung der Musik Karlheinz Stockhausens (Stuttgart: Franz Steiner, 1993), 29. Blümroder also points out that both Hermann Heiss (a student of Josef Mathias Hauer) and Josef Rufer (an advocate of Schoenberg) gave lectures on dodecaphony at the Hochschule in 1950. For his part, Maconie only mentions Heiss as Stockhausen’s ‘first real encounter with serial technique in practice’, which greatly enthused the young composer. This would suggest that Stockhausen’s initial serial affinities lay predominately with the techniques of Hauer rather than those of the Second Viennese School (it may be parenthetically, conspiratorially noted that Hauer’s transcendental mysticism more neatly aligns with Stockhausen’s spirituality than Schoenberg’s religious beliefs). See Maconie (1990), 4.
assembled in hindsight, and its selection is more derived from confirmation bias than actual analysis of the piece and its context within Stockhausen’s biography (it is only in a further footnote that he implies a similarity in orchestration with Frank Martin’s neoclassical *Petite Symphonie Concertante* [1944–45]). As a rejoinder to Maconie’s analysis – although a convincing proof of this suggestion would far exceed the scope of the current study – it could be argued that the Drei Lieder are primarily stylistically indebted to Stockhausen’s work as an accompanist, evidenced by the prominent place of the piano within the ensemble and the expressive, cabaret-like writing for solo alto voice. Far from dispelling ‘any lingering supposition that Stockhausen’s extension of the serial principle to tempo and phrase-structure was a development subsequent to his Paris period,’ a more contextually rich reading of the Drei Lieder undermines ‘lingering suppositions’ that, in 1950, Stockhausen had even consistently deployed any serial principle whatsoever.

This lengthy rejoinder is more than a gratuitous takedown of an easy musicological target; it is a demonstration of how musicologists retroactively craft their analyses to agree with a discourse which inevitably provides the same explanation for any number of practices. While Christoph von Blümroder’s analysis of the Drei Lieder is more internally consistent (and certainly more rigorous) than Maconie’s, his methodology is similarly questionable to the extent that it searches for serial thinking in a piece of music far more easily explicated by classical forms. Of course, these analyses also suffer from being written in a musical environment hugely different from the one in which Stockhausen composed them. To understand how this work might have been seen in the context of the New Music of 1951, it is revealing to consider the Darmstadt jury’s terse verdict on it, as reported to Stockhausen by Eimert: ‘the texts were felt to be too gruesome and the music too old-fashioned.’ As might be expected, it is the latter point of criticism to which Maconie takes exception, calling the verdict ‘difficult to understand.’
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110 Ibid, 14, fn. 1.
111 Further evidence for this contention is supplied by the text of the songs themselves. Tellingly, Maconie adds a revised introduction to the Drei Lieder in the second edition of his book, describing them as revealing a ‘totally different side’ to Stockhausen’s character, ‘ironic’, ‘mordant’, and reminiscent of Georg Grosz. This revision only goes as far as the texts, however, and Maconie’s musical analysis of the piece remains largely identical. See Maconie (1990), 7–10.
112 Cf. Maconie (1976), 17. What appears to be at stake for Maconie here is precisely what is discursively at stake for so many composers of the post-war avant-garde: the issue of innovative stylistic primacy.
114 Kurtz, 31.
115 Maconie (1990), 10.
Even discounting Eimert’s account of the stylistic grounds for objection, Stockhausen’s formal application to the courses was far from impressive. While Goeyvaerts’s music had been internationally broadcast on multiple occasions, Stockhausen’s application to the Ferienkurse frankly concluded: ‘Public performances to date: none.’ Elsewhere, Iddon cheekily observes ‘it was not obviously an interest in encountering Schoenberg that caused him to apply.’ This is a significant observation, and one that underlies just how ambivalent the young Stockhausen was to the New Music scene at large. Regardless, the Stockhausen who arrived in Darmstadt in 1951 was far from an initiated or established personality in music, let alone the avant-garde. Rather, he could be more accurately described, at least at this stage, as an outsider.

Yet Stockhausen was not completely in isolation. In the early spring of 1951, he had approached Herbert Eimert to review a third performance of Burleska in his capacity as critic for the Kölnischer Rundschau. The two immediately formed a connection. Kurtz characterises Eimert’s role as ‘Stockhausen’s paternalist sponsor, paving the way for his first performances and employment at the radio station [NWDR, later WDR].’ In simple terms, Herbert Eimert was the first influential figure to take an interest in Stockhausen, and it was upon his advice that, despite the rejection of his Drei Lieder, Stockhausen interrupted his Bartók thesis to attend the 1951 Darmstädter Ferienkurse.

Will Success Spoil Karel Goeyvaerts?

In mid-1950, Goeyvaerts began composing the piece that would, for better or worse, be synonymous with his legacy in the post-war avant-garde. His account of its conception is worth quoting in full for its intensity of feeling – an intensity uncommon in his predominately breezy autobiography:

At the time the Tre Lieder were being first performed I was already working on my Sonata for two pianos. It was like as if [sic] I had reached the promised land. At various stages in my life I have turned my back on the past, yet never have I closed a chapter so abruptly.
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116 Quoted in Iddon, New Music at Darmstadt, 52.
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118 Kurtz, 30.
119 Kurtz’s assertion that they ‘soon found themselves engaged in expert conversation on New Music’ is perhaps somewhat fanciful.
120 Ibid, 31.
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I began to discourage anyone who wanted to perform the *Tre Lieder*. Henceforth my name was going to be linked with a completely different type of music.\(^{122}\)

Later, he adds:

The year 1950 marked a turning point in my life. It was a year for reflection. My thinking matured and ideas which had long been in my head suddenly gelled. It was like a jigsaw [sic] puzzle when one is left with just a few remaining pieces: they find their own way to the right place.\(^{123}\)

While there is no reason to doubt the sincerity of Goeyvaerts’s account, it would seem that these ideas gelled more gradually than he felt to be the case in retrospect. While the composition of the Sonata for two pianos – which must be taken as precisely the ‘completely different type of music’ Goeyvaerts intended to write – was underway, Goeyvaerts also composed two other pieces, the Second Violin Concerto (date usually given as 1950, but speculative, see below) and the one-page *Invention à trois voix for piano* (manuscript dated 30 January 1951).\(^{124}\) Goeyvaerts makes no mention of the latter, and his account of the former is flippant and embittered. Indeed, his treatment of the piece as a humiliating afterthought – and his eagerness to shift the focus back to the Sonata – emphasises just how brutally Goeyvaerts wished to turn his back on his prior output:

It was probably also in 1950 that I wrote my Second Violin Concerto. [...] The then director of the UNESCO’s International Music Council, Heiter Corrêa de Azevedo, decided to publish the work with a subsidy from Unesco, who had just then set up a fund for such purposes. Before even the publication saw the light of day, I was hard at work on my Sonata for two pianos, which marked such a step forward that I preferred to let all that preceded it disappear in embarrassed silence. I took no steps to have the Second Violin Concerto performed.\(^{125}\)

If the publication of the Second Violin Concerto ever saw the light of day, the only record of it is a single score and parts edited by UNESCO housed in the Leuven archive.\(^{126}\) Yet Goeyvaerts’s palpable disdain for the Second Violin Concerto here results in a somewhat confused chronology. He previously said that he was working on the Sonata ‘[a]t the time the *Tre Lieder* were being first performed,’ which would indicate July of 1949 (unless Goeyvaerts means the


\(^{123}\) Ibid, 43.

\(^{124}\) ALKG, folder 40.


\(^{126}\) ALKG, folder 39.
ISCM performance in June of 1950. This would mean that composition of the Second Violin Concerto was contemporaneous with that of the Sonata, or even that composition of the Second Violin Concerto had commenced after Goeyvaerts had begun working on the Sonata. In Delaere’s chronology, Goeyvaerts was indeed working on both compositions in tandem, finishing the Concerto before the Sonata in 12 January 1951. Further adding to the confusion, the manuscript of the Second Violin Concerto is undated, making it the only completed composition without an authorial date in Goeyvaerts’s entire output. It would almost appear that Goeyvaerts is trying to erase the memory of its conception.

Furthermore, the global form of the Second Violin Concerto is remarkably similar to that of the Sonata for two pianos, suggesting that Goeyvaerts was indeed working on both pieces in tandem. Oddly, Goeyvaerts describes the two movements of the Second Violin Concerto in the same terms as the Sonata without seeming to notice: ‘the first [is] constructed following a strictly rational pattern, whereas the second was intended as a sort of irrational variation on the first.’ This is nearly identical to the description given of form of the Sonata for two pianos as ‘continuity between rational determination and irrational intuition,’ with both ‘rational determination’ and ‘irrational intuition’ acting as discrete musical structures connected through a larger meta-process.

Significantly, these descriptions of formal symmetry can also be found in Barraqué’s writing on his music of this period. His preface to his Sonata for piano (1950–1952) likewise describes a formal opposition of ‘a “free” style (start of the work, for example) to a “rigorous” style.’ Taken by itself, this may seem like little more than a shared interest in the juxtapositions of musical material characteristic in sonata form. But Goeyvaerts and Barraqué’s understanding of symmetry during this period is essentially Messiaenic rather than classical, as an expression of spiritual – specifically Roman Catholic – perfection through musical structure.

128 Mark Delaere, ‘Auf der Suche nach serieller Stimmigkeit: Goeyvaerts’ Weg zur Komposition Nr. 2 (1951)’, in Die Anfänge der seriellen Musik, ed. Orm Finnendahl (Berlin: wolke, 1999), 20. There is no reason to doubt the accuracy of Delaere’s chronology; the point being made is simply that Goeyvaerts seems to prefer the Second Violin Concerto be erased from chronology altogether.
129 A LGK, folder 39.
131 The quotation, presumably from Goeyvaerts, is taken from Toop, who unfortunately does not mention its source. See Toop, ‘Messiaen/Goeyvaerts’, 153.
132 Quoted in Griffiths, Barraqué, 39.
Barraqué’s withdrawn ballet *Melos* (1950–1951) contains several movements clearly indebted to Messiaen’s practice, most notably ‘Entrée de la Peinture’, which is constructed through multiple isorhythmic figures which pivot and reverse at the centre of the piece, resulting in a perfectly symmetric and strikingly elaborate construction (see figure 1). Heribert Heinrich has furthermore examined the technical borrowings from Messiaen in Barraqué’s *Trois Melodies* (1950; later incorporated into *Séquence*), as well as identifying ‘symmetrical forms’ which, Heinrich suggests, Barraqué had found in Webern.

![Fig. 3.2: Jean Barraqué, Melos, third movement, ‘Entrée de la Peinture’, bars 26–28. Bar 27, in quadruple time, is the symmetrical pivot of the entire movement (the dotted lines throughout the movement in the](image)
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134 Heribert Heinrich, ‘Serien Konstruktion und “Serienne Ästhetik”: Zu Jean Barraqués Nietzsche-Kantate *Séquence*’, in *Rewriting Recent Music History: The Development of Early Serialism 1947–1957*, ed. Mark Delaere (Leuven: Peeters, 2011), 139–160. Heinrich’s contention that Barraqué’s understanding of twelve-tone technique at this time was largely in accord with Leibowitz (Heinrich, 141) is not, to my mind, clearly evident from the music; certainly the contemporary *Melos* displays far more technical and formal processes familiar from Messiaen and Goeyvaerts – and, crucially, their interpretation of Webern and Machaut – than those of Leibowitz’s Schoenberg.
published score indicate section breaks; here they also indicate the point of mirror-symmetrical retrogradation).

Delaere’s brief analysis of the Second Violin Concerto also serves to illustrate the piece’s kinship with the contemporary Sonata for Two Pianos, although he confines his investigation almost entirely to the first, ‘rational’ movement of the piece, ‘Prolégomènes’. This is an understandable decision, since signs of Goeyvaerts’s future compositional development might more plausibly be teased out in ‘Prolégomènes’ than the second, ‘irrational’ movement, ‘Trancendances’, which Delaere simply describes as a ‘free variation’ of the first, wherein musical cells are ‘gradually transformed into thematic-motivic forms, which undergo a traditional development process.” 135 The series Delaere identifies as undergirding the melodic material of the two trumpets in the first movement appears immediately familiar to those with a knowledge of Webern’s music, with emphasis placed on smaller intervals (especially minor seconds) and combinatorial trichords. 136

Fig. 3.3: Row forms in ‘Prolégomènes’, Second Violin Concerto. Cf. Delaere (1999), 20.

Yet Delaere points out that this series is merely hypothetical, and an examination of its deployment bears out this caveat. In the trumpet duet Delaere excerpts, the appearance of the series is 1-2-3-7-2-11-4-5-6-6-8-4-7-8-9-1-5-9-10-11, with only the second trumpet playing the final 12th pitch of the chromatic total. 137 As it plays out, in fact, this duet appears to be more akin to the polytonality of Milhaud than the Webernian constructivism initially suggested by the

135 Delaere, ‘Goeyvaerts’ Weg zur Komposition Nr. 2’, 22.
137 See ibid, 21.
‘original’ row: the harmonies frequently oscillate between major thirds, fifths, and unisons. This is not lost on Delaere, who describes a passage as a ‘cantilena’ recalling the ‘pre-serial production’ of Goeyvaerts. So Goeyvaerts’s feelings that the piece did not belong to his new phase of creative activity are not entirely ungrounded.

Still, like the contemporaneous Sonata, the Second Violin Concerto is more transitional than backsliding. Most significantly, Delaere notes that Goeyvaerts rotates the register of hexachordal pitches in certain instrumental groups, so that a pitch occurring in the highest octave will be displaced to the lowest octave on its next appearance. A nearly identical process, on a much larger scale, underpins the two central, ‘rational’ movements of the Sonata. Deleare also notes a certain symmetrical ‘pre-compositional serial ordering’ of rhythmic and dynamic values, which suggests the symmetrical valuation of multiple parameters in the Sonata. It is clear, then, that at the very least the Second Violin Concerto served as an experimental testing ground for certain formal strategies which Goeyvaerts would later develop over the next seven years, as well as others he would discard forever. Indeed, Delaere himself elsewhere characters the Second Violin Concerto alongside the Sonata for Two Pianos as ‘transitional works’ in Goeyvaerts’s oeuvre.

Chronological and stylistic objections aside, Goeyvaerts’s claim that he preferred to let these compositions henceforth ‘disappear in embarrassed silence’ rings true. The fact that, despite their initial interest and financial commitment, UNESCO ultimately neither distributed nor even published the score seems likely to have been a result of Goeyvaerts’s antipathy towards the piece. If this is indeed the case, Goeyvaerts had sabotaged what would have been the first publication of his music.

The Sonata

I. Musical analysis

While the Second Violin Concerto, like the rest of Goeyvaerts’s output before 1951, has fallen into historical obscurity (it has never been published, and could reasonably be described as a
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'withdrawn', even 'suppressed', work), the concurrently composed Sonata for Two Pianos has been the subject of considerable scrutiny for both its aesthetic content and its historical impact. While the various analyses (summarised below) are certainly more rigorous than those mentioned in conjunction with Stockhausen's early work, there is still detectable in them a sort of retrospective confirmation bias. Having been made two decades after the fact (at the earliest), these analyses inevitably emplot the Sonata into the discourse of post-war New Music as one of the first serious successors to Anton Webern. Yet a close examination of the compositional structures at play in the piece might offer a significantly different genealogy for Goeyvaerts's creative practice.

Like the Second Violin Concerto, the global form of the Sonata for two pianos is a juxtaposition of contrasting sections of ‘rational’ and ‘irrational’ organisation. However, unlike the side-by-side juxtaposition of the Concerto, the movements of the Sonata – in what Goeyvaerts no doubt considered a significant refinement – present a unitary formal organisation: not only are the central ‘rational’ movements contrasted with the outer ‘irrational’ movements, but the entire piece is a symmetrical mirror image of itself. However, this is only the broadest frame of organisation, and while they never subvert or contradict this frame, the smaller-scale structural forms of the piece operate on discrete (although counter-dependent) processes. It is therefore useful to differentiate between the global structure (the rational/irrational mirror), the macrostructure, and the microstructure of the piece, especially since analyses of the piece have a tendency to focus only on a single structural frame while neglecting the others.

After the global mirror structure, the next level of formal organisation is the macrostructure governing the central two movements. Like the global structure, this macrostructure operates as a completely symmetrical mirror. However, the mirroring which occurs in the central movements of the Sonata is far more elaborate than that of global structure. First of all, the pitch range is condensed from the opening range of 5 octaves into a space of 2 ½ octaves (in the second movement), before expanding out once more to a range of 5 octaves (in the third movement). Concomitantly with this process, the musical material is exchanged between the two pianos, so that in the third movement Piano 2 plays a retrograde of what Piano 1 played in the second movement and Piano 1 plays a retrograde of Piano 2, concluding with the opening notes of the second movement in opposite pianos. The results of these two processes are shown in figure 3.4.
Herman Sabbe notes that Goeyvaerts’s compositions in general are characterised by ‘a multiple symmetric development, i.e. an evolution to and from a turning point which is at the same time the centre of the composition.’\textsuperscript{142} In the Sonata, this fulcrum occurs at the \textit{attacca} between the two movements, where the processes governing the presentation of material reverse and the piece returns to how it began.

Secondly, the pitch material itself (as in the individual pitches rather than the register) is derived from two overlapping heptachords, shown in figure 3.5, with the overlapping notes (A and E flat, the latter enharmonically spelled as D sharp in the second heptachord) acting as “pivot” tones. These two pivots retain their register while the other pitches are displaced, eventually becoming the outer pitches of the harmonic field. The idea of “static music” so

\textsuperscript{142} Herman Sabbe, ‘Goeyvaerts and the Beginnings of “Punctual” Serialism and Electronic Music’, \textit{Revue belge de Musicologie/Belgisch Tijdschrift voor Muziekwetenschap}, 48 (1994), 80. This need not be realised as an actual point (viz. \textit{punctum}), and often not even an identifiable moment. This ‘turning point’ is the location and/or moment wherein the processes being deployed in the composition either reverse, turn back on themselves, or transform. Since such processes can be multidirectional, it is perhaps more accurate to speak not of a ‘turning point’ but a fulcrum.
essential to Goeyvaerts’s aesthetic conception is most clearly present to a listener in the strict alteration of these two heptachords and, furthermore, their presentation between the two pianos: Piano 1 always plays heptachord I then II, while Piano 2 plays II then I, so that the totality of the pitch material is simultaneously present in each iteration (this is shown in figs. 3.3 and 3.4). As with the octave displacement, the presentation of these heptachords is reversed in the third movement, ultimately concluding with the same material which opened the second movement.

![Fig. 3.5: Sonata for Two Pianos, heptachords in central movements](image)

![Fig. 3.6: Sonata for Two Pianos, presentation scheme of heptachords, second movement (third movement presentation is a retrograde of this scheme)](image)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Piano I</th>
<th>A1</th>
<th>AII</th>
<th>B1</th>
<th>BII</th>
<th>C1</th>
<th>CII</th>
<th>DI</th>
<th>etc.</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Piano II</td>
<td>AII</td>
<td>A1</td>
<td>BII</td>
<td>B1</td>
<td>CII</td>
<td>CI</td>
<td>DII</td>
<td>etc.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

![Fig. 3.7: Sonata for Two Pianos, formal outline of second movement](image)
There is still a further level of organisation, one which establishes the Sonata as – to use Iddon’s significant phrase – ‘point music par excellence’. This is the microstructure of the piece, the procedure which determines the identity of each individual sound event. Goeyvaerts’s name for this procedure is ‘synthetic number’: every pitch, in addition to a chromatic series of seven durations, four dynamics, and two separate types of articulation, is accorded a separate number. These parameters are then combined so that the resultant sound event will add up to a value of seven – to take the first note of the second movement, a B flat (= A sharp) has a value of 1, a dotted minim tied with a dotted crotchet has a value of 3, a piano dynamic is 2, tenuto is 1, which adds up to 7. It is in this microstructure that the most obvious parallel to Messiaen’s Mode arises, since both composers conceived of several independent parameters of composition to an unprecedented degree. Yet there is a crucial difference: Goeyvaerts has generated his individuated musical material from a single organising principle (as he himself repeatedly informs us), while Messiaen’s ‘Mode’ ultimately unfolds melodically. Nevertheless, the surface similarities between the two pieces – at first glance, the fact that both scores prominently feature independent dynamics and articulation for each individual note – as well as their rough contemporaneity and status as the first works of a European ‘multiple serialism’ has led commentators to propose a series of potential genealogies for their creative processes.

II. Historiographical analysis, or Who Paid the Piper?

The historical ‘models’ for the techniques used by Goeyvaerts in the Sonata, according to Toop, ‘probably lie in Messiaen (register exchange in “Regard d l’Onction Terrible”) and Webern (palindromes and a sort of register exchange, albeit on a small scale, e.g., first movement of Piano Variations).’ Toop’s reference to Webern here is almost apologetic, and for good reason, since the two stylistic borrowings he identifies as coming from Webern are far more clearly present in Messiaen’s music. Later, Toop admits that the series he identifies as opening the work is ‘actually a rather strange sort of series for a young composer familiar with late Webern to have used.’ The source of Goeyvaerts’s familiarity, however, is rather taken for
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143 Iddon, New Music at Darmstadt, 54.
144 As Iddon points out, Goeyvaerts is somewhat inconsistent in his reckoning of these values. For the category of duration, he occasionally counts the value of the succeeding rest into the duration of the note (as in the example given) and occasionally not. See ibid, 54–55.
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granted (as mentioned above, Toop simply states that ‘all Messiaen’s early pupils’ would have learned about Webern through Leibowitz). In a footnote, Toop mentions that ‘Goeyvaerts had made a detailed study of Webern’s Piano Variations in the winter of 1949–50.’\(^\text{147}\) In a further footnote, he asserts this piece as ‘the work Goeyvaerts had studied most closely’ of Webern, apparently to the exclusion of others, to offer a possible explanation for Goeyvaerts’s ‘rather strange’ series.\(^\text{148}\) The ‘detailed study’ Toop mentioned may be tentatively connected to Goeyvaerts’s vague reminiscences about sitting ‘tucked away in a corner or on the lawn of the Cité Universitaire with a Webern score on my knees’.\(^\text{149}\) But if the Webern score Goeyvaerts mentions here was the Piano Variations, there is no concrete record of it; the only extant Webern score annotated by Goeyvaerts is the Symphony, op. 21 (of which, more later).\(^\text{150}\) Oddly, the claim that Goeyvaerts had made a rigorous analysis of the Webern Piano Variations in particular is widely repeated throughout the literature; it is also made by Griffiths and Maconie.

Nevertheless, the ‘palindromes’ Toop claims Goeyvaerts derived from the Piano Variations are, if anything, even more in evidence in this earlier piece, of which Webern said that ‘[g]reater unity is impossible.’\(^\text{151}\) Herman Sabbe seems to be aware of this, and claims that certain techniques found in the Sonata are more indebted to Webern’s Symphony, op. 21 (which Goeyvaerts did certainly analyse) than the Piano Variations.\(^\text{152}\) Furthermore, Sabbe’s investigation of Webern’s influence far exceeds that of Toop; he identifies numerous formal concepts which Goeyvaerts could have derived from Webern (in particular the Symphony), most generally:

1) symmetrical organisation of pitch material,
2) fixed octave position of certain notes,
3) simultaneous presentation of prime and retrograde pitch sequences,
4) “unity of form-structuring principle”, and
5) parametric organisation.\(^\text{153}\)

Sabbe’s investigation is far more detailed than this brief outline might suggest; for example, within the category of ‘symmetrical organisation of pitch material’, he notes two particular

\(^{147}\) Ibid, 154, fn. 13.
\(^{148}\) Ibid, 155, fn. 16.
\(^{150}\) ALKG, folder 151.
\(^{151}\) Webern, The Path to the New Music, 55.
\(^{152}\) Sabbe, ‘Beginnings’, 57. Sabbe does, nevertheless, mention the Piano Variations as a possible source.
\(^{153}\) Ibid, 57–62.
methods of dividing pitch material into two symmetrical halves found in both Webern’s Symphony and Goeyvaerts’s Sonata, one ‘with identical sequence of intervals’, the other ‘with identical composition of intervals mirroring one another’ around one or more symmetric axes.154 The analytical utility of such a distinction is perhaps somewhat opaque, but this is beside the point: Sabbe is simply making a compendium of everything Goeyvaerts could have taken from Webern. His investigation aims at thoroughness rather than clarity.

Contrarily to Toop and Sabbe’s approaches, Mark Delaere emphasises the historical contingency of Goeyvaerts’s techniques, drawing attention to the fact that Goeyvaerts had no contact with Leibowitz, and his analyses of Webern were undertaken ‘without any assistance’.155 This seems rather closer to the point, and emphasizes that whatever Goeyvaerts may have gotten out of Webern was certainly not to be found in the pedagogical approaches surrounding Webern’s music at the time. Such a distinction is of crucial historical importance, since many of the formal devices Sabbe’s analysis observes in Webern were only ‘discovered’ in analyses published years after the composition of the Sonata.

As for Messiaen, Sabbe focuses on two pieces, bypassing Toop’s suggestion of the ‘Regard d l’Onction Terrible’ from Vingt regards sur l’enfant-Jésus (1944). These are the Livre d’Orgue (1951) and, unsurprisingly, the ‘Mode’. In contrast to his previous discussion of Webern’s influence, Sabbe’s accounting for Messiaen is rather more general (perhaps owing to the fact that Sabbe has already categorised many of the techniques Goeyvaerts could have found in Messiaen as Webern’s provenance). He only mentions the ‘pre-arranged serial conception’ of durations, dynamics, and articulations, as well as ‘the far-reaching differentiation within these parameters’.156 But it is precisely such a precompositional unifying form which Sabbe identifies as central to Goeyvaerts’s new aesthetic thought, specifying that Messiaen’s ‘chromatic’ series of multiple parameters ‘has undoubtedly paved the way for the idea that all relations between all parameter-elements could be based on one single common ratio’.157

Sabbe’s generality here is fortuitous, since, as it happens, Goeyvaerts had no knowledge of either of the two Messiaen pieces Sabbe draws from when he composed the Sonata. Oddly, Sabbe suggests that ‘[b]oth the biographic and the textual data’ support the contention that the
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154 Ibid, 57.
155 Delaere, ‘Goeyvaerts’ Weg zur Komposition Nr. 2’, 14.
156 Sabbe, ‘Beginnings’, 62. Sabbe’s somewhat opaque nomenclature for these parameters are here clarified, which he refers to as, respectively, ‘time elements,’ ‘intensities,’ and ‘modes of attack’.
157 Ibid, 63.
‘Mode’ influenced the composition of the Sonata, since in fact they suggest the opposite: Goeyvaerts and Messiaen were mutually unaware of the apparent similarity of their compositional approaches until after they had completed their work.\textsuperscript{158} It is also telling that Sabbe puts the influence of Messiaen in a separate category from that of Webern, implying a sort of exclusivity of their aesthetic practices. Such a division in fact draws attention to a fundamental weakness in Sabbe’s study: by isolating and exhaustively accounting for each potential influence, he ignores both the stylistic overlap between both the other influences he names and contemporary compositional practices in general; the palindromes Sabbe draws attention to in Webern are no less present in the work of Berg, or, for that matter, Messiaen, whose non-retrogradable rhythms are an additional candidate for influencing Goeyvaerts towards symmetrical form. Nevertheless, it is clear that Messiaen’s compositional thinking was at the very least considered sympathetically by Goeyvaerts, despite his not knowing the two pieces by his teacher whose surface features most clearly resemble those of the Sonata. And, crucially, Sabbe also positions the dual influences of Webern and Messiaen – characterised as a ‘mutual fertilization’ – against the ‘twelve-tone academicism’ dominant in 1951.\textsuperscript{159} But the common denominator in this ‘mutual fertilization’ – precisely what Goeyvaerts found so appealing about Messiaen and Webern – is only examined in the third and final category of Sabbe’s catalogue of potential influences.

Besides Webern and Messiaen, Sabbe also identifies ‘medieval techniques’ (seemingly \textit{tout court}) as being ‘saliently present’ in Goeyvaerts’s composition. His foregoing examination is uncharacteristically conservative, however, focusing only on the similarities of isorhythmic taleae to Goeyvaerts’s methods ‘to achieve structural unity’, only mentioning in passing that hocketing, ‘[i]n addition to the example of Webern,’ may have inspired the isolation of differentiated sounds.\textsuperscript{160} He further suggests that it is ‘quite likely moreover that Goeyvaerts has been inspired by other techniques of variation structuring from the late Middle Ages’, giving the examples of simultaneous tempo variations in Dufay and Josquin.\textsuperscript{161} Curiously, Sabbe concludes his brief discussion of medieval influence with a somewhat embarrassed

\begin{footnotesize}
\textsuperscript{158} Ibid, 62.
\textsuperscript{159} ‘...door een wederzijdse bevruchting van deze twee voorbeelden, en over het toenmalig dodecafonisch academisme heen, de basis van de door-gecomponeerde ‘punctuele’, veralgemeend-seriële schrijfwijze.’ Sabbe, ‘Comentaar’, in \textit{Documenta Musicae Novae I}, Publikaties van het seminarie voor muziekgeschiedenis, nr. 3 (Ghent: Rijksuniversiteit-Gent, 1968), unpaginated.
\textsuperscript{160} Sabbe, ‘Beginnings’, 64–68.
\textsuperscript{161} Ibid, 68.
\end{footnotesize}
apologia for his subject: ‘N.B. Goeyvaerts’ interest in the Middle Ages was linked to a feeling of familiarity (whether or not well-founded) with that era having originated from the idea of being at the brink of a new age’.

Despite Sabbe confining his comparison to the microstructural level of the pointillist texture, ‘medieval techniques’ are demonstrably in evidence in nearly every formal process of the sonata. The global mirror-structure of the piece can be found in several pieces in the Ars Nova style, most notably Machaut’s Ma fin est mon commencement. The exchange between sets of material which occurs at the macrostructural level of the central movements bears a striking resemblance to the stimmtausch technique of vocal exchange evident in motets (especially English) from the late thirteenth century (compare figs. 3.7 and 3.8).

Fig. 3.8: Presentational scheme of vocal material in stimmtausch (Rondellus) motet structure (cf. Crocker, 698)

Furthermore, a precedent for the ‘cross’ of the central movements – where the possible pitch range is compressed and, subsequently, in an inverse process, expanded – may be found in the harmonic structure of the earliest polyphonic organum. Typically, the two voices begin on a unison, expand to the widest pitch range (usually an octave), and then contract gradually back into a concluding unison, or, even more similar to Goeyvaerts’s form but occurring less often, there may also be a reverse of this process where the two voices begin on an octave, contract to
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162 Ibid.
163 Elsewhere, Sabbe himself draws this comparison in regard to Goeyvaerts’s Nummer 4 (1952); see Sabbe, A Paradigm of “Absolute Music”: Goeyvaerts’s No. 4 as “Numerus Sonorus”, Revue belge de Musicologie/Belgisch Tijdschrift voor Muziekwetenschap, 59 (2005), 247.
a unison, and then expand back to an octave. While there are many more parallels which can be drawn (e.g. Goeyvaerts’s drawing of pitch material from two overlapping heptachords compared with the system of chant tropes), the point is clear: Goeyvaerts’s compositional procedures in the Sonata are heavily indebted to methods of medieval organisation. Interestingly, Sabbe himself pursues the connection between Goeyvaerts’s serialism and medieval music in far greater detail in a separate article analysing *Opus 2* and *Opus 3 met gestreken en geslagen tonen* (1952), but again limiting his comparison to isorhythm and talea and only mentioning pieces by Machaut and de Vitry as potential precedents.

In addition to its analytical applicability, the category of ‘medieval music’ is materially evident in Goeyvaerts’s possessions, more so than works of Webern or Messiaen. While no extant transcriptions Goeyvaerts may have made of Webern or Messiaen’s music remain, there are several pages of transcribed Gesualdo and Monteverdi madrigals, as well as Gregorian chant. Furthermore, there is a notated copy of the score of Machaut’s *Messe de Notre Dame*, which was taught in Messiaen’s analysis class. Indeed, there were opportunities beyond Messiaen which would have given Goeyvaerts an understanding in medieval techniques: he would almost have certainly have encountered the musicologist Jacques Chailley, who was a professor at the Conservatoire National specialising in early music.

