

The Avant-garde and the End of Music: A Hegelian Perspective on the Aesthetics of Twentieth- Century Radical Music

Golan Gur

Department of Music Sociology, Humboldt University of Berlin, Germany
golan_gur@hotmail.com

Proceedings of the International Conference *Beyond the Centers: Musical Avant-Gardes Since 1950*,
Thessaloniki, Greece, 1-3 July 2010, <http://btc.web.auth.gr/>

Abstract: The paper deals with the avant-garde in music and its relationship to nineteenth-century thought regarding musical progress and the end of art. It offers an analysis of the musical avant-garde that focuses on its underlying assumptions and convictions, highlighting its long-term continuity with the nineteenth-century philosophy of history and its counterpart in the theory of the *Neudeutsche Schule*, as reflected in the writings of (Karl) Franz Brendel (1811-1868). My main concern is the historical development of twentieth-century radical art music, from Arnold Schoenberg to Pierre Boulez, and its overlap with G.W.F. Hegel's notion of the "death of art". In exploring this musical-philosophical nexus, I try to illuminate the socio-philosophical meaning of the literary activity of twentieth-century musicians. The article proposes to understand the connection between ideas and compositional praxis in the work of avant-garde composers as analogous to the critical-philosophical turn envisioned by Brendel.

The twentieth century is unique in the history of Western music. When viewed from a broad perspective, one can easily recognize the qualities that set it apart from earlier musical eras. No prior period offered such a wide range of stylistic possibilities, compositional systems and aesthetic ideologies. With the possible exception of the seventeenth century, in no other era were the most basic principles of composition so fundamentally questioned and threatened by alternative ways of writing music. For the most part, new musical styles and compositional techniques did not endure for more than a limited period of time, and even then they were by no means accepted by all major composers. Newly invented musical languages did not replace one another, as was usually the case in earlier periods, but coexisted in an uneasy tension, joining past styles that retained their imposing presence in popular genres such as film music. From the outset, and despite claims to the contrary, the twentieth century was a "Babel" of musical languages, with none fully functioning as the composers' *lingua franca*.ⁱ

The diversity of twentieth-century music was partially the outcome of internal developments within the field of composition. The expansion of orchestral and especially harmonic possibilities during the nineteenth century, and the search for new expressive means and musical forms by early modernist composers, engendered a widespread and well-documented feeling that tonality as a system of formal organization was exhausted and had to be replaced by a new, and less strict, method of composition. This, in turn, motivated composers to work out new compositional systems and musical languages. The proliferation of compositional practices was further sustained by a broader (if somewhat less easily detectable) socio-cultural process that began well before the twentieth century. At the heart of this process is the emergence of a new perspective on the history of music, a perspective that had far-reaching implications for the work of contemporary composers.

As noted by several recent scholars, twentieth-century composers approached their work in a highly self-conscious manner, aware of the historically relative nature of their preconceived musical traditions.ⁱⁱ In an attempt to explain this development, J. Peter Burkholder proposed that modern composers were affected by the establishment of the modern bourgeois concert hall. As he rightly points out, present-day concertgoers are exposed to a very different musical experience than that typical of earlier times. Crucially, modern concert programs are mainly based on the music of the past, thus turning the

concert hall into something of a sonic museum where one could enjoy the crowning achievements of the great composers of classical music. Accompanying this museum-like character of the concert hall is a new mode of listening which favours a serious, contemplative and intensely personal experience over the more casual listening habits of past generations. According to Burkholder, the modern concert hall and the listening habits associated with it provided modern composers with an image of who they are and what they could aspire to:

The mainstream of the past one hundred years consists of music written for an audience familiar with the art music of the 18th and 19th centuries, by composers who were or are themselves highly informed members of that audience, who wrote or write music with a concern both for continuing the tradition of European art music, particularly its aesthetic assumptions and its understanding of the relationship between artist and audience, and for distinguishing their own work stylistically from other composers, both predecessors and contemporaries. In a word, the mainstream is historicist: these composers are writing music for a museum, for that is what the concert hall has become.ⁱⁱⁱ

