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From the Editors

On behalf of the Editorial Board, I am pleased to present Volume Eight of *Musicological Explorations*, a journal published by the graduate students of the University of Victoria School of Music. The intent of this journal is to enrich the discourse in music and related arts at the university level by providing a forum for scholarly work by graduate students and faculty.

I would like to take this opportunity to express my gratitude to the many people and groups who helped make this year’s edition possible. Firstly, I am extending my deepest gratitude to the board for their hard work and dedication this past year. I would also like to thank our Faculty Advisor, Dr. Michelle Fillion, for her invaluable assistance and guidance throughout all the trials and tribulations in producing the journal this year. For their generous funding contributions, I would like to offer sincere thanks to the Faculty of Fine Arts, the Faculty of Graduate Studies, and the School of Music at the University of Victoria. Further, I would like to acknowledge the University of Victoria Library and the estate of Philip T. Young for their donation of books for a fundraising book sale. Your contributions were instrumental to the success of this year’s publication. Finally, many thanks to the administrative staff at the School of Music who were always willing to provide support, information, and encouragement as needed.

The many accomplishments of this past year suggest that there will be many great things to come for the authors and the members of the Editorial Board who worked so diligently on the current
volume. I wish you all success in your future endeavors. To the readers, the Editorial Board thanks you for your continued support, and hopes that your interest will be renewed for years to come.

Deborah Hopper
Senior Managing Editor
The O’Rourke Factor: 
Authorship, Authority, and Creative Collaboration in the Music of Wilco

Sheena Hyndman

In a documentary interview with Jeff Tweedy and Jim O’Rourke, O’Rourke announced rather jovially that everyone says he ruins records, and the evidence of that could be found in Wilco’s Yankee Hotel Foxtrot.¹ As this footage comes from a documentary specifically about Wilco and the making of Yankee Hotel Foxtrot, it may seem odd that Jeff Tweedy is the only member of the band present in this interview, especially when considering that this discussion centers on the “failure” of a project that involves four other people who were active participants in the music making, and yet, are nowhere to be found in this particular interview. In this article, I will explore the importance of Jim O’Rourke’s role as the mixer in the making of Wilco’s fourth studio

¹ This interview is found on disc 2 of I Am Trying to Break Your Heart, dir. Sam Jones, 92 mins., Plexifilm, 2003. Though this interview appears as extra footage and was not a part of the actual documentary, I feel that O’Rourke’s statement provides an appropriate starting point for discussing creative responsibility and its repercussions in terms of political economy in the music industry. Additionally, while the topic of this paper deals with the authorship of a record, I feel that it was the effects of political economy in relation to Yankee Hotel Foxtrot that spawned this discussion of creative responsibility in the first place, as it is likely that O’Rourke would not have made his statement had Reprise Records accepted the album as it was. For more information about Wilco’s relationship with Reprise Records, see Greg Kot, Wilco: Learning How to Die (New York, NY: Broadway Books, 2004), 154-235.
release, *Yankee Hotel Foxtrot* (2002). Examining issues of authorship, authority, and collaboration, this article will look at examples of O’Rourke’s contribution as the mixer and how his specialized technological skill and prior experience as a performing musician and composer was an essential part of the creative music making process.

Formed in 1994, alternative (alt) country group Wilco was born from the ashes of Uncle Tupelo, one of North America’s leading alt-country groups in the early 1990s. After parting ways with long-time partner Jay Farrar, singer/songwriter Jeff Tweedy gathered Uncle Tupelo’s remaining members, bassist John Stirratt, drummer Ken Coomer, and multi-instrumentalist Max Johnston, and Wilco began recording their debut album *A.M.* in 1995\(^2\). *A.M.* was both a critical and commercial failure, but subsequent Wilco releases were better received by critics. After several personnel changes, collaborations and side projects, Tweedy began working with composer and multi-instrumentalist Jim O’Rourke and drummer Glenn Kotche, and together they formed the group Loose Fur. The Loose Fur project, along with the early experimental techniques used on their 1999 release *Summerteeth*, greatly impacted the making of *Yankee Hotel Foxtrot* in the following year; the different experimental techniques from Loose Fur and *Summerteeth* were applied to and extended on this new work, the band invited Kotche to become their full-time drummer, and O’Rourke was brought in to mix

\(^2\) For a more complete timeline, please refer to the appendix. Also, all biographical information, unless otherwise mentioned, comes from Greg Kot’s *Wilco: Learning How to Die* (New York, NY: Broadway Books, 2004).
the album.

Considered by some critics to be “the daVinci of experimental music,” Jim O’Rourke has had an extensive and prolific career as a composer, performer, and producer. Following the completion of a degree in composition from DePaul University, O’Rourke worked with many notable groups and musicians and has participated in the making of over 200 albums. Despite this, he is probably best known in the contemporary music world for his work with Sonic Youth that began when he was brought in to mix and perform on NYC Ghosts & Flowers, released in 2000. Soon after, O’Rourke was invited by Tweedy to collaborate on a project that would later become Loose Fur, which ultimately led to his being asked to mix the final tapes for Yankee Hotel Foxtrot.

Following the recording of Yankee Hotel Foxtrot, Reprise Records, a subsidiary of Time-Warner-AOL, rejected the album, stating that major changes needed to happen before it could be released. Wilco, however, was satisfied with their work and were unwilling to make any alterations. After failing to come to an agreement, Reprise let Wilco out of their contract with their finished album, and the band promptly streamed the entire album onto the internet from their website. This move garnered the band much attention from the media that, in turn, spawned a bidding war between more than thirty record companies who wanted a chance to release Yankee Hotel Foxtrot.

---


Hotel Foxtrot on their label. In the end, Wilco signed with Nonesuch, also a subsidiary of Time-Warner-AOL, reportedly because Tweedy liked the idea of working with a company who could get the public interested in music by “a bunch of old Cubans.”

Yankee Hotel Foxtrot, finally released in April of 2002, is considered by many to be Wilco’s finest and most innovative work to date. In their ground-breaking use of studio recording technology, Wilco effectively changed the face of alt-country music; though much of Tweedy’s songwriting still connects to traditional aspects of country music, Wilco’s use of voice generators, tape loops, and especially complicated mixes makes Yankee Hotel Foxtrot an exceptionally original work.

In considering Jim O’Rourke’s statement that “[he] ruins records, and [Yankee Hotel Foxtrot is] the evidence,” an important question comes to mind: what does the mixer have to do with the success or failure of a pop music album? There are, of course, several ways to answer this question, but for now I will discuss technologies and the aesthetics of sound.

The expansion of sonic technologies through the second half of the twentieth century has produced virtually limitless possibilities in the creation of music, and nowhere has this phenomenon been more exploited than in the modern recording studio.


6 I Am Trying to Break Your Heart: A Film about Wilco, dir. Sam Jones, 92 mins. Plexifilm, 2003. DVD.
Engineering a recorded or live performance, once limited to checking volume levels for symphony orchestras and rock and roll bands, has become a creative endeavor with the field of possibility limited only by the imagination of the person behind the technology. In the manufacturing of popular music, the idea of creating a sound becomes an important marker of identity for engineers, perhaps because the definition of the term sound seems to have become largely limited to describing relationships with the changing technologies of musical production; while, for example, musicians can alter a guitar sound with any number of playing techniques, an engineer's special identifying feature is rooted on the creation of a value based proper perspective for said musician’s guitar sound. Phil Spector’s “Wall of Sound”, characterized by dense mixes of overlapping electric and acoustic instrumental parts often playing in unison, is perhaps one of the most famous examples of a unique and readily identifiable production style.

With the advent of sound recording, musicians have been able to distance themselves from the act of performance in favor of what H. Stith Bennett calls “impossible music”, that is, music that could not be conceived of or performed live in the same way it is formed in the studio. This was certainly the case with Wilco’s *Yankee Hotel Foxtrot*, whose conception...

---

7 Ibid., 192-193.
depended on the impossible simultaneous combinations of noise tracks with musical instruments. However, it’s also important to realize that a finished product, whether it is a live performance or a recorded one, depends on the highly specialized skill and aesthetic sensibilities of sound engineers, particularly the mixer. Further, an album mixed by the songwriters or even by another engineer would have a very different sound that, in turn, could impact an audience’s reception of the record. In this sense, studio technology becomes social technology insofar as it involves more than just the musician in

10In his 1974 study on the social organization of recording engineers, Edward Kealy suggests that, because musicians are becoming more aware of the opportunities afforded to them by newfound intimate knowledge of the recording studio, mixers are losing control over sound recording. However, as Steve Jones argues, “few musicians are capable of mixing their own recordings and operating the equipment in a control room.” This supports the necessity for specialized knowledge, and by extension, separate roles performed by both musicians and non-musicians. See Edward Kealy as quoted Steve Jones, Rock Formation: Music, Technology, and Mass Communication (Newbury Park: Sage Publications, 1992), 171. Further, Simon Frith provides an interesting example in which the performer was powerless to control their sound, which was imposed on both them and the audience by the mixer’s value judgments of what constitutes a good sound. The justification that was used in this situation was that audience pleasure relies on the objectivity of people who are considered sound experts. See Simon Frith, Performing Rites: On the Value of Popular Music (Cambridge: Harvard University Press, 1996), 24-25. Also, see Susan Schmidt-Horning, “Engineering the Performance: Record Engineers, Tacit Knowledge, and the Art of Controlling Sound,” Social Studies of Science, Vol. 34, No. 5 (2004): 703-31. Here, Schmidt-Horning examines how factors like skill, formal education, and changing technologies contribute to sound engineering as a form of tacit knowledge.
music making; audience receptivity is always a point of
consideration, and the development of new
technologies, such as the development of mixing
board sliders,\textsuperscript{11} helps to generate new roles and
creative outputs for engineers.\textsuperscript{12}

As this demonstrates, the mixer is an
indispensable creative partner in music making, and
therefore has a role that partly determines an album’s
route to failure or success. However, this also raises
the issue of the extent to which the mixer should be
considered a creator, or author, as a result of their
collaboration with musicians. Further, how much
credit should be granted to the mixer for aiding in the
creation of a final product?