It is clear, then, that received ideas about what the Sonata *should* look like have informed critical evaluation of what it *is* – an attempt to push Webern-shaped pegs through Goeyvaerts-shaped holes. Perhaps not surprisingly, Toop’s aesthetic verdict is rather unfavourable, and he concludes his article by asserting ‘[i]t’s not difficult to see why [the Sonata] has failed to survive as part of the 2-piano repertoire, even among specialists in new music.’ Furthermore, he contends that ‘it’s difficult to believe that the actual music of Goeyvaerts’ Sonata was as dazzling an inspiration to Stockhausen as the Messiaen study which he encountered at the same moment in time.’ There are two major problems with this contention. First, Stockhausen only had access to a recording of the Messiaen piece (a recording which, as Peter Hill has observed, 
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165 Cf. Gérold, 238.
167 ALKG, folder 130
168 ALKG, folder 145
171 Ibid, 158.
is ‘thickly pedalled’ and ‘impressionistic’, and thus far removed from the rather crisper pointillism evident in Goeyvaerts and Stockhausen’s performance of the Sonata), while he practiced the score of Goeyvaerts’s Sonata enough to give a formidably accurate performance. Second, and more importantly, the facet of the Sonata most obviously and repeatedly lifted by Stockhausen after his encounter with Goeyvaerts is the very aspect which is not present in Messiaen’s Mode: the macrostructural ‘cross’ that symmetrically divides the piece. Indeed, in order to better understand just what the Sonata might have represented to a young composer, it is worth interpreting it in terms derived from Goeyvaerts’s position in 1951, especially since these terms were to become increasingly muddled in an aesthetic spat between Adorno and the ‘Darmstadt School’ in the following years.

Sabbe remarks that it is ‘impossible to say with absolute certainty whether Goeyvaerts emulated the late Middle Ages directly’ or simply discovered the technical confluence from his analyses of Webern or through Messiaen. This is true, but the question of origin addressed by Sabbe here is perhaps less significant than the specificity of what might be drawn from a Catholic-medievalising reading of Webern which would be unavailable from a more historicist, Adornian-Leibowitzian reading. An annotated study score of Webern’s Symphony op. 21 survives among Goeyvaerts’s papers. This particular edition of the Symphony was only published in 1955, but Goeyvaerts’s annotations – not least due to their concision and relative scarcity – have almost certainly been adapted from earlier analyses he had made from handwritten copies of the score by himself or Barraqué. While the remainder of the second movement is entirely without marking, the first eleven bars contain the most detailed annotation of the entire score. Goeyvaerts not only notes the melodic symmetry of the twelve-note theme given in the clarinet, but also extrapolates this symmetry to multiple structural parameters of the composition. Most significantly, he identifies the tritone A-E flat in bar 6 as the central ‘pivot’ of the entire construction, the precise function these same pitches serve in the Sonata.
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174 ALKG 151.
While the multiple symmetry indicated here is visually and conceptually compelling, from a strictly analytical perspective, Goeyvaerts’s interpretation is slightly problematic: notwithstanding Webern’s claim for his Symphony demonstrating that ‘[g]reater unity is impossible,’ Goeyvaerts has significantly overestimated the technical unity of this particular passage. The ‘octave exchange’ [octaafwisseling] Goeyvaerts identifies in the melody of the clarinet is nonexistent; his suggested tritonal division between the clarinet and orchestral parts is likewise somewhat misleading, since the pitch material of the two horns and harp is simply the retrograde form of the initial series (which does, admittedly, begin by harmonising the F of the clarinet with a B). However, as detailed above, both of these technical devices (fixed register exchange and tritonal pivots) are evident in multiple works by Messiaen and Machaut, as

176 Webern, 55.
indeed the other symmetrical relationships of this passage which actually are extant in the score.177 The example of Webern’s Symphony, then, represented the projection of the spiritually-conceived technical devices of Messiaen and Machaut on a broader, parametically elaborate canvas.

Leibowitz’s reading of this same passage notes the symmetrical construction of the row and the ‘rhythm’ (not durations), but interprets these as thematic functions, referring to the harp and horns as ‘accompagnement’ whose material simply ‘is derived from the retrograde form’ of the basic row.178 Such a subordinate function is irreconcilable with Goeyvaerts’s interpretation, which is directly informed by his ideal of a “static music”, i.e. music conceived as a projection in time and space of a basic idea generating the structure.179 In relation to such an ideal, Webern’s music, far from being a logical development of a historical process, is simply another instantiation, complementary to Messiaen, Machaut, and Goeyvaerts’s own practice, of formal processes that enunciate a timeless spiritual perfection.180

**Michel Fano**

While certainly nowhere near as public as the grand pedagogical initiatives undertaken by Leibowitz and Adorno at the same time, Goeyvaerts and Barraqué’s musical practice was far from hermetic. Goeyvaerts almost certainly brought the handwritten copy of the Second Cantata he had received at the ISCM performance in Brussels – the work was not published until 1951 –181 back to Barraqué in Paris, since the composer Michel Fano, then twenty-one years old and also a student in Messiaen’s class, recalls his first exposure to Webern was going over a handwritten score of the Second Cantata with Barraqué.182 Like Goeyvaerts and Barraqué, Fano neither studied nor attempted to study with Leibowitz. His own Sonata for Two Pianos (1950–
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177 In his analysis of Goeyvaerts’s Sonata, Toop specifically suggests Messiaen’s ‘Regard de l’Onction Terrible’, the eighteenth of the *Vingt regards sur l’enfant-Jésus* (1944), as the example of register exchange Goeyvaerts might have built on (Toop, ‘Messiaen/Goeyvaerts’, 154). From an historical perspective, this is rather more opportune than Sabbe’s suggestions of the *Livre d’Orgue* and the Mode, neither of which Goeyvaerts had any knowledge of during composition of the Sonata (Sabbe, ‘Beginnings’, 62). However, since these formal devices were present in Messiaen’s musical practice since the 1930s, a particular deployment of them is somewhat beside the point.
180 As Jan Christiaens has argued, Goeyvaerts’s aesthetic understanding throughout his compositional career is strikingly compatible with aspects of Heidegger’s philosophy. See Jan Christiaens, “‘Absolute Purity Projected into Sound’: Goeyvaerts, Heidegger, and Early Serialism”, *Perspectives of New Music*, 41.1 (2003), 168–178.
181 UE 11885.
182 Conversation with the author, 1 June 2017.
which Toop claims ‘points in a quite different direction’ from Goeyvaerts and Stockhausen’s music, namely ‘to the path which led, via Structures, to French “neo-s Serialism”’, nevertheless utilises a number of technical devices common with the works of Messiaen, Goeyvaerts, and Barraqué during this period: register and dynamic exchanges, isorhythm, modal pitch reservoirs, and large-scale symmetrical constructions with tritonal pivots. These features are analysed in dizzying detail by Jean-Louis Leleu and Pascal Decroupet, who frame their analysis as a firm rebuttal of Toop’s suggestion of stylistic relation between Fano and Boulez, concluding: ‘The density of the carefully controlled network of relations which we see interwoven in the “coda” demonstrate the degree to which Fano’s Sonata, in its conception, is far from the automatic composition cultivated by Boulez in Structure Ia...’ Interestingly, Toop’s analysis also identifies some of these structural characteristics, observing that the initial two series (beginning on C and F sharp) which commence the Sonata are ‘the most symmetrical of all 12’ that Fano’s precompositional work has generated. In fact, these two series are not only horizontally symmetrical, as Toop suggests, but vertically symmetrical as well, exhibiting precisely the cross-relationships that Goeyvaerts noted in Webern’s Symphony:

---

183 Toop gives the dates of composition as 1950–1951 (Toop, ‘Messiaen/Goeyvaerts’, 142); Fano’s website gives 1952 (http://www.michelfano.fr/Oeuvres/score_Sp2P.html, accessed 25.5.2018). Irritatingly, the fair copy of the score itself is undated.
184 Toop, ‘Messiaen/Goeyvaerts’, 164.
186 Toop, ‘Messiaen/Goeyvaerts’, 166.
Fig. 3.10: Michel Fano, Sonata for Two Pianos, first paired series with vertical symmetry indicated. This figure corresponds to figs 14–15 in Toop, 166, except Toop has mistakenly given the value of the mezzopiano B flat in the F sharp series (third to last note, below) as a quaver tied with a semiquaver, rather than a quaver tied with a demisemiquaver.

However, unlike Goeyvaerts and Barraqué’s music of this period, Fano’s use of these devices is largely confined to pre-compositional work: the sort of elaborate symmetrical forms visible in the scores for Melos or (Goeyvaerts’s) Sonata for Two Pianos cannot so directly be found on the pages of Fano’s music. This is not to suggest that these structures are less integral to Fano’s compositional practice – to the contrary, as Leleu and Decroupet demonstrate, they inform Fano’s organisation of each compositional parameter – nor that they have less than a profound effect on the finished score. Rather that Fano does not employ them as an end in themselves, but as a structural principle upon which to depart towards radically new and abstract figurations of musical language; they are scaffolding, rather than a blueprint.

The most impressive illustration of these figurations is Fano’s follow-up to his Sonata, the Étude for 15 Instruments (1952–1954). The ‘scaffolding’ here is familiar from the Sonata as well as a number of contemporary pieces by Goeyvaerts, Barraqué, and others: the initial presentation of the 12-pitch series and its fixed registers is sketched by Fano both horizontally and vertically at the top of the first page of the manuscript of the score (see fig. 7).  
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187 In addition to the pitch organization discussed above, Fano organizes duration, dynamics, and register symmetrically. Leleu and Decroupet further demonstrate Fano’s organization of a ‘mode’ combining pitches, durations, dynamics, and registers; see Leleu and Decroupet, 127.

188 Two fair copies of the score were produced, but are now lost, except for a single, two-sided page. Fano rediscovered the corrected manuscript of the score in 2018. For a modern corrected edition of this score, see Appendix A.
However, the structural processes at work in the Étude develop towards ends unforeseen in the Sonata. Even from the retroactive, post-complexity perspective of the early twenty-first century, the results are dizzyingly abstract (see fig 3.12).
Fig. 3.12: Michel Fano, Étude for 15 instruments, fair copy bars 89–93, brass section. Note the incomplete \textit{11}-uplets given to rests and the septuplet which begins in the piccolo trumpet but concludes with the second horn.

Fano treats the duple meter – consistently maintained with few exceptions throughout the piece but undergoing elaborate fluctuations in tempo (e.g. accelerandi from $q = 50$ to $q = 52$ over three measures) – as a sort of time matrix, a template over which he gradually displaces the positions of sound events. This begins, intuitively enough, by dividing bars into tuplets (3, 5, 7, 9, 11), but these irrational durations are increasingly applied not only to the sound events themselves and their immediate surroundings, but also to the broader temporal unfolding of the total aural space. Fano makes it so that even a ‘rational’ duration (say, a quarter note outside of a tuplet) can occur at an ‘irrational’ location (immediately following a rest that represents one eighth note of a septuplet). There are also numerous instances of tuplets interrupted by another tuplet before concluding their duration, tuplets beginning in one instrument but finishing in another, and approximate durations given as parenthetical rests with a ‘$>$’ or ‘$<$’ indication (cf. fig. 3.12). Occasionally Fano simply marks a tuplet value with an exclamation point, which evidentially signifies an infinitesimal truncation of the tuplet (see fig. 3.13).
It should be immediately emphasized that these summative remarks should in no way function as a satisfactory analysis of Fano’s music at this time; to the contrary, they risk presenting a deceivingly transparent description of increasingly complex methods Fano develops and oversimplifying what is a truly remarkable compositional practice. Indeed, while his formal vocabulary exhibits formal devices common to Messiaen, Barraqué, and (if only indirectly) Goeyvaerts, it is precisely this complexity and dynamism that distinguishes Fano’s practice from that of Messiaen, Barraqué, Goeyvaerts, and (later) Stockhausen during this period. This is not a merely stylistic point, and demonstrates that, in Fano’s hands, these structural devices did not operate in service to a particular neo-Platonic conception of Roman Catholicism (nor, to anticipate a later point, were they utilized purely for their technical advancement). Rather than existing in themselves as a token of a higher metaphysical power, they serve as a means for abstracting, recombining, and proliferating the parameters of music so that they are no longer recognizable in their traditional function: this is the distinction between a mirror and a hall of mirrors. After 1955, Fano largely moved from concert works to film, notably creating ‘partitions sonores’ for numerous films by Alain Robbe-Grillet. Building on his use of fixed processes for separating and reconfiguring parameters to render them disjointed and unrecognisable, Fano’s partitions use sounds as a means of complicating the diegesis of the film. In Robbe-Grillet’s L’Homme qui ment (1968), for example, which follows a mysterious man (potentially named Boris) who repeatedly boasts of his heroic exploits in the French Resistance, Fano manipulates a limited set of sounds (footsteps, gunshots, glass shattering) and overlays them in contexts which change the significance of the narrative environment (e.g. echoing...
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Such a stylistic divergence gains further depth from Fano’s idiosyncratic readings of the
mature works of Alban Berg. This may at first seem somewhat counterintuitive, since the formal
devices deployed by Fano in these works parallel those which Goeyvaerts and Barraqué
‘discovered’ in Webern. Indeed, Toop is eager to link Fano’s work with Webern, noting that in
the Sonata, ‘Webern’s method of using the last notes of a series as the first notes of the next (e.g.
Concerto, op. 24) yields a continuous sequence of transpositions by a fourth.’ But subsequent
analysis by Jean-Louis Leleu and Pascal Decroupet reveals that Fano’s model is, ‘paradoxically’,
the all-interval series which is ‘cyclically deployed’ by Berg in the first movement of the Lyric
Suite. Fano’s interpretation of Lulu is even more revealing of the scope of his compositional
concerns: as a student, he identified how the palindromic dramatic form of the opera
complemented palindromic forms in the music and observed that structural aspects of the row-
forms deployed corresponded with psychological qualities of the characters (e.g. the ‘inversion’
assigned to the lesbian Countess Geschwitz). But Fano’s inspiration from Lulu goes further:
in an unpublished essay from 1953, he deploys the basic row of the opera as a ‘série génératrice’
which, when emplotted in a 12-by-12 matrix, reveals a reciprocal correspondence between the
intervallic ‘space’ of the series and its deployment in ‘time’. By manipulating these matrices,
especially through multiplication, Fano is able to generate new material, which he calls ‘séries
deduites’ from the same basic series, a process which appears to prefigure the use of ‘pitch
multiplication’ and ‘proliferating series’ in the works of Boulez and Barraqué, respectively, later
in the decade. In this light, Toop’s comment on Fano leading the way to ‘French “neo-
serialism”’ is actually insightful, if misapplied.

If the all-interval series undergirding the Lyric Suite and the palindromic structure of
Lulu are by now commonplace analytical observations, it is worth emphasizing, again, how both
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189 See ‘Alain Robbe-Grillet / L’Homme qui ment. Rencontre avec Michel Fano’, 23 February 2012;
https://www.centrepompidou.fr/cpv/ressource.action?param.id=FR_R-9abe5aa13555a3c0741e65427ccc53&param.idSource=FR_E-31d26df539efcc5c9b29f3f358ad7 (accessed 27.03.2020).
191 Leleu and Decroupet, 105.
192 Conversation with the author, 3.1.2016. Fano’s knowledge of Lulu at this time was somewhat limited, however,
since he only had access to a piano reduction of the score (which, of course, omitted the incomplete third act;
conversation with the author, 29.1.2019).
193 See Michel Fano, ‘Séries deduites’, unpublished manuscript, 1953. This point in particular is confusing, since by
‘time’ Fano seems to understand a conceptual function of the row itself separate from rhythm or metre.
194 Ibid.
the identification of these structures and the significance attached to them by Fano was far from established in the post-war period. In accordance with his reading of Berg’s work as ‘The Awareness of the Past in Contemporary Music’, Leibowitz emplots Berg’s music *tout court* as self-consciously striving to link Schoenberg’s techniques to classical forms. Thus, for Leibowitz, the Lyric Suite is simply another instance of Berg reconciling Schoenberg’s ‘acquisitions’: ‘[J]ust as Schoenberg’s harmonic acquisition of fourth-chords was traditionally consolidated, in a tonal manner, by Berg, the “traditional process” of the creation of the twelve-tone technique is repeated in the Lyric Suite.’ For Berg’s operas, Leibowitz’s search for ‘awareness of the past’ is even more pronounced: he reads both *Wozzeck* and *Lulu* as a return to the vocal primacy found in Monteverdi after the orchestral confusion of the post-Wagnerian era. While it is not lost on Leibowitz that, in *Lulu*, ‘Berg assigns the roles of the male characters in the third act – those who will be responsible for Lulu’s death – to the same singers who, in the first two acts, took the parts of the men for whose death Lulu was responsible,’ he notes this only as an example of ‘vocal unity.’

**Goeyvaerts and Stockhausen to Darmstadt, 22 June–10 July 1951**

Goeyvaerts had his final exam at the Conservatoire in May 1950, after which he moved back to Antwerp. He shortly thereafter acquired teaching positions at the Music Academy in Borgerhout and the Flemish Catholic Academy, although these jobs still allowed him ‘plenty of spare time’ for him to ‘contemplate the parameters which determined the structure which was to become my Sonata for two pianos.’ However, the Sonata was not in a complete enough form to be performed by the spring of 1951, when Goeyvaerts learned that Schoenberg would be leading a composition seminar at the Darmstädter Ferienkurse für Neue Musik. With
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195 The subtitle for the third part of *Schoenberg et son école*.
197 It may be noted in passing that this was precisely the position outlined and taken by Carl Orff in his Monteverdi adaptations.
198 Leibowitz, *Schoenberg*, 177.
199 Goeyvaerts, ‘Paris – Darmstadt’, 41. Goeyvaerts does not specify the month, but two scores with conducting instructions of the piece he presented for his final exam list May 1950 as their date of completion (ALKG, folder 38).
200 Ibid, 43. As mentioned above, Goeyvaerts also composed the Second Violin Concerto and *Invention à trois voix for piano* during this time.
trepidation, Goeyvaerts submitted his *Music for violin, contralto and piano* instead, which was accepted for performance.\textsuperscript{201}

For an event that would prove epochal for the history and historiography of the post-war avant-garde, Goeyvaerts’s retrospective account of the 1951 Darmstadt courses is remarkably grim, framed as a long series of disappointments. The first of these came when Schoenberg was unable to attend the courses due to a serious illness that would take his life less than a month later. He was, as mentioned earlier, replaced by Adorno. Goeyvaerts did not find out about the cancellation until arriving in Darmstadt, where he recalls being ‘bitterly disappointed.’\textsuperscript{202} It appears that, for Goeyvaerts at least, the presence of Schoenberg was the primary, if not sole, draw of the Darmstadt courses, which ‘were not yet particularly well known. The number of participating composers was very limited.’\textsuperscript{203} This unflattering assessment is largely borne out by historical record: non-German composers were a minority at the 1951 courses, and the courses themselves had only been rebranded as ‘international’ in 1948.\textsuperscript{204} Certainly in 1951, the Darmstadt courses would have seemed relatively provincial to a composer who had been performed at the ISCM Music Days. Writing to his cousin Mia Greeve, Goeyvaerts puts on a brave face, noting ‘[i]t is very important to me to point out that other young people are attracted to the musical ideas which are the basis of my music, like the constructive absolute, which I think I told you about before.’\textsuperscript{205} Goeyvaerts here appears to be hopefully generalising from a single young person, a feint he reveals through the conclusion of his letter: ‘Right now a Cologner with whom I agreed to have a drink might come knocking at any moment.’\textsuperscript{206} Certainly this excursion would have provided a welcome respite for Goeyvaerts, since he was somewhat unsatisfied with his lodging arrangements, as he admits to Greeve: ‘I’m sharing my room with a Swiss from Basel, who is a dodecaphonist ...’ \textsuperscript{207} It appears that Goeyvaerts’s impatience with his roommate Jacques Wildberger (who was indeed an avid dodecaphonist in 1951) was symptomatic of his opinions of the aesthetic sense of the courses.

\textsuperscript{201} Ibid, 44. Goeyvaerts claims he selected this piece, written three years prior, because Schoenberg ‘wanted to have a work for small ensemble performed.’

\textsuperscript{202} Ibid.

\textsuperscript{203} Ibid.

\textsuperscript{204} Iddon, *New Music at Darmstadt*, 26–27.

\textsuperscript{205} ‘Het is voor mij van heel grote betwening vast te stellen dat andere jongeren zich aangetrokken voelen tot de muzikale ideeën die aan de basis liggen van mijn muziek, zoals het absoluut constructivistische waarover ik u als eens gesproken heb, gelooft ik.’ Goeyvaerts to Mia Greeve, 2 July 1951; *Selbstlose Musik*, 296.

\textsuperscript{206} ‘Nu kan ieder ogenblik een Keulenaar komen aankloppen, waarmee ik afgesproken heb om samen te gaan souperen.’ Ibid.

\textsuperscript{207} ‘We hebben tweepersoonskamers; ik deel de mijne met een Zwitser uit Bazel, die dodecafonist is ...’ Ibid.
Pursuant to this, Goeyvaerts was further disappointed to find that, while apparently ‘serial thinking had caught on’ amongst the younger participants, the techniques of the Second Viennese School had largely been assimilated rather than expanded upon, and he ‘had little response to my ideas concerning ‘static music’, i.e. music conceived as a projection in time and space of a basic idea generating the structure.’

It would seem then that Wildberger (or, less immediately, his ilk) had as little time for Goeyvaerts’s compositional ideas as Goeyvaerts had for his. In a letter written to Jean Barraqué from ‘a table on the refectory terrace of the ‘Seminars [sic] Marienhöhe”, Goeyvaerts frames his annoyance in much the same way as his later autobiography: ‘From morning to evening there is discussion, we kill ourselves in German, English, or French. Everybody is serial and nobody understands anything of it. It is crazy that everyone occupies themselves with serial academicism.’

Tellingly, Goeyvaerts came to this grim verdict three days before the opening of the Second International Twelve-Tone Congress (II. Internationaler Zwölftonkongreß), which doubtless would have done little to improve his mood. Even the much-buzzed-about Luigi Nono (‘a name on everyone’s lips’) had not yet, according to Goeyvaerts, conceived of an organisation of music that exceeded basic dodecaphony. Goeyvaerts’s criticism of Nono here is remarkably similar to the later well-known criticisms of Stockhausen concerning Il canto sospeso: ‘He [Nono] was too bound up with the power of the text, too involved with semantic meaning, in short too attached to the extra-musical element a text represented.’

Curiously, and in seeming contradiction with the ambivalence towards his compositional ideas, Goeyvaerts recalls that in Darmstadt he ‘had the reputation of someone who knew a lot about Webern. Everybody wanted to learn about my analyses, but the problem was I had never clearly formulated them in the methodical way a German composer would have done.’

Taken at face value, this memory is perplexing on several grounds. First of all, virtually no German composer of Goeyvaerts’s generation had the opportunity to ‘formulate’ an analysis of Webern in 1951 – as mentioned above, Webern scores were practically non-existent in the years immediately following the war – so Goeyvaerts’s reference to a body of ‘methodical’ Germanic analyses of Webern is most likely recalling those made after the 1951
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209 ‘Du matin au soir on discute, on se tue en allemande, en anglais ou en français. Tout le monde est serial et personne n’eut rien compris. C’est fou comme le monde se remplit de sériels académiques.’ Goeyvaerts to Barraqué, 29 June 1951; Selbstlöse Musik, 282.
211 Ibid, 45.
Furthermore, if Goeyvaerts indeed had such a reputation in the Darmstadt of 1951, the source of such a reputation is far from obvious, since, as Goeyvaerts himself has noted, the courses were a fairly national and even provincial affair in 1951, and Goeyvaerts was one of the few non-German composers in attendance. Indeed, the fact that Goeyvaerts spoke very little German at the time must have considerably hampered his communication with the other participants, even assuming they were eager to learn about Webern. The one major figure at the courses who had prior personal contact with Goeyvaerts, and therefore had both the familiarity and the position to disseminate a reputation, was Herbert Eimert. As described above, Eimert’s experience with Goeyvaerts at the ISCM festival would certainly leave the impression that Goeyvaerts was an expert in Webern. It seems safe to conclude that, if Goeyvaerts’s reputation as a Webern expert preceded him in 1951, it was due to the influence of Eimert. That Stockhausen was indeed very eager to learn about Webern from Goeyvaerts is thoroughly and consistently attested in Stockhausen’s contemporary writings and correspondence. But it appears probable that such an eagerness was instilled in Stockhausen not by Goeyvaerts, but by Eimert.

In fact, Eimert’s institutional clout at the Ferienkurse in 1951 was such that he presented a joint lecture with the director of the courses, Wolfgang Steinecke, titled with characteristic portentousness ‘Is Music at an End? An Optimistic Meditation on Musical Limit-Situations’. The lecture is revealing to the extent that it provides a context and a theoretical precedent for the discursive positions Eimert would later use to foreground the young Darmstadt composers (although it is unclear to what extent Steinecke also contributed to this lecture). Eimert positions New Music as an ‘optimistic’ opposition to the ‘pessimistic’ narrative of ‘the last Romantics’, exemplified in Pfitzner, as well as the ‘turn to a classical austerity’ found in Stravinsky, Bartók, Hindemith, and Honegger. Later, in Steinecke’s words, the New Music is characterised – again using terms taken from Karl Jaspers – by Verbindlichkeit, which Eimert defines as both ‘objective legitimacy of expression and authenticity of form’.
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212 In all likelihood, Goeyvaerts is drawing on his personal experience of the Webern evening organised by Eimert.
213 ‘Ist die Musik am Ende? Eine optimistische Betrachtung über musikalische Grenzsituationen’, in Im Zenit der Moderne, III. 340–353. The key word ‘Grenzsituation’ hints at the philosophical debt this lecture owes to the work of philosopher Karl Jaspers. Elsewhere, Borio gives the date of this lecture as 1950, but this is surely a lapsus calami, since the lecture contains a recording of Nono’s Variazioni canoniche sulla serie dell’op. 41 di Arnold Schoenberg (1950) which was first performed at the conclusion of the 1950 courses (ibid, I.269).
214 Ibid, III. 341–342. Although Steinecke, perhaps playing the good cop, has some kind words for Palestrina (1917).
switching to a polemical mode, then tells his listeners: ‘You are now going to hear a series of examples, which represent such typical limit-situations in modern music. It is very extraordinary and extreme musical examples which we bring, they have no “reconciliation” and whoever has based his musical position purely on history, presumably without any inkling of our own historical catastrophe, will hear such music only with the gravest chagrin.’

Strikingly, the examples curated by Eimert are immediately recognizable as something very nearly approximating the canonic litany of the European avant-garde that one finds to this day in historical overviews: two pieces, *Intégrales* (1925) and *Ionisation* (1933), by Varèse, a piece by Goeyvaerts, *Le soleil des eaux* by Boulez, *Variazioni canoniche sulla serie dell'op. 41 di Arnold Schoenberg* (1950) by Nono, *Psyché* (1946) by Jolivet (the only example of dubious canonicity by modern standards), and, crucially, Webern’s *Piano Variations*, op. 27 (1936). It is essential to note that, while Varèse and Nono had previously attended the courses, all of the other music deployed by Eimert had, at best, a tenuous relationship to the institution of Darmstadt as it existed in 1951. While Webern’s *Piano Variations* were performed at the 1948 courses, the decision to use such a piece as a foundational criterion of New Music – especially Darmstadtian New Music – was a far from obvious one, since this performance was the only piece of Webern programmed in 1948, in contrast with 4 pieces by Schoenberg, 3 by Bartòk, Blacher, Milhaud and Honegger, and 10 by Hindemith (11 if one counts the new version of *Das Marienleben* (1936–1948), performed in addition to the 1922–1923 version). As such, Eimert here presents for the first time a template for the Darmstadt School: Boulez, Goeyvaerts, and Nono, with Varèse and Webern as their spiritual predecessors. Eimert’s curation in effect synthesizes a foundation myth for Darmstadt modernism predicated on Adornian/Leibowitzian historicism, a myth whose development was overseen by Eimert himself over the course of the following decade.

Eimert’s reading of New Music – since this talk is being given alongside the director of the Ferienkurse, this is undoubtedly institutional, ‘official’ New Music – inevitably reveals his preoccupation with his own historical status as a composer in post-war Germany. To this end, Varèse’s *Ionisation* is seen as a representation of modern warfare, and Eimert criticises the ‘ill-adjusted audience’ who, oblivious to this, greeted its performance the previous year in
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217 See *Im Zenit der Moderne*, III.527–532.
Darmstadt with jeers. Eimert’s reading of Webern is still more iconoclastic. Drawing on Mann’s *Doktor Faustus*, Eimert presents Webern’s work as a ‘taking-back’ (Zurücknahme) of nineteenth-century romanticism, in parallel with the Faustian composer Adrian Leverkühn’s desire to retract the finale of Beethoven’s Ninth Symphony. This retraction is at once metaphorical and literal: Eimert uses the conclusion of Leverkühn’s (fictional) cantata, where a high cello note is slowly and extremely quietly sustained before finally being overcome by silence, as a thematic analogy to Webern’s music, which ‘consists of naked row-skeletons and avoids all historical forms (such as fugue, canon, imitation, complimentary rhythms, etc.) Anton Webern,’ he concludes, ‘is a master of these history-less and abstract sound-forms, he has, so to speak, conceived – far beyond Schoenberg – twelve-tone music to its end.’ Furthermore, Eimert and Steinecke emphasise the hermetic quality of this music, the latter pointing out that, despite its small audience, Webern’s music is ‘more real’ than ‘Unterhaltungsmusik, which inundates humanity like lukewarm bathwater,’ and the film and radio music heard by millions. As with Varèse, Webern’s supposed inaccessibility to a wide public is positioned by Eimert and Steinecke as a crucial legitimizing facet of his music.

On the other hand, the younger generation are portrayed as stuck in a creative crisis, unsure of what should come after the Neoclassicism of Stravinsky and Hindemith (which recalls Eimert’s rejection of Stockhausen’s *Drei Lieder*). Three tentative paths forward are represented by Boulez, Goeyvaerts, and Nono. In Eimert and Steinecke’s reckoning, Boulez represents a sort of synthesis between Webern and Schoenberg in his vocal writing, while his use of timbre and rhythm are characteristic of ‘young French music’ under the influence of Olivier Messiaen. To further illustrate this influence, Eimert and Steinecke play a recording of Goeyvaerts’s *Tre lieder per sonare a venti sei*. Like Boulez, Goeyvaerts is presented as a member of the ‘young French school’ interested in the ‘previously unknown possibilities of
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218 Ibid, III.347–8. The trope of the misunderstood composer besieged by an ignorant public, would of course become one of the most familiar clichés of historical narratives of the post-war musical avant-garde.
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224 According to Borio and Danhauser, the portion of the lecture which names the piece by Goeyvaerts being played is missing, but from the context (e.g. the mention of the Ondes Martenot) it can be confidently asserted that the recording played is of the *Tre lieder*. See ibid, 352.
sound production’, which Steinecke connects back to Varèse. Revealingly, Goeyvaerts’s piece is here contrasted with the ‘strict twelve-tone work’ of Nono, with the suggestion that a synthesis between the two is the next necessary historical evolution in New Music: Goeyvaerts’s (and Varèse’s) timbral innovations lack a strong formal basis and Nono’s ‘completely new style’ is hindered by his ‘outdated orchestration’. Eimert and Steinecke’s blueprint laid out in this lecture would largely proceed as planned over the next decade at Kranichstein, with some reshuffling of the parts: Goeyvaerts would take Nono’s place as the ‘strict’ serialist and Nono would be presented as representing the sensitive, humanist dimension of the New Music. The synthesis Eimert and Steinecke describe was to be carried out by the composer who became metonymic with the Darmstädter Ferienkurse: Karlheinz Stockhausen.

Meanwhile, the acme of Goeyvaerts’s disappointment came with the music of the composer that brought him to Darmstadt in the first place. Schoenberg’s *The Dance of the Golden Calf*, an excerpt from the second act of the opera *Moses und Aron*, received its world premiere under the direction of Herman Scherchen on 2 July 1951. The performance was hailed as a spectacular success, as Scherchen’s report to Schoenberg indicates: ‘Without exception, ALL reviews I have seen so far basically expressed the same idea: that this was THE musical event.’ For Goeyvaerts, however, the piece was another ‘big disappointment’, representing a sort of creative bankruptcy. Writing thirty years after the fact, he declares ‘Schoenberg had done nothing about pushing seriality a stage further. Quite the contrary.’ Goeyvaerts’s anger at Schoenberg can indeed be felt in a letter describing the performance to Yvette Grimaud: ‘C’est du Verdi sériel’. But his reaction in 1951 does not precisely square with his recollection in 1988.

