

In these meetings I propose to sketch a panorama of our musical situation as observed through the windows of my personality and delineated by the positions that were assigned to me in the changing scenes. Obviously the picture will be subjective, which I hope shall not impair its relative validity, especially since I will try to show that objectivity is intrinsically impossible, and where it is attempted, illusory.

If I thus limit the perspectives of my design to my own field of vision, I hope that this will not be interpreted as an expression of egotism, or vanity. Much as I have from time to time desired to occupy the vantage point of a detached observer who would faithfully register the sum total of the phenomena offered to his view, it was my fate to become always actively involved in the processes that would come under the consideration of comprehensive criticism. Thus my ruminations are inevitably conditioned by the changing positions of my creative personality. It would seem to me insincere if I should pretend that I am able to disregard these limitations, and therefore I have to accept them, for better or worse.

My presentation will be articulated in four chapters. The first, which is the subject matter of today's meeting, will be concerned with the position in history of the contemporary composer, ^(and) with the varying degrees of his historical consciousness and the ways in which his work is influenced by these factors. In the second meeting I plan to discuss the ~~position of the~~ composer's involvement in the problems of the society of which he is a member. This subject matter I shall mainly illustrate by referring to my operas (of which I have written twenty), since ^{a good number of} these works have very outspoken political implications.

2'30"

In the third session I should like to talk about the sociological and economic background of the composer's work as it has unfolded in our century. To conclude this series of informal communications I wish to focus the particular situation of composition at the present time, discussing the concept of serialism and investigating how it developed and what became of it. At the end of each session I shall play the tape recording of one of my works, such as would seem appropriate to illustrate some of the points made.

To turn to the object of today's deliberation, which is history and historical consciousness, let us consider first the nature of history. If we define history as the sum total of things past, we have to realize that it exists only to the extent of our knowledge of it. We may experience the consequences of something that has happened in the past, but this in itself does not suffice to make us know that it happened, and ~~before~~ ^{unless} we know this, the particular event might just as well never have happened. The nearly unique source of our historical knowledge is the report that was made by ^{some witness of} ~~somebody~~ ~~the~~ ^(historian's) ~~event~~ and was left for us to peruse. The pious resolution to ~~it~~ give faithful account of what happened exactly as it happened, or as it has become fashionable to say: to "tell it like it is", this resolution must remain wishful thinking to a high degree, for he depends on reports that were drawn up by human beings who were biased in hundreds of different ways. And the historian sifting those reports is himself prejudiced even if he should not be aware of it, his prejudice being generated by the sequence of the very events he is planning to explicate.

Insight of this kind became available to me only when I immersed myself into the mysteries of history ~~preparing~~ ~~my opera~~ ^{preparing} ~~my opera~~ Charles V., about which I shall have to say ~~more~~ more later. At the beginning of my career

as a composer, around 1920 when I had reached the same age as our century, my historical consciousness was at a very elementary level. In the composition classes of my teacher Franz Schreker in Vienna we heard very little about music history.

~~because he did not care~~ He did not think very highly of the musicological studies that went on at the University, and at the Conservatory the teaching of history was greatly limited to abstract descriptions of styles and endless lists of composers' ^{names} whose music we never heard nor saw, for at that time there were no records or tapes to listen to, and no micro-films of ancient music to look at. Thus the composition students knew hardly any music before Bach. We studied sixteenth century counterpoint for ~~more than~~ good three semesters six hours weekly according to a watered-down nineteenth century version of the eighteenth century interpretation by Johann Josef Fux of the idiom of Palestrina whose music we never touched.

The purpose of this training was to endow the students with a sense of discipline and to make them aware of the importance of technique, meaning that they should understand that one can not rely on inspiration alone, but must also ~~have~~ have enough skill ~~for moving on~~ to keep going on the assumptions of a certain stylistic image. ~~The~~ The acquisition of such know-how was supposed to be indispensable when we ~~were~~ were turned loose as "free" composers.

