to the composer’s conception of the piece, since it is a “diachronic narrative” of Nativity events (ibid.). Conversely, Messiaen’s Vingt regards centers on the birth of the eternal God in time. His “regards” are synchronic in nature—a jubilant, “timeless’ succession of stills” (ibid.)—rather than a linear unfolding of Nativity events. To grasp the compositional aesthetics of Vingt regards more thoroughly, Burton turns to the Catholic writer Columba Marmion, whose view of the Nativity is truly more Catholic than that of Toesca. But Burton notes how much Messiaen added to Marmion’s reading of the Nativity in the latter’s Le Christ dans ses mystères, while retaining its essential visual “gazes” (p. 95). Respecting Trois petites litanies, Burton probes the depths of the inventive collage citation technique characterizing its texts, as Messiaen juxtaposes different images and phrases from the Bible—interspersed with his own images—to generate a metaphorical rainbow of Scriptural associations (p. 119). Finally, Burton suggests how difficult it was for Messiaen in the explicitly non-Catholic Chant des déportés “to express the sentiments of the collective Moi of the deported” (p. 125).

Before focusing on the Tristan Trilogy and its celebration of secular passion in chapter 5, Burton returns to the occupation years in chapter 4 to look at Visions de l’amen and Ernest Hello’s influence on its conception (“Messiaen and Ernest Hello: Abyss, Altitude, and Amen [Visions de l’Amen],” pp. 127–50). What follows is a detailed discussion of Hello’s theology and how it helped to shape Messiaen’s work for two pianos, which is not often pursued in Messiaen scholarship. Chapter 5 (“Agape and Eros [II]: Messiaen’s ‘Tristan’s Trilogy’ [Harawi, Turangalîla-Symphonie, Cinq rechants],” pp. 151–232) is the tome’s longest and weightiest chapter. By 1945, Messiaen (who was by then France’s premier Catholic composer) began to write the song cycle known as Harawi, which became the first installment of his “Tristan Trilogy” (the other two pieces being the Turangalîla-Symphonie and Cinq rechants). Burton dissects the cultural history of the trilogy, deciphering how Messiaen walked a fine line between Agape and Eros in these compositions, ultimately seeing no contradiction between them in his Catholicism. Burton planned but never wrote the book’s intended final chapter (“Conclusion: Between Surrealism and Scripture”), which is unfortunate because it would have been highly welcome, given this book’s fascinating viewpoints.

In spite of the high quality of its insights, this book contains unfortunate content and copy-editing errors. For example, in his discussion of Harawi (p. 182), Burton reverses the medieval color symbolism that Messiaen associated with violet in a 1967 conversation with Claude Samuel (Conversations with Olivier Messiaen, trans. Felix Aprahamian [London: Stainer and Bell, 1976], 20) by stating that reddish violet (purple) suggests the “Truth of Love” and bluish violet (hyacinth) the “Love of Truth.” Although Burton repeats an error in the source he cites (Audrey Ekdahl Davidson, Olivier Messiaen and the Tristan Myth [Westport, CR: Greenwood, 2001], 25), this state of affairs reflects the Burton’s tendency to depend too much on secondary sources. But given the book’s genesis, as well as its difficult path to publication—Burton died in 2008; Roger Nichols edited the book—most of these errors can, and should, be excused; in my opinion, the book’s overall excellent content, expressed in a highly engaged writing style, overrides such concerns. All things considered, this book is a superb contribution to the literature on Messiaen and a must-read for all parties interested in his music.

VINCENT P. BENITEZ
The Pennsylvania State University


The recent crop of scholarship on Karlheinz Stockhausen is turning out to be exceptionally abundant. Along with Jerome Kohl’s long-awaited book on the early wind quintet Zeitmasse (Karlheinz Stockhausen: Zeitmasse [Abingdon, U.K.: Routledge, 2017]), Thomas Ulrich recently published a sizable study of the seven Licht operas (Stockhausens Zyklus Licht: ein Opernführer [Cologne: Böhlau Verlag, 2017]). Adding to this bounty is this new volume of essays. Its editors, Imke Misch and M. J. Grant, have
themselves published a considerable amount of research on Stockhausen, and Misch has extensive experience working for the composer’s foundation in Kürten, Germany. Their volume, entitled *The Musical Legacy of Karlheinz Stockhausen: Looking Back and Forward*, is an uneven but welcome contribution to the harvest.