This is, in brief outline, the cultural background for the extreme technical and stylistic heterogeneity of modern music. Leaving aside folk and various forms of popular music, it would be impossible to think of the numerous schools and compositional movements of the twentieth century without considering the new historical perspective opened up by the modern concert hall and the wish of composers, consciously or not, to secure their position in it.^{iv}

At the same time, additional considerations should be taken into account if we are to understand the historical significance of the avant-garde, and the path taken by its early and later exponents. My starting point in exploring these is the simple and, I believe, incontrovertible observation that despite the objective diversity of musical styles and methods, pluralism was not initially embraced as a desirable ideal. More often than not, twentieth-century composers and musicians tended to attach themselves to schools or “-isms” that they conceived as the single authentic and legitimate form of modern music. This was certainly the case for composers associated with Schoenberg and the serial technique. As Walter Wiora noted, ‘the representatives of serial and serial-electronic music did not see these as a trend among others, but as the only one that corresponded to the present state of composition and to the developing and prospective state of society’.^v

Nowhere was the belief in one binding compositional practice or an aesthetic truth more apparent than in the heated polemics over the question of the “true” path that should be followed by contemporary composers, polemics fought by the composers in theoretical and critical essays, and other avenues of publication. Arnold Schoenberg –by no means an uninterested observer– gave a paradigmatic expression to the sensibilities of the time. In his first major theoretical essay, *Harmonielehre*, he prophesied that future music would abandon the traditional diatonic major-minor system in favour of the chromatic scale and would reject the distinction between consonance and dissonance.^{vi} By 1911, the year of the first edition of his book, Schoenberg’s prediction had already become a reality in his own compositions as well as in those of other composers.^{vii} Obviously, there was an apologetic and even polemical intention behind this proposal. He may have intended his comments as a response to the criticism voiced by conservative music theorists of his time, theorists for whom the end of tonal harmony was tantamount to the end of music. Heinrich Schenker, with whom the composer was engaged in controversies on several occasions, announced in the Introduction to his *Kontrapunkt*, published a year before *Harmonielehre*, that ‘[w]e stand before a Herculaneum and Pompeii of music! All musical culture is buried; the very tonal material –that foundation of music which artists,

transcending the spare clue provided by the overtone series, created anew in all respects from within themselves– is demolished'.^{viii}

It is tempting to reject Schenker's reaction as typical of a conservative theorist who cannot adjust himself to new musical realities, but it would be equally misleading to take Schoenberg's own position at face value. One hundred years after Schoenberg wrote his first atonal pieces, we can now say for certain that this music was not admitted into the musical canon the way the "progressive" music of Mahler or Strauss was. Schoenberg's music, and indeed that of most modernist composers, is still very much a matter of dispute and controversy. In this regard, Schenker may have been a more sensitive observer than avant-garde composers would wish us to think. His reaction, I presume, is indicative for a real and fundamental crisis that took place in music during the first decades of the twentieth century. Although music, or even modern art music, is by no means over, Schenker is correct in pointing out the decisiveness of the break with past practices and traditional forms of creativity.

The issue at stake is not only compositional technique as such, but the very concept of music and musical experience. This point will become clearer later on, but it should first of all be clarified that the controversies over the nature of new music were not only between "progressive" composers and "conservative" theorists. Modern composers were similarly divided among themselves on this question. Best known perhaps is the rivalry between Schoenberg and Stravinsky. In an article dated 1926, Schoenberg implicitly refers to Stravinsky and the neo-classicists, criticising them for producing a compromised and inauthentic form of musical modernism:

Tonal or atonal; by now, the question whether one or the other is justified, admissible, possible, necessary or indispensable, has already taken on a more manageable form –it has become a matter of opinion. This is an advantage, since those confronted by the question can ignore all the objective points on which decisions are based and can follow their own inclination, whim, feeling and the various points to do with self-preservative instinct.^{ix}