In spite of recent efforts to broaden
perceptions of authorship to include collaboration, for
many people the function of the author is still one of
individualized action. From a purely philosophical
point of view, M. Thomas Inge’s observation of
collaboration stands as such:

\textsuperscript{11} Before the creation of vertical sliders, the mixing board
employed large and cumbersome knobs that were difficult to use.
Record engineer Tom Dowd’s innovative idea to replace mixing
board knobs with vertical sliders not only made the act of mixing
exponentially easier, but from a visual point of view, it also served
to make the mixing board appear more like a musical instrument.
In addition, Dowd was responsible for making eight-track
recording common practice in recording studios. Inspired by Les
Paul’s home studio, the eight-track recorder allowed the mixing
of an album to take place after all the parts were recorded, which
was never possible with single track technology. For more
information, see \textit{Tom Dowd and the Language of Music}, dir. Mark
Mooreman, 90 mins, Palm Pictures, 2003. DVD.

\textsuperscript{12} Paul Théberge, \textit{Any Sound You Can Imagine: Making
Music/Consuming Technology} (London and Hanover: Wesleyan
University Press, 1997), 217.
It is commonplace now to understand that all texts produced by authors are not the products of individual creators. Rather, they are the result of any number of discourses that take place among the writer, the political and social environments in which writing occurs, the aesthetic and economic pressures that encourage the process, the psychological and emotional state of the writer, and the reader who is expected to receive or consume the end product when it reaches print. Even if it is not intended for an audience or the publishing marketplace, a piece of writing cannot escape the numerous influences that produce it. All discourse is socially constructed.\(^{13}\)

While Inge makes allowances for the different types of relationships that may influence a work, he completely bypasses the most immediate and basic part of collaboration; the primary interaction between more than one person with the intent to create something, whether is it a novel, a finance report, or in the case of this paper, a popular music album. All of the factors outlined by Inge still exist, but remain secondary influences in relation to a pre-existing primary relationship between two or more people who work directly together.

In their essay based on collaborations with each other, Kathleen Blake Yancey and Michael Spooner attempt to clarify what collaboration as a concept actually means. Most of the sources they consult agree that “all writing is inherently collaborative” and that the definition of collaboration

is “far from self evident.”\textsuperscript{14} According to John B. Smith, one of their sources, collaboration carries with it the expectation of a singular purpose and a seamless integration of the parts, as if the conceptual object were produced by a single good mind… The reader is unable to tell from the internal clues which chapters or sections were written by which authors.\textsuperscript{15}

Further, Smith views cooperative work to be less stringent in its demands for intellectual integration. It requires that the individuals that comprise a group… carry out their individual tasks in accord with some larger plan. However, in a cooperative structure, the different individuals… are not required to know what goes on in other parts of the project, so long as they carry out their own assigned tasks satisfactorily.\textsuperscript{16}

While this distinction between collaboration and cooperation may be required when considering works of literature and academic essays, it is possible for music making to be at once collaborative and cooperative. In the making of \textit{Yankee Hotel Foxtrot}, for example, the members of both the band and the production team cooperate by performing certain actions on individual equipment, but they do so with


\textsuperscript{16} Ibid.
the goal of creating a seamless finished product to be released under the umbrella of the name Wilco. It is not required that the bass player know how to engineer the recording, nor does the engineer need to know how to play the piano, but each member works together in order to make themselves appear as both a cohesive ensemble and as invisible individual contributors to their audience.  

In terms of songwriting, *Yankee Hotel Foxtrot* is regarded by the members of Wilco as being the group’s most collaborative effort to date, with each band member contributing ideas about what direction the songs should take. Despite this, Jeff Tweedy’s name is the one that appears in the songwriting credits. Like so many other groups in popular music

---

17 Blake Yancey and Spooner further discuss the problematic nature of Smith’s treatment of “collective intelligence” and how it divides the concepts of collaboration and cooperation. It is important to note that both authors (for lack of a better term) agree that Smith is perhaps too prescriptive and may be deterministic in his definition of these terms, as he assumes that in a cooperative endeavor members will organize themselves hierarchically. Blake Yancey and Spooner later offer a compromise that takes into account Smith’s more linear perspective, but is much more fluid and circular. Using this paper’s case study as an example, it is easy to see that the issue of cooperation versus collaboration is not as cut-and-dry: though the goal of the people involved is to create a product that falls into Smith’s guidelines for a collaborative work, there is clearly a hierarchy in Wilco. Therefore, Wilco is but one of many examples that is more appropriately discussed in cyclical terms. See Katherine Blake Yancey and Michael Spooner, “A Single Good Mind: Collaboration, Cooperation, and the Writing Self.” *College Composition and Communication*, Vol. 49, No. 1 (1998): 51-59.

history, Tweedy is the embodiment of what has been referred to as “an idea-led-word-producer”, or the front man who is responsible for producing inspiring lyrics that will ultimately influence the audience’s vision of the band as “a happy democracy working together.”

Though aspects of songwriting are discussed and deliberated by the band, creative authority is ceded to Tweedy, who ultimately holds the position of head creator within the hierarchy of Wilco. While I am not disputing Tweedy’s authority over the creation of individual songs I would question his authority over Yankee Hotel Foxtrot as a finished product. As Robert Self said, “objects of art require a maker”, but does that mean the idea of a maker must be limited to one person? In any music making ensemble, no one person, instrument or sound is more important than any other, and any absences of personnel or sounds would surely affect the finished product. Additionally, though Tweedy’s songs are considered by some to be works of genius, it is obvious in looking at previous Wilco albums that his songwriting was not enough to generate commercial

---

19 Griffiths’ discussion here is about Radiohead, a popular music group with a similar power structure to that of Wilco. Thom Yorke is responsible for song and lyric writing, song arrangement, artwork, and any other aspect that promotes an image for the group. Griffiths asserts that this creates tension between Yorke and the other members of the band, and that it would be just as easy for any other member of the band to make similar contributions as word-producers. Griffiths’ general argument has some merit and can easily be applied to other examples of power structure in popular music. See Dai Griffiths, OK Computer (London: Continuum, 2004), 81-87.

success for the band. Finally, as mentioned earlier, there were a number of different people besides the members of Wilco involved in the making of *Yankee Hotel Foxtrot*, which was the biggest commercial and critical success for the band since their inception.

In view of this, I propose that the authorship of an album like Wilco’s *Yankee Hotel Foxtrot* should be viewed, not as the realization of a figurehead’s single vision, but as Michel Foucault suggests, as “a series of specific and complex operations.”21 As in the creation of anything, the manufacture of an album is based on a symbiotic relationship between performers and producers, and, however small the role, each individual action helps to determine the outcome of the final product. Through a brief comparative analysis of musical examples from Wilco and other sources, I will further explore the question of collaborative authorship and authority in popular music through the examination of a non-musician’s role in the making of *Yankee Hotel Foxtrot*.

Before discussing *Yankee Hotel Foxtrot*, I would like to provide a frame of reference by looking at two examples from different albums. The first comes from Wilco’s 1999 studio release called *Summerteeth*, mixed by Jim Scott. The second example is an excerpt from Sonic Youth’s *NYC Ghosts & Flowers*, which was mixed by Jim O’Rourke.22

---

22 In order to fully comprehend what is being demonstrated, it is necessary to listen to all examples with earphones. If none are available, the listener should position themselves in front of a set of stereo speakers in such a way that any difference in sound between the left and right speakers will be noticeable.
Upon listening to the examples, perhaps the most obvious characteristic of the example from *Summerteeth* is the very dense sound; in its entirety, the song “Shot in the Arm” uses more than 18 different musical instruments and sound layers at one time. The layers are mixed very much in the foreground, sitting at the centre of the left-right stereo spectrum, which serves not only to eliminate the possibility of dynamic contrast throughout the song, but also to make it tremendously difficult to hear detail in certain layers without extremely close listening. The only noticeable play between the left and right speakers happens at the start and the finish of the song, and only because there is a dramatic absence of other sounds. It is possible that there is interplay between left and right during the body of “Shot in the Arm,” but due to the dense mix it is difficult to be certain.

Sonic Youth’s “Nevermind (what was it anyway)” from *NYC Ghosts & Flowers*, however, paints a very different picture. First, though a number of different sound layers are utilized, they are used sparingly in order to distinguish themselves and create detail that is audible without having to listen closely. The song is given texture through the use of obvious and distinctive foregrounds, middlegrounds, and backgrounds, with some sound layers fitting within these categories and others traveling up and down in between. Additionally, there is significant interplay between the left and right speaker, with certain layers traveling across the sound spectrum, or with two similar sounds occurring in each speaker, but at different tempi, in different keys, and so on. All of these mixing techniques employed by O’Rourke serve to create a unique sonic experience with texture and
Considering the details outlined above, I will now look at two different examples of the same song by Wilco. The first example is taken from film maker Sam Jones’ documentary footage of Wilco recording the song “Poor Places” in their Chicago loft. The next example comes directly from the album *Yankee Hotel Foxtrot* and is the final version of “Poor Places,” mixed by Jim O’Rourke.

As with the first two examples, the version that is not mixed by O’Rourke is very dense sounding. Figure 1 shows the different sound layers used in both versions of the song’s introduction, and there are obviously a greater number of musical layers (such as the low-register piano) and extra-musical layers (such as the layer called atmosphere) used in Wilco’s original conceptualization of “Poor Places.” It is worth noting that there are a greater proportion of non-musical, synthesized sounds used in O’Rourke’s mix of the introduction, which is texturally sparser than the version from the documentary. Additionally, the wide array of sounds found in the version from the documentary are used at later moments in O’Rourke’s mix of the song; while these two versions may sound radically different, it is important to know that O’Rourke did work with the material that was presented to him.
The O'Rourke Factor

The next two figures plot the different sound layers on a left to right stereo spectrum and show approximately where different sounds are placed in the mix. Immediately apparent is the complete lack of

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Jones 2003 (pre-O'Rourke)</th>
<th>Wilco 2002 (mixed by O'Rourke)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>&quot;Engine&quot; → &quot;beep&quot;</td>
<td>&quot;Beep&quot;</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>&quot;Atmosphere&quot;</td>
<td>&quot;Atmosphere&quot;</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>&quot;Static&quot;</td>
<td>&quot;Click&quot;</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Claves</td>
<td>Drone</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Shakers</td>
<td>Voice</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Low register piano (B flat)</td>
<td>Electric organ</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Voice</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Figure 1 Sound layers from introductions of two versions of "Poor Places"\(^{23}\)

\(^{23}\) The extra-musical layers listed above refer to sounds not made by conventional musical instruments. While some layers are more obvious (for example, "beep," "click," and "engine"), others, such as "atmosphere" and "static" are more difficult to describe definitively. However, I have included these layers because they are obviously a part of the sonic landscape of the song. The layer "static" refers to the hissing noises, similar to what one would hear on a radio. "Atmosphere" is meant to denote what is commonly described as white noise; that is, the sounds that typically occur in everyday surroundings and are not always noticed by listeners.