A compilation of papers read in 2011 at the Stockhausen Concerts and Courses Kürten workshop, the book brings together a roster of mostly European scholars. The papers range considerably in length, depth, and ambition, as did the presentations at the conference. It is probably for good reason that a considerable amount of time elapsed between the conference and the publication: the papers presented in 2011 varied across the board, and while certain studies underwent major improvements, others were omitted completely in the publication. Many of the essays are quite short and present merely tentative beginnings of larger research projects. It is worth noting that if these projects were to be followed through more comprehensively, many would surely bear even greater fruit.

Nevertheless, the volume brings together some excellent research. Among the most important papers is the first contribution, by Mark Delaere. An expert on the extensive correspondence between Stockhausen and Karel Goeyvaerts, which consists of about 175 letters written between 1951 and 1958, Delaere shows how the two young composers shared an enthusiasm for new music and a deep devotion to Catholicism. Among the three principal themes running through the correspondence are “the concept of static music, the quest for absolute purity, and theological justification” (p. 23). Electronics could, in theory, provide the composers with the means to produce static music, a kind of sound that would be “congruent with the stasis of absolute Being” (p. 24). The compositional quest for “absolute purity” justified the use of the sine tone, a strangely disembodied sound without any overtones. Unlike Goeyvaerts, Stockhausen soon abandoned use of the sine tone, turning instead to the use of more complex sounds and the famous “insertion,” or Einschub (the focus of another essay in the collection). Goeyvaert’s avoidance of tones other than the sine wave left him with far fewer options, and ultimately his music has not stood the test of time as well as that of Stockhausen. Even more than these two goals, what set Goeyvaerts and Stockhausen “light years” apart from their other young European colleagues was their religious fervor (p. 32). While Stockhausen never abandoned his belief that music could convey a profound theological message, the correspondence seems to indicate that Goeyvaerts was the more ardent believer of the pair. It would be fascinating to tell the story of the origins of European serialism by fully exploring its theological foundations, but such a history would almost surely fracture the neat historical narrative that has become all too customary in textbooks.

An essay by Gustavo Oliveira Alfaix Assis evaluates the concept of the Einschub in Stockhausen’s music. This practice introduces a spontaneous, unforeseen element into the music, it is something outside of the original form-plan. Stockhausen used the Einschub to add an element of organism to the work, in such a way that the musical composition would resemble aspects of a biological system. But Assis undercuts his claim that Stockhausen’s Einschübe function “much as ‘chaos’ does in nature” in the very next text he quotes, in which Stockhausen explains that the insertion—while unplanned—is nevertheless a kind of musical event “that had been missing” and therefore was a “necessary addition to an organism” (p. 83). Hermann Conen’s excellent analysis of the Einschübe in Stockhausen’s *In Freundschaft* (Hermann Conen, *Formal-Komposition: Zu Karlheinz Stockhausens Musik der siebziger Jahre* [Mainz: Schott, 1991], 251–56) shows that while these “cadenzas” often depart significantly from the surrounding material, they sometimes contain musical paraphrases of the musical context, leading one to conclude that they are not entirely part of a chaotic system. To better describe the Einschub, Assis might have taken a cue from Leopoldo Siano’s essay (“Between Music and Visual Art in the 1960s: Mary Bauermeister and Karlheinz Stockhausen”), where we briefly read about the notion of alchemy in Stockhausen (p. 99). Perhaps the Einschub functions partly as a means to dissolve or liquidate formal structures that have governed a composition, until the piece re-forms (or “coagulates”) back into its more fixed form.
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Another direction Assis explores in his attempt to clarify the Einschub is its similarities to surrealist art, but he does not make clear how something musical that is “considered to be outside the context” can, like surrealist objects, bring “the whole closer to the actual desired result” (p. 84). Even if his reasoning does not always persuade, in the big picture Assis is on to something.