While in the regimented field of strict counterpoint every note was scrutinized for its correctness according to the rules, in free ~~composition~~ ^{composition} we were left more or less to our own devices - criticism was vague, perfunctory and capricious. The general idea was that the music to be written by the young composers should ^(sound well and) be original - which was interpreted mainly to mean that it should not be obvious or commonplace - and modern, that is fitting into the generally accepted concept of progress, but not shocking or absurd.

The concept of progress, of course, implies some sort of

historical consciousness. It is based on the assumption that the events of history follow each other as a chain of causes and effects ~~wherein~~ ^{wherein} the causes are observed, ascertained and analyzed by man so that he may control ~~the~~ and bring about the effects in such a way that the subsequent ~~state~~ ^{state} of affairs will be better than the previous one - whatever he may set up as the ultimate ideal goal of this wonderful process.

In terms of the musical situation in which I found myself as I described it before progress meant that the musical idiom of Wagner was better than that of Haydn or Beethoven because he dared to use more dissonant chords and delay their resolutions more ingeniously, that songs by Hugo Wolf were better than those by Schubert for similar reasons, which made them more communicative for the "modern mind", and so forth. From all this it followed that we ~~had~~ ^{were trained} to go on in the same spirit, discover new dissonances and disguise the facts of tonality more cleverly. Thus we moved about in a territory vaguely delineated by the landmarks set up by Debussy, Max Reger, Richard Strauss and perhaps Scriabin. This was the generally accepted image of modernism. Franz Schreker who was at home in that territory was considered ~~a~~ pretty progressive, while Schoenberg was looked upon as a dangerous lunatic.

In fact, the difference between the more moderate conventions in which I ~~was~~ ^{launched} my first compositional ventures and the ~~seemingly~~ radical philosophy of the Schoenberg circle was more one of degree than of essence. Schoenberg too was a believer in progress moving along a one-way street toward higher and more valuable achievements. He ~~was~~ ^{had}, however, an infinitely keener intellect than Schreker, was much more articulate and more courageous ⁱⁿ living up to the conclusions he had ~~derived~~ from his view on history. But at the time I am speaking of, in the first quarter of the century he was ^(either) praised and ~~damned~~ as a revolutionary prophet who cleared away the useless rubble of the past, or ^{damned} as a subversive nihilist bent upon tearing down the venerable conventions established by a glorious past.

When my teacher, Franz Schreker, was called to Berlin around 1921 to become director of The Academy of Music I followed him there ostensibly to complete my formal studies in music. Actually I received this ^{institute's} diploma, which made me a sort of a licensed composer — whatever that may have meant — more or less on sufferance, for I had drifted away from the ~~official~~ official line of thinking long before. More than ever I was convinced that a young composer had to serve the cause of progress, but now to be progressive meant to break away from traditional concepts with much more daring and conviction. ^{As much as, I knew of, it,} Schoenberg's music, which was little enough, to me, it still remained ~~very little known~~ rather obscure. I was more attracted by the elemental features of Béla Bartók, and began to write music which ^{dispensed} ~~dispensed~~ rather cavalierly with ~~the~~ the respectability of tonal ^{relationships} and was rich in dissonant polyphony and rhythmic insistence on protracted ostinatos.

At that time I ~~used to~~ produced quantities of music at a speed ~~that~~ that today is quite incomprehensible to me. I am unable to figure out how it was possible only mechanically to write down so many notes in so short a time, not to mention the creative effort that had to go with, or before the desk work. In addition to the sheer number of compositions, many of them were rather bulky, long works. Today I don't see a contradiction here, for it seems to me that the habit of writing fast promotes the production of long, possibly repetitious and loquacious pieces while a propensity for writing slowly ~~induces~~ induces concentration and economy.

My main interest was devoted to the form of the Symphony, and in this I can see a certain symptom of being conscious of historical continuity. I remember distinctly (~~that~~ ^{for} I even put it down as a note in a diary that I used to keep off and on at times) that I had

decided to try to become the successor of Mahler in the field of the Symphony. Thus I wrote no less than three symphonies at the age of 23, and each one of them has, in my opinion, retained to this day ~~many~~ ^{some} elements of high vitality.

