

Chapter 1

Introduction

To observe notation through successive eras of written music enables one to seize the characteristics of the sound world that musicians chose to privilege, given the mutations of aesthetic thought.

Jean-Yves Bosseur, *Du Son au Signe*¹

Objects of study, scope and the ‘poietic fallacy’

Musical sketches are objects that composers produce as they create their work. The study of this material has traditionally meant the careful examination of paper documents. This practice arose in the nineteenth century and was closely associated with (but not limited to) the reception and exegesis of Ludwig van Beethoven’s work, which has led some scholars to assume that Beethoven’s surviving sketches and drafts constitute the point of reference for sketch studies per se.² Indeed, the very terms we use (sketch, draft, fair copy, derived from *Skizze*, *Entwurf*, *Reinschrift* and their equivalents in other languages) acquired musical coinage in the nineteenth century as collectors, critics and scholars attempted to make sense of Beethoven’s manuscripts. While the terminology, criteria and methods developed to classify and examine this corpus were foundational, they are not universally valid. Consider the composition of electroacoustic or digital music and the resulting source material. Examining Agostino Di Scipio’s early work (1987–2000) requires scholars to extract information about his compositional technique from a wide variety of sources, including magnetic tape, floppy discs and digital hard drives, as well as dealing with manuscript material containing notes, diagrams, drawings, etc.³ Work on Beethoven’s legacy may also prove to be of less than central importance for the study of music composed before the French Revolution. New terms and different criteria may have to be developed in order to properly examine creative processes in which borrowing and pastiche were ubiquitous and in which the production of music was often collaborative, involving composers, copyists and performers. The single author paradigm, which

2 *Music Sketches*

continues to dominate sketch studies today, would have seemed strange in an era that had little sense of copyright.

In the past, musicologists involved in sketch studies have tended to concentrate on one composer or a group of composers working in a genre (Philip Gossett's studies of Italian opera) or in a circumscribed time and place (Robert Orledge's work with the manuscripts of turn-of-the-century French composers). This is now changing. William Kinderman has raised the bar in a book-length study of the creative process of composers from Wolfgang Amadeus Mozart to György Kurtág, including chapters on the music of Beethoven, Robert Schumann, Gustav Mahler and Béla Bartók.⁴ In so doing, he demonstrated the pertinence of sketch studies for the analysis of specific works. He also single-handedly expanded the scope of sketch studies. Two decades earlier, Thomas Whelan made a first attempt to deal comprehensively with the history and theory of sketch studies. His case studies examine the sketches of Beethoven, as well as of Joseph Haydn, Franz Schubert and Alban Berg.⁵ Whelan's contribution was followed by Jessie Ann Owens's ground-breaking study of the compositional techniques of Renaissance composers.⁶ These achievements are symptomatic of a significant enlargement of the methods and goals of sketch studies at the turn of the twenty-first century, some of which are quite surprising. Mario Aschauer has recently produced a recording of documents pertaining to Schubert's unfinished opera *Adrast D 137*. Each recording of a draft or fragment is accompanied by a short recorded commentary. The work remains incomplete, but the medium provides the general public with a new kind of access to the composer's working documents.⁷

This book seeks to prepare the student and scholar to engage with this rapidly expanding field, while providing an opportunity to examine issues and problems arising from the study of composers' working documents produced between 1600 and the present. It picks up where Owens's book leaves off and is intended to be complementary to the *Handbook to Twentieth-Century Musical Sketches* first published a decade ago.⁸ The 400-year period under study has been divided approximately in two. The first could be described as the era of the composer/performer (ca. 1600 to the French Revolution). This was a time when the distinction we draw between the composer and the performer was not nearly as sharp as it is today. Virtually all professional musicians were performers and most composed, arranged or prepared music for performance as called upon by circumstance. A very good example of these multi-tasking individuals would be Johann Mattheson, the author of *Der vollkommene Capellmeister*. He was an accomplished performer (opera singer and organist), a successful composer (seven operas, numerous oratorios and cantatas), as well as a teacher and one of the eighteenth century's most successful writers on music. The second could be designated the era of the strong work concept (ca. the French Revolution to the present), in which music conceived as 'works' consigned to

paper (as opposed to music as an acoustic event, experienced through performance) emerged as a new concept that had a major impact in Western culture going forward. As a rule, the traditional descriptors of Western music histories (Baroque, Classic, Romantic and Modern) have been replaced by dates and centuries.