The relationships between Goethe’s theories of organicism (especially concepts such as Steigerung [intensification], Bildungsstrieb [drive to formation] and Ökonomie [compensation]) and Stockhausen’s compositional theories are severely underappreciated in the scholarly literature. The Einschub is the logical place to root a more substantial inquiry into this important question.

Whatever similarities exist between Stockhausen’s art and surrealism, his strongest connection to the art world by far was through his second wife, Mary Bauermeister. Although much has already been written on this long and fruitful relationship, Leopoldo Siano’s essay sketches out most of the important connections. Already well known in Cologne through her famous studio, which brought together artists such as John Cage, Nam June Paik, David Tudor, Cornelius Cardew, Mauricio Kagel, and many others, Bauermeister achieved even greater renown through her lens boxes. This curious contraption usually contained a detailed drawing on the back of a wooden box, which is distorted by sliding layers of glass in between it and the viewer. The glass has lenses glued on it, which interfere with and transform the view of the drawing underneath. Siano emphasizes how important the musical metaphor of “intermodulation” was for Stockhausen in works such as Mikrophonie I and Hymnen (p. 97). Ultimately, Siano argues that Bauermeister’s effect on Stockhausen’s music was stronger and more important than is often thought: with her influence he “overcame the monism and dualistic logic that characterized the early years of his career” (p. 99). Siano’s work is important for understanding the collaborative nature of Stockhausen’s art, and the debt he owed to others.

Marcus Zagorski’s contribution to the book may be most in line with the editors’ purpose in mapping a slowly reifying Stockhausen “legacy.” Zagorski argues that Stockhausen’s own theoretical writings of the 1950s and 1960s influenced Carl Dahlhaus’s telling of history in several important ways. Rejecting Thomas Kuhn’s theory of scientific history as an influence on Dahlhaus, Zagorski instead locates echoes of Dahlhaus’s notion of “problem-history” in Stockhausen’s essay “Erfindung und Entdeckung” (“Invention and Discovery”), published in volume 1 of Texte zur Musik (ed. Dieter Schnebel [Cologne: DuMont, 1963], 222-58). The notion of composition as a process of identifying problems and then testing solutions “lent compositional choices both the prestige of science and the air of inevitability” that Dahlhaus sought in his writing of history (p. 55). In Zagorski’s thinking, Stockhausen’s imprint can also be found in Dahlhaus’s idea of the “work-in-progress.” This Dahhausean theory calls into question the idea that a piece needed to be closed and fully formed, suggesting instead that it could be more or less in a state of flux, mutated, and modified by performers as much as composers. Zagorski argues that Stockhausen’s more technical, “scientific” approach to writing about composition in the 1950s appealed to Dahlhaus as the nucleus of a historiography because it prioritized method over socio-political histories that were becoming more prevalent in German universities during the 1960s and 1970s (p. 59). By suggesting that Dahlhaus’s history of music from Beethoven to Schoenberg is indebted to Stockhausen’s own notion of composition, Zagorski implies that Stockhausen’s legacy may ultimately resonate far beyond his own particular oeuvre.