\(^{24}\) The model for Figures 2a and 2b comes from earlier work where I attempted to plot the stereo soundscapes found in the music of Wilco. A more complete discussion and analysis of Wilco’s “Poor Places” as mixed by Jim O’Rourke can be found in my paper “What’s That Noise? Space, technology, and mixing in the music of Wilco” (Unpublished paper, York University, 2005). The left and right boxes indicate the left and right speakers, with the line in the middle representing center. The arrows that point towards or away from the center indicate either a wash of sound across the center and into the opposite speaker, or they indicate a diminishing away from their starting position on the spectrum.
background sounds in Figure 2a, which represents the example taken from Sam Jones’ documentary. It is important to note that the sounds appearing in the middle-ground are synthesized extra-musical noise, while the layers in the foreground are made by musical instruments. Interestingly, the low-register piano starts very much in the foreground and gradually fades into the middleground. The harmonic accompaniment of the electric organ, shown here in double parentheses, is so much in the foreground that at some points it is difficult to hear the singer. Additionally, while there is some wash across the spectrum in the layer called atmosphere, there is a fairly even mix between the left and right speakers, with no one side favoring any sound over the other.

respectively. Where the same sound occurs in both speakers, the words that are capitalized indicate that the sound is slightly more prominent in that speaker. The letters appearing in parentheses on the same line as a sound layer indicates a pulsation in sound. Finally, the different fonts indicate the different dimensions of the sounds: background layers in italics, middle-ground layers are underlined, and foreground layers are in bold print.
Conversely, the introduction mixed by O’Rourke features the background quite prominently, and also uses only synthesized “noise” tracks, with Jeff Tweedy’s voice being the only conventional instrument. This not only makes the whole thing significantly quieter than the other introduction, but also serves to draw attention to the texture created by the mix. The atmosphere washes are much more audible and pulsate at moments, bringing them in between the back and middle-grounds for split seconds. The left and right stereo mix is much more fluid, with some sounds favored in one side over the other. Atmosphere and beep are favored, for example, which indicates that they are of greater importance in the left speaker, while the drone is more significant in the right speaker.
The concept of authorship has come under considerable scrutiny of late and the constant individualization of the author is problematic in many ways. In a world where the idea of the individual is ubiquitous while the actual individual may not be is an area of study that deserves more attention outside the realm of literary criticism. Many interesting examples of the issues addressed in this article can be found in other aspects of popular music besides the production of a record. For instance, Alvaro Barbosa’s recent innovative research on collaborative musical composition through the use of computer network systems and communications technology provides another perspective on how technology affects and influences the authorship of music.25 Another interesting example of how the notion of individual authorship affects the identity of a performer can be

found in the work of Ani DiFranco. This nomadic folk-rocker is so aware of her “individualism” that she was prompted to start her own record company, Righteous Babe Records, simply because she decided that there was nothing a big label could offer her that she could not already provide for herself. Though this type of do-it-yourself attitude should certainly be applauded, it is evident in the lengthy personnel lists provided in the jackets of her sixteen studio releases that there were things that she could not do on her own. If, for the sake of argument, we are to consider her music works of individual genius, are session musicians and engineers to be regarded merely as technologies at the disposal of DiFranco’s creative whims?

What I have demonstrated in this article, with both my discussion and my analysis, is that through the direct and indirect involvements of several people, the issues of authorship and authority in popular music become subjects of contention and negotiation that deserve to be further scrutinized. Advances in technology, aesthetic judgments, and audience reception are but a few factors that have affected the way music is made both in and out of the recording studio, and thus, require a change in thinking about creative responsibility as an individualized action. Wilco’s *Yankee Hotel Foxtrot* is only one example of an album where the mixer played a significant creative role, and by extension, O’Rourke’s role as the mixer is one example of the many important non-musical jobs that contributed to the acclaim of the album. In beginning to explore such issues and how they relate

---

26 Information on Ani DiFranco, see http://www.righteousbabe.com/ani/bio.asp.
and contribute to music making, this article has provided a starting point for further examination of authorship, authority, and creative collaboration in popular music.
### Appendix: Timeline

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Year</th>
<th>Event</th>
<th>Wilco Personnel</th>
</tr>
</thead>
</table>
| 1994 | -Uncle Tupelo disbands, Wilco is formed | -Jeff Tweedy, singer/songwriter  
-John Stirrat, bass  
-Ken Coomer, drums  
-Max Johnston, multi-instruments |
| 1995 | -Wilco releases *A.M.* (Cure) | |
| 1996 | -Wilco releases *Being There* (Reprise Records)  
-Jay Bennett replaces Max Johnston | -Tweedy  
-Starratt  
-Cooper  
-Johnson  
-Bennett* |
| 1998 | -Wilco collaborates with Billy Bragg and Natalie Merchant to record *Mermaid Avenue* (Elektra) | |
| 1999 | -Wilco releases *Summerteeth* (Reprise) | |
| 2000 | -Jeff Tweedy collaborates with Jim O'Rourke and Glenn Kotche to form Loose Fur  
-Multi-instrumentalist Leroy Bach joins Wilco | -Tweedy  
-Bennett  
-Starratt  
-Cooper  
-Bach |
| 2001 | -Glenn Kotche replaces Ken Coomer on drums  
-Wilco records *Yancy Hotel Fourcot*  
-Jam O'Rourke mixes *THF* tapes  
-Reprise rejects *THF*  
-Jay Bennett is fired from Wilco | -Tweedy  
-Bennett  
-Starratt  
-Bach  
-Kotche |
| 2002 | -Yancey Hotel Fourcot is released on Nonesuch Records | -Tweedy  
-Starratt  
-Bach  
-Kotche |

* Names in bold print indicate new personnel.
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Abstract

Over the last decade, Chicago based alternative (alt) country band Wilco’s sound has undergone some drastic changes. From the decidedly folk-influenced early works, to their experimental middle period, to their present technologically complex stereo soundscapes, it would seem that Wilco has begun to progress beyond the category of alt-country into more musically innovative waters. Changes in personnel, both within the band and on the production team, as well as outsider influence from Wilco’s long list of side projects, have helped to generate a new experimentalism that works in tandem with Wilco’s alt-country roots to create a style of music that has yet to be categorized with any accuracy in the popular music lexicon.

One of the most important influences on Wilco’s shifting sound is Sonic Youth’s Jim O’Rourke, who mixed and produced Wilco’s most recent studio recorded albums, Yankee Hotel Foxtrot (2002) and A Ghost is Born (2004). This article explores the importance of O’Rourke’s role as the mixer in Wilco’s fourth studio release, Yankee Hotel Foxtrot. Examining issues of authorship, authority, and collaboration, this article shows examples of O’Rourke’s contribution as the mixer and how his specialized technological skill and prior experience as a performing musician and composer was an essential part of the creative music making process.
Jacques Hétu’s “Style composite”: Sonic Planes and Large Structure in the *Prélude*, op. 24

*Stephanie Lind*

Listening to the music of Jacques Hétu (b. 1938), it is not hard to understand why his music has been well-received and frequently performed in Canada. He successfully blends contemporary compositional techniques with more familiar neo-classical idioms. According to Irène Brisson, in her article on Hétu in the *Encyclopedia of Music in Canada*:

> [his] versatile repertoire, conceived for traditional and practical ensembles (string quartet, wind quintet, symphony orchestra, etc) has resulted in Hétu being one of the most frequently performed Canadian composers… Hétu has described his music as incorporating "neo-classical forms and neo-romantic effects in a musical language using 20th-century techniques." Indeed, with a solid background in classical forms, as the titles and the often traditional stamp of his works suggest, Hétu constructs his works around cyclically repeated and skilfully varied motivic units … As a result of his stylistic preferences, Hétu has often exacerbated proponents of the various trends that have laid claim to the title of "avant-garde" since the 1950s. Because many contemporary music ensembles have an aesthetic agenda tied to one or more of these trends, Hétu has needed to look to mainstream classical musicians for performances. This has not been difficult

---

1 An earlier version of this paper was given at the *Perspectives on Music in Canada Symposium*, University of Calgary, January 2006. I would like to thank the attendees, as well as my colleagues and professors at the University of British Columbia, for their feedback on my presentation.
for the composer, given his preference for traditional ensembles; it has ultimately led to the dissemination of his works among a broader concert-going public.²

Hétu’s compositional style often incorporates classical forms, simple rhythms, repetition, sequence, and a mix of tonal and atonal pitch structures. Pitch is organized into the “modes of limited transposition” developed by Olivier Messiaen, with whom Hétu studied.³ Messiaen was an enormous influence on many Québécois composers who studied in Paris, and also on many well-known European composers including Stockhausen, Boulez, and Xenakis.⁴ As a direct result of Messiaen’s teachings, many Québécois composers have integrated modality into their music by using novel, non-diatonic scales; this modality is outlined in Messiaen’s writings, particularly his treatise *Technique de mon langage musical.*⁵ At the same time, Québécois composers, like their English-Canadian counterparts such as John Weinzweig and (to a more limited extent) Barbara Pentland, have emphasized

---


³ While Messiaen was not the first to utilize the modes in his compositions (for example, the whole-tone collection, much used by Debussy), he was one of the first to develop the idea that these modes form a group because they have only a limited number of unique possible transpositions. For more information, see Olivier Messiaen, *Technique de mon langage musical* (Paris: Leduc, 2000; original 1944), 85-99.


repetition and the development of smaller motives in their works.

Hétu himself describes his mix of modern and traditional elements as a “composite style.” He explains:

Personally, in regards to my compositional style, I see no use in completely abandoning the compositional techniques of the past; I am searching for a synthesis of elements from past and present, taking from each that which seems useful to me. In other words, I believe in the possible existence of a style encompassing several systems. A brief analysis of a fragment from one of my works will illustrate and clarify my thoughts.

The first four measures of my Variations for Piano state, in a contracted manner, the essential elements which generate the entire work. In total, one can recognize two sonic planes. On one hand, the extreme registers: these are the melodic declaration of the theme; on the other hand, the middle register: this is its harmonic declaration. The conjunction of these two planes creates the contrapuntal and rhythmic characteristics of this fragment.