The fact that I did not approach the problem of the symphony for another twenty years should, however, indicate that I was not quite convinced of ~~my~~ ~~the~~ the validity of the project. When I took it up again in the 1940s, I found the results rather disappointing. My only comfort is that nobody else has succeeded any better in continuing the great symphonic tradition.

A considerable number of modernistic compositions of mine originated in those years of the early twenties. In looking back at them I notice that their generally atonal idiom here and there includes isolated fragments of the language of tradition, usually evoking memories of a very early stage of the musical material, not yet touched by the late-romantic mannerisms of chromatics. Such encapsulated remnants of another age evoke frequently a feeling of nostalgia and melancholy. The procedure as such is related to the principles of surrealism, of which at that time I had not the slightest idea.

Elements of surrealism also characterized the movement of neoclassicism that ~~became~~ ^{began to be} noticeable at that time and was to become the dominant musical style for more than two decades. In terms of the ^{notion that history is a} one-way street ~~of history~~ leading onward and upward, neo-classicism evidently was an anti-progressive, contrary movement in that it professed the wish to restore ancient manners of ~~expression~~ musical design.

As I remember it, the first manifestation of this trend was Stravinsky's Pulcinella, in which he transcribed, re-wrote and remodeled materials fished out from the work of the early eighteenth century Italian composer Pergolesi.

At the same time it looked progressive, for it was ~~designed~~ ^{designed} to do away with the romanticism of the preceding generation, of which Schoenberg's expressionism seemed to be an obsolete continuation.

15 min.

This set the tone for most of the retrospective efforts to come.

The late seventeenth and eighteenth centuries were the primary targets of the restorative activities of neo-classicism. Of course the reactionary aspect of this movement made it highly popular with a public frightened by the progressive attitude of the Schoenberg school, by what was called the destructive excesses of expressionism.

The situation was not really as simple as all that, for the neo-classicists, especially Stravinsky, did not just excavate the old models to imitate them in their new creations, they treated them rather as pleasing and attractive relics of a better age — I shall have to say more about this when I will consider the sociological aspects — and they presented the models with all the damage and scars inflicted upon them by time. Today, ^{by hindsight} we are able to state that in this respect neo-classicism was progressive after all, for the concept of fragmentation, of the broken-up whole, of the ^{irrevocable} ~~abandonment~~ ^{survive and succeed} of its parts was to ~~mark~~ the age of neo-classicism. But at the time one could not know this, and actually ~~the~~ the victory of this progressive, be it negative aspects of neo-classicism was based on entirely different premises, as we shall see.

Another ~~very~~ element that made neo-classicism ~~interesting~~ interesting even for the followers of the atonal-expressionistic tendencies was the emphasis on objectivity. The public, which was repelled by the sharp dissonances of the atonal idiom, did not recognize that they were the inevitable result of carrying further and on to the bitter end the ~~the~~ essential features of the beloved late romanticism. The emotional exuberance that had made Wagner, Strauss and related composers so dear to audiences wallowing in soulfulness as long as it was contained within the boundaries of an ever so expanded tonality had eventually ~~exploded~~ exploded beyond these lines and ~~created~~ brought about the wild gestures, violent contrasts, ~~the~~ cutting dissonances and improbable melodic jumps of the expressionistic idiom. Some of the younger ~~adepts~~ ^{adepts} became ^(among them myself)

a little tired of the overheated emotionalism of the style and began to dream of a cool, detached objective music that would rely on perfect construction rather than on ~~exuding~~ ^{exuding} ~~communication~~ of sentiment. The concept of the autonomy of music as a law unto itself began to take powerful roots. For such composers neo-classicism seemed to carry a significant message, even if they would not agree with its reactionary ~~program~~ program.