No date can properly demarcate the two eras identified above. Composer/performers (Frédéric Chopin, Franz Liszt, Sergei Prokofiev) have remained an important part of Western musical culture to this day and some form of ‘weak’ work concept undoubtedly existed in the centuries leading up to the French Revolution. Nevertheless, the brutal elimination of the *ancien régime* and the upheaval resulting from the Napoleonic Wars had far-reaching consequences and indirectly influenced how composers understood their activity, as well as the value and social function of their work. Many, notably Beethoven, came to see themselves as *Tonkünstler* (artists/poets of sound) beholden to no one, rather than as gifted *Kapellmeister* (well-rounded musicians) in the service of some dull aristocrat. This change of attitude must have contributed to the way they and others valued the artefacts produced in writing their music. Musical sketches and drafts only began to be collected and seriously studied in substantial numbers around the turn of the nineteenth century in German-speaking lands. This does not mean that documents of this type, produced in the seventeenth and eighteenth centuries, have not survived. Many have, but not for the same reasons or in the same way as sketches and drafts written in the nineteenth and twentieth centuries.

This book’s primary objects of study are not limited to composers and the documents they produce. The women and men who have devoted their careers to locating, examining and interpreting these objects are also included. Their achievement is just as compelling, and for our purposes just as important, as that of the composers who produced the sketches in the first place.

With the exception of a cabaret song by Erik Satie (Figure 7.3), all of the examples presented in facsimile and transcription can be grouped under the rubric ‘Western art music’. This is an arbitrary and rather unfortunate limitation. (When I began this project approximately a decade ago, my focus on art music and the resulting exclusion of popular music did not appear to me to be as important as it does now.) As electronic music (in both its popular and elitist styles) ages, classicising tendencies are inevitably increasing, bringing with them a concomitant interest in how this music was made: note, for example, the current interest in the Beatles and their creative processes.⁹ The inclusion of popular ‘musics’ into the field of sketch studies will doubtless require a redefinition of terms and a further enlargement of concepts. For example, in the 1950s songs began to be sketched out as demo recordings rather than as lead sheets.¹⁰ Innovative

4 *Music Sketches*

practices such as these will force musicologists to examine not only tapes, but also vintage recording equipment (microphones, preamplifiers, processors, mixing consoles, etc.), as well as the paper documents that inevitably accompanied the production of music using these devices. In my defence, I would say that many of the concepts and skills discussed in this book can be usefully transferred with some adjustment to the study of sources pertaining to creative activity in other musical styles and cultures.

Finally, we should guard against exaggerated claims, both positive and negative. Studying composers' working documents will not provide answers to all questions, or solve all problems, musical or otherwise. By the same token, sketch studies should not be seen as a threat. Richard Taruskin has recently raised the spectre of the 'poietic fallacy': i.e. 'the conviction that what matters most (or more strongly yet, that all that matters) in a work of art is the making of it, the maker's input'.¹¹ Behind this statement stands a deep-seated apprehension of the concepts and practice associated with high modernism. The object of Taruskin's critique was a recent study of Arnold Schoenberg's music, which provided him with the opportunity to accuse modernist composers and critics of placing too much importance on 'technical innovation, the delimitation of the purview of criticism to matters of structure and craft, and the derogation of other critical approaches as vulgarian'.¹² In other words, music associated with high modernism and discussion of its making have led to a 'divergence of interests' between composers and listeners that continues to bedevil the reception of new music of the twentieth and twenty-first centuries.¹³ Schoenberg and discourse about his music (which have always been among the chief bulwarks of the 'poietic fallacy . . . and the counterproductive mischief that it can make'¹⁴) are assigned primary responsibility for this sorry state of affairs. In Taruskin's view, how Schoenberg composed and how well he did it have been promoted to a primary musical value, resulting in the ultimate poietic fallacy: 'the one that led modern music into the cul-de-sac where absurdly overcomposed monstrosities by Elliott Carter and Milton Babbitt have been reverently praised by critics and turned into obligatory models for emulation by teachers of composition'.¹⁵