First, the theme. Its declaration presents the twelve tones of the chromatic scale but only the first six will have a structural function. The last six tones are merely the transposed retrograde of the first six, at a close variation… Secondly, the harmony: the chords are constructed from a mode previously catalogued by Olivier Messiaen… there is a relationship between this mode and the theme: the last six notes of the latter are also part of the mode. The contrapuntal aspect of this passage is characterized by the imitative treatment of these two sonic planes.6

6 “Personnellement, en ce qui concerne ma technique d’écriture, je ne vois aucune utilité à abandonner complètement la méthode d’écriture du passé; je cherche une synthèse des éléments passés et
Hétu observes that the listener must consider the interaction between “harmonic” and “melodic”, or “modal” and “motivic” dimensions of the music. Modal is appropriate since Hétu describes the harmony as “constructed from a mode previously catalogued by Olivier Messiaen”\(^7\); the term motivic aptly describes the short length, frequent repetition, and variety of transformations associated with his melodic material. Indeed, Hétu’s discussion of the Variations for Piano cited above clearly outlines several elements that will be important in analysing his Prélude, op. 24: the use of symmetrical materials (in the Variations, Messiaen’s modes and a retrograde-

\([^7\) Ibid.\]
Jacques Hétu’s “Style composite”

invariant 12-tone row), and the superimposition and integration of multiple musical planes. This paper will examine how these two elements are manifested throughout the Prélude, specifically how the two sonic planes, manifested as modes of limited transposition and atonal 0126 tetrachords, ornament an underlying structure based on the augmented triad.  

I will begin my analysis of the Prélude by outlining the basic elements of the motivic and modal layers. Measures 1-4, shown in Figure 1, present in octaves the series of pitch classes <D, D#, E, Bb> and <G, G#, A, Eb>. These pitch class series share the same sequence of interval classes, <1, 1, 6>, and belong to the same set class, 0126. In fact, they are T5 transpositions of one another, just as measures 1-2 and 3-4 are T3 transpositions of one another. The motive

---

8 A few conventions of pitch-class set theory will be identified here for those readers unfamiliar with the standards used in this document. 1) Any transposition Tx indicates a transposition x semitones higher than the original form. T5, for example, indicates a transposition five semitones higher, and is thus synonymous with “transposition by perfect fourth”. 2) Pitch class sets will be categorized by prime-form labels; for example, (D)(I) 0126, where D indicates the starting pitch class of the set, “I” indicates that the intervals occur in descending form – inversion – rather than ascending form (which is assumed if no “I” is present), and the set class number indicates the distance in semitones of each constituent pitch class from the starting point, D. See Joseph N. Straus, Introduction to Post-Tonal Theory (Englewood Cliffs, NJ: Prentice Hall, 1990), for more information.

9 Note that any set sharing the same ordered interval series will belong to the same set class. If we start on any pitch class (for example, C) and apply the ordered interval series <1, 1, 6> semitones (in ascending form, C, C#, D, Ab), set class 0126 will result (in this case, (D)(I) 0126).
is immediately repeated in the upper voice of measures 5-8 as a melodic motive, distinguished from the surrounding material by register. This pitch motive, \(<C, C^#, D, G^\#>\), is given in Figure 2. Instances of this motive, a member of set class 0126, recur extensively throughout the Prélude, and thus this material may be considered the main motive of the work.

Figure 1  Introduction, measures 1-4

Figure 2  Main motive, from mm. 5-6, upper voice

Figure 3 examines the saturation of measures 5-8 with instances of the 0126 motive. Within measures 5-8, the slurred motivic group heard in measures 5-6 is repeated twice. Each repetition presents several instances of the 0126 motive, indicated in the figure through pitch-class names horizontally aligned with the score. These tetrachords are not immediately audible within this passage.
because instances of 0126 interweave with one another; Figure 4 will assist in explaining this relationship. Given any chromatic trichord, a 0126 tetrachord can be formed by adding another pitch-class either four semitones above or four semitones below this trichord. The two resulting 0126 tetrachords are inversions of one another: the centre of the chromatic trichord acts as an axis about which the added pitch class is inverted, and thus the union of the two sets forms a symmetrical set. Theorists call this sort of operation a “contextual inversion,” and I will refer to this particular one as “$J$”.

Figure 3 Measures 5-8 (SC 0126 tetrachords are each outlined once within dotted boxes – n.b. not all occurrences of these tetrachords are indicated).
Figure 4 The J contextual inversion

Figure 5 gives a network illustrating further relationships among the 0126 tetrachords in measures 5-8. Observe how pairs of J-related tetrachords, aligned horizontally on the diagram, are transposed by $T_5$, shown by downward-directed arrows. $T_5$ was prepared for this structuring role by the introduction of the Prélude, where measures 3-4 were related to measures 1-2 by $T_5$. In addition, the repetition of $T_5$ implies a symmetrical construction: sets (D)(I) and (C) 0126 are the same distance from sets (G)(I) and (F) 0126 as the latter are from (C)(I) and (A#) 0126.
Now that the motivic layer of the Prélude has been described in terms of 0126 tetrachords, let us examine how these tetrachords interact with the modal layer. For reference, a list of symmetrical collections (i.e. modes), including Messiaen’s modes of limited transposition, are listed in **Example 1**. Note that each mode repeats at a transposition determined by the total span of the interval sequence. For example, mode 3, the enneadic collection, has a repeated interval sequence that spans 4 semitones, and thus repeated transpositions of $T_4$ ($T_4$, $T_8$, and $T_0$) will generate the same collection of pitch-classes. Most modes are also inversionally symmetric; however, note that modes 4 and 5 are inversionally symmetric with one another rather than with themselves.
Example 1 Symmetrical collections\textsuperscript{10}

\textsuperscript{10} Note that modes 4 and 5 are not pitch-class subsets of mode 2 on this table, but rather set-class subsets. To make an analogy to tonal structures, modes 4 and 5 are to mode 2 as a pentatonic collection is to a major scale: the set-class of the smaller set is a subset of the larger one. The instances of each mode given in Example 1 do not generate pitch-class subsets since each mode has been transposed to begin on C for the sake of consistency. This example is a summary of the information given in Messiaen 2000/1944, 85-99.
The analysis on Figure 6, which gives measures 1-4 of the Prélude, indicates several transformations that by repetition become characteristic: T₁, T₅, and T₈. T₁ is heard in the chromatically-ascending bass line, T₅ is heard as a series of fifths overlapping this chromatic line, and T₈ is heard as the transposition between the whole-notes of the right hand from measures 1 to 2 and 3 to 4, in addition to being highlighted via bass leaps during measures 2 and 4. These transformations are indicated with arrows on the figure. The passage evokes a whole-tone sonority, in particular during measures 2 and 4, which features leaps between bass notes belonging to a single whole-tone collection within each measure. How can this aural experience be explained given that T₁ and T₅, neither of which is heard within the whole-tone collection, are emphasized within the passage?

Since measures 3-4 sequence measures 1-2, the analysis will be broken down accordingly into two groups. Figure 7 lists the pitch classes present in measures 1-2, and compares them to the C whole-tone collection. Of all the pitch classes of the excerpt, only D♯ is not a member of the C whole-tone collection. It can be heard as chromatic passing motion from D to E in the lower staff, thus fulfilling an ornamental function (i.e. as a passing note not belonging to the principal tonality) rather than a structural one.
Figure 6  Measures 1-4, with repeated transformations

Figure 7  Pitch classes in measures 1-2

**Figure 8** gives the pitch classes of measures 3-4, a transposition of measures 1-2 with one extra pitch class, D. If this passage is to be interpreted analogously to measures 1-2, the pitch classes form a D♭ whole-tone collection, with extra pitch classes D and G♯. While the G♯ (analogous to the D♯ in the previous example) can be understood as part of a chromatic passing move, the D is not heard as such within measures 3-4. A second explanation is that the extra pitch classes form 0126 tetrachords superimposed on the whole-tone collection, indicated with brackets above and below the chart. This tetrachord type forms the main motive of the work, as examined in connection with **Figure 3.**  **Figure 9** modifies our analysis of measures 1-2 to reflect this second analysis, interpreting the extra pitch class D♯ as a member of a superimposed 0126 tetrachord.
Elements of three common collections (the whole-tone, hexatonic, and octatonic ones) appear regularly throughout the work. Many passages allude to a particular modal collection via characteristic melodic or intervallic patterns, but contain extra pitch classes that undermine this interpretation. Like the previous example, these can be understood as superimpositions, where a form of the 0126 tetrachord is overlaid on the modal materials. Figures 10 through 15 give several examples of overlapping modes and 0126 tetrachords elsewhere in the work.

Measures 9-12 are given in Figure 10. In this example, two different types of musical material are heard, differentiated by duration, dynamic level, and register: the right hand repeats a single-line melody (with slight variations) featuring eighth-durations in a high register; this motive is also heard in the left-hand beginning in measure 11, beat 4.5. In measures 9-11
the left hand repeats material featuring symmetric elements; specifically, the motive <C, D_b, D> is registrally symmetric about D_b4, and the {B_b, G} dyad is registrally symmetric with the {F#, A} dyad about A_b3. Figure 11a gives the pitch classes in the upper staff of measures 9-12. This material features repeated interval classes 1 and 3. While these intervals feature in several symmetric collections, including the octatonic, enneadic, and hexatonic collections, the total pitch-class collection of this material lies closest to that of a hexatonic collection, with only one extra note. Aurally, the isolated semitone dyads, in addition to the interval class 3 leaps, support this interpretation. The bracket below Figure 11a indicates a 0126 subset that includes the non-hexatonic note.

Figure 11b lists the pitch classes in the lower staff from measure 9 to the fourth beat of measure 11. This material repeats interval classes 1 and 3 once again, generating a sense of unity with the right-hand material. In this case, however, the hexatonic collection does not seem as well suited because the semitones within the passage are spaced via interval class 3 (characteristic of the octatonic collection) rather than interval class 4 (characteristic of the hexatonic collection). The total pitch-class content of this passage reveals that these pitch classes form a portion of the octatonic collection plus one additional note. The non-modal note can once again be understood as part of a 0126 subset, indicated with brackets below the chart.