Personally I have not conscientiously or consistently followed the line of neo-classicism. In Germany, under the influence of sociological considerations which I shall discuss later, it took on a distinctly restorative shape when composers such as Hindemith ~~and~~ started to revive the concerto grosso style of the late seventeenth and early eighteenth centuries. The busy contrapuntal texture of Bach became the chief model of these compositional endeavors. To my taste the results often were academic, betraying too obviously the historical consciousness of the authors, and pedantic in displaying a fatiguing sameness of color and texture.

I was, ^{eventually} more attracted by the French variety of neo-classicism as represented by Stravinsky, Milhaud, Honegger and others. The occasional touches of surrealist irony lent ~~some~~ some of their works a flavor of charming roguishness. The ~~stiff~~ ancient model, slightly damaged by a few wrong notes in the harmony, by rhythmic distortion, or anachronistic instrumental color, is quoted in a surprising context rather than reconstructed with resources brought up to date. Another ^{aspect} ~~aspect~~ that made this newly discovered province of music highly interesting was the introduction of jazz elements.

At that time in Central Europe very little was known about American jazz which began to penetrate the continent only after the conclusion of World War I. The little we knew about it ~~fit~~ very well ^{with} our wishes for a ^{corresponded}

During this period, strenuous efforts were made everywhere to create national musical styles. Composers were assiduously delving into the materials provided by folkloristic research. Nearly all of this work was neo-classically oriented, be it only because the raw material was easily adaptable to traditional treatment. Bartók was about the only composer who tried in his most important works to interpret the folklore stuff in different ways. It is remarkable that these nationalistic tendencies that for decades were most vociferously advanced have totally petered out after the Second World War, and fortunately so.

clean, ~~and~~ crisp, clear-cut, unsentimental, objective music. Nearly all European composers ~~at~~ that time reacted to the new phenomenon by incorporating some of its characteristics into their so-called 'serious' music. As far as I know, only the members of the Schoenberg school never gave in to the temptation. They were too thoroughly steeped in the idea of incongruity of serious and entertainment music, which had been regarded for nearly a hundred years as an unshakable axiom.

My own private turn-about ^{became} ~~was~~ eventually somewhat different from everybody else's reactionary spree, of which I probably ~~could~~ be proud if I cared to. I did not visualise returning to the seventeenth century, but to the early romanticism of Franz Schubert. ~~This was probably due to personal circumstances.~~ On the surface this can probably be well enough explained as owing to personal circumstances. When I arrived in Berlin as a student, I struck up close friendship with the pianist and composer Eduard Erdmann, ^{by} a few years my senior. He happened to be an enthusiastic devotee of Schubert's music, and since he had the temperament of a forceful evangelist and I was at a highly impressionable age, I was easily swayed to share his admiration for the Viennese master. More ~~complete~~ ^{elaborate} explanations would probably take into account that my hasting from the same Vienna may have caused a sort of selective affinity when I, under the influence of the general tendency to look backward, searched for a model at the time of my rising doubts about the validity of my atonal exploits. Historical research might hit upon still ^{other} ~~some~~ motivations.

I am using this very small, marginal detail of my private curriculum vitae to illustrate what I mentioned about the relativity of historical material.

My neo-romantic period lasted about five years. The main product of my occasional preoccupation with jazz is the opera *Journeys end*, which became so successful and famous that it

even infiltrated the Metropolitan Opera House in New York, forty years ago. It created a tremendous sensation for reasons that I found entirely wrong, a fact that irritated me a great deal. It was labeled "jazz opera", which I felt to be a misnomer, for whatever jazz there occurs is brought in ~~in~~ to characterize the professional sphere of the protagonist, Jonny, ^{leader of} an American combo. ~~The music~~
 The music attached to the other characters, which to me were at least as important as Jonny is conceived in that early romantic idiom I had chosen as my model, occasionally touched up with dissonant spices and Italianizing ~~with~~ Puccinesque vocal exuberance.