First, the study of the creative process should not be seen as part of a putative conspiracy (led by 'modernist/progressive' critics, scholars and composers) to destabilise the Western classical canon. Since the nineteenth century, composers' manuscripts have been studied to find answers to questions provoked by compositions (especially of instrumental music) that were, apparently for the first time, emphatically understood as works of musical art. For example, when was the piece composed, who is the composer and who else may have contributed to the work? What constitutes a complete and definitive version of a given composition? How does the compositional process relate to the structure of the finished work, as

well as other works written before or after by the same composer? How does the compositional process relate to more abstract theoretical questions? What are the relationships between the writing of a given work and the broader cultural context? Musical conservatives should rest assured that studying musical sketches has little bearing on the creation of ever more outrageously innovative music. New music will continue to be written with and without this knowledge.

Second, the so-called 'poietic' and 'esthetic' phases of a given work are far more interdependent than Taruskin seems to realise. Charles Rosen observed that one of the hallmarks of the nineteenth-century literature was a blurring of the line between life and art, which can be observed in letters, journals and other ostensibly private documents. 'The combination of stagecraft and intimate confession, of objective and subjective elements of tone and structure, turn these private documents into literature, the counterpart of Byron's greatest poems, *Childe Harold* and *Don Juan*, where public art assumes the character of the private document.'¹⁶ This is not to say that the work is merely subsidiary to incidents or events of the artist's private life. Rather, the Romantic ideal of the unity of life and work implies a blending of perspective. In Rosen's view some of the most interesting composers, notably Hector Berlioz and Robert Schumann, 'arranged their lives and even their personalities in order to realise their projects and their conceptions most effectively'.¹⁷ Schoenberg was keenly aware of this, and, according to Joseph Auner, his insight stands as a vivid manifestation of the 'blurring of boundaries between the work, the creative process, the artist, and the audience typical of twentieth-century art'.¹⁸

Third, Taruskin conveniently neglects to mention that he has been pleased to use evidence gleaned from his studies of Igor Stravinsky's sketches and drafts when it suited his purposes (see Chapter 9). Ironically, he has been one of the more effective contributors to the establishment of the so-called 'poietic fallacy' he now criticises so vehemently.¹⁹

As well as clarifying the issues and questions that have and have not motivated a study of composers' working documents, the discussion above is also a good indicator of the type of field the reader is entering. The examination of sketches and the creative process is not just another 'ivory tower' discipline, in which scholars quietly contemplate their objects of study in the hush of great libraries and archives. On the contrary, sketch studies has been and continues to be a lively, contested field in which scholars will argue (sometimes vociferously) about how best to transcribe Beethoven's sketches, whether and to what extent the study of working documents can be useful for musical analysis or if the unfinished work projects of deceased composers should or should not be completed. The reader will be exposed to some of this discussion in the following chapters.

What are musical sketches and how are they produced?

The term ‘musical sketch’ is a catch-all for the vast variety of documents that have been used by composers to work out their ideas. Paper of various qualities and formats is usually thought of as the primary support for these documents. In fact, composers have used all kinds of objects and devices: from the erasable *cartella* of the sixteenth and seventeenth centuries to the digital screens of the late twentieth century.

Derived initially from the visual arts and literature, the terms sketch, draft and fair copy are widely used, and in many domains outside the fine arts. At a very basic level they suggest a linear process by which a composer, artist or writer moves from a first idea to a general outline (a draft) and then to a polished result, often called the ‘Fassung letzter Hand’.²⁰ In most cases, the creative process is far more complex, resembling a network of relationships rather than a straight and narrow path.²¹ Fabien Czolbe insists on the need to dissociate work chronology from the creative process that produces these works. The latter is usually not teleological.²² Rather, it tends to resemble a heterogeneous network of related activities in which we find starts and stops, unexpected turns, circular movement, long fallow periods and sudden explosions of activity. Furthermore, musical sketches can be produced at all stages of the creative process and not just in the initial phases of a project. Composers will sketch solutions to newly discovered problems as they prepare parts for a first performance, as they correct and adjust the work following a first performance and as they check editorial proofs. Kinderman has often compared works of art to icebergs: ‘what is visible is but a small part of the whole’.²³ The larger part is what we discover when we examine a composer’s working documents.