In measure 11, beat 4.5, the lower staff begins to imitate material from the upper one. One can see by the vertical alignment on Figure 11c that this imitation, beginning with the pitch classes <E, A#, B>,
Jacques Hétu’s “Style composite” combines the two collections, taking semitone dyads from each; \{E^b, E\} is derived from the octatonic collection, \{B^b, B\} is derived from the hexatonic collection, and \{F^#, G\} is shared by both.

Figure 10 Measures 9-12

a) Pitch classes in measures 10-12, right hand

b) Pitch classes in measures 9-11, left hand

c) Pitch classes in measures 11-12, left hand (shading indicates common semitone dyads between the actual pitch class collection in comparison with the octatonic and hexatonic collections)

Figure 11 Common collections in measures 9-12
Measures 13-16 are given in Figure 12. The passage has three separate voices made distinct by register and duration: voice 1 occurs in the highest register as quarter notes, voice 2 in the inner register as eighth notes, and voice 3 in the lowest register as quarter-note dyads. Semitone motion in the lowest voice, in addition to interval classes 2, 3 and 6 in all voices, imply an octatonic collection. The total pitch class collection, shown in Figure 13, corresponds to OCT (C, C♯), with G♯ as an extra pitch.

Figure 12 Measures 13-16

Figure 13 Pitch classes in measures 13-16

The next passage evocative of a symmetrical collection is heard in measures 31-37, given in Figure 14. In this example, two voices present a unison melody featuring isolated semitone dyads and interval class 3 leaps. An interpretation based on the HEX (C, C♯) collection, which as previously explained features
the same elements, is given in Figure 15. In this case, D♯ is the extra pitch class.

Figure 14 Measures 31-37

Figure 15 Pitch classes in measures 31-37

To summarize the analysis thus far, the importance of the 0126 tetrachord is substantiated through its repetition in instances of the main motivic material (Figure 1), the introduction (Figure 2), and linking material such as measures 9-12 (Figure 10 and Figure 11). Interestingly, this tetrachord can be formed by adding any pitch class to the whole-tone, octatonic, and hexatonic collections. See Figure 16, which illustrates this property. The whole-tone and octatonic collections are the only modes of limited transposition in which set class 0126 is not a subset, but which appears as a subset after the addition of any one note; the hexatonic collection, not identified as a
mode of limited transposition by Messiaen, also shares this property. Note that due to the symmetric structure of these collections, the same set class will result regardless of the choice of added note for each symmetric collection. Thus the 0126 tetrachord provides a motivic link between the three commonly-used modes of limited transposition in this work.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Collections</th>
<th>Set Class</th>
<th>Set Class after adding any one pitch class</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Whole-Tone</td>
<td>02479</td>
<td>0 1 2 4 6 8 9</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Chromatic</td>
<td>01346796</td>
<td>0 1 2 3 4 6 7 9 1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Metatomic</td>
<td>014569</td>
<td>0 1 2 4 5 8 9</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Figure 16 SC 0126 tetrachords superimposed on symmetric collections

The connection between two sonic planes within the work, modal and motivic, has been demonstrated. However, these materials are only one aspect of the Prélude's large structure. Let us explore how other elements are involved in this process.

We saw previously in measures 5-8 how J-related 0126 tetrachords were sequenced by T5. Figure 17 gives measures 16-20, a passage employing similar motivic material to these earlier measures. Observe how the musical material in bars 16-17 is transposed twice by T8, ending with the motivic group first heard in measures 5-8. Figure 18a illustrates these T8 transformations graphically. Figure 18b shows the T8 transformations that are characteristic of the augmented triad. Note that graphs (a) and (b) are...
identical: this shows that the progression of the main motivic group is modelled after the augmented triad. The association between these two structures is further substantiated by the repetition of the augmented triad at the end of each statement of the motivic group within measures 16-20 (and analogously within measures 5-8).

![Figure 17 Measures 16-20](image)

Please note that there is a possible error in the score. In the lowest voice of measures 19-20, a C appears to be tied to a B; the system break (eliminated here in order to condense the example) makes it unclear whether this is a tie, or whether the markings are intended as slurs.
Another passage rich in augmented triads, measures 21-24, is given in Figure 19. Measure 21 begins a canon at the octave between two voices, rhythmically displaced by an eighth-duration. Repetitions of the canonic theme in measures 22-24 vary and transpose the theme, each time adding a new voice. By measure 24, the original two canonic voices have been built up to eight voices, presenting a canon between two sets of parallel augmented triads. The end of this measure is the dynamic and registral climax of the Prélude, and thus the emphasis of the augmented sonority at this point implies an important role for this sonority throughout the work.
Further evidence of the structural role of the augmented triad can be seen in measures 25-28, given in Figure 20. Three augmented triads are featured in this passage: the recurring {Ab, C, E} and {Eb, G, B} on the last quarter duration of each bar, and the {D, F#, Bb} arpeggiated through whole-note durations in the bass. These refresh the idea that the augmented sonority motivates transformations throughout the work. Several other factors support this hearing. Observe the 0126 tetrachords indicated on the figure. Figure 21 shows that these tetrachords once again relate by J, and also that J-related pairs are transposed by T4. This is the same transposition heard from one measure to the next within measures 25-28. Figure 22 changes the order of the tetrachords shown on Figure 21. Since both T8 and T4 are pitch class transformations characteristic of the augmented triad, this order reversal will allow a comparison to processes seen in Figure 18 while still retaining the analogy to the augmented triad. The two graphs of Figure 18 are identical (isographic) to the graph of Figure 22: in other words, both have the same structure as the augmented triad.
Figure 20 Measures 25-28

Figure 21 Transformations between tetrachords in measures 25-28
The preceding examples have demonstrated similarities between the structure of the augmented triad and the transformational structure between tetrachords within the Prélude. I do not believe that instances of augmented triads in the music, nor allusions to the structure of the augmented triad among tetrachords, are allusions to traditional sonorities. Rather, I believe they are one manifestation of symmetry in this work.

The two sonic planes described by Hétu have now been clearly outlined: the surface-level 0126 tetrachords (the motivic element), and the changing modes of limited transposition within each phrase or subsection (the modal element). In addition, I have outlined another sonic plane: the movement-structuring augmented triads. While it is an interesting analytical exercise to outline these three planes, the relevance of analysis to this work lies in showing how
these musical materials are connected, creating unity within the work. In David Lewin’s words, “The essential and difficult analytical task at hand is not to articulate the two strata but to integrate them.”12 I believe the three planes are cleverly integrated via the common phenomenon of symmetry. Symmetry occurs in the internal (intervallic) structure of the augmented triad. The modes of limited transposition over which 0126 tetrachords were superimposed are also symmetrical, a defining feature of these modes. Lastly, although the 0126 tetrachord is not a symmetrical collection, the union of two 0126 tetrachords related by the J transformation form a symmetrical collection. The integration of the three planes results from both their superimposition and the sharing of structural elements from one plane to another, several examples of which have been presented in this document. First, as seen in connection with Figure 16, the 0126 tetrachord acts as a link between the symmetrical collections used within the Prélude since it is generated in the same way within each collection, by adding one note to any of the three modes. Second, the structure of the augmented trichord generates the transpositions of the motivic 0126 tetrachords. In spite of Hétu’s intentional use of stratification, he has cleverly combined three layers of distinct material into a unified whole.
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Abstract

The music of Jacques Hétu mixes modern and traditional elements, often using classical forms, uncomplicated rhythms, repetition, and sequence in a mix of tonal and atonal pitch structures. The opening section of his Prélude et Danse, op. 24, is exemplary. Pitch is organized into the “modes of limited transposition” used by Olivier Messiaen, with whom Hétu studied in Paris. However, these modes are not always apparent to the ear. More obvious are the 0126 tetrachords superimposed over the modal layer and whose reiteration unifies the piece. An analysis that focuses only on that motivic unity cannot account for the contrasts present in the Prélude: contrasts between different modes from one passage to the next, surface-level and background-level events, and different emphasized transformations.

The key to understanding both unity and contrast in the Prélude lies in Hétu’s own description of his work. He identifies two sonic planes corresponding to melodic (“motivic”) and harmonic (“modal”) dimensions of the music. This article employs a new approach to conceptualizing pitch structure — transformational theory — to interpret these compositional decisions. It demonstrates how symmetrical collections and atonal tetrachords ornament an underlying structure based on the augmented triad, and how this interpretation is strengthened through instances of this sonority on both the surface and in the background of the Prélude. Thus three sonic planes coexist. The change of focus between these three planes creates contrast adding interest and motivating the work. The Prélude manages
to present new material through repetition, and contrast through similarity, all the time effectively merging these aspects into a unified whole.
Goethe’s “Suleika”
Cynthia Boucher

Goethe was distraught when, in 1805, his very close companion Friedrich Schiller died. Thereafter, the great poet endured a period of minimal production and struggled to continue his literary pursuits:

For in the decade after Schiller died, [Goethe] hardly seemed one. Age does not favour lyrical writing: old men are less likely to fall in love, to feel each new spring as a revelation, or in general to suffer the sharp emotions that stimulate the lyric (Reed, 232).

Instead of immediately pursuing lyric poetry as he had once done, Goethe pursued an interest in Orientalism, encouraged by the presence of a growing field of scholarship in Germany and Herder’s introduction of Oriental literature into Goethe’s poetic vocabulary (Wolff, in Goethe, 1974; Byrne, 368). Herder was well read in the literature of his time, bringing Saadi, Olearius, as well as Indian and Chinese poetry to Goethe’s attention. Under his influence, Goethe began to read the Qur’an, which inspired his drama Mohomet, and several years later, in 1812, Herder introduced Goethe to the writing of Muhammed Shams ud-Din, a Persian poet who published under the pseudonym Hafiz (Byrne, 368).

Goethe may have originally been attracted to Hafiz due to the nature of his pseudonym, which is a designation for those who have mastered the Qur’an and means ‘One Remembering’. He found in the works of Hafiz many parallels to his own life (Byrne,
Where Hafiz was honored by the prince Shah Sedshan, Goethe was honored by Karl August, the duke of Saxe-Weimar-Eisenach through an invitation to Weimar. They both lived out their lives of study and pleasure through the most politically and militaristically chaotic times in Asian (for Hafiz) and European (for Goethe) history. Goethe saw further parallels between the war of his time and the war of Hafiz’s time:

Dynastic wars culminated in the campaigns of Timur, as the French Revolutionary Wars had culminated in the campaigns of Napoleon. Hafiz met Timur in person, as Goethe had met Napoleon at Erfurt in 1808. Both conquerors came to grief in winter wars, Timur in China, Napoleon in Russia (Reed, 233).