^{(if at all,}
 The label ^{of} jazz-opera could be affixed much rather to a later ^{work} ~~opera~~ that I wrote in this period, the "Life of Orestes", which I shall discuss the next time. Here the jazzy flavor permeates one clearly defined sector of the stage action to create a sort of colloquial musical language, a musical lingua franca of our time. ~~After~~ ^{In later years} (it has been held against these pieces that the jazz ^{which} ~~they~~ displayed was really no jazz at all, or at best a very poor primitive specimen. This is true enough, and hardly worth pointing out. What I brought into play was not a replica of the real thing, which I might not even have done if I had known the real thing, but I tried to project ~~my picture~~ the reflexion of the image ^{of jazz} that I had formed in my mind on the basis of my very scanty knowledge of ^{it} ~~the thing~~ — just as I projected in ~~the picture~~ Jonny spelt out an idealistic wish dream of America, ~~in the~~ in the vein of similar pictures drawn by the early romanticists. Of the real America I knew hardly more than that it was the land of gangsters and prohibition, and neither aspect was inviting.

For my ~~the~~ ostensibly reactionary exploits I also fabricated a little theory to the effect that the newly discovered means

of musical expression, that is the atonal vocabulary, should not ~~not~~ prevent the use of the old ones, and that it should be possible to restore the old vocabulary to its original power and freshness through something vaguely mystical which I called "Urerlebnis", or primordial experience. In this I hoped to differentiate myself constructively from my fellow modernists of the Schoenberg school who promoted the idea that the new idiom had superseded the old and ~~made~~^{rendered} a meaningful use of the old resources impossible. Only Alban Berg was striving for a synthesis in accordance with his conciliatory, warm-hearted temperament, but he arrived at different results. I don't know how successful the application of my Urerlebnis has been. Some of the works that originated in this frame of mind, especially groups and cycles of songs, have retained a great deal of vitality. Nonetheless I noticed that after a while I had run out of steam and that it was time to look for ^a promising switch if I should keep going at all. on his track

The alternative was between giving up composing entirely (or at least for an indefinite period), or returning to modernism. While I considered the former seriously and concentrated for some time on literary work, the latter won out and I ^{began a} somewhat gingerly approach to the twelve-tone technique, which in the meantime had been developed by Schoenberg. ~~Thus~~ Today, when the high-brow musical magazines abound with analyses and detailed descriptions of compositional procedure, it is hardly believable that for years the only source of information on the twelve-tone technique was a rather vague and not entirely ~~correct~~^{accurate} essay in a Vienna periodical. The practitioners of the technique whom I knew, Alban Berg and Anton Webern, were quite reticent about what they were doing, and it seemed indelicate to ~~push them~~ become too inquisitive. Thus I had to rely on my own research, which was slow and laborious, although the basic principles of this technique were simple

enough. But it was a completely new and unaccustomed way of musical thinking.

Among musicians at large and laymen as well the twelve-tone technique was regarded as an aggravated case of atonality, or worse, as the ~~epitome~~ ^{desperate effort} of a ~~desperate~~ composer who had run out of inspiration. During my romantic excursion I had shared this view, and even incurred Schoenberg's wrath by putting a few sarcastic remarks into a lecture. The traces of the master's anguish may be found in the preface of his ~~last~~ Satires for chorus where he deposited a not too brilliant pun on my name. Later I apologized for my immature dig, and we lived in peace ever after.

It is nowadays easy to interpret the inauguration of the twelve-tone technique historically as a part of the general tendency of restoration prevailing during the nineteenth century. At that time it appeared to be a radically new departure, and the dialectical truth probably is that it was both. This technique ~~may now~~ ^{may now} be seen as a conservative factor because it imposed a strict discipline onto the chaotic world of atonality.

The rationalization that was ~~looking~~ ^{looking} out from the inner circle was that ^(the atonal) composers had realized that without some kind of constructive order only short pieces of music could be written, and that the revived desire of ~~not~~ creating larger forms prompted the invention of a new discipline. Another explanation was that in order to ~~maintain~~ secure the atonal character of the idiom it was necessary to prevent any tone from ~~becoming~~ ^{gaining} through repetition too much weight and becoming a tonal center in the old sense, and ^{in order} to achieve this end it became desirable to systematize the order of succession of ^{our twelve pitch-classes} ~~the~~ before ~~entering~~ the process of actual composition so that none would reappear before the other eleven had been sounded. Be that as it may, a trend toward restoration of law and order certainly promoted the invention of the twelve-tone technique.

