Seminar: Analyzing Early Music (1300-1600)

MUS212A. Spring 2018, Wednesdays 10am-1pm
Professor Karen Desmond
Office hours T/Fri 12:30-1:30pm
or email kdesmond@brandeis.edu for appt.

This seminar comprises an investigation of analytic approaches to early music (pre-1600), including such issues as text-music relations, tonal structures, compositional planning, use of pre-existing material.

Learning outcomes
1. You will have an in-depth knowledge of the content, techniques, and style of specific Western European repertoires from the Middle Ages to the late Renaissance;
2. You will hone your critical reading skills, especially of music analyses, and gain knowledge of analytical trends and disciplinary developments with respect to early music.
3. You will be able to evaluate and apply a variety of analytical techniques to a number of early music repertoires;
4. You will gain experience teaching music analysis at an advanced level and leading discussion within a graduate seminar;
5. You will be able to write a lengthy analytical paper with scholarly rigor, integrating previous scholarship with your own analytical observations and interpretations, either at the level of close reading of a particular work or works, or an analytical assessment of a larger repertoire.

Required Textbook

None. This course is on music analysis, therefore, the time spent in class situating composers and works within their historical and cultural context will be minimal. The recent Norton series, *Western Music in Context*, with a volume and anthology by Margot Fassler on medieval music, and by Richard Freedman on Renaissance music, provide general introductions to the historical periods covered in this class. For more detailed enquiries on specific composers or topics, *Grove Music Online* and/or *MGG* should be the first resource you consult, and there are various other good recent overviews, such as the 2015 *Cambridge History of Fifteenth-Century Music* (ed. Busse Berger and Rodin). The score and text/translation for the work to be analysed each will be handed out in class. I will also recommend critical editions and recordings for each repertory under consideration.

Seminar Format and Required Work

- Read the required readings each week, submitting your preliminary responses (c. 300-400 words) to the discussion kickstarter’s provocation by 10am on the Tuesday before the Wednesday seminar;
- Serve as discussion kickstarter (at least once);
- Listen to the required works with a score;
- Peer teach the assigned analysis composition (at least once);
- Submit your analytical item online by 5pm each Tuesday before the Wednesday seminar;
- Write a 4,500-word research paper.

After the first class, I will distribute an online form so that you can sign up for your kickstarter and peer-teaching roles.

Discussion kickstarter: The kickstarter is responsible for facilitating the discussion of the week’s assigned readings. On the Monday morning (by 10am) preceding the Wednesday seminar, the kickstarter will post a provocation online in response to the week’s readings (maybe a question, maybe not); the seminar participants should offer some preliminary reflections on this provocation by 10am Tuesday. The kickstarter should then distribute a robust list of questions to
the seminar participants by 5pm on that same Tuesday. These questions might compare the approaches taken by the various authors; focus on a particularly problematic or complex passage; encourage us to search for slippage in an author’s argument, or a poorly conceived thesis; situate an author’s approach with respect to previously assigned readings, etc.

In class, the kickstarter should begin with a critical overview of the readings (no more than five minutes), and then facilitate the seminar discussion, using the questions you posted the previous evening. Handouts of highlighted passages or music examples to be discussed may be helpful.

Peer teaching: Each class, one student will be tasked with teaching the focus composition (for the assigned work, see class schedule below under ‘Analyse’). This should not be delivered as a presentation; you will teach this composition and your analysis of it to the class. The peer teaching element of the seminar should last no more than 30 minutes. In addition to selecting listening excerpts and marked-up examples from the score, some attempt should be made to situate the composition within the larger repertoire (to this end, see the ‘Repertoire prompt’ in the course schedule below). Remember, analysis is not merely description, you should tell the story of this composition, aim to reveal to us its essence, as you understand it, or better, guide us towards our discovery of it.

Ideally the discussion of the readings and the peer-teaching activity should dovetail; in most cases we’ll probably begin with the peer teaching and follow with the discussion; however, you are welcome to confer with each other on how you would like to integrate these activities.

Analytical item: By 5pm on the Tuesday prior to class, everyone (except the person who will peer teach that week) should submit an analytical item relating to that week’s assigned composition. You should listen to the assigned composition, study the score, and then produce something that illustrates something about the composition, such as: a succinct prose discussion of your observation; a marked-up music example of an important moment; a graph; a table; a line drawing; a reduction; a counter-example found in another composition, etc. Don’t make us work to hard to understand your analytical item – circle the notes in the score, the numbers in the table. And please don’t submit the same kind of analytical item every week of the semester.