In an attempt to honor and emulate Hafiz, Goethe began writing poems intended to loosely resemble those of the Persian poet. T.J. Reed notes that Goethe’s purpose was to honor Hafiz but he hardly imitates his forms. Reed continues that considering the parallels between their two lives, Goethe did not need to imitate Hafiz in spirit “since it comes as a reminder of his true self” (234).

Despite Goethe’s emulation of Hafiz and the Oriental themes that run through the poetry of this time, the story of the Divan is not completed solely through Goethe’s intellectual pursuits. It is also inspired by love and began even before Goethe had met the woman whose presence would be so integral to the Divan. Reed points out that the poem
‘Phänomen’, written before Goethe met Marianne von Willemer, actually fortells a new love:

Wenn zu der Regenwand Phöbus sich gattet,
Gleich steht ein Bogenrand
Farbig beschattet.

Im Nebel gleichen Kreis
She ich gezogen;
Zwar ist der Bogen Weiß,
Doch Himmelsbogen.

So sollst du, muntrer Greis,
Dich nicht betrüben;
Sind gleich die Haare weiß,
Doch wirst du lieben.

(Translated by Edgar Alfred Bowring)

After Goethe’s second trip to visit the Rhine in 1815 he returned a renewed man. He spent the 12 August to the 18 September with the Willemer family, followed by a weekend from 23 to 26 September. During these times Goethe fell in love with Marianne (Byrne, 370). Their love was suppressed because of Marianne’s hasty marriage that same September, and due to their considerable age difference of 35 years. This would be forever contained within the Divan cycle as it had been a source of inspiration.

---

1 Marianne von Willemer, born Marianne Jung, becomes the love object of Goethe’s lyric.
Goethe breaks out of the intellectual and emotional rut caused by the death of his friend Schiller nearly a decade earlier. He then begins to produce the work that contains the poem “Suleika,” which will become the central historical and music-analytical focus of this article. The first part of this article reviews the history and context of Goethe and his Divan, and the second presents an analysis of “Suleika,” the poem to the west wind written by Marianne von Willemer and later altered by Goethe. The final portion of the article examines two settings of the poem, by Carl Friedrich Zelter and Franz Schubert, comparing the treatment of the material while keeping Goethe’s own ideas about text setting in mind.

**History**

Goethe had found in Marianne the emotional spark, the love, and the anguish that he needed to produce lyric poetry once again. This time however, the lyric is presented with a strange self-awareness that was not present in his earlier works:

For the Divan is distinctively about love in age. If love was a recurrent theme for Goethe, it was never the same twice—not, as popular legend would have it, an identical force repeatedly switching on an identical poetry….In his maturity he knows a real woman, but their enjoyment is also for him a crowning moment where history, culture and nature meet and enhance each other in conscious fulfillment….The Divan too mingles nature with culture. Knowledge and
awareness—of love, of legendary past lovers, of himself as once more a lover, living the role of an Eastern love-poet, Hatem to Marianne's Suleika—once again enhance pleasure... He feels unease too, at having so little to offer in return for her youth and beauty: ‘zu erwidern hav ich nichts’ [to answer I have nothing] (Reed, 236).

Goethe places himself and Marianne (who authored several of the poems in the cycle) in the Eastern and Western realms of this cycle by selecting the names of the characters in the *Divan* from an Eastern source, Herbelot’s *Bibliothèque Orientale* of 1697, in order to describe the love of two distinctly European people (Byrne, 369). The Eastern roles the couple played “offered total freedom, but only in the imagination.” The fulfillment of their desires could only be realized in poetry (Reed, 237). Goethe named the cycle *Divan*, a Persian word taken from Hafiz, meaning ‘collection’ or more specifically ‘a collection of songs’ (Byrne, 369). Goethe had a lifelong interest in music, therefore it is not surprising that the title *Divan* is a specific musical reference indicating the possibility of musical setting. This aspect of Goethe’s poetry has interesting implications for both the reading of the text and the musical settings given Goethe’s expressed opinions about capturing the nuances of the text with music. If Goethe had wanted the poems of the *Divan* to be sung, it is likely that he had expectations concerning the style and method of performance and composition.

During Goethe’s lifetime, a change occurred the in method of song setting that shifted the emphasis of song from the text to the music. Composers began to move away from strophic
settings, embracing through-composition and more elaborate musical interpretations. This was not a shift for which Goethe expressed appreciation. It was his preference for the older style of simple strophic settings that drew Goethe to the music of Carl Friedrich Zelter. Being a close friend of Zelter’s, Goethe praised his compositions for giving primacy to the text, rather than the melody:

Meantime our worthy Zelter has cared for the ear, in the higher sense, and through the composition of some songs by Schiller and by me, has really brightened our winter hours. He captures the character of the entire [poem] exquisitely in identically recurring strophes, so that it is again felt in every single part, where others through a so-called through-composition destroy the impression of the whole by not controlling the details (As quoted in Byrne, 12).

The simplicity of the style allowed the performer to interpret the nuances of the text without interference. A description given by Goethe of a rehearsal with the performer Ehlers indicates the extent to which Goethe was dedicated to the strophic forms:

Ehlers was useful and pleasing in many roles as an actor and singer, and was especially welcome in the latter type of social entertainment, where he really peerlessly performed ballads and other songs of that type with guitar accompaniment with exact attention to the words of the text. He was untiring in studying the most appropriate expression that consists in the singer giving prominence to the different nuances of individual strophes in line with the melody
Goethe's “Suleika”

and so being able to fulfill the duty of the lyricist and epic poet equally. In this spirit, he agreed when I demanded hours of him in the evening, even right into the small hours of the night, to repeat the same song with all the shades as exactly as possible; by this successful practice he was convinced how reprehensible all so-called through-composition of songs was, through which the general lyrical character is entirely revoked and a false interest in detail is demanded and created (as quoted in Byrne, 12).

Goethe was committed to the strophic setting of poetry until his death. He perhaps did not realize that it was largely the “unprecedented emotional and musical power” of his own poetic works that “inspired the innovations that gave rise to the new form” (Stein, 232). In fact, Mitchell writes that it is because of Goethe that the lied was first invented by the hand of Schubert. She writes the day that Schubert wrote “Gretchen am Spinnrad” to a text from Goethe’s Faust, is the “birthday of the German Lied.” Mitchell continues, writing that although Schubert had written several songs before this, “it was only when [Schubert] tried his hand at Goethe’s lyrics that he achieved the creation of a new type of song which lifted this art form at on stroke to a higher level of significance” (64).

“Suleika”

When Goethe published his Divan, it contained several poems written by Marianne von Willemer. Her words and his combine to create a
conversation between two lovers, Hatem and Suleika. These names, selected by Goethe from Herbelot's *Bibliothèque Orientale* (1697), are the cloaks under which Goethe can confess his love for Marianne. However, she is not lost to the ideas of Eastern philosophy offered by Goethe. Her love poems, labeled ‘Suleika’ by Goethe to indicate Marianne’s speaking, are pleadings to the east and west winds, respectively in Oriental poetry the messenger of love and the Zephyr. The first poem is optimistic as Suleika receives news of love via the east wind. The second poem is slightly darker. Suleika remains optimistic about love, having met with her lover, but her words are shadowed by the pain of separation, and she pleads with Zephyr the west wind to send a message to her lover. Byrne notes that although “the *Suleika* poems are…not of Goethe’s hand, …his influence is naturally felt within these poems” (376). Indeed Goethe had altered the text of Marianne’s love poems and included them in this ‘collection of songs’, but he did not give credit to Marianne for the writing until many years later when she confessed her authorship to a friend.

Marianne was unhappy about the changes that Goethe had made to her poems. She was particularly annoyed by the seemingly unnecessary changes that Goethe made to the fourth stanza of her first Suleika poem, complaining: “Es ist doch nur eine einzige Strophe, die Goethe verändert hat, und ich weiss nicht warum; ich finde die meine wirklich schöner” (as quoted in Boyd, 203). The changes Goethe made to this stanza are marked here:

2 It is nevertheless only one strophe, which Goethe altered, and I do not know why; I really find mine more beautiful.
Marianne:

Und mich soll sein leises
Flüstern
Von dem Freunde lieblich
grüßen;
Eh' noch diese Hügel düsten,
Sitz ich still zu seinen Füßen.

Goethe:

Und mir bringt sein leises
Flüstern
Von dem Freunde tausend
Grüße;
Eh, noch diese Hügel düstern,
Grüßen mich wohl tausend
Küsse.

The alterations in the first and second lines are necessitated by Goethe’s complete change of the last line. In Goethe’s version, the east wind brings a thousand kisses to the waiting lover, while in Marianne’s version the east wind is less active, bringing only whisperings to the lover sitting silently. Boyd suggests that “Perhaps greater metrical smoothness and finer vowel gradation have been attained, but the native restraint has disappeared, the thought has become almost banal, unworthy of the poetess as we know her, and untrue.” She continues by writing that it is “with justice Marianne could complain” (203).

In the second Suleika poem, complementary to the first, Goethe’s changes do not alter the meaning of the text as much as in the first Suleika poem (Boyd, 204):
Marianne:

Ach, um deine feuchten
Schwingen
West, wie sehr ich dich
beneide:
Denn du kannst ihm Kunde
bringen,
Was ist in durch die Trennung;

Goethe:

Ach, um deine feuchten
Schwingen
West, wie sehr ich dich
beneide:
Denn du kannst ihm Kunde
bringen,
Was ich in der Trennung
leide.

Die Bewegung deiner Flügel
Weckt im Busen stilles Sehnen,
Blumen, Augen, Wald und
Hügel
Stehn bei deinem Hauch in
Tränen.

Doch dein mildes sanftes
Wehen
Kühlt die wunden Augenlider;
Ach für Leid müßt ich
vergehen,
Hofft ich nicht zu sehn ihn
wieder.

Geh denn hi zu meinem
Lieben,
Spreche sanft zu seinem
Herzen;
Doch vermeid, ihn zu
betrüben,
Und verschweig ihm meine
Schmerzen.

