

ARRANGEMENT AS ANALYSIS

NICHOLAS COOK

Analysis has been one of the major growth areas in the training of musicians over the last twenty or thirty years. New analytical methods of ever-increasing sophistication have been developed while older methods, such as that developed by Heinrich Schenker, have been the object of a massive resurgence of interest. There is, however, a paradoxical sense in which the greater prominence of musical analysis has masked a decline in its real educational significance. This is because as analysis has become more abstract, not to say abstruse, it has turned into a specialty. Especially in North America, people tend to focus on analysis as an alternative to specializing in historical studies, or performance, or whatever. In other words analysis has become one option among several. Traditionally, however, analytical studies occupied a much more central role in music teaching. The difference is that the insights which are today presented in an abstract and even intellectual manner—and often as ends in themselves—were formerly the outcome of practical musical studies such as arrangement and orchestration.

Figure 1 illustrates this. It shows bars 13-15 of Debussy's 'Danseuses de Delphes' (from Book 1 of the *Preludes*) together with two alternative analytical interpretations of the passage; these are marked (a) and (b), and they use the symbols for rhythmic analysis developed by Cooper and Meyer.¹ For readers unfamiliar with these,

— represents a stressed note and  an unstressed one, while the square brackets show what belongs together in a single rhythmic group; you can see that an entire group can be regarded as stressed or unstressed at the next level of structure, so that the analysis is a hierarchical one. What does the difference between these two interpretations actually amount to? In (a), there is no immediate rhythmic connection between bars 14 and 15; you might bring this out in performance by making a slight break before the beginning of bar 15, so the last four chords of bar 14 become a kind of rhetorical gesture, with the crescendo perhaps reaching the level of *forte*. By contrast, (b) suggests that the last four chords of bar 14 act as an upbeat to the beginning of bar 15, so that there is no rhythmic break at this point; this implies a smoother style of

JOURNAL OF MUSIC THEORY PEDAGOGY

performance, with the crescendo leading up to the *mezzo-forte* at the beginning of bar 15.

Figure 1. (mm. 13-15)

The figure displays a musical score for measures 13 through 15, featuring a piano and a violin. The piano part is written in a grand staff (treble and bass clefs), while the violin part is in a single staff. The key signature has two flats (B-flat and E-flat), and the time signature is 3/4. A crescendo hairpin is shown below the piano staff, starting in measure 13 and reaching its peak in measure 15. A *mezzo-forte* (mf) dynamic marking is placed at the beginning of measure 15. A large bracket spans the top of the violin staff across measures 13, 14, and 15. Below the score are two analytical diagrams, labeled (a) and (b). Diagram (a) consists of two horizontal lines with brackets underneath, indicating groupings of notes across measures 13, 14, and 15. Diagram (b) also consists of two horizontal lines with brackets underneath, showing a different grouping of notes, specifically linking the rising chords of measure 14 with the middle-register tune of measure 15.

But it is not actually necessary to use abstract symbols such as Cooper and Meyer's in order to express these analytical insights. Figure 2 shows two alternative orchestrations of this passage, and these correspond precisely to the two analyses in Figure 1. Thus the first orchestration emphasizes the discontinuity between bars 14 and 15 by changing the instrumentation at that point, as well as by the dynamic indications, whereas orchestration (b) links the rising chords of bar 14 with the middle-register tune of bar 15, underpinning this with a roll on the timpani.

In order to orchestrate or arrange such a passage it is necessary to decide what goes with what, which is exactly what Cooper and Meyer's symbols are intended to show. And deciding what goes with what (more formally termed segmentation) is the basis of virtually all analytical techniques. The analytical insights expressed by Roman numerals, for instance, can be equally well expressed—in fact, better expressed—through arrangement. Figure 3 shows the piano score of bars 45-48 of 'Einsame Blumen' (from Schumann's *Waldscenen*); it contains no phrase-markings above the level of individual bars, so it's not immediately obvious which chords belong with which, and where the breaks are in terms of harmonic structure.

ARRANGEMENT AS ANALYSIS

Figure 2.