Research Paper: ‘a theorist looks at one piece, a musicologist looks at two’ (per Joseph Kerman, according to Peter Schubert)

By April 30, you will submit an analysis paper of 4,500 words (this word count does not include footnotes or bibliography), suitable for submission to a journal such as the Journal of Music Theory. In fact, JMT has a very useful style guide that you can follow in the formatting and style of your paper: https://www.dukeupress.edu/Assets/Downloads/JMT_sg.pdf. As to the content of your paper, you may decide to focus on the composition you peer-taught, perhaps considering it in comparison to one other work, or you may choose different piece from the repertoires focused on in this seminar, or you may do a repertoire study. Please come and see me in the middle of the term to propose your topic for your final research paper.
Lightning Talk: Our last class will feature lightning talks (6 minutes each) highlighting the most important findings of your research paper.

Success in this 4 credit hour course is based on the expectation that students will spend a minimum of 9 hours of study time per week in preparation for class.

Brandeis Policy Statements

If you are a student with a documented disability on record at Brandeis University and wish to have a reasonable accommodation made for you in this class, please see me immediately.

You are expected to be honest in all of your academic work. Please consult Brandeis University Rights and Responsibilities for all policies and procedures related to academic integrity. Students may be required to submit work to TurnItIn.com software to verify originality. Allegations of alleged academic dishonesty will be forwarded to the Director of Academic Integrity. Sanctions for academic dishonesty can include failing grades and/or suspension from the university. Citation and research assistance can be found at LTS - Library guides.

Course Schedule

All reading and analyses or other activities to be completed in advance of the week it is assigned. Material not readily available from the Brandeis Library will be be put on Latte.


Readings I
- Agawu, “How We Got Out of Analysis”
- Brett, “Facing the Music”
- Everist, “Introduction” to Models of Musical Analysis
- Schubert, “Authentic Analysis”

Readings II
- Atkinson, The Critical Nexus, 6-19, 85-105, 149-170 (optional)

Further readings
- Bent, “Analysis,” Oxford Music Online
- Leach, Fallows, van Orden, “Recent trends”

Readings prompt: From Readings I, why analyse (early) music? What are the interesting questions?

Activity: From Readings II, be able to:
- Explain the Greater Perfect System.
- Explain how to derive the pitches on the monochord.
- Outline the species of fourth, fifth, and octave, and how the church modes relate to these.
**Week 3. Jan 24. Relationship between the language syntax and music.**

**Readings**
- Desmond, “Analogical Discourse”
- Hornby, *Medieval Liturgical Chant*, chapter 3 (chapter 2 also relevant)
- Maloy, *Inside the Offertory*, chapter 3
- Treitler, “Gender and Other Dualities”

**Works**
- Deus deus meus
- Qui habitat

---

**Analyze:** Qui habitat

**Readings prompt:** Describe the methodologies of Hornby and Maloy. How do they attempt to illuminate meaning in these repertoires? What are the stakes here?

**Repertoire:** Gregorian and Old Roman second-mode tracts.

---

**Week 4. Jan 31. Pre-existent material and structural scaffolding.**

**Readings**
- Everist, “Motets, French Tenors”
- Ibos-Augé, “Quoting Motets”
- Pesce, “Montpellier 8 PORTARE Motets”

**Works**
- Tout solas et toute joie/Bone Amour, qui les siens doctrine et aprent/NE ME BLASMES
- Par une matinee, el moys joli d’avril/O clemencie/D’UN JOLI DART
- De mes amours sui souvent repentis/L’autrier m’este venue velente/DEFORS COMPIEGNE
- Au tans nouvel, que naissant flouris/Chele m’a tollu/J’AI FAIT NOUVELETEMEN
- Mout ai longuement Amour/Li dous maus d’amier/PORTARE
- Cis a petit de bien en li/Plusieur dient, que j’aim par amours/PORTARE

---

**Analyze:** Par une matinee/O clemencie/D’UN JOLI DART

**Readings prompt:** What analytical techniques are deployed by these authors? What compositional procedures do they identify? What repertorial features do they identify?

**Repertoire:** Ars antiqua motets based on chansons.

---

**Week 5. Feb 7. Counterpoint and Reductive Analyses.**

**Readings**
- Fuller, “Guillaume de Machaut: De toutes flouris”
- Leach, “Interpretation and Counterpoint”
- Flynn, “The Intabulation of De toutes flouris”

**Works**
- De toutes flouris (B31)
- Puis qu’en oublie (R18)

**Further readings**
- Crocker, “Discant, Counterpoint, and Harmony”

**Analyze:** Puis qu’en oublie (R18)

**Readings prompt:** What aspect(s) are ignored by these types of analyses? What is illuminated?

**Repertoire prompt:** Machaut’s rondeaux.
Week 6. Feb 14. Large-scale pitch organization, tonal centers, mode and polyphony

Readings
- Lefferts, “Signature Systems”
- Bain, “Multiple Tonal Centers”
- Boone, “Tonal Color in Dufay”
- Judd, “Modal Types and Ut, Re, Mi Tonalities”

Works
- Dufay, *Helas ma dame*
- Dufay, *Reveillés vous*
- Dufay, *Adieu m’amour*
- Josquin, *Salve regina*

Further reading
- Powers, “Tonal Types”
- Treatler, “Tone System in the Secular Works of Dufay”

Analyse: Dufay, *Helas ma dame*

Readings prompt: Think about how the large-scale tonal organization of Dufay’s *Helas ma dame* works according to the various systems of tonal organization proposed/discussed in the readings.