The terminology of sketch studies is notoriously vague. For example, no watertight definition for the musical sketch exists. The primary reason for this state of affairs is the enormous array of methods and techniques that composers have developed and continue to devise in working out their ideas. Sketches are mnemonic devices and are usually meant to conserve that which cannot be committed to memory. They can be written in conventional staff notation, but also in other music notation systems such as tablature (numerous examples of this are presented below). More often than not, these manuscripts will contain a heterogeneous mix of different types of symbols from a variety of writing systems. György Ligeti’s short description of his compositional technique serves as a good example.

I write my sketches with pencil, first approximately, in words that are only addressed to me and that stand for specific musical ideas. If you read ‘Scriabin’ in my sketches, this does not refer to ‘Scriabin’. Rather the word refers to something that occurred to me in Scriabin’s tenth Sonata. These words are like

computer addresses. Then I make drawings and then musical notation, always with a pencil. I can erase. With today's technology I could use notation software. This is more perfect and you can print it immediately: but I like the smell of a good quality, sharpened Faber-Castell pencil. I first have to sharpen it: that is like smoking a pipe or a cigarette (something I don't do). I sharpen the pencil. I draw my own staff lines (Stravinsky was a drawing fetishist: this does not go so far with me). Someone else could make the fair copy from my sketches. However I need to hear the whole thing again as I write out the fair copy. If I were to do this with a computer, everything would go too fast. When I see music on the screen, it's not the same as when I write it out myself. If I were twenty years younger, I would probably write directly on the screen. These are the habits developed from writing for one's entire life with a pencil.²⁴

The meandering style of Ligeti's 'homage to the pencil' is not only indicative of his writing technique, but of his creative process in general. It reminds us that composers' sketches are highly idiosyncratic. No two composers write their music in the same way, even those who have known one another for a long time. István Anhalt and George Rochberg corresponded for over forty years (1961–2005). They frequently wrote about the creative process, but approached it very differently. Rochberg seems to have taken a very disciplined approach following carefully laid out plans: 'And before I gear up for some chamber music I must write, I want to settle a few details in the sketches for the 2nd Suite [from his opera *The Confidence Man* (1982)] ... [I will then] put them aside 'til I'm ready to sit down & write 200 pages of score.'²⁵ By contrast, Anhalt was much more intuitive. Referring to work on the libretto for an opera based on the life of Julius Oppenheimer, he wrote: 'As it is ... I am filling pages with notes and the more I am scribbling the more the "thing" takes shape. The eventual composition of the "notes" will be but the last act. The "notes" are in the process of formation/assembly (my own little/big jigsaw puzzle, for which I am inventing the model and the "pieces") already ... '²⁶ (Anhalt completed the libretto, but not the opera.)

The sheer diversity of working methods should make us sceptical of attempts to define stages of this activity all too precisely. If this is true of musical sketches and drafts in general, it also holds for the working documents of individual composers, whose compositional techniques inevitably change over time. Jonathan Bernard has recently categorised Ligeti's working documents into five basic types: jottings (words, often in Hungarian or German), drawings, charts, tables, musical notation.²⁷ These categories are germane to a study of the sketches and drafts pertaining to work on the Requiem and many other works of that period (ca. 1960–80). Indeed, three of the categories (jottings, drawings and musical notation) are explicitly mentioned by Ligeti in the above quotation. However, the first four categories are absent from the surviving sketches and drafts that pertain to the more than 100

8 *Music Sketches*

works Ligeti composed before he left Hungary in December 1956. Also they will not apply to the sketches and drafts for all works written afterwards. For example, Bernard mentions *Volumina*, written in graphic notation and the *Poème symphonique*, the score of which is a set of instructions.²⁸

Philology and genetic criticism

Before beginning, the reader needs to be aware of two approaches to the study of musical sketches and the creative process: philology and genetic criticism. The former contributed to the emergence of the discipline of sketch studies in the nineteenth century and the latter has had a strong impact on the development of the field in the second half of the twentieth century.

Philology

Philology is a critical and hermeneutic activity, the goal of which is to establish a complete comprehension of texts as they changed over time and to interrogate their relationship to history and to the cultures out of which they emerged and within which they circulated.²⁹ The roots of this activity can be traced back to the scholars of antiquity who sought to establish a standard text of the epic poems attributed to Homer and, somewhat later, of the Bible. Over the centuries, the study textual evidence (textual criticism) was developed by scholars we now associate with the term philology.