(a)

hns *mf* tpts *f* ob I, cl I *mf*
 tbns *mf* cl II, bsn *mf*
 vln I, II, fl *mf* bsn II *f* vln I, II, fl *mf*
 vla, ob *mf* vla *mf*
 vcl db *mf*

Detailed description: This musical score (a) is for a symphonic movement in 3/4 time. It features five staves. The top staff is for Horns (hns) in F major, playing a melodic line with a crescendo leading to a fortissimo (f) dynamic. The second staff is for Trumpets (tpts) in F major, playing a rhythmic pattern. The third staff is for Oboe I and Clarinet I (ob I, cl I) in F major, playing a melodic line. The fourth staff is for Trombones (tbns) in F major, playing a rhythmic pattern. The fifth staff is for Clarinet II and Bassoon (cl II, bsn) in F major, playing a melodic line. The sixth staff is for Violins I and II, Flute (vln I, II, fl) in F major, playing a melodic line. The seventh staff is for Viola and Oboe (vla, ob) in F major, playing a melodic line. The eighth staff is for Bassoon II (bsn II) in F major, playing a melodic line. The ninth staff is for Violins I and II, Flute (vln I, II, fl) in F major, playing a melodic line. The tenth staff is for Viola (vla) in F major, playing a melodic line. The eleventh staff is for Violoncello and Double Bass (vcl db) in F major, playing a melodic line. The score includes various musical notations such as notes, rests, and dynamics.

(b)

fl, ob I *mf* fl, ob I, II *mf*
 ob II, cl I *mf* cl I *mf*
 cl II, bsn I *mf* bsn II *mf*
 tpt I, II *mf* hn I *mf* hn II *mf*
 vln I, II *mf* vln I, II, fl *mf* vla, vlc *mf*
 db *mf*

Detailed description: This musical score (b) is for a symphonic movement in 3/4 time. It features five staves. The top staff is for Flute and Oboe I (fl, ob I) in F major, playing a melodic line. The second staff is for Oboe II and Clarinet I (ob II, cl I) in F major, playing a melodic line. The third staff is for Clarinet II and Bassoon I (cl II, bsn I) in F major, playing a melodic line. The fourth staff is for Trumpets I and II (tpt I, II) in F major, playing a rhythmic pattern. The fifth staff is for Horns I and II (hn I, hn II) in F major, playing a melodic line. The sixth staff is for Violins I and II (vln I, II) in F major, playing a melodic line. The seventh staff is for Violins I and II, Flute (vln I, II, fl) in F major, playing a melodic line. The eighth staff is for Viola and Violoncello (vla, vlc) in F major, playing a melodic line. The ninth staff is for Double Bass (db) in F major, playing a melodic line. The score includes various musical notations such as notes, rests, and dynamics.

JOURNAL OF MUSIC THEORY PEDAGOGY

Figure 3. (mm.45-48)




Figure 4. (mm. 45-48)

A musical score for three parts: Violins (Vlns), Violoncello (Vcl), and Piano, covering measures 45 to 48. The key signature has two flats. The Vlns part has a melodic line with many beamed notes. The Vcl part has a more rhythmic, chordal accompaniment. The Piano part consists of a series of chords, some of which are marked with a sharp sign (#). There are slurs and phrasing marks throughout the passage.

Of course one could play the music without any larger articulation, performing everything at precisely the same speed and without dynamic variation; it would even be possible to arrange it in such a way as to avoid making any harmonic interpretation of the passage (Figure 4). But in either case the result would be painfully dull and mechanical; it's obvious that the music needs shaping in terms of some sense of what goes with what. Figure 5 provides one such interpretation; here the violin's dynamics, the cello's bowing, and the piano's rhythm all suggest that bars 46-47 belong together as a single harmonic unit. But this is a strange interpretation of the music that actually produces a rather Wagnerian effect, because the links between the chords that it couples together are linear rather than harmonic. The natural interpretation of the music is, of course, that embodied in Figure 6, which couples together bars 45-46 and 47-48; that is to say, the chord at bar 45 leads to that at bar 46, and the chord at bar 47 leads to that at bar 48.

ARRANGEMENT AS ANALYSIS

Figure 5. (mm.45-48)

Figure 5 shows a musical score for measures 45-48. The score is arranged in three systems, each containing three staves: Violins (Vlns), Violoncello (Vcl), and Piano. The key signature is B-flat major (two flats). The Vlns part features a melodic line with eighth and sixteenth notes, including some grace notes. The Vcl part provides a harmonic accompaniment with sustained notes and some movement. The Piano part consists of block chords and some moving lines, primarily in the lower register. The notation includes various musical symbols such as clefs, key signatures, note heads, stems, beams, and slurs.

Figure 6. (mm. 45-48)

Figure 6 shows a musical score for measures 45-48, identical to Figure 5. It features the same three systems of staves for Violins (Vlns), Violoncello (Vcl), and Piano. The key signature is B-flat major. The Vlns part has a melodic line with eighth and sixteenth notes. The Vcl part provides harmonic support with sustained notes. The Piano part includes block chords and moving lines in the lower register. The notation is consistent with Figure 5, including clefs, key signatures, and various musical symbols.