Sag ihm nur, aber sag’s
bescheiden:
Seine Liebe sei mein Leben;
Freudiges Gefühl von beiden
Wird mir seine Nähe geben.
Three of the five changes made by Goethe alter the meter of the poem so that each line has eight syllables, but do not greatly effect the meaning. This now simplified repeating eight syllable pattern, along with the quatrain form, goes along with Goethe’s ideas about poetry that is meant to be set to music. His poem “To Lina” from *Lieder* serves as an introduction to these ideas. Here, Goethe urges that his poems be sung instead of read in order to both personalize the poetry and breathe life into the words:

An Lina

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>German</th>
<th>English</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Liebchen, kommen diese Lieder</td>
<td>Should these songs, love, as they fleet,</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Jemals wieder dir zur Hand,</td>
<td>Chance again to reach thy hand,</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Sitze beim Klaviere nieder,</td>
<td>At the piano take thy seat,</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Wo der Freund sonst bei dir stand.</td>
<td>Where thy friend was wont to stand!</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Laß die Saiten rasch erklingen,</td>
<td>Sweep with finger bold the string,</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Und dann sich ins Buch hinein;</td>
<td>Then the book one moment see:</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Nur nicht lesen! immer singen!</td>
<td>But read not! Do nought but sing!</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Und ein jedes Blatt ist dein.</td>
<td>And each page thine own will be!</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>German</th>
<th>English</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Ach, wie traurig sieht in Lettern,</td>
<td>Ah, what grief the song imparts</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Schwarz auf weiß, das Lied mich an,</td>
<td>With its letters, black on white,</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Das aus deinem Mund vergöttern,</td>
<td>That, when breath’d by thee, our hearts</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Das ein Herz zerreißt kann!</td>
<td>Now can break and now delight!</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

(Translated by Edgar Alfred Bowring)
Mitchell notes that “the language of music is not weighed down by utilitarian use, and therefore functions as a natural medium for unrepresed artistic utterance” (68). By encouraging his readers to sing the lyric, instead of simply reading it, or perhaps even imagining the speech in one’s mind, Goethe encourages his readers to break away from the constraints of speech and experience the poems entirely as expressive renderings. Being more inclined towards strophic settings, Goethe’s alterations hint at an attempt to produce text that can easily be set to such music. The meter allows for the text to be set to music, while the music allows the text to break free from speech (via nuance). Additionally, Goethe may have found the text and speech versions of poetry to be entirely lesser forms. When he sent his West-Ostlicher Divan to Zelter on January 30, 1820, he included a letter with a note indicating that Zelter should ‘dress the naked song’ if the poetry pleased him. From this, Mitchell concludes that “In Goethe’s view, a ‘Lied’ that remains merely on the printed page is condemned to a shadowy existence” (61).

Two Settings

Altogether, there have been six settings of Marianne’s Goethe-altered poem to the west wind: Carl Bank, “Suleikas Song” (op. 7, no. 5); Carl Eberwein, “Suleika”; Felix Mendelssohn, “Suleika” (op. 34, no. 4); Fanny Hensel, “Suleika”; Franz Schubert, “Suleika II” (op. 31, D. 717); and Karl Friedrich Zelter, “Suleika.” The following looks at the last two of these six, those by Zelter and Schubert.
The text of “Suleika” concerns love and the space between lovers. The speaker, who takes the place of Marianne, asks the west wind to deliver a message of love to her lover:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>German Text</th>
<th>English Translation</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Ach, um deine feuchten Schwingen</td>
<td>Ah, West Wind, your most wings gliding</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>West, wie sehr ich dich deneide:</td>
<td>Stir my envious admiration:</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Denn du kannst ihm Kunde bringen,</td>
<td>For to him you bring this tiding,</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Was ich in der Trennung leide.</td>
<td>How I grieve in separation!</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Die Bewegung deiner Flügel</td>
<td>Your wings’ motion has such power,</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Weckt im Busen stilles Sehnen,</td>
<td>Yearning through my heart it presses;</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Blumen, Augen, Wald und Hügel</td>
<td>Hill and forest, field and flower</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Stehn bei deinem Hauch in Tränen</td>
<td>Fill with tears from your caresses.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Doch dein mildes sanftes Wehen</td>
<td>Yet your mild and gentle blowing</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Kühl dt die wunden Augenlider</td>
<td>Soothes and cools my eyelids burning;</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>A ch Für Leid müött ich vergehen,</td>
<td>I had died from pain so glowing</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Hoft ich nicht zu sehn ihn wieder.</td>
<td>But for hope of his returning.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Eile denn zu meinem Lieben, Spreche sanft zu seinem Herzen;</td>
<td>Hurry then to meet my lover,</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Doch vermeid, ihn zu betrüben,</td>
<td>Softly to his heart appealing;</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Und verbirg ihm meine Schmerzen.</td>
<td>Yet you must not cloud him over,</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Sag ihm, aber sags bescheiden:</td>
<td>And my pain must keep concealing.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Ah, West Wind, your most wings gliding
Stir my envious admiration:
For to him you bring this tiding,
How I grieve in separation!
Your wings’ motion has such power,
Yearning through my heart it presses;
Hill and forest, field and flower
Fill with tears from your caresses.
Yet your mild and gentle blowing
Soothes and cools my eyelids burning;
I had died from pain so glowing
But for hope of his returning.
Hurry then to meet my lover,
Softly to his heart appealing;
Yet you must not cloud him over,
And my pain must keep concealing.
Tell him, though with modest
Seine Liebe sei mein Leben;  
Freudiges Gefühl von beiden 
Wird mir seine Nähe geben. 

That his love is my life’s essence, 
In them both I shall rejoice 
When again I feel his presence.

(Translated by Edgar Alfred Bowring)

In the first stanza Suleika expresses envy of the west wind, whose ability to traverse long distances quickly by way of flight could reunite her with her lover if only she had this power. The power of quick journeying is god-like in this setting. The wings of the west wind suggest Zephyr, the Greek god of the west wind, and as such a power of travel that could never be given to a mortal. The west wind also maintains Goethe and Marianne’s disguises as Hatem and Suleika as the east-west voyaging of the wind is maintained despite the fact that the two German poets were physically separated by a space spanning north-south. With east-west space standing in for north-south space, Suleika expresses distress over the distance of separation and, in the second stanza, reflects the wind’s envious power to touch many things at once: it seeks messages in Suleika’s heart, but also moves through hills, forests, fields, and flowers. By the third stanza, the west wind’s power relieves Suleika’s distress as she begins to calm herself from the ‘burning’ of her eyelids, caused by the tears the wind had stirred in her. Here is the true source of the tears: they are tears caused by the sudden hope that a message may be delivered to her lover, but eased at the same time by the coolness of the gentle breeze across her face. Finally, Suleika urges the wind to be off with her message, but not to reveal her pain. Such
revelation would cause her lover distress, or perhaps scare him further away. If the wind can appeal softly, and with modest voice, Suleika’s lover will learn of her devotion to his love and perhaps return. The final two stanzas express a modicum of desperation for Suleika. She wants badly to have her lover know of her dedication, but wants this message delivered in a manner that is completely unlike her pleas and envious words to the west wind. The contradiction between her actual manner and the manner she wishes for addressing her far-off lover compound the anxious and restless nature of her expressed tears and envy.

Musically, the distress and envy are for the most part features of the accompanimental parts. The melodies used by Zelter and Schubert in the setting of “Suleika” have very few similarities, and, with the exception of the final part of Schubert’s setting, are expressive but not evocative of the imagery from the poem. However, the accompaniment parts of both works are similar in that they both use arpeggiation. This seems no surprise given the genre of the works, but a closer examination of the contexts reveals that this aspect holds significance in both instances.

Zelter’s setting of “Suleika” appears in the collection *Fünfzig Lieder* as song number 24. The accompaniment of this setting employs arpeggiation in all but measures 8-10, which include a cadenza-like figure that calls attention to this important point in each stanza. The only other song of the 50 collected works in *Fünfzig Lieder* that employs this sort of free

3 The words that fall on this figure in each stanza are: leide (suffer), Tränen (tears), wieder (return), Schmerzen (pain, suffering), and geben (giving, presence). These are the last words of each stanza.
flowing arpeggiation (instead of the strict contrapuntal style used to fill out chords) is one titled “Ich Denke dein” on a poem by Friederike Brun. The text of this poem conjures images of nature, most predominantly that of waves, banking against the shore. The connection seen between these two uses is in the motion shared by waves and wind, the principle nature image in Marianne’s poem. The relatively relaxed use of arpeggiation in “Suleika” suggests the blowing of the wind. There is a subtle rising and falling figure in the eighth note accompanimental figure that weaves throughout the vocal parts (Example 1).

Example 1 Zelter’s “Suleika” eighth note figure, mm. 1 – 2

The range here is restricted, but the figure clearly moves on each downbeat in an ascending then descending line: B, C, (d), E, D, C, E, C, B. This wind image projected by a rising and falling accompaniment is also reflected in the final measures of the work. Since Zelter’s setting is strophic, these last measures act as a gust of wind between each stanza of text (Example 2).

Example 2 Zelter’s “Suleika” triplet figure from mm. 10 – 12
Here again the rising line is emphasized by its placement on the downbeat, while the remainder of the pitches expand the harmony in ascending bursts. Despite the fact that he is known for rather bland settings that rarely evoke the text, highlighting the text in the manner Goethe advocated, Zelter incorporated rising and falling lines that suggest the wind image of Marianne’s poem. In this way, the strophic form of Zelter’s setting may be thought to aid in the evocation of a continuously and repetitively blowing wind.

Schubert also uses an accompanimental figure that evokes an image of the wind described in the poem. This one is less likely to be contested because of the expectation that Schubert will include this type of imagery. Although both Zelter and Schubert employ figures that may be read in this way, Schubert’s wind-like accompaniment is much more elaborate than Zelter’s (Example 3).

![Example 3 Schubert’s “Suleika II” wind figure, mm. 3 - 9](image)

Schubert begins with a static octave repeated between two F pitches in the right hand and suggests the wind by moving away from this static state. The effect is of a breeze. A small gust (m. 4) is followed up by a longer, strong wind (mm. 6-7) that abruptly falls off with the last push of air (m. 8) leaving the listener in the same static, windless state as before. This pattern
can be found throughout mm. 1-128 of this work, encompassing the first three stanzas. After this point Schubert’s wind becomes agitated, depicting the increased agitation of the poem.