Maria Caraci Vela defines the philology of music as ‘a discipline the goal of which is the restitution of a musical text in the form as close as possible to that which the composer considered completed and finished’.³⁰ Nineteenth-century German scholars had a strong impact on the emergence of this approach.³¹ The debate surrounding the authorship of Mozart’s Requiem, as well as the newly established projects to publish critical editions of the complete works of great composers (Johann Sebastian Bach, Mozart and Beethoven) provided a strong impetus for the application of philological techniques and approaches to musical texts (see Chapter 2). One of the most influential figures in this regard was Otto Jahn, a professionally trained philologist, who was one of the first to apply these skills to the study of Beethoven’s surviving sketches and drafts. In the Preface to his Mozart biography first published in 1855, he wrote that the application of philological methodologies to the study of music would be beneficial, particularly with regard to the establishment of reliable chronological work lists.³² Jahn was heavily involved in the critical edition of Johann Sebastian Bach’s complete work (see Chapter 2). Of course, not all German critics and scholars of music were professional philologists.

Nevertheless, the study of Classical texts of antiquity played an important part in German higher education, which meant that the goals and methods of philology were very well established in the intellectual milieu in which they worked.

The methods and values of philology have continued to exert a strong impact. They provided the nineteenth-century scholars with well-honed tools and tested criteria that were easily adapted to establish standards with regard to the analysis and interpretation of written documents. The centrality of the strong work concept, the importance that many musicologists place in identifying the ‘first sketch’ (i.e. the point of departure for a specific compositional project) and the tendency to understand the creative process as a chronological trajectory are all part of a legacy that continues to resonate in the field to this day.

Genetic criticism

In the mid-1970s French literary scholars under the leadership of Louis Hay established a new field of research that focused on a systematic analysis of manuscript collections called ‘la critique génétique’. The impetus was the acquisition by the Bibliothèque nationale de France (BNF) of the Schocken collection of Heinrich Heine’s manuscripts.³³ If the philology is interested primarily in the outcome of the creative process (i.e. the text, how it changed and how it was received over time), genetic criticism ‘pursues an immaterial object (a process) through the concrete analysis of the material traces left by that process’.³⁴ In other words, the knowledge of the text is not an end in itself, but rather a means to better understand the process that brought it into existence. Referring to Schumann’s writing techniques, Bernhard Appel notes that musical thought is materialised in the writing process and, as a result, no other source material gives such immediate access to this thought as the physical traces of this process.³⁵ The evidence of this process can be found not only in the manuscripts that pertain directly to compositional activity (sketches and drafts), but peripheral sources such as correspondence, marginal notes in books, texts, photographs, as well as information from the wider intellectual and cultural context within which the process took place. Thus what the composer knew of other composers’ works, the literary background of vocal texts, his or her sense of identity are all part of what Czolbe identifies as the archaeology of the text that allows us to better understand the musical thought behind the work.³⁶ This gives rise to the notion of the ‘avant-texte’: i.e. a vast web of hermeneutic and theoretical information that provides the background against which texts are ultimately produced.

Musicology, both in France and elsewhere, has been slow to embrace the term. Indeed, Gossett worried that assembling the entire genetic history of any given work would be an impossible task. ‘I know how much I have learned about *La forza del destino* by investigating elements of its genesis, but could I ever produce a complete

10 *Music Sketches*

genetic critique of the opera?³⁷ Even if the answer to Gossett's rhetorical question is no, Kinderman has shown that there is much to be gained in making the attempt. His study of the cultural and musical avant-textes (or pre-texts) of *Parsifal* provide an excellent example.³⁸ In fact, over the past half-century, scholars undertaking projects involving sketch studies have become ever more attentive to study of the creative process in the broad/'genetic' sense of the term. For one thing, this brings the study of composers' working documents closer to the creative process as apprehended by composers themselves. Carl Dahlhaus observed that they 'tend to assign more significance to the process of creation, to the genesis of a work, than to the result, and sometime in fact so emphatically as to make it seem that the objectification of the compositional process in a structure that outlives it signifies an alienation of art from its true being'.³⁹ For another, studies of composers' working documents undertaken from the perspective of genetic criticism tend to undercut the rather abstract idea of the musical score as a closed system of relationships that contains all we need to know to understand the work.⁴⁰