The Verdi quip has largely been read by historians as an example of a post-war composer acerbically dismissing musical tradition. But this reading, no doubt largely informed by Boulez’s later polemics and indeed supported by Goeyvaerts’s later autobiography, does not seem plausible in context. Goeyvaerts’s music prior to the Sonata was largely polytonal, and his
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227 Quoted in Carola Nielinger-Vakil, *Luigi Nono: A Composer in Context* (Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 2015), 90. Goeyvaerts was certainly less affected than Nono, who, if Scherchen’s word is to be trusted, burst into tears during the performance.  
229 Ibid, 46. ‘C’est du Verdi sériel!’ also appears in the letter to Barraqué from Darmstadt, and Goeyvaerts additionally describes the concert as ‘een sort dodecafonische Verdi!’ to Mia Greeve (2 July 1951), suggesting that Goeyvaerts regarded this quip highly enough to deploy it frequently. It also suggests that Goeyvaerts had formed his opinion from the rehearsals alone, since the letter to Barraqué predates the official premiere by three days. See Selbstlöse Musik, 284.
relationship to musical tradition was unstrained enough for him to speak approvingly of a
production of ‘my beloved Rosenkavalier’ he saw ‘twice within three days’. It must be
remembered that, despite Goeyvaerts’s observation that ‘serial thinking had caught on’, the
piece of his being performed on the official programme of the 1951 courses was in no sense a
serial work. Therefore, in all likelihood, Goeyvaerts’s remark was not chastising Schoenberg for
having recourse to Verdi. Rather, it was criticising his recourse to dodecaphony.

At any rate, Goeyvaerts now felt his aesthetic isolation to be complete; after his account
of the Schoenberg performance, he concluded that ‘one thing was abundantly clear, my Sonata
stood alone.’ Yet there was still a redeeming takeaway for Goeyvaerts’s 1951 Darmstadt
experience. In his letter to Barraqué, he mentions that despite his almost perpetual irritation at
the other participants, ‘to my great joy, I have met a young German who I will tell you more
about in Paris, who I found in a sort of despair at the recent evolution of Schoenberg and others
less talented, who no longer respond to the musical ethos today.’ It would appear that both
young composers sought to impress one another. In his autobiography, Goeyvaerts admits that
he ‘probably waxed too enthusiastic about my Paris circle, because Karlheinz became
convinced that all salvation could be expected from that quarter.’ For his part Stockhausen
seems to have told Goeyvaerts that he had studied Boulez’s Second Piano Sonata, which, since
the piece was unpublished and Stockhausen had never been outside of Germany at this point,
would have been nearly impossible – the only reasonable possibility being the interception of
Eimert. However, considering the disparity in both age (Stockhausen was five years younger
than Goeyvaerts) and experience, Stockhausen’s misrepresentation of his exposure to New
Music is certainly understandable, and even sympathetic.

Posturing aside, it is clear that both Stockhausen and Goeyvaerts felt a fundamental
artistic connection and unity of purpose. Despite the language barrier (recall Goeyvaerts’s
earlier remark about making do with German, English and French), Stockhausen ‘understood
immediately’ both the aesthetic significance and, as a fellow Roman Catholic, the spiritual
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232 ‘Mais j’ai eu la grande joie de faire la conterte d’une jeune Allemand dont je te reparlerai à près et qui j’ai
trouvé dans une sorte d’angoisse devant l’évolution récente Schönberg et d’autres moins géniales, qui ne répond
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essayé d’analyser.’ Goeyvaerts to Barraqué, 29 June 1951.
dimension of Goeyvaerts’s new conception of music. As Goeyvaerts describes it to Barraqué: ‘After a conversation which went to the heart of things, I knew he had experienced the joy of a deliverance; moreover, I have enriched myself with the ideas that this conversation has awakened in me. Since then we have been inseparable, so that we are already the cause of certain murmurings.’ To Barraqué, at least, Goeyvaerts was careful to pre-empt such murmurings: ‘I assure you that this is all infinitely purer, more profound, and less romantic than it appears. [...] But music has never passed through a stage which is more beautiful, more complete, more absolute than now.

While Stockhausen seemingly shared Goeyvaerts’s low opinion of the music being performed at Darmstadt, the courses were not entirely without inspiration. French critic and musicologist Antoine Goléa gave a lecture entitled ‘The Situation of New Music in France’ on 26 June, in which he played recordings of Honegger’s Fifth Symphony (1950), Jolivet’s Piano Concerto (1949–1950), and Messiaen’s Quatre études de rythme, performed by the composer. This latter piece contains, of course, ‘Mode de valeurs et d’intensités’, which treats pitch, dynamic, duration, and articulation as separable parameters. Both Stockhausen and Goeyvaerts had no knowledge of the piece (Goeyvaerts says that Messiaen had made no mention of it in any of his lectures) and were so enraptured with it that they approached Goléa after the lecture and asked to hear the recording multiple times, by Goléa’s later reckoning, about thirty. The composers noted the similarity between this piece and Goeyvaerts’s Sonata, with Stockhausen describing it as ‘fantastic music of the stars’. It should be noted again, however, that the recording that Goléa had was of Messiaen himself playing the piece heavily pedalled, with a gradually unfolding, rather than traditionally ‘pointillist’, texture. Yet between Messiaen’s ‘Mode’ and Goeyvaerts’s Sonata, Stockhausen experienced a remarkably

236 ‘Après une conversation, qui est allé jusqu’au fond même des choses, la joie d’une délivrance; moi du reste aussi je me suis enrichi par les pensés que cette conversation a fait surgir en moi et depuis ce ment-là nos ne nous quittons plus de sorte que nous sommes déjà l’objet de certains chuchotements.’ Goeyvaerts to Barraqué, 29 June 1951.
237 ‘Je t’assure que tout cela est infiniment plus pur, plus profond et moins romantique (!) que ça en a l’air. [...] Mais la musique n’a jamais passé par un stade plus beau, plus complet, plus absolu que maintenant.’ Ibid (exclamation point Goeyvaerts’s).
238 Ibid. Iddon characterizes this recollection (most likely correctly) as ‘almost certainly exaggerated’.
240 Again, see Hill, Messiaen Recorded, 85–90.
abrupt conversion to an entirely new conception of musical thought and, fatefully, soon had an opportunity to publicly defend this ‘music of the stars’ with Pauline fervour.

**Adorno Contra Goeyvaerts, or, Dead End / Way Out ‘51**

Near the conclusion of the 1951 courses, Goeyvaerts and Stockhausen performed the second movement of the Sonata for two pianos at Adorno’s composition seminar. There had previously been a ‘long discussion’ of the piece in Fortner’s course on 29 June. This discussion seems to have gone smoothly, and Goeyvaerts tells Barraqué that he came out of it something of a celebrity: ‘Everybody is talking about it now; the journalists approach me asking for interviews, photos, etc. In sum, a lot of nonsense!’

Goeyvaerts, then, had every reason to approach the performance in Adorno’s seminar with confidence.

The actual planning for the performance of the Sonata must of necessity have been a relatively last-minute affair since there was no place for rehearsals allotted on the official course programme, although Goeyvaerts may well have arrived in Darmstadt with the intention of recruiting another pianist to perform it with him. If this was the case, he could hardly have hoped for anything better than what he found. According to Goeyvaerts, Stockhausen knew the piece ‘inside out’ before the performance and discussion, and this can be verified both by Stockhausen’s impassioned defence of the piece and his surprisingly accurate performance of it, especially considering that he had, at most, a week to learn it. Unlike the Messiaen recording, the performance given by Goeyvaerts and Stockhausen is immediately recognizable (at least on a retrospective hearing) as what would come to be known as ‘point’ music: each sound event is discretely articulated and maximally differentiated, creating an extreme lack of continuity which contributes to an experience of something close to stasis.

In hindsight, it is tempting to suggest that precisely the audible result of the piece is what caused the diametrically opposite receptions of Goeyvaerts’s Sonata in Fortner’s and Adorno’s seminars. On the page, the Sonata does not look terribly different from a wide variety of modernist repertoire, especially if, as had been done in Fortner’s class, the outer two movements are considered along with the central ones. Indeed, Goeyvaerts’s use of an ‘irrational’ form of loose dodecaphony for the outer movements results in a music which
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242 ‘Tout le monde en parle maintenant; les journalistes viennent me prendre des interviews, des photos, etc. Enfin, un tas de bêtises!’ Goeyvaerts to Barraqué, 29 June 1951.
appears quite similar, perhaps even more extroverted, to that of Fortner himself. But Goeyvaerts and Stockhausen only played the second movement in Adorno’s seminar, which Goeyvaerts himself describes as ‘the thinnest of the four movements’. Furthermore, they played it in a manner in which little piano music – least of all that of Webern – had ever been played before.

After the performance and a short analysis given by Goeyvaerts, an obviously bewildered Adorno started discussion with the question ‘why did you write that for two pianos?’ At this, Goeyvaerts recalls, ‘the group of participants dissolved in laughter,’ which ‘made me lose my concentration.’ Between this and the task of formulating an answer in German, Goeyvaerts appears to have been unable to properly articulate his aesthetic reasoning, prompting Stockhausen to step in on his behalf.

Historiographically speaking, Stockhausen’s intervention is a seminal narrative moment. It represents the first emergence of Stockhausen as visionary and, concomitantly, the gradual subsumption of Goeyvaerts’s aesthetic thought into his own. Indeed, Stockhausen’s intercession is an occasion for historians (in particular, Stockhausen biographers) to present him as the first harbinger of a totally new conception of music in emotional, even heroic terms. Kurtz’s treatment is illustrative in this respect: ‘Goeyvaerts, with his shaky grasp of German, felt insecure. Then Stockhausen stood up, quiet and confident, and gave a lucid analysis of the second movement, which was coolly received by Adorno.’

Yet Kurtz’s David-and-Goliath treatment of this encounter ultimately rings true, despite his decision, so to speak, to focus on the wrong David. Most significantly, Kurtz emphasizes that Adorno himself was hardly the mostly likely candidate to be bewildered by a piece of modern music. On the contrary, he was a ‘representative of twelve-note music, which he was putting forward in Darmstadt as the latest musical development’. Adorno’s position then becomes understandable, if not sympathetic: having asserted himself as an apostle of musical modernity, he was here confronted with a music which confounded every aesthetic formulation of modernity that he had previously known while appearing to make claims on precisely the sort of progressive domination of musical material that he had theorized. Furthermore, Adorno’s own authority on New Music was subverted by being ‘faced with an unknown young student
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from Cologne whose polite but firm reply to all his objections was, “Professor, you are looking for a chicken in an abstract painting.” Adorno clearly got more than he bargained for.

Goeyvaerts’s recollection of a largely hostile and mocking reception to his ideas – a recollection supported through implication in the biographies of Stockhausen – is contrary to Mark Delaere’s account of the performance as ‘being perceived by most of the seminar participants […] to be a completely new and most promising development in composition.’ It is true that at least one of the seminar participants besides Stockhausen took the piece seriously. Antoine Goléa, who was familiar with and supportive of Goeyvaerts in Paris, introduces the piece as a composition ‘which lies at the most extreme point of what is theoretically and practically conceivable.’ His review goes on: ‘Rules applied here with iron rigour and extreme consistency lend the music a status of world affairs, the eternal properties of which bear comparison with the precession of the stars. That Adorno himself shied away, and at the same time admitted that this musical flow became suddenly “comprehensible”, is not least characteristic of the icy-hot, angelic horror of this music.’ Goléa’s description of the Sonata appears to be largely informed by his other experience with the two young composers at the courses, and the stellar imagery in particular is surely taken directly from Stockhausen’s rapturous description of Messiaen’s ‘Mode’. What Goléa has added to Stockhausen’s description is the sense of extremity and finality he finds in this music. It is precisely this extremity, Goléa suggests, that caused Adorno to ‘shy away.’ This frames Goeyvaerts’s Sonata in much the same way that Messiaen framed his ‘Mode’: as an experiment of the most rigid and metaphysically wrought control, a framing that, considering he possessed the recording of Messiaen performing the Quatre études before it was given an official release, Goléa might well have been familiar with. But such a framing equates Messiaen’s perspective with that of Goeyvaerts, who saw things quite differently: while Messiaen indeed considered his ‘Mode’ to be a self-contained experiment, Goeyvaerts felt such an experiment to be not an end point but a new beginning (as his later re-titling of the Sonata as Nummer 1 most obviously attests). It therefore seems likely that at this point, as Goeyvaerts says, only Stockhausen viewed such
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techniques of ‘iron rigour and extreme consistency’ to be a ‘most promising development in composition’.

This conclusion is supported by the only other press account of the performance, written by Ruth Rehmann, a student at the courses. Rehmann’s account also contains the same emphasis on the ultimate extremity of this music that Goléa’s does: ‘Beyond the others, the Belgian Karel Goeyvaerts weaves his ideas of an equilibrium of pitches, expressed through numbers, which create an impression of a static music and lead, followed through to the logical conclusion, to an annihilation of pitch, to silence.’\(^{251}\) This description additionally appears to conflate ideas articulated by Goeyvaerts (and/or Stockhausen) with those that must have come, at least primarily, from Adorno. The concept of static music and synthetic number (which is certainly what the ‘equilibrium of pitches, expressed through number’ is referring to) are indeed central to both the poietic process and the aesthetic thinking behind the *Sonata*. But any sort of ‘logical conclusion’ from these methods, let alone one resulting in the absolute negation of sound, would certainly not have been proposed by Goeyvaerts or Stockhausen. Such a conclusion, however, would fit very neatly with what is known of Adorno’s philosophical understanding of the piece. Writing six years after the fact, Heinz-Klaus Metzger, who was also participating in the workshop and present for the performance, recalls that Adorno ‘insisted’ that Goeyvaerts was an existentialist, ‘something the latter violently denied.’\(^{252}\) It is precisely this ‘annihilation’, then, that was the hermeneutic point of contention between the two, with Adorno’s materialist reading of the *Sonata* being incompatible, at least in terms of ideology, with Goeyvaerts’s transcendental poiesis.\(^{253}\)

In fact, this was not the first time in the 1951 courses that such an ‘extinguishing’ of sound was presented as the logical conclusion to a particular avant-garde musical praxis. Eimert’s interpretation of Webern’s Piano Variations, described in detail above, concerns precisely such a phenomenological and theoretical finality construed in musical terms. Even more pointedly, Eimert’s likening of Webern to the Faustian composer Adrian Leverkühn is directly complimentary to Adorno’s quip that the two young composers he engaged in argument with


\(^{253}\) It may be remarked as an aside that there is a strong historical precedent for critics describing a new style of music as a self-annihilation, dating back at least to Alexandre Oulibicheff’s contention that Beethoven’s late quartets were ‘the negation of music itself.’ (Beethoven, ses critiques et ses glossateurs, 1857).
were simply ‘Adrian Leverkühn und sein Famulus.’\textsuperscript{254} When one considers that Adorno was in fact Mann’s primary consultant on the compositional character of Adrian Leverkühn, it becomes clear just how singular the discourse for an institutional understanding of New Music was at this point.

Regardless, Adorno’s misunderstanding is fundamental. As Iddon points out, ‘there is little in Adorno’s later writing – and he returns to this event repeatedly – to suggest that he ever truly “comprehended” what Goeyvaerts was trying to do. Nonetheless, over a period of ten years, he would seemingly find it difficult to view anything else as paradigmatic of the sorts of constructivist trends he saw in the new music.’\textsuperscript{255} Adorno’s evident and long-lasting bewilderment at the piece is especially notable when one considers that there was hardly a more prominent authority on modern music, and especially the music of the Second Viennese School, to be found in 1951. As it happened, Adorno had given the concluding talk of the Second International Twelve-tone Congress on the subject of Anton Webern just a few days prior.\textsuperscript{256} Certainly Adorno’s knowledge of Webern at this time would have far exceeded that of either Goeyvaerts or Stockhausen. If the Sonata was the logical pursuit of a structural ideal found in the mature work of Anton Webern, why didn’t Adorno recognize it? More to the point, why didn’t Goeyvaerts or Stockhausen explain the piece to Adorno with reference to Webern? Yet none of the accounts of this fateful encounter make reference to the composer who would subsequently be positioned as the sole historical precedent for the post-war avant-garde.

In fact, it seems as if Adorno was himself inviting just such a Webernian exegesis of the work, repeatedly asking where the antecedent and consequent phrases of the piece were. But it was precisely this question which was met with Stockhausen’s famous riposte. Seen in this light, the encounter between Goeyvaerts/Stockhausen and Adorno gains an additional significance, one that has generally gone unremarked by musicologists: it was the first, and arguably only event where members of the so-called Darmstadt School explicating their aesthetic concerns and compositional process without – or at least with minimal – institutional mediation. That neither Goeyvaerts nor Stockhausen made mention of the one composer who would later be depicted as the lodestar of the post-war avant-garde speaks to the fact that the Webernian

\textsuperscript{255} Iddon, New Music at Darmstadt, 59.
\textsuperscript{256} On 4 July 1951, at 3:00pm (\textit{Im Zenit der Moderne}, III.548).
legacy was largely a retroactive concern, and, perhaps more importantly, one imposed primarily by established cultural gatekeepers, rather than the young composers themselves.

The experience, of course, was also epochal for Stockhausen. Asked by an interviewer in 1971 why his music does not give ‘an impression of one thing following another to some purpose,’ Stockhausen falls back on his defence of Goeyvaerts, a response worth quoting in full because of the remarkable similarity to the answer he must have given to Adorno two decades previously. Stockhausen positions his music against a far-reaching historical tradition of Western art music preoccupied with ‘variation’, the same ‘principle’ that Adorno used to argue for Schoenberg’s historical legitimacy over Hauer:

You are used to figurative music, and you follow transformations of a theme or a motif as you follow a figure in a drama. Whereas in music since 1950 – and here Webern is one of the most important forerunners of this new spirit – it is not so much the figures you follow as the way the forces appear. As I said in 1951, the whole tradition of Western music is based on the principle that in a given composition the same figures are shown in different aspects, that is variation technique, development technique. The new spirit that I have mainly brought about is just the opposite. It brings music into the mainstream of abstract art.257

It is significant (although understandable, since Goeyvaerts had been absent from the musical world for over a decade when the interview was given) that Stockhausen has now reframed his response as a self-defence, where it was originally given in support of his older colleague.

The eclipsing of Goeyvaerts achieved in this response (where it is now Stockhausen who ‘mainly brought about’ a newly abstracted compositional paradigm) is now part of the dominant narrative of twentieth-century music history. For example, Taruskin frames Stockhausen’s riposte to Adorno as simply pertaining to ‘an embryonic total-serial piece that another student had submitted.’258 Such an eclipse is, in hindsight, seemingly justified, since Stockhausen’s international career exploded the following year and he remained a powerful figure in New Music until his death, while Goeyvaerts took an indefinite leave of absence from musical life in toto less than ten years later.

But there was little to suggest this course of events in July 1951. Goeyvaerts notes with satisfaction that ‘from that moment on, me and Stockhausen were ‘Adrian Leverkühn und sein

258 Taruskin, V.45.
Famulus’ in Adorno’s look. This satisfaction is no doubt tied to the fact that, as Iddon notes, at this point in time Goeyvaerts was the Faustian composer and Stockhausen the exegete. Stockhausen himself was well aware of the disparity of both age and experience in 1951, and seems to be genuinely enthusiastic and flattered about the idea of being a disciple, writing to Goeyvaerts soon after the courses that henceforth he would only mention Goeyvaerts’s name.

Kreuzspiel: Composition and Environs

Stockhausen’s encounter with Goeyvaerts bore rapid results. By the end of the 1951 Darmstädter Ferienkurse, he had already made his first sketches of what was to become Kreuzspiel. These first sketches refer to the register structure of the piece – delimiting the seven octaves between A₂ and a⁴ – a formal stratagem taken directly from Goeyvaerts’s Sonata. Slightly over a month later, Stockhausen had completed ‘the first sketches of the entire form’ while living with the parents of his later wife Doris Andreae in Hamburg.

From the early development of Kreuzspiel, it is clear that form of the piece – the same protracted cross of multiple parameters found in the central movements of the Sonata – was a far higher compositional priority for Stockhausen than its practical execution and instrumentation. The first mention Stockhausen makes of potential instrumentation, in a letter to Goeyvaerts on 10 August 1951, refers to ‘a high voice and piano’. One month later, this had changed to ‘still a male voice… and a percussionist’. It appears that Stockhausen did not concretely settle on the instrumentation of Kreuzspiel until just after he had completed his final exams in Cologne in mid-October.

In hindsight, this appears to be more or less the standard operating procedure for Stockhausen. Kurtz goes so far as to position the composition of Kreuzspiel as a sort of template, providing ‘a good example of the way Stockhausen’s works often [sic] come into being. At the
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260 Iddon, New Music at Darmstadt, 57.
261 Ibid.
262 Blümroder, 44. Blümroder traces the conception of Kreuzspiel directly to the end of the 1951 courses on 10 July.
263 Ibid, note 37.
264 Ibid.
265 ‘für hohe Stimme und Klavier’. Quoted in ibid.
266 ‘noch eine Männerstimme… und einen Schlagzeuger’. Stockhausen to Goeyvaerts, 13 September 1951. Quoted in ibid.
267 Stockhausen’s exams were from 13 to 19 October; he writes to Goeyvaerts on 22 October that he has begun composition on Kreuzspiel (ibid).
start the idea for the piece is like a vision, its processes grasped only in an intuitive way. Then it is sketched out, often undergoing minor transformations of detail. Disregarding that instrumentation in toto is perhaps more than a ‘minor transformation of detail’, Kurtz’s observation is largely applicable to Stockhausen’s compositional process for his mature career. Indeed, the ‘formula composition’ which explicitly occupied Stockhausen from Mantra (1970) until his final works (the last nine hours of KLANG, 2006–2007), delimits a creative process largely identifiable with that undertaken in Kreuzspiel: beginning with a single, unifying conception of the entire piece (or series of pieces) and continuing on through increasingly differentiated details until the creation of a final performance score. But it must be forcefully maintained that nothing Stockhausen had written prior to Kreuzpiel gives any suggestion of such a compositional process – this was something very new for Stockhausen.

Goeyvaerts too experienced a great creative momentum after the 1951 courses, but with rather more frustrated results. His hopes of having Yvonne Loriod perform the Sonata, expressed enthusiastically in a letter to Stockhausen on 18 July 1951, were dashed one week later by her pretensions (according to Goeyvaerts) of being a ‘great pianist’ unworthy of the endeavour. Although he secured a radio performance of the piece by Yvette Grimaud and Claude Helffer, Goeyvaerts was clearly stung, and Messiaen’s coolly diplomatic response to both the Sonata and his own ‘Mode’ did not improve matters (‘I have found Messiaen in a very unfortunate, complicated condition’). Nevertheless, Goeyvaerts pressed on with the composition of his next work, Opus 2 for 13 instruments, which was to leave the Sonata in the dust (‘The Sonata now appears so crude and primitive to me...’). Goeyvaerts goes on to describe the various formal procedures he is deploying – all familiar from Sabbe’s inventory – to his new friend, drawing special attention to the increased structural emphasis placed on the fulcrum in the centre of the piece, which Goeyvaerts compares to the ‘death mirror’ in Jean Cocteau’s Orphée (1950).

268 Kurtz, Stockhausen, 40.
269 Goeyverts to Stockhausen, 18 July 1951; Selbstlose Musik, 301.
270 Goeyvaerts to Stockhausen, 26 July 1951; ibid. Goeyvaerts’s characterization of Loriod as an insufferable diva is remarkably consistent: in his memoir, written thirty years later, he recalls her ‘ordering oysters and an expensive fish dish’ at a café meeting with him, Messiaen, and Stockhausen, which put an almost insurmountable strain on Stockhausen and his finances; see Goeyvaerts ‘Paris – Darmstadt’, 49.
272 ‘Die Sonate scheint mir jetzt so roh und primitiv...’ Ibid.
During the composition of *Kreuzspiel*, Stockhausen increasingly attached himself to the network encompassing Goeyvaerts’s practice, receiving and exchanging texts, scores, books, ideas, and techniques. For all participants, Stockhausen was clearly the eager apprentice. Goeyvaerts treated him with both professional, artistic, and pastoral care, and Stockhausen responded enthusiastically in his role as a novice (in an answer to Goeyvaerts’s criticism, he writes: ‘I am still terribly small and still must learn much!’). However, since Goeyvaerts had now left Paris, this network was now decentralised, forcing Goeyvaerts to write to Barraqué asking for a piano reduction of Stravinsky’s *Sacre* and a score of Webern’s Piano Variations, op 27. For his part, Stockhausen sent Goeyvaerts copies of Adorno’s *Philosophie der neuen Musik* and Hesse’s *Glasperlenspiel*.

This initiation was at once aesthetic, technical, geographic, social, and professional. Coincident with the composition of *Kreuzspiel*, Stockhausen prepared a move to Paris to continue his studies with Milhaud and Messiaen. Goeyvaerts passed on his contacts and prejudices of the Parisian music community (clearing up an understandable misconception, he writes with reference to *Glasperlenspiel*, ‘Yvette is not Yvonne Loriod, but Yvette Grimaud. Loriod is a pianist of the feuilleton era!’). He also gave Stockhausen extensive assistance in mundane matters such as enrolment procedures and fees for the Cité Universitaire, housing in Paris, train times, and French-German translations. And, most significantly, Goeyvaerts entrusts Stockhausen to Barraqué’s care in explicitly paternal terms: ‘He is someone who will not disappoint your character as a musician. I am proud to say that he is my spiritual son.’

Maconie describes the situation which greeted Stockhausen in Paris upon his arrival in January 1952 thus: ‘Schaeffner, agent provocateur for musique concrete, proclaiming the dawn of a new era of tape music; […] Leibowitz, resisting any challenge to his newly won authority as keeper of the serial keys; Messiaen, welcoming every new development and thereby innocently wreaking havoc among the established as well as the new conventions of musical order; and Boulez, wearing the colours of total predetermination, in the midst of the fracas lashing out at
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274 Goeyvaerts recalls that Stockhausen ‘spoke to me confidentially of his fear of psychiatric illness’ on a visit to Antwerp; see Goeyvaerts, ‘Paris – Darmstadt’, 48.

275 ‘Ich bin noch arg klein und muss noch viel lernen!’ Stockhausen to Goeyvaerts, 30 April 1952. See *Selbstlose Musik*, 326–327.


all and sundry.” This sympathetically energetic description, however, appears to provide less
a sense of what might have excited Stockhausen than what excites a Stockhausen biographer.
At this point, the only figures Stockhausen had expressed interest in were Messiaen and
Milhaud.

While Stockhausen gave up on Milhaud immediately (telling Goeyvaerts ‘Der redet nur
Quatsch’ after his first lesson), Messiaen’s classes aligned well with his plans for
compositional apprenticeship, particularly through the three concepts mentioned previously:
the law of attack-duration relations, rhythmic characters, and nonretrogradable rhythms.
Blumröder quotes an extended passage of Stockhausen’s notes from the period which very
neatly agree with a detailed exegesis of the monnayage technique, distinguishing perceptions of
time-duration of attacks separated by rests. Combined with what he had learned from
Goeyvaerts, Stockhausen had now begun to establish a consistent and wide-ranging
compositional practice.

*Kreuzspiel: Analysis and Metaphysics*

The affinities between *Kreuzspiel* and Goeyvaerts’s Sonata have been systematically
documented by Herman Sabbe, to the point where any discussion of influence (or the anxiety
thereof) can be little more than a summary of the more salient points from Sabbe’s analysis. It is, however, worthwhile to note the rather peculiar contexts of this study. On a bibliographical
level, the text is deeply confusing. It is published in volume 19 of *Musik-Konzepte*, given the title
*Karlheinz Stockhausen: …wie die Zeit verging…*, which comprises a two-page ‘Editorial’ by editors
Heinz-Klaus Metzger and Rainer Riehn, Sabbe’s ninety-page article ‘Die Einheit der
Stockhausen-Zeit: Neue Erkenntnismöglichkeit der seriellen Entwicklung anhand des frühen
Wirkens von Stockhausen und Goeyvaerts. Dargestellt aufgrund der Briefe Stockhausens an
Goeyvaerts.’, and nothing else. This makes citation largely a matter of conjecture, convenience,

280 Blümroder, 43. See especially note 7, ‘D i f f e r e n z e n zwischen Länge und Zeitdauer von Schlägen oder
Tönen warden durch P a u s e n ausgedrückt’ [formatting sic].
281 Sabbe, ‘Die Einheit der Stockhausen-Zeit: Neue Erkenntnismöglichkeit der seriellen Entwicklung anhand des frühen
Wirkens von Stockhausen und Goeyvaerts. Dargestellt aufgrund der Briefe Stockhausens an
precedent, and good faith;\textsuperscript{282} most often, Sabbe’s text is referred to simply as \textit{...wie die Zeit verging...}, although it is fairly certain that this is not the title Sabbe has given it and instead refers to the full nineteenth volume of \textit{Musik-Konzepte}.\textsuperscript{283} Furthermore, significant portions of Sabbe’s text present in \textit{Musik-Konzepte} comprises re-worked and summarized material taken from the much more exhaustive doctoral study undertaken by Sabbe published in Dutch in 1977, which Sabbe repeatedly refers to in the text.\textsuperscript{284} More broadly, the \textit{Musik-Konzepte} text recapitulates analyses and aesthetic arguments that Sabbe had been published for almost a decade prior.\textsuperscript{285}

As it stands, \textit{...wie die Zeit verging...} is something of a musicological Trojan horse, presenting itself as a Stockhausen monograph yet treating its ostensive subject largely as an epiphenomenon of Karel Goeyvaerts’s compositional practice. Indeed, Sabbe is hardly ambiguous in stating his case. The study commences with a description of Goeyvaerts’s work from roughly 1950 to 1957 (summarized from Sabbe’s doctorate) and its ideological/metaphysical underpinnings (in a section somewhat misleadingly titled ‘Aspects of Historical Reception in Goeyvaerts’s Thought’).\textsuperscript{286} For Sabbe’s argument, this is more than contextual preparation, and \textit{Kreuzspiel} is introduced as a collaborative effort between Stockhausen and Goeyvaerts, even, by extension, a satellite work of Goeyvaerts’s already established practice. In Sabbe’s telling, Goeyvaerts essentially acted as an aesthetic midwife for the piece, steering his younger friend away from his original conception – \textit{Mosaic}, scored for high voice and piano, a title which Goeyvaerts felt suggested a fragmentation rather than the essential unity of form – towards the piece’s present title.\textsuperscript{287} On a more practical level, Goeyvaerts directed Stockhausen through various revisions of orchestration, first expanding the forces to ‘high voice, male voice, piano, and percussion’, before finally convincing Stockhausen to replace the two vocal parts with, respectively, oboe

\begin{itemize}
\item \textsuperscript{282} It may be conceded in passing that citational practice is rarely otherwise.
\item \textsuperscript{283} This is how it is cited in Iddon, \textit{New Music at Darmstadt}, 318; Delaere hedges his bets with ‘\textit{...wie die Zeit verging... Die Einheit der Stockhausen-Zeit’} (see Delaere, ‘The Stockhausen-Goeyvaerts Correspondence and the Aesthetic Foundations of Serialism in the Early 1950s, in \textit{The Musical Legacy of Karlheinz Stockhausen: Looking Back and Forward}, ed. M.J. Grant and Imke Misch (Hofheim: Wolke, 2016), 34. Oddly, in Sabbe’s final piece of Goeyvaerts advocacy, the text is cited as ‘\textit{Stockhausen – Wie die Zeit verging’}; see ’Karel Goeyvaerts: More Than a Footnote to the Book of Music’, in \textit{Rewriting Recent Music History}, 67.
\item \textsuperscript{284} Herman Sabbe, \textit{Het muzikale serialisme als techniek en als denkmethode} (Ghent: Rijksuniversiteit Gent, 1977). Sabbe would draw on this study, in a more piecemeal fashion than in \textit{Musik-Konzepte}, in much of his later articles on Goeyvaerts; an English translation of the first few sections has been published as ‘Goeyvaerts and the Beginnings of “Punctual” Serialism and Electronic Music’ (op. cit.).
\item \textsuperscript{286} Sabbe, ‘Einheit’, 7–18.
\item \textsuperscript{287} Ibid, 18.
\end{itemize}
and bass clarinet. Indeed, the letters exchanged between Stockhausen and Goeyvaerts during the composition of *Kreuzspiel* reveal something very near a master/apprentice relationship, with Goeyvaerts instructing his younger friend in both the aesthetic, theological, and ethical dimensions of this new compositional practice as well as technical advice on notation and performance convention which are plainly pedagogical in tone (‘Indication of metre throughout (even if this gives a false representation of rhythm) is essential for a good performance (e.g.: piano part in III!)’). These ideological discussions, while also clearly instructional in tone and intent, relate more directly to the rich specificity of the compositional practice now shared by the two composers, and outline ideas that both Stockhausen and Goeyvaerts would repeatedly turn to in their later writing. Prompted by Stockhausen’s mention of ‘longing for the timeless’, Goeyvaerts elaborates a remarkably concise theory of art and theological truth:

> The conservatism of Catholic culture goes much further than hierarchical ordinance: development is expression of the human spirit. We are arrested (clamped down) with our thoughts and always await a perceptible (by the intellect) actualisation of the miraculous. The more we cling tight to our thoughts, the more we actualise our own human nature and therefore stand further from God. To me this seems to be the essence of the individualism developing since the Renaissance. The truth, the absolute, exists outside of time; the Zeitgeist is only an encounter of truth by the time-bound creature. There is art only where truth has come to expression, and the manner in which it came to expression is quite secondary and bound to the temporal experience of truth.