Note Schoenberg's comment on 'the objective points', which spells out his belief in the inevitable nature of atonality. What passes for "tonality," however, is not only traditional music but also post-tonal works of mixed and eclectic character such as those of Stravinsky. 'Many modern composers', Schoenberg goes on to say, 'believe they are writing tonally if they occasionally introduce a major or minor triad, or a cadence-like turn of phrase, into a series of harmonies that lack, and must lack, any term of reference. Others hope the use of ostinati and pedal-points will do the same thing for them. Both are acting like believers who buy an indulgence'.^x Schoenberg's position would have been unintelligible had it not been fuelled and motivated by the widespread belief that there could be only one possible way to compose music following the abolishment of tonality. This conviction, which was often taken for granted, led composers to engage themselves in intensive efforts to work out compositional techniques and systems that they thought were grounded on objective foundations, such as the observable historical development of music.

Schoenberg was undoubtedly the first most influential twentieth-century composer to introduce the notion that the development of music proceeds progressively. Later avant-garde composers drew on his example, invoking concepts of progress and historical inevitability in an attempt to justify and explain the rationale behind their innovations. This is evident, for instance, in the series of talks delivered in Vienna by Anton Webern in the years 1932-33 and later published as *The Path to the New Music (Wege zur neuen Musik)*:

New music is that which has never been said. So new music would be what happened a thousand years ago, just as much as what is happening now, namely, music that appears as something never said before. But we can also say, 'follow the course of things through the centuries and we shall see what new music really is'. And perhaps then we shall know what new music is today –and what obsolete music is.^{xi}

The significance of the "new" is an axiom of avant-garde aesthetics, but "meaningfulness" is an equally important consideration. The quote from Webern emphasizes the extent to which the innovations of the Second Viennese School were conceived –first and foremost by its own members- as the product of an inevitable historical development rather than of arbitrary action. The concept of progress, which has its origins in the philosophy of the eighteenth and nineteenth centuries, provided a perspective on the past from which one could extrapolate about the music of the present and the future.

The notion of progress in art has frequently been criticized in recent decades and for good reason.^{xii} Nonetheless, it would be a mistake to underestimate its centrality to the aesthetics of the avant-garde and to modernist musical thinking in general. Progress was a reality to the extent that composers and musicians believed in this concept and it affected their artistic choices and preferences. In reality, there was no unified concept of musical progress but many, reflecting the convictions and aspirations of their originators. Claims in the name of progress have also been made by composers and critics who would hardly fit into the category of the avant-garde. Be that as it may, twentieth-century composers were not the first to appeal to this concept in legitimizing new compositional practices. They were preceded by Franz Brendel, who was probably the first author on music to articulate the historico-philosophical assumptions of the musical avant-garde.

Best known as the editor of the *Neue Zeitschrift für Musik*, who succeeded Robert Schumann, Brendel made a unique theoretical contribution by interpreting musical progress in terms of the relationship between composition and 'criticism'.^{xiii} In his highly influential *Geschichte der Musik in Italien, Deutschland und Frankreich*,^{xiv} he argues that this viewpoint allows one to recognize that a new creative era had begun, an era in which criticism was an integral part of art itself.^{xv} The context for Brendel's claim is his belief that the development of music and musical criticism are interdependent. Directly quoting G.W.F. Hegel, he argued that the history of music follows the same course of evolving self-awareness that Hegel assigned to history as whole.^{xvi} Accordingly, he conceives the essentially technical treatment of music in traditional theoretical treatises on composition as an indication of the unawareness of composers to the real nature of their endeavour. Only such Romantic authors as Johann Friedrich Rochlitz (1769-1842), founder of the *Allgemeine musikalische Zeitung*, and E.T.A. Hoffmann took the first crucial step towards a critical discourse that abstains from focusing on technicalities and pedagogical aims in exchange of an attempt to come to terms with the spiritual content of musical works.^{xvii}

In Brendel's view, music and musical criticism are parallel and complementary. The early romantic criticism adopted the semi-conscious position of the artist and described the musical work in terms of the changes of emotional states. Brendel assigned a central role to Schumann in this development. Although he denies that Schumann made any significant contribution to musical thinking, he credits him for adding a new dimension to the relationship between music and writing about music. As one of the most innovative composers of his time, Schumann, he argues, was more receptive than earlier critics to new developments.^{xviii} More importantly, in his dual capacity as a composer and author, Schumann strengthened the interconnection of music and criticism. The reciprocal relationship between the two is central to Brendel's understanding of modern musical culture:

A fact of special importance is that through Schumann, the artist began to participate in the criticism [of art]. This participation is the very thing
Beyond the Centres: Musical Avant Gardes Since 1950 Conference Proceedings, Thessaloniki 2010

which created, prepared for, and guides modern times. It would have been bad if the artists had taken over sole reign, if they prevented non-artists from participating in this task, [and, on the other hand], great progress [can be made] when both parties work together and complement one another.^{xix}

The "subjective-psychological" phase of the Romantic criticism is not, however, the last stage of the critical discourse of music. In Brendel's time, the most advanced mode of criticism, and the one to which he tried to contribute, involved the attempt to grasp music in its totality through the unfolding of different phases of development and, on this basis, to justify and promote new artistic creation. Brendel believed that this could be achieved most effectively in his own time because of the seemingly objective and scientific framework provided by the new discipline of art history (*Kunstwissenschaft*).^{xx} As far as compositional work is concerned, the new critical awareness signifies for Brendel the beginning of a new musical period, one in which completely spontaneous and unreflective creation was no longer possible. With regard to this, Brendel made the curious suggestion that while earlier music was written as though it was obeying a law of nature, contemporary music is defined by its awareness of its own theoretical foundations.^{xxi}

Brendel proposes not only a theory of progress but also a theory of "end." Although he did not refer to it explicitly, his interpretation of the course of music and musical discourse brings to mind Hegel's thesis about the "death of art". According to Hegel, art is one of the forms taken by the spirit in its quest for self-realization, with religion and philosophy being the next stages. Brendel envisions a similar destiny for music. In his view, instrumental music, the apex of the progress of music in earlier decades, was exhausted during the time of Beethoven and arrived at an impasse. Richard Wagner's musical dramas, which represented for Brendel the latest stage in the development of music, do not follow this tradition; rather, they diverge from it and stand for the beginning of a new musical age, albeit one with roots in Gluck and Berlioz. Significantly, an important aspect of Brendel's reception of Wagner is the composer's aesthetic and polemical essays. While Brendel acknowledged that Wagner was first and foremost a composer, he took these literary efforts to be part and parcel of the composer's creative work.^{xxii}

Brendel's thesis that the progress of music leads from the end of "natural" instrumental music to the birth of a new kind of music that is bound up with reflective thinking proves to be extremely forward looking in light of later musical development. To begin with, he presented a model upon which radical composers could draw in making the case for new compositional practices; secondly, his theory suggests, by way of Hegel, useful categories for analyzing the connection between music and philosophical ideas. It is with regard to the latter that Brendel's historical conception seems most instructive in relation to the activity of modern avant-garde composers.

Brendel's ideas cannot be directly applied, however, to twentieth-century music for the reason that the avant-garde concept of progress differs from his in at least one crucial respect: for avant-garde composers musical progress involves, first and foremost, the elaboration of new musical means and organizational procedures. This approach has its origins in the nineteenth-century aesthetics of absolute music and, more directly, in the notion of the autonomous artwork, but it is hard to see how it fits in with Brendel's notion of the fusion of music and criticism. If anything, radical modern music proceeded in the opposite direction, stressing, for the most part, the independence of music from verbal communication. Indeed, only in the twentieth century were the conditions created for composing music that was literally a 'world unto itself', to quote Ernst Ludwig Tieck's famous expression. This was made possible, first and foremost, by the highly individualized thematic organization of many atonal (including serial) works and, after WWII, the subjection of all musical parameters to mathematical treatment, which resulted in what comes closest to a "pure" musical process.