Many musicologists are striving to attain this result, without explicitly acknowledging the relationship of their work to genetic criticism. A few examples of recent work will suffice. To begin, Auner has shown how Schoenberg's row sketches allow us to examine in detail the composer's postulate that the idea of a given work will emerge unambiguously from a many-sided presentation of its content, 'but without having to be stated directly'.⁴¹ Auner demonstrates this through a close reading of the sketches of specific compositions, from the *Serenade*, Op. 24 through to the *Sechs Stücke* for male chorus, Op. 35.⁴² Susanna Pasticci has studied the sketches and drafts pertaining to the *Symphony of Psalms* in order to better understand the concept of the sacred in this work. Her research has led to a more precise understanding of its role in Stravinsky's work as a whole, particularly during the interwar years.⁴³ Kimberly Francis's examination of manuscripts pertaining to the same composition has shown that the creative process continues long after the composer has completed the autograph fair copy and that this can involve a network of individuals. She shows how Nadia Boulanger contributed to helping Stravinsky better understand his own work and to crafting a public image of the composer during the interwar years. Francis's research is in sync with modernist scholarship that, according to Suzanne Cusick, seeks to reevaluate 'woman's work and the culturally feminine so that they cease to be marginalized and devalued, but might be reinterpreted as important elements of musical culture'.⁴⁴ Francis's work also shows just how seamlessly the web of textual and cultural phenomena that make up the avant-texte run into a discussion of the work's reception. Finally, Ulrich Mosch has examined the working documents pertaining to Kurtág's third string quartet, *Officium breve in memoriam Andrae Szervánszky*, Op. 28. The goal is to understand how the presence of the past, both in terms of personal memory and the broader

cultural context, impinge on our analysis and interpretation of the composer's music in general.⁴⁵

In its quest for meaning, genetic criticism moves beyond the goals of traditional philology and opens up new perspectives for the study of music. Increased knowledge of the creative process (including failed initiatives, interrupted developments, abandoned fragments, short cuts, dead ends, etc.) tends to undermine the very notion of the musical work as an isolated, self-contained aesthetic object.⁴⁶ One consequence of this is the productive deconstruction of the appearance of aesthetic autonomy, not as an historic concept that impacted thinking about music in the nineteenth and twentieth centuries, but as a normative frame for the analysis of music today. According to Kinderman, this perspective, gained from the genetic criticism, 'can reveal unsuspected links between musical projects, bring to light the aesthetic qualities of unfinished or fragmentary efforts, and disclose blurred boundaries between biography and art, genesis and structure, historical and analytical concerns'.⁴⁷ A good example of this type of outcome is Anna Stoll Knecht's recent work on Gustav Mahler's sketches for his Seventh Symphony through which she was able to examine the function and broader implications of allusions to Wagner's *Die Meistersinger von Nürnberg* in the Symphony as a whole.⁴⁸

The study of the creative process also tends to undermine the use of monolithic, one-size-fits-all theoretical systems (transformational theory, pitch-class set analysis, Schenkerianism) for the analysis of specific works. Such systematic approaches are of course valid and perfectly legitimate for theoretical work that seeks constants in broadly defined repertoires: for example, an understanding of sonata form in late eighteenth and nineteenth centuries. However, in my study of Anhalt's last work, *Four Portraits from Memory* (2005–7), I observed that in reducing the work to a series of measurable units, these approaches may in fact miss or distort those qualities that the composer found so compelling in performance.⁴⁹ Kinderman has called for an 'integrated approach', whereby musical analysis takes guidance from sources, and the study of the creative process draws upon analytical insight. From this perspective the examination of composers' working documents can be seen as the 'nexus between biography and analysis, history and theory'.⁵⁰ Such an approach should result in more nuanced analytical results, more closely tied to the idiosyncrasies of particular composers at various points in their careers.⁵¹

Overview

This book presents neither an exhaustive history, nor a comprehensive theory of sketch studies. Rather it seeks to provide the reader with a reliable overview of important historical perspectives and theoretical questions that pertain to the study