While there is much to unpack here, Goeyvaerts’s primary contention is fairly clear: artistic production can only occur in service of an atemporal, theological truth value. The role of the artist is first and foremost to remove themselves from the galleys of human development and
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288 Ibid, 18–19.
289 ‘Eine durchgehend metrische Notation (auch wenn diese vom Rhythmus eine falsche Vorstellung gibt) ist für eine gute Aufführung notwendig (z.B.: Klavierstimme in III!).’ Goeyvaerts to Stockhausen, 28 November 1951; see Selbstlose Musik, 312.
perceive the absolute – here identified with the distinctly non-Hegelian ‘miraculous’ – and then, as if an afterthought, assemble the technical means to instantiate some part of this absolute within a human time scale. The hierarchicalizing impulse of Catholicism (or, at least, Goeyvaerts’s neo-Platonic conception of Catholicism) provides the template for this mediation between the absolute and the timely. Accordingly, Goeyvaerts provides a schematic delineating three levels of musical composition. The top level is ‘absolute “Being”, immobile’; beneath it are the global structure of the composition and, finally, the actual composition as it exists as both score and performance. In composing Kreuzspiel first as ideal form – particularly the same ideal form developed by Goeyvaerts in his Sonata – and only latterly as concrete instantiation (e.g. instrumentation), Stockhausen appears to be following this scheme closely.

Needless to say, this understanding of art and history is almost wholly irreconcilable with the institutional discourse of New Music as it was articulated in the years after World War II. Not only is musical material, as a particular ‘manner in which truth comes to expression’, of only epiphenomenal significance, but historical development and human subjectivity are themselves inimical to the existence of true art. Nothing could be more supremely undialectical than the theological Absolute of Goeyvaerts’s model. Jan Christiaens proposes a kinship between this model and Heidegger’s ‘Der Ursprung des Kunstwerk’, which is appealing not least in that it explains why Adorno may have initially pegged Goeyvaerts as an existentialist. However, it threatens to elide the particularly Catholic dimension of this practice, which is crucial to its working out through a set of compositional techniques and formal procedures. In truth, Goeyvaerts’s formulation does little more than provide a universal theological scaffolding for the techniques developed by Messiaen, the Ars Nova composers, and Anton Webern – it can be effectively read as an ambitious exegesis on the fleeting mention from Messiaen’s Technique of ‘the truths of our Catholic faith’. Within this model, then, Webern is simply another technical instantiation of a timeless theological truth articulated through structured sound. Like Messiaen or Machaut, Webern is simply an avatar for an extra-human Absolute. Unlike the Webern of Adorno and Leibowitz – a figure of intimidating futurity – this Webern is significant precisely because he is untimely, because he has abjured history in favour of eternity. It is not surprising, then, that despite the devoted interest paid to Webern’s scores

291 Jan Christiaens, “‘Absolute Purity Projected into Sound”: Goeyvaerts, Heidegger, and Early Serialism’, Perspectives of New Music, 41.1 (2003), 170.
292 Ibid.
by Barraqué, Goeyvaerts, and, latterly, Stockhausen, they gave no attention whatsoever to his biography or writings.

If any doubt yet remained on the technical provenance of *Kreuzspiel*, Sabbe provides an itemized inventory of ‘shared innovation features between *Kreuzspiel* and *Nummer 1* and/or *Opus 2* by Goeyvaerts’, which, in its indefatigable comprehensiveness, is worth quoting in full:

- ‘Pre-compositional’ multiserial organisation of materials and parametric binding of serially-ordered dimensions.
- Methodical integration of silences, alongside sound-values, in the time-duration-organisation.
- Division of the serialised pitch-total into symmetrical halves (Hexa- and Heptachords, respectively).
- Serialisation of octave placement (register). Binding of particular registers with particular instruments. Corresponding limitation of the range of instruments used and manufacture of a pitch- and timbre-continuum. Accordingly, also partial alignment of the piano part to the melodies of the instrumental parts (left and right hand one voice each).
- Permutation of the pitch-totals and registers through systematic exchange between the two halves of the series and the respective halves of the register-totals. (These double-fanned, crossing rotations around a single axis are related to Messiaen’s ‘permutation en éventail’, but not identical to it).
- Wedding of the formal categories of discontinuity (through individual determination of individual sounds) and continuity in the sense of continuous equilibrium of the rate of change (through gradual transformations from one state to the other).
- Employment of the cross-structure and its different aspects on different levels (section, part, entire work) [n.b. this directly corresponds to the division of ‘global’, ‘macro-’, and ‘microstructure’ in the above discussion of Goeyvaerts’s Sonata]: convergence-divergence, retrograde, exchange. Emphasis on the cross-points as structural centres through different methods of concentration: contraction of range, emphasis of individual values (either via mean frequency or, conversely, singular deployment of extreme values), increase of density (number of sounds or sound-insertions per time unit), unique scalar disposition of duration- or dynamic-series. The manifold use of the cross-technique results in a multidimensional mirror-symmetry: before-after, above-below, inside-outside.
- Use of the ‘synthetic number’

It may appear to be an act of obscene analytical overkill to further taxonomize Sabbe’s inventory, but it is worth noting that many of the commonalities described here are also present
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293 Sabbe, ‘Einheit’, 20. For a somewhat more intuitive examination of *Kreuzspiel* drawing on the work of Christoph von Blumröder, see Iddon, *New Music at Darmstadt*, 72–75, which, tempering Sabbe’s strict parallels, suggests Stockhausen’s piece ‘is simultaneously more ambitious and less rigorous in its application of technique than either *Mode de valeurs et d’intensités* or the Sonata for Two Pianos.’
in the work of Messiaen, Barraqué, and Fano described above. While “pre-compositional”
multiserial organisation of materials and parametric binding of serially-ordered dimensions’ is
arguably present in much of the work of composers associated with Darmstadt – Iddon suggests
that this disparate group is cumulatively linked by ‘little more than existence of pre-
compositional work which includes independent consideration of more than one parameter’ –
most of these structural methods are unique to this particular lineage. There are, to be sure,
variants and idiosyncrasies even within this tradition – for example, neither Messiaen,
Barraqué, nor Fano used ‘synthetic number’ – but these appear to be personal interpretations
of a remarkably common set of compositional tools: palindromes, mirror-symmetries,
balance/stasis, and, most significantly, cross-structures extending to every level of composition.

**Preparations for Darmstadt, 1952**

Stockhausen’s presence in Paris also made him an essential liaison for the Darmstadt courses,
through the conduit of Herbert Eimert and Wolfgang Steinecke. Writing to Stockhausen almost
immediately after his arrival, Eimert reveals that Steinecke ‘wants to attempt to win Messiaen
for this year’s courses, but has no route to him whatsoever. Could such a connection be
established by you via Goeyvaerts?’

Steinecke himself wrote to Goeyvaerts to this end one week later, in return offering a premiere of his Second Violin Concerto. Goeyvaerts clearly was ambivalent and, in what retrospectively reads like an overplaying of his hand, suggests instead two performances of *Opus 2* separated by a pause, a formatting decision which ‘is very
important because the spiritual constitution which it [*Opus 2*] demands likely would not be
established at a first hearing.’

The request appears to have cast doubt on Goeyvaerts’s usefulness in Steinecke’s mind, and he pursues the matter of Messiaen in correspondence with Stockhausen instead. Eager to please but having only just encountered Messiaen, Stockhausen
in turn wrote to Goeyvaerts for information that he would pass on to Steinecke, with which
Goeyvaerts obliged him cheerfully enough (‘so viele Fragen zu beantworten!’ begins a letter
from 19 February 1952).
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294 Iddon, *New Music at Darmstadt*, 83.
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Stockhausen’s letters to Eimert from Paris reveal the influence of his Goeyvaerts-Messiaen orientation. In his first letter, after effusively thanking Eimert for ‘so much and so unexpected help’, Stockhausen encourages Eimert (and Steinecke) to bring only Messiaen instead of Jolivet to the 1952 Darmstadt courses, since ‘the two have no connection whatsoever’.299 This is a remarkable, if characteristic, self-assured statement from a young composer to a senior cultural administrator who had recently presented a work by Jolivet as representative of general progressive trends in New Music in his Darmstadt lecture with Steinecke. Eimert’s view was certainly the more established one in the early 1950s, harmonising with Jean Étienne Marie’s emplotment of Jolivet and Messiaen as the spiritual fathers of Boulez’s practice.300 Indeed, on either historical or aesthetic grounds, it is difficult to find any support for Stockhausen’s claim, and it is very likely that at this stage Stockhausen had no knowledge of Jolivet or his music. Nevertheless, Eimert (and, by extension, Steinecke) took Stockhausen’s advice, and focused entirely on securing Messiaen for the 1952 courses.

Compared with his laconic submission to the 1951 Ferienkurse, Stockhausen took a distinctly more proactive approach with Kreuzspiel. Already in October 1951, he sent a handwritten copy of the score to Darmstadt for consideration in World New Music Days to be held in Salzburg.301 The jury duly declared the piece ‘unperformable’, and, for the second year in a row, accepted pieces by Henze instead. A clearly embittered Stockhausen took issue with such evident aesthetic preferences of the jury, writing to Eimert: ‘There’s little point in getting gunpowder up one’s arse like Mr Henze and exploding quite pitifully one day, subsequently flying around in outer space in a thousand pieces.’302 Clearly, Stockhausen was undeterred, and through the help of Eimert and his slight leverage in the Messiaen wrangling, managed to arrive at two potential premieres by the end of January 1952 either at the Frankfurt New Music Weeks or the 1952 Darmstadt courses, a savvy bit of competition which most likely nudged Steinecke towards offering a firm commitment for a performance to secure the premiere, despite

300 Marie, 159–160.
301 Iddon, New Music at Darmstadt, 70.
302 ‘Es hat wenig Sinn, Pulver in den Hintern zu kriegen wie Herr Henze und dann eines Tages ganz jämmerlich zu platzen, um so irgendwo im weiten Weltraum herumzufliegen in tausend Stücke.’ Stockhausen to Eimert, 1 February 1952; Kirchmeyer, ‘Elektronische Messe’, 237. The above translation of this particularly difficult passage was suggested by Wieland Hoban.
regarding the hiring of nine players as an extravagance.\textsuperscript{303} While still doubtlessly among the youngest of the composers who would be present in 1952, Stockhausen’s return to Darmstadt found him in a much more central and stable position within the courses. Furthermore, as the vitriol against Henze makes clear, Stockhausen believed he had found a trusted ally in Eimert.

Accordingly, something of a coherent, shared project soon becomes distinguishable in Stockhausen’s correspondence with Eimert. By March 1952, Stockhausen was on friendly terms with Boulez, spurred not least by a mutual hatred of Henze (Stockhausen writes enthusiastically to Eimert: ‘And how it stings when Boulez pounces on Henze – and everyone with him, wild with outrage: badly orchestrated, badly made, badly written, finally he is no musician, not even a commander of his métier’).\textsuperscript{304} The encounter with Boulez, like that with Goeyvaerts, reinforced Stockhausen’s sense of having been denied access to his true calling within Germany’s musical culture, and insists that Eimert use his influence to remedy this situation: ‘And I feel that you must make every effort to create a studio for M. Eppler [Werner Meyer-Eppler] or a chamber music series for young composers. And that is the only resource in all of Germany! It’s well known in Paris that one can only accomplish anything in Cologne!’\textsuperscript{305}

Clearly, Stockhausen had been inspired by the work that Boulez and Barraqué had been doing under Schaeffer’s tutelage, mentioning especially the interpolation and assembly of series for different parameters of sound – a clear overlap with what he had learned from Messiaen and Goeyvaerts.\textsuperscript{306} However, Stockhausen clearly intends to deploy this technology towards far more neo-Platonist ends than Boulez’s series of timbres suggest. The echoes of Goeyvaerts’s thinking are obvious:

But personality is nevertheless expressed with this work, just the same as it is when using more traditional means. And finally, I believe that we are moving towards a time in which all material aspects (sonic broadening, searches for extraordinary effects, etc.) are increasingly subordinated to necessities manifest in the spiritual. No one wants to deny the tremendous possibilities of electronic music – but it is an expansion of the

\textsuperscript{303} Iddon, \textit{New Music at Darmstadt}, 71.
\textsuperscript{304} ‘Und wie weh tut das, wenn Boulez über Henze herfällt – und alle mit ihm, wild vor Entrüstung: schlecht orchestriert, schlecht gemacht, schlecht geschrieben, endlich ist er kein Musiker, nicht mal ein Beherrscher seiner Metiers.’ Stockhausen to Eimert, 10 March 1952; Kirchmeyer, ‘Elektronische Messe’, 239.
\textsuperscript{305} ‘Und ich fühle es mit, wie Sie sich verrenken müssen, um ein Studio für M. Eppler oder eine Kammermusik-Reihe für die Jungen möglich zu machen. Und das ist die einzige Stelle in ganz Deutschland! Man weiß es sehr gut in Paris, daß nur in Köln was getan wird!’ Ibid, 240.
\textsuperscript{306} Stockhausen writes these names as ‘Baraque’ and ‘Scheffer’, implying that he had not become well acquainted with either (see ibid).
material breadth, which always quickly consumes itself, while the spiritual always demands the conservation of material.³⁰⁷

Within this spiritual scheme, Stockhausen takes Boulez for something of an enervated demiurge, who ‘has a Satanic joy in destroying, in creating, in refining, in speculating and in debating.’³⁰⁸ Indeed, it is precisely his preoccupation with the material sphere that precludes Boulez from the spiritual insights which Goeyvaerts’s practice is able to attain:

And so it is not surprising that he [Boulez] cannot make much of Goeyvaerts, who is ahead of us all, and whose last two works op. 2 and op. 3 (which Boulez, certainly, and no one else has encountered) are more than marvellous. (op. 2 will be performed this evening in Brussels – for 13 instruments – and he’s still working on op. 3). In these two pieces I have been able to see, for the first time, onto the foundation of human comprehension, into the pure condensation of a musical idea. Try to seek out these, before all others, if my hearing tells you anything at all.³⁰⁹

In his turn, Steinecke offered Goeyvaerts a stipend for the 1952 courses (recognizing his acting as a translator for Messiaen) but insisted on the performance of the Second Violin Concerto. After a few further attempts to push Opus 2, Goeyvaerts resigns himself to Steinecke’s will, and requests that Steinecke forward the score of Opus 2 Goeyvaerts had sent him to Alessandro Piovesan, the secretary of the Venice International Music Festival.³¹⁰ Responding to Steinecke’s subsequent request for a programme note for the Darmstadt performance, Goeyvaerts minces neither words nor ambition:

‘The Second Violin Concerto that is performed here still belongs to a series of orchestral and chamber music compositions whose aesthetics I have fully abandoned since 1950 [n.b. – the Second Violin Concerto was completed in January 1951 at the

³⁰⁹ ‘Und so ist es nicht verwunderlich, wenn er mit Goeyvaerts nicht viel anfangen kann, der uns allen voraus ist, und dessen letzten beiden Werke op. 2 und op. 3 (die Boulez allerdings und noch noch niemand nicht kennt) mehr als bewundernswert sind. (op. 2 wird heute abend uraufgeführt in Brüssel – für 13 Instrumente – und an op. 3 arbeitet er noch). In diesen beiden Stücken habe ich zum ersten Male auf den Grund des menschlich Begreifbaren sehen dürfen, in dem reinen Niederschlag einer musikalischen Idee. Versuchen sie es, diese zu bekommen vor allem anderen, wenn Ihnen mein vernehmen irgend etwas sagt.’ Ibid.
³¹⁰ Goeyvaerts to Steinecke, 3 May 1952; Selbstlose Musik, 300.
earliest]. There is still in this piece traditional twelve-tone technique and a rhythmic organisation based on “series of note values” and timbres expressed through rhythmic “personages”.

New works are Opus 1 for 2 pianos (a section of which was demonstrated in the Adorno Composition Seminar of the previous year), Opus 2 for 13 instruments and Opus 3 with bowed and struck tones. In these works the structure of each separate aspect of the sonic phenomenon is determined from a singular, timeless idea.

Last year I had the opportunity to get to know the Darmstadt courses and concerts as a participant. I believe, that in our collectivist time, in which artistic production arises almost impersonally from the totality of the spiritual and is scarcely any expression of an individual feeling, these annual meetings, this exchange of thoughts fulfils an imperative necessity.’

Goeyvaerts’s utopian longing for a communal Darmstadt was coupled with his dystopian experience of Flemish musical culture after his return from Paris. In a formulation that appears at its surface not a million miles off from the socially alienated artist of Adorno’s and Eimert’s modelling, Goeyvaerts writes to Stockhausen: ‘You’re right: it’s patience that we need. If nothing comes and we remain in this horrible loneliness for a while, we become afraid and want to force the spirit out of this impasse. But more than ever, I know we must not do anything. The only thing we need is to wait and always keep faith.’

Goeyvaerts’s isolation here is not only from society at large but also from the particular network within which his practice functions. After his letter of introduction for Karlheinz, Goeyvaerts’s correspondence with Barraqué comes to an abrupt halt – Goeyvaerts tells Stockhausen in April 1952 that Barraqué never responded this letter – and he appears increasingly reliant on his younger friend for both

---


Neue Werke sind Opus 1 für 2 Klaviere (ein Satz davon wurde voriges Jahr im Adorno-Kompositionsseminar vorgeführt), Opus 2 für 13 Instrumente und Opus 3 mit angeschlagenen und gestrichenen Tönen. In diesen Werken ist die Struktur bei jedem verschieden Aspekte der klanglichen Erscheinung von einer einzigen, zeitlosen Idee her bestimmt.


312 ‘Tu as raison: c’est la patience qu’il nous faut. Si rien ne vient et l’on reste dans cette terrible solitude pendant quelque temps, alors on a peur et on veut forcer l’esprit à sortir de cette impasse. Mais plus que jamais, je sais qu’il ne faut rien faire. La seule chose qu’il faut c’est d’attendre et de garder toujours la foi.’ Goeyvaerts to Stockhausen, 25 January 1952; Selbstlose Musik, 318–319. He nevertheless concludes in a distinctly non-Adornian vein: ‘Il serait incompatible avec la bonté de Dieu de laisser attendre éternellement celui qui a soif de Sa Beauté.’

313 Goeyvaerts to Stockhausen, 7 April 1952; Selbstlose Musik, 326–327.
information, conversation, and professional exposure after a series of disappointments with both national and international musical authorities. Goeyvaerts had become involved with the NIR (Nationaal Instituut voor de Radio-Omroep),\(^{314}\) applying first for a job as a programmer (a job he ultimately did not get) and organising concerts with other Belgian composers like Louis De Meester, David Van de Woestijne, and Vic Legley, with whom he found little sympathy, kinship, or professional remuneration.\(^{315}\)

True to his word, Goeyvaerts kept patient and continued to compose. Sabbe describes *Opus 3 with bowed and struck tones*, composed during the first months of 1952, as achieving the ‘ultimate form’ that Goeyvaerts had been working towards in the Sonata and *Opus 2*.\(^{316}\) Certainly this seems to be how Goeyvaerts must have thought of it, describing the painful process of the work’s completion to Stockhausen, ‘it seems to me extremely difficult. Should it not be against the nature of music to be so difficult to invent? Or do all these difficulties come only from the fact that I am thinking too “humanly” to penetrate into these realms? One should think without leading their own thoughts.’\(^{317}\) This artistic asceticism by this point began to run quite directly parallel with a personal one, and Goeyvaerts immediately follows the description of his compositional problems with a complaint of the ‘decadence’ of Flanders which drives him to distraction.

Accordingly, Goeyvaerts treated his activities in Belgium with detached ambivalence, which may have had a part in the scrapping of the planned premiere and radio broadcast of *Opus 2* (originally set for 4 and 2 June 1952, respectively, in Brussels).\(^{318}\) If Stockhausen’s encounter with Goeyvaerts suggested to him that Paris was the site of musical destiny, inversely, Goeyvaerts’s encounter with Stockhausen appears to have convinced him to set his hopes on Germany. This decision had mixed results. While Goeyvaerts’s own initiatives to break into German musical life were largely unsuccessful – like Stockhausen, his submission (of *Opus 2*,...
naturally) to the Salzburg World New Music Days had been rejected – his contact with Stockhausen and Eimert proved more fruitful, resulting in a radio broadcast of a studio recording of the Sonata for Two Pianos on NWDR-Köln. This broadcast took place on 29 May 1952, on a programme that included the first performance of Kreuzspiel (likewise in a studio recording) and pieces by Messiaen (most likely the Quatre études de rhytme) and Nono (perhaps a recording of Polifonica-Monodia-Ritmica, performed at the 1951 courses?) as well as a spoken introduction by Stockhausen describing the technical procedures involved in the composition of the works. From Goeyvaerts’s remarks, it is clear that Stockhausen’s introduction presented the works as a unified tendency in contemporary composition, and his letter to Stockhausen demonstrates a concern that the connections between these different practices has not been made carefully or accurately: “The Nono could have come first [in the programme], but then again there would be the difficulty of linking our music with that of Messiaen, which should occur at the beginning of the introduction.” Goeyvaerts makes some minor objections to the performance of the Sonata, as well as the tone of Stockhausen’s introduction: ‘Maybe you were a bit too “technical” in your introductory words... but, sure... you can’t always sacrifice everything for intelligibility.’

While Stockhausen seems to have had a significant hand in the creation of this programme, the framing of the broadcast corresponds directly to the emplotment of New Music proposed by Eimert and Steinecke at the preceding Darmstadt courses, once again presenting an international group of young composers as central representatives of an objective historical tendency. The crucial difference was that here these international composers are placed within a singular aesthetic category. Where Goeyvaerts’s music was starkly contrasted with Nono’s in 1951, now both composers, alongside Stockhausen, are deployed as a unified movement. Here

---

320 This was preceded by a confusing episode: NWDR-Hamburg was to broadcast Goeyvaerts’s Second Violin Concerto (a fact, omitted from Goeyvaerts’s autobiography, that somewhat tempers his subsequent disavowals of the work) and were also interested in performing a ‘new work’ by him. Goeyvaerts sent them the Sonata at the same time that Stockhausen had given the score to Eimert as a suggestion for broadcast at NWDR-Köln. Unaware that the same work could not be performed at both stations, Goeyvaerts finally opted for broadcast on NWDR-Köln. Goeyvaerts to Stockhausen, 2 October 1951; Selbstlose Musik 309–310. See also Goeyvaerts, ‘Paris – Darmstadt’, 49.
321 Irritatingly, there is very little information available on this broadcast; it is only given a parenthetical mention in Kurtz’s Stockhausen biography.
322 ‘Der Nono hätte vielleicht zuerst kommen müssen, aber dann gäbe es wieder die Schwierigkeit, unsere Musik an die von Messiaen knüpfen, die doch am Anfang der Einführung vorkommen sollte.’ Goeyvaerts to Stockhausen, 30 May 1952; Selbstlose Musik, 330–331.
323 ‘Vielleicht warst Du in Deinen einführenden Worten ein bisschen zu “technisch”... Aber, ja... Man kann doch nicht immer alles der Verständlichkeit opfern.’ Ibid.
was the way forward from the creative stalemate of the young composers depicted by Eimert and Steinecke, one which neatly aligned with the blueprint they had presented less than a year prior, with some shuffling of parts (Messiaen has replaced Varèse as the major relevant composer of an older generation).

Judging by his comment on the broadcast, Goeyvaerts appears ambivalent about this new grouping, finding the Nono piece out of place in the programme and commenting that his sister’s husband had ‘quite spontaneously’ remarked on the stark difference between the ‘strong structure’ of Kreuzspiel against Nono’s music. But for Stockhausen, and certainly for Eimert, the inclusion of Nono was a given. Stockhausen had written Nono in 10 March 1952, reminding him of their ‘brief encounter at Darmstadt’. Stockhausen wrote to Eimert that he had formally contacted his Italian peer: ‘I’ve written to Nono – introduced myself to him, as it were.’ Nono wrote back enthusiastically and almost immediately (13 March), professing not only remembrance of Stockhausen but deep kinship with him and Goeyvaerts (who Nono repeatedly refers to collectively with Stockhausen) focused particularly in Darmstadt itself: ‘I believe that you and Goeyvaerts are like me and Maderna. When we work and live together, I believe something genuinely good and beautiful can be achieved musically. At the Marienhöhe we will see together, clearly, how and with whom it can be done. It must be a brotherhood; if something is done against one of us, it will be as if it were done against all of us.’

Soon after, Nono also made friendly overtures to Goeyvaerts in a letter Stockhausen’s wife passed on to the composer in Antwerp (Nono had evidently written the letter before asking for Goeyvaerts’s address, or assumed that Goeyvaerts lived together with Stockhausen, and had sent it directly to Stockhausen). Writing to Stockhausen in response, Goeyvaerts was appreciative of Nono’s letter more for its ethical dimension than its overtures of artistic commonality. In fact, Goeyvaerts draws a sharp distinction between Nono and ‘young Frenchmen’ like Boulez and Barraqué: ‘[Nono] is indeed quite nice and seems to be upright to me (so much different than

324 Ibid.
327 Nono to Stockhausen, 13 March 1952, in Karlheinz Stockhausen bei den Internationalen Ferienkursen, 41; quoted and translated in Iddon, New Music at Darmstadt, 72.
328 Goeyvaerts to Doris Stockhausen, 28 March 1951. Selblose Musik, 325.
Barraqué, Boulez, etc.). His suggestion for candid [offenherzig] criticism is so honourable and much different from the young Frenchmen, who always give free rein to annihilation in their criticism of friends.\textsuperscript{329} Goeyvaerts’s opinion of Nono here is nothing new. In a letter addressed to Barraqué during the 1951 Ferienkurse, Goeyvaerts writes: ‘One of the finest, nicest, and most cultured fellows is the young Italian Luigi Nono. I am curious to hear his music.’\textsuperscript{330} It remains to be seen, then, what had motivated these composers to connect in such a ‘brotherhood’ at this point in spring 1952, rather than immediately following their initial encounter in Darmstadt.

Alongside Maderna, Nono had already visited Eimert in early 1952, during which time they undertook intensive study of twelve-tone technique, and it is likely that Stockhausen received Nono’s address from Eimert in the first place.\textsuperscript{331} As Iddon suggests, this was almost certainly under the auspices of Eimert’s recent Lehrbuch der Zwölftontechnik.\textsuperscript{332} The book had initially been published in 1950 by Breitkopf and presents an intensely structural focus on row construction and its compositional applications. Like Rufer, Eimert’s scope is ecumenical, and, while foregrounding his argument on works by Schoenberg, Berg, and Webern, draws from a broad range of musical production. Unlike Rufer, these composers are never designated as a ‘school’ – Eimert instead refers to a ‘Schoenberg circle’ in Vienna.\textsuperscript{333} Nevertheless, Eimert thoroughly, even self-consciously, adopts the Adornian-Leibowitzian historicist model. Twelve-tone music is ‘firmly situated in music-historical structure [Gefüge], a last, generalised material process of music which at its core has nothing whatsoever to do with modish and topical stylistic tendencies,’ whose relevance is comparable to ‘the polyphonic epoch’ of Bach or the ‘figured bass age’ of Monteverdi.\textsuperscript{334} Even Adorno and Leibowitz’s Trinitarian function is cannily maintained by Eimert: while ‘Schoenberg and his school’ do not make an appearance, Eimert’s introduction does assert ‘E. Křenek and his school (G. Perle, R. Erickson)’.\textsuperscript{335}

\textsuperscript{329}‘Er ist tatsächlich ganz nett und scheint mir rechtschaffen zu sein (so ganz anders als Barraqué, Boulez, usw.). Sein Vorschlag zur offenherzigen Kritik ist so ehrlich und ganz anders als die jungen Franzosen, die in ihrer Kritik ihrer Freunde an der Vernichtung immer freien Lauf lassen.’ Goeyvaerts to [Karlheinz] Stockhausen, 28 March 1951. Selbstlose Musik, 324–325.
\textsuperscript{330}‘Un des gens fins, des plus gentils, des plus cultivés est le jeune italien Luigi Nono. Je suis curieux d’entendre sa musique.’ Goeyvaerts to Barraqué, 29 June 1951. Selbstlose Musik, 284.
\textsuperscript{331}Iddon, New Music at Darmstadt, 72.
\textsuperscript{332}Ibid.
\textsuperscript{333}See, for example, Eimert, Lehrbuch der Zwölftontechnik (Wiesbaden, Breitkopf & Härtel, 1952), 58–59. Even in this case, Eimert is careful to differentiate between Schoenberg, Berg, and Webern.
\textsuperscript{334}Ibid, 5.
\textsuperscript{335}Ibid.
While Iddon characterises Eimert as a Hauer partisan, a sort of analytically straight-edge version of Heiß, the position Eimert advocates in his Lehrbuch is at once far more broad, more complex, and more totalizing than that of Heiß or Steinbauer. Eimert foregrounds not only Schoenberg and Hauer (and Krenek) as the sources of twelve-tone technique, but prominently his teacher Jef Golyscheff, twice citing articles by Willi Schuh describing Golyscheff in the context of Mann’s Doktor Faustus. Echoing the conclusions of the twelve-tone congresses (where, in 1951, he himself gave a talk debating ‘Twelve-tone style or twelve-tone technique?’), twelve-tone technique for Eimert is precisely that: a constructive basis for the ordering of musical material. In Eimert’s telling, the blinkered aesthetic focus of critics like Hans Ferdinand Redlich and Adorno threatens to calcify exactly the historical potential and technical possibilities of this technique by telescoping it as merely a particularized and impoverished enunciation of an objective historical condition that has long passed: ‘music-theoretical understanding has remained utterly stuck in the primitive beginnings of those Anbruch essays.’ While nominally a riposte directed at Adorno, here Eimert in fact follows Rufer in exploding Adorno’s historicist model into a universal programme, in which twelve-tone technique is generalized as the transcendent signifier of New Music through an analytical Aufhebung of the Second Viennese School.

The cataloguing impulse which undergirds this book, replete with row tables, diagrams, and charts of intervalllic structures, in retrospect seems to have much in common with similar arguments advanced by Milton Babbitt (the attention given to the intervalllic character of row forms and their corresponding Gestalt particularly prefiguring combinatorality and, by extension, pitch-class set theory); its repeated emphasis of possibilities for ‘polyphony’, conversely, seems to place it closer to a French (read: post-Leibowitz) understanding of twelve-
tone techniques. However, certain of Eimert’s formulations seem to be reminiscent of the structural devices deployed by Goeyvaerts, Barraqué, and Messiaen – certainly they would have appeared so to a young composer eagerly adopting this practice.

In a discussion of all-interval series (which appears to be indebted equally to F. H. Klein and Berg’s ‘grandmother chord’ and Webern’s structural segmentation of rows), Eimert describes a symmetrical series divided by a tritone at its centre. Similarly, in a later chapter on ‘Series-refractions (non-twelve-tone thematic)’, Eimert describes three strategies for ‘refracting’ series to arrive at ‘non-twelve-tone themes’:

1. through harmonic or polyphonic refracting of a series;
2. through crossing of series;
3. through interpolation of different series.\(^{340}\)

Eimert’s explanation of the second item in this inventory as a mirror-symmetrical exchange of rows suggests a smaller-scale version of the structural devices used in Goeyvaerts’s Sonata and Kreuzspiel. Similarities notwithstanding, the possible theological dimensions of these structures are not touched on in either case, and Eimert moves briskly onwards to cataloguing further aspects of row organisation.