Repertoire prompt: Dufay’s chansons

Week 7. Feb 28. Pitch inflection, stylistic fingerprints, and analytical minefields

Readings
- Rodin, “Josquin and Epistemology”
- Rodin, *Josquin’s Rome*, chapter 2
- Wegman, “The Other Josquin”

Works
- Josquin, *Inter natos mulierum*
- Josquin, *Illibata Dei virgo nutrix*

Further reading
- Bent, “Diatonic ficta”
- Bent, “Musica ficta”, *Oxford Music Online*
- Boorman, “False Relations and the Cadence”
- Brown, “Accidentals and Ornamentation”
- Milson, review of Fallows’ *Josquin*
- Urquhart, “Cross-relations”

Analyse: *Inter natos mulierum* and *Illibata Dei virgo nutrix*

Readings prompt: What are the broader disciplinary problems that resulted in the deattribution of *Inter natos mulierum*? Think in particular about the problem Wegman identifies regarding “overstating the case.” What about our (or the field’s) perception of stylistic anomalies?

Repertoire: Josquin motet repertory (including those of doubtful authorship).

Week 8. Mar 7. Repertoire analyses and questions of genre

Readings
- Bokulich, “Contextualizing Josquin’s *Ave Maria . . . virgo serena*”
- Judd, “Some Problems”
- Milsom, “Making a Motet”

Works
- Josquin, *Ave Maria . . . virgo serena*
- Regis, *Ave Maria . . . virgo serena*

#### Readings
- Zayaruznaya, *Upper-voice Structures*, chapters 5 and 6
- Earp, “Declamation as Expression in Machaut’s Music”
- Boone, *Patterns in Play*, chapter 6 (read in tandem with Earp’s 2001 *JAMS* review for a summary of the earlier chapters)

#### Works
- Machaut, *S’il estoit/S’Amours*
- Dufay, *Ce jour de l’an*
- Dufay, *Mon chier amy*

#### Further readings
- Bent, “What is Isorhythm?”
- Desmond, *Music and the moderni*, chapter 2
- Bhogal, *Details of consequence*, Introduction

#### Analyse: *S’il estoit/S’Amours*

**Readings prompt:** Think about the different ways in which these three authors emphasize the analytical importance of specific details of the upper voices.

**Repertory prompt:** The French motet repertoire given in Zayaruznaya’s Table 1.1 (chapter 1 and chapter 4 will be helpful here)


#### Readings
- Owens, *Composers at Work*, chapters 5 and 10
- Wegman, “Compositional Planning”

#### Works
- Isaac, *Sanctissimae virginis votiva festa*
- Richard Davy, *O Domine celci terreque creator*

#### Further reading
- Owens, “The Milan Partbooks”
- Reynolds, “Musical Evidence of Compositional Planning”

#### Analyse: Isaac, *Sanctissimae virginis votiva festa.*

**Readings prompt:** What is evidence that Owens assembles for her hypothesis on Isaac’s compositional process of *Sanctissimae virginis*, and how does music analysis factor into her argument?

**Readings**
- Cumming, “From Variety to Repetition”
- Cumming, “Renaissance Improvisation”
- Cumming and Schubert, “The Origins of Pervasive Imitation”

**Works**
- Isaac, *Inviolata integra et casta es Maria*
- Isaac, *Alma redemptoris mater*
- Isaac, *O decus ecclesie*

**Further readings**
- Cumming, “From Two-Part Framework to Movable Module”
- Schubert, “From Improvisation to Composition”

**Analyse:** Isaac, *O decus ecclesie*

**Readings prompt:** Consider the implications of the recent focus on improvisation and the analysis of fifteenth- and sixteenth-century polyphony.

**Repertoire prompt:** Overview of the large repertory considered by Cumming and Schubert in their “Origins” article.

---

**Week 12. April 11. Reconstructions**

**Readings**
- Hartt, “The Duet Motet”
- Sandon, “The Henrician Partbooks,” chapter 5

**Works**
- Anonymous, *Majori vi leticie/[Majorem caritatem]/Majorem intelligere*
- Hugh Aston, *Ave Maria dive matris*

**Further readings**
- Dumitrescu, “Reconstructing and Repositioning”

**Analyse:** Hugh Aston, *Ave Maria dive matris*

**Readings prompt:** Consider Sandon's statement that restoration “tends not to stimulate much interest in the wider scholarly community” and why this might be.

**Repertoire prompt:** Describe the repertoire that is incompletely preserved in the Peterhouse partbooks.

---

**Week 13. April 18. Presentations - a 6-minute lightning talk on your research paper findings.**
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