12 *Music Sketches*

of the creative process in music at the beginning of the twenty-first century. Though Beethoven is mentioned in virtually every chapter, the reader may be surprised to discover that none of his sketches and drafts have been reproduced in the pages this book. Over the past century, more of Beethoven's sketches have been published than of any other composer, and these publications are accessible in major libraries across the world. In choosing visual examples, I have preferred images that have not been published before, or, if they have been, are not easily accessible. The thirty-four black and white plates included in this book present a range of different types of working documents from various phases of the creative process. The reader will find sketches, drafts and the occasional fair copy of works for solo instrument, chamber ensembles, vocal ensembles and larger orchestras. They cover approximately 400 years of compositional practice that took place mainly, but not exclusively, in Europe. Each of these documents was physically examined by me at least once in the process of writing this book.

The following chapters can be read as nine self-contained essays. They are intended to present specific aspects of the field, opening a perspective on certain issues, problems and skills related to the topic. Each is accompanied by extensive bibliographic references that should allow the reader to pursue questions and consult sources. The resulting bibliography is both long and extremely heterogeneous, running off in many different directions: alphabetical order has meant that Max Mathews and Johann Mattheson incongruously rub shoulders. Despite its length, the select bibliography is by no means exhaustive, nor can it be. Given the enormous expansion of the study of the creative process in music over the past few decades, the idea of such bibliography is rapidly becoming, if it is not already, a utopian dream.

Though the chapters may be read in any order, the reader will find numerous topics and problems linking different sections of the book, such as authorship, concepts of music, as well as the proper preservation of physical and aesthetic objects from the past. In all chapters, relevant terminology is presented, historically situated and, in numerous cases, interrogated.

The study of composers' working documents is both rewarding and challenging. It forces the musicologist to take a holistic approach, requiring broad knowledge and reminding the practitioner that theoretical concepts of music do not and indeed cannot be understood as standing outside history and culture. It also demands sharp analytical skills in a host of different domains. For example, as well as analysing the music contained on the page, the scholar may also need to be aware of how handmade paper was fabricated in a given time and place and of the corrosive impact that iron gall ink may have had on these papers. Finally, like the study of music in general, the study of sketches and drafts is more often than not a multi-lingual/multi-cultural endeavour. Many of the words we use in English have come to

us from other languages (primarily Italian, German and French) and some quite directly: *particella* (*particell* in French or German, short score or *particell* in English), *Stichvorlage* (printer or engraver's copy), *brouillon* (a slippery term that can be understood as a synonym of *esquisse* (sketch) or of *ébauche* (draft)). A glossary has been provided at the end of the book to help with definitions, but it should not be used as a crutch. If the composer who wrote the working documents you are studying spoke languages other than English, it is incumbent on you to acquire a general working knowledge of them, and not just of the technical terms pertaining to music and the study of manuscripts. If you do not, you will remain handicapped and unreasonably dependent on a colleague, librarian or archivist who does.

Chapter 2 presents a survey of sketch studies past and present. It begins by examining the nineteenth-century origins of the discipline and traces its expansion into a field during the twentieth century. It also examines prospects for the study of the creative process of composers working before the French Revolution, and it ends with a brief look at how the field is evolving at the beginning of the twenty-first century. Chapter 3 looks at how composers' working documents have survived, and what we need to do to find them.

The remaining seven chapters can be divided into two groups, reflecting Georg Feder's two levels of philological research: the low and the high.⁵² Chapters 4 to 6 discuss sketches as physical objects, the challenges of working with loose-leaf sketches and sketchbooks respectively. They examine the palaeographic and codicological aspects of the study of sketches and introduce some of the skills and knowledge required to do this. Chapters 7 to 10 look at how the content of these objects is interpreted for specific purposes. Chapter 7 examines the pros and cons of transcription and facsimile reproduction. Chapter 8 looks at the impact the study of composers' sketches and drafts can have on the critical edition of music. Chapters 9 and 10 examine contentious issues. The former reports on the origins and the outcome of the great debate about whether and to what extent the study of a composer's sketches and drafts can be beneficial for the analysis of the musical work to which they pertain. The argument about this consumed the time and energy of numerous scholars at the centre of the field during the second half of the twentieth century. The latter asks whether we should or should not use surviving working documents to complete works left unfinished at a composer's death. The question is fraught with both moral and technical issues that are germane to the discussion of musical borrowing at the beginning of the twenty-first century.