

Jonathan Cross, editor. *The Cambridge Companion to Stravinsky*. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 2003.

REVIEWED BY LYNNE ROGERS

Given the number of scholarly books and articles on Igor Stravinsky and his music, it might be daunting for those wishing to become familiar with the field to decide where to begin. *The Cambridge Companion to Stravinsky*, a recent addition to The Cambridge Companions to Music, is a fine solution to this dilemma. The volume's fourteen essays, many authored by well-known Stravinsky specialists, introduce readers to a wide variety of topics and approaches that together create a rich picture of the composer, his music, and the currents in research.

Certainly, the *Companion to Stravinsky* is not the first broadly focused collection of scholarly essays in Stravinsky studies, but it is the first in English published since the comprehensive *Confronting Stravinsky* (Pasler 1986a).¹ Moreover, it is the first such collection published "A.T." (that is, After Taruskin: postdating Richard Taruskin's influential *Stravinsky and the Russian Traditions* [1996]). In addition to its later publication date, the *Companion to Stravinsky* differs from *Confronting Stravinsky* in two significant respects. First, relatively few of the *Companion's* essays offer new insights; rather, most explicate concepts and summarize information with which those already acquainted with Stravinsky scholarship will be familiar. Second, although some essays in the earlier collection are suitable for the musically educated non-

specialist, the *Companion* appears to be geared deliberately for this audience.

This assessment is in line with the goals stated in the 2003 brochure for The Cambridge Companions to Music, which notes that this series provides "clear and accessible information . . . written with the student, the performer and the music lover in mind." This claim holds true for many of the essays in the 327-page *Companion to Stravinsky*. To be sure, the level of difficulty is uneven, so that while some chapters are ideal for the intended audience, others require more advanced backgrounds or substantial patience with knotty prose; on the whole, however, the volume provides a thoughtful and informative introduction to the field of Stravinsky studies. Its copious endnotes allow the chapters to serve effectively as jumping-off points for those wishing to pursue a topic further. This feature and the volume's breadth, quality of scholarship, and overall accessibility make it particularly fitting for use in teaching.

The book comprises three parts: "Origins and contexts" (Chapters 1–3), "The works" (Chapters 4–8), and "Reception" (Chapters 9–14). In addition to the essays, the volume features a helpful chronology of Stravinsky's life and works by Anthony Gritten (ix–xiii) and a chronological list of works (285–290). The former would be more useful if it included an explanation of "[OS]," the abbreviation for the Old Style (Russian) dating system that Gritten uses for dates preceding 1909.²

Part I begins with Rosamund Bartlett's readable "Stravinsky's Russian Origins." The essay, relying heavily on Taruskin's work (1996), provides an effective summary of the Russian historical and cultural environment into which Stravinsky was born and came of age. In chapter 2, "Stravinsky as Modernist," Christopher Butler characterizes Stravinsky's modernism by placing him in a context for music, art, and literature. Butler's argument contains interesting descriptions and ideas, but his discussions of Stravinsky's

1 *Stravinsky Retrospectives* (Haimo and Johnson 1987), a smaller and more narrowly based collection, was published shortly afterward.

2 For a succinct explanation of Old Style dating, see Walsh 1999, 539.

music are marred by numerous vague statements; for example, in writing about Stravinsky's innovative treatment of rhythm in *The Rite of Spring*, Butler declares, "dissonance for once does not rob music of movement" (24). What this statement means is unclear, since in its traditional tonal role, dissonance actually furthers movement.

In his thoughtful examination of "Stravinsky in Context" (Chapter 3), Arnold Whittall challenges Taruskin's evaluation of Stravinsky's role as "the very stem" of twentieth-century concert music (Taruskin 1996, 1675). Whittall sees Stravinsky instead as one significant legacy among several, and he argues that his individuality is enhanced when considered in relation not only to his Russian past but also to the tradition established by his Austro-German contemporaries. In particular, he proposes as a fruitful analytical path that scholars consider dialogues between Stravinsky and other major composers on shared topics and generic associations (56). Whittall's demonstration of this approach examines how Stravinsky and his Austro-German contemporaries express "archetypal emotional states such as loss and regret" (39). He finds that, despite stylistic differences, their technical means are similar.