Eimert republished *Lehrbuch der Zwölftontechnik* two years later, in 1952, with a new ‘Supplement’ which both greatly expands the scope of Eimert’s historical framework and clarifies its trajectory. Expanding on the ‘series-refractions’ discussed in the first edition, Eimert proposes such refractions within a single row. The reason for giving this new demonstration, Eimert explains, is that ‘it very easily reveals the way to the constructive method of completely through-organised [durchorganisierten] material.’\(^{341}\) This is precisely the path which Toop retroactively attempts to map in his emplotment moving from the *durchgeordnete musik* of Messiaen, Goeyvaerts, and Fano, to the ‘proper’ serialism of Boulez and Stockhausen. Writing twenty years earlier, the trajectory of this path seems just as clear to Eimert. After a cursory mention of ‘new contributions’ such as Krenek’s “‘Rotation’-principle of row segments’, Eimert turns to a more important matter: ‘Compared with this, for the first time something fundamentally new is contained in the idea developed in Messiaen’s school which applies the

\(^{340}\) Ibid, 45.
\(^{341}\) Ibid, 61.
variation principle to all dimensions of sound material.\textsuperscript{342} In retrospect, this reads as a fairly de rigeur assessment of the development of post-war serialism, one echoed by both specialised (e.g. Toop) and general scholarship dealing with the foundation of the Darmstadt School. In 1952, however, there are at least three unique, consolidating claims advanced by Eimert here. First, and most obviously, the development of this idea is ‘fundamentally [grundsätzlich] new’ when seen against general historical tendencies since the advent of the twelve-tone system, reducing practices like that of Krenek to imitative dilettantism. Second, Messiaen has here for the first time been given that subject-position of primary historical priority in the Adornian-Leibowitzian schema of international-institutional New Music: he is the leader of a school. Third, in contravention to Messiaen’s own ambivalence to twelve-tone music in general and Schoenberg in particular, this new Messiaenic school is brought into line with the continuum of Adornian-Leibowitzian historicism as the historically necessary, ineluctable progression of the structuring of musical material.

It is this last claim that necessitates Eimert’s concept of the ‘variation principle’. Within the Adornian-Leibowitzian model, this is precisely the method by which Schoenberg secured historical legitimacy for his twelve-tone practice, against the anti-historical no-man’s-land of barren asceticism: ‘By contrast [to Hauer], Schoenberg radically integrates the classical, and, even more, the archaic techniques of variation into twelve-tone material.’\textsuperscript{343} However, none of the composers of Messiaen’s newly-christened school – least of all Messiaen himself – had any sustained compositional engagement with nor even interest in such a ‘variation principle’ as a formal device. It is broadly true that certain students of Messiaen mentioned above – Barraqué, Goeyvaerts, Fano, Stockhausen – differentiated multiple aspects (not yet the more familiarly scientistic ‘parameters’) of a composition and treated them separately before recombining them within a single global schema. However, the formal procedures these composers applied to the separated compositional aspects – cf. Sabbe’s inventory above – bear little resemblance to any method of classical variation. Quite the opposite: the pursuit of a ‘static music’ which occupied these composers at this time necessitated formal procedures which minimised, even annihilated any suggestion of dynamism or fluidity in order to more perfectly enunciate a trace of absolute Being.

\textsuperscript{342} \textit{Zum ersten mal etwas grundsätzlich Neues dagegen enthält der in der Schule Messiaens entwickelte Gedanke, das Variations-prinzip auf alle Dimensionen der Tonmaterie anzuwenden.} Ibid.

Yet Eimert insists on the centrality of this variation principle: ‘As the classical procedure of twelve-tone technique related only to melody and harmony, thus now the other elements of music follow the variation principle of constant transformation prefigured in twelve-tone technique.’ Characteristically, Eimert gives a list of these elements:

1. the twelve tones,
2. the octave registers (up to seven),
3. the different rhythmic values,
4. the different levels of dynamic intensity,
5. the characteristic articulation (attack) form of the tone (staccato, tenuto, legato, etc.).

In an addendum which belatedly answers Adorno’s question on where antecedent and consequent phrasing figures in with all this, Eimert explains: ‘For the structure of the phrase, the evaluation of octave registers – which already with Anton Webern has led to broadly-spaced “punctual” formations – is critical.’

Taken together, these three claims consolidate and advance the project outlined by Eimert and Steinecke: the proposal of a new phase of the international avant-garde which synthesized historically-determined technical procedures of dodecaphony with an expanded inventory of musical material and, subsequently, transcended the impasse (or ‘limit-situation’) of Schoenbergian dodecaphony. Accordingly, Eimert’s argument here pushes Messiaen, Goeyvaerts, and Stockhausen into a teleological history which reads their practice as the necessary fulfilment of the formal potential of Schoenberg and Webern, subletly reconciled with the (now unnamed) Hauer: ‘It appears that something has been fulfilled here which was already anticipated right at the beginning of twelve-tone music [Zwölftonmusik], at the antipode of Schoenbergian affect-music: the free, balanced play of twelve tones [Zwölftonspiel], which is arrived at by the way of the autonomous combinatorial experiment.’

---

346 ‘Für die Struktur des Tonsatzes wird die Auswertung der Oktavlagen entscheidend, die schon bei Anton Webern zu weitläufigen *punktuellen* Bildungen geführt hat.’ Ibid, 62.
347 ‘Hier scheint sich etwas zu erfüllen, was schon ganz in den Anfängen der Zwölftonmusik, am Gegenpol der Schönbergschen Affektmusik, geahnt wurde: das freie ausgeglichene Zwölftonspiel, das auf dem Wege des autonomen kombinatorischen Experiments gewonnen wird.’ Ibid, 63. This is specifically in reference to Messiaen’s ‘Quatre Etudes for piano [sic]’, which Eimert dates to 1951.
Messiaen, Goeyvaerts, and Stockhausen on Adorno’s terms, which is to say that he articulates their practices within a formal vocabulary that can be assimilated into the discourse of institutional New Music – precisely what Goeyvaerts and Stockhausen failed to do in July 1951.

The argument of Eimert’s supplement, which proposes for the first time an aesthetic kinship between an international group of young composers and certain formal procedures developed by Olivier Messiaen, matches up neatly to Goeyvaerts’s account of Stockhausen’s introduction to the radio programme which included Kreuzspiel and the Sonata. Indeed, Eimert even provides a musical example which reads a hybrid between these two pieces, using ‘the twelve pitches, six octave registers, six rhythmic values (semiquaver, quaver, crotchet within a triplet with quaver rest, crotchet, dotted crotchet, minim), five dynamic values (pianissimo, piano, mezzo-forte, forte, fortissimo) and three characteristic attack forms (stacc., ten., leg.)’.

![Musical Example](image)

**Fig. 3.14: Demonstration of ‘punctual’ music in Eimert, Lehrbuch der Zwölftontechnik, 62 (ex. 84)**

The resulting four bars notated on a grand stave look a great deal like the piano parts in the Sonata or Kreuzspiel, and Eimert’s description of where the music might go from here is equally familiar: ‘This is the first phase of a piece [wherein] the pitches are distributed so that each of the six octave registers contains two of the twelve pitches. According to the plan of construction, the tones must now be passed through the octave registers in the following phases. The example could just as well represent the end phase; the beginning phase would then look like a twelve-tone sequence in a tight register, from which the pitches would be led out from phase to phase and distributed to the other octave registers.’  

\[\text{348} \] With regards to the other ‘elements’ of the...
composition, Eimert’s text borrows even more explicitly from the practice of the younger musicians: ‘Rhythm, dynamics, and attack forms are similarly brought into a fixed ordering condition, such that they are all related to a synthetic number of order that remains fixed throughout the phases.’ Unquestionably, this is a programmatic technical demonstration of the compositional procedures involved in Kreuzspiel, the Sonata, and, to a lesser extent, Messiaen’s Quatre études de rythme, the only piece of music which Eimert refers to by title in the text. Indeed, Goeyvaerts’s particular objection to the ‘technical’ quality of the programme’s introduction suggests that it was not Stockhausen at all who had written it, but Eimert. Even if Stockhausen had not been directly ventriloquized by Eimert in this case, the text of this supplement demonstrates that Eimert was certainly prepared to incorporate wholesale, and generalise, specific technical procedures from the practices of younger composers into his master narrative of New Music. This is hugely significant: ‘synthetic number’, a compositional device devised by Karel Goeyvaerts and consistently applied exclusively by him, is taken to be representative of not only a large international group of composers but the acme of technical progress in art music.

Goeyvaerts’s ‘technical’ objection, as well as his pointed observation about Nono’s fundamental difference, highlight the effect of this move and its departure from what Goeyvaerts understands his music to be. Eimert has effectively transformed the particularly Roman Catholic metaphysical programme of this practice into a universalized technical schema, one which follows organically on the heels of dodecaphony as an internationally valid method of composition. The formal procedures utilised by Goeyvaerts and Stockhausen to arrive at an approximation of a selfless music wherein pure being (the Absolute, Roman Catholic deity) is momentarily made present have, in Eimert’s new emplotment, become the inverse: the next historically logical step in a dialectical process of increasing mastery over musical material, the way out of the limit-situation imposed by the advent of twelve-tone music. As such, they are now no longer in the service of the Roman Catholic God but the dialectical-materialist History of Adorno and Leibowitz – the conceptual as well as the practical prerequisite for the Darmstadt School. Indeed, Eimert’s elevation of this practice into

Oktavlagen geführt werden. Das Beispiel könnte ebensogut die Schlußphase verkörper; die Anfangsphase sähe dann etwa so aus wie eine Zwölffolge in enger Lage, aus der die Töne dann Phase um Phase herausgeführt und auf die übrigen Oktavlagen verteilt werden müßten.’ Ibid, 62.

349 ‘Auch Rhythmus, Dynamik und Anschlagsform sind in ein festes Ordnungverhältnis zu bringen, und zwar so, da sie alle auf eine synthetische Ordnungzahl bezogen werden, die durch alle Phase hindurch festgehalten wird.’ Ibid, 63.
Adornian-Leibowitzian institutional discourse circumscribes its descriptive and legitimising vocabulary. By replacing its neo-Platonic frame with a historicist one, this practice is universalised as a world-historical condition – one which overlaps neatly with the contemporary institutional ideology of New Music.

There is an additional, subtler discursive transferral enacted in this replacement. While Eimert’s new emplotment incorporates the pre-compositional methods of this practice wholesale, to the point of near plagiarism in the case of ‘synthetic number’, his reading of the technical operations themselves, shorn of their neo-Platonist numerology, is rather more mechanistic. To begin with, Eimert’s composer is given free reign to organise each divisible compositional element in whichever configuration might be more compelling. There is no reason to prefer a cross-structure to, say, a rhapsodic structure in combining the separate compositional parameters; even his interpretation of the unifying ‘synthetic number’ is thoroughly secular. Such a reading emphasises process rather than stasis, describing the constructive means by which elements are progressively recombined rather than a unifying system for fixing their appearance in an immutable order that mirrors some sort of higher being. This, then, is the crucial difference between Eimert’s ‘punctual music’ and Goeyvaerts’s ‘static music’ – it is a depiction of a mechanical procedure rather than a metaphysical state. Accordingly, it is generalised. Eimert’s reading of Goeyvaerts and Stockhausen’s practice not only brings it into line with Adornian-Leibowitzian historicism but aligns it with numerous other composers, such as Boulez, Leibowitz, Nono, and Maderna, who had similarly applied twelve-tone procedures to other musical parameters. While all these practices were previously disparate, arising from mutually exclusive aesthetic concerns and ideological traditions – and, in Stockhausen and Goeyvaerts’s case, only remotely related to the music of Schoenberg, Berg, or Webern – Eimert’s technical reading emphasises their unity and universal application in New Music as the Darmstadt School of post-Webernian punctual music.

Indeed, the category of ‘punctual music’ itself is far from self-evident, since no practitioner associated with the category had described their work in such terms. According to Wörner, Eimert ‘hit upon the word *punktuell*’ in conversation with Stockhausen over Messiaen’s ‘Mode’ at some unspecified later date after Golea’s Darmstadt lecture in 1951.\(^{350}\) Kirchmeyer

\(^{350}\) Wörner, 80–82.
fixes the date of the coinage at 30 December 1952, in a letter from Eimert to Stockhausen; Wörner’s suggestion appears more plausible since, as noted above, Eimert was deploying ‘punktuell’ to describe Webernian figurations throughout 1952. At any rate, it is a rather more technical and sober classification than ‘static music’ or ‘fantastic music of the stars’, and thus appears to be a characteristic Eimertism. But such a category of music, existing on the vanguard of technical proficiency and defined by the careful, isolated consideration of each of its constituent elements, had already been devised by Eimert in 1925. Eimert’s term then was not punktuell but atomistisch, and he categorised recent works by Schoenberg, Hauer, and Golyscheff as ‘atomistic music’, a tradition within which he placed his own compositional output.

Here something of the historical contingency of Eimert’s position becomes visible. Eimert’s first theoretical publication, the Atonale Musiklehre, published while he was still a student at the Cologne Musikhochschule in 1924, is very similar to the later Lehrbuch in both style and content, with the main body of the text largely devoted to inventories of technical elements (in particular, various configurations of ‘twelve-tone complexes’, a term borrowed from Golyscheff). In the second section of the tract, subtitled ‘Historical and Aesthetic Observations’, Eimert outlines a vague teleology of musical development, beginning with ‘the classical view of centricity (root, tonality)’ and concluding with ‘the loosening of tonally-organized harmony in Impressionism’. However, Eimert explicitly rejects this tradition as irrelevant to the topic at hand because it has manifestly failed to come to grips with the empirical technical means of music: ‘When attempting a theoretical groundwork of Impressionism, one immediately encounters the un-mergable opposition of music-logical and aural-psychological functions.’ In opposition to this historical teleology, Eimert proposes a purely technical one: ‘The development from classical to modern music is a constantly progressing compression and spatial reduction of the seven-tone tonal complexes by the means of modulation.’ The implications of these ‘technical foundations’ are explored throughout the
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352 Ibid, 11 (see also endnote 87).
354 Ibid, 62.
355 Ibid, 63. Eimert goes on to cite ‘the investigations of Stumpf and Riemann’ as disproving Helmholtz’s assertion of the phenomenological role of the overtone series (ibid, 64).
remainder of the section, with both the systematic impulse and Eimert’s contribution to it clearly foregrounded: ‘In 1914, twelve-tone music was found for the first time in the unpublished compositions of the Russian Golyscheff. Some years later, the idea of pure atonality took on a tangible form with the Viennese theorist and composer Hauer. Within this developmental line, this current musical treatise provides the first systematic presentation of atonal techniques.’\textsuperscript{356} In this light, Eimert’s continuing interventions within the evolving discourse of New Music appear to have been made from a remarkably consistent ideological position for almost four decades: even before the advent of ‘punctual music’, he had insisted on the primacy of technical universality of twelve-tone technique, most notably in his contribution to the Second International Twelve-Tone Congress in Darmstadt in 1951. Indeed, Eimert’s reading of Golyscheff (and, to a lesser extent, Hauer) in the Atonale Musiklehre proposes precisely what he later put forward in his reading of Stockhausen, Goeyvaerts, Messiaen, and, above all, Webern: a total rational configuration of parametrised technical means of composition.

**Kreuzspiel, concluded**

Taking a broad view of the programme, there is little to suggest that the 1952 Darmstädtter Ferienkurse offered anything radically new or different from its previous iterations. The courses opened with a performance of Jean Giraudoux’s Judith with incidental music by Henze, followed by staged performances of Orff’s Die Kluge (1942), which had previously been staged at the 1946 courses, and Honegger’s Jeanne d’Arc au bûcher (1934–1935); over the course of the following week, Heinrich Strobel presented a six-part lecture series on ‘the complete works of Igor Stravinsky’, a subject on which he had also lectured in 1947.\textsuperscript{357} The concert schedule included works by Prokofiev, Leibowitz, Dallapiccola, Stravinsky, Bartók, Milhaud, Ravel, Jolivet, Hindemith, and Jacques Ibert, alongside those of Schoenberg, Berg, and Webern, with further portrait concerts devoted to Bartók and Ferruccio Busoni. Indeed, this compositional roster for officially scheduled concerts remained largely unchanged throughout the 1950s.

It would appear, then, that Eimert’s blueprint for the Darmstadt School – not to mention Leibowitz and Adorno’s blueprint for New Music – was totalizing in content but not effect. Judging from scheduled performances and lectures alone, certainly there is little indication of

\textsuperscript{356} Ibid, 66.
\textsuperscript{357} *Im Zenit der Moderne*, III.552–557.
any fundamental change in the state of affairs which had existed since 1946 (repeat performances of Orff, repeat lectures on Stravinsky, etc.). There are, nevertheless, a few indications which point towards the unified Darmstadt School of music historiography. Most obviously, there was the presence of Messiaen, who led composition seminars alongside Hanns Jelinek and performed his Quatre études de rythme in the opening concert (with Jelinek’s Second String Quartet). Less obviously, the concerts devoted to ‘music of the young generation’ – a feature of the courses since 1948; previous iterations mentioned ‘new’ or ‘contemporary music’ tout court – for the first time brought together most of the foundational figures of the Darmstadt School (Pierre Boulez, Karlheinz Stockhausen, Karel Goeyvaerts, Bruno Maderna, and Luigi Nono) alongside what amount to ‘bit players’ in Darmstadt historiography, such as Giselher Klebe and Renzo Dall’Oglio.\(^\text{358}\) To be sure, this music in total represented less than 5% of the programmed concerts (in terms of duration of the performances, even less). Nevertheless, it was these performances, and the so-called Wunderkonzert on 21 July 1952 containing Kreuzspiel in particular, which were reliably the focus of critical reception both in 1952 and subsequently. Eimert’s blueprint was only tangentially concerned with the actual programming of Darmstadt – like that of Adorno and Leibowitz, it was primarily occupied with the discourse of New Music.

Certainly it was in a discursive capacity that Eimert’s presence was central to the 1952 courses. While it had nowhere near the breadth of Strobel’s Stravinsky panorama, Eimert’s lecture on ‘Problems of Electronic Music’ gave a concentrated crash course in the new teleology he had developed, which presently resulted in both ‘punctual music’ and electronic music. Indeed, Eimert suggests, the two are inseparable at the zenith of New Music practice, since through punctual music ‘the connection to electronic possibilities is quite automatic.’\(^\text{359}\) The technical means which underlie this connection, as well as their historical derivation, are those which Eimert delineated in his Lehrbuch: the total rational configuration of parametrised technical means of composition which arose from the practice of Anton Webern. Eggebrecht summarises the positioning of Eimert’s move very neatly: “The expression “punctual music” casually functions as a connecting concept to electronic music, above all as a bridging concept from serial music back to Webern; through this he conveniently provides historical legitimation

\(^\text{358}\) The term ‘bit players’ has been used by Iddon to describe figures like Pousseur and Goeyvaerts; see Iddon, ‘Die zufälligen Serialisten – oder: Die Darmstädter Schule und wie es dazu kam’, lecture given at Darmstadt, 12 August 2014.

to serial music.\textsuperscript{360} But here Eimert applies this point directly to the discursive reception of New Music, addressing his Darmstadt audience directly and instructing them that ‘wherever you hear this peculiar punctual music, the spirit of Webern is present that has indeed pre-shaped the idea of totally through-organised \textit{[durchorganisierten]} musical material.’\textsuperscript{361} Considering that this instruction was given less than five hours before the scheduled performance of \textit{Kreuzspiel}, Eimert’s invocation of ‘wherever’ appears rather directed.

Irrespective of his new status as a member of the embryonic Darmstadt School, Goeyvaerts once again does not appear to have enjoyed his stay at the courses. While it may have been some small comfort that he no longer had to share a room with Jacques Wildberger, Wildberger was nevertheless present – in fact, his Quartet for flute, clarinet, violin, and cello had been programmed alongside \textit{Kreuzpiel}. This must have stung Goeyvaerts, who had previously entertained hopes that both \textit{Kreuzspiel} and \textit{Opus 2} might be performed in the same concert.\textsuperscript{362} His repeated appeals to Stockhausen to have Steinecke recruit Grimaud to perform instead of the despised Loriod (‘please tell him that the only pianist who has developed a relevant playing technique of New Music is called Yvette Grimaud’) were either ineffective or ignored outright, and Loriod in fact was further engaged to lead a piano seminar.\textsuperscript{363} Worse still, Goeyvaerts was further humiliated by being recruited to page-turn for Loriod’s performance of Boulez’s Second Sonata, a fact he bitterly remembered thirty years later.\textsuperscript{364} His recollection of Yvonne turning to him after the concert and announcing the ‘two revelations of the moment’ as Stockhausen and Boulez appears somewhat more doubtful, if no less earnest.\textsuperscript{365} But it was the \textit{Wunderkonzert} and its aftermath that seems to have hurt Goeyvaerts the most. While Goeyvaerts gives no recollection of the concert itself in his memoir, he does mention a dinner after the courses with Stockhausen and Doris, hosted by Doris’s uncle: ‘Karlheinz could not stop talking about the sensation created by \textit{Kreuzpiel}.’ When Doris’s uncle inquires if any of Goeyvaerts’s music had been performed, Stockhausen responded ‘Sure, with an orchestra,’ a response Goeyvaerts read as crassly dismissive.\textsuperscript{366} Little wonder, then, that Goeyvaerts decided

\footnotesize{\textsuperscript{360} ‘Der Ausdruck punktuelle Musik fungiert gelegentlich als Anschlußbegriff zur elektronischen Musik, vor allem über als Brückenbegriff von der seriellen Musik zurück zu Webern; dadurch ist er geeignet, die serielle Musik geschichtlich zu legitimieren.’ Eggebrecht, ‘Punktuelle Musik’, 353 (formatting altered).
\textsuperscript{361} Eimert, ‘Probleme’, in ibid, 353.
\textsuperscript{362} Goeyvaerts to Stockhausen, 16 November 1951; \textit{Selbstlose Musik}, 311–312.
\textsuperscript{363} Goeyvaerts to Stockhausen, 19 February 1952; \textit{Selbstlose Musik}, 323.
\textsuperscript{364} Goeyvaerts, ‘Paris – Darmstadt’, 49.
\textsuperscript{365} Ibid.
\textsuperscript{366} ‘Ja, und zwar mit Orchester’, as Goeyvaerts has it; see ibid.}
to bid the summer courses good riddance: ‘For me that ended Darmstadt. I have never been back.’

The live premiere of Kreuzspiel had indeed generated attention. In fact, the public scandal of Kreuzspiel was explicitly connected to the classroom scandal of the previous year, with Stockhausen again serving as the famulus of a rigidly esoteric musical practice. However, while the confrontation with Adorno by all accounts was conceptually bewildering and unexpected, the Darmstadt press was well prepared for their encounter with Kreuzspiel. In a review by Albert Rodemann for the Darmstädter Tagesblatt which Iddon characterises as ‘probably about the norm’ for press response, the grouping is explicit:

Why Karl Heinz [sic] Stockhausen entitled his music for oboe, bass clarinet, piano, and four percussionists Kreuzspiel is incomprehensible. Following a system of ‘static music’, the indefensibleness of which Theodor Adorno already demonstrated the previous year to its Flemish inventor, the sound of the piece goes far beyond that which we have been accustomed to call music. That he [n.b. – this refers to Goeyvaerts, not Stockhausen] finds a few devotees to celebrate his work […] doesn't change things a jot. Every idea finds its prophets. And its sect.

The ideological priming shaping Rodemann’s account is twofold. On one layer, there is the familiar concept of the quasi-Gnostic ‘sect’, the negative antecedent of the proper ‘school’ grouping of historically legitimate New Music. On a deeper level, however, there is an immunological paranoia that such a forbiddingly esoteric practice has evidently not died an immediate and natural death – one of a most barren poverty – but in fact amassed an international following even after its ideological annihilation by Adorno. Such a fact threatens to cede the hard-won subject positions of Adornian-Leibowitzian historicism to conniving usurpers: Henze and Wildberger had been programmed alongside Goeyvaerts and Stockhausen, respectively, in the 1952 courses. This, then, is the ‘change’ that Rodemann is so eager to repudiate. His report is not merely dismissive, it is defensive. Of course, such categorical journalistic hostility recalls the reaction to Leibowitz’s own entry at the Ferienkurse just four years prior. However, while critics were quick to note the umbilical connection between Leibowitz and his followers, the music of the ‘younger generation’ of the 1952 courses is described as a more autochthonous phenomenon. While clearly leery of Goeyvaerts’s ‘sect’,
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367 Ibid.
Rodemann nevertheless posits a broader conceptual unity centred on Luigi Nono, ‘the father of the Kranichstein model of the young compositional generation’, praising his ‘bold and charged abstraction’.369 Here again Rodemann’s reading is representative: the Aachener Nachrichten similarly describes a unified ‘punctual style, which leads back to Anton Webern, and which the young H. K. [sic] Stockhausen still handles clumsily in his Kreuzspiel’, which ‘has found its master in Luigi Nono’.370 It is nevertheless surprising that this category of ‘punctual music’ was not applied to the other pieces on the same programme, especially since both were by composers who had a far more sustained engagement with dodecaphonic procedures than either Stockhausen, Nono, or Maderna: Camillo Togni’s Omaggio a Bach and Jacques Wildberger’s Quartet. Yet such a stylistic connection between Nono and Stockhausen had been proposed publicly less than two months prior to the Wunderkonzert in the radio broadcast of Kreuzspiel. Indeed, it was precisely the spuriousness of this link between Nono’s music and Stockhausen’s that Goeyvaerts had commented on to his friend. A critical mass of recent analytical scholarship bears out the conclusion that Goeyvaerts attributed to his brother-in-law: Nono was doing something categorically different from Stockhausen in his compositional practice.371 But the press did not have recourse to any sustained analytical reading of this new ‘punctual’ music. They had recourse to programmes, lectures, and the radio – all of which were mediated by Herbert Eimert. This is not to suggest that Eimert had singlehandedly primed the press response to Darmstadt – if he had, surely more of them would have gotten Stockhausen’s name correct – rather that nearly all available information on this music and the discourse which made sense of it would have been made available through him.

Correspondingly, while it is certain that the experience of the Wunderkonzert had made a strong impression on critics, their published responses suggest that this was typically a generalised and rather nebulous one. Iddon’s study makes much of the confusions, elisions, and erroneous recollections this concert produced in its wake. In a review which ‘seemed to be making some reference to what Rodemann had said’, the correspondent of the Abendpost complained that ‘most of what was on offer in Kranichstein left the listener cold.’ One could be

369 Ibid, 87.
mistaken in thinking that this remark perhaps referred to the Orff and Honegger operas or Strobel’s Stravinsky hexalogy if the review did not immediately clarify the exact site of this coldness: ‘The twelve-tone row has become a fetish and its propositions have become empty phrases. As justification, the pseudo-geniuses present their scores and point to interesting graphic images of their musical algorithms.’\(^{372}\) Clearly, an extremely small number of performances of ‘punctual music’ almost completely dominated the critical discourse, to the extent that the title Hille Moldenhauer’s review deployed this zygotic repertoire as a metonym for the entirety of the courses: “Punctual” Music and Indoor Slippers: Impressions of the International Courses for New Music.\(^{373}\) At this stage, Moldenhauer’s impressions should be rather predictable: “Punctual Music” is the shibboleth for this skeleton, whose secrets only its composers know.\(^{374}\) As Iddon is quick to note, such impressions of scientistic and obfuscatory composers did not seem to have a solid referent, and ‘the only concrete event to which reference can have been being made was the session on electronic music and musique concrète on 21 July\(^{375}\) – the same day as the Wunderkonzert – which opened with lectures by Eimert and Werner Meyer-Eppler and concluded with Boulez’s commentary on pieces of musique concrète by Schaeffer, Messiaen (\textit{Timbres-durées}), and himself.\(^{376}\) Eimert’s lecture clearly had acted as something of a discursive will-o’-the-wisp for the Darmstadt press, with Walter Friedländer recapitulating a slightly garbled version of Eimert’s historicist talking points in an effort to explain ‘what was on offer this year in Darmstadt’: “Punctual” music is directly historically derived from twelve-tone music […] Even the next resultant step from “punctual” music can be inferred: electronic music.\(^{377}\) More surprisingly, just one week after the performance, Paul Müller’s review for the \textit{Rheinische Post} claims not only that Boulez had been featured on the same programme as Stockhausen, Nono, and Maderna, but that it was three \textit{Structures} which were performed rather than the Second Piano Sonata.\(^{378}\) In a retrospective

\(^{372}\) Iddon, \textit{New Music at Darmstadt}, 85.


\(^{374}\) Quoted and translated in Iddon, \textit{New Music at Darmstadt}, 88.

\(^{376}\) Ibid.

\(^{377}\) See \textit{Im Zenit der Moderne}, III.555.


essay published posthumously in 1962 Darmstädter Beiträge zur neuen Musik, Steinecke himself capitalized on Müller’s mistake, and gives the example of this imagined Wunderkonzert featuring Stockhausen, Maderna, Nono, and Boulez’s Structures as an example of the varied stylistic orientations of the Darmstadt School in 1952. On a more forthright note, Friedländer confessed that ‘Karl Heinz [sic] Stockhausen’s Kreuzspiel for chamber ensemble and Renzo dall’Oglio’s Cinque espressioni for orchestra, both written in the “punctual” manner, can hardly be distinguished from one another.’ Such confusion is precisely the point, however. These muddled reports can only be mapped onto the literal events of the courses – the programmed concerts, workshops, and lectures – with extreme difficulty and circumspection, but they do match the conceptual blueprint of New Music developed by Eimert and Steinecke. Iddon’s conclusion that such historical revisionism ‘enabled Steinecke quite literally to backdate the idea of the “Darmstadt School”’ must therefore be gently qualified. Steinecke’s conflation enacts the concept of a Darmstadt School which had been proposed by Eimert in early 1952 as a coherent, international movement capitalising on the untapped technical possibilities of Anton Webern’s serial method. The creation of the Darmstadt School preceded its students and their practices.

Meanwhile, at Darmstadt: History and Programming

If the press response to the 1952 courses may be seen to represent both a paradigmatic reversal in the discourse of post-war New Music and a definitive close to the primeval institutional history of Darmstadt, it is worthwhile to note that this reversal is fundamentally discursive. At the outset of the 1946 courses, Steinecke described their objective in negative terms, as a necessary corrective to ‘a criminal cultural politics that robbed German musical life of its leading personalities and its connection with the world.’ The primary rhetorical objective of the courses at their inception, then, was one of internationalisation and ‘catching up’ to the outside world (Nachholbedarf). It was uncertain, as the press response to the 1947 courses makes clear, if a coherent avant-garde, let alone a modernist New Music, was to play any part

381 ‘eine verbrecherische Kulturpolitik das deutsche Musikleben seiner führenden Persönlichkeiten und seines Zusammenhanges mit der Welt beraubt.’ Wolfgang Steinecke, reproduced in Im Zenit der Moderne, 1.24–25.
In retrospect, then, the courses are hardly recognizable as the historical Darmstadt at this stage; Iddon’s thorough pre-history describes them as ‘ramshackle affairs in most respects’, to the extent that they primarily functioned ‘as experiments in finding out what the courses could be and how they might function.’ Such a confusion of purpose in retrospect problematizes the usual historiographical demarcations and conceptual vocabulary deployed to explicate the post-war avant-garde, especially the ‘zero hour’ myth. Contrary to Steinecke’s inaugural address, the first courses extensively programmed the work of composers implicated in the Nazi regime, and numerous works by such composers were heavily represented in the two following iterations. While many of the more compromised of these composers dropped from the programmes of later courses (e.g. Ernst Pepping and Kurt Hessenberg), others like Carl Orff and Wolfgang Fortner continued to be prominently featured throughout the decade.

From the outset, then, it is essential to maintain that the instrumentality of Darmstadt as discourse cannot be easily reconciled with the majority of the concrete administrative and programmatic decisions that were made about the courses themselves. A historical account solely focused on the latter would be able to present only the most glacial changes of repertoire over the first twenty years of the courses’ existence. Discursively, on the other hand, Darmstadt moves in lurches and jolts. The suture of Steinecke’s internationalist project to Leibowitz and Adorno’s historicist project, initiated in 1948 with the advent of Leibowitz as composition faculty and accomplished in 1950 with Steinecke’s announcement that Schoenberg’s work and thought formed the ‘pedagogical foundation’ and ‘primary departure point for work within the courses’; enacted a categorical re-grounding of the courses, presenting their pedagogical purpose as not only a social (i.e. internationalist) but aesthetic one aligned with a singular New Music. For about two years, this suture held in the critical discourse, and press reports, while disparaging, described a singular avant-garde of young
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382 Iddon, *New Music at Darmstadt*, 21. Iddon’s subsequent claim that Steinecke was ‘guided more by contingency than by ideology’ during this period might be nuanced by the suggestion that Steinecke was indeed guided by ideology, just not a very clear or consistent one.

383 In addition to Orff, Heiß, and Fortner: Werner Egk, Kurt Hessenberg, Helmut Degen, Ottmar Gerster, Gerhard Frommel, Harald Genzmer, Hugo Distler, Karl Marx, Ernst Pepping, Franz Flößner, Erich Sehlmch, Hugo Herrmann, Gerhard Schwarz, Paul Höffer, Hermann Reutter, Othmar Schoeck, Bruno Stürmer, Wilhelm Maler, and others. It should be noted, however, that such a repertoire was about the norm for programmes of contemporary art music in the aftermath of the war; see Ian Pace, *Reconstruction*, appendices.