How could these interpretations have been expressed using Roman numerals? The interpretation, or rather the lack of interpretation, in Figure 4 is equivalent to labelling each chord in relation to the piece's overall tonic (B-flat), without attempting to indicate any relationships *between* the chords. The resulting analysis is I#5 - IV-VI7/#5/3 - II, which is both complicated and meaningless. The strange interpretation in Figure 5 corresponds to I#5 - VI - (VI - I7/#5/3) - II,

JOURNAL OF MUSIC THEORY PEDAGOGY

which is again complicated, though it does at least say something. The sensible interpretation in Figure 6, however, could be equated with either of two possible Roman-numeral interpretations. Of these, one is VI (V#5 - VI) - II (V7/#5 - I), while the other is IV (V#5 - I) - II (V7/#5 - I). In each case the music is divided into two pairs of chords, with the first of each pair in some kind of dominant relationship to the second. The difference is that in the first version bars 45-46 are regarded as an interrupted cadence formula on the submediant, whereas in the second they are regarded as a perfect cadence formula on the subdominant; accordingly the first version interprets bar 45 as an altered D triad, whereas the second interprets it as an altered B-flat triad. What does this theoretical distinction actually mean? The answer is that it means nothing at all, at least in terms of the music as Schumann wrote it. Of course, Schumann could have written it in such a way that it definitely implied either the one interpretation or the other. For instance, he could have added a seventh, as he did in bars 47-48, and this would have been C according to the first interpretation but A-flat according to the second (Figure 7 explains). But the fact is that Schumann did not add a seventh; and we should not analyze the passage as if there were one by deciding on one interpretation or the other. However—and this is the point—using Roman numerals forces you to decide on either the one interpretation or the other. It does not allow you to say the important thing about the music, which is how the segmentation works, without at the same time saying something spurious about it. By contrast, the arrangement allows you to say what you want to say about the music, and no more.

Figure 7.



B $\flat$: VI(V $\sharp 5$ - VI) IV(V $\sharp 5$ - I)

But why, it might be asked, do we need either the analytical reduction or the arrangement in order to say what we want to say about the music? Can't such an interpretation be embodied simply through

ARRANGEMENT AS ANALYSIS

performance? Of course it can. But the purpose of an analysis is not simply to embody an interpretation; it is to stimulate it. As I said, it is possible to perform music without really making up one's mind on the kind of issues I have been discussing. But there will be something indecisive and colorless about such a performance. Analysis strengthens performance because it compels the performer to decide exactly what he does think. It does this by offering him explicit models of relationships that are merely implied in the music. And again this is something that is involved in arranging. Take as an example the opening bars of the *Allegretto* from Beethoven's Sonata Op. 14/1 (Figure 8). Bar 1 is marked *piano*; bar 3 is marked *sforzando*. A crescendo during bar 2 is implied; but it is no more than an implication—a matter of performance interpretation. When Beethoven arranged this sonata for string quartet, however, he composed the crescendo into the music (Figure 9)³; it is made explicit through the increase from two instruments in bar 1 to three in bar 2 and four in bar 3. The greater complexity of the quartet medium demands an explicit interpretation of the music on the arranger's part; in short, it demands analytical insight.

Figure 8.



Strictly speaking, it is not the piano sonata that has been arranged for string quartet, but Beethoven's analytical image of it. Bars 47-59 of the finale provide a good illustration of this; Figure 10 compares the two versions. The differences are quite drastic, owing to the excessively pianistic idiom of the original. Beethoven has had to

JOURNAL OF MUSIC THEORY PEDAGOGY

strip away everything that is specific to the piano medium, before refashioning the music for string quartet. Just how much of the piano sonata remains in the quartet transcription? The two versions share the same bass, and consequently the same harmonic outline; also the downbeats of the melody usually coincide, though the register is not always the same. But that is all. This represents Beethoven's conception of the work's underlying structure (a conception that is clearly molded by figured bass and species counterpoint, which still formed the mainstay of composition teaching in Beethoven's day). The piano and quartet versions are different elaborations of the same underlying structure—elaborations appropriate to the specific medium in which they are realized.

Figure 9.

The musical score for Figure 9 is a transcription of a piano sonata movement for string quartet. It is in 3/4 time, marked "Allegretto", and features four staves (treble and bass for two parts). The music is in B-flat major. The first system shows the initial measures with dynamics *p*, *cresc.*, and *sfz*. The second system continues the melody and accompaniment.