Although Zelter’s settings give emphasis to the wind figure at the end of each stanza, necessarily concluding with this more agitated state, Schubert’s version sets the entire two final stanzas quite differently than the first three. He retains the wind figure, but here, in increased disturbance, the figures only rise before abruptly halting and returning to the register of origin (Example 4).

Example 4  Schubert’s “Suleika II” agitated wind figure, mm. 130 – 131

The tempo here is also faster, adding to the hurried feel of this pattern. Byrne suggests that the tempo indication of the first half of the work mit Bewegung is a symbol of love’s longing and the mild west wind (381). Following this interpretation, the indication for the final two stanzas, Etwas geschwinder, suggests the urgency of longing present in the text and the hurrying of the west wind departing with love’s message.

---

The tempo indication of the first half of the work mit Bewegung also appears as Mässige Bewegung in some editions.
The depiction of the wind through rising and falling accompanimental figures seems to be the only way that either Zelter or Schubert addresses the oriental theme of this poem. It seems unlikely that either was unaware of the east-west dichotomy, considering the title of Goethe’s collection. Schubert additionally set the song to the east wind, “Suleika I,” as a companion piece to “Suleika II”, also written by Marianne. In “Suleika I” he uses pentatonic inflections to evoke the orient. It seems that the text and the wind figures in his setting of “Suleika II” were thought sufficient for portraying the distance between lovers, disregarding the oriental east-west. This is perhaps because the narrative of the text is quite strong compared to the narrative of the first poem. The second poem indicates action, while the first relies on the reception of a message and its emotional associations.

Since the text is strongly driven by a narrative, most analysts today would consider Schubert’s formal setting more appropriate than Zelter’s since it incorporates a wider variety of musical material. The strophic form of Zelter’s setting gives the same music to each stanza, leaving the singer to nuance the music according to the meaning of the text. However, Schubert’s setting is also highly repetitive. In fact, it is the repetitive structure of his setting that makes it an interesting object for analysis while conveying a sense of the single-mindedness of the goal of the speaker.

Firstly, Schubert’s setting is quite clearly in two formal parts. Aside from the key and the text, the two sections could almost be considered two separate movements: the first is in two-four time, the second in three-four; the first has flowing accompaniment,
the second jarring; the first maintains metrical unity while the second often juxtaposes six-eight over three-four in the accompaniment with a common eighth note; the second part is in a faster tempo; and there is no melodic continuation. Example 5 shows the structure of the first section (mm. 1-128), with melody and poetic line marked below each group of measures. There are three levels to this diagram, each representing a formal section of the first half. Notice that each formal section contains one stanza of the poem and the harmonic structure of the entire first half is a closed tonic-dominant-tonic form. Schubert uses varying combinations of text and melodic repetition in this part of the song. Repeated, complete lines of text are bracketed below and repetitions of melodic material are bracketed above and labeled by type (single line melodic repetition, Y, or two line melodic repetition, X). In the first section, lines one and two are set to identical music (Y) and, although lines three and four are set to different music, the entire section is repeated immediately after its first statement (X). In the second section, the ideas of structure are retained, but their order is altered. Here Schubert begins by repeating two phrases of music in succession (D and E, marked X on the second level). Since only the last two lines of each stanza are repeated, the text repetition and the melodic repetition do not coincide. Instead, the text repetition falls on a Y type melodic repetition where the same melody (F, in this case) occurs twice.

The relation of level 1 to level 2 is a swap of formal melodic structure. The text pattern stays the same, but the X patterns appear first and are followed by the Y pattern. These structures swap yet again in
the third level, returning to the YXX of the first and creating an overall ABA form for the setting of the first three stanzas. Additionally contributing to the sense of repetitive form, structurally, textually and melodically, the third section returns to the music of the opening as if in da capo form. In fact, the third stanza is completed at the point of the bracketed X which completes lines 11 and 12 as well as the AABC melodic unit of the first section. It is only when this section is complete that the real repetition of two lines of text and two repeated melodies is seen as only the melodic lines H and I occur with a full double statement.

What is interesting about the formal structure of Schubert’s setting in relation to Zelter’s is that Schubert’s internal form of each part of the first section strongly resembles the form of Zelter’s setting. This is particularly relevant for Schubert’s settings of the first and third stanzas, as the melodic material is repeated to the same melody. Zelter’s melody sets the first two lines of each stanza to the same melody transposed up a major second. The final three lines of each stanza are extended by longer durations, a cadenza, and have different profiles than the first two lines. The structure of Schubert’s initial statement of the first and third stanzas is almost identical to Zelter’s. Additionally, both composers emphasize the turning point of each stanza. For Zelter, this is accomplished by employing a cadenza-like figure on the final line of each stanza and then repeating the entire line. For Schubert it comes in the form of repeating the final two lines of text, and additionally with the same music in the first and third stanzas. Schubert’s structure is by no means strophic,
but he does play on the expectation of a completed structure at measure 101 by suggesting a close, but then extending through two more repetitions of the last two lines to conform to his established pattern. The mix-and-match structure of this first section seems almost simultaneously a mischievous jab at, and an admiring nod towards, some older forms that use repetitive structures, such as ternary forms, strophic forms and arias.
Example 5  Schubert’s “Suleika II” mm. 1 – 128.
Example 6: Schubert’s “Suleika II” mm. 129 – 186.
In the second section of the work (mm. 129-186), Schubert combines aspects of the wind figure with aspects of form. As the text is agitated and the west wind leaves to deliver a message to Suleika’s lover, the formal structure begins to disintegrate. Example 6 shows the structure of the second half of the work in the same fashion as the previous diagram. Measures 131 to 146 comprise one X type structure, where two melodies are repeated as well as the repetition of the text (this time in pairs of lines, due to the increased tempo). The two sets of melodies in this section comprise two separate Y type structures where the same melody is repeated twice. The second Y structure contains a different melody that is quite similar to the A melody, as will be discussed in what follows. At measure 151 another repetition of both melody and text occurs with a minor alteration of a minor second transposition (interestingly recalling Zelter’s major second transpositional method). At the point of this transposition, the first obvious break from an established formal pattern since it is the first and only directly transposed melody in the entire work, the formal structure breaks apart, fragmenting and lacking in structural melodic repetition. It is as if Suleika is drained from her pleadings calling wistfully after the wind who has already rushed into the distance with her message, the completion of which marks the beginning of fragmentation (m. 155). In Schubert’s setting, these last words are for the speaker alone. She speaks to herself, and the fragmented wisps of previous melodies (mm. 172-184) contribute to this sense of inner hope, pain, and longing.

Although not imperative for a formal interpretation of structure, it is interesting to note,
from a standpoint of comparative analysis with a strophic structure, that Schubert’s smaller internal forms for each stanza are more repetitive than Zelter’s. In fact, where Schubert’s melodies are labeled differently in this structural analysis, they are often quite similar, primarily in rhythmic profiles. Consider for example, two melodies from the first half of the song (Example 7 a, b).

7a) Melody A:

7b) Melody D:

Example 7  Comparison of melodic lines in Schubert’s “Suleika II.”

The similar profiles of these two melodies create a strong connection between the first lines of the first and second stanzas. Each strophe begins with similar material, bringing it closer to the strophic form that Goethe favored, but still allowing it to retain identity. A similar case could be made for melodies B and H:
8a) Melody B:

8b) Melody H:

Example 8  Comparison of melodic lines in Schubert’s “Suleika II.”

The rhythmic profiles, and some pitches, connect these two melodies though they seem chronologically distant and possibly formally unimportant. However, in this case both the B and the H melodies begin larger formal X repetitive sections. The H melody is used after the false conclusion at measure 101, drawing a stronger connection to the established formal structural pattern of repeated materials.

**Conclusion**

To conclude, it is appropriate to return to a consideration of the text analysis presented in the second part of this article. Having shown some similarities between the two compositions, as well as many differences, Goethe’s published version of Marianne’s poem as a ‘song’ in the *Divan* shows Goethe’s serious musical intention. Marianne’s version is a love poem that swaps the north and south of Germany for the east and west of the Orient. Goethe’s version conveys an immediacy to this separation, dramatically more suitable, and ‘corrects’
the meter of the lines to suit a strophic or repetitive setting. Both composers set the music in such a way that relies on the metrically similar lines. In the case of Zelter, phrases begin and end in the middle of measures and use an accentual pattern that relies on a set number of syllables. Alterations would have to be made to one or more strophes had not each line contained the same feet and meter. In the same way, Schubert’s repetitive structure would lose some force if the rhythmic patterns or melodic profiles had to be altered to accommodate the text. Surely Schubert does this elsewhere, but in this work, one of his longest songs with an elaborate framework of important repetition for its dissolution at the ending reflects Suleika’s emotional state, the effect would surely lose some force.

In many ways, Schubert seems to have been more attuned to the Oriental themes of Goethe’s Divan than Zelter. The themes of east and west as dichotomous were only just emerging in literature when Goethe was writing. Similarly in music, the settings of Zelter and Schubert demonstrate not only a new through-composed style, but also an emerging musical interest in Orientalism. Oriental themes can found throughout the arts from the late 18th century. In literature, Goethe was followed by authors such as Ralph Waldo Emerson (“Indian Superstition”) and Edgar Allen Poe, whose “Al Aaraaf” is based on stories found in the Qur’an. In music, many composers have taken an interest in Oriental themes and texts. For example, George Friedrich Handel’s Tamerlano is set in Anatolia and Gilbert and Sullivan’s Mikado is a comic opera set in Japan. However, by the early 20th century, Orientalism began to be associated
with, not only a dichotomy of East and West, but also with a power relationship of East versus West, where the West was associated with domination and imperialism. By 1978, with the publication of Edward Said's important book *Orientalism*, the dichotomy of East and West seems to have lost its previous inquisitive force in the arts, and gained a level of taboo and awareness of the problems of the West’s re-presenting of Eastern culture.
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Abstract

“Goethe’s ‘Suleika’” addresses Orientalism, a historical shift in musical structure, and the suitability of texts for various musical structures by examining two settings of a poem by Goethe. The article begins by exploring the history of the poem “Suleika,” of Goethe’s West-Östlicher Divan, from its authoring to its eventual musical setting, including notions of an east-west dichotomy and Goethe’s expressed concerns about the ‘proper’ musical setting of poetic text. The article continues to explore two musical settings, one by Franz Schubert and the other by Carl Friedrich Zelter, in order to explore the relationship between these settings and the discussions of text setting and Orientalism presented in the opening discussions.
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