Many writers have pointed to similarities between Stockhausen’s epic operatic heptology, entitled Licht, and Richard Wagner’s earlier grandiose contributions to the art form. Magdalena Zorn’s all-too-brief essay explores these connections to an extent not yet seen in the literature. While both Wagner and Stockhausen “composed out of a similar motivation” in their sense that music was inextricably intertwined with religion (p. 125), they also shared a certain approach to opera as Gesamtkunstwerk. Through literature and graphic art, Stockhausen approached opera from an “intermodal” concept that also “formed the basis of [Wagner’s] dramas” (p. 126).
Specifically, Hermann Hesse’s novel *Das Glaserlenspiel* (Zürich: Fretz & Wasmuth, 1943), which Stockhausen knew well, emphasizes the unity and correspondence of sensory information. Turning towards the graphic arts and the aesthetics of Wassily Kandinsky, as well as the theosophical theories of Helena Blavatsky, Zorn traces further influences through Messiaen’s personal theories of sound and color. Zorn could have found more material in Stockhausen’s early essay “The Concept of Unity in Electronic Music” (trans. Elaine Barkin, *Perspectives of New Music* 1, no. 1 [Autumn 1962]: 39–48), where the composer proposes that the domains of pitch, rhythm and form are all part of a single unified continuum of experience. This and other Stockhausen writings, including the article “... how time passes...” (trans. Cornelius Cardew, English-language ed. of *Die Reihe* 3 [1959]: 10–40) lend considerable insight into the differences between Wagner’s concept of *Gesamtkunstwerk* and Stockhausen’s much more totalizing idea of experiential unity. But despite some surface similarities, many fundamental aspects of *Licht* have nothing to do with Wagner’s *Ring*. Instead of centering on characters from mythic folklore, Stockhausen creates idealized cosmic spirits in his three protagonists. Rather than representing metaphorically a decaying world on the brink of collapse, Stockhausen’s operatic cycle optimistically opens up the possibility of growth, rebirth, and renewal throughout. It is worth approaching with caution Zorn’s suggestion that studying the “significant parallels” (p. 133) between Wagner’s leitmotifs and Stockhausen’s formula composition will yield insight to the latter’s concepts of *Gesamtkunstwerk*, as Stockhausen’s techniques are so much more complex and consistent. Such an undertaking might yield only limited results, since Stockhausen’s worldview, compared to that of Wagner, extends further in almost every direction.

You Nakai’s essay poses an interesting question: why did Stockhausen seem to stop writing about theory in the 1960s? Many writers noted the abrupt change in literary style flowing from Stockhausen’s pen after the second installment of *Texte zur Musik* (Cologne: DuMont, 1964), which lurches from technical essays and analyses

to a more esoteric, almost scrapbook style. You suggests a provocative answer to the question. At the same time he stopped writing theory, Stockhausen adopted the mantle of the “listening” composer and the role of *Klangregler* (sound projectionist) (p. 75). Works that were previously derived from relatively strict serial machinations could now only reach their final form through the act of listening; their predetermined structure was simply a starting point. Evidence for this comes from an account of Stockhausen changing the order of the three heads in a standard tape recorder, a technique pioneered by his studio assistant Gottfried Michael Koenig. Stockhausen altered the tape heads order from “erase-record-playback” to “playback-erase-record,” thus allowing him to “turn into a listener” (p. 67). You argues further that in his 1960 essay on Moment Form (“Momentform: Neue Zusammenhänge zwischen Aufführungsdauer, Werkdauer und Moment,” *Texte zur Musik* vol. 1, 189–210), Stockhausen described musical structure “from the standpoint of the listener,” not the composer, thus radically elevating the status of the auditor into a creative listener (p. 69). Looking back on Stockhausen’s remarkable accomplishments of the 1960s from our present-day perspective, when it is possible to play back, manipulate, combine, and filter sound clips in a digital audio workstation with the mere touch of a button or click on a touchpad, You’s analysis makes the most sense.

Among the remaining essays in the volume, Georg Henkel’s musings on the meaning of Stockhausen’s notion of “fremde Schönheit” (“alien beauty,” p. 141) from a theological perspective provides a useful exploration of some assumptions underlying the composer’s thinking. The other contributions in the book are of only limited value, as they either venture too far into minutiae of Stockhausen’s serial technique, or retell information already widely available in other sources. If this volume is itself to be part of Stockhausen’s legacy, it is perhaps most wise to keep in mind that its essential unevenness is a sign that scholars are still coming to grips with a complex, difficult, and often puzzling subject.

Paul V. Miller
Duquesne University