ARRANGEMENT AS ANALYSIS

Figure 10. (mm. 47-59)

The musical score for Figure 10 (mm. 47-59) is presented in two systems, each containing two staves. The key signature is B-flat major (two flats). The first system (mm. 47-50) features a melody in the upper staff of the first system, marked *r* (ritardando), and a melody in the lower staff of the second system, marked *sf* (sforzando). The second system (mm. 51-54) features a melody in the upper staff of the first system, marked *r*, and a melody in the lower staff of the second system, marked *sf*. The score includes various musical notations such as notes, rests, and dynamic markings.

JOURNAL OF MUSIC THEORY PEDAGOGY

Figure 10. con't.

The musical score for Figure 10 consists of two systems, each containing four staves. The notation is in a key with one flat (B-flat) and a common time signature. The first system features a highly active melodic line in the top staff, primarily composed of eighth and sixteenth notes. The middle and bottom staves of this system contain sustained chords, with the dynamic marking *sf* (sforzando) appearing twice. The second system continues the melodic line in the top staff, incorporating various articulations such as slurs and accents. The middle staff of the second system includes a dynamic marking of *p* (piano). The bottom staff of the second system contains sustained chords, with the dynamic marking *sf* appearing once. The overall texture is characterized by a complex, fast-moving melody over a harmonic accompaniment of sustained chords.

ARRANGEMENT AS ANALYSIS

Figure 10. con't.

The first system of the musical score consists of two systems of staves. The first system has four staves: Treble, Treble, Alto, and Bass. The second system has two staves: Treble and Bass. The music is in 4/4 time and features a key signature of one flat. The first system includes a *sf* (sforzando) marking in the Treble staff of the second system. The second system includes a *sf* marking in the Bass staff.

The second system of the musical score consists of two systems of staves. The first system has four staves: Treble, Treble, Alto, and Bass. The second system has two staves: Treble and Bass. The music is in 4/4 time and features a key signature of one flat. The first system includes a *sf* (sforzando) marking in the Bass staff. The second system includes a *sf* marking in the Bass staff.

JOURNAL OF MUSIC THEORY PEDAGOGY

Working out the underlying structure of a piece of music, then, is a precondition of successful arrangement; no arrangement can be better than the analytical interpretation it embodies. Indeed one might reasonably describe arrangement as analysis made audible. Just as in orchestration, clarity of conception translates directly into clarity of sound. Busoni pointed this out with regard to Richard Strauss' *Sinfonia Domestica*: "Strauss . . . has said himself: 'Wagner makes everything sound but I am often unable to achieve this'. That is because Wagner concentrates everything on the principal idea. Strauss really has twelve subordinate ideas, and they are in confusion."⁴ A confused image of the music results in a confused sonority, and one of the advantages of teaching analysis through arrangement is that such confusion is rendered immediately obvious to the student. Everybody can hear the difference between a musical arrangement—one which embodies a clear conception of how the music works—and an unmusical one. By contrast it is much harder to explain to someone just why one Schenkerian interpretation is musical, and another unmusical, if they cannot already see it for themselves.

Of course there are many analytical insights about music that cannot be adequately expressed through arrangement, especially where large-scale directed motion and formal structure are concerned. Arrangement is no substitute for more abstract and speculative techniques of analysis. But an intellectual understanding of musical structure needs to be built upon a practical understanding of it; and in view of this, it's unfortunate that studies in theory (including analysis) and composition (including arrangement) tend to be understood as alternative topics, rather than as complements to one another. This can easily result in students adopting an inappropriately intellectualizing approach to music when they analyze it. If on the other hand basic analytical concepts such as segmentation, and structure vs. elaboration, are introduced through practical applications, then theoretical refinements and extensions of these concepts are less likely to produce people whose analytical interests are at best tangential, and at worst antipathetic, to their practical musical activities.

ARRANGEMENT AS ANALYSIS

NOTES

¹Grosvenor Cooper and Leonard B. Meyer, *The Rhythmic Structure of Music* (University of Chicago Press, 1960).

²The parentheses indicate progressions which relate to the scale degree shown in front of the parentheses, rather than relating directly to the tonic. So VI (VI) reads as 'VI of VI', VI(VI - I) as 'VI - I of VI', etc.

³Beethoven has transposed the arrangement a semitone higher than the piano original, in order to take better advantage of the open strings.

⁴Ferruccio Busoni, *The Essence of Music* (New York, 1957), p. 175.