Thus, nothing would seem further removed from this development than Brendel's vision of the coming of the "critical period" in music; yet, a moment of reflection suggests differently. A central but often overlooked aspect of twentieth-century musical culture is the resort to the written word, in an attempt to endow music with meaning. I have already mentioned and quoted Schoenberg's and Webern's apologetic arguments. Although neither of the two composers, nor later exponents of the avant-garde, seemed to consider this possibility, their theoretical and critical preoccupation with music may have been part of their creative work to a greater extent than acknowledged. With his many writings and studies of past composers and his almost obsessive concern with his own historical position, Schoenberg was the model for later generations of avant-garde composers. Indeed, as a distinctively uncompromising group of artists, avant-garde composers were particularly prone to explain their music in writing because of the iconoclastic nature of their work and the difficulty of the ordinary listener to cope with it. Admittedly, it is doubtful that this is what Brendel had in mind, but the fact remains that verbal commentary played a major role in the activities of avant-garde musicians.

The significance of this commentary lies not in its sheer quantity but, more importantly, in its actual content and the evidence it provides for the reciprocal relationship between philosophical deliberations and compositional praxis. As Carl Dahlhaus noted,

From the time when the aesthetics of emotion and inspiration fell into disrepute and the imagination of composers was stimulated rather by intellectual operations, practice and theory –composition and reflection– have become closely interlinked... The creation of works and the development of musical poetics complement one another, and not infrequently the one merges into the other.^{xxiii}

This development is inseparable from the recourse of avant-garde composers to the concept of progress as a source of motivation and legitimation. The concern for "making progress" brought compositional work into contact with theoretical and historical considerations, almost as a matter of necessity. As mentioned before, the late nineteenth and early twentieth centuries saw tremendous expansion in compositional resources and unprecedented creative freedom. The predominance of "progress" as a compositional consideration was a reaction to this state of affairs. The idea that the history of music is a process of linear development provided composers seeking to be innovative a way to make sense of the new situation of musical anarchy, a prism through which one could distinguish the meaningful from the trivial. However, since the meaning of progress was far from obvious, or, rather, could have been interpreted in a multiplicity of ways – composers had no choice but to explain, through writing and lecturing, the historical and philosophical significance of their work.

Viewed from this perspective, one can discern a growing dependency on theoretical thinking and discourse ('criticism' in Brendel's sense) throughout the twentieth century. Schoenberg, who was also an accomplished writer on music, took the crucial step in this direction, followed by the composers belonging to the so-called Darmstadt School. In the case of Schoenberg, the value of progress was part of a more comprehensive aesthetic position that was rooted, by and large, in the world of expressionism. Despite the many transformations in his musical language, he remained faithful to the ideal of emotional expression and, on a more formal level, to traditional forms and gestures. This has been widely acknowledged not only by music scholars, but also by post-war serial composers who sought to transcend his achievements. Speaking for the many, Pierre Boulez's main charge in his provocative 1952 article "Schoenberg is Dead" argues that Schoenberg failed to understand the implications of his own work, especially of his dodecaphonic pieces: the invention of the twelve-tone technique should have been succeeded by the working out of specifically serial forms. 'Schoenberg', he proclaims, 'never concerned himself with the logical connection between serial forms as such and derived

structure'.^{xxiv} The solution, according to Boulez, is to dissociate serialism from the work of Schoenberg and to put serial principles in the service of new aesthetic goals.^{xxv}

The proposal made by Boulez in "Schoenberg is Dead" found fertile ground among post-WWII composers and brought about a change in compositional aesthetics, akin to the critical-philosophical turn delineated by Hegel and Brendel. The attempt to develop new musical forms by applying the serial principle to all musical parameters, while eliminating any trace of past tradition, was essential to the rise of avant-garde composition as a "critical" pursuit. Without delving into the strategies of individual composers, the mathematization of the compositional process produced a seemingly contradictory result: on the one hand, the concept of music as an autonomous art seems to find its most complete realization in musical works embracing total serialism; on the other hand, the dependency on explanation and clarifications by conceptual means increased. It is significant that composers such as Boulez, Stockhausen, and György Ligeti were intensively involved in writing and lecturing about music. Even more important is the fact that what they wrote and said – particularly their historical-philosophical positions – related directly to their artistic creation.