384 To be sure, such an enterprise would be a welcome rejoinder to the lingering monumentalism of music historiography; nevertheless, its chronological scope exceeds that of the present study.

composers at the forefront of the courses advancing a coherent and mutually understood aesthetic project, as in Stuckenschmidt’s grouping of works by Antoine Duhamel, André Casanova, and Michel Philippot (all current students of Leibowitz) as representing at once ‘the most aggressive of twelve-tone technique’ and ‘the danger of Leibowitzian radicalism’. Borio sums up this period elegantly: ‘Between 1948 and 1951, most of the young composers working in Darmstadt adopted twelve-tone technique’.  

Of course, in its explicit function as a forum for post-Schoenbergian dodecaphony, the Darmstadt courses operated as host to a musical practice which had been extensively theorised and developed over a vast global network. In rhetoric which might suggest to a cynical mind that the international charter of the courses had never been taken as an article of good faith, Stuckenschmidt repeatedly emphasises how such an alien practice had been artificially imported to Darmstadt by Leibowitz and his school. It is representative that the Second International Twelve-Tone Congress whose proceedings occupied three days of the 1951 courses were an independently organised and constituted entity to which Darmstadt provided a forum – a forum which had previously been in Milan. At the conclusion of the Milan session, Wladimir Vogel, who co-organised the congress with Malipiero, envisioned an expansion of its pedagogical scope – a ‘more extensive meeting than the Milanese one’ with the introduction of ‘working groups’. After Vogel’s initial plans to organise the next congress in Locarno fell through, Steinecke intervened and proposed the Darmstadt courses as a potential venue. Not only would the congress have a captive audience, its activities would be integrated within the pedagogical apparatus of the courses, with Schoenberg himself leading a composition seminar. Matters did not proceed entirely as planned. Schoenberg soon cancelled due to serious illness (although not so soon to prevent the advertising of his presence); Steinecke offered leadership of Schoenberg’s session to Vogel, who modestly declined, and later demurred from attending the congress altogether. He was,
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387 ‘Zwischen 1948 und 1951 eignen sich die meisten in Darmstadt wirkenden jungen Komponisten die Zwölftontechnik an.’ Borio, ‘Kontinuität der Moderne?’, Im Zenit der Moderne, I.187.  
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390 Steinecke to Vogel, 21 November 1950; cited in Piccardi, 250.  
391 Ibid.  
392 See Piccardi, 251. Piccardi characterizes Vogel’s excuses as ‘trivial’, but astutely concludes that the composer was probably far more comfortable remaining in Switzerland (it is not difficult to imagine Vogel seeing the transition from lakeside Locarno to Woogle–side Darmstadt as a considerable downgrade, institutional apparatus notwithstanding).
of course, ultimately replaced by Adorno. Carlo Piccardi’s study of the Dodecaphonic Congress emplots the moment of Vogel’s abdication as the bookend to the dodecaphonic era more broadly, with the young Darmstadt composers at the 1951 courses exclusively engaged with the radical ‘post-Webernian current’, in effect resulting in ‘a second avant-garde’.\(^{393}\)

Piccardi and Borio’s bracketing, once again, is a discursive one. If the 1951 courses may be read as a victory lap or high-water mark of international dodecaphony, such a demarcation is far less visible from the musical practices represented at the courses or the Congress itself. To be sure, the Congress programme was, on its own terms, a systematic one, moving from a discussion on a ‘systematic representation of “classic” twelve-tone technique and its possibilities’ to the ‘possibilities for continuation of twelve-tone technique (mutations of such in the work of younger composers)’.\(^{394}\) And Goeyvaerts’s recollection that the twelve-tone method ‘had caught on’, like Piccardi and Borio’s periodisation, is partially borne out by the programmed concerts, which featured the more reliable of the younger dodecaphonists like Henze, Togni, and Wildberger.\(^{395}\) But such a discursive stability was negotiated against musical practices which were far less stable and systematic: Wildberger’s piece, for example, was immediately followed by Goeyvaerts’s in the second ‘Musik der jungen Generation’ concert.\(^{396}\) Even the official concert of the Congress contained two pieces by Hauer alongside the freely atonal and expressionistic Zwei Stücke for clarinet and piano by Egon Wellesz, a composer who Adorno had marked as pursuing a ‘bad modernism’, with the likes of Werner Egk and Hermann Reutter, that Adorno’s own theory was designed to actively resist.\(^{397}\) Indeed, the other two representatives of this ‘bad modernism’ had been programmed, alongside Carl Orff, on the opening concert of the 1951 courses.\(^{398}\) Yet the Second International Twelve-Tone Congress appears from press responses to have been the defining fixture of the courses, with the premiere of Schoenberg’s ‘Der Tanz um das goldene Kalb’ representing its ultimate triumph. Indeed, the ecumenical and stabilising movement of international

\(^{393}\) Ibid.

\(^{394}\) ‘Systematische Darstellung der »klassischen« Zwölftontechnik und ihrer Möglichkeiten’, ‘Erweiterungsmöglichkeiten der Zwölftontechnik (Mutationen derselbe im Schaffen der jüngeren Komponisten)’; occurring on 3 July and 4 July 1951, respectively. See *Im Zenit der Moderne*, III.548.

\(^{395}\) Ibid, III.547–551.

\(^{396}\) Ibid, III.550.


\(^{398}\) *Im Zenit der Moderne*, III.544. Egk’s offering, an Orchester-Sonate for large orchestra (1948), had previously been performed in the closing concert of the 1948 courses under the composer’s baton.
dodecaphony – Piccardi notes the ‘pluralistic’ character of the concert programming for the congress in Milan – very nearly appears to have encompassed the entirety of Darmstadt’s discursive economy, incorporating even erstwhile dissidents like Hermann Heiß and Herbert Eimert into its service.

There was, nonetheless, a limit to the stability of this discourse, a point past which something of Piccardi’s ‘second avant-garde’ begins to appear. As Schoenberg’s replacement, Adorno’s composition seminar was the pedagogical extension of the Second International Twelve-Tone Congress. His encounter with Goeyvaerts and Stockhausen, and the minor press attention it generated, runs contrary to the otherwise unqualified focus on dodecaphony as international New Music practice. Adorno’s defensive response – the cultic, ex-centric relegation to Adrian Leverkühn und sein Famulus – might well have been the last word if discursive provisions had not been made to integrate the music of the Sonata for Two Pianos into the mainstream of international-institutional New Music.

It is only at this point after the encounter that Webern finally arrives, acting as a retroactive tether to Goeyvaerts’s ex-centric, eccentric, and pre-Scholastic practice. Eimert’s deployment of Webern, then, operates as a gesture of affirmation – Adorno’s orientation, and that of international dodecaphony, is not wrong, Eimert says, it is simply technically insufficient, it has missed the most important, most historically propositional aspects of the very practice it advocates. Eimert accepts international, historically-conditioned dodecaphony and its universal validity – most obviously in his role as a participant in the Second International Twelve-Tone Congress, giving a presentation arguing that twelve-tone music is a universal technique rather than a mannerist style – but proposes a subsequent stage in this historical evolution: ‘punctual’ music developed from Anton Webern’s mature works. Next to Goeyvaerts’s and Stockhausen’s firm denial of Adorno’s practice as a search for chickens in abstract paintings, Eimert here enacts both a reconciliation and an elevation of Adornian-Leibowitzian dodecaphony. Simultaneously, Goeyvaerts’s Sonata and Stockhausen’s Kreuzspiel are not at all aberrations which subsist outside of the teleology of New Music, as Adorno had mistakenly taken them to be. Goeyvaerts and Stockhausen’s rejoinder to Adorno, then, becomes just that – an event of course-correction or aesthetic clinamen rather than
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ideological overhaul. Through the advent of ‘punctual music’, Adornian-Leibowitzian historicism is not discarded, but enlarged. The discourse of New Music is re-stabilised.

But as the press reports make clear, this reconciliation and its discursive stability is conditional on the young composers’ willingness to play along. Here Nono’s enthusiasm and sense of camaraderie carries the day: as a figure with reliable dodecaphonic credentials (his appearance at the 1950 courses having already resulted in his grouping, with Maderna, as ‘young Italian dodecaphonists’), Nono’s adoption of Eimert’s theoretical frame at the beginning of 1952 ensured the conceptual unity of this emergent Darmsadt School in the discourse surrounding the courses. Thus Goeyvaerts and Stockhausen’s barren cultic practice is rejected on its own terms, but as an extreme morphological variant of the spirit of the younger generation, more healthily exhibited in Nono, it is conditionally – and grudgingly – accepted as New Music. It remained to be seen, however, whether Goeyvaerts and Stockhausen would themselves accept their discursive position within the Darmstadt School.

---

Chapter 4: Webern Remains (und Eimert ist auch dabei)

As the press reaction to the 1952 Darmstädter Ferienkurse makes clear, Eimert’s understanding of New Music was becoming a popular understanding of New Music. The distinction between ‘understanding’ and ‘appreciation’ bears emphasizing yet again: none of the critics appeared to have any more affection for Kreuzspiel than Goeyvaerts’s Sonata the year before (indeed, it rather seems that they liked it a great deal less), but they did know precisely what to make of it. It was not the quasi-mystical enunciation of some barely-perceivable supranoumenal truth, it was not a metaphysical challenge to material progress, rather, it was precisely the next logical step in such progress. And it was not at all hermetic – in fact, it had been adopted by all the leading voices of the younger generations which, in a small feat of circular logic, were seen as leading voices precisely because they had adopted it. In short, it was New Music.

Over the course of a year, Eimert had taken a musical practice that was discursively volatile and not only stabilised it but generalised it to include an entire generation of composers: the Darmstadt School. Such volatility then, had simply been a misunderstanding, prompted by Adorno’s blinkered inability to see where the arc of historical progress really led. If the discursive significance of such a stabilisation is relatively obvious – New Music made sense again – the professional and institutional consequences are more complex. After all, Eimert’s Darmstadt School might very well prove as abortive as Leibowitz and Adorno’s.

In an effort to trace the professional and institutional consequences of this stabilisation, the final chapter which follows explores how practitioners and musicologists adapted to the formation of the Darmstadt School. The case study here is the diverging careers and friendship of Stockhausen and Goeyvaerts. If the available evidence makes it rather difficult to emplot this particular historical narrative in terms other than the tragic, the precise nature of Goeyvaerts’s fall to obscurity offers a more fruitful avenue for investigating precisely what was at stake in carving out a durable subject position within this newer New Music. This is not purely the case of a consummate artist refusing to compromise his ideals and suffering the consequences – as will be seen, Goeyvaerts continued to be eager to please – but rather a more nuanced case of a subject who is unable to speak the discourse his position requires.

Yet again, this case study is juxtaposed with discourse analysis. The focus here is a demonstration of how the stabilised discourse that resulted from the 1952 Darmstadt courses was instrumentalised into a concrete institutional programme: the support of the Darmstadt
School and the pursuit of technical progress in music. The discursive stabilisation begun by Eimert in 1952 was cemented by the Webern evening he organised on 23 July at the 1953 Darmstadt Courses, where Stockhausen, Nono, Boulez, and Goeyvaerts presented talks (the latter two in absentia) describing Webern's central importance to contemporary musical practice. Billed as an event honouring Webern's 70th birthday, this short symposium was widely reported in the press and became the defining event of avant-garde music in the post-war era, as will be detailed in the conclusion. Once again, Eimert’s ventriloquizing of younger composers is key to this institutional project.

The consequences of Eimert’s dummy act are both professional, historical, and, above all, discursive. The subject positions of these musicians – their relative centrality or marginality – was not a product of their musical practice but of the discourse that they reproduced, or, in Goeyvaerts’s case, repeatedly failed to reproduce convincingly. To this end, Herman Sabbe’s almost overwhelmingly thorough account of the commonalities between Stockhausen and Goeyvaerts’s musical practice during this period is examined against the musical-historical discourse within which it attempts to emplot Goeyvaerts as a central figure. The evident failure of Sabbe’s attempt and those of later scholars – in his (positive) review of Selbstlose Musik, Iddon characterises Goeyvaerts as ‘the archetypical musical footnote to history’ and Sabbe and Delaere’s efforts as upgrading the composer to ‘now a wonderfully expansive, vivid, and detailed footnote’ –¹ is used to demonstrate more generally why and how scholarship of these figures continues to be defined as the embellishment of footnotes.

Stability and its Consequences: Goeyvaerts

After sending a light-hearted letter from Antwerp detailing his return, dated 28 July 1952 and ending with a request for his friend to ‘write me a long letter’,² Goeyvaerts’s correspondence with Stockhausen breaks off for more than three months. Occupied only with the completion of Nummer 4 met dode tonen (1952) and freelance jobs (including a stint as a replacement organist),³ Goeyvaerts’s sense of alienation was exacerbated. Recalling this post-Darmstadt slump in his memoirs, Goeyvaerts writes: ‘One thing became very clear to me as a result of all

¹ Iddon, ‘Selbstlose Musik. Texte, Briefe, Gespräche by Karel Goeyvaerts, Mark Delaere’, review, Notes, 69.3 (2013), 532; 535.
² Goeyvaerts to Stockhausen, 28 July 1952; Selbstlose Musik, 332–333.
³ Ibid.
that had happened: I was facing a period of prolonged loneliness. Opus 2 and Opus 3 met gestreken en geslagen tonen were performed in Belgium, and if any interest was generated by them, neither Goeyvaerts nor the press make any note of it. The performance of Opus 3 at the 1953 ISCM World Music Days in Oslo, on the other hand, did generate mild attention, all of it negative. Edward Clark’s review in The Musical Times is illustrative here. After a rhetorically posed introduction (‘What of the younger men? It is to these that one instinctively looks for indications of new developments’), Clark immediately concludes that ‘[t]he exponents of “experimental” techniques failed to convince on this occasion.’ The two ‘exponents’ Clark cites are Goeyvaerts and Milton Babbitt. The latter’s song cycle, Clark determines, ‘failed’ on expressionistic grounds, ‘because he did not follow Schönberg, who once explained to the writer that a composer chose words to set which enabled his music to express itself, not the other way round.’ Goeyvaerts’s failure, fittingly, is rather more absolute:

The piece by Karel Goeyvaerts ‘aux sons frappes et frottés’ [sic] was a disappointment to listeners familiar with the compositions of Edgard Varèse, Darius Milhaud and others or with the fascinating examples of ‘musique concrète’ recently heard in various countries. Particularly unconvincing was the use of stringed instruments, violins and cellos, only to produce single notes. The effect of the whole was static.

Clark’s perspective here is reminiscent of Eimert’s two years prior at the 1951 Darmstadt courses, when he played Goeyvaerts’s Tre lieder to illustrate the maximalist strains of Parisian instrumental music and its kinship with Varèse. And it was as a pupil of Milhaud that Goeyvaerts first made his name – and the acquaintance of Eimert – with this same piece at the 1950 ISCM festival. Clark’s ‘disappointment’, then, is not only understandable, it is remarkably perceptive: if Goeyvaerts was the same composer, with the same aesthetic practice, as he was in 1950, then the timbral reduction to only the eponymous ‘bowed and struck tones’ (the former furthermore played sempre senza vibrato) made little sense. Ironically, however, Clark’s final comment suggests that the music did precisely what Goeyvaerts wanted it to do, although Clark clearly reads this ‘static’ effect as a negative outcome. It is Clark’s remove from the post-Webernian conversation which allows him to give one of the most aesthetically coherent
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6 Ibid, 377.
7 Ibid.
readings of Goeyvaerts’s music at this time, as a static disappointment of dynamic expectations. Without the tether of ‘punctual music’, ‘post-Webernianism’ or the Darmstadt School, Opus 3 was experienced as a misfire, unconnected with more fruitful ‘experiments’. Left outside the hothouse of the newly-christened Darmstadt School, Goeyvaerts’s practice withered.

Clark’s account appears to coincide with a BBC review of the festival Goeyvaerts remembers for ‘a series of derisory remarks about my text in the programme – a text which they had not understood at all.’ A letter from Goeyvaerts to Stockhausen mentions that ‘lots of commotion and laughter’ were audible in the live broadcast, suggesting that the commentators were not the only ones left in bewilderment. Such misunderstandings had concrete professional ramifications for the young composer – no doubt further contributing to his sense of marginalisation – and Goeyvaerts’s professional contacts in the Francosphere seemed to abruptly dry up since he had relocated to his home country. After his circuitous return from Darmstadt in late July 1952, Goeyvaerts became interested in the possibilities of electronically generated sound, particularly ‘sinus tones’, drafting Nummer 4 met dode tonen in the winter of 1952, which, as Sabbe notes, is most likely the first work intended to be realised through purely electronic means. Eager to pursue this work, Goeyvaerts petitioned the critic and musicologist Paul Collaer, who was previously instrumental in securing performances of his music in Paris and was now the head of the NIR, to be granted permission to experiment with sinus tones on equipment available in the studio. This request was ‘flatly refused’ by Collaer. This rejection clearly stung, since Goeyvaerts’s memoir takes time to mention that ‘a few years later, I bumped into Collaer at a concert [and] he spoke with admiration of the Gesang der Jünglinge, the first fully home-grown product of the Cologne Studio. He probably no longer thought of the chance he had missed two years earlier.’ Goeyvaerts has somewhat muddled the chronology in this recollection: his request to work with sine waves was rejected in 1953, and Gesang der Jünglinge was not performed until 1956, so the chance Collaer had missed in fact occurred at least three times.
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years before this conversation happened. It is tempting to read this error as confirmation that Collaer’s rejection was still fresh in Goeyvaert’s mind, as this aside is among the most uncharacteristically embittered that Goeyvaert makes in his entire autobiography.

Goeyvaerts chalks up Collaer’s neglect to the fact that Goeyvaert no longer moved in Francophone circles, writing that Collaer ‘had suddenly become cooler in my regard since I had left Milhaud and gone back to my native country to try and pursue a career. It went so far that my compositions, hitherto accepted for performance virtually as a matter of course, now ended up at the bottom of some drawer and were forgotten.’ As it so happens, Collaer had not forgotten about Goeyvaert at all: an index in his 1955 book La Musique Moderne lists Goeyvaert’s Tre Lieder per sonare a venti sei, the same piece he enthusiastically broadcast half a decade prior, as one of the seven most important compositions of 1949, alongside Schoenberg’s A Survivor from Warsaw and Britten’s Spring Symphony. Indeed, Goeyvaert is one of only nine composers born after 1920 who are mentioned in the book. In the text itself, however, Collaer’s enthusiasm for Goeyvaert is more measured. He is initially mentioned alongside Stockhausen as one of the two most representative examples of ‘analytical’ trends in young composers. Collaer’s opinion of such trends can be gleaned from a later description, no doubt informed by Goeyvaert’s abortive request to him in 1953: ‘Karel Goeyvaert, shaped by Messiaen and Milhaud, has renounced all other forms of composition to express himself exclusively with electronic music.’ It would appear, then, that Collaer’s neglect stemmed far more from discursive considerations than geographical or nationalist ones. What is more, these apprehensions echo those voiced earlier by Clark, emplotting Goeyvaert as a promising composer from a solid background who had gone off the deep end. Like Hauer, he had all the trappings of New Music while remaining fundamentally outside of its evolution.

Still, Goeyvaert’s hopes for both a broader understanding of his musical practice and a sympathetic institutional setting for him to pursue his increasingly abstracted ideal of ‘static music’ – which now had become so ascetic that only electronically-generated tones could be
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permitted – were not totally extinguished. He approached Vic Legley, who was engaged to conduct a concert with *Kreuzspiel, Opus 3*, and Nono’s *Polifonica – Monodica – Ritmica* on 14 April 1953 which would subsequently be broadcast, in an attempt to find support in realising *Nummer 4* in the studio. Although Goeyvaerts later recalls that Legley was ‘unable to understand why I wanted to use sinus tones in my compositions,’ a letter to Stockhausen from 20 February 1953 describes Legley as ‘very interested’ in *Nummer 4*, and he ‘immediately’ put Goeyvaerts in touch with laboratory technicians at the NIR. However, this too ended briskly in disappointment, resulting in tones that were ‘certainly not dead, and in fact more alive than, say, a clarinet tone’.

**Stability and its Consequences: Stockhausen**

In November 1952, Goeyvaerts resumed his correspondence with Stockhausen in an enthusiastic letter detailing the composition of *Nummer 4* and his hopes for working with electronically-generated sound in a studio environment. Stockhausen very much shared these hopes. Both inspired and disappointed in the work Boulez and Barraqué had been doing under Schaeffer, Stockhausen had repeatedly written to Eimert throughout 1952 encouraging him to create a studio for compositional experiments with purely electronically-generated sounds.

Not long after Goeyvaerts had written this letter, Eimert wrote to Stockhausen that the intendant of the NWDR had advised Stockhausen that ‘you should duly complete your studies in Paris and afterwards take on no further work without consulting with us.’ Eimert suggested that a one-year contract would be arranged for Stockhausen and ‘other close collaborators’ on his return to Cologne, characterising this development as ‘a stroke of fate’.

Alongside this good news, Eimert describes the vast possibilities afforded by the studio’s technology, with which ‘one can organise all imaginable sounds’, suggesting that electronically generated sound can radically expand or replace, for example, ‘the available material of the
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violin developed in the epoch from Corelli to Brahms’ with ‘a certain musical total-principle’ or ‘a pure application principle’ which would reconfigure the fundamentals of sound in a manner far exceeding ‘the limits of playability’.\(^{25}\) In view of such opportunities, Eimert suggests that Stockhausen might rethink his current practice: ‘With these considerations, I would like to encourage you to also be on the lookout for other formal principles.’\(^{26}\) In case the implication here is too subtle, Eimert turns to a concrete example in a broadcast of Stockhausen’s *Spiel* he had listened to 11 December, in which it seemed to him that Stockhausen’s present compositional methods had reached the limits of their effectiveness. ‘[W]ith such highly organised “Point Music”’, Eimert warns, in characteristically technical language, ‘the production and decay processes of the instruments are very essential – if one removes them, and this indeed is what happens with barbaric tape-editing, then something mechanical rolls along, like in the rhythmic tape studies of Messiaen and Boulez’, contrasting such a ‘sequence of blind sounds’ with ‘the tremendous vividness of electronic music’.\(^{27}\) As it happened, Goeyvaerts had also listened to the 11 December broadcast of *Spiel*, and was far more appreciative in his response to his younger friend: ‘For the first time it has emphatically struck me that this music actually avails “selfless being”. Where almost all music takes the listener to some state of excitement, here one experiences just the opposite: a great peace, in which one barely thinks or feels.’\(^{28}\) It is precisely the undifferentiated, static unfolding that concerned Eimert which Goeyvaerts takes as Stockhausen’s ultimate mastery of his art.

‘Punctual’ or otherwise, Stockhausen was under increasing pressure to alter the compositional practice that he had developed from Goeyvaerts and Messiaen. Eimert’s reservations resonate with Boulez’s negative reactions to Goeyvaerts during his stay in Paris. Doubtless Stockhausen had initially brushed these off – his letters to Eimert during his time in Paris are uniformly enthusiastic about his older friend in Antwerp, and he even mentions that Boulez ‘cannot make much of Goeyvaerts’ simply because the Belgian ‘is ahead of us all’.\(^{29}\) But Boulez was clearly threatened: Peyser’s biography mentions an unspecified later event in which

\(^{25}\) Ibid.
\(^{26}\) ‘Mit solchen Überlegungen möchte ich Sie anregen, auch noch nach andern Gestaltungsprinzipien Ausschau zu halten.’ Ibid.
\(^{27}\) Ibid.
\(^{28}\) ‘Zum ersten Mal ist es mir besonders aufgefallen, dass diese Musik wirklich zum “selbstlosen Sein” hilft. Wo fast alle Musik den Zuhörer in irgendeinen Zustand von Aufregung bringt, empfindet man hier gerade das Gegenteil: Eine große Ruhe, bei der man kaum noch denkt und fühlt.’ Goeyvaerts to Stockhausen, 12 December 1952; *Selbstlose Musik*, 337.
\(^{29}\) Stockhausen to Eimert, 10 March 1952; Kirchmeyer, ‘Elektronische Messe’, 241.
Stockhausen was ‘trying to undermine Boulez’ by pointing out that Goeyvaert’s Sonata for Two Pianos had been composed before the first book of Structures.\(^3^0\) Boulez’s response, as reported by Peyser, clearly reveals what is at stake: ‘Goeyvaerts is an invention of Stockhausen’s. He was to me what Hauer was to Schoenberg.’\(^3^1\) Again, Goeyvaerts is placed definitively outside the discourse of New Music. As such, Stockhausen’s position must be re-evaluated. In Peyser’s telling, Stockhausen had simply been ‘young and awed by Goeyvaerts’, but lost his naivety as soon as he met Boulez:

Immediately, under the influence of the slightly older and immensely powerful man, Stockhausen made the shift from Schoenberg to Webern and to an extension of the serial principle to areas other than pitch relations. Within a year Stockhausen returned to Cologne and the post-Webern movement took roots in Germany.\(^3^2\)

While, as Kovács has noted, Peyser’s credentials as a music historian are not uncontested (it appears she may herself have been ‘under the influence of the slightly older and immensely powerful man’), her narrative here is an unmistakable emplotment from Anglophone historiography. It is for this reason that Peyser can immediately assure her readers that ‘Boulez’s depreciation of Goeyvaerts’s talent is echoed by other specialists in the field’ – Boulez, like Schoenberg, is the important composer, Goeyvaerts, like Hauer, is an esoteric eccentric. Boulez and Schonberg are the centre; Goeyvaerts and Hauer are the periphery. Yet this emplotment is confused even on its own terms: if Stockhausen was under the influence of Goeyvaerts, how could Boulez have introduced him to techniques he already knew?

Stockhausen certainly seems to be a peculiarly contested commodity. In his ‘small monograph’ on Eimert, Helmut Kirchmeyer credits the older composer and theorist not only with the ‘discovery’ of Stockhausen but very nearly his de facto adoption:

The Eimert-Stockhausen relationship was as tight as it could possibly be between two men of such an age difference. Stockhausen no longer had any parents. His father had disappeared on the Hungarian front, his mother was murdered by the National Socialists in Cologne. The Eimerts’ marriage remained childless. For Eimert, Stockhausen became a son for whom he would do everything. He advised him, recommended Paris as a place of study, sent him to Darmstadt for the New Music

\(^{3^0}\) Peyser, 77.
\(^{3^1}\) Ibid.
\(^{3^2}\) Ibid.
Courses, drummed up his first commissions and, with great effort, brought him into the electronic studio as a semi-permanent artistic collaborator in 1953.\textsuperscript{33}

If the implication was not clear enough here, Kirchmeyer later makes it explicit: ‘Stockhausen was Eimert’s follower.’\textsuperscript{34} And, of course, there is always Herman Sabbe, who has asserted that Stockhausen’s work instead ‘followed in the footsteps’ of Goeyvaerts in numerous publications over the course of almost half a century.\textsuperscript{35} What is at issue here is not which one of these accounts is more truthful than the others, but rather the terms on which they establish their truth claim over the person and music of Karlheinz Stockhausen.

Despite Stockhausen’s Damascene initiation into the Messiaen-Goeyvaerts-Barraqué tradition which radically transformed his compositional practice – a Stunde null if there ever was one – in retrospect, at least, Stockhausen appeared unready to acknowledge a ‘mature style’ either in Kreuzspiel or subsequent works like Spiel, Schlagtrio, and Punkte. At the time, however, Stockhausen seemed far more confident of having reached compositional maturity. Adopting Goeyvaerts’s rather austere Nummer-system, he designated Kreuzspiel as Nr. 1, Spiel as Nr. 2, Schlagtrio (formerly Schalgquartett) as Nr. 3, and Punkte as Nr. 4.\textsuperscript{36} After the Donaueschingen premiere of an abridged version of Punkte on 11 October 1952, Stockhausen was introduced to Alfred Schlee, the head of Universal Edition, who expressed interest in publishing his music. While he did sign a contract with Universal – and continued to correspond with Schlee, who, in early 1953, promised to send Stockhausen all of Webern’s published scores in preparation for a ‘Webern evening’ Eimert was planning for the 1953 Darmstadt courses – Stockhausen did not opt to publish any of his music at with Universal at this point. Stockhausen’s next composition, which began with the readily Goeyvaertsian title of Nr. 5 für 10 Instrumente, clearly took on a more epochal significance for the composer, who changed the title later to Kontrapunkte and Nr.
1 für 10 Instrumente, before finally splitting the difference in Kontra-Punkte with the designation Nr. 1.\textsuperscript{37}

As Nr. 1, Kontra-Punkte became Stockhausen’s first commercially published score,\textsuperscript{38} concomitant with an overhaul of his official Werkverzeichnis: Kreuzspiel was now merely Nr. 1/7, the first in a series leading up, via Nr. 1/2, Punkte, to Kontra-Punkte.\textsuperscript{39} Clearly, this was a new(er) beginning for Stockhausen’s œuvre. In a short commentary appended to the score, Stockhausen describes the work in a starkly technical vocabulary as a juxtaposition of ‘the dimensions of sound, also known as “parameters”; this happens in a prescribed fourdimensional [sic] space: lengths (durations), heights (frequencies), volume (loudnesses [sic]) and forms of vibration (timbres).’\textsuperscript{40} Yet the metaphysical concerns familiar from Kreuzspiel are not totally absent: Stockhausen’s note concludes with a description of ‘an unique and extremely unified contruction [sic]. A hidden force which creates cohesion; related proportions: a structure. Not the same figures in a changing light. Rather this: different figures in the same, all-penetrating light.’\textsuperscript{41} Put in dialogue with his later comment in the interview quoted above, this performance note becomes less opaque, if no less esoteric. There, Stockhausen positions his music – as well as the New Music of the 1950s more broadly – against the ‘variation principle’ that characterised Western art music, ‘the same figures are shown in different aspects, that is variation technique, development technique’.\textsuperscript{42} Variation, then, is ‘the same figures in a changing light’, a relationship that Stockhausen’s music逆means. Like Goeyvaerts, Stockhausen is describing his music as arriving at metaphysical truth that has been neglected and even suppressed by Western art music of the bourgeois era.

Nevertheless, it was the parameters rather than the all-penetrating light which became emblematic of the Darmstadt School’s increasingly secure presence in the discourse of New

\textsuperscript{37} Blümroder, 99–101; Blümroder also mentions ‘KONTRA-PUNKTEN’, but this appears to just be a typo.

\textsuperscript{38} UE 12 207.

\textsuperscript{39} See Blümroder, 79; Stockhausen retained this numbering system for the rest of his life, although it is not commonly used as a reference even within the Stockhausen-Verlag, and the numbering seems distinctly unhelpful in distinguishing between the nested, modular scenes of LICHT. At present, Stockhausen’s oeuvre is organized from Nr. 1/11, Chöre für Doris, to Nr. 101, PARADIES, the ‘21st hour’ of KLANG. See the worklist available in English and German from the Stockhausen Verlag, available in English at http://www.karlheinzstockhausen.org/pdf/Karlheinz_Stockhausen_Works_English.pdf (accessed 30.8.2019).

\textsuperscript{40} See Kontra-Punkte, UE 12 207 (Universal Edition: 1953). The English translation given in the score, which is retained here, makes Stockhausen’s description even more obtusely technical: Höhen, which clearly has the implication of Tonhöhen (pitches), is translated as ‘heights’; similarly, Lautstärke would more intuitively be rendered ‘dynamics’ rather than ‘loudnesses’.

\textsuperscript{41} Ibid.

\textsuperscript{42} Stockhausen, Towards a Cosmic Music, 8.
Music. Whether the pressure was more from Boulez or from Eimert, Stockhausen now described his practice with reference to a toolkit of advanced techniques rather than a cipher-play – a *Glasperlenspiel* – of some kind of extra-temporal truth. The vocabulary from the foreword to the score of *Kontra-Punkte* is repeated nearly verbatim in Stockhausen’s contribution to the Webern symposium organised Eimert on 23 July 1953 in Darmstadt and later broadcast on the NWDR *Nachtprogramme* presented by Eimert on 12 November of the same year. Here, Stockhausen credits ‘Webern’s approach to the new compositional principles’ as postulating a ‘functional connection’ between ‘all three dimensions of the acoustic world’, which he defines as ‘relationships between time-durations, pitches and dynamics [Zeitdauern, Tonhöhen und Lautstärken].’

In self-imposed exile (or, at least, self-justified non-presence) from Darmstadt, Goeyvaerts sent his contribution to the Webern evening as an attachment in a letter to Stockhausen. Entitled ‘Anton Webern, Departure Point of an Evolution’, Goeyvaerts frames his argument as Stockhausen has, by claiming that ‘Webern is distinguished from Schoenberg and all other twelve-tone composers’ through his ‘application of sound material as a medium for the realisation of a structural network.’ However, Goeyvaerts immediately emphasises the ‘spiritual foundation’ of such a method, since ‘not a person, but a way of being should govern the tones. Music becomes an image of an essence, the composer becomes an artificer of the tones.’