This conjecture is corroborated by the fact that a ^(substantial) number of Schoenberg's dodecaphonic works are structured after the pattern of the classical Sonata form. They are different from the exercises of neo-classicism in that ~~they tried~~ ^{the twelve-tone school tried} to revive the spirit of the old forms while neo-classicism presented replicas of their facade with interesting cracks added.

~~Thus~~ Historical perspective reveals that the advent of atonality was experienced ^{by the public} as a violent shock while the introduction of the twelve-tone method caused hardly a ripple — just slightly raised eye-brows among tradition-minded experts, although it would have been logical had it happened the other way around. For atonality had been foreshadowed, as the evolutionists would say, ever since Wagner's generation had pushed toward the limits of tonality, while the idea of pre-organizing the musical material according to abstract serial patterns was something radically new. It did not register that way, because the character of the musical idiom, the sound material that was perceived, remained roughly the same, regardless of whether it was ordered serially or freely piled up in atonal clusters. On the other hand, the earlier transition from ^(harmonies) ever so loosely strung together in a tonal net to those seemingly unrelated dissonant clusters was shockingly conspicuous.

My ^{own} first venture in the new technique was a most ambitious one. It was the full-length historical opera Charles V. About its extramusical implications I shall talk the next time, which I hope will make clear that I considered the project one of utmost importance in every respect. This attitude prompted me to make it also the point of departure for a completely new phase of my musical development. After this opera I wrote two works, a set of variations for piano and my Sixth String Quartet, in which I perhaps ^{most thoroughly} ~~explored~~ ^{explored} the truly progressive aspects of the twelve-tone technique; at least I see it today in this light.

Later, when I had come to live in America after 1937, I oriented myself more toward Schoenberg's inclination for reviving the Sonata form. It would be easy to say that this happened ~~to me~~ under the influence of the conformist American atmosphere, or perhaps prompted by the hope to become somewhat more acceptable to a musical community that by the critical experts was told that the twelve-tone technique was a freakish conceit of a small Viennese group of neurotics and that American music ^{happily} had left such aberration far behind. When I in the 1940's experimented with relaxing the structures of the old twelve-tone technique by introducing ~~a~~ a new concept, which I called "rotation", it may have appeared to be a dubious attempt at compromise. In fact, however, this does not seem to have been the true motivation, because the first work in which I applied the rotational technique, turned out to be of fiendish difficulty, so that it had my Lamentation of the Prophet Jeremiah

to wait for sixteen years before it was produced in its entirety. Only ^{about as many} ~~ten~~ years later I realized that my rotational technique was my first tentative step into ^(still undiscovered) the territory of serialism, for ~~by~~ by the term "rotation" I wanted to describe a progressive switching ~~of~~ of the tones within the twelve-tone series according to premeditated patterns in order to obtain additional derivative forms of the basic set.

It was only in America that I became fully conscious and cognizant of music history, ^{but} as it seems, purely ^{by chance.} ~~incidentally~~. It so happened that the place of my first teaching assignment, ^(in this country) Vassar College, had a magnificent music library, in which I loved to browse. Obviously I was ready for this new experience, ~~for~~ soon enough I ~~did~~ stopped browsing and began to study more and more seriously. Probably subconsciously

for I was under no obligation to use that library. As a matter of fact, my boss, a hidebound musicologist, did not like it at all.

I looked for prototypes of ^{our own} compositional procedures, and ^{eventually} ~~eventually~~ I 15
~~eventually~~ found astonishing parallels. My attention was especially
attracted by the design of Gregorian chant, ~~which I discovered~~
~~very~~ and by the complexities of fifteenth century polyphony.
To my dismay I noticed that the majority of musicologists
whose work I greatly admired and appreciated because it had
provided me with otherwise inaccessible material of historical
studies - that these scholars almost resented the composer's inter-
est in their work, and I regretted that they did not reciprocate
this interest at all.