This would not have been possible without the creative freedom achieved by the breakthroughs of earlier composers. These breakthroughs enable contemporary composers to fulfil their unique and highly individual aesthetic worldviews. Moreover, the adherence of post-war avant-garde musicians to intellectual ideas and technical procedures signifies the removal of the last property of musical experience as it is traditionally conceived, namely the expectation of emotional expression and identification. This, in turn, gave rise to new thoughts about the possible goal and meaning of contemporary music. In his analysis of Boulez's *Structure Ia* for two pianos, Ligeti describes Boulez's and Webern's rigorous serialism in terms of a new compositional approach, an approach that conceives composition as analogous to the process of scientific discovery:

The beauty of such a composition is to be found elsewhere, not in those of earlier times. Webern's interval-objects...possess a rest of subtle expressivity, and although the beauty of this music no longer lies in its "expression", here and there, the traces of this expressivity served the stumbling listeners as a kind of crutch. In Boulez's *Structures* [italics mine], all this is absent. Here, the crux of the matter in Webern, the beauty of pure structures, is revealed. Since in music this can only happen in time, composition at the serial level relies on playing with time; this way, the composition loses its essence as "work of art": composition then becomes a means to analyse the connections of the material. To some, this approach may seem negative and even inartistic, but to the contemporary composer, there is no other way if he wishes to make progress.^{xxvi}

Ligeti's words attest to the extent to which musical works were evaluated for historical considerations, while being deprived of those values that are associated with traditional works of art. It is not the musical work and its provision of aesthetic pleasure, that is essential, but rather its contribution to the progress of music by virtue of the technical innovations which it demonstrates.

Post-war radical composers quickly moved on to experiments with ever new compositional methods, but the connection between music and reflective thinking remained one of the defining features of avant-garde aesthetics. The new scientific-experimental concept of music, which underlies many of the developments initiated by radical composers working after WWII, narrowed the gap between musical composition and philosophy, since both activities were now considered to be united in a similar analytical effort. It is at this point that the reality of music-making coincides most visibly with the Hegelian thesis of the death of art as it was introduced to the field of music by

Brendel. To be sure, music did not turn literally into “philosophy”, but representative works of the avant-garde presuppose a greater degree of theoretical knowledge than any other body of works in the past as a prerequisite for their understanding. It might be even argued that theoretical knowledge and discourse have replaced habitual expectations derived from traditional music as a framework for coming to terms with new musical experiences.

There are reasons to believe that at least some of the leading serial composers never intended integral serialism, or any other musical systems they worked out, to be more than a temporary experiment, a stage on the road to a more stable and enduring musical language. Even so, their work did not result in a new form of common practice, nor did it lead to the establishment of a coherent aesthetic position. The fragmentation of the musical world seems to be ever-increasing, with new styles and ideas joining earlier ones. What is more, criticism of the philosophical idea of progress in art and other fields dramatically changed the current perspective on the historical course of music and its possible future development. Claims such as those of Ligeti and others about the inevitable progress of music are less likely to be expressed nowadays and retrospective trends are flourishing in contemporary art music.

In this paper I have tried to propose a context for understanding the avant-garde as part of a broad intellectual and cultural movement. In this context, the avant-garde has a different historical role than the one its representatives assigned to themselves. The works of twentieth-century radical composers reflect in the most extreme way the fundamental change that took place in musical thinking following the complete abolishment of traditional stylistic conventions and the rise of historical awareness. This change had, however, wider implications, affecting the very concept of music. The avant-garde is not the only meaningful form of musical modernism but rather the one that brought the exploitation of creative freedom to the point where music and language merged into one another. Whether this should be considered as “progress,” is a different issue. Although it is common today to refer to the demise of the avant-garde, it seems more appropriate to speak of the end of the *idea* of the avant-garde. However, even that is not entirely accurate. The philosophization of music brought about by avant-garde composers-essayists is likely to continue as long as a new musical “naturalism”, to use Brendel’s term, does not show itself in the compositions of the present-day. This is probably the only sense in which avant-garde concepts of progress and end can be used without committing to value judgements and controversial notions of historical determinism.

I would like to thank Sabine Feisst and Tomas McAuley for reading and commenting on an earlier version of this paper.