For his part, Eimert presented these two short expositions, alongside contributions from Nono and Boulez, as representing not only a unified compositional methodology but a proscriptive aesthetic program for New Music. Much of Eimert’s argument had not been altered from his ‘limit-situation’ lecture with Steinecke two years prior: he again presents Webern’s music as ‘having thought through the twelve-tone system until its final abstracted territory, behind which silence appears to stand’, which nevertheless signifies ‘that this supposed end of music is at once a beginning’. As Eimert continues, however, the thrust of his argument immediately becomes far more direct than it was in 1951: ‘a beginning, in any case, for a group of young composers, who do not let the latest fashionable slogan, the “musical humanity”
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43 See Eimert, ‘Junge Komponisten bekennen sich zu Anton Webern’, in *Im Zenit der Moderne*, III.64.
44 Goeyvaerts to Stockhausen, 18 July 1953; *Selbstlose Musik*, 352. Stockhausen prepared a typescript from this, reproduced in *Im Zenit der Moderne*, III.61–62 (fn. 1), gently editing, clarifying, and tightening up Goeyvaerts’s German (e.g. ‘geistigen Grundlagen’ becomes ‘Geistesgrund’).
46 Ibid.
(»musikalischen Humanitas«), go unchallenged, and with unshakeable faith and strength of belief see in Webern the definitive master of the totality of New Music.\textsuperscript{48}

For one familiar with English-language historiography of New Music, this formulation is far from unexpected, and nicely encapsulates an idea put rather more disparagingly by Richard Taruskin – that post-war European serialism was little more than a manifestation of ‘the desperate antihumanism [sic] of the early atomic age’.\textsuperscript{49} While it may be contested that Eimert does not seem to come across as particularly desperate either here or elsewhere, it is hard to argue that, for whatever reason,\textsuperscript{50} he has placed the Darmstadt School as his avatar against what might very well be read as the humanistic impulse \textit{in toto}. Nevertheless, in the context of the present study, such a formulation should appear rather bizarre, not least since Goeyvaerts and Nono had repeatedly and publicly emphasised their desire for their music to inculcate some sort of new, quasi-utopian community.\textsuperscript{51} Indeed, if any such commonality might be demonstrated between the Darmstadt School as it stood in 1953 – Goeyvaerts, Stockhausen, Boulez, Nono, Maderna – it may very well be made fruitfully on terms precisely inverse to Eimert’s proposal, from a shared concern with a new, more integral relationship between composer, music, and public (and, for Goeyvaerts and Stockhausen, God). Eimert himself certainly was aware that there was little to justify this characterisation but nevertheless maintains its enunciative coherency. Such a paradoxical position is clear from his letter to Steinecke describing the Webern symposium at Darmstadt, which at once presents Eimert as the transparent advocate of the Darmstadt School and expresses bemused mockery at Nono straying from the script:

\begin{quote}
I thought that I would start off and, for a couple of minutes, present the general situation from the perspective of the young composers. Then Nono would say something about the hu-uman \textit{[das Määnschlich]} for 5 to 6 minutes, followed by Stockhausen talking shop for ca. 15 minutes.\textsuperscript{52}
\end{quote}

\begin{footnotes}
\textsuperscript{48} Ibid.
\textsuperscript{49} Taruskin, 43.
\textsuperscript{50} A further investigation, either discursive, aesthetic, or psychological, into potential causes for this evident ‘antihumanism’ would unfortunately risk completely engorging the already distended biographical exegesis of Eimert in the present study.
\textsuperscript{51} Most succinctly, in Goeyvaerts’s programme note to the 1952 Darmstadt performance of his Second Violin Concerto (see above).
\textsuperscript{52} Eimert to Steinecke, 22 June 1953; quoted and translated in Nielinger-Vakil, \textit{Luigi Nono}, fn. 123. It is most likely not coincidental that Stockhausen’s talk was allotted thrice the time as Nono’s.
\end{footnotes}
Indeed, Nono himself had written to Steinecke three days prior, expressing an explicit desire, as it were, to rescue Webern from advocates like Eimert: ‘[I want to] say something new about Webern, against the mentality for which Webern is practically just high-abstract mathematics, and against those who speak of his music only with formulas.’ For Eimert, Goeyvaerts was even further from the mark, and, unlike Nono, Boulez, and probably Stockhausen, Goeyvaerts was asked to provide an alternative essay for the subsequent *Nachtprogramm* broadcast. This second essay, given the rather less equivocal title ‘Perpetual Renewal of Music: Avowal to Anton Webern’ maintains the overall course of Goeyvaerts’s earlier argument – Webern is differentiated from ‘twelve-tone music from Schoenberg to Dallapiccola’ by his structural innovations – but replaces reference to ‘spiritual foundations’ with the more amenably Eimertian concept of ‘parallel technical and physical findings’, and presents metahistorical phenomena which prefigure Webern’s practice, such as ‘the splintering of tonality after *Tristan*’ and ‘the decomposition of rhythm in Stravinsky’s *Sacre*’. Writing to Henri Pousseur, Goeyvaerts seems upset at Eimert’s mediation of his writing, describing a hope that cultural gatekeepers who advocate for their music will ‘be of good will’, before admitting that such is not presently the case: ‘It’s the attitude we’ve adopted with Eimert and God knows he keeps spouting nonsense...’ Here, once again, an almost absolute disjuncture is maintained between the structural discourse of New Music and its practice; its enunciation as a discourse effectively irreconcilable with – or, more pointedly, irrelevant to – the practices of its subjects. As such, Taruskin’s claim re-establishes a discursive truism even though it cannot be applied to the music or thought of any of the composers it represents.

Irreconcilabilities aside, Eimert is far from finished. Teasing out the significance of this ‘truly astonishing event’ which has thrown ‘the seemingly most esoteric musician from the Schoenberg circle suddenly into the centre’ of the latest technical developments of music production, Eimert anticipates some objections which are almost eerily reminiscent of those voiced half a century later by Taruskin: ‘A physical-mathematical music then? A ‘game of Mandarins’, as Honegger once called it? Is it really? And furthermore it could be asked: here, in the wake of great physical upheavals, shall a musical materialism be reared which has forgotten
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53 Nono to Steinecke, 19 June 1953; quoted in Borio, ‘Kontinuität der Moderne?’, *Im Zenit der Moderne*, I.216.
54 See *Im Zenit der Moderne*, III.61 (fn. 1).
56 ‘C’est l’attitude que nous avons adopté avec Eimert et Dieu sait s’il dit encore des inepties...’ Goeyvaerts to Pousseur, 23 October 1953; *Selbstlose Musik*, 394–395.
the human origin of art?" The source of such objections, Eimert suggests in no uncertain terms, is Theodor Adorno, prefigured in the language of centricity and esoterica: 'I betray no secret: the criticism on Webern today is essentially Adorno’s criticism, subservient to Schoenbergian dialectics, which has designated the situation of these young composers as a “situation of the broken”', a verdict Eimert compares to the arguments of Hans Pfitzner during the 1930s. Once again, this is a seemingly odd rhetorical move (although, in all fairness, Eimert’s comparison between Pfitzner and Adorno on the basis of a sort of world-historical Kulturpessimismus is inspired, not least from both men’s admiration for the historiography of Oswald Spengler), positioning the most prominent theorist of New Music against the discursive formation he had himself developed. Nevertheless, Eimert maintains that the ‘young composers’ are enacting precisely the teleological event envisioned by Adornian-Leibowitzian historicism; as Eimert puts it, 'the powerful lesson issued to us by the history of occidental music is that the musical material came and has come to address us on its own terms’. The issue then, for Eimert, is not that the Adornian-Leibowitzian discourse of New Music was in error, but rather that its theorists were too blinkered to see its natural development from Webern to the ‘young composers’ of the Darmstadt School. Indeed, the sheer scope of his assembled advocates operates as Eimert’s concluding Q.E.D.: ‘if these young composers – at the moment individuals in France, Italy, Belgium, Germany, Sweden, and the United States – if these young composers now learn again the material language identified from music, then they do so as people of the 20th century.’

Such a turn from metaphysics to Webern was at once discursive, aesthetic, ideological, professional, and deeply personal. Goeyvaerts quickly became aware that his young friend was after something rather different in Kontra-Punkte; after hearing a radio broadcast of the piece
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60 Eimert, ‘Junge Komponisten bekennen sich’, Im Zenit der Moderne, III.59.

61 ‘...wenn nun diese jungen Komponisten – vorerst noch einzelne in Frankreich, Italien, Belgien, Deutschland, Schweden und die Vereinigten Staaten – wenn diese Jungen nun die mit der Musik identische Materialsprache wieder erlernen, dann tun sie es als Menschen des 20. Jahrhundert.’ Ibid.
that was ‘very sensibly introduced’ by a discussion between Eimert and Stockhausen in the summer of 1953, Goeyvaerts was struck by the incipient materialism of the music, writing to Stockhausen, ‘as its first process, this music already has a conception of sound; you can’t deny that.’ For Goeyvaerts, this is ‘more than just a formal issue’, it represents a fundamental divergence in practice and understanding. In a subsequent letter, Goeyvaerts clarifies his view of this divergence: ‘For me, sounds only come at the end, after the spiritual structure is so definite that nothing more may be changed.’ While Goeyvaerts still maintained that ‘differences are necessary for love’ in 1953, his friendship with Stockhausen chilled over the next four years before breaking off definitively. On 24 September 1958, Goeyvaerts sent his final letter to Karlheinz and Doris, an invitation to his wedding. They did not attend.

All of this demonstrates why Sabbe’s archaeology of Stockhausen’s work from Kreuzspiel to Kontra-Punkte and environs is so laborious, so painstakingly exhaustive, so definitive, and, above all, so insistent – it is this moment that makes possible advocacy for the centrality of Goeyvaerts’s importance within New Music. It is nevertheless somewhat curious that Sabbe has exclusively occupied himself with a comparative study of those works composed in the early 1950s, especially since Goeyvaerts himself had worked closely with Sabbe at the Institute for Psychoacoustics and Electronic Music (IPEM) at the University of Ghent throughout the 1970s, in particular collaborating with both Sabbe and Lucien Goethals on a multimedia theatre piece, Hé...?!, in 1971. Yet Sabbe himself drops the thread connecting Goeyvaerts and Stockhausen’s practice at the point where Stockhausen begins to increasingly concern himself with ‘dynamic aspects’ of composition in a dialectical re-reading of Goeyvaerts’s ‘static’ music (which, Sabbe, parenthetically concedes, is ‘in part mystically-esoterically inspired’). Here the double-edged
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62 Goeyvaerts to Stockhausen, 18 July 1953; Selbstlose Musik, 352.
63 ‘Bei mir kommen die Klänge erst am Schluss, nachdem die geistige Struktur so definitiv ist, dass nichts mehr geändert werden kann.’ Goeyvaerts to Stockhausen, 4 August 1953; Selbstlose Musik, 353.
64 Goeyvaerts to Stockhausen, 18 July 1953; Selbstlose Musik, 352.
65 Goeyvaerts to Stockhausen, 24 September 1958; Selbstlose Musik, 386.
66 The letter contains handwritten additions by Doris and Karlheinz; Doris writes ‘What do you say? I’ll answer.’; Karlheinz writes ‘Won’t work! [Geht nicht]’ (ibid). Goeyvaerts may well have anticipated a lack of response. For the first and only time in their correspondence, Goeyvaerts gives his last name in his signature, albeit parenthetically – ‘Karel (Goeyvaerts)’ – presumably in case the Stockhausens had forgotten him.
67 There is some confusion regarding the title of this ‘audiovisual manipulation’. In the work list provided in Selbstlose Musik, Delaere gives the title as Hé; the index of the book simply gives the title as Hé, as does Goeyvaerts’s autobiography (cf. Selbstlose Musik, 533; 106–107, 548). However, the recording of the piece present in the IPEM archive (as recording IPEM 26/27) gives the title as “Hé...?!”; whether the added ellipsis and question mark are to be read as part of the title or simply an expression of exasperation from the archivist is unclear, but I have sided with the former.
quality of the metahistorical Stockhausen becomes amusingly obvious – it is certainly possible to legitimise historiographically marginal figures through reference to Stockhausen, but only insofar as 1) such a reference harmonises with pre-existing historiography, and 2) Stockhausen’s practice is itself held to be representative of the mainstream of New Music. Since, for both Sabbe and music historiography, it is clear that Stockhausen’s practice was indeed the primary manifestation of New Music for the latter half of the 1950s, and since, for Sabbe, this practice is at a remove from the compositions which Goeyvaerts produced at this time, his study must be circumscribed at the moment where Stockhausen is, as it were, no longer following in Goeyvaerts’s footsteps. This is why the thread is dropped. On the other hand, since Stockhausen’s talismanic relation to New Music was contested and ultimately deposed by the early 1970s, any legitimating operation reliant on a comparison with his practice from this period would be pointless. This is why the thread is not picked up again.

It would be a fairly obvious analytical move, then, to juxtapose scholarship by Mark Delaere arguing for the essential methodological continuity in Goeyvaerts’s compositions over his mature career with the more ambitious (and far less convincing) unifying impulse of Stockhausen biographers like Robin Maconie. Indeed, Delaere himself gestures in this direction, drawing a series of transitions from a brief, unpublished text by Goeyvaerts (‘Zum Relativismus!’) written in 1955 which reference contemporary transitions in Stockhausen’s practice, e.g. ‘all-embracing rationality ↔ musical intuition’, ‘composition ↔ interpretation’, and, most pointedly, ‘points ↔ groups’. A convincing exposition of this move is unfortunately not possible within the confines of this study, but a brief outline of some of the most obvious parallels may give some sense of the enduring relation between Goeyvaerts and Stockhausen’s methods of composition.

In 1969, Goeyvaerts wrote the text score Vanuit de Kern (‘Out from the Core’) for two performers and objects. The two performers begin the piece in the centre of the performing space, and, during the course of the piece, gradually expand outwards, engaging with new instruments, in a rough analogue to the expansion of the universe. Goeyvaerts describes the

71 Ibid, 183.
piece as ‘an improvised musical action’ representing a ‘triumphant intercommunication’ which emerges ‘from perfect emanation’.\textsuperscript{73} Stockhausen’s YLEM, a text score ‘for 19 or more players/singers’, was completed three years later. The term YLEM refers to the ‘periodic explosion’ which occurs every 80,000,000,000 years, according to a model of ‘the oscillating universe’; accordingly, the piece comprises the gradual expansion outwards of the performers after an initial sonic ‘explosion’ in two cycles, concluding when the performers have expanded out so far that they have left the performance venue altogether.\textsuperscript{74} Significantly, the cue which inaugurates each ‘big bang’ consists of the tritone A-E flat,\textsuperscript{75} the ‘pivot’ pitches in Goeyvaerts’s Sonata for Two Pianos. As might be expected, Stockhausen’s rhetoric is rather more ambitious than his older counterpart, describing the piece as ‘music which best succeeds when the players establish telepathic communication with one another’.\textsuperscript{76} Nevertheless, the juxtaposition of these two works suggests that Goeyvaerts and Stockhausen’s musical practices shared far more than a common preoccupation with ‘punctual’ music in the early 1950s. If Sabbe felt inclined to argue that Stockhausen was still in Goeyvaerts’s footsteps at the beginning of the 1970s, a dialogue between Vanuit de Kern and YLEM would surely be a fortuitous departure.

The question of footsteps is perhaps not the most productive analytical tool. Certainly, by the early 1970s, Stockhausen had begun to emphasise continuity within his practice over any sort of universal vanguard, discursively torpedoing any lingering claim for avant-gardism. Most concretely, this resulted in the belated publication of withdrawn early works from the period between Kreuzspiel and Kontra-Punkte: Formel, Spiel, and Schlagtrio (formerly Schlagquartett), revised versions of which appeared between 1973 and 1974 from Universal Edition. Stockhausen himself began to comment on the similarity between the formal procedures used in its composition and those in his more recent work, especially Mantra.\textsuperscript{77} Significantly, these procedures – collectively designated as ‘formula composition’ – characterised Stockhausen’s compositional output for the rest of his life. Most famously, the entirety of the opera cycle LICHT, the composition of which occupied Stockhausen for nearly thirty years, derives from a single ‘superformula’, which may be helpfully read as an extreme enunciation of Goeyvaerts’s “static music”, i.e. music conceived as a projection in time and space of a basic idea generating

\begin{thebibliography}{9}
\bibitem{Selbstlose Musik} Selbstlose Musik, 498–499.
\bibitem{Kreuzspiel} See Stockhausen, liner notes to Stockhausen CD Edition no. 21.
\bibitem{Formel} Ibid.
\bibitem{Schlagtrio} Ibid.
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the structure." Stockhausen himself repeatedly speaks of ‘projection’ of different sections of the LICHT superformula in the composition of many of the operas’ modular sections, particularly the glacial electronic layers in FREITAG aus LICHT. Of course, by this point, Stockhausen was no longer the contested commodity he had been; the Boulez who took credit for Stockhausen’s initiation into proper New Music had disavowed his erstwhile protégé as a ‘hormonal hippie’. A canonical position for Karel Goeyvaerts, or anyone else for that matter, would be difficult to assert through reference to LICHT, which is why Sabbe has limited his scope to a handful of early, historically opportune, works.

Even so, Sabbe’s argument, which has remained remarkably consistent throughout his four-decade career, is treated with much circumspection on nearly every possible interpretive level by his editors, interlocutors, and commentators (indeed, one might assume this to be one reason why Sabbe has felt the need to reiterate himself so regularly). The fact that what is in effect a monograph meticulously detailing how Stockhausen adopted the practice of his younger peer has been published under the guise of an edited volume devoted to Karlheinz Stockhausen is elliptically commented upon in the introductory editorial by Heinz-Klaus Metzger and Rainer Riehn, who frame the volume as a sort of settling of scores. Much like Henze, Metzger and Riehn describe a state of creative collapse brought about by blinkered cultural gatekeepers:

Presumably serial composition has degenerated and perished under its own immanent difficulties. In the newer works of some of its formerly most prominent protagonists, who in the meantime have abandoned it, as in the works of many younger composers, who are already quite removed from the completion of the serial school, it becomes apparent how prophetic Adorno had been in his most authoritative salvos against post-Webernian serialism, in no way kind and especially fixated against Goeyvaerts, in which he sensed with an unerringly instinct a secretly central progenitor of the entire movement: the breakdown of the ‘bad Samaritan’ was followed by the whole of musical experience.

79 See, among others, Stockhausen, liner notes to Stockhausen CD Edition no. 49.
80 Peyser, 200.
However, a footnote to this paragraph goes quite a way further than Henze’s bitter lament for a paradise lost, drawing on the concept of the Lamed Vav Tzadikim (given in Hebrew script in the text), the thirty-six righteous people present in every era whose secret existence justifies humankind in the eyes of God, to describe the presence of ‘unknown composers who even today produce relevant music’. Maintaining the premise of this analogy, they refuse ‘to reveal the names of any living people’, but mention three who ‘have died far too early’: Jean Barraqué, Herman Van San, and Franco Evangelisti. This is a subtle but spectacular reversal: New Music that is historically conditioned and ‘relevant’ to its epoch exists, but it is axiomatically that which is excluded from the institutional discourse. In fact, the discourse of historically legitimate and institutionally conditioned New Music endures precisely because of the continued existence of those practitioners whom it explicitly denies participative subjectivity. Just as the Lamed Vav Tzadikim can only be identified negatively – if someone claims to be one, they certainly are not – the truly essential musicians, those whose work alone moves history forward, can be recognized only by their permanent absence. And, not coincidentally, Metzger and Riehn have presented this site of sacral exclusion as an anti-trinity.

To the extent that Sabbe is ultimately arguing for a prominent canonical position for Goeyvaerts and his work, such a framing is perhaps somewhat infelicitous to his purpose; at any rate, it is difficult to imagine another scholar making this point more methodically and convincingly than Sabbe has done. Nevertheless, his efforts fall short on his own terms: if Goeyvaerts’s centrality to the development of the post-war avant-garde has been established and agreed upon in positive terms, then it remains to be seen how he stubbornly remains, despite Sabbe’s tireless attempts to the contrary, no more than a footnote to the book of music. Accordingly, Sabbe’s blind spot is to present the historical claim made by Goeyvaerts’s music as largely self-evident on analytical and aesthetic grounds; unlike Metzger and Riehn, the received discourse of Adornian-Leibowitzian teleological canonicity is sufficient for his argument. There is, naturally, recourse to value judgement, like that underlying Toop’s assertion that the Sonata’s obscurity is well-deserved. The unaccountability of taste notwithstanding, this valuation is unconvincing for a number of reasons, most obviously due to
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8. Ibid. 4, fn 2.
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the simple fact that to this day this music is almost never performed. Even assuming a wide exposure to this music at the time it was written, the performances were inevitably truncated (like Stockhausen and Goeyvaerts’s own performance), haphazard, or even deliberately sabotaged, making it effectively impossible to reasonably assert any confident canonical arbitration one way or another. So much for values.

New Music Reconciled

Metzger and Riehn’s upending of the Adornian-Leibowitzian discourse proves useful: it explains the persistent obscurity of certain composers in the face of sustained advocacy to the contrary. This is not an aesthetic, stylistic, or otherwise qualitative action, it is a fundamentally structural and discursive one. Small wonder, then, that Adorno’s readings of New Music in the 1950s do little more than reassert the validity of the historicist model he had already established. If, in 1955, publishing a lecture given in Stuttgart in early 1954 in which he finally responded to Eimert’s squibs, Adorno could draw a parallel between the standardization of ‘Music Festival music’ and ‘the victory of the “gallant style”’ after the achievement of Bach, it was only because precisely such a redux of style gallant was the grim historicist verdict he and Leibowitz had proposed for a decade.84 Certainly, Adorno himself had little doubt that his emplotment had been vindicated: the third edition of Philosophie der neuen Musik concludes with a notice stating that, despite some ‘protestations that the book had done its duty and was no longer needed’, the treatise in fact ‘critically anticipated developments that only became manifest after 1950.’85 As such, Adorno’s complaint against recent works of New Music, as articulated in ‘Das Altern der neuen Musik’, is not so much that the works of ‘the iconoclastic exponents of “pointillist” music’ are barren and atrophied (since, for Adorno, they axiomatically are), but rather that pointillist music as a practice has somehow abdicated (Adorno suggests repression) its capacity to understand its own historical-material-social condition. ‘In them’, Adorno writes of such pieces, ‘meaninglessness becomes the program, though sometimes dressed up with Existentialism: in place of subjective intention, Being itself is supposed to be heard.’86 But precisely because of the

85 The note to the sixth German edition (1969) is included in Hullot-Kentor’s translation; see Philosophy of New Music, 163.
high degree of technical advancement which they employ – Adorno takes Eimert at his word here – ‘this music is anything but that of primal sources; it is subjectively and historically mediated to the extreme.’

It is telling, too, that the Roman Catholic God is so far from Adorno’s emplotment that the closest concept he can reach for is ‘primal sources’. Elsewhere, Adorno and Horkheimer use similar language to describe the Homeric mythopoesis opposed by post-Nietzschean reactionaries to liberal democracy, a set of concerns which result in a very particular reading of Goeyvaerts’s music. This is a significant terminological shift, and suggests that ‘Being itself’ is not quite as clear-cut as Adorno suggests: what for Goeyvaerts and Stockhausen is a theological truth becomes, in Adorno’s telling, an atavistic truth. As such, Adorno is able to dispatch the music of the Darmstadt School in the same manner he had dispatched those overawed by Homer’s ‘extreme difference to chthonic mythology’, as fetishists who are unable to see that ‘primal powers [...] already represent a phase of enlightenment.’

Accordingly, the recourse to ‘Being’ in Adorno’s reckoning is quickly elided with familiar concepts occupying the dark side of Enlightenment, like ‘the rationalisation of art’ and ‘the scientization of art’, ultimately resulting in an equally familiar, desperate fetishism: ‘Deluded, man sets up something artefactual as a primal phenomenon, and prays to it; an authentic instance of fetishism.’

Metzger himself was one of the first to take Adorno to task. ‘Das Altern der Philosophie der neuen Musik’, first broadcast on the WDR on 23 October 1957, was later published with the designation ‘Intermezzo I’ in the fourth volume of die Reihe in 1958, alongside an ‘Intermezzo II’ assembled by Eimert which, making the polemical argument that Adorno’s criticism was little more than moribund neo-fascism from the Webern Nachtkonzepte even more explicit, juxtaposes excerpts from ‘Das Altern der neuen Musik’ with ‘remarks in a similar vein by one Hellmut Kotschenreuther’ made at an unspecified earlier period of time which advance an
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88 Theodor W. Adorno and Max Horkheimer, Dialectic of Enlightenment, trans. John Cumming (London: Verso, 1997), 43–44. Dialectic of Enlightenment is without a doubt the most relevant of Adorno’s works not explicitly devoted to music for an understanding of the nuances of his (often critical) position on New Music throughout post-war period; Philosophie der neuen Musik was itself originally intended as an appendix to this collaborative work. It has not been cited previously because, while its relevance to Adorno’s thought on music in particular is significant, its relevance to the unfolding discourse of New Music is rather more difficult to directly evidence. If a common objection to giving undue prominence to Adorno at Darmstadt is that Philosophie der neuen Musik was more cited than actually read, Dialectic of Enlightenment was hardly even cited.
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91 See Iddon, New Music at Darmstadt, 129.
explicitly *Blut und Boden* ideology in their condemnation of modern music. Naturally, Metzger’s contribution, translated idiomatically as ‘Just Who is Growing Old?’, is rather more nuanced: like Eimert’s gloss on Adorno’s New Music and Adorno’s gloss on Eimert’s New Music, Metzger finds himself to be largely in agreement with his adversary – whom he describes as ‘the first truly educated musician among philosophers’ – and, at most, simply accuses him as a category mistake. Indeed, Metzger asserts that Adorno’s ‘basic idea […] of an objective historical tendency in musical material’ in *Philosophie der neuen Musik* ‘can scarcely be denied’, and ‘has been absorbed into the awareness of history which nowadays cannot be avoided by any young composer’. Nevertheless, Adorno failed to follow through on his own model, leaving the Darmstadt School to pick up the slack: ‘Following Webern, Metzger concluded, it was precisely Boulez, Stockhausen, and Pousseur […] who had taken up the challenge to deal with the dialectic between these processes and compositional will. This was exactly what Adorno had suggested would be at the heart of a progressive compositional attitude to material.’

However, in order to reconcile Adorno’s discourse – in essence, presenting the Darmstadt School as what Adorno had been arguing for all along – Metzger is obliged to make a structural adjustment to the discursive formation of the Darmstadt School, one which involved the increasingly unreliable subject of Karel Goeyvaerts. Metzger hone in on the recourse to metaphysics which had so disturbed Adorno in this New Music, and, in a gesture of reassurance, isolates it as a uniquely unrepresentative discourse. To do so, he uses personal experience to equate it – not without reason – wholly with Karel Goeyvaerts and his music.

If I remember rightly, in 1951 young Karel Goeyvaerts used this sort of argument when he brought his Opus 1 for two pianos to Adorno’s composition class at Darmstadt. [...] Again (and this I do recollect very clearly), Goeyvaerts used such ‘exposition’ in reply to
Adorno’s questions as to what his Opus 1 was ‘about’. If it had ever occurred to Adorno to ask a composer like Boulez or Stockhausen about the ‘function of phenomenon within a work’s total context of meaning’ he would have been rudely awakened by a very different reply. Instead, he merely substituted the name Boulez for Goeyvaerts. It is clear from the essay [‘Das Altern der Neuen Musik’] that one of its principles that one of its principal sources is this discussion with the young man from Antwerp, who is an artist of exemplary moral bearing and subjective attitude, but who seems, as regards the main point at issue, to have lost himself in deviation just as Hauer did in his time.97

Here Goeyvaerts, who was in fact one of the eldest members of the Darmstadt composers, is relegated as ‘the young man from Antwerp’ to the barren, ex-centric subject position of New Music discourse. Just as Boulez had predicted, Goeyvaerts was neither an irrelevance nor an error, but fundamentally outside the proper dialectical unfolding of history: he was Hauer. To stabilise Metzger’s ecumenical discourse of New Music and reassure Adorno that this music was exactly the self-critical, historically determined exposition of advanced musical material he had called for all along, Goeyvaerts is deployed – to use a metaphor the composer himself might have appreciated – as a Paschal lamb. His practice provided the systematic description of technique which was universalised in the Darmstadt School.

It is not surprising, then, that Adorno would react to Metzger’s ecumenical criticism with an equally ecumenical gesture, ‘entering into direct dialogue’ with Metzger in a programme broadcast on the WDR on 19 February 1958.98 Indeed, as Iddon notes, there was so little contention between the two theorists that the recording of this broadcast likely occurred in the summer of 1957 – well before Metzger had even publically given his rebuttal.99 The mutual ‘concessions of ground’ which Iddon chronicles over the course of this and subsequent exchanges, have, as Iddon confesses, a somewhat perfunctory character,100 since Metzger had taken care to ensure that both theorists would be largely occupying the same territory from the outset. Their debates, like the discourse more broadly, revealed nothing about music, only which set of techniques was worthy of universalisation. And of course, by this stage, Cage had already arrived on the scene,101 making the exposition of post-Webernian techniques, whatever that may be, something less of a pressing concern. The discourse of New Music now turned its attention to stabilising another, more aleatoric, set of techniques.

97 Metzger, ‘Just Who is Growing Old?’, 79.
98 Iddon, New Music at Darmstadt, 133.
99 Ibid.
100 Ibid, 133–141.
101 See, generally, ibid, 167–228.
In 1964, after Stockhausen had definitively abandoned *die Reihe*, Eimert published the first and only of a projected series of ‘Bücher der Reihe’, titled *Foundations of Serial Technique in Music*.\(^\text{102}\) The inventories and graphs are back in force, and the main body of the text is bifurcated by a table listing 1,928 of the 3,856 available all-interval series.\(^\text{103}\) Eimert even finds space to compare Adorno to Spengler once again.\(^\text{104}\) While such a settling of old scores and cataloguing serial impulse, delineated in further chapters on possible spatial projections of intervallic material, might well seem out of touch with more recent musical production, Eimert’s discourse is unmistakably directed at the newest of New Music. His teleology is still that of the *Atonale Musiklehre*: the autonomous, universal evolution of structural methods of musical organisation. By this date, Eimert expects the reader to be familiar with such an evolution and its attendant technique wherein ‘musical elements are not only themselves ordered, but also connected to one another in ordered series of elements that creates a totality, a unity. This development process of integral composing’, Eimert continues, ‘is today not only straightforward but also recognizable in its limits.’\(^\text{105}\) Predictably, these limits are overcome, yet again, through technical progress, whereby ‘the youngest music’ has abandoned ‘sterile seriality’ to pursue ‘aural, spatial, and interpretive actuation’, a territory Eimert systematically charts for the bulk of his study.\(^\text{106}\) Indeed, Eimert claims, remarkably, that the extraordinarily complex and rather fanciful geometrical functions he describes are exactly those which have already been adopted by leading composers.

Compositional practice of rotation technique may be found with John Cage and his school, with Mauricio Kagel and Karlheinz Stockhausen. Cage’s *Piano Concert* (1958) [sic] contains an abundance of rotation practices, of tone organisations in circular and curvilinear form through to obliquely situated line systems. Independently from Cage, Kagel has developed a systematic rotation technique in his works *Transicion I* (electronic, 1958) and *Transicion II* (1958/59) which allows groups of sounds to be rotated by means of a turntable mounted on the score page and thus makes available the...


\(^{103}\) See ibid, 72–86. This inventory is so strikingly totalizing that Toop uses it to illustrate ‘the real death-blow to serialism [...] Suddenly, everything was there; you could no longer discover, only select.’ See Richard Toop, ‘Against a Theory of Musical (New) Complexity’, in *Contemporary Music: Theoretical and Philosophical Perspectives*, ed. Max Paddison and Irène Deliège (Surrey: Ashgate, 2010), 97.


\(^{105}\) ‘In solcher Zubereitung werden die musikalischen Elemente nicht nur in sich geordnet, sondern auch als geordnete Elementreihen so miteinander verbunden, daß sie ein Ganzes, eine Einheit bilden. Dieser Entwicklungsprozeß des integralen Komponierens ist heute nicht nur überschaubar, sondern auch in seinen Grenzen erkennbar.’ Ibid, 10.

\(^{106}\) Ibid, 11.
calculation of the rotational position through the angular function. Stockhausen employs rotation technique in his work *Refrain for three players* (1959), after he had already practiced composing with the circular form, representative in this context, in the piece named after it, *Zyklus, 1959 (= circle).*

Thus, Eimert argues, these composers are merely following the ineluctable technical logic of twelve-tone technique into increasingly expanded conceptions of musical form. By reading these composers as systematically following the course of technical progress inaugurated by Anton Webern, Eimert presents a smooth continuity between the discursive formations of the Second Viennese School, serialism, and aleatoric and graphic music, not to mention the entirety of the Western art music tradition. Once again, the future was just like he imagined.