The tension thus created led to the termination of my
tenure at Vassar College, and I became head of the music depart-
ment at Hamline University in St. Paul, Minn. Only ~~then~~ ^{then} I could
continue my historical studies undisturbed, for I was my
own boss. There was only ^{one} ~~an~~ slight drawback; I had practically no
library. When this obstacle was ~~not~~ ^{to some degree} overcome
through the extensive use of microfilm I was able with the
aid of a group of outstanding graduate students to achieve some
results that gave at least us a great deal of satisfaction, if to
nobody else. My own particular object of study was the music of
Johannes Ockeghem, which I have found fascinating to this day.

It has been criticized that I ~~apparently found it necessary~~
~~to search for historical prototypes in order to justify modern~~
to search for historical prototypes in order to justify modern
compositional method. I feel that such objections are based
on a misunderstanding. The fact that the ~~the~~ melismata of Gre-
gorian Chant displayed inversion and retrogression, or the fact that
some medieval composers like Dufay used their cantus firmi
as basic melodic patterns from which they derived individual
motivic shapes for their polyphonic design, such facts did not
in my opinion justify the application of such procedure in the
twelve-tone technique. Obviously the only justification of any
technique is the accomplishment of viable results. What I was
interested in was observing and experiencing the permanency
of certain ways of musical thinking, the existence of archetypes

that seemed to run through the known history of occidental music and from time to time to ~~blossom out into~~ crystallize in the shape of stylistic ~~entity~~ entities.

I 16

In my teaching I ~~asked~~ asked the students to undergo a thorough training in sixteenth century counterpoint the rules of which I derived as far as possible from the practice of the old masters directly, not because I wanted them to revive the style of Palestrina, but in order to make them aware of the function of strict technical discipline in relation to a ~~completely known~~ ^{totally controlled} body of ~~music~~ ^{style} music so that they would be able, ~~on the strength of such experience~~, to apply this experience to their excursions into new, so far unknown and not yet controlled territory.

Today I am not any longer so convinced that this historical orientation is as necessary or useful as I thought under the impact of my own historical studies. The nineteenth century entertained the invariably naive notion that all that had happened before it was either ~~the~~ ^{welcome} preparation of ~~the~~ its own ultimate excellence or deplorable detour and delay. I remember having ~~seen~~ ^{seen} ~~an edition published about 1890 of~~ an edition published about 1890 of a work by Dufay in which the commentator criticized the fifteenth century composer for not yet knowing how to modulate properly from d minor to c sharp. It did not occur to him that Dufay never thought of modulating anywhere, but worked on entirely different assumptions. But in the eyes of the modern critic it was just that which made his music ^{appear} inferior.

It may be true that strong ages ~~are~~ ^{are} not lost in awe and admiration of history because they are too occupied with creating and building their own things. The Baroque era was one of those periods. The artists of that time had no qualms about tearing down or disfiguring the most venerable monuments of the Gothic because they found them obsolete and unsightly and were convinced that they had something far superior to substitute for the ancient stuff. It is fortunate that in music to assert itself a new generation does not need to destroy

the works of its ancestors. It is sufficient to let them gather dust on the shelves of the library. Whether ignorance, or even contempt of history reveals strength, or weakness, or just laziness and self-indulgence, can be ascertained only by evaluating the products of such mentality. But this evaluation is in turn a function of historical processes. If we feel that history takes its course according to some inexorable internal necessity it would not seem to matter very much whether ^{or not} we are aware of its preordained pattern. If we feel that we are making history as free agents we may not pay much attention ~~to~~ to precedent - only to be told afterwards that our action was a logical consequence of all that went before.

To be or not to be historically oriented is a question that can not be answered any better than the question: to be or not to be, period. Or rather, question mark.