ⁱ Luciano Berio described contemporary music in similar terms. See: Luciano Berio, *Remembering the Future* (Cambridge: Harvard University Press, 2006), pp. 8-9.

ⁱⁱ I do not wish to suggest that the work of composers belonging to the so-called common practice period proceeded in a “naive” or “unreflective” manner; nor do I wish to imply that they were unaware of alternative ways of writing music. At the same time, one cannot avoid the feeling that critics sympathetic to the work and convictions of modern composers often tended to exaggerate the importance of technical innovations in the works of past composers at the expense of those elements in their musical style rooted in established traditions.

ⁱⁱⁱ J. Peter Burkholder, “Museum Pieces: The Historicist Mainstream in Music of the Last Hundred Years”, *The Journal of Musicology* 2.2 (1983): 115-34.

^{iv} This historical awareness was further amplified by the ever-growing availability of scores and records, and the broadcasting of radio programs with music from the most chronologically and geographically remote musical cultures.

^v Walter Wiora, *Die vier Weltalter der Musik* (München: Bärenreiter, 1988 [1961]), p. 142. All translations from the German are mine unless accompanied by reference to an authorized English translation.

^{vi} Here I am citing the second edition of 1922. Arnold Schönberg, *Harmonielehre* (Wien: Universal-Edition, 1922), pp. 16-7 and 21 (Footnotes).

^{vii} By 1911, Schoenberg composed some of his best known early atonal pieces, including *Drei Klavierstücke*, Op. 11 (1909), 15 *Gedichte aus das Buch der hängenden Gärten*, Op. 15 (1908/9), and *Erwartung*, Op. 17 (1909).

^{viii} Heinrich Schenker, *Counterpoint*, translated by John Rothgeb and Jürgen Thym (New York: Schirmer Books, 1987 [1910]), xvii.

^{ix} Arnold Schoenberg, “Opinion or Insight?”, in *Style and Idea*, edited by Leonard Stein, translated by Leo Black (London: Faber and Faber, 1975), p. 258.

^x *Ibid.*

-
- ^{xi} Anton Webern, *The Path to the New Music*, edited by Willi Reich, translated by Leo Black (Bryn Mawr, Pennsylvania: T. Presser Co., 1963), p. 12.
- ^{xii} In musicology, Leo Treitler questioned and refuted historiographical narratives that construe music as a story of continuous progressive development. See for instance: Leo Treitler, "The Present as History". *Perspectives of New Music* 8 (1969): 1-58, and "What Kind of Story is History?". *Nineteenth-Century Music* 7.3 (1984): 363-373.
- ^{xiii} Brendel's term "Kritik" can be translated as either "criticism" or "critique". The former is a better translation because of his many references to proper "musical criticism." However, it is clear that he uses the term in a broader sense as equivalent to musical thinking and discourse.
- ^{xiv} The first edition was published in 1851 with many subsequent editions. Here I am using the fourth edition (Leipzig: Verlag von Heinrich Matthes, 1867).
- ^{xv} *Ibid*, 598.
- ^{xvi} *Ibid*, 582.
- ^{xvii} *Ibid*, 584.
- ^{xviii} *Ibid*, 589.
- ^{xix} *Ibid*, 591.
- ^{xx} *Ibid*, 583.
- ^{xxi} *Ibid*, 597-8.
- ^{xxii} *Ibid*, 619.
- ^{xxiii} Carl Dahlhaus, "Progress and the Avant-garde," in *Schoenberg and the New Music*, translated by Derrick Puffett and Alfred Clayton (Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 1987), p. 16.
- ^{xxiv} Pierre Boulez, "Schoenberg is Dead", in *Composers on Modern Musical Culture: An Anthology of Readings on Twentieth-Century Music*, edited by Bryan Simms (New York: Schirmer Books, 1999), p. 149.
- ^{xxv} *Ibid*, 150.
- ^{xxvi} György Ligeti, "Pierre Boulez: Entscheidung und Automatik in der Structure Ia". *Die Reihe* 4: *Junge Komponisten* (1958): 62-3.