If Eimert’s commentary here – his systematic, elaborate technical readings of works commonly understood to result from aleatoric processes or even less technical concerns – appears jarring, it is worth remembering that he is not arguing for anything particularly novel. Musical progress as autonomous refinement of technical processes was Eimert’s argument since the *Atonale Musiklehre* forty years earlier. Indeed, if the scientistic language is smoothed over and the context of an extraordinarily exhaustive manual for serial-geometrical transformations is put to one side, what Eimert presents is an eminently recognisable portrait of the ‘second generation’ of the Darmstadt School: John Cage, Mauricio Kagel, and, still, Karlheinz Stockhausen. Elsewhere, Eimert’s reading of Cage is recognisably textbook, and even prefigures the emplotment of Helmut Lachenmann: Schoenberg’s projected ‘emancipation of dissonance’, Eimert claims, was pursued logically by Cage into the ‘emancipation of noise [geräuschfarben]’.

And Eimert is not wrong, of course, there are circles in these works. There was independent treatment of musical parameters through ‘synthetic number’ in Goeyvaerts’s
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108 Ibid, 132–133.

109 WEBERN, still Eimert’s touchstone figure; much of his graphic extrapolations of intervallic relations are illustrated through Webern’s works, e.g. opp. 17, 20, 21, 23, 24, 25, 26, 27, 28, 29, 30, and 31. See ibid, 127–131.
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Sonata as well. But Eimert’s point once again is that not only are these composers using the same sort of circle (or ‘systematic rotation technique’, if you like), they are using it in pursuit of the same end, the expansion and refinement of technical procedures to organise sound material. In such a discourse, it is immaterial whether Cage has encountered the *I Ching* or Goeyvaerts is a practicing Catholic: the curvilinear figures in the *Concert* are the same circles as any number of graphic scores; the number 7 is as good as any other. The only idea, the only phenomenon which may be found in New Music is the teleological course of technical mastery. Such a discourse is able to explain almost any musical practice, but it will always provide the same explanation. It is no wonder, then, that despite the almost incommensurable multiplicity of practices evident in both the concert programming and attendance of the Darmstädter Ferienkurse, historical accounts of New Music have only ever resulted in the same story.
Conclusion: Darmstadt and History

The history of twelve-tone technique is still unwritten. Therein, even the forgotten or occasionally mentioned in passing origins and by-ways of development might attract attention if, beyond their merely historical value, they fit into an image of a ‘system’ or significant accoutrements thereof that has only now become comprehensible.¹

Eimert’s position was not wholly one of uncritical scientistic zealotry. While he appears to harbour little doubt that his neo-Archimedean transformations of ‘spatial sound conditions’ (Tomraumverhältnisse) map seamlessly onto the practices of Cage, Stockhausen, and Kagel, he is less sure what to make of figures from the past, among whom, tellingly, he includes himself. His book concludes with a ‘small historical excursus’ on three overlooked composers who, Eimert asserts, were instrumental in the early technical practice of twelve-tone music: Fritz Heinrich Klein, Jef Golyšcheff, and Eimert himself.² In both intent and content, this concluding section is virtually identical to the concluding section of the Lehrbuch der Zwölftontechnik titled ‘On the History of Twelve-Tone Technique’, with Klein replacing Hauer as the primary unsung architect of musical progress.³ Eimert’s apologia, which begins with the epigraph to this Conclusion, ‘gives a few analytical notes’ on pieces by these composers which demonstrate precisely the systematic technical approach to composition that Eimert has described for his entire career. Indeed, one gets the sense that these works by Klein, Golyšcheff, and Eimert provide a far more direct demonstration of the techniques Eimert has been describing and their systematic application than Cage, Kagel, or Stockhausen. Why are the composers who actually wrote this music confined to the margins?

They are confined to ex-centricity because this discourse has never been concerned with music or practice, it is only concerned with technique as systematic, universalising historical explication. Eimert says as much himself. Introducing his Foundations of Serial Technique in Music, Eimert describes his critical practice as a ‘systematic science [Wissen]’, which, somewhat ironically, he opposes to ‘Historismus’ that disastrously separated the study of musical technique

² This ‘Kleiner historischer Exkurs’, then, is also an untranslatable pun on Klein’s name. See Eimert, Grundlagen, 160–163.
³ See Eimert, Lehrbuch der Zwölftontechnik, 56–60.
from the study of history. According to Eimert, this separation results in a “limping-behind” theory that is remedied by his ‘systematic’ approach which, like that of Adorno and Leibowitz’s earlier books, integrates theory as an immanent by-product of history: ‘It is that theory in the original sense of the word, which thinks “towards” music and for which the historical is always and everywhere present.’ Eimert cites Webern as inaugurating this systematic approach with his proposal that there would be “no longer division between science [Wissenschaft] and inspired production”. Instead of ‘limping behind’, then, the role of theory (‘theory’ here being synonymous with technical analysis) in this discourse is to rush ahead and provide a universal explicating ground for contemporary production of New Music. Contrary to Eimert’s and his ventriloquised Webern’s claims, then, theory and practice are not reunited in this discourse, they simply exchange places, with theory operating as a precondition for any practice to claim historicity. The discourse of New Music, as developed by Adorno, Leibowitz, Eimert, and numerous others, requires a barren, ex-centric, systematic demonstration of technique before the work of history can be applied to its proper subjects: the real composers of New Music.

Much like Leibowitz’s discursive coup at the 1948 courses, Eimert’s reading of Webern and his persistent presentation of a unified, international group of ‘young composers’ permanently reconfigured the way in which both New Music in general and Darmstadt in particular were understood. It was immediately picked up by the press – sample headlines include ‘The Situation of »Ruin«. Anton Webern and the Youngest Generation of Composers’, ‘An Unknown Forms Schools. Anton Webern Memorial Concert in the Seminar Marienhöhe [sic]’, ‘Schönberg, Webern and the Young Generation’ and has remained the defining historical event of post-war European New Music to this day. Accordingly, the music of the Darmstadt School is reduced to the technical demonstrations of composers themselves marginal to the historical narrative. In An Introduction to Twentieth Century Music, published in 1961, the American musicologist Peter S. Hansen devotes a small section to European serialism, following on a section concerning ‘The Age of Webern’, which is given the intimidating title
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4 Eimert, Grundlagen, 9. The further irony of deploying historicism to refute historicism is naturally familiar to the scholar of aesthetic periodisation in the late twentieth century.
5 ‘Es ist jene Theorie im ursprünglichen Sinne des Wortes, die “an” der Musik denkt und für die das Historische immer und überall gegenwärtig ist.’ Ibid, 9–10.
6 Ibid, 10.
'Total Control'.

Hansen gives Boulez’s series of durations, articulations, and dynamics for the first book of *Structures* (incorrectly identifying them as being from the Second Piano Sonata) as the primary examples of a ‘totally controlled’ music wherein ‘every factor is planned by the composer, and the performer need only carry out his precise directions.’

He concludes his account by noting: ‘It would be hazardous to say that any masterpieces of totally controlled music have been written as yet. A major problem lies in the fact that the systems of order they embody are far too precise to be perceived by most listeners, and the absence of any familiar elements such as melody and timbre [sic] tend to make for aridity.’

David Ewen’s book *Modern Music: A History and Appreciation—From Wagner to the Avant-Garde* was published one year later, in 1962. The concluding chapter on the avant-garde is far less reserved than Hansen’s account:

Most of the changes that took place in modern music discussed in the preceding chapters represent evolution. [...] But with the music of the avant-garde, which has so inundated the world of music, what we have is not evolution but revolution: a complete break with the past. [...] A new notation has been devised consisting of lines, marks, curves, parabolas, so that many an avant-garde score looks like a design for a missile.

Although it is never outright disparaging, this sort of alarmist sci-fi language is largely representative of the chapter as a whole, as when Ewen describes the material of Webern’s Symphony as ‘ideas reduced to fragments, ideas so pulverized that they have become atoms.’

Ewen claims this piece to be the singular touchstone of the post-war avant-garde, where ‘[a]bstraction, objectivity, the absence of the human element, and brevity reach their ultimate destination’. He goes on to say that Webern’s Symphony suggested to composers that they could create series of durations, dynamics, and articulations in addition to pitches, resulting in a system which he calls, simply, ‘serialism’. This is precisely the practice Eimert had lionised in his *Lehrbuch*, replete with its historical and technical teleologies and even Eimert’s erstwhile ‘atomic’ characterisation. The only difference is that Ewen’s language is negative while Eimert’s is positive. The story is exactly the same.
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Reginald Smith Brindle’s *The New Music*, published in 1975, is somewhat unusual in that it begins with a ‘public confession’ from the writer himself for having participated in the indefensible dogmatism of the subjects he treats. From there, the story is familiar. Certain composers, ‘striving towards a more ascetic, less emotional language than Schoenberg’s high-pressure expressionism, seized on Webern’s slender, intellectual conceptions as the basis for a new musical language. This so-called “Post-Webern” school will be treated in the next chapter.’

After this promised chapter on the inauguration of ‘The Webern Cult’ at Darmstadt in 1953, he proceeds to ‘The Avant-Garde—Pointillism’, chronicling how ‘the Webern cult [...] merged into a ‘Post-Webern’ school [and] crystallized into a cult of the Avant-Garde.’ Smith Brindle then moves onto ‘Integral Serialism’ (which he seems to largely elide with ‘pointillism’), before concluding with a familiar caveat: ‘Certainly it is possible to write music through cerebral devices, without getting emotively involved or even attempting to mould it into more artistic form. But is this really art?’

Eric Salzman’s *Twentieth-Century Music: An Introduction* was first published in 1967 by commercial textbook publisher Prentice Hall and has gone through four editions, the most recent of which was published in 2002. Salzman distinguishes European New Music from its American counterpart (represented by Babbitt) by stating that, for European practitioners of serialism, ‘[t]he twelve-tone idea [...] is not a method (in Schoenberg’s sense) nor a complex system (in Babbitt’s sense) but rather a total generating principle through which a new and complete identity of materials, means, structure, and expression could be achieved.’ Thus, these composers charted ‘all possible points of intersection’ between different musical parameters in the course of composition. As an aside, Salzman notes: ‘It is not quite accurate to say, as some commentators have, that this is music in which analysis precedes composition. The analysis is quite equivalent to the piece.’

The post-war generation are further described as ‘Webernites’ who ‘did not hesitate to draw the most extreme conclusions’ from the master’s
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fixation on ‘the individual, isolated sound event and the rational, organizing power of the serial principle.’

Stockhausen is touchstone figure, ‘the most influential architect and theorist of European Serialism’.

He is introduced in very nearly dictatorial terms:

Stockhausen’s initial concerns were the complete isolation and definition of every aspect of musical sound and the extension of serial control into every domain. The latter point is important: Stockhausen envisaged the possibility of serializing and thus pre-controlling even such matters as the density of harmonic, vertical masses; the number of musical events occurring in given time segments; the size of intervals and the choice of register; the types of attacks and articulations employed; the rate of change of texture and tone color.

Salzman does point out that the ‘reign’ of European serialism was ‘rather brief’, but goes on to say that 'literally dozens and even hundreds of totally organized, post-Webern serial pieces were written, nearly all for small combinations of instruments and nearly all based on a highly rationalized arrangement of isolated, “pointillist” events and textures, often surrounded by generous amounts of highly organized silence.’

With an extremely liberal understanding of the categories of ‘pointillism’, ‘post-Webern’, and so on, there are ('literally') less than a dozen extant scores which might fit Salzman’s description. These include Goeyvaerts’s Opus 2, Opus 3 met gestreken en geslagen tonen, and Nummer 6 met 180 klankvoorwerpen; Stockhausen’s Kreuzspiel and Schlagtrio; Michel Fano’s Étude for 15 instruments; and Herman Van San’s Sneden and Latticen. Of these pieces, only Goeyvaerts’s Opus 2 and Opus 3 and Stockhausen’s Kreuzspiel had public performances in the early 1950s (Van San’s Sneden was premièred as ‘Opus 5’ at the 1957 Ferienkurse). None of these scores were published in the 1950s; Fano’s and Van San’s work remains unpublished. If Salzman’s remark about 'highly organized silence' is taken at face value, Goeyvaerts’s Opus 3, which uses rests as ‘negative values’ separating sounds, is in fact the only piece that fits such a description. Later, Salzman aligns this imaginary corpus with a ‘positivist’ conception of musical material, which (he claims) evolved into a ‘structuralist’ one in the later 1950s.
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It is very odd that a single piece by an obscure Flemish composer appears to have become the sole referant the totality of avant-garde musical production in Europe in the early 1950s. But this was precisely the state of affairs that Eimert had described in his *Lehrbuch der Zwölftontechnik*. Of course, like Eimert and Adorno, these historians never let on that their descriptions could only fit the music of Karel Goeyvaerts. Bryan R. Simm’s *Music of the Twentieth Century: Style and Structure*, first published in 1986, follows Salzman in giving Stockhausen’s *Kreuzspiel* as ‘an example of post-war pointillism’ which takes Webern as its sole model.\textsuperscript{28} Subsequently, *Kreuzspiel* is later described as roughly equivalent to Boulez’s *Structure Ia* ‘[i]n its rigorous application of serial procedures and elaborate pre-planning’.\textsuperscript{29} Together, these practices represent the primary force shaping the European post-war avant-garde: the ‘Darmstadt School’, a group described, in an extremely telling conflation, as being ‘founded in 1946’.\textsuperscript{30}

It is clear that by this point Stockhausen and Boulez have become metonyms not only for the ‘Darmstadt School’ but the Darmstädt Ferienkurse in its entirety, even though, until the late 1950s, the courses themselves were largely devoted to Igor Stravinsky and Carl Orff. Of course, as everyone now knows, Orff is not New Music. Nor is the Stravinsky which was the subject of Strobel’s discussion. But the Stravinsky who adopted an idiosyncratic method of organising hexachords is fitfully emplotted in the textbook narrative as a member of the old guard who strove, in the words of Burkholder, Grout, and Palisca, ‘to keep up with the times’.\textsuperscript{31} These times are Eimert’s times, where the international avant-garde boldly took up the telos of technical progress from where Webern had left it: ‘At a memorial concert of his works at Darmstadt in 1953, Webern was hailed as the father of a new movement.’\textsuperscript{32} In fact, this is the sole historical event mentioned in the section on ‘Serialism’ in Burkholder, Grout, and Palisca’s textbook.

This story of the Darmstadt School acts as foundational doxa for intellectual, aesthetic, and institutional projects as seemingly disparate as American minimalism and post-

\textsuperscript{29} Ibid, 332.
\textsuperscript{30} Ibid, 344–345. This error of dating speaks to the logic of this discourse – why *shouldn’t* Stockhausen and Boulez have been there from the start? Why did ‘zero hour’ have to wait until 1951?
\textsuperscript{31} Burkholder, Grout, and Palisca, 828.
\textsuperscript{32} Ibid, 917.
minimalism, the *Neue Einfachheit*, and a critical sociology of the political economy of music.\(^{33}\) Even critical accounts take this narrative at face value – for example, see Daniel K. L. Chua’s claim, itself echoing Max Paddison, that ‘[t]he composers at Darmstadt’ who adopted Adorno’s position in *Philosophie der neuen Musik* as legitimation for their music ‘simply didn’t get the drift.’\(^{34}\) This discourse keeps doing the same job: it points from technique to universal-historical legitimation. The techniques may be contested, as may the attendant legitimation, but everyone is very clear that this is how New Music is spoken of.

If the preceding study has done anything to problematize or even undermine the textbook account of Darmstadt, then it has accomplished something necessary and worthwhile, and it augments an ever-growing body of scholarship impatient with the metanarratives operative in historiography of New Music. But, as can be seen from Sabbe’s example, the work of setting the record straight is tedious, narrowly-focused, and, evidentially, more than a little futile. Having completed this fine-grained work, the scholar is likely to take a step back and discover that it has been silently assimilated into the same story, the same history, the same canon, the same stable discourse. In this light, the account given here, which presents a sort of pre-history of Darmstadt, may well appear patently inadequate: sure, it fills in certain gaps, e.g. precisely what Barraqué, Goeyvaerts, Fano, and Stockhausen saw in Webern in the early 1950s or exactly how far back the concept of ‘punctual music’ can be traced, yet ultimately does little to recast how this music is understood. Like Eimert’s forgotten pioneers, the foregoing events appear as marginal fissures within a primeval sub-phase of one broader historical continuity, of anecdotal technical interest. Certainly the technical focus of the analyses given above of music by Goeyvaerts, Barraqué, and Stockhausen could be easily read as parallel to Eimert’s ‘forgotten or occasionally mentioned in passing origins and by-ways of development’, not to mention Sabbe’s more direct crusade against historical neglect: they trace the development of technical processes and their shared application by a group of like-minded composers. Sabbe and Eimert are mistaken, however, in thinking that the obscurity of these practices is merely a case of neglect. The argument made – ‘Golyscheff, too, was important!’ or ‘Goeyvaerts was more than a footnote!’ – inevitably follows the logic of the discourse, it points from technique to universal-historical legitimation. But the impact is underwhelming, since the techniques


described have already been deployed to legitimate the real composers of the Darmstadt School. Sabbe and Eimert are not saying anything conceptually new about these composers, then, they are simply retroactively fitting them to the teleology of New Music that had been long established. Accordingly, Goeyvaerts becomes, at best, the odd relation to post-Webernian serialism, even though his music is the only music which deploys the technical procedures used to describe this movement. Clearly technique is not enough.

It is for this reason that a genealogical account must be provided for New Music as a discursive institution which produces and fills subject positions. The analysis provided here of the work of René Leibowitz and Theodor W. Adorno towards the institutional establishment of a specifically dodecaphonic, historically-conditioned, unified and universal New Music at a point when these categories were not only contested but fundamentally incoherent, is a very limited response to this task. It is limited both in its results and in its scope. The real focus of this study is not the successive sutures of Schoenberg and Webern onto this discourse – the stabilising events – but the powerful dehiscence which occurred between the summers of 1951 and 1952. To be sure, such a dehiscence is manifest almost exclusively through conceptual and discursive configurations. In other words, while concert life, even New Music concert life, carried on with programming Orff and Egk, there was a period when it was disturbingly unclear what New Music was, where it came from, and what it was meant to do. The critical reception of Goeyvaerts’s Sonata during and after the 1951 courses resorted to elemental metaphors of cosmic fire and ice and ‘angelic horror’ or metaphysical analogies of death and annihilation; the press response for the succeeding year deployed stabilised historical categories which are both recognizable and easily assailable into the textbook narrative of New Music as it exists to the present.

What is at stake is at once more complex and rooted than a simple misrepresentation of the purely poietic realm of Goeyvaerts and Stockhausen’s compositional practice. Eimert’s discursive intervention and the resulting conceptually unified critical response to Darmstadt after 1952 stabilises not only how this music is received, but, on a phenomenological level, how it is heard to begin with. The assumption that a piece of music is a painstakingly constructed processual apparatus which represents the acme of technical proficiency results in a far different listening than the assumption that a piece of music is to inaugurate some sort of higher mystery beyond sensory perception. Put bluntly: a post-Adornian frame insists that the constitutive category of what is there in New Music is historical-material and (Eimert would
insist) technical. This category is not only anti-metaphysical, its foundational character is a repudiation of metaphysics, which, for Adorno, is nothing more than masked affirmation.\(^{35}\) Of course, when heard on these terms, ‘static music’ is likely to be the ‘unconvincing’ experience reported by the press at both Darmstadt and the ISCM. Even if Goeyvaerts’s naïve request to Steinecke for two performances of Opus 2 at the 1952 Ferienkurse had been granted, they would have been heard just as Stockhausen’s Kreuzspiel (and, for that matter, Leibowitz’s Chamber Symphony op. 16, performed at the 1948 courses) had been: as unpleasant yet necessary representatives of the latest stage of historical-technical progress. Eimert’s discourse stabilised this music at the cost of all other available readings. This is not to suggest that the established institutional categories of New Music are, in any extra-discursive form, either stable or continuous – rather that they are simply and consistently available. Even a cursory glance over the historical artefacts amassed around the Darmstädter Ferienkurse reveals a wealth of caesuras, confusions, and remarkable disruptions at the levels of discourse, aesthetics, practice, and institutional and professional functionality. Yet such events were inevitably subsumed, smoothed over, and explicated in the same discourse of historical progress, the same story of New Music. It is not coincidental that Martin Iddon’s study on one of the most explosive of these disruptions is given the title ‘Trying to Speak’.\(^{36}\)

A different sort of reading, listening, and speaking about New Music can do more than rehabilitate the popular reception of Karel Goeyvaerts, though this is itself, no doubt, a worthy goal. It would be able to reckon with a vastly expanded field of musical production. Such a field is, in fact, what has always been on display at Darmstadt. Taking the 1954 courses as a case study, Iddon argues that the only programmed composition, Michel Fano’s Sonata for Two Pianos, represented anything close to a sort of ‘total serialism’.\(^{37}\) Yet few of the other figures Iddon mentions – Gunter Schuller, Giselher Klebe, Hans Eklund, Juriaan Andriessen, Heimo Erbse, Karel Husa, Alexander Goehr, Don Banks, Camillo Togni, Bengt Hambraeus, and Jacques Wildberger – have been given any sustained scholarly attention in connection with Darmstadt. For that matter, neither has Fano.

A mode of interpretation not tethered to this same discourse of New Music would be able to provide narratives of contingencies, of friendships, of collaborations both major and

\(^{35}\) At least this is his position in ‘Das Altern’.
\(^{37}\) Iddon, New Music at Darmstadt, 102–106.
minor, of events without inevitability, that would work towards providing a non-reductive account of how New Music was made in Europe. Indeed, these are precisely the sorts of subjects that critical, ‘social’ histories from Born to Taruskin seem to want to describe. But their description is that of Latour’s resentful sociologist: scattered minor musics watching helplessly as the juggernaut of serialism, propped up by Cold War propaganda, dominated all avenues of artistic production. No wonder, then, that Taruskin uncritically cites Henze’s account of Darmstadt: it is the same discourse, the same story of ineluctable technical progress, except the bad guys are in control.\(^38\) The issue is never the discourse, only the figures which populate it. Not only does the reproduction of this discourse fatally undercut any possibility of nuanced engagement with extant manifestations of musical practice, it ensures that New Music itself remains a closed system, with the same inside-outside endlessly policed. Perhaps this is the reason why Taruskin persistently fails to identify figures which might be unfamiliar, as when he reproduces a strikingly diverse photograph of 52 composers only to point out Milton Babbitt and Elliot Carter: his resentfully adopted discourse has ensured that he is unable to speak of anything other than the same dread serialists.\(^39\) In their advocacy of some emancipatory, non-hierarchical artistic project, historians of New Music maintain a discourse which is far more totalitarian than anything that has actually taken place at the Darmstadt courses.

Adorno himself later attempted to arrive at an emancipatory project of art. Contrary to Eimert, who often appears rather pleased that matters invariantly went according to plan, Adorno often appears disappointed and even troubled that his discursive model of New Music had, sure enough, ineluctably played out in exactly the manner he had projected. The extent to which he seriously considered alternatives to the ‘musical mastery of nature which progresses to the Absolute’ is difficult to ascertain.\(^40\) Adorno seems to be aware that the imagery he deployed for such a project had an escapist veneer of intellectual kitsch: the ‘amiable illusion’ of message in the bottle aloft on the flood of barbarism, desperate fragments shored against the ruins of ‘art’s necrology’.\(^41\) Still, Adorno maintained hope that matters might be otherwise. Such a position, as outlined in ‘Vers une musique informelle’ is, within both Adorno’s thought in

\(^{38}\) Taruskin is heavily reliant on Henze’s autobiography, even using it to suggest that Stockhausen had been planning the 9/11 attacks in the 1950s (see Taruskin, 474).

\(^{39}\) Ibid, 473–474.

\(^{40}\) Adorno, Philosophie, 193.

\(^{41}\) The Flaschenpost-an-sich can be found at the conclusion of Philosophie; for its undulations on the barbaric seas, see Minima Moralia: Reflections from Damaged Life, trans. E. F. N. Jephcott (London: Verso, 1974), 209.
particular and the discourse of New Music more broadly, somewhat contradictory.\textsuperscript{42} He begins by confessing that his ‘narcissism’ has lured him into behaving badly towards recent musical practice, just as the Wagnerians rejected Strauss and the Straussians rejected Schoenberg.\textsuperscript{43} The next inevitable step, Adorno concedes, was the Schoenbergians rejecting the ‘system-driven music’ of the Darmstadt School. Clearly, Adorno is still thinking of his initial encounter with Goeyvaerts and Stockhausen, causing him to attribute, reasonably enough, a ‘theory of static music’ to Stockhausen. Here Adorno seems to be conceding Metzger’s point that he was unable to appreciate the products of a historical process that he himself had described. Yet Adorno seizes on Metzger’s coining of ‘a-serial music’ – which he identifies as ‘one of the most advanced concepts’ – to propose one last opportunity for ‘musical emancipation’.\textsuperscript{44} In Adorno’s terms, this is musique informelle, ‘a type of music which has discarded all forms which are external or abstract or which confront it in an inflexible way.’\textsuperscript{45} To be sure, musique informelle can only exist on the terms of standardised, stabilised New Music discourse, and Adorno immediately clarifies that ‘although such music should be completely free of anything irreducibly alien to itself or superimposed on it, it should nevertheless constitute itself in an objectively compelling way, in the musical substance itself, and not in terms of external laws.’\textsuperscript{46} It is not unexpected, then, that Adorno seems to be much more interested in making his emancipatory point from Schoenberg’s earlier works rather than any contemporary practice. Nor is it surprising that Adorno recapitulates his materialist gloss on Schoenberg: ‘What stopped the development of the “free musical style” [...] was not anything inherent in the music, as Schoenberg may well have imagined, but sociological and ideological factors.’\textsuperscript{47} Indeed, contrary to his opening apologia, Adorno even finds space to once again relegate Eimert and Stockhausen to the barren, ex-centric subject position of New Music for ‘the ascription of an occult quality which mysteriously creates an objective musical meaning to an already prepared material to which the composer has only to adjust himself’.\textsuperscript{48} But while Adorno reproduces this familiar discourse, he simultaneously rehearses its descriptive poverty, on the one hand

\textsuperscript{43} Ibid, 269–270. 
\textsuperscript{44} Ibid, 272. 
\textsuperscript{45} Ibid. 
\textsuperscript{46} Ibid. 
\textsuperscript{47} Ibid, 274. 
\textsuperscript{48} Ibid, 287.
dictating that ‘advances in control of the material of music cannot now be reversed’ and on the other hand conceding that ‘[i]t is no doubt true that the phrase about the irreversible nature of history, the wheel of time which cannot be turned back, says everything and nothing.’

He decries ‘music’s masochism’ and ‘its short-sighted commitment to ideas that were disastrous philosophically, as well as in other respects,’ proposing instead a ‘music whose end cannot be foreseen in the course of production,’ a point he repeats in his oft-quoted conclusion that ‘[t]he aim of every artistic utopia today is to make things in ignorance of what they are.’

Such a dictum seems to efface the more deterministic attitude found in *Philosophie der neuen Musik*, and might be read as a ideological link between Adorno and various post-structural movements. But Adorno knows precisely what these things are: they’re *musique informelle*. He’s even seen them before, from Schoenberg’s ‘free atonal’ period. In this light, Tia DeNora’s reclamation of Adorno to nuance the more reductive claims of new musicology and music sociology is doubly inspired, and demonstrates that these seemingly mutual antagonists in fact share a common shortcoming in their understanding of New Music: their criticism operates with a prioric concepts under the pretence of empiricism.

The social historian, in their desperation (or, latterly, empirical confidence), looks to music to provide some fleeting evidence of both some objective correlative to Society and an emancipatory project, of freedom, while simultaneously insisting on precisely what such freedom is, where it is to be found, how it must behave, and how it is to be understood. Such a troubled mediation therefore misses its mark; it identifies music itself as the site of sedimentation and emancipation, of control and liberation, rather than the discourse which persistently grounds how such music is understood before a single note has been played. The masochism Adorno attributes to music is really that of social history; indeed, it could only be, since this discourse was never concerned with music in the first place, only the universalisation of technique. It is the enduring resentment of the story of New Music as it continues to be told. Only a history which is closely attuned to disruptions rather than continuity, to instability rather than stability, which doggedly traces the negotiations of discourse, the transmission of ideas and forms, and the fine detail of musical works, which,

---

49 Ibid, 276; 275.
50 Ibid, 293; 303; 322.
51 In particular, Tia DeNora notes this seeming disconnect between the ‘structuralist’ and relational strands of Adorno’s thinking on music; see DeNora, *After Adorno: Rethinking Music Sociology* (Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 2003), 13–15.
52 DeNora’s use of Latour to nuance Adorno’s more stringently deterministic claims in this context is likewise salubrious (ibid, 38–40).
above all, strives for appreciation above comprehension, will be adequate to keep up with New Music as it was and continues to be practiced. That is to say, as Goeyvaerts good-naturedly put it after returning to Darmstadt for the first time in thirty-six years, ‘New Music never goes the way that you would expect. If it did, it wouldn’t be New Music.’

I am convinced that, on this point at least, Goeyvaerts is right. New Music can do – and certainly has done – far more than the textbook accounts dispatched above could give it credit for. The historical and analytic research presented here is not meant as a definitive account of (a very brief and limited cross-section of) Darmstadt as-it-happened but rather an attempt to open this music up to greater and more careful attention, to allow it to go a way that we do not expect. But such an opening is not straightforward, and, indeed, one of the most depressing outcomes of attempts not wholly dissimilar to the one made here is just how quickly expectations are stabilised after a supposed disruption. Thus, if certain marginal figures either described in detail or mentioned in passing here are thrown up to illustrate just how misleading and conceptually threadbare the historiography of New Music in Europe has remained, it is not so they may be neatly emplotted within a slightly expanded but narratively identical new history, where the smooth, stable course of musical progress flows on unabated. Make no mistake: I do not want to see any themed volumes on ‘Jacques Wildberger: Moderate Modernist’.

Better, then, to find new connections, new developments, even new teleologies rather than infinite variants of the same story. Granted, this is rather difficult, and flies in the face of the more empirical inclinations of the musicological discipline. But, as the critiques of Taruskin lugubriously demonstrate, an empirically-framed ‘social history’ does little more than skew the metanarrative frame: musical development is no longer reducible to material dialectics or technical progress as Eimert or Adorno would have it, it is instead reducible to social relations. The story, however, is the same: there is no question that surely, this is what happened, this is all that happened. There is no available recourse for social history to argue that the same set of facts (post-Webern pointillism, the Darmstadt School) are not the case; the conclusions are embedded in the premises. As soon as the explicating ground is adopted, the descriptions remain in place. Social history is therefore inadequate because it relies on the a prioric

discursive grounding of the same historicism it critiques, long before the supposedly ‘empirical’ work can take place.

But there are events which force this ground to disappear, which refuse emplotment, which plunge the historian into the same bewilderment of Adorno confronting Goeyvaerts and Stockhausen. From these events, certain unexpected figures may be traced, figures which, like revenants, bear an uncanny resemblance to familiar historical descriptions of musical subjects while somehow eluding sensible explication and undermining the very historicity they signify. It is as if these figures appear, for a brief moment, as incommensurable forces heralding some sort of epistemological collapse – the death of sound into silence, as commentators on Goeyvaerts’s and Stockhausen’s performance in 1951 had it – before one moment later being subsumed once again into the same discourse as embellished footnotes: there is Josef Hauer, the eccentric mystic who invented a rival twelve-tone system, there is Jef Golyscheff, the mysterious theorist who devised a rudimentary organisation of multiple musical parameters before his time, there is Karel Goeyvaerts, the young man from Antwerp who turned Karlheinz Stockhausen onto Webern. Perhaps the best outcome that might result from this study is the cultivation of a research method which would take unstable events and eccentric subjects not as inconvenient outliers which must be reconciled with History or as sadly neglected subjects which must receive their long-overdue attention, but as vectors of potential escape. Such a method would not only draw connections between the immediate, material lives of these figures and their contingent interactions with institutional organs, but read musical works as a departure point for forging new, more penetrating, properly empirical analytical tools which attend to what such music could do as much as what it does.54 It is an old goal, more than a little rear-guard postmodernist, but one that has been repeatedly deferred, a move away from explication and towards appreciation.

54 This is, to my mind, what Benjamin Piekut has been doing with an adjacent subject. See particularly Experimentalism Otherwise: The New York Avant-Garde and Its Limits (Berkeley: University of California Press, 2011).
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