For instance, Whittall asserts that the endings of both Stravinsky's *Oedipus Rex* and Berg's *Wozzeck* evoke the "tragic vulnerability of innocent optimism," and that both works rely upon the effect of ostinato to convey this affect (46). He invokes Michael Cherlin's writings on Schoenberg and his use of opposing elements to intensify meaning. Whittall then shows how this technique is equally characteristic of Stravinsky, offering two examples of this technique from the end of the "Apothéose" of *Apollon musagète* (49). Here, the polarity of centric pitch classes D and B, along with the interaction and separation of textural strata, evokes vulnerability and loss (50–51). More specifically, Whittall holds responsible for the passage's expressive power "the contrast between the 'mechanistic' ostinatos of the lower strata and the fined-down lyrical melody of the upper stratum" (51). If the upper stratum is viewed in a somewhat dif-

ferent manner, however, even more conflict arises. One can understand the upper stratum to be as mechanistic as the two lower strata: all three layers begin with patterns that lengthen, albeit at different rates, as they repeat over the course of the ending bars. Nonetheless, the pattern of the upper stratum is the most lyrical, because of its dotted rhythms—in contrast to the patterns of equal durations in the other strata—combined with the poignant, descending leap of a major seventh. Thus, the upper stratum on its own embodies the conflict between the lyrical and the mechanistic, expressing a kind of caged lyricism that enhances the tragic affect of the passage.

Part II, "The Works," comprises four chapters that span Stravinsky's output from his early through his serial works and one essay on the composer's compositions for theater. Anthony Pople's interesting and readable "Early Stravinsky" (Chapter 4) contemplates the challenges of evaluating in hindsight a composer's earliest works, in this case primarily student compositions through *The Firebird*. He assesses and explains characteristics of these works, their compositional influences, and the emergence of Stravinsky's own voice in them. Pople's discussion of the social, musical, and historical contexts summarizes pertinent sections of Taruskin's *Stravinsky and the Russian Traditions* (1996) concisely and effectively.

Kenneth Gloag's "Russian Rites: *Petrushka*, *The Rite of Spring* and *Les Noces*" (Chapter 5) is particularly rich in ideas and observations that would convert easily into topics for discussion in an analysis course. Because of the clarity of Gloag's prose, this essay is accessible for students as well as seasoned scholars. The point of the chapter is to investigate, in the three works named in the chapter's title, "the expression of Stravinsky's Russian inheritance within the context of modernism" (79). Gloag begins his discussion of *Petrushka* with examination of features of the work's opening that he defines as "paradigmatic for the work as a whole" and "modernist" in their nature and behavior: techniques of juxtaposition, emphasis on particular pitches as a substitute for tonal

function, and the remaking of historical materials (81). He notes that because of these modernist features, the coherence and continuity of *Petrushka* are at issue (86). Gloag only hints at a resolution to this significant point; the lacuna is an open invitation for investigation and debate.

Gloag sees *The Rite of Spring* as taking the “preference of the discontinuous over the continuous to a new extreme” (88). Particularly intriguing in his explanation of the work’s essential discontinuity is his criticism of what might be judged compositional miscalculations. For example, he notes that while the transitional passage at figure 12, at the end of the “Introduction” to Part One, is certainly successful in anticipating what is to follow, this increased continuity undercuts the immediate impact of the following section, “The Augurs of Spring” (88). Perhaps the most insightful criticism—also potential fodder for classroom debate—is stated at the end of his discussion of the difficulty of creating satisfactory closure in an environment of intense juxtaposition and discontinuity. He offers as an example the work’s ending, which he finds arbitrary and thus unsatisfactory (90).

An important issue that is not raised in this chapter is the relationship of the musical discontinuities of these works to their programmatic content and compositional histories. In her essay in *Confronting Stravinsky*, Jann Pasler suggests that some of Stravinsky’s compositional innovations in *Petrushka* and *The Rite of Spring*, including the discontinuity and juxtaposition discussed by Gloag, resulted from Stravinsky’s desire to reflect the stage action musically and from his collaboration with other artists (1986b, *passim*). She also credits this situation with the emergence of another technique also mentioned by Gloag (84, 89), a procedure in which fragments of a longer melody appear before the entire melody is heard (1986b, 64–65).

Gloag’s essay ends with a short commentary on *Les Noces*, apparently misinterpreting Taruskin’s analysis of the work. Gloag comments that much of the ballet’s musical material was derived from Russian folk sources (94) and cites

Taruskin’s Table 4 (Appendix) in *Stravinsky and the Russian Traditions* as a summary of the sources (298, n30). On the contrary, Taruskin asserts that by the time he composed *Les Noces*, Stravinsky had absorbed the essential elements of Russian folk music so thoroughly that he no longer needed ethnographic sources for them (1996, 1370) and notes only two known instances of melodic borrowing in the work (1996, 1372). Taruskin’s Table 4 actually provides sources for texts (1996, 1423–40).

In “Stravinsky’s Neoclassicism” (Chapter 6), Martha Hyde offers a theory of imitation for the composer’s neoclassical works. Her theory involves four strategies of imitation used by Stravinsky, each of which is a different way of controlling anachronism, the “contrast or clash of period styles or historical aesthetics” (100). Writing in a clear and sophisticated manner, Hyde illustrates the strategies with persuasive, detailed analyses of excerpts from *Octet*, *Mavra*, *The Fairy’s Kiss*, *Symphony in C*, and *The Rake’s Progress*.³ In fact, the effectiveness of presentation is such that the essay, by far the longest in the volume, could have been shortened by at least a quarter of its length without sacrificing its impact.

An especially exciting discussion focuses on *The Rake’s Progress* as an example of “dialectical imitation,” which presents an “aggressive dialogue between a piece and its model” (122). Her approach yields profound results when it views Goethe’s *Faust* as a model for *The Rake*. In focusing on the question of Tom’s redemption at the end of the opera, Hyde notes that his descent into madness, in deviating from the narrative of the model, attains special significance. It might be possible to view this deviation, too, as a variant of the opposing forces that create meaning in Stravinsky’s music, as discussed earlier by Whittall (Chapter 3). Certainly, aware-

3 Example 6.3 (106), showing the opening of Variation E from the *Octet*, erroneously assigns the top part to clarinet in Eb, rather than to clarinet in Bb.

ness of the model heightens the sense of loss achieved by the opera's close.

Hyde's theory of imitation is a potentially illuminating approach to Stravinsky's neoclassical works. Further applications of the theory might well produce an overview that includes information on the relative prevalence of each type of imitation, which would place Hyde's chosen passages in a richer context. For instance, the essay's example for "heuristic imitation," which "advertises its dependence on an earlier model, but in a way that forces us to recognize the disparity, the anachronism, of the connection being made" (114), is the first movement of the *Symphony in C*, by now such an analytical warhorse for sonata form in neoclassical Stravinsky that it is impossible to extrapolate from its appearance here how commonly this type of imitation occurs.⁴

In his thoughtful essay, "Stravinsky's Theatres" (Chapter 7), Jonathan Cross contemplates Stravinsky's works for theater as being either "rough" or "holy," terms borrowed from the innovative English theatrical director Peter Brook (139). Both types may contain aspects of ritual (140), which often figure in another Stravinskian theatrical hallmark, the distancing of the audience from the work (143*ff.*). Cross notes that many of the defining characteristics of Stravinsky's music, among them repeating rhythms, ostinatos, and non-developmental structures, are particularly well suited to the presentation of ritual (140). In light of recent scholarship on Stravinsky and his Russian origins (e.g., Taruskin 1996), one might ask whether his familiarity with particular rituals may have actually inspired the development of these musical features.

Joseph Straus offers in "Stravinsky the Serialist" (Chapter 8) an effectively structured and highly informative synopsis of Stravinsky's serial techniques and works. Straus explains

terms and concepts with his usual clarity; even so, because of the unavoidably technical nature of the subject matter, this essay is best suited to readers who are at least minimally versed in the procedures of classic serialism. The chapter will provide those readers with an excellent introduction to Stravinsky's idiosyncratic serial methods.

After providing a historical context for Stravinsky's serialism, the chapter concentrates upon technical aspects of his late music. Straus divides the works into five stylistic categories, based upon pitch collection and compositional techniques that reveal a rough "evolutionary chronology" (156). He supports this view with detailed discussions of one or more well-chosen musical passages for each category. He interprets his observations as evidence of Stravinsky's compositional thinking and highlights the various devices that make Stravinsky's approach to serialism so distinctive. Straus's discussion of the famed rotational arrays is especially rich in astute and useful explanations of significant features. Analyses in the second and third stylistic categories (diatonic serialism and non-diatonic serialism) are enhanced with commentary on compositional sketches suggestive of the composer's creative process. Particularly insightful comments regarding the third, fourth (twelve-note serialism), and fifth (twelve-note serialism based on rotational arrays) stylistic categories explicate Stravinsky's ingenious methods for achieving more control over the vertical aspect of serialism. Indeed, in his book on Stravinsky's late music, some of which is summarized in this chapter, Straus understands the development of that music as arising in part from the composer's attempts to confront the problems inherent in writing serial harmony (2001, 141).

Part III ("Reception") embraces a particularly varied and intriguing array of topics. Nicholas Cook's engaging essay, "Stravinsky Conducts Stravinsky," probes the relationship between Stravinsky's pronouncements about the performance of his works and the recorded evidence of his own performances as conductor. This chapter is ideal for the intended audience

4 In an earlier article on imitation in neoclassical music, Hyde offers a more detailed explanation of her theory and applies three of the categories of imitation (including heuristic imitation) to works by composers other than Stravinsky (Hyde 1996).

of a book in The Cambridge Companion series: it investigates important and sophisticated questions, yet remains highly accessible because of an engaging writing style and a minimum of technical terminology.

Cook begins by discussing Stravinsky's motivations for conducting his own works for recording. These include his much publicized dislike of conductors and performers (178) and, as a corollary, a desire to clarify his compositional intentions (179). It is in relation to the latter, and to Stravinsky's well-known philosophy of objectivity in performance, that Cook tests Stravinsky's recordings of *The Firebird* and *The Rite of Spring* for their adherence to the scores. Acknowledging that many factors affect performance, Cook chooses tempo, and measures the tempos of passages in Stravinsky's multiple performances of the works, comparing these to the tempos marked in the scores. Cook's graph of tempos in three different performances of "The princesses' *khorovod*" of *The Firebird* reveals consistency over almost 40 years (186). In contrast, his graph of tempos of three difference performances, spanning nearly 30 years, of selected points in *The Rite of Spring*, demonstrates increasing divergence from those indicated in the score (188).

Cook enriches his findings with commentary on the reception of Stravinsky's recordings and a detailed history of Stravinsky's views of performance. The latter discussion, incorporating numerous statements by the composer, reveals a change in philosophy: Stravinsky's earlier concept of objective performance and its prohibition against interpretation becomes, over time, more flexible and sensitive to style and circumstances. Cook effectively presents a picture of a composer proclaiming, then later reevaluating, his own truths. He notes in closing that Stravinsky's actions as a conductor often did not conform to his pronouncements about performance, but "what is perhaps surprising is the extent to which, though Stravinsky did not do what he said, others did" (191). In this light, he remarks on the influence of Stravinsky's glorification of objective performance on performance practice in general, and on the performance of early music in particular.

In "Adorno's Three Critiques" (Chapter 10), Max Paddison tackles the challenge of explicating the philosopher's views of Stravinsky's music. Paddison places the notorious 1949 critique in *Philosophie der neuen Musik* in the context of two other critiques of Stravinsky's music, one earlier (from 1928 and 1932) and one later (from 1962). Paddison looks beyond music to provide a context for Adorno's writings, proposing the influence of German literary tradition on his rhetorical style and the effect of Samuel Beckett on his philosophical outlook.

In presenting summaries of the three critiques, Paddison reveals both continuities and changes in Adorno's judgments of Stravinsky's music, and of Stravinsky's music in relation to Schoenberg's. Paddison's concise and elegant explanations conduct the reader smoothly through the twists and turns of an often abstract and difficult subject.

In "Stravinsky in Analysis: The Anglophone Traditions" (Chapter 11), Craig Ayrey demonstrates a broad knowledge of the aforementioned analytical trends and places them in historical context. He discusses Stravinsky's philosophy of objectivity, introduced earlier in Cook's essay (Chapter 9), and proposes that it and other of Stravinsky's pre-1945 philosophical declarations influenced the positivist post-war style of analysis of his music (204). In turn, Ayrey suggests, the formalist analytical approaches encouraged Stravinsky's revisions of the compositional histories of certain earlier works (204). Ayrey discusses three seminal essays from the 1960s that "established the formalist mode of Stravinsky analysis"—Arthur Berger on pitch, Edward T. Cone on form, and Pierre Boulez (in translation) on rhythm—and then extends this discussion to include encompass relevant work by other prominent analysts (204).⁵ He notes that

5 Berger 1963, Cone 1962, Boulez 1968/1953. Boulez's essay was first published in French in 1953. The first English translation, listed in the bibliography for this review, was published in 1968. In his endnotes, Ayrey mentions the year of the first English translation, but provides a complete citation instead for the 1991 translation.

Taruskin's findings about Stravinsky's Russian traditions support the roles, although not the origins, of the octatonicism asserted by Berger, and later by van den Toorn (1983), and the formal procedure described by Cone (207). Later in the chapter, Ayrey evaluates the analytic trends focusing on pitch centers and voice leading, including extensions of Schenkerian techniques.

In general, Ayrey demonstrates a solid understanding of the analytical literature he discusses, makes interesting observations, and uncovers relationships among analytical traditions. Nonetheless, serious problems mar his efforts. His study assumes knowledge of concepts and technical procedures beyond the grasp of the intended audience for *The Cambridge Companion* series. Furthermore, his writing style is complex and sometimes confusing, as is the organization of the chapter. In addition to his exposition of the analytical literature on Stravinsky, which occupies approximately ten pages of this twenty-seven-page essay, Ayrey includes his own analysis of *Lacrimosa* from Stravinsky's *Requiem Canticles*, the text and examples for which fill the remaining seventeen pages. The analysis initially arises from a reference to rotation, "Stravinsky's transcendent principle" (208). Although rotation is significant in both the formal and pitch structures of *Lacrimosa*, this observation does not justify the lengthy and extremely detailed analysis—nor is other justification provided. Moreover, the writing in the analysis is particularly dense, making it especially unfriendly to non-specialists.

Exacerbating these challenges for readers are errors in the analysis of pitch. Example 11.2 (219) attempts to summarize the content and structure of the verticals from the hexachordal arrays derived from row form IR. The right side of the example, displaying verticals from the array based on the first hexachord, contains errors in the pitch content of the second, fourth, and sixth verticals (Va 2, 4, and 6). This occurs because the lower staff requires treble clef for these sonorities, rather than the bass clef shown. Unfortunately, Ayrey incorporates the incorrect pitches into his set-class labeling of the verticals, which renders his conclusions about

the structural relationships among these verticals unreliable and the discussion on pages 219–220 particularly troublesome to follow.⁶

Despite problems within the analysis of *Lacrimosa*, Ayrey does make some valuable points about the work; his discussion of the significance of G in the movement, for example, is especially enlightening. These observations would have been yet more potent had he included an explanation of notational conventions used in his intricate "voice-leading" graph, Example 11.1 (214–217), especially if they are not intended to convey traditional functions. Furthermore, a consideration of the relationship between the music and the text beyond the larger formal picture would have enhanced some of his analytical findings. For instance, Ayrey's commentary on the return of G in multiple octaves in m. 243, the approximate center of the movement (244), might have noted that this important moment immediately follows the words "*resurget ex favilla*."⁷

Stuart Campbell's readable and well-balanced overview of critics' reactions to Stravinsky's music in "Stravinsky and the Critics" (Chapter 12) compares ideas from both chronological and geographical viewpoints, with the latter including synopses of criticism from Russia, France, England, Germany, and the United States. Among many well-chosen quotations are those showcasing reactions to *The Rite of Spring* and the composer's adoption of neoclassicism, as well as those comparing Schoenberg and Stravinsky. Campbell's commentary explains the significance of the critics' comments and provides perspective on their biases. This informative and intelligently written introduction to Stravinsky reception will increase awareness of the role of cultural differences and temporal proximity in music criticism.

- 6 Ayrey characterizes the overall structure of the sets of Va as "progressive," presumably since the last set class differs from the first, as he analyzes them (219). As Straus notes (169–170 and 2001, 154), the sequence of set classes in this type of rotational array is always palindromic.
- 7 In the discussion of this return of G, the measure number reads incorrectly as 234, rather than 243 (224).

“Composing with Stravinsky” (Chapter 13), featuring Dutch composer and Stravinsky scholar Louis Andriessen in conversation with the volume’s editor Jonathan Cross, makes a unique contribution to the *Companion* by examining Stravinsky’s influence on recent composition. Cross sets the scene for the conversation with a brief summary of important Stravinskian compositional trademarks—rhythmic energy and innovation, block formal structures, a sense of ritual, and a breakdown of barriers between popular and art music—punctuated by references to composers in whose music he perceives these same techniques (248–251). In the conversation, Andriessen addresses the compositional techniques named by Cross and adds to them, also expanding the list of composers whose music carries the marks of Stravinsky’s legacy. Andriessen’s comments on these and other topics include insights worthy of further investigation; for example, in expounding upon his claim that *The Rite of Spring* is “a key work for the twenty-first century,” he asserts that it is not the work’s treatment of rhythm that will be influential, but rather “the magical combination of diatonic melodic material and chromatic harmonic material” (254). With its relaxed and more personal tone, this witty chapter is perhaps the most entertaining in the volume.

In the book’s final chapter, “Stravinsky and Us,” Richard Taruskin challenges readers with a significant ethical and artistic problem that centers on an anti-Semitic text in Stravinsky’s *Cantata* (1952). He lays the groundwork for presentation of the problem with an evaluation of Stravinsky’s stature and the set of myths that overall constitute the received view of him. Much of this material will be familiar to those who have read Taruskin’s other writings on the composer. Those unfamiliar with Taruskin’s prior work will likely find this informative and opinionated exposition accessible, stimulating, and even eye-opening. Taruskin defines the myths and their sources, presents evidence that deflates them, and then offers new understandings. He assesses the costs of our belief in these myths, particularly the myths of objectivity and absolute music.

These costs feature prominently in a detailed discussion of the widely known and much analyzed second “Ricercar” of Stravinsky’s *Cantata*. It is the text of this movement, by an anonymous English poet, that contains highly offensive references to Jews, and thus it lies at the heart of the aforementioned dilemma. In his argument, Taruskin assumes Stravinsky’s anti-Semitism; what concerns him here is the “blindness to its presence” exhibited by us performers and commentators (278). As evidence, he names numerous music scholars who have discussed the piece in print but not mentioned this glaring aspect of the text. He asserts that the Stravinskian myth of absolute music, which promotes consideration of a work in ignorance of its extra-musical meaning, encourages such blindness. Taruskin wonders whether we grant special dispensation for moral indifference to artists, especially to those of significant artistic stature (283).

Thus, the dilemma: if blindness to the text is not a moral option, what constitutes an appropriate response to it by performers and scholars? Taruskin contemplates as a solution altering the text to remove the derogatory verses but predicts that such an action would offend contemporary performers, who feel an obligation to fulfill the composer’s intentions as transmitted through the score (282). This “most fundamental obligation of ‘classical music’” derives at least in part from the Stravinsky-fostered myth of objective performance, discussed here by Taruskin (282) and earlier by Cook (Chapter 9). What is more important, then, the artistic or the ethical, and what is our role when they are seen as being in conflict?

This question does not confine itself to the “Ricercar.” “A Narrative: The Stoning of St. Stephen,” the second movement of *A Sermon, a Narrative and a Prayer* (1960–61), contains a similarly disturbing portrayal of Jews that spans seventy measures of music (although what might be considered the most offensive lines in the passages from the New Testament were not chosen for the musical setting). For the racial and gender stereotyping exhibited by the Moor and the Ballerina in the much earlier *Petrushka* (1912), one might consider excusing Stravinsky on grounds of youth and

cultural origins, but these same excuses cannot be made for him in regard to the much later serial works written when he lived in the United States. Taruskin does not propose a definitive solution to the performance of the “Ricercar”—and there probably is no perfect answer to the problem he describes—but does urge that no matter what tack is taken, performers and scholars acknowledge the problem of the text and its implications.

Among readers of this journal, those who are not specialists in Stravinsky studies but nonetheless find themselves in the position of teaching a course involving Stravinsky’s music would likely find the *Companion* a helpful starting point and a source for assigned readings as well. Serving as the frosting on the cake are the threads that link some of the chapters. *The Rite of Spring*, for example, is viewed from different vantage points. Stravinsky’s philosophy of objectivity, the relationship between Schoenberg and Stravinsky, and Stravinsky’s influence on performance practice are addressed in multiple essays. In addition, several authors observe Stravinsky’s borrowings from music of the past and assess the nature of tonality in the works.

A recurring feature of the book that is less welcome, however, is the inappropriate summoning of compositional intention. Although the invocation of intention may seem to add to the persuasiveness of an argument, it is typically unfounded. A related issue is the insufficient attention paid in this volume to Stravinsky’s creative process; this burgeoning field of inquiry has become particularly active during the last two decades as access to the composer’s manuscript materials has increased. Moreover, the concept of creative process often arouses the curiosity of non-specialist music lovers. Discussions in the chapters by Straus and Taruskin hint at the riches of this area; these scholars are among many who have published in this field.⁸ Another important topic that

lacks adequate representation in *The Companion* is Stravinsky’s involvement with ballet. Although it resulted in some of his most important works and working relationships, dance receives only occasional, brief acknowledgements when the music of these works is discussed in the volume.⁹ Nevertheless, these criticisms do not undermine *The Companion*’s value as a thoughtfully organized and engaging introduction to a wide spectrum of topics and approaches in Stravinsky studies.

REFERENCES

- Berger, Arthur. 1963. “Problems of Pitch Organization in Stravinsky.” *Perspectives of New Music* 2.1: 11–42. Reprinted in Boretz and Cone 1968, 123–54.
- Boretz, Benjamin and Edward T. Cone, editors. 1968. *Perspectives on Schoenberg and Stravinsky*. Princeton: Princeton University Press.
- Boulez, Pierre. 1968/1953. “Stravinsky Remains.” In *Notes of an Apprenticeship*, translated by Herbert Weinstock, 72–145. New York: Alfred A. Knopf. Originally published as “Stravinsky demeure.” In *Musique russe*, edited by Pierre Souvchinsky, 151–224. Paris: Presses Universitaires de France.
- Carr, Maureen A. 2002. *Multiple Masks: Neoclassicism in Stravinsky’s Works on Greek Subjects*. Lincoln: University of Nebraska Press.
- Cone, Edward. 1962. “Stravinsky: The Progress of a Method.” *Perspectives of New Music* 1.1: 18–26. Reprinted in Boretz and Cone 1968, 155–164.
- Haimo, Ethan and Paul Johnson, editors 1987. *Stravinsky Retrospectives*. Lincoln: University of Nebraska Press.
- Horlacher, Gretchen. 2001. “Running in Place: Sketches and Superimposition in Stravinsky’s Music.” *Music Theory Spectrum* 23.2: 196–216.

8 Just a few of the publications that include investigations of Stravinsky’s compositional procedures are Carr 2002, Horlacher 2001, Smyth 2000, Straus 2001, Taruskin 1996, and van den Toorn 1987.

9 Readers interested in Stravinsky and dance may wish to consult publications such as Joseph 2002 and Jordan 2002.

- Hyde, Martha 1996. "Neoclassic and Anachronistic Impulses in Twentieth-Century Music." *Music Theory Spectrum* 18.2: 200–235.
- Jordan, Stephanie. 2002. *Music Dances: Balanchine Choreographs Stravinsky* (videotape). New York: George Balanchine Foundation.
- Joseph, Charles M. 2002. *Stravinsky and Balanchine: A Journey of Invention*. New Haven: Yale University Press.
- Pasler, Jann, editor 1986a. *Confronting Stravinsky: Man, Musician, and Modernist*. Berkeley and Los Angeles: University of California Press.
- . 1986b. "Music and Spectacle in *Petrushka* and *The Rite of Spring*." In Pasler 1986a, 53–81.
- Smyth, David. 2000. "Stravinsky as Serialist: The Sketches for *Threni*." *Music Theory Spectrum* 22.2: 204–24.
- Straus, Joseph. 2001. *Stravinsky's Late Music*. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press.
- Taruskin, Richard. 1996. *Stravinsky and the Russian Traditions: A Biography of the Works through Mavra*. Berkeley and Los Angeles: University of California Press.
- van den Toorn, Pieter C. 1983. *The Music of Igor Stravinsky*. New Haven: Yale University Press.
- . 1987. *Stravinsky and The Rite of Spring: The Beginnings of a Musical Language*. Berkeley and Los Angeles: University of California Press.
- Walsh, Stephen. 1999. *Stravinsky: A Creative Spring*. New York: Alfred